

Scenario Feedback

May 21, 2019 Workshop

Greater Growth on the Water

Naomi's group:

- Consider retiree growth in this scenario to correspond to increase in tourism
- Make sure that dispersed housing does still include housing on the water, even if it also has dispersed housing elsewhere (participants noted that in their jurisdictions housing on the water is seen as a stronger market than is commercial development)
- Having AV flat in this one compared to AV up in the Greater Suburban/Greenfield Growth scenario is useful because both have dispersed housing and longer trips, but in this one you will not get capacity benefits from AV, while in Greater Suburban/Greenfield Growth you will
- On characterizing greater military growth:
 - This should not be new bases but rather increased utilization at existing bases
 - On explanation for this could be that technology allows for remote operations meaning that military personnel in the region could be engaging in activities worldwide through technology

Vlad's group:

- It may not be realistic to expect environmental regulations to actually be looser than they are in the 2045 baseline scenario. Therefore, better to show the arrow as steady rather than declining.

Greater Growth in Urban Centers

Naomi's group:

- AV adoption may not be so impactful in this scenario because there are more non-driving mobility options
- Rail Use for Freight:
 - Growth in urban centers has the potential to put pressure on rail infrastructure – suggested analysis of impact on at grade rail crossings
 - Asked if there is enough rail capacity to facilitate greater freight movement on rail. Answered that rail capacity is controlled by the private sector and the scenario would just assume that capacity investments are made to enable the scenario. If we learn through the scenario planning that it's important, then that could be monitored in planning efforts going forward.

Nick's group:

- Retiree Population Growth
 - Are retirees moving to downtown urban areas as well as suburban town center developments? Both have similar amenities and attractors.
 - Is this more likely to follow the baseline (when all movement is considered)?
 - Consider the costs of urban/downtown square footage vs. suburban town center square footage: In this scenario, which are we gearing towards empty nesters/retirees and which are we gearing to younger generations?
- Water Technologies
 - Why is Water Technologies tied to Urban Centers? Urban waterfronts are developed.
 - This may need to be better defined as a driver.

- AV Adoption
 - Trending upward here might be aggressive. It doesn't make sense in urban areas this soon. Hampton Roads regional economy might not support above-baseline adoption of personal AV usage.

Jason's group:

- Military population may hold steady in this rather than decline downwards given that the economic trend for Federal/Military is trending "steady."
- Retiree population may find urban places that are diverse, walkable and vibrant to be more attractive than suburban. Consider revising this trend to either steady or upwards.
- Question was raised on why are even considering military or retiree population when the model is just allocating people, and not military people, or older people?
- There was discussion about the "tighter environmental regulations" and how it was uncertain exactly how these differ between scenarios. A suggestion was made to keep the same "steady" assumption for this for all scenarios.
- The whole AV/CV needs further clarification. There is not consensus yet in the research community on how AV/CV will impact growth and development yet. Need to be explicit in how we are testing these in our scenarios and what the assumptions are. Also, are we to separate AV and CV?

Greater Suburban/Greenfield Growth

Nick's group:

- Urbanization
 - Could a population shift to the suburbs spur some redevelopment of downtown
 - Urban land prices will go down
 - There may be a shift in population/residential distribution based on socioeconomic factors
- AV Adoption
 - Generally agree with the strong growth but it will be on the trucking/commercial side

Jason's group:

- Be cognizant that the Retiree Population is not really connected to employment forecast because they are not linked to jobs.
- Transit propensity in suburban/greenfield may not be steady, might trend downward if this if more people are living in auto oriented places.
- Need to understand the differences between the two higher "Port Competitive" scenarios, e.g., what are the assumptions behind the strong downward trend in rail and barge in this one vs the greater growth on the water. Did not question the arrows, just needed to understand the nuances of the two port oriented scenarios.
- The whole AV/CV needs further clarification. There is not consensus yet in the research community on how AV/CV will impact growth and development yet. Need to be explicit in how we are testing these in our scenarios and what the assumptions are. Also, are we to separate AV and CV?

Vlad's group:

- It may not be realistic to expect environmental regulations to actually be looser than they are in the 2045 baseline scenario. Therefore, better to show the arrow as steady rather than declining.
- The group felt that the active transportation arrow should be steady rather than declining in this scenario. Greater suburban growth could be in the form of mixed-use suburban centers (such as New Town in James City County) which could still have considerable localized use of active transportation modes.

Other

Naomi's group:

- Sea level rise will affect the cost of development along the water and may shift where the waterfront is that attracts development in the growth on the water scenario

Nick's group:

- Tighter Environmental Regulation needs to be more clearly defined

Jason's group:

- It would be good to see or know better what some of the base 2045 growth trends are to know what "steady" means, and consequently from that what is meant by downward or upward off of those trends.

Vlad's group:

- The cost of gas could be a big external factor that would significantly affect travel and VMT
- It seems that the scenarios have more to do with VMT growth so why not define the scenario narratives in terms of what they would do to future VMT?