CHAPTER 1: The Long View

I. Transportation Shapes the City

The transportation system of the District today is inherited from decisions made decades and centuries ago. The vision for transportation in the District contained within the moveDC Plan and the decisions on transportation that will be made in the years to come will influence the city for generations, much like those of the past have contributed to the city of today. Reviewing the history of the city and how it has been shaped by the transportation system is essential to understand how transportation will continue to influence where we live, work, shop, go to school, and make daily decisions about how to get around.
II. History of the City

In transportation, like many other things, the future is built on the shoulders of the past. Transportation’s influence in shaping the city has changed considerably over time. The following sections briefly summarize past transportation influences in the District.

A. PAST AS PROLOGUE

Like virtually every other human settlement, Washington, D.C., grew up around transportation systems. In 1790, the District of Columbia was created to be the capital of the fledgling United States of America. Georgetown, Alexandria, and Bladensburg were already settled along banks of the Anacostia and Potomac Rivers, but much of the new capital was a blank slate.

Pierre L’Enfant was commissioned to lay out the capital city in 1791. His design created the layout of the City of Washington, which still provides the foundation for the overlapping system of a connected street grid and diagonal axes with grand vistas and open spaces. The presence of the L’Enfant Plan on the National Register of Historic Places is a testament to the enduring value of this original structure of the city.

For more than 100 years, transportation access in the District was by horse or on foot, shaping the city through the construction of footpaths and carriage houses, and also presenting public health and sanitation challenges in the streets. As the capital and the nation grew, settlements extended outward along a series of country roads that led to farmland and country estates. At the turn of the 20th century, developers established numerous independent subdivisions that capitalized on the city’s growing population and increased transportation capabilities—from railroads to the first streetcar lines.

From the first electric streetcar launch in Eckington in 1888 to the completion of Union Station in 1908, rail was the cornerstone of mobility for the city in the early 20th century. Streetcar lines reached out to Brookland and Anacostia and ran up Connecticut Avenue to the bucolic country estates in Chevy Chase, creating nodes of activity along their length. Many of these original streetcar routes are still in service as today’s Metrobus lines.

Seeing the rising positive and negative impact—pedestrian safety, noise, and soot (of coal-powered engines)—of railroads and the expanding growth of the city, the McMillan Commission made a bold proposition to create a modern and elegant multimodal hub for the Capital, while forming or preserving the prized major parks the District enjoys today. As the plan moved to implementation, the tangle of existing rail lines was relocated from the Potomac River plain to clear the way for the National Mall.

The early 1900s were a time of rapid growth and change for the city. The population increased by more than 50 percent in the first 20 years of the new century—rising from 278,000 people in 1900 to more than 437,000 people in 1920. By 1940, the District’s population reached more than 660,000.

Fueled by the easy access offered by the expanding streetcar network, urban neighborhoods sprang up on formerly rural lands. Housing development boomed in Pleasant Plains; on Barry’s Farm, the original homes of what is now Barry Farm

---

grew; and Swampoodle’s shantytowns (now NoMa) gave way to both industries and the Uline Arena, bringing the likes of Joe Louis, Malcolm X, and, of course, The Beatles to Tiber Creek’s former floodplain.2

Another stone was soon laid that would have as much impact on the future of the city as the McMillan Plan of just a decade before. The laying of the “Zero Milestone” just south of the White House in 1919 marked the beginning of the era of the auto.3

D.C. planners of the early twentieth century saw automobiles as the solution to their urban mobility problems. They didn’t contribute to public health issues like horses and weren’t on fixed routes like the streetcars.

As more cars entered the city, they took up more space—moving and parked. A 1946 article in The Rotarian highlighted parking and transportation challenges, which were not unlike those experienced in the city today. Transportation officials struggled with the trade-offs between meeting the demand for parking and driving with historic preservation and maintaining parks and open space. In many cases, they decided to accommodate the growing demands of the automobile.

Post World War II, cars fast became affordable to everyday people. They appeared to be the perfect solution to serve the mobility needs of a city that expanded far beyond the original Boundary Street (now Florida Avenue). As the auto era dawned, the streetcar age waned. More and more lines changed from trolley to bus service until the last streetcar exited the city in 1962.

In 1956, ten years after World War II ended and the population of the District peaked, two plans were released to deal with the increasing demands for auto movement and storage. A proposed freeway plan and a new zoning ordinance both shaped the future of the District and region.

The same year, based on the belief that accommodating the demands of auto mobility was a prerequisite to a successful city, Harold Lewis published the Lewis Plan of 1956, which recommended a major zoning overhaul for the District of Columbia. Among other things, the Lewis Plan proposed strict requirements for substantial parking in new developments. The Zoning Ordinance of 1958 adopted most of of the Lewis Plan’s recommendations and is still largely the foundation for zoning in the District of Columbia.

While the L’Enfant Plan emphasized a grid of streets capable of sharing the traffic loads, planner Harland Bartholomew proposed the freeway plan for the Washington region that was a dramatic departure from the traditional city. Bartholomew’s Plan channeled auto movement onto a limited network including three circumferential freeways. Bartholomew believed that they would help cluster new development in efficient ways as a means to both contain and strengthen the growing city.4

Many people were not in agreement with the freeway plan—least of all those people who lived in one of the 200,000 housing units in the region standing in the way of automotive progress, many of them African American.5 While many Washingtonians are familiar with the Building Height Act of 1910, few know about what amounted to the Roadway Width Act of 1893. That law stated that “no highway right-of-way in the city could be wider than 160 feet (with width of Pennsylvania Avenue).6 The eight- and 10-lane planned freeways vastly exceeded the comparatively diminutive 160-foot monumental boulevard and, thus, several freeways were stopped by court order.

---

2 www.voices.washingtonpost.com/rawfisher/2006/11/saved_dcs_beatles_connection.html
3 www.fhwa.dot.gov/infrastructure/zero.cfm
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B. THE MODERN CITY

Surface and Underground Transit

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) emerged as the regional transit agency in 1967, amid the discussion of a freeway plan for the Washington region. The authority was created by an interstate compact, ultimately approved by Congress. After the WMATA Compact was approved by the Maryland General Assembly in 1965, and passed through the Virginia General Assembly and Congress in 1966, WMATA was founded on February 20, 1967. Among its first acts, WMATA laid out the first plan for a regional subway system in 1967 and began a process of consolidation of regional bus lines from private operators.

Ultimately, the battle over planned freeway expansions ended in a compromise. Some sections of the planned system were built; however, many more were not. Meanwhile, $5 billion of planned highway funds went to create what is now a world-class subway system—Metrorail—though ultimately along alignments slightly different from the original concept.

WMATA broke ground for the first of its Metrorail lines in 1969. The first line in the system—Red Line—opened March 27, 1976. This line connected Dupont Circle to Rhode Island Avenue. The 103 miles (166 km) of the original 83-station system were completed on January 13, 2001, with the opening of the Green Line’s segment from Anacostia to Branch Avenue.

While WMATA’s original compact provided plans for regional rail service, transportation demands were growing, and the need for reliable bus service to connect riders to destinations, and to future rail stations, became evident. In response, WMATA acquired four area bus systems in 1973 and consolidated them into the Metrosbus system with a unified red, white, and blue brand. Metrosbus served as the exclusive source of public transit in the District until Metrorail service began operation in 1976.

Biking, Walking, Buses, and Streetcars

The last decade has seen an increase in interest and investment in popular early forms of travel—walking, bicycling, and transit. The first bike lanes in the city were installed in 2000 and in little more than a decade the network has grown exponentially to more than 50 miles. Meanwhile, sidewalks have been improved or built anew in many parts of the District.

The District also has led the way for American bike sharing by launching its first system—SmartBike—in 2008. That system laid the foundation for the successful launch of Capital Bikeshare (CaBi) in 2010, which is the nation’s second largest system (as of January 2014).

These investments have led to some of the highest rates of walking and biking for transportation of any city in the United States. As of 2012, approximately 12 percent of District residents (39,000 people) walked to work and four percent (13,500 people) biked to work each day.

Recognizing the need for additional transit service, the District launched its own branded bus service—Circulator—in 2005. Circulator continues to expand, adding new routes to the initial system. This popular new alternative now has grown to five routes carrying more than 16,000 riders every weekday.

In 2014, further expanding transit options, the District’s modern streetcars will reenter public service in the District for the first time since 1962. The modern streetcar is making a comeback in D.C. and several major U.S. cities. Streetcar has demonstrated an ability to provide efficient, high-quality transit and serve as a catalyst for investments in housing, retail and commercial properties. The first line of the D.C. streetcar is along H Street NE. The District has begun procurement of private-sector partners to design, build, operate, and maintain the 22-mile priority streetcar system.
The National Influence

The federal government is inextricably linked to transportation planning, policy, and funding in the District of Columbia. Many major arteries are not directly controlled by the District of Columbia, but by federal agencies. For instance, the grounds around the Capitol are controlled by the Architect of the Capitol and the National Park Service controls roadways in places such as Rock Creek Park. As the capital city, the District’s infrastructure also must accommodate special events, motorcades, and other unique roadway requests.

Planning for the United States Bicentennial Celebration of 1976, coupled with the District’s population declines of the 1960s, ’70s, ’80s, and ’90s, altered the emphasis of policy, planning, services, and infrastructure from a residential focus to a focus on national visitors and suburban commuters.

The threat of global terrorism and increased awareness of homeland security in the late 1990s and early 2000s again altered transportation infrastructure of D.C. Pennsylvania Avenue—a critical east-west connector in downtown—was ordered closed to vehicular traffic by President Clinton in May 1995. After the events of September 11, 2001, sidewalks surrounding many government buildings changed. In the interest of security and hardening perimeters of federal agencies, some street connections have been restricted or closed, altering travel patterns for pedestrians, drivers, and bicyclists.

E Street NW, another important downtown connection through the White House grounds, remains closed across the Ellipse due to concerns about national security. First Street NW/SW and NE/SE around the Capitol have been closed to through-vehicular traffic. Retractable barriers have been installed on Independence and Constitution Avenues to create vehicle checkpoints. Several streets across the District are closed or constrained in their use. While some streets have been restored as security upgrades to buildings and security checkpoints are upgraded, those that remain closed create circulation and planning challenges for all modes of travel.

The federal government also remains an important and large employer and one that supports the multimodal transportation system in the District. Federal transit benefits support the region’s high transit ridership and federal location and parking standards integrate federal agencies with the District’s multimodal transportation improvements. As the federal workforce continues to evolve, maintaining these connections will be important for the District going forward as well.
III. The Way Ahead

The history of transportation in the District has been one of challenges and opportunities. Planners of each era had their own dilemmas to face. City builders of the 1800s faced “manure in the streets, horse carcasses clogging the roads, and frequent biting and trampling.” At the onset of the 1900s, electrification promised new ways to allow people to travel farther faster. At the same time, the proliferation of trolleys troubled planners who saw their tangle of wires as visual pollution.

The 21st century yields rising automobile congestion, rapidly rising travel costs, and concerns about rising carbon emissions. The most recent stand-alone citywide transportation plan—1997 Transportation Plan for the District of Columbia—called for the expansion of multimodal options, many of which have now come to fruition. Since that time, the District has experienced rapid growth and the expansion of multimodal options. The population and employment growth during the past 17 years have strained the transportation system, even as maintenance needs continue to grow.

To meet these and other challenges, the District of Columbia requires strategic investment and a spirit of innovation. moveDC builds from the District’s history to address existing strengths and challenges and outline a path forward for the future.
A. TODAY’S GROWING CITY
After a long period of decreasing population, the District is again growing, having added nearly 30,000 people between 2000 and 2010 and by approximately 1,100 people each month since 2013. Figure 1.1 shows a historic summary of the population of D.C. since 1900.

B. BUILDING FROM THE PRESENT
The District of Columbia’s transportation past is a strong foundation for future investments. The street network is mostly interconnected. Transit is largely clean, comfortable, and convenient. Many parts of the city have a diverse land use mix, which puts many amenities within easy reach of residents. Most residents, workers, and visitors have the option to walk, bike, ride, or drive depending on their needs, moods, and abilities. These factors combine to make the city among the top in the nation in ratings of walkability, bikeability, and transit access. Beyond the summary below, more details on the strengths and weaknesses of each mode are provided in the modal chapters contained within this plan.

Strengths
The city enjoys a community culture that values choice. Residents consistently have supported investments in a diverse transportation system. Although individuals may rely on just a single mode—such as driving—the general city populace has supported investments in facilities, programs, infrastructure, and services for all travel modes.

The transportation system provides choice, convenience, and reliability to support a variety of households and new market activity. The network of redundant routes forming the city’s grid and angled avenues provide flexibility and resiliency as incidents occur or needs and demands change. Figure 1.2 shows recent changes in the way District residents travel to work.

The District’s transportation system also adds to a competitive advantage in attracting and retaining residents, as residents are able to choose how much transportation they need and what they spend on transportation. In the most recent recession,

Figure 1.1: Historic Summary of D.C. Population

Figure 1.2: Work Travel Mode Summary for D.C. Residents, 2000 and 2010

Source: U.S. Census and District of Columbia, Office of Planning
the city grew while other places declined. This is attributable to many things, not the least of which is that its residents, workers, and businesses had the ability to be flexible and adapt to changing economic conditions through their transportation choices.

The streets of the city form a linear park system and the many street trees cool the city and clean its air and water. The District’s active transportation networks—sidewalks, bike lanes, and many trails—offer people opportunities for physical exercise, many times simply through running the errands of daily life. The abundance of non-motorized and transit options reduce the number of auto trips that would otherwise need to be taken. When auto trips are required, the city not only accommodates privately-owned autos but also offers different options for the use of shared autos by the week, day, hour, or minute, depending on the need.

**Challenges**

Transportation in the District is far from perfect, not unlike any other major city. In many cases, past planning has resulted in a handful of streets being called on to simultaneously accommodate vehicular traffic, bicycles, trucks, and transit, meaning that priority for any mode is difficult. At the same time, these streets are evacuation routes and are the planned corridors for economic development. Ultimately, the city’s transportation plan needs to make choices between these demands, while retaining overall choices in mobility.

The physical legacy of the post-WWII era focus on orienting transportation system operations to serve auto-commuter needs is still evident today. Travel from suburb to downtown is frequently quicker and easier than getting from neighborhood to neighborhood within the city.

Many of the District’s streets and transit services experience a significant peak in use during morning and evening rush hours. Despite the generally large size of streets and some major transit infrastructure, when elements of these systems fail, demand overflows onto neighborhood streets and to services not designed to carry peak demand. The overflow creates impacts that affect people’s travel quality and reliability and also residents’ quality of life.

L’Enfant’s plan overlaid a series of diagonal avenues over a regular grid of streets. While his vision was to create important and vibrant civic spaces where these two layers intersected and reduce travel distances between city communities, he also succeeded in creating large, complex, and confounding intersections. These intersections challenge efficient roadway operations and have daunting distances pedestrians must cross.

Early in the city’s history, the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers linked the city to the fledgling nation. Today, these rivers, Rock Creek Park, major natural features, and institutional campuses divide the city and are challenges to connectivity between neighborhoods.

In many locations, the continuous grid laid out by both L’Enfant and McMillan is broken. Among other impacts, missing local street connections can create circuitous travel for people and goods, and isolate neighbors and neighborhoods.

While the city’s pedestrian and bicycle network is expanding, it is still incomplete. Gaps in the sidewalk system force pedestrians—including children, seniors, and the disabled—into the street at some locations. Many bicycle routes are suitable for the sturdy and experienced, but unusable for the young or timid.
In the District, many lower income communities struggle with existing transit fee structures that do not facilitate transfers between bus and rail and charge a higher fee for more efficient services. Low-income travelers who tend to be less able to absorb this additional financial cost often have to make the choice to pay a time penalty and in turn a lower transit fare instead of paying more for a more efficient trip that would save time.

People in areas of the city that have few fresh food options or high performing schools must travel out of their communities to meet these daily needs, sometimes making trips not required in other communities. Shared-vehicle systems like Capital Bikeshare and the many carsharing systems require a credit card in order to join, making them harder to access to those without a bank account or with poor credit.

The District has an aging transportation system. Many streets have not been rebuilt in the past half century and many more are overdue for major maintenance. The Metrorail system and dozens of bridges require major improvements and investment. Traffic signal and lighting systems are in need of modernization. Currently, funding is stretched to ensure a state of good repair for the existing system. Meanwhile, the transportation system needs to grow and change to meet existing and anticipated demand.
IV. Developing a Shared Vision for the Future

Current forecasts for the District—prepared in 2013 by the District of Columbia Office of Planning—suggest that the city will grow to nearly 900,000 people and have more than 1,000,000 jobs by 2040. Meanwhile, the region surrounding the District will grow and change significantly. These forecasts are shown in Table 1.1.

This growth will create more activity in congested areas and bring energy into neighborhoods that could benefit from investment. Meanwhile, the many programs, policies, and services already planned will begin to transform the city’s transportation system, but will not be enough to help the city reach its full potential and preserve and enhance people’s mobility. Without sustained investment in all facets of transportation, the District’s competitiveness could be affected by the inconvenience and economic loss of congestion, lack of sufficient transportation choice, and system reliability. Choosing to not invest in the District’s future is not an option. By the numbers, without sustained investment, the District’s future (2040) transportation system will face:

- **More congestion on District streets.** Vehicular delay would increase by nearly 50 percent from existing (2014) levels. This would translate to longer peak travel periods, more widespread and severe congestion on major roadways, more non-local traffic pressure on neighborhood streets, reduced mobility in growing parts of the city, and more difficult access to the city from the region.
- **Transit crowding and congestion.** Forecasts indicate that transit systems within the District would need to accommodate more than 70,000 additional daily riders and those crossing the border with surrounding jurisdictions would need to carry nearly 130,000 additional daily riders. Metrorail and other critical transit services would struggle to provide a comfortable and reliable travel experience for their users.
- **Unaccommodated bicycle demand.** Forecasts for walking and bicycling indicate that nearly 250,000 more walking and bicycling trips will be made within the District on a daily basis in 2040. An additional 29,000 bike and walk trips will be made between the District and neighboring places. The District has already invested in and continues to invest in a robust pedestrian and bicycle network. Without further investment, opportunity may be lost and many would-be walkers and bicyclists could choose to travel by another, more costly (to the District) travel mode.

Table 1.1: District and Regional Population and Employment Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>602,000</td>
<td>784,000</td>
<td>897,000</td>
<td>1,002,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington metropolitan area</td>
<td>6,626,000</td>
<td>3,993,000</td>
<td>8,661,000</td>
<td>5,618,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: DC – District of Columbia Office of Planning; Region - MWCOG Approved 8.2 Forecasts
A. moveDC
From the beginning of the moveDC planning process, the development of the District’s transportation plan was about more than transportation. The process to develop the moveDC Plan reflects the broader understanding of transportation’s effect on the city and the life of its residents, workers, and visitors. The following briefly summarize the sources of information and process used in the development of moveDC’s vision, goals, and performance measures.

Exchanging Ideas and Inspiration
To expand the conversation about the moveDC Plan and immediately involve the community in its development, moveDC hosted a community event to kick off the planning process on February 9, 2013, at the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Library. The Idea Exchange was attended by more than 300 people who shared ideas, perspectives, wants, needs, hopes, and visions for the future. The outcome of the event provided much of the basis for the initial development of moveDC’s goals and vision, in addition to offering insight into existing issues and future solutions.

Perspectives from city leaders, in combination with participant input at the activities and the panel discussion, were significant and informative. Key themes arising out of the Idea Exchange included:

- Transportation’s broad effect on many facets of life in the District
- The need to make efficient use of existing transportation resources
- Bicycling’s critical role in a complete transportation system
- Critical nature of prioritizing pedestrian accommodation and safety
- The need to balance accommodation of residents and commuters
- moveDC’s critical role in meeting the SustainableDC goal of 75% of work trips by non-auto means
- Challenge for 2013’s transportation system to meet the growing city’s needs
- Difficulty in maintaining affordability as the transportation system matures

Building the Vision
Development of moveDC’s vision continued during the first round of workshops—Ideas that Build—in March and April 2013. During this round of workshops, moveDC’s draft vision became an activity for public input. Figure 1.3 is an image of the many comments people provided on moveDC’s draft vision statement.
Looking Toward Peers

Much like we can learn about how to move forward by studying the lessons of the past and listening to the perspectives of existing residents, workers, and visitors, we can benefit from looking toward peer cities. Washington, D.C. is an international city and world capital. moveDC looked to transportation plans of noteworthy global peers—New York City, New York, USA; London, England; Vancouver, BC, Canada; Stockholm, Sweden; Tokyo, Japan; Copenhagen, Denmark; and Melbourne, Australia; in addition to local and regional plans—for insight on vision and goals.

The moveDC planning process reviewed the transportation and comprehensive plans of New York City, London, and Vancouver in detail. The moveDC planning process also completed a high-level review of planning initiatives in Stockholm, Tokyo, Melbourne, and Copenhagen. The planning team desired to review plans from other major cities such as Paris, France; Berlin, Germany; and Hong Kong; however, English-language versions were not available for review. A brief summary of the substantive findings from these plans is below.

**New York City, New York, USA**
- Passing legislation about the desired outcomes helped to institutionalize planning efforts beyond the then current administration. Legislation was passed to codify PlaNYC goals into the city’s policy.
- Designating funding made for an action-oriented plan: PlaNYC included $199 million for projects in the city’s 2008 budget and $1.6 billion in the 10-year capital plan.
- Quantifying goals, targets, and objectives is critical to measuring, evaluating, and reporting progress.
- Major transportation investments offer opportunities to catalyze private development and improve the viability of commercial real estate.
- Collaborating with a coalition of advocacy organizations helped to push the plan and build support.
- Employing significant travel demand management measures, such as road user charging, influenced mode shift supportive of overall plan goals and targets.
- Providing funding for planning and project implementation in boroughs allowed Transport for London (TfL) to ensure transport facilities and services would be safe, integrated, efficient, economical, and consistent with overall plan goals.

**Vancouver, BC, Canada**
- Using clear indicators to help determine investment priorities provided a data-based backing to communicate the rationale and effectiveness of investments.
- Low-cost pilot projects allowed agencies to test and refine innovative projects and programs before replicating or committing significant resources.
- Events, such as Cyclovia car-free street events, provided short-term opportunities and encouragement for active transportation and mode shift.
- Developing tools, such as a “cycling comfort index” to evaluate Bicycle Level of Service (BLOS), allowed for adjustment to plan priorities and investments.

**London, England**
- A coordinated and integrated planning approach to deliver the Mayor’s Transport Strategy (MTS), London Plan, and Economic Development Plan simultaneously helped move all of the city’s goals together at once.
- Building flexibility into overall strategy allowed boroughs (local units of government) to choose local priorities that fit within the overall strategy.
- Identifying funding for initiatives sped implementation.
Stockholm, Sweden
- Despite an affluent population with a high rate of vehicle ownership, Stockholm has a high mode share for public transit, bicycling, and walking.
- A combination of plans, policies, and projects have led to high-quality transit services; high auto-related taxes and fees, parking charges, and the center city congestion charge combine to make driving costly compared to non-auto modes of transport.

Tokyo, Japan
- Tokyo’s goals and vision includes a combination of policies and recommendations to address disaster resistance, energy efficiency, and international competitiveness.
- Three-year action plans are formulated to ensure the viability of the measures taken to achieve the vision of Tokyo in 2020. The progress and results of the measures are checked regularly, with the plans revised every year to accurately and promptly reflect changes in the social climate.

Melbourne, Australia
- The plan is guided by five principles: a city for people, a creative city, a prosperous city, an eco-city, and a connected city.
- The City of Melbourne took a leadership role in prioritizing pedestrian infrastructure through multiple policies and strategies that encouraged street furniture and art, and required human-scale buildings and frontages.
- Key directions of the plan’s transport strategy included integrating land use and transportation planning, go anywhere, anytime transit, and support for walking and cycling as dominant modes of transport.

Copenhagen, Denmark
- The focus of Eco-Metropolis: Our Vision for Copenhagen 2015 is encapsulated in four main goals: making Copenhagen the world’s best cycling city; making it a “climate capital,” providing an accessible, first-class waterfront and parks; and ensuring a healthy, pleasant environment.
- National spatial planning policies in Copenhagen have encouraged and required mixed-use and dense development near transit; notably requiring that all significant new commercial development be located within a 600-meter walk of a rail station.
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B. MEASURING PERFORMANCE

Performance measurement, how to do it, and what to measure were topics of discussion from the earliest stages of moveDC through its completion. Understanding the complexities of the District’s transportation needs in combination with agency, regulatory, political, and public climates, the moveDC Plan was developed to be defensible and implementable from day one.

Performance criteria were used at different stages of the moveDC planning process, from the development of alternatives and the recommended plan through the implementation strategy. The following briefly summarizes information and sources used in the development of performance measures for moveDC.

United States Department of Transportation
The United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) oversees the implementation of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21), enacted in 2012. MAP-21 is the federal government’s transportation authorization bill and funds surface transportation programs. MAP-21 guides local transportation policy by setting the following performance-based planning factors:

- Support economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency
- Increase the safety of the transportation system for all users
- Increase the ability of the transportation system to support homeland security and to safeguard the personal security of all users
- Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight
- 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
- Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight
- Promote efficient system management and operation
- Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system

Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
The Metropolitan Washington Council of Government’s Transportation Planning Board (MWCOG TPB) is the federally designated metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the region. TPB prepares plans and programs required by the federal government to receive federal-aid transportation funds. TPB’s vision lays out eight broad goals to guide the region’s transportation investments into the 21st century. The Vision was unanimously approved in October 1998 by the TPB after an extensive public outreach effort that lasted three years. The goals outlined in TPB’s vision for the region are:

- Provide reasonable access at reasonable cost to everyone in the region
- Develop, implement, and maintain an interconnected transportation system that enhances quality of life and promotes a strong and growing economy throughout the entire region including a healthy regional core and dynamic regional activity centers with a mix of jobs, housing, and services in a walkable environment
- Give priority to management, performance, maintenance, and safety of all modes and facilities
- Use the best available technology to maximize system effectiveness
- Plan and develop a transportation system that enhances and protects the region’s natural environmental quality, cultural and historic resources, and communities
- Achieve better interjurisdictional coordination of transportation and land use planning
- Achieve an enhanced funding mechanism(s) for regional and local transportation system priorities
that cannot be implemented with existing and forecasted federal, state, and local funding
• Support options for international and interregional travel and commerce

District Plans
The moveDC vision, goals, and performance measures build from District of Columbia agency plans and various D.C. stakeholder plans. They include, but are not limited to:

• 1997 Transportation Plan for the District of Columbia
• District of Columbia Bicycle Master Plan (2005)
• District of Columbia Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital (2006)
• District of Columbia Pedestrian Master Plan (2009)
• D.C.’s Transit Future System Plan (2010)
• NCPC’s Capital Space (2010)
• DDOT’s Action Agenda (2010)
• Office of the Mayor’s 5-Year Economic Development Strategy (2012)
• Office of the Mayor’s One City Action Plan (2012)
• A Vision for a Sustainable D.C. (2012)
• Architect of the Capitol’s Strategic Vision & Five Year Focus (2012)

V. Our Vision and Goals
The moveDC vision and goals set a high bar for the District’s transportation future. The following presents moveDC’s vision and goals. The plan’s performance metrics are summarized in Appendix 1.1.
A. Vision
The District of Columbia will have a world-class transportation system serving the people who live, work, and visit the city. The transportation system will make the city more livable, sustainable, prosperous, and attractive. It will offer everyone in the District exceptional travel choices. As the transportation system evolves over time, the District will:

- Be more competitive and attractive locally, regionally, nationally, and internationally
- Have safer and more vibrant streets and neighborhoods
- Have cleaner air, streams, and rivers, and be more responsive to climate change
- Accommodate the travel needs of all residents, workers, and visitors regardless of age or ability
- Integrate the District’s transportation system with the region’s transportation network

B. GOALS
moveDC’s goals and objectives are derived from existing District plans, including Sustainable D.C. and the Strategic Highway Safety Plan, prior DDOT vision and goal statements, and input from the public during the moveDC process.

→ Sustainability and Health: Achieve 75% of all commute trips in the District by non-auto modes
  - Increase non-auto mode split
  - Increase access to parks and green space
  - Encourage active transportation for health benefits
  - Reduce air and water quality impacts of transportation
  - Prepare the transportation system for changing environmental and climatological conditions
- Increase transportation availability to economically challenged or targeted redevelopment areas

→ Safety and Security: Achieve zero fatalities and serious injuries on the District transportation network
  - Improve safety for all users
  - Improve redundancy of transportation networks to handle emergencies
  - Expand sidewalk network
  - Maintain ability to evacuate the District in case of emergency
  - Preserve security of key functions without impacting the transportation system

→ Citywide Accessibility and Mobility: Maximize system reliability and capacity for moving people and goods
  - Increase the person-carrying capacity of the transportation system
  - Improve system reliability
  - Reduce financial barriers to the lowest-income transportation system users
  - Accommodate the movement and management of freight and goods
  - Integrate the District’s transportation system with the region’s transportation network

→ Public Space: Reinforce Washington, D.C.’s historic landscapes and quality of neighborhood public space
  - Protect and enhance important corridors and urban landscapes
  - Make streets functional, beautiful, and walkable
  - Increase tree coverage

→ Neighborhood Accessibility and Connectivity: Support neighborhood vitality and economic development
  - Increase the coverage of all modal networks throughout the District
  - Increase the number of transportation choices for travel between city neighborhoods
  - Increase transportation availability to population centers and jobs, schools, amenities, and services

→ Preservation: Maximize reliability for all District transportation infrastructure by investing in maintenance and asset management

→ Funding and Financing: Invest in transportation to achieve outcomes within the plan horizon
An investment in the District’s future, the 11th Street Bridge