

TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ITEM #1



National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

Technical Committee Minutes

**For the meeting of
January 6, 2017**

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the January 6, 2017 Technical Committee Meeting

Chairman Davis convened the meeting. Participants introduced themselves.

2. Briefing on the MAP for the Proposed Enhancements to the Title VI/Environmental Justice Analysis of the CLRP

On behalf of Ms. Klancher, Mr. Ritacco briefed the committee on the January TPB presentation which asked the board to endorse the draft map as part of the proposed enhancements to the Title VI/Environmental Justice analysis of the CLRP. The map identifies small geographic areas that have significant concentrations of low-income or minority populations using an index based on tract-level demographic data from the U.S. Census 2010-2014 American Community Survey. The committee was briefed on the stakeholder input and consultation process, and comments regarding the originally proposed name of the map which was "Communities of Concern." The committee was also asked to provide input on alternative names, including Environmental Justice Areas, Equity Areas Emphasis Areas, or Equity Emphasis Areas.

Mr. Ritacco stated that after anticipated TPB approval, TPB staff will conduct Phase II of the Title VI and Environmental Justice (EJ) analysis, focused on comparing changes in mobility and accessibility attributable to the 2016 CLRP, between winter and early-spring, followed by briefings of the analysis in late-spring or early-summer.

Mr. Weissberg inquired on the purpose of the map and the Title VI/Environmental Justice analysis of the CLRP as well as any possible funding implications. Mr. Ritacco clarified the Equity Emphasis Areas will be used to analyze the TPB's Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on these areas versus the rest of the region on a variety of accessibility and travel time measures between 2016 and 2040. Mr. Srikanth provided clarifications regarding definition of "disproportionately high and adverse impact" in the analysis, possible TPB uses, and the engagement process conducted to date for identifying these areas. Mr. Weissberg expressed concern on the identification of areas within Prince George's County and whether certain areas would be analyzed. Mr. Srikanth noted that all areas within the region would be analyzed during Phase II as well as the analysis focus on areas with high concentrations of low-income and minority populations.

Mr. Hartline asked about specific tracts within Charles County and the reasoning behind why certain areas, including military installations, were included. Mr. Ritacco explained the methodology used for identification of areas across the region and committed to touching base with Mr. Hartline in the future to discuss specific examples in Charles County.

Ms. Davis inquired on possible implications if the analysis finds the CLRP to have disproportionately high and adverse impact between Equity Emphasis Areas and the rest of the region. Mr. Srikanth explained there is no legal "stick" between federal approval of the CLRP and findings of the analysis.

Mr. Brown noted that not all member jurisdiction projects rise to the level of being in the CLRP and the challenge this creates for this type of analysis. Mr. Srikanth agreed and clarified that the analysis will not be done for each Equity Emphasis Area but for all identified areas as a whole versus the rest of the region as a whole.

Mr. Weisberg noted his concerns regarding areas inside the Beltway south of Route 50 that could be considered areas of need. Mr. Srikanth explained the index scoring used to identify areas and the increased importance placed on low-income factors.

Mr. Foster asked if further analysis could be helpful for member jurisdictions including sidewalk connectivity or locations of aging bridges for possible use in local products. Mr. Srikanth noted the TPB's commitment on providing all the data and tools to member jurisdictions for use in local planning and analysis.

Mr. Holloman expressed the proposed names were all better options than "communities of concern" with a preference for Transportation Emphasis Areas or Environmental Justice Areas. Mr. Srikanth noted that MPOs across the country have used varying names and in discussions with Board members a few had expressed interest in Equity Emphasis Areas. Some also expressing concern that using "Emphasis Areas" alone which may suggest a lack of focus on other areas. A decision is to be made prior to the January TPB meeting.

Mr. Davis noted that some of the proposed names, especially "Environmental Justice Areas," may resonate with professionals familiar with this work but may not resonate with the public. Mr. Lake agreed that "Emphasis Areas" alone would be difficult for many to understand and therefore including a qualifier may make it easier to understand.

Mr. Weissberg noted his acceptance of using Equity Emphasis Areas and stressed the importance of including additional communities within Prince George's County.

Ms. Davis inquired about possible additional measures beyond those listed in Phase II, like air quality. Mr. Srikanth noted that the analysis will be for the CLRP as a whole. He spoke about the analysis' limitations in forecasting air quality, water quality, or other environmental indicators at small-level geographies. However, he noted that the map could be used by local members or other transportation agencies for NEPA or project-level studies.

3. TPB Bylaws Amendment

Currently, there is no provision in the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) Bylaws to allow for remote participation in the Board meetings by members or their alternates via telephone and/or the internet. In response to a request from TPB members, staff announced a proposal to amend the bylaws so as to allow participation of the Board members or their alternates remotely via the internet and/or the telephone. The bylaws with the full proposed amendment language was reviewed (additional text is underlined and deleted text is ~~strikethrough~~). The TPB was given notice at its December 21, 2016 meeting that an action to formally amend the bylaws was planned to be taken at the January 18, 2017 meeting. Comments were being solicited through January 12, 2017.

4. Review of Outline and Preliminary Budget for the FY 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is the annual budget for TPB staff to carry out the metropolitan transportation planning process. Staff presented a preliminary total budget estimate for the FY 2018 UPWP, the proposed funding level for each work activity, and an

outline of the proposed FY 2018 work tasks. Several staff members discussed their individual components of the UPWP. This information is preliminary and will be refined over the next two months. The TPB will be asked to approve the FY 2018 UPWP at its March 15, 2017 meeting.

5. Long-Range Plan Task Force

Mr. Srikanth briefed the committee on the Long-Range Plan Task Force. He said that the task forces' Phase I report was accepted by the board at the December meeting. He said this report will provide contents for the 2018 long-range plan, which will have an "unfunded" component. He said that some members of the task force have expressed interest in "game-changer" projects. He also noted that some members would like to more extensively explore regional policies, including pricing, land-use, and technology. He said the task force would be developing a work plan that will outline the process for developing and analyzing scenarios. He said that a board resolution would be developed that describes this scenario development approach. He said he thought the board would be asked to approve this resolution in April or May. He said that staff will work with the Technical Committee on these efforts.

Mr. Holloman asked if the board has provided any guidance on the schedule for the next activities of the task force. He noted that the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority is currently considering the inclusion of "game-changer" projects in its next long-range plan. Mr. Srikanth said he expected the scenario development and analysis would take 6-9 months. He said the NVTa's inputs would be very useful.

Mr. Nampoothiri confirmed that he has been discussing these processes with Mr. Srikanth.

Ms. Davis said it is important to focus on how the limited list of projects will be used. She said she would like it to include projects that can be moved forward. She said it is important to focus on maximizing use of infrastructure that is already in place. She said she was concerned about focusing on new projects that are not currently in the plans of the TPB's members.

Mr. Weissberg partly agreed with Ms. Davis, but he said a balance is needed. He said we should be considering and promoting projects that take care of existing needs as well as projects that address future demands. For example, he said it would be important to try to address the long commutes experienced by workers living in the eastern side of the region. He said we should not just be focused on maintenance.

Ms. Davis said she was not necessarily referring to maintenance. She said we need to identify solutions for places where bottlenecks currently exist and where additional capacity on the existing system is needed.

Mr. Srikanth said it would be useful to develop and analyze an array of scenarios. He said one objective could be optimization of the existing system. He noted that some of the region's transportation investments are not being optimally used, but he noted that the solution to this situation may not be more transportation capacity, but other solutions, including land-use changes.

Mr. Weissberg emphasized that scenarios need to go beyond solving current bottlenecks and also seek to meet future demands.

6. Performance Based Planning and Programming

Mr. Eric Randall spoke to a memorandum that was part of the mail-out on the latest developments in federal rulemaking, including performance-based planning and programming. Several final rules are pending: pavement and bridge condition, transit safety, and system performance, any or all of which could be published at any time. He also indicated a summary table in the memo that list all performance measures and their associated action dates for all performance measures.

Mr. Randall then continued with a presentation intended to provide an overview of PBPP to the board at their January meeting. The intention for the year to provide monthly briefings to the board to prepare them for the PBPP process and target-setting. This first presentation is intended to recap the overall PBPP rulemakings, which was last done in June 2016, and then be followed by presentations on the transit asset rule and target-setting, the highway safety rule and target-setting, and so forth.

Mr. Randall described PBPP as a strategic performance management process that will be incorporated into multiple transportation plans and programs, including the TIP. PBPP is a federal requirement coming out of the MAP-21 and FAST acts. Designed to connect federal aid to the projects being funded in an on objective, performance-driven way. Observed performance will drive project programming and future transportation planning. He covered the federal national transportation goals and how they lead to a set of performance measures. A slide on each area of performance with the measures and associated dates shown, for highway safety, transit safety, highway pavement and bridge asset condition, transit asset, and system performance (congestion, freight, and air quality) of the performance measures.

Mr. Whitaker asked if state and MPO targets have to be set at the same time. Mr. Randall explained that this might be best practice, but as the TPB includes three states, each on their own timeline, this is unlikely for the TPB's MPO goals. Furthermore, given the differing conditions in DC, Maryland, and Virginia, the MPO target would be a combination of these state targets, and so could be higher than DC's target but lower than Virginia's state target, as well as any adjustment for conditions in the Northern Virginia portion of the state. The method by which MPOs will produce reports on measured performance and targets is not yet determined.

Mr. Holloman asked if there is coordination with BRTB and FAMPO on bordering areas, such as Laurel. Mr. Randall responded that this is what the TPB will have to work on over the next year, determining responsibilities for all stakeholders including adjacent MPOs.

Mr. Brown asked if there are different expectations for different regions, especially rural versus urban areas. Mr. Randall answered that at least initially reporting will be done for the region as a whole, though more discrete data will be available. Mr. Meese added that states have the option to report separately for rural and urban areas, but that MPOs report for all NHS roads in their planning area.

Mr. Brown then asked if there are different criteria for the different types of roads in more rural areas like Loudoun County. Mr. Randall responded that the measurement is based on what is observed, which will be determined by the type, width, and geometry of the road, so the measured performance will indirectly take these factors into account. He added that MPO target-setting is for the region as a whole, and that the target is not necessarily useful for anyone. The concept is that the measurement process enables more discrete analysis by jurisdictions and road agencies of their specific performance if they so wish. Mr. Schermann

added that the methodology, data collection, and calculation for congestion is done through specific formulas that take into account rural and urban factors, based on anticipated and actual travel times. The challenge will be in setting desired travel times, which the states have to take the lead in doing before TPB can start calculating performance.

Mr. Brown then asked if data collection has yet begun. Mr. Randall responded that some analysis had been done, but agencies are awaiting the final rule until they proceed with further effort. Mr. Meese added that the NPMRDS is a national database, and that there may be options for states and MPOs to use alternative sources of data to calculate performance. Mr. Srikanth noted that future presentations will address some of these questions. There is a lot of work that has to be done by states and MPOs in the next year and a half to implement PBPP. The work of the long range planning task force is an important challenge for TPB, but the PBPP is a federal requirement and TPB staff will need to work on collecting data, calculating measured performance, and setting targets. He emphasized that all stakeholders, including those in attendance today, will need to work on understanding and implementing the complex set of PBPP rules. An example of that is the work that MTA has done, the next agenda item.

7. Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) Presentation on their Transit Asset Management Initial Performance Targets for 2017

Ms. Arnold introduced herself and the other MTA staff in attendance. She gave an overview of the transit asset management performance and targets for MTA's directly operated transit services, speaking to a presentation. She noted that webinars on the topic had been held in December, and so she would only provide an excerpt of the complete slide deck.

Ms. Arnold reviewed the federal mandate for transit asset management performance targets as well as asset inventory reporting and putting together a management plan. She noted she was focusing on the reporting for directly operating services of MTA, including the MARC and commuter bus that operate into the DC area, though much of MTA operates in Baltimore. MTA is a large transit serve, operating rail, so reports directly to FTA on performance; the smaller locally operated transit services (LOTS) are either reported for by the state or can report directly on their own, as Montgomery and Prince George's counties are required to do to their size. She covered the performance measures for transit asset and spoke to the detailed criteria for the measures. Also, each asset class, such as a different size of bus, have to be measured and have a target set. She mentioned the challenges and barriers to completing the transit asset process, including unclear requirements and that this is a new task for many agencies.

Ms. Arnold then showed the MTA performance and targets. In some assets, such as the MARC railcars, no vehicles exceed their useful life and the target for next year is also that no vehicles will exceed their life. On the other hand, almost 90% of MTA's metro cars exceed their useful life. This will also be the goal for metro cars for the next year, though there is a longer-term plan to replace them. MTA's facilities also have many in poor condition, largely due to missing data. As the full asset management plan is developed, better data will be collected and a plan for bringing assets into a better state of repair will be produced. Regarding guideway performance, she mentioned that MTA hopes to collect information from Amtrak and CSX to measure performance, which should be available next year.

Mr. Srikanth thanked Ms. Arnold for her presentation, the work that had been done, and noted how information should be improved over time as the MTA and other agencies adopt the rule. In regards to adoption in Virginia, Mr. Srikanth asked if NVTC or other agencies were working to do group reporting for the smaller agencies. Ms. Massie stated this was the plan

and Mr. Horsley clarified that this work is being done in the central DRPT office in Richmond. Ms. Davis noted that WMATA is also working on the effort, and Ms. Sonali reported the same for VRE. Ms. Erickson added that this information needs to be obtained from all agencies and will have to go to the board in May.

Mr. Srikanth expanded that the transit asset info for the region will need to go to the board for information in April as draft and for approval in May, so information is needed from the region's transit agencies. He noted that Eric and other staff at TPB will be working on this information, but each agency needs to take action. He also noted that some board members may be interested in aspirational targets for transit, which may lead to differences in comparison to the targets for individual agencies.

Ms. Sonali asked Ms. Arnold if MTA had submitted any reports yet to FTA, to which the answer is no, it is not required for the first year, but targets still need to be set even if only via internal memo. She then asked TPB staff when information will be due to the TPB, to which the response was by the end of March.

It was asked of Ms. Arnold why MTA is not reporting for 5310 recipients, and Ms. Arnold responded that they are closed door operations, for which reporting is not required. A follow up question is if the rule applies to contracted service, and the answer is yes. In some cases, federal assets may have to have some information reported annually, but not for performance under this rule.

8. Transit Asset Management Initial Performance Targets for 2017 – Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOCG)

Mr. Randall spoke to a presentation on COG's targets transit asset management for 2017. Staff have written a memo setting targets for the year, but it is not yet complete and cannot yet be distributed as was originally the plan for this agenda item. Accordingly, he quickly reviewed the key aspects of the rule, including the two key criteria of direct responsibility for capital equipment and the issue of closed-door versus open-door service which together largely determine what has to be reported under the transit asset rule. He emphasized that reporting to the FTA this initial year is optional, but will be required in future years. Also, what precisely MPOs will have to report is still uncertain, pending FTA guidance.

Mr. Randall displayed the region's transit operators and whether they are Tier I or Tier II services. This includes COG, which distributes Section 5310 funds to fund wheelchair-equipped taxicabs and vans for vanpools. Accordingly, COG needs to measure performance and set targets for these assets. Current performance is that none of these vehicles exceed their useful life, and none of them are expected to in the coming year. Accordingly, COG intends to adopt a target of zero percent of vehicles exceeding useful life for FY 2018.

9. Status Report on the 2017-18 COG/TPB Household Travel Survey

Dr. Joh delivered his presentation on the 2017-2018 Regional Household Travel Survey, including an overview of the survey design and sampling plan and an updated survey schedule. He noted that the HTS is the primary source of observed data for model estimation and travel forecasting, is conducted every 10 years with the last regional HTS in 2007-2008, and is the largest single discrete project in the UPWP. Dr. Joh provided a brief background of the 2017-2018 HTS, branded the Regional Travel Survey (RTS), and noted that the survey contractor, Resource Systems Group, Inc. (RSG) has experience using a web-based survey retrieval system (rSurvey) and a survey smartphone app (rMove). Dr. Joh mentioned that the main survey will be comprised of 15,000 households within the TPB modeled region during a

12-month data collection period, with an 800 household pretest including a 400 household smartphone sample. The survey will consist of a one-day household travel diary and a GPS component, using an address-based sample and multimode data collection using web-based, smartphone and telephone retrieval.

Dr. Joh also provided an overview of the survey sampling plan and showed a map of the sampled region; the sampling frame is stratified into 66 geographic strata in the TPB modeled area. He mentioned that similar to the 2007 survey, the focus will be on regional activity centers, where most of the future growth in the region is anticipated. Higher density and mixed-use areas will be oversampled, and special outreach efforts will be made to survey hard to reach households. Dr. Joh also mentioned that questions from the 2007 survey were reviewed to determine which questions/variables would be kept, dropped, and added; key new variables include HOV and Express/Managed Lanes use, Uber/Lyft and Capital Bikeshare use, types of transit passes used, and toll transponders in vehicle. He also noted the broad scope of the RTS and that transit surveys conducted during the 2017-2018 period can yield more detailed information for specific activity centers or corridors; therefore, opportunities should be identified to integrate the RTS with current or planned on-board transit surveys. Dr. Joh noted the updated survey schedule, including the start dates of the pre-test survey in February 2017 and the main survey in June 2017.

A committee member from Virginia mentioned that they will be involved in the mailing of the survey letters for their portion of the region and requested acknowledgment; Dr. Joh thanked the member for pointing that out and stated that the COG/TPB team will look forward to their agency's involvement in the survey effort.

A committee member from Virginia asked if he and other members of the Technical Committee could participate in the survey pre-test. He asked if the COG/TPB team has a committee that they are working with to develop the survey; he also expressed that the survey effort is important and would be interesting for his jurisdiction due to the changes that have occurred since the last survey. Dr. Joh appreciated the member's interest in the survey and mentioned that some state DOT staff have been invited for the pretest. Mr. Roisman added that there is not a committee but a technical advisory group consisting of representatives from the three state DOTs and WMATA; the VDOT representative is Bob Josef. He also added that the project does not lend itself to a large technical advisory group; any questions specific to Virginia should be directed to Mr. Josef. In terms of participating in the pre-test, Mr. Roisman mentioned that home addresses from the Technical Committee participants are needed. He also noted that he will double check with Bob Griffiths (the survey Senior Advisor) regarding whether the Technical Committee can be invited, but does not see any reason why they could not participate in the pre-test. Finally, Mr. Roisman mentioned there will be an option to use the smartphone app if one has a qualifying smartphone. Mr. Milone mentioned that the Travel Forecasting Subcommittee has been engaged in the survey activities and that Mr. Roisman and Dr. Joh have provided regular briefings on the survey effort to the subcommittee.

A committee member from Maryland asked if the 2007 HTS covered the same study area as the 2017 survey and whether St. Mary's County is included; Dr. Joh responded that yes, both surveys covered the TPB modeled area, which includes St. Mary's County. The committee member also suggested that Washington County should also be considered for inclusion in the survey as it would be helpful to Frederick. Mr. Roisman noted that COG/TPB is having conversations with BMC/BRTB staff and MDOT about other MPOs participating in the survey; Ms. Erickson also added that the Hagerstown MPO, which includes Jefferson County (West Virginia) and Washington County, is also interested in the survey.

A committee member asked about the new variables for the 2017 survey, whether a generic term will be used for rideshare and not just specific to Uber and Lyft; similarly, for bike share, he asked whether it will include other bike share programs other than Capital Bikeshare. Dr. Joh responded that the question is currently phrased to ask about general rideshare use, using Uber and Lyft as examples; however, the survey specifically asks about Capital Bikeshare since it is the dominant bike share program in the region. Mr. Ramfos commented that the term “ride-share” might be confusing for some respondents and instead suggested using “ride-hailing” or TNCs.

A citizen asked how the rideshare survey question will also incorporate taxi cabs and other modes; Dr. Joh responded that Uber/Lyft and other rideshare will be treated separately from taxi cabs and hired car services.

10. Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transit (DRPT) I-395 Transit Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

Mr. Roseboom delivered his presentation on the study. He acknowledged other key staff on the project who were in attendance: Todd Horsley of DRPT, who was the study manager, and Jay Evans from Cambridge Systematics, who provided consultant support on the study. This study emerged from VDOT’s I-395 Express Lanes Study, which will convert eight miles of the two existing reversible HOV lanes on I-395 from north of the Turkeycock Run interchange between Edsall Road and Duke Street (VA 236) in Fairfax County just outside the border with the City of Alexandria to near South Eads Street in Arlington County to three reversible managed Express Lanes. The Commonwealth’s goal is to maximize person-throughput in the study corridor, and the project agreement provides for an annual transit payment from toll revenues for multimodal improvements in the corridor (similar to the agreement for Transform 66 Inside the Beltway). The subject study seeks to identify multimodal improvements in the corridor that could be funded by the annual transit payment from the Express Lanes toll revenues. The Virginia Secretary of Transportation directed DRPT to conduct the transit / TDM study in parallel with the Express Lanes NEPA study, which concluded in December.

Mr. Roseboom said the annual payment is described in a letter from the Secretary to the TPB Chairman and chief elected officials of Arlington, Fairfax, and Alexandria, which was documented as a condition of including the Express Lanes in the regional Constrained Long Range Plan. The payment will be at least \$15 Million annually, with provisions for annual escalation and sharing of excess revenues. The multimodal improvements funded with this payment must benefit toll payers in the corridor.

Mr. Roseboom said the study began in April 2016 and is wrapping up now, and will determine projects that will be eligible to receive funding from the annual transit payment. The study builds on a previous DRPT study in 2008 and looks at the entire I-95 / I-395 corridor from Spotsylvania to Arlington and includes the corridor jurisdictions and transit operators, as well as the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC). The study did not identify a mechanism for project selection, it only identified a list of eligible projects. The Commonwealth will make a future determination regarding who will ultimately make a decision on project selection and funding – for Transform 66 Inside the Beltway, that decision is made by a recommendation from NVTC to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB).

Mr. Roseboom said that transit and TDM services, programs, and facilities that were studied included service to work destinations in the corridor inside the Beltway (including downtown DC) and directly use the Express Lanes, or provide direct access to transit services in the corridor or increase person-throughput or travel choices in the study area. The initial list of projects was developed with key stakeholders and review of area plans. The projects were

tested using a travel demand model using criteria that echo both the statewide project prioritization system (SmartScale) and the multimodal component criteria developed by NVTC for evaluating projects for Transform 66 Inside the Beltway, and the list was refined by key stakeholders. There was a public outreach component of the study during the summer. The cumulative project list totals \$6.6 Billion in needs and 135 projects. That full list would provide significant benefits to peak period transit throughput, total peak period transit trips, and transit mode share for work trips in the study area. Example projects from the full list include the West End Transitway in Alexandria, frequency improvements to PRTC routes, new express bus services and park and ride lots in Stafford, Fredericksburg, and Spotsylvania, VRE service improvements, and expansion of or new regional TDM programs. The study report will be available this month. The Commonwealth determination regarding project approval and programming will be made later this year. The Express Lanes will open in 2019, and the initial transit / TDM program for the corridor will be approved by the CTB in 2020.

A committee member asked when during 2017 will the decision be made on project approval and programming and who is making the decision. Mr. Roseboom responded that no specific timeframe exists and that word will come from the Secretary's office. He also noted that the Secretary had previously committed at CTB to local decision-making in this process.

A committee member asked at what level of geography were the cited data on changes in mode choice. Mr. Roseboom responded that it was the study corridor along I-95 / I-395. Mr. Evans added that the cited data are for work trips only. Mr. Roseboom added that the study area extends generally along the roadway from Spotsylvania to downtown DC and goes out 1-2 miles from the roadway depending on land use and development patterns. Mr. Evans suggested that the study area maps in the report are the best reference. A committee member also noted that the data in question refer to the impacts of implementing the full program at \$6.6 Billion, and the annual payment from the Commonwealth is only \$15 million.

Chairman Davis asked about a web link to the final study report. Mr. Roseboom responded that the final report was not ready yet; Mr. Horsley added that the final changes were coming soon from the Secretary's office, and following that the final report would be ready and posted.

11. Metropolitan Planning Organization Coordination and Planning Area Reform Final Rule

In the interest of time, this agenda item was postponed to a subsequent meeting.

12. TPB and Technical Committee Subcommittee: Subcommittee Activities

Staff provided an overview of the TPB's committee and subcommittee structure. The purpose of the review was to both highlight the mission and the activities of the subcommittees that report to the Technical Committee and TPB and to encourage representatives of the member jurisdictions to participate in the activities of these subcommittees.

13. Analysis of Transportation Impacts of WMATA's SafeTrack Program

Mr. Randall quickly mentioned that TPB staff continue to work on analyzing the transportation impacts of WMATA's SafeTrack program for surges 1 through 10. This will include local transit information, highway traffic counts, any non-motorized data, and any other information on travel patterns during the surges. Analysis is almost complete, but further review is need. A presentation is anticipated at the February 3 committee meeting.

14. Status Report on Multi-Sector Working Group (MSWG) Activities

Mr. Sivasailam provided an update on the status of Multi-Sector Working Group activities. He discussed the materials that would be presented to the COG board at their January meeting. If the COG board adopts the recommendation of the MSWG Policy Task Force, the transportation strategies would be forwarded to TPB for consideration.

Mr. Walz of Department of Environmental Programs Director informed the members about a regional grant application for electric vehicle (EV) infrastructure funding through the Volkswagen emissions settlement fund. In response to a question from Allison Davis of WMATA, Mr. Walz clarified that four rounds of funding are available over a 10-year period as part of the settlement.

15. Transportation and Land Use Connection (TLC)

Mr. Cobb stated that the solicitation period for applications to TLC technical assistance would open on February 1. He said that TLC would hold a joint solicitation with the ULI-TAP program, which provides fee-based assistance from ULI's real estate experts to local jurisdictions. He said that he would return to the committee next month with updates on the FY 2017 projects and more information.

Ms. Erickson added that more information on TLC technical assistance is available via the memo, as well as the TLC website.

16. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – January 6, 2017**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP -----

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick County David Whitaker
City of Frederick Timothy Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County Gary Erenrich
Prince George’s County Victor Weissberg
Anthony Foster
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery County -----
Prince George’s County -----
MDOT Kari Snyder
Matt Baker
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County Mike Lake
Malcolm Watson
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
NVTA Sree Nampoothiri
NVTC Patricia Happ
Prince William County James Davenport
PRTC Betsy Massie
VRE Sonali Soneji
VDOT Norman Whitaker
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
Todd Horsley
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----
WMATA Allison Davis

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

FHWA-DC -----
FHWA-VA -----
FTA -----
NCPC -----
NPS Laurel Hammig
MWAQC -----
MWAA -----

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP
Lyn Erickson, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Bill Bacon, DTP
Lamont Cobb, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Ken Joh, DTP
Arianna Koudounas, DTP
Jessica Mirr, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Dzung Ngo, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Sergio Ritacco, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Jon Schermann, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Lori Zeller, DTP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS
Nicole McCall, DCPS
Steve Walz, DEP

OTHER

Alex Brun, MDE
Jesus Hernandez, VDOT
Jeannie Fazio, MTA
Holly Arnold, MTA
John Hartline, Tri-County Council for
Southern Maryland
Sonya Lewis-Cheatham, Virginia DEP
Bill Orleans