

TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ITEM #1



National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
March 4, 2016

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the March 4 Technical Committee Meeting

The minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on Project Submissions for the 2016 CLRP Amendment

Mr. Austin briefly highlighted the comments that had been received since the beginning of the public comment period. He stated that full copies of the comments received thus far would be distributed to the agencies the following week. He noted that Mr. Srikanth had sent a response to a representative of the United House of Prayer regarding the potential implementation of bicycle lanes on 6th St. NW stating that the inclusion of this project in the air quality conformity analysis would not preclude the substitution of 5th or 9th Streets if DDOT chose to move forward with either of those alternatives and that DDOT would continue to work with the church. Mr. Austin also noted that VRE would be submitting updated language for the Financial Plan portion of the CLRP project description form for the Extension to Haymarket-Gainesville.

Ms. Posey briefly described some technical corrections that had been made to the Air Quality Conformity Inputs table.

Mr. Srikanth asked if the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission had taken any action pertaining to the I-395 Express Lanes project. Mr. Goldfarb stated that the Commission had approved a resolution in support of the project. He added that the resolution stressed the importance of an annual transit payment and that NVTC and PRTC should have a close, collaborative role in the development of the project. Mr. Roseboom added that there was significant discussion about determining the actual amount of the payment, but that VDOT indicated it was too early in the process to determine how much it would be. He noted that there was a concern that the project should not hold up the CLRP process.

At the February TPB meeting, Mr. Srikanth noted that a request had been made for clarification of the documentation required to ensure that funding for new projects was reasonably expected to be available. Mr. Srikanth stated that every four years, the CLRP undergoes a major update which includes a financial plan that documents all of the expected costs of building and maintaining the facilities in the CLRP as well as the revenues used to fund it. In the years between each major update, he noted that the information requested has been limited to two questions on the CLRP form: the cost, and presumed sources. He said that staff intends to review the Call for Projects form and instructions to strengthen the expectations and criteria required for new projects. Ms. Davis inquired if there was a risk of over-extending funding by putting projects into the CLRP during off years. Mr. Srikanth answered that projects are looked at individually during the submission process to ensure that funding is reasonable. As an example, He noted the I-66 projects that had been submitted the previous year. Ms. Erickson also noted that when the Purple Line was submitted during an off year, two other projects were removed from the CLRP in order to maintain fiscal constraint. Mr. Srikanth noted that the quadrennial updates were a chance to bring everything up-to-date.

Mr. Srikanth also noted that agencies, when submitting requests for amendments to the TIP, state in a letter whether funding for the project is new or was previously accounted for in the financial analysis. He said that this documentation was recently required in response to recommendations from FHWA and FTA.

3. Briefing on Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the 2016 CLRP Amendment and the FY 2017-2022 TIP

Ms. Posey stated that the conformity scope of work was out for public comment, and was scheduled to be approved by the TPB at its March meeting. She noted that the only change to the document, since she reviewed it in February, was that it is no longer necessary to include a 2015 analysis year. She explained that while it is a requirement to include attainment years (2015 is the region's attainment year for the 2008 ozone standard) in each conformity analysis that is not the case if the attainment year has passed.

There were no questions.

4. Review Draft FY 2017 Unified Project Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Griffiths spoke about the anticipated changes in the Fiscal Year 2017 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) funding levels and Fiscal Year 2016 carryover funding, largely associated with FAST Act expectations and requirements. The UPWP is the TPB's annual budget and work program document, including all federal mandated work activities, regional planning activities, and federally assisted state, regional, and local planning activities.

Mr. Griffiths noted that the currently budgeted Fiscal Year 2017 funding totals \$13,343,903, including FHWA and FTA planning funds (\$9,080,265) and associated State and Local matches (\$1,135,033, or 10 percent each), Fiscal Year 2015 underruns (\$1,743,572), and CASP programming funds and airport contracts (\$250,000). Because staff typically takes a conservative approach to budgeting, expected carryover funding from Fiscal Year 16 and new planning funds associated with FAST Act activities was not included. As regular practice, a UPWP budget amendment, typically in September, will include those monies.

Mr. Griffiths presented on ten program areas revised for Fiscal Year 2017: Long Range Planning, Performance-Based Planning and Programming, Mobile Emissions Planning, Planning Programs, Travel Forecasting, Travel Monitoring and Data Programs, Cooperative Forecasts, Public Participation, Transportation Alternatives and TLC Program, and TPB Support and Management. In total, these account for \$11,971,285 in budgeted activities.

Mr. Griffiths noted the assumptions with the Fiscal Year 2017 UPWP. New planning funds are the same as Fiscal Year 2016, retain the same activities as Fiscal Year 2015, unchanged budget levels, and an anticipated fall amendment.

Mr. Griffiths summarized the new activities. Fiscal Year 2017 UPWP includes long-range planning work to identify regionally significant unfunded projects and an enhanced Environmental Justice analysis. Air quality planning work includes a mobile emissions inventory for Ozone NAAQS maintenance plan and a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Action Plan. Travel demand modeling includes completing phase 1 of the Strategic Models Improvement Plan. For Planning Programs, key products include a complete regional Bicycle Beltway plan and a regional freight forum. Finally, the UWPW includes improvements to stakeholder participation activities.

Mr. Griffiths said that next steps include presentation to the Transportation Planning Board and a 30-day public comment period, expected approval in March, submittal to FTA and FHWA in April, and implementation by the start of Fiscal Year 2017.

Mr. Griffiths then took questions from the committee. Ms. Erickson asked why Title VI/Environmental Justice activities appeared in to different sections. Mr. Srikanth noted the introductory section illustrated the TPB's two-prong approach, in the long-range planning activities as well as public participation. However, Mr. Srikanth expressed an openness to adjusting the way it is characterized.

Mr. Srikanth asked the committee take special note of the list showing all regionally significant planning studies on page 10 of the document, noting they do not only apply to federally funded activities. This list includes those from WMATA and the state transportation departments. He said that if members of the Technical committee note any missing activities, they should inform staff.

Mr. Srikanth noted the reductions in technical assistance due to current conservative funding assumptions. This is particularly due to the flat-line budget used from last fiscal year. Once carryover funding is identified, technical assistance activities plus the household travel survey and performance based planning activities could see increases.

5. Review Draft FY 2017 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

Mr. Ramfos referred to the handout that was in the agenda packet and reviewed the information that was released at the TPB on the draft FY 2017 CCWP at the February 17, 2016 meeting. The document had also been released for public comment on February 11. He stated that there were no additional comments or significant changes made to the draft document.

The final draft would be presented to the TPB for approval on March 16th.

6. Update on the Development of Policy Language for the Regional Freight Plan

Mr. Schermann updated the committee on the development of draft policy language for inclusion in the National Capital Region Freight Plan. He noted that the planned discussion of the preliminary draft freight policies scheduled for the February 17 meeting of the Transportation Planning Board did not occur due to lack of time. However, board members did receive copies of the draft policies as part of the mailout materials. Since then, staff has received comments from the District of Columbia Office of Planning pointing out that the existing draft policies do not address environmental justice issues. To address this gap, staff has drafted an additional freight policy statement that reads:

“The Transportation Planning Board supports the consideration of potential social and economic effects of freight-related programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.”

He said this statement has been inserted into the number 5 position, with the remaining statements shifted one number higher to accommodate it.

Mr. Schermann said that if staff receives positive feedback from the TPB at the March 16 meeting, the policy statements will be incorporated into the Draft National Capital Region Freight Plan. He said that TPB may potentially be asked to approve the full freight plan, including the policy element, later this spring.

Mr. Emerine thanked staff for the inclusion of the new draft policy statement and suggested that the word “environmental” be added so that it would read:

“The Transportation Planning Board supports the consideration of potential social, economic, and environmental effects of freight-related programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.”

Mr. Schermann concurred and agreed to make the suggested change.

7. Briefing on the COG Cooperative Forecasting Process

Mr. DesJardin, COG Community Planning and Services Director, briefed the Committee on the new projections, “Round 9.0”. Mr. DesJardin stated that this year is the 40th anniversary of the COG Board’s approval for the first Cooperative Forecasts, “Round 1”, which projected growth to 1995. Mr. DesJardin also stated that the region’s planning directors established the Cooperative Forecasting program so that the local governments and the region would have a consistent set of population, household and employment projections for capital improvements planning based on a common set of assumptions about future growth locally and in the region. Mr. DesJardin presented a PowerPoint showing summarizing the process for developing the new Forecasts, noting that Round “9.0” is a major update based on new national and regional economic and demographic assumptions. Mr. DesJardin also thanked Mr. Griffiths for his assistance in working with the local planning staffs during the forecast reconciliation process. Mr. DesJardin noted that the region would add approximately 1.1 million more jobs and about 1.5 million more people between 2015 and 2045. Mr. DesJardin also noted that, among all jurisdictions, the District of Columbia would capture the greatest number of new jobs, as well as the largest population growth during the forecast period. Mr. DesJardin noted the “Return to L’Enfant” project added to the CLRP and TIP previously by DDOT was now being constructed in the air rights above the 3rd Street Tunnel.

Mr. Davenport inquired as to the impact relationship between population and job growth during the period following the Great Recession.

8. Update on the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group

Mr. Swanson discussed the agenda for the upcoming Unfunded Capital Needs (UCN) Working Group meeting scheduled to take place prior to the TPB meeting on March 16, 2016. He stated that the UCN Working Group agenda would focus on 1) No Build analysis and 2) TPB’s proposal on how to document and participate in the project selection processes by the member jurisdictions.

Mr. Swanson noted that in order for TPB to have a greater impact on project selection with respect to regional priorities, TPB would need to get involved in the process earlier. Mr. Swanson added that TPB staff would first need to understand local selection processes better and how they relate to the TPB Vision and Regional Transportation Planning Priorities. He stated that staff is considering developing a questionnaire for the member jurisdiction representatives that would help document local project selection processes (via the Transportation Planning Information Hub website). Mr. Swanson also noted that staff would need to identify regional priorities and CLRP deficiencies (e.g., congestion and stagnant mode share for transit) and translate them into objectives that TPB staff would like to promote at state and local level. He added that staff plan to develop a plan of unfunded projects based on the criteria derived from CLRP deficiencies and performance measures.

Mr. Swanson concluded that some of the discussion in regards to the development of plan of unfunded projects would likely take place at subsequent UCN Working Group meetings.

Mr. Vuksan presented the preliminary results of 2040 No Build Analysis. Mr. Vuksan first provided the UCN study background and described the No Build, CLRP and All Build scenario assumptions, all of which will be studied in Phase I of the UCN study. Mr. Vuksan stated that No Build scenario assumes 2040 demographic data and 2015 transportation networks. He then emphasized that the No Build analysis was different from the CLRP Performance Analysis because it analyzes two 2040 scenarios - the CLRP and No Build (as opposed to 2040 CLRP versus 2015, which is how the CLRP is typically evaluated). Mr. Vuksan noted that this type of analysis is useful as it takes land use out of the equation.

Mr. Vuksan stated that key findings of the analysis (CLRP versus No Build) are:

- Total transit trips increase by 5% (nearly 70,000) in the CLRP
- Total VMT and VMT per capita increase by 2% in the CLRP (but VMT per capita in both 2040 No Build and CLRP is lower than today)
- Despite the slight increase in VMT, compared to the No Build or “Do Nothing” scenario, expanded highway and transit capacity in the CLRP leads to decreases in congestion and Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay (by 17%)
- The average number of jobs accessible by auto and transit within 45 minutes during morning commute increases by 13% and 14% in the CLRP, respectively; accessibility to jobs by auto and transit shows greatest increases in the I-66 Outside of the Beltway Corridor in the CLRP
- Emission estimates in the CLRP change very slightly and are within 1% of No Build estimates; in scenario testing, land use typically has a greater impact on emissions than highway and transit projects
- Criteria pollutants in the CLRP are within the established budgets

At the conclusion of the presentation, Mr. Vuksan reminded the Technical Committee members that All Build project specifications are due on March 7. He added that if they are not received, TPB staff will apply default criteria identified in the All Build Scenario Project Specification Needs memorandum (February 22, 2016) by Dusan Vuksan, distributed at the meeting (and electronically on February 22).

Ms. Erickson asked about the relationship between the projects in the TIP and No Build, and Mr. Vuksan stated that even if a project is in the TIP, if it has not been physically built today, it is not included in No Build.

Ms. Hoeffner inquired about minimal changes in accessibility to jobs by transit in Western Fairfax County. Mr. Vuksan, Mr. Srikanth and Mr. Griffiths stated that this could be occurring for a number of reasons, including the boundary nature of the accessibility function, no new transit projects in parts of the area in question, and inclusion of some of the major projects in No Build (Silver Line Phase I is already included in No Build). Mr. Srikanth added that the minimal impact range does not indicate that there are no changes in the area, but that they are below a certain threshold.

Mr. Brown inquired about the types of projects that are included in the CLRP networks. Mr. Vuksan and Mr. Griffiths stated that the projects that are included are those specified in the Conformity Table (not specified as studies).

Ms. Snyder asked whether there were any future plans to do specific maps to demonstrate how No Build performs in relationship to the CLRP, and whether the maps would look different from those that were presented. Mr. Vuksan stated that the accessibility maps would be a reverse of the maps that were presented, showing decreases in accessibility throughout the region in No Build relative to CLRP. Mr. Vuksan and Mr. Griffiths stated that, at this point in time, staff would continue to focus on showing how the CLRP improves regional outlook relative to No Build.

Mr. Emerine stated, and TPB staff concurred, that it is important to note, particularly when presenting to TPB, that the “green areas” on accessibility maps are not necessarily the areas with greatest accessibility to jobs, but that they represent the areas with greatest change in accessibility to jobs in the CLRP relative to No Build.

Mr. Whitaker inquired whether TPB staff would be able to show changes in congestion between No Build and CLRP. Mr. Vuksan noted that TPB staff would consider producing congestion maps in the next stage of the process, and he also stated that based on the auto access to jobs maps, congestion reductions would likely appear throughout the region relative to No Build.

Mr. Srikanth reiterated that it is important for our member representatives and the TPB to be able to review the CLRP in this context, relative to No Build. He added that this analysis will be supplemented with evaluation of All Build Scenario, and that this entire process should enable staff to identify deficiencies discussed previously by Mr. Swanson.

Mr. Nampoothiri suggested that staff evaluate today’s conditions against 2040 No Build to demonstrate to the TPB how much the conditions would deteriorate in 2040 if the region did nothing. Mr. Srikanth noted that the TPB is underwhelmed by the CLRP performance in relationship to the conditions today, and that No Build analysis has not been shared with the TPB.

Mr. Rawlings asked whether TPB staff would include any CLRP-related cost information in future presentations. Mr. Vuksan and Mr. Griffiths stated that TPB staff would consider including costs and dollar amounts for the UCN Working Group presentation. Mr. Griffiths added that another question would be how much more the conditions would improve relative to No Build if additional transportation resources were made available.

Ms. Davis suggested that, in order to give TPB members additional time to digest the complex information, TPB staff should share the presentation with TPB members prior to the forthcoming UCN Working Group meeting. Dan Goldfarb suggested simplifying some of the information from the presentation when it is being presented to the TPB.

In response, Mr. Griffiths noted that the key findings slide summarized the information appropriately. Mr. Srikanth stated that the presentation was appropriate for the Technical Committee, but he agreed to take another look at how the charts and maps can be used to emphasize the key findings and message from the analysis.

Mr. Emerine suggested that TPB staff seek RSVPs for the UCN Working Group meeting to improve the TPB member attendance.

In closing, Mr. Srikanth asked the Technical Committee members to review the technical information for inconsistencies, and noted that TPB staff is going to take a look at the findings by geographic subarea for possible presentations in the future. Mr. Srikanth also

added that staff would take a look at making the presentation less technical for the TPB members. Mr. Roseboom asked Technical Committee members to share this information with the TPB members and to provide All Build assumptions to TPB staff by March 7.

9. Update on the Development of MAP-21 Performance Measures

Mr. Eric Randall briefed the Committee on updates to the US DOT regulations on performance measures under MAP-21, speaking to a presentation and to a memorandum included in the meeting mail-out. He noted that the new FAST Act for federal surface transportation continued these performance provisions with essentially no changes. He reviewed the schedule for publication of the proposed and/or final rulemakings for the five categories of performance rules. Key notices of proposed rulemaking for Transit Safety were published on February 5. Other rulemakings anticipated in February included the Highway Safety and HSIP final rules and the System Performance proposed rule, but none of these were published.

Mr. Randall briefed the committee on TPB staff's continuing collaboration with DDOT, MDOT, and VDOT, on collecting data and planning for forecasting and target-setting for the performance provisions. He then spoke to the Transit Safety draft rulemakings in detail, covering the status and purpose of the five associated rulemakings in this area. The four proposed performance measures for transit safety were covered: fatalities, injuries, safety events, and system reliability. The requirements for coordination of transit agency performance targets with the metropolitan planning process were presented.

Mr. Randall then spoke to the two recently announced grant opportunities announced by USDOT, the eighth round of the TIGER Grants, with \$500 million available, and the new FASTLANE Grants, with \$800 million available. He concluded by mentioning two draft administrative circulars published by the FTA: award management requirements and the equal employment opportunity program.

Mr. Meese added that TPB staff would appreciate a heads-up on any FASTLANE grant applications. Mr. Randall noted that the TPB usually provides an endorsement letter and would be ready in to do so in April for any grant applicants.

10. Briefing on Proposal to Restructure the TPB's Access for All Advisory (AFA) Committee

Ms. Klancher updated the committee about efforts to combine the TPB's Access for All Advisory Committee (AFA) and the Human Services Transportation Coordination Task Force (HSTC). She summarized the history of both groups at the TPB and shared that the AFA was established in 2001 as a way to reach groups that represent low-income, minority, and disabled populations and also that the HSTC was established in 2006 in order to create a human service coordination plan which describes how the TPB implements programs like JARC, New Freedom, and more recently Enhanced Mobility. She said that these two groups have overlapping purposes and memberships and that now is a sensible time to combine the groups. Members and leadership from the AFA and Task Force were briefed on the proposed combination and expressed support for the proposal. She referenced the AFA's mission statement and said that it has been updated to include people with limited English proficiency and older adults and that the objectives are mostly unchanged and include: serving as a forum for regional discussion, provide feedback on the CLRP and the TIP, and provide guidance on updates to the Coordinated Human Services plan, and serve as a regional forum for coordination. She said that the chair of the new committee would be a TPB member that would be selected with consultation from TPB officers. The chair will be able to

select a vice-chair who may or may not be a TPB member. She mentioned that the desired membership for the new committee will include community based leaders who represent low income and minority communities as well as people with limited English skills and older adults. These members are meant to serve as community connectors. The committee will also include ex-officio members from agencies including departments of transportation – VDOT, MDOT, DDOT, FHWA, and FTA – in addition to the local transportation agencies. Private transportation providers will also be invited. She said that the committee will meet five times a year, with an opportunity for special meetings as needed and that the first meeting would be on June 23.

Ms. Klancher said that recruitment will include a call for applications and recommendations from TPB members and that staff would also conduct outreach to ensure a good mix from around the region. She briefed the Steering Committee on March 4 and that the TPB would be briefed in April or May.

Ms. Erickson observed that this new committee would be responsive to many federal requirements, and she encouraged staff to describe how the proposed committee would respond to those requirements.

A Committee member asked whether transit agencies not affiliated with a local jurisdiction would be invited to participate.

Ms. Klancher said that she would update the description so that those groups could have ex-officio members.

Mr. Malouff asked when the new committee would provide comment on the CLRP.

Ms. Klancher said members of the most recent AFA were invited to comment on the CLRP and that in the future, comments will likely occur once the performance analysis is ready and the CLRP is open for comment prior to approval.

Mr. Emerine asked is the AFA would regularly report to the TPB.

Ms. Klancher said that this is open for discussion, and the committee has briefed the board in the past when there is a plan or something to adopt.

Mr. Emerine said that periodic briefings might be a good idea.

Mr. Srikanth said that the AFA has provided comments on the CLRP, has submitted a comments document to the board, and that sometimes the committee has a representative brief the board.

11. Briefing on the VDOT Project-Level Air Quality Resource Document

Mr. Roseboom introduced Mr. Ponticello from VDOT's Central Office and Mr. Szekeres from Michael Baker consultants. Mr. Roseboom indicated that he has been involved in projectlevel conformity analyses, and noted that the project-level resource document should be helpful to COG and the localities when doing that level of evaluation.

Mr. Ponticello stated that VDOT, with the help of Michael Baker consultants, has developed a project-level air quality resource document and online data repository. He said that the intent of the document is to streamline the development of project-level air quality studies to meet

NEPA and conformity requirements. He explained that, in addition to the regional air quality conformity analysis, there are federal requirements to make sure that individual projects do not adversely affect air quality. He pointed out that TPB's consultation procedures defers the responsibilities of meeting the project level conformity analyses to the state DOTs. He noted that this document has gone through the consultation process.

Mr. Szekeres stated that the resource document addresses project level conformity. He noted that the document streamlines two phases: 1) analytics of doing the analyses, and 2) consultation. He pointed out that there is an accompanying online data repository to support modeling. He stated that the document was presented to the Inter-Agency Consultation for Conformity (IACC) at COG on December 14, 2015, and involved all required federal, state, and local agencies. He noted that the December presentation included discussion of models, methods, and assumptions for project level analysis. It also included discussion of PM2.5 project assessment criteria that limit consultation to those projects that may be of air quality concern. He noted that streamlining included an agreement that interagency consultation can be satisfied without consulting separately on every decision about each project. He stated that the resource document develops procedures that will apply for any hot-spot analysis. He reviewed an outline of steps (review of thresholds, etc.) that VDOT would use to determine if a PM2.5 project would reach the level of needing consultation. Mr. Szekeres listed the resource document contents, and indicated that many of the resources are included in the appendices of the document. He gave examples of data in some of the appendices, including conformity exemption tables, local MOVES model data from COG's regional conformity analyses, default background concentrations, and default meteorological data. He noted that these appendices will be updated as data changes.

Mr. Ponticello stated that the document helps VDOT in many ways, especially in streamlining procedures for completing project level conformity analyses, and in assuring consistency in methods to meet federal requirements. He encouraged MDOT and DDOT to adopt similar procedures.

Mr. Milone informed the presenters that TPB staff member Eulalie Lucas, the designated point-of-contact for consultation, has recently retired. Mr. Milone requested that any future communication regarding consultation or data requests go directly to him. He also asked for clarification about the specific version of MOVES that is supporting the VDOT document. Mr. Szekeres indicated that they are using MOVES2014. Mr. Milone noted TPB staff will use newer MOVES2014a to support upcoming conformity work. Mr. Ponticello noted that once TPB approves the conformity analysis, VDOT will contact TPB staff and request updated files. He explained that there is a requirement to use the same data and assumptions for project level conformity as is used in the regional conformity analysis.

Ms. Casey stated that those sort of procedures might be helpful for DDOT. She noted that in the past there were inconsistencies in hot-spot analyses in the District, so she had created a guide for project managers and consultants to use when doing those sorts of analyses. The guide required that people go to her to get data and assumptions, which she would get from COG. She noted that many project managers and consultants want to use horizon years to match their projects, and she always suggests using years that match the TPB horizon analysis years to make use of easily available approved data. She stated that she would like to be able to refer people to the document and the data repository. She asked if DC data would be included in the repository. Mr. Ponticello replied that some of the data in the repository relates to the District and Maryland. He suggested that he would be happy to work with the District to help in any way.

12. Update on Activities of COG's Multi-Sector Working Group (MSWG) on Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Mr. Griffiths provided an update on the activities of COG's Multi-Sector Working Group on Greenhouse Gas Emissions (MSWG). In 2015, the MSWG, with technical assistance from a consultant team lead by ICF International, analyzed 22 strategies (at both viable and stretch levels) for the potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the region and bring the region closer to the adopted COG goal to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 80% over 2005 levels by 2050. The results of the analysis were presented to the TPB, MWAQC, CEEPC, and the COG Board.

The COG Board expressed concern that some of the strategy assumptions go beyond what local jurisdictions have adopted and requested that COG staff put together straw recommendations for a set of regional consensus strategies that member jurisdictions and state partners could support. The straw recommendations were presented to a policy-level working group in January 2016. The group requested more input from local jurisdiction staff and asked COG staff to put together a questionnaire for local staff to find out whether the strategies were implementable; the level of intensity for implementation; supportive actions that were needed from other entities; challenges, obstacles, and opportunities; and a general sense of the implementation timeframe.

A draft of the questionnaire was distributed. The questionnaire would be distributed local jurisdiction staff in Energy and Built Environment, Transportation, and Land Use sectors. The survey will also be sent to CAOs and the elected officials who were involved with the policy-level working group.

The survey was expected to be sent out later that day or the following Monday. Mr. Walz noted that there will be one e-mail sent to the lead contacts in each jurisdiction with other staff copied. COG staff will request that the leads coordinate their responses as there is some overlap between the sectors. The survey questions were pre-tested and the questionnaire reflects input from that pre-testing.

The survey can be completed either using Survey Monkey or the Word document. Responses are requested by April 1st. COG staff will summarize the results for the policy-level working group. Results released publically will be a consolidated report of the responses; however, any elected official can request the detailed responses from his or her jurisdiction. The policy-level working group is expected to meet again in April.

A second handout had the list of transportation contacts who will receive the questionnaire. Representatives from Alexandria and WMATA requested changes to their contacts. Carrie Sanders should be listed for Alexandria and Rachel Healy and Allison Davis should be reversed for WMATA. Mr. Griffiths noted the changes.

13. Update on Process for Selecting FY 2017 Projects in Northern Virginia under the Federal Transportation Alternatives Program

Mr. Cobb announced that the TPB is currently reviewing projects for FY 2017 federal funds for the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) in Northern Virginia. The TPB has \$2.5 million in funding for projects. TAP, established by MAP-21 in 2012, now falls under the 2015 FAST Act as part of the Surface Transportation Block Grant program as a funding set-aside. As the states and MPOs transition to FAST, the program will still be referred to as TAP to avoid confusion. The TPB directs TAP as a component of the Transportation/Land Use

Connections program. Through TAP, the TPB can fund larger projects than in the technical assistance component and promote regional priorities through local planning.

Mr. Cobb stated that for TAP in Virginia, the TPB works with VDOT's Local Assistance Division, with local TMA funding going to the TPB, and the additional statewide funds going to the Commonwealth Transportation Board. The TPB will organize a selection panel of TPB staff and transportation planners from Maryland and the District of Columbia familiar with the region. The selection panel will review projects based on set criteria that support regional goals. The panel's recommendations will be submitted to the Technical Committee on April 1, and to the TPB for approval on April 20th.

Mr. Srikanth inquired about funding amounts for Maryland and the District of Columbia.

Mr. Cobb responded that the District of Columbia has not released TAP funding information. Roughly \$1.7 million in funding will be available for Maryland projects. The application cutoff for Maryland FY 2017 TAP funds is May 16, 2016.

14. Update on the TPB's Street Smart Program

Mr. Farrell spoke to a memo. The Spring 2016 campaign wave will take place April 11 – May 8th. There will be a couple weeks of television, plus four weeks of bus backs and internet advertising. The Spring budget for Spring is smaller than for the Fall. The press event will take place in Silver Spring transit center, April 12 or 13, final date TBD. Partner agencies will carry out enforcement, and we will have several enforcement activation events, whereby the press will cover live enforcement. We continue to get substantial support from the transit agencies, which are providing significant free space, including bus cards.

15. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – February 5, 2016**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County Ben Yeckley
Frederick County -----
City of Frederick -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County John Thomas
Prince George’s County Anthony Foster
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery County -----
Prince George’s County -----
MDOT Lyn Erickson
Kari Snyder
Samantha Biddle
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington County Sarah Crawford
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County Malcolm Watson
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
NVTA Sree Nampoothiri
NVTC Dan Goldfarb
Prince William County James Davenport
PRTC Betsy Massie
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Norman Whitaker
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

Allison Davis

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Nick Ramfos, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Bill Bacon, DTP
Lamont Cobb, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Nicole McCall, DTP
Jessica Mirr, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Erin Morrow, DTP
Dzung Ngo, DTP
Jinchul Park, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Wenjing Pu, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Sergio Ritacco, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Steve Walz, DEP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS

OTHER

Alexandra Brun
Bill Orleans
Dan Painter
Jim Ponticello, VDOT
Ryk Rybek, Just Economics
Dan Szekeres, Michael Baker, Inc.