

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

---

## **Technical Committee Minutes**

For meeting of  
**November 7, 2014**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE – November 7, 2014**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT	Mark Rawlings
	Jameshia Peterson
DCOP	Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County	-----
Frederick County	-----
City of Frederick	Timothy Davis
Gaithersburg	-----
Montgomery County	John Thomas
Prince George's County	-----
Rockville	-----
M-NCPPC	
Montgomery County	-----
Prince George's County	Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT	Lyn Erickson
	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	Marie Scheetz
Loudoun County	Robert Brown
Manassas	-----
NVTA	-----
NVTC	Claire Gron
	David Koch
Prince William County	James Davenport
PRTC	Betsy Massie
VRE	Christine Hoeffner
VDOT	Norman Whitaker
	Dan Painter
VDRPT	Tim Roseboom
NVPDC	-----
VDOA	

WMATA

Danielle Wesolek

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

FHWA-DC	-----
FHWA-VA	-----
FTA	-----
NCPC	-----
NPS	-----
MWAQC	-----
MWAA	Mike Hewitt

COG STAFF

Kanti, Srikanth, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Robert Griffiths, DTP  
Andrew Meese, DTP  
Gerald Miller, DTP  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Anant Choudhary  
Lamont Cobb, DTP  
Paul DesJardin, DCPS  
Michael Farrell, DTP  
Ben Hampton, DTP  
Charlene Howard, DTP  
John Kent, DTP  
Jeff King, DEP  
Wendy Klancher, DTP  
Sunil Kumar, DEP  
Jessica Mirr, DTP  
Jane Posey, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Rich Roisman, DTP  
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP  
John Swanson, DTP  
Dusan Vuksan, DTP

OTHER

Bill Orleans

## **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

### **Technical Committee Meeting**

---

#### **TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

#### **1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from October 3 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

#### **2. Briefing on the Draft Update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region**

Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint. The current draft of the bicycle and pedestrian plan is an update to a plan last adopted in 2010. It identifies the various bicycle and pedestrian projects from local plans that the TPB intends to carry out by 2040. It is not fiscally constrained.

The plan was developed under the oversight of the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee, and the projects in the plan were submitted by state, local, and agency staff. The projects needed to be of a size and scope to be regionally significant. Since 2010 the region's plans have gotten much more ambitious. The RTPP places great importance on the walk and bike modes. The proportion of bicycle and pedestrian only projects in the TIP has doubled. WMATA has also gotten far more active in promoting walk and bike access to Metrorail. The TPB has adopted a Complete Streets policies, and the States and local agencies have either adopted new policies or revised existing ones. Those policies are starting to be implemented.

Bicycling has greatly increased since 2010 in the core jurisdictions, and walk mode of access to Metrorail has increased.

There has been a significant drop in motorized fatalities, less so for walking and bicycling.

Bicyclist injuries have increased, which we believe is primarily due to a large increase in exposure. Bicycling has increased faster than bicyclist injuries, so the exposure-adjusted risk has declined.

New facility types, such as protected lanes, are becoming more common.

The NACTO Urban Bikeways Design Guide and Urban Street Design Guide have become available, as well as the EPA School Siting Design Guide, and the ITDP Bike Share planning guide.

The region now has far more planned facilities, roughly \$6 billion worth of new facilities through 2040. This reflects far more ambitious local plans.

As a follow-on to the plan Mr. Farrell said that we will create an on line map and visualization of the plan. Ms. Howard added that the on-line version would bring the paper plan to life and make it more interactive. Ms. Mirr demonstrated the draft on line map and visualization of some of the plan data. For example, size of Metro stations symbols on one map corresponded to the share of pedestrian mode of access. GIS staff will work with Mr. Farrell and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee to finalize this application.

Mr. Brown noted that Loudoun County had very few projects on the new map, despite having many developer-funded bike paths, as well as planned improvements around future Metrorail stations. Mr. Farrell replied that Loudoun County staff did not have good information on where developer-funded trails were being built. The plan is generally focused on publicly funded projects that appear in the TIP. However, we are open to adding developer-funded projects if we can get the information. Mr. Farrell added that in the on-line map we'll be able to fit a lot of the smaller projects.

Ms. Erickson noted that the plan is to be presented to the Board this month as an information item, and then for approval in December. So subcommittee members should look at it now. Mr. Farrell concurred that now is the time to provide comments, and add projects to the database. Staff can access the on line database directly to add or edit projects, or send Mr. Farrell a spreadsheet. Mr. Farrell suggested that while not every local project should be in the regional plan, we encourage agencies to add their larger projects. GIS shape files are very welcome; we can add them to our map. Ms. Erickson suggested that members talk to their bicycle and pedestrian staff.

Mr. Whitaker suggested that for a future update we should have graphic that shows just the major regional feature, though there is no such thing as a bicycle arterial. Ms. Howard said that we have the capability of displaying more or less projects, or different types of projects. Another member said that facilities such as trails and cycle tracks could be considered bicycle arterials.

Mr. Thomas noted that many of the projects in the database had three extra zeroes. The cost is supposed to be in thousands of dollars. Other projects showed total project costs, not the pedestrian or bicycle portion. Mr. Farrell replied that in many cases he did not get lot of detail on the project, so it was hard to discern whether a cost estimate was reasonable. For the global estimates Mr. Farrell did not rely on the project level

costs, but instead imputed a total cost based on project type and mileage. Many of these projects have not yet been designed and do not have a cost estimate.

Mr. Brown said that there are policies in this document that can help Loudoun County become more bicycle friendly.

Ms. Wesolek suggested using a more recent TIP. Mr. Farrell said that he would do so and that this section was written before the current TIP was available.

### **3. Review of Update of the Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan for the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program**

Ms. Klancher provided an overview of the Update to the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan document. The Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan, which was approved by the TPB in 2009, must be updated to guide funding decisions for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program. She said that the Enhanced Mobility Program is a new FTA program that combines the prior New Freedom and Section 5310 programs. The Enhanced Mobility program provides grants to local governments and non-profit agencies to improve access to transportation for people with disabilities and older adults. The Enhanced Mobility program provides approximately \$2.8 million a year in Federal funds the Washington DC-VA-MD Urbanized Area and matching funds are required: 20 percent for Capital or Mobility Management and 50% for operating projects.

Ms. Klancher explained that the TPB's Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force oversaw the development of the key elements of the Plan and approved them in May 2014. The key elements are the backbone of the Coordinated Plan: and are 1) a description of the unmet transportation needs of people with disabilities and older adults, 2) an inventory of existing transportation services; 3) strategies for improved service and coordination, 4) priority projects for implementation and 5) competitive Selection criteria for the Enhanced Mobility grant program.

Ms. Klancher stated that in the TPB approved the key elements of the update to the Coordinated Plan in July to guide the first solicitation for the Enhanced Mobility grant funds. Applications were due in late- October. The TPB will be asked to approve the entire update to the Coordinated Plan at its November 19 meeting. She asked that Tech Committee members review the Appendices with the Task Force membership and the listing of specialized services by jurisdiction. She said that TPB Vice Chair Mr. Lovain chairs the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force and the Selection Committee. Depending on the Selection Committee deliberations, the TPB may be asked to approve the funding recommendations in December.

Ms. Erickson asked how many applications were received for the Enhanced Mobility grant funding. Ms. Klancher replied that 11 applications were received.

Ms. Erickson asked if the Coordinated Plan update had a positive reaction and if the applications received were influenced by the Coordinated Plan update. Ms. Klancher said that the applications did respond to the priority projects in the Coordinated Plan. She said that the Task Force worked hard to develop the priority projects, which include projects that provide for local government transit and human service agencies to coordinate on specialized transportation services.

Mr. Roseboom asked what the breakdown is of the 11 applications received between D.C., MD and VA, and if the Selection process considers the geographic distribution of grant funds.

Ms. Klancher replied that she didn't know the exact breakdown between the 11 applications received for Enhanced Mobility. She said that the Enhanced Mobility selection is based on the previous JARC and New Freedom selection process and the geographic preference was not a criterion. However, of the 66 JARC and New Freedom projects totaling over \$25 million, the break-out is approximately 1/3 in D.C., 1/3, in MD and 1/3 in VA. JARC and New Freedom applications were scored based on how well the proposed project responded to the strategies in the Coordinated Plan and the ability of the applicant to implement the grant.

#### **4. Briefing on the Highlights of Listening Sessions with Staffs of TPB Jurisdictions on How the Region is Achieving the Goals in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)**

Mr. Swanson briefed the committee on a draft report on a series of 10 listening sessions that staff conducted between June and October with local staff of the TPB's member jurisdictions. He said the listening sessions were designed to 1) gather information on whether and how jurisdiction staff believe we are achieving regional goals, and 2) expand awareness among our member governments of the RTPP. He described key themes that emerged in the sessions.

Mr. Holloman said he thought the sessions were great. He asked whether staff intended to conduct similar sessions with the public at large. He also suggested that staff might consider repeating these sessions with local staff on a periodic basis to track progress toward the RTPP goals.

Mr. Swanson said that those were good suggestions.

Mr. Thomas noted that the sessions asked polling questions. He asked whether staff considered reporting the actual polling result numbers in the report.

Mr. Swanson said that staff told participants in the sessions that the poll results were only being used to trigger discussion and would not be reported in a quantified manner.

He said the polling questions were intended to trigger discussion and were very useful for that purpose.

Mr. Emerine said he was surprised that rail was not listed as a concern under Goal 6.

Mr. Swanson confirmed that rail was not discussed under Goal 6 in any depth, but he emphasized that the sessions did not provide much time for discussion of Goals 4-6.

Mr. Hampton added that in earlier parts of the discussions, Long Bridge was identified as a needed improvement for transit.

Mr. Emerine said he found it particularly useful that transportation and land-use staff were brought together for the session in which he participated.

Mr. Swanson said that it was a key objective for all the sessions to include land-use and transportation staff.

Mr. Griffiths asked if participants focused mostly on local concerns or regional issues.

Mr. Swanson said that most of the discussions focused on local concerns, although participants were asked to think regionally at key points.

Mr. Sivasailam asked for more information on how technology was discussed in relation to management and operations.

Mr. Swanson said that in a number of sessions, participants expressed apprehensions that the region was not poised to take advantage of emerging technologies.

Ms. Erickson said she was glad that staff had conducted these sessions and she hoped more of this kind of outreach would be conducted in the future.

## **5. Briefing on the Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2015 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP**

Mr. Austin distributed the brochure for the Call for Projects. He indicated that the feedback from the Technical Committee and TPB had been incorporated into this version and he described those changes. He also described the schedule and the revised CLRP project description form.

Ms. Erickson asked committee members to get any comments on the brochure to staff by the following Wednesday.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if there were any exemptions for projects that were under a certain size. Mr. Austin replied that as long as the project was deemed regionally significant for air quality analysis purposes it should be included regardless of size.

Mr. Emerine asked if the question on reducing greenhouse gas and/or criteria pollutants should be broken into two. Mr. Austin agreed that it should.

Mr. Emerine also asked if these new data points would be queryable. Mr. Austin stated that they would be, but noted that at this time, agencies were not going to be asked to go back and answer these questions for every project already included in the CLRP. These data points would only be available for new projects.

Ms. Wesolek asked if the new Regional Policy Framework questions would be required. Mr. Austin said they would not be required and that if a box was left unchecked.

Mr. Brown asked if there was any question or criteria that asked if the project was part of a locally or state approved plan. Mr. Miller stated that this was incumbent upon the agency.

Mr. Malouff asked if local jurisdictions in Virginia would continue to be required to submit project descriptions to VDOT for them to submit to the TPB. Mr. Austin replied that VDOT intended to continue using this method.

Ms. Posey spoke to the future transit assumptions memo. She asked agencies to review and update the assumptions by February 6, 2015.

## **6. Briefing on the Development of a List of Unfunded Transportation Projects**

Mr. Griffiths reported that staff had been requested by the TPB to develop a list of the region's unfunded transportation projects. This list of unfunded projects should include all transportation projects in the region that are in approved state and local government plans, but are not currently included in the CLRP. This list should also include cost information about these projects.

Mr. Griffiths stated that in response to this request staff proposed to work with the members of the TPB Technical Committee to compile this list of unfunded transportation projects. It is expected that these unfunded projects would be drawn primarily from the Move DC Plan in the District of Columbia, the local jurisdiction MDOT priority letters in Maryland and the NVTAT Transaction Plan 2040 in Virginia. In addition,

local jurisdiction TPB Technical Committee members and TPB Technical Committee members representing WMATA, PRTC, NVTC, VRE and MARC will also be asked to provide a listing and cost estimates for unfunded projects in their approved transit plans.

Mr. Griffiths was asked if any criteria had been developed to identify the projects to be included in this list of unfunded transportation projects.

Mr. Griffiths responded that while some believed that the list should be limited to just the regionally significant transportation projects, others strongly believed that this list should include a complete list of unfunded projects in approved state and local plans. Mr. Griffiths stated that Technical Committee members would be asked to include all transportation projects in their approved plans that are not currently in the CLRP, but would be eligible to be included in the CLRP if funding were available. Further each project in this list should have a cost estimate and/or cost estimate range.

Mr. Griffiths reported that he would be presenting this proposed approach to the TPB at their November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **7. Briefing on the Request from the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) and the Climate, Energy and Environment Policy Committee (CEEPC) to Affirm Support for the 2008 COG Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Goals**

Mr. Srikanth reported on the Board members' discussion at the 10/15/14 meeting on the topic of the region's Greenhouse gas reduction goals. He described the joint 10/9/14 letter from MWAQC and CEEPC that the TPB had received requesting the TPB to (1) affirm the region's multi-sector goals to reduce Greenhouse gases; and (2) to work with COG in the multi-sector, professional working group that COG would convene to analyze multi sector strategies that would help reduce Greenhouse gases.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the Board has asked staff to prepare a Draft of a resolution that the Board would discuss at its November meeting on affirming the region's GHG reduction goals and also to work with COG staff to propose an outline of the multi-sector working group. He noted that he did not have draft documents on either item yet but that he was working with the MWAQC staff director to develop a draft resolution since MWAQC was also considering adopting a resolution and that he was also working with COG staffs in develop an outline for this multi-sector working group.

Speaking about the resolution Mr. Srikanth said that the resolution will provide some background on the 2008 Climate Report which contains the specific Greenhouse gas reduction goals, the 2010 TPB What Would It Take analyses that was based on these goals and would then state the TPB supports these goals and also that it will work with COG on this multi-sector working group.

Describing the current staff level discussion on the outline for the multi-sector working group, he noted that: it is likely to be headed by COG Deputy Executive Director and staffed by the Directors of the three COG Departments; its members will be professionals from the various Transportation, Energy, Environment and Planning agencies at the State and Local levels; the working group is likely to secure consultant services to perform the technical analysis; the expectation is that the working group will identify specific strategies in the four sectors that could realistically be implemented at local, regional; or state level to help reduce Greenhouse gases; that these strategies will be at a high level and not project level; the technical analysis of the strategies will quantify the estimated reduction Greenhouse gases, the cost and timeframe to implement these.

Mr. Srikanth said that there will opportunity for public input in this process and that the final product would be an action plan, a report like What We Can Do collectively in all sectors to help advance the region towards its Greenhouse gas reduction goals. This report would be presented to the various Policy Committees/Boards at COG which would then consider if specific Greenhouse gas reduction targets can be set for each of the four sectors. Mr. Malouff asked if the expectation was that based on this work a different set of goals for Greenhouse gas reductions could be set.

Mr. Srikanth responded that the region's Greenhouse gas reductions goals have already be set and the working group is tasked with identifying what portion is attainable through actions that can be realistically implemented in all sectors at local, regional and state levels. There was acknowledgment that these viable strategies from all sectors when added could fall short of the achieving the goals and should that be the case then larger strategies needed to close the gap would be examined.

Mr. Emerine noted that the working group may not have to start from scratch to identify strategies as there are many earlier reports documents that have looked at this.

Mr. Whitaker suggested that the working group should invite national leaders who can speak to technological and other regulatory strategies at national levels that are likely to be implemented OR to their potential to reduce Greenhouse gases if implemented to help guide the selection of regional strategies.

## **8. Proposed Reconstitution of the Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee**

Mr. Randall briefed the committee on the proposed reconstitution of the current Regional Bus Subcommittee (RBS) as the Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee (RPTS). He reminded members of the MAP-21 requirement for public transportation representative on MPO policy boards, to which the TPB responded at its September meeting with a resolution. Besides affirming the TPB was already meeting the guidance,

given WMATA is a member of the board as are jurisdictional representatives for other public transportation providers, the TPB also approved reconstituting the RBS as the RPTS, and directed that a more formal process for consideration of the needs and interests of public transportation be developed.

The distributed memorandum laid out the proposed mission, goals and membership of the reconstituted subcommittee. Mr. Randall reviewed how the RBS functions and suggested the RPTS would follow a similar process, only with broader outreach. He noted that the federal definition of providers of public transportation is vague, and offers inclusion to paratransit and provide providers of public transportation as well. In addition, recent discussion is for the RPTS to work towards an annual report, or “State of Public Transportation” that would serve to compile public transportation needs and interests and formally transmit them to the TPB. This would serve to formalize a process for these needs and interests to be heard.

Mr. Randall also noted that the forthcoming MAP-21 performance provisions for transit state of good repair and safety, which would require TPB adoption of targets for performance measures in these areas, would also serve as formal means of communication to the TPB. This memorandum and the proposed annual report will be discussed at the next subcommittee meeting, and a final memorandum will likely be brought back to the Committee for consideration in December.

Mr. Mokhtari said that the formal annual report is a good idea, and suggested it be timed for completion before the annual call for projects.

Ms. Erickson also concurred with the annual report concept and thought it would offer good value to the TPB.

Ms. Massie noted that PRTC will also submit performance targets to the FTA, and asked how these will interface with those of the TPB.

Mr. Srikanth responded that considerable work will be needed on the transit state of good repair and safety measures and targets, and that details on these have yet to come. He then went on to announce that at the certification review the federal staff offered to host a workshop on the performance provisions, for the Washington region as well as other MPOs and agencies. He noted that the states are fundamental to the performance provision process, and that each agency will need to work with its state, while the TPB will also need to coordinate with the states. The RPTS will serve as one possible forum where the transit measures and targets will be discussed. This will be just on avenue for all the performance measures and targets that will eventually come to the Committee and then to the TPB for approval.

Ms. Wesolek asked if there would be a working group for the performance provisions.

Mr. Srikanth responded that there will likely be multiple venues for addressing the performance provisions, with subcommittees looking at their specific areas, e. g., public transportation, safety, congestion, etc. The potential larger working group would focus on the coordination with the states and transit agencies, focusing on the processes for collecting data. The details of the working group will have to be developed going forward.

## **9. Update on the Washington Region Transportation Planning Process Certification Review on October 28 and 29**

Mr. Srikanth reported that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) conducted a certification review of the transportation planning process for the Washington region on October 28 and 29. He thanked all of the Committee members and state and local DOT staff who participated over the two day sessions. He said that the sessions generally went well and that the US DOT staff seemed interested in learning about what we are doing that was beyond the MPO planning requirements. He mentioned that we highlighted activities like the Community Leadership Institute and enhancements to our CLRP process and the new Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.

He commented that it was overall a good discussion and the staff responses were well received. He said some suggested areas for improvement were noted including looking at how well our public participation process is working. He said that Ms. Jackson of FHWA will give a preliminary report to the TPB at its November meeting and that the draft certification report will be sent to us in early 2015.

Mr. Emerine commented that he attended an afternoon session and found it very educational. He said it was good to hear TPB and FAMPO staffs describe their activities and processes. He suggested that TPB staff should take advantage of more peer-to-peer exchanges. Chair Erickson noted that FAMPO as a very small MPO can do some things that are more difficult for a large one.

Mr. Srikanth commented that we can consider more exchanges with other MPO staffs. He said that the FHWA and FTA staff have indicated that they will help us set up a regional workshop to begin looking at how to implement the MAP-21 performance-based planning process. The workshop will be in early 2015. It will help us see how other regions and states are developing performance measures, setting targets and incorporating them into their planning process so we can get a head start for our process.

## 10. Briefing on the Development of a GIS-Based Mapping Application for CLRP Projects

Ms. Howard made a brief presentation (and passed out a flyer) on the work done to date to prepare a GIS –based web map of 2014 CLRP projects. She explained that a team of DTP staff has been working on reconciling the CLRP database (maintained by Andrew Austin) with Jane’s table of conformity projects in order to create a visualization of the projects contained in the CLRP. The plan is to replace the current static map image on the CLRP page on the COG website with an interactive web map. This will be done in the near future.

She showed two version of the map viewer that represent different ways in which to interact with the available attribute data for the CLRP projects. The embeddable viewer is the version envisioned to be on the CLRP website and contains the CLRP projects with the ability to view information via a popup menu. The project viewer map allows users to view additional information on the individual conformity project phases of a CLRP project.

Mr. Austin remarked that all of the data available through both online map viewers come from the CLRP database, so the information presented is only good as the information in the database. He asked members responsible for preparing CLRP database submissions to review the information on their database records, especially for cost, project limits, description, and completion date(s). Ms. Howard then added that the team has already done a fairly extensive reconciliation of the database tables, and that the database is in good shape for the 2015 conformity cycle/CLRP project inputs.

Mr. Brown asked whether all of the projects are represented or only major projects of the 2014 database, and that it would be beneficial for Loudoun County to have all projects available on the interactive map.

Ms. Howard responded that the database is representing projects updated for 2014 and that there has been some internal discussion on perhaps adding some of the smaller projects below the level of regionally significant to the online map. Right now the projects on the map represent the CLRP projects included in Air Quality Conformity analysis (facility types 1, 2, and 5)—all of highway and most of transit. Mr. Griffiths asked what facility types 1, 2, and 5 represented, and Mr. Austin stated that the projects represented facility types of interstate, expressway, and primary arterial.

Mr. Griffiths asked whether the web links provided on the flyer were live so committee members could view the maps online. Ms. Howard responded that yes, the links were live and available.

Mr. Mokhtari asked whether the same type of information available for the CLRP projects could be available for the TIP. Andrew Austin responded that providing a visualization of the TIP is a phase 2 projects that will be available sometime in the future.

#### **11. Report on the Kick-off Meeting of the Vehicle Probe Data Users Group**

Speaking from a presentation titled "[Report on the Kick-off Meeting of the Vehicle Probe Data Users Group & Congestion Monitoring](#)", Mr. Pu went over TPB's congestion monitoring activities and reported on the highlights of the kick-off meeting of the Vehicle Probe Data Users Group that took place on Thursday, October 9, 2014.

The Users Group aims to bring more collaboration and consistency in the use of vehicle probe data in the TPB member jurisdictions, and to potentially discuss future MAP-21 related performance measures that could rely on vehicle probe data, such as traffic congestion. The kick-off meeting was well attended with 26 participants from all over the region as well as Virginia Department of Transportation Central Office in Richmond, VA and Baltimore Metropolitan Council. From a wide range of experience with vehicle probe data, the participants reported their applications and challenges with the data and expectations for the Users Group. The kick-off meeting also included a live demo of the Vehicle Probe Project Suite developed by the Center for Advanced Transportation Technologies Laboratory (CATT Lab) of the University of Maryland and COG/TPB's use of vehicle probe data and lessons learned.

In response to Mr. Mokhtari's question regarding data sharing, Mr. Pu mentioned a series of congestion monitoring and other TPB monitoring data have already been shared in the [Regional Transportation Data Clearinghouse](#) (RTDC). Ms. Howard added that an aggregated INRIX speed data layer will soon be added to the RTDC.

#### **12. Update on the Development of MAP-21 Performance Measures**

Mr. Randall updated the Committee on the latest developments regarding US DOT regulations on performance measures under MAP-21, speaking to a presentation. Since last discussed in September, there have not been any new rules issued and the announced publication dates have continued to slide to the right. However, it was anticipated that the bridges and pavement condition provisions would be published November 14.

#### **13. Other Business**

None.

#### **14. Adjourn**