

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

777 North Capitol Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20002-4226
(202) 962-3200

**MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
March 18, 2015**

Members and Alternates Present

Marcel Acosta, NCPC
Charles Allen, DC Council
Bob Brown, Loudoun County
Ron Burns, Frederick County
Rick Canizales, Prince William County
Allison Davis, WMATA
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Dan Emerine, DC Office of Planning
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County/DOT
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jay Fisette, Arlington County
Jason Groth, Charles County
Rene'e Hamilton, VDOT
Neil Harris, Gaithersburg City Council
Konrad Herling, City of Greenbelt
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax County
Shyam Kannan, WMATA
Tim Lovain, City of Alexandria
Dan Malouff, Arlington County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
Kelly Russell, City of Frederick
Peter Schwartz, Fauquier County
Elissa Silverman, DC Council
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Tammy Stidham, NPS
Todd M. Turner, Prince George's County
Jonathan Way, City of Manassas

Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County/DPW&T
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Sam Zimbabwe, DDOT

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Robert Griffiths
Nicholas Ramfos
Andrew Meese
Eric Randall
John Swanson
Rich Roisman
Mark Moran
Anant Choudhary
Michael Farrell
Andrew Austin
Daivamani Sivasailam
C. Patrick Zilliacus
Wendy Klancher
Dan Sonenklar
Ben Hampton
Bryan Hayes
Sergio Ritacco
Lamont Cobb
Debbie Leigh
Deborah Etheridge
Stuart Freudberg COG/EO
Paul DesJardin COG/DCPS
Bill Orleans Resident
Stewart Schwartz CSG
Jameshia Peterson DDOT
Gregory Matlesky Chairman Mendelson
Andrew Beacher VDOT
Norman Whitaker VDOT
John Hartline Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland
Nat Bottigheimer Fehr & Peers DC
Matthew Ridgway Fehr & Peers DC
Amy Cavaretta Cambridge Systematics
Malcolm Watson Fairfax County DOT
Pierre Holloman City of Alexandria
Rob Kiernan The Northeast MAGLEV
Nancy Abeles Resident
Tina Slater Purple Line NOW

Tamara Vatnick	DC/Office of Planning
Norman Whitaker	VDOT
Marie Sinner	VDOT
Andy Beacher	VDOT
Betsy Massie	PRTC

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Vice-Chair Lovain filled in for Chair Mendelson, who was not immediately available.

The Board received no public comments at the meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes of February 18 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the February TPB Meeting Minutes. The motion was seconded and approved.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Mr. Rawlings referred to the mailout material and summarized the March 6 Technical Committee meeting. He said that the committee discussed four agenda items, including: the final draft FY 2016 budgets of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP); a staff review of amendments for carryover funds from the FY 2015 UPWP budget to FY 2016; and a final report of a planning study regard commuter bus parking and staging in the District of Columbia and Arlington County.

Mr. Rawlings said that the committee recommended staff present the draft FY 2016 UPWP and CCWP, with amendments for carryover funds from the FY 2015 UPWP budget, for Board approval.

Mr. Rawlings also noted that the committee discussed the following informational items: the results of a study to analyze pedestrian and bicycle improvements for 25 select transit stations; the first meeting of the Multi-Sector Working Group on Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction; a 2014 triennial aerial survey of peak period freeway congestion; the latest updates from USDOT regarding MAP-21 performance measures regulations; and the development of a regional unfunded projects list.

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Mr. Summersgill said the CAC met on March 12. Referring to the CA report, he said that COG staff briefed the CAC on the regional cooperative forecasts on population, households, and jobs. He said the group agreed to create two subcommittees to develop recommendations for the regional list of unfunded projects and public outreach. They discussed other topics for potential committee action this year, including promoting better data gathering and analysis to promote safety, and the need to coordinate transit data trip planning among the Washington region's transit providers.

5. Report of Steering Committee

Mr. Srikanth referred to the mailout and handout material. He said that the Steering Committee met on March 6 and approved three amendments to the FY 2015-202 TIP. None of the three amendments affected the air-quality conformity analysis. The first amendment included a request from the Maryland Department of Transportation to add funding for four highway projects in Frederick, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties for two resurfacing and systems preservation projects along I-95 and I-495, one reconstruction project along US 15 and US 40 and a planning project involving segments of I-495, I-270, and the I-270 spur. The second amendment included a request from the Virginia Department of Transportation regarding funding for two road maintenance projects and an intersection improvement project in Fauquier County. The third amendment, also from VDOT, included funding for rail construction projects at rail stations and crossings.

Mr. Srikanth noted an error in the mailout packet for Board members regarding VDOT's TIP amendments. He said that staff had corrected the error and posted the updated documents on the TPB website.

Mr. Srikanth reported on the letters received and sent on behalf of the Board. He said that the TPB received a letter from the Federal Railroad Administration informing the Board that the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation will begin a Tier II NEPA environmental impact study on the development of a high-speed rail corridor from Washington to Richmond. He said that the FRA has invited the TPB to participate in the Tier II study. Mr. Srikanth noted that staff has attended past informational meetings on the project and will continue to participate.

Mr. Srikanth also informed the Board on a second memo regarding updates to the Board on the January 12 WMATA incidents. He said that the memo responds to direction to staff to look into a briefing to the Board on the matter of the Jan. 12, 2015 Metrorail smoke incident near L'Enfant Plaza station. He said that the ongoing NTSB recommendation has not yet provided new information regarding the incident or its investigation. Both COG and WMATA staffs were available and willing to brief the Board at the April meeting on actions initiated that they are involved in, actions particularly related to WMATA safety and communications internally and with various regional emergency management service agencies.

Mr. Srikanth referred to the memo and noted that COG staff will be able to provide information about work among its various committees, including the fire chiefs' committee and rail safety subcommittee, with WMATA and public safety communications agencies on fire radio testing, corrective action protocols, and first responder training and radio communications. He noted that WMATA staff would be able to provide information on their actions since January 12, including ten early action safety items and their response to the NTSB's February 11 urgent safety recommendations.

Vice-Chairman Lovain responded that the Board looks forward to the April meeting.

Ms. Hudgins asked if EMS-related agencies were involved in COG and WMATA work regarding the January 12 incident.

Mr. Srikanth responded that EMS groups are involved.

6. Chair's Remarks

Chair Mendelson requested an update on the TPB's plans to commemorate its 50-year anniversary.

Mr. Srikanth reported that staff would present a proposal to the Board in April. He said the proposal would have a three-pronged approach using the *TPB News*, *TPB Weekly Report*, and *The Region* magazine to describe the Board's accomplishments over the past 50 years. He mentioned that the anniversary events provide an opportunity to look back at how the Board has addressed past challenges in mobility and transportation access as well as look forward to the issues the Board may face in the future. Staff will produce a video showing the accomplishments over the past 50 years and future issues, including interviews of Board members, agency administrators and other officials. Mr. Srikanth said staff has tentatively planned two events for the end of the calendar year. The first will take place prior to the TPB meeting in November and the second will occur in conjunction with the COG Annual Meeting in December.

Mr. Srikanth also mentioned that the TPB would kick off the Street Smart pedestrian safety campaign on March 25 at the College Park City Hall. Prince's George's County Executive Rushern Baker and Maryland Governor's Highway Safety Representative Milton Chaffee were expected to attend the event. He encouraged Board members to attend.

ACTION ITEMS

7. Approval of Amendment to the FY 2015 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), and Approval of FY 2015 UPWP Carryover Funding to FY 2016

Mr. Srikanth referred to his presentation as he described two resolutions to carry over \$1.7 million in funding and activities from the FY 2015 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to the FY 2016 UPWP. He said that the first action is to amend the current (FY 2015) Budget to downwardly revise the funding amounts and remove some activities for the current fiscal year. He said that the five planned activities for this fiscal year within the basic program totaling \$1.1 million would not be completed this fiscal year and a few additional activities under the States' Technical Work program, totaling \$629,000 would not be completed this fiscal year. The second action is to then carryover these funding amounts and the tasks into the proposed Budget and Work program for the next fiscal year – which is the subject of the next item on the agenda. He said that there was a separate resolution for each of these two items and that staff requests and recommends that the Board adopt both resolutions.

Mr. Fisette asked if it was a standard practice to carry over funding from one fiscal year to another.

Mr. Srikanth said that this was a standard practice per an agreement that the TPB has with the state DOTs.

Mr. Herling asked for a description of some of the activities that would be carried over to FY 2016.

Mr. Srikanth referred to page three of the memo that describes the specific activities that will be carried over, which include public participation, the establishment of performance measurements as required by MAP-21; activities to be carried out by the reconstituted Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee; and travel condition monitoring. He added that \$925,000 of the \$1.1 million carried over for planning activities would be used to conduct household travel surveys starting in 2016. He said that page 11 of the memo describes the carry over activities related to the technical assistance program for the state DOTs and WMATA.

Mr. Herling asked if these projects would have a high priority in FY 2016.

Mr. Srikanth said that these activities would be moved to start the new fiscal year.

Mr. Turner made a motion to approve R15-2015 to amend the FY 2015 UPWP.

The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

Mr. Turner made a motion to approve R16-2015 to carry over FY 2015 UPWP funding to FY 2016 UPWP. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Emerine asked that page 68 of the FY 2016 UPWP indicate that the household travel surveys will now be completed in 2016 instead of 2015.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the document and the text Mr. Emerine was referring to will be discussed under Item 8, but that this discussion was about Item 7. He said that some of the geographically focused household surveys are being done in the current fiscal year. He said that there was money to conduct additional surveys, which would not be completed in FY 2015, and those surveys would be conducted in FY 2016. Additionally the second bullet on page 68 is referring to the analysis of the data that will be collected in the current fiscal year.

The motion to approve R16-2015 was approved unanimously.

8. Approval of FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Srikanth said that a draft of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) was released for public comment on February 18. He said that no comments were submitted by the public, but that the document was reviewed by the TPB's Technical Committee, the three state DOTs, and WMATA. Based on comments provided by these groups, the UPWP was updated to include: carryover funding and activities that were approved by the Board in Item 7; updates to the states' planning and resource program descriptions; and descriptions for the technical assistance programs

for each of the state DOTs and WMATA.

Mr. Kannan referring to page 58 of the FY 2016 UPWP asked which section of TPB oversight is contained for any of the elements under the regional studies and specifically the Unfunded Project list work. He also asked staff to provide a little bit more clarity into the work program, even at the conceptual level that is proposed for the Unfunded Project list work activity. .

Mr. Srikanth responded that the typically, activities under regional studies, is under the oversight of the Board as these tasks are generally initiated by the Board. H said that based on discussion to date the approach for this task would be in two parts. The first part compiles the region-wide listing of all of the projects for which funding has not been identified. He said staff is currently working with the members of the local jurisdictions in compiling that list and we would bring that back to the Board. The second part is taking what we suspect will be a rather long list of projects needing probably billions of dollars. The discussions at the Board meeting has been to take that rather large list with very high dollar value and see if we can identify a handful of regionally significant multimodal projects, that this Board can collectively get behind and explore innovative means of finding new monies to implement the projects.

Mr. Schwartz asked if TPB staff could create a table that shows the recipients of the \$15 million in UPWP program.

Mr. Srikanth said that page 23 of the UPWP provides a detailed allocation of the UPWP funding. He said that the monies in the UPWP are spent by the staff of the planning board, except for the money set aside for technical assistance. He explained that there is no sub-allocation of money to other agencies.

Mr. Schwartz asked if the TPB conducts an internal evaluation of annual spending at the end of a year to satisfy ourselves and satisfy the board that that was money well spent.

Mr. Srikanth said that relevant sections of the United States Code 23 and 49 outline all of the required MPO activities, which are outlined in the UPWP. He said that money provided by the federal agencies to execute UPWP activities is approved by the FHWA and the FTA. One major focus of the TPB's work is to develop the TIP, which the states use to develop their statewide STIPs. The federal approval of the statewide TIP is required before federal funds for transportation projects would be released to the states. Federal approval of the TIPs is evidence that the TPB is doing good work. He said that if the FHWA or FTA did not approve the STIP that would mean that something that the TPB or state DOT's has done is not acceptable. This region has had no incidents so far.

Mr. Srikanth also noted that the FHWA and FTA conduct a three-day audit once every four years to assess how the MPO has performs in regards to the federally required activities. He said that the TPB concluded its most recent federal audit in 2014, and that staff is waiting for a report by the FHWA and the FTA in the next month or two.

Mr. Schwartz said he understood that the TPB's work is not necessarily done because it is good for the region but because it is required. He further said it seemed that the TPB does not evaluate its own activities, but rather it relies on external evaluations.

Mr. Srikanth said that the TPB's work under Regional Studies was a good example of regional planning work that has been good for the region. He referenced the TPB's Vision Document and the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan documents as examples of regional planning. These documents lay out the principles and priorities the TPB has adopted to help guide the types of transportation improvements projects that are selected and funded by the various jurisdictions in this region. Mr. Srikanth also referenced the TPB's significant role that brought focus on funding needs for the Metro system, which resulted in the US Congress, adopting the PRIIA Act providing the region about \$3B in funding for Metro planning work at a regional level.

Mr. Schwartz thanked Mr. Srikanth for his explanation, and encouraged the TPB to consider conducting an internal evaluation to assess whether the money that the region is spending on planning is achieving the information and analysis that is needed to help the region.

Mr. Fisette referenced the Unfunded Project list proposed in the FY 2016 UPWP and said that based on his work in Virginia that there are limitations on how the new funds can be used, which are not necessarily understood. He suggested that as part of this work a matrix that explains the sources of those funds and limitations are on the use of those funds.

Mr. Srikanth agreed and noted that with regard to the new funds in Northern Virginia he has been talking with the executive director of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority about briefing the Board on this funding and opportunities. He said it would be useful to incorporate similar information about funding in Maryland and the District of Columbia in the TPB's development of the regional list of unfunded projects.

Ms. Erickson addressed Mr. Schwartz and said that the TPB outperforms the other MPOs in Maryland in terms of spending its funding and creating the data and the information that are needed to execute projects on a daily basis. She said that an internal evaluation might be helpful, but added that TPB members might benefit from learning more about the work of the TPB.

Mr. Snyder asked to be associated with comments made by Fairfax and Arlington County TPB representatives in regards to the I-66 inside the beltway study during the February 18 meeting. He also asked why the Route 7 study in Virginia is not included in the UPWP.

Mr. Srikanth said that he can have the table amended to include this study, but also said that this study is not currently receiving any planning funds through the TPB.

Mr. Snyder also asked about the \$78,400 in the UPWP for emergency preparedness. He said that number seems insufficient.

Mr. Srikanth said that there are other public safety and emergency committees at COG. He said that

these groups have funding and provide oversight of emergency preparedness for the region. He said that the money in the UPWP only reflects TPB's contribution to the overall effort and is money for coordination and planning as it relates to TPB staff's involvement with those committees.

A motion was made to adopt R17-2105 to approve the final FY 2016 UPWP. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously

9. Approval of FY 2016 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

Mr. Ramfos said that the FY 2016 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP) was released for public comment on February 12. He said there was no comment from the public. He said that the Commuter Connections subcommittee and the state DOTs have reviewed and approved the work program.

A Board member asked how Commuter Connections markets its services and whether or not there is an effort to engage media.

Mr. Ramfos said that Commuter Connections has a mass-marketing initiative that includes year-round marketing, additional special events like Bike to Work Day and Car-Free Day, and co-branding with local transit providers in the Washington area. He explained that Commuter Connections works with both COG's Office of Communications and consultants to get the message out to the media.

A motion was made to approve R18-2015 to approve the FY 2016 CCWP. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

10. Approval of an Amendment to Update Projects and Funding in the District of Columbia Section of the FY 2015-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Zimbabwe said that the District of Columbia is requesting an amendment to the 2015-2020 TIP to include funding for 18 new projects based on the District of Columbia's capital planning. He added that the amendment does not remove any projects from the TIP.

A motion was made to approve R19-2105 to approve an amendment to update projects and funding in the District of Columbia section of the FY 2015-2020 TIP. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

11. Briefing on the COG Cooperative Forecasting Process

Mr. Desjardin briefed the Board, referring to an on-screen presentation. He provided an overview of the Cooperative Forecasting process as well as the results of the Round 8.4 Cooperative Forecasts. He explained that Arlington County, the City of Alexandria, and Fairfax County updated their

population and household growth forecasts slightly in this latest round, and that Prince William County updated its population, household, and employment growth forecasts. His presentation also included information on differences in growth forecasts between the inner and outer jurisdictions, and by individual jurisdiction.

Chair Mendelson opened the floor to questions.

Mr. Elrich expressed concern that policymakers and decision-makers might misunderstand the forecasts and put pressure on local planning departments to zone for more residential and commercial development than they need. He drew attention to the fact that the forecasts are actually based on development patterns that have already been planned at the local level.

Mr. Desjardin concurred with Mr. Elrich's point that the forecasts are based on what is already planned.

Mr. Herling asked whether staff can say how much of the forecast growth is anticipated to occur near mass transit, and whether staff can provide a breakdown on the types of employment that are forecast in each jurisdiction.

Mr. Desjardin said that an analysis of the forecasts shows that more than half of residential growth and three-quarters of all new jobs will be located in Activity Centers, more than half of which have transit access. He also said that staff has a breakdown of the employment growth by sector, but only at the regional level. He said that the next major round of forecasts, Round 9.0, could try to look more closely at employment growth broken down by sector at the jurisdictional level.

Mr. Harris asked whether staff had studied the accuracy of past forecasts.

Mr. Desjardin explained that staff had studied the accuracy of past forecasts on a few occasions. He said that employment has tended to be underestimated, that the number of households has been accurate, and that population has tended to be overestimated. He said that the variance in population has been due to unexpected shifts in fertility, international immigration, and other demographic factors.

Mr. Erenrich echoed Mr. Elrich's concern about how the forecasts might be used. He asked whether it would be possible for the local planning departments that provide the forecasts to note how much of the anticipated growth is already in the "pipeline" – that is, for which permits have been issued – versus how much is only spelled out in local plans and could conceivably be changed.

Mr. Kannan highlighted one aspect of the forecasts that makes them especially useful to local and regional planners: that they can often better predict employment growth than private-sector firms can do, since they work directly with local planning departments.

12. Briefing on the Implementation of the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program

Mr. Randall briefed the Board on the Implementation of the Regional Priority Bus Project, funded by a \$58.8 million TIGER grant the TPB received in 2010. He stated there are 16 project components currently in implementation by five state and local agencies, with TPB staff assisting with project coordination and federal reporting. Mr. Randall noted that major projects completed include the Alexandria portion of the Potomac Yard Transitway and new buses for the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission. Projects slated for completion this year include the Takoma-Langley bus transfer center and the installation of real-time information displays at bus stops across the region. Projects beginning this year include transit signal priority systems, improvements at the Franconia-Springfield and Pentagon Metrorail stations, and capital improvements for bus-only lanes in the District of Columbia and Virginia. Mr. Randall recommended that agencies complete all projects in 18 months. This schedule allows time for invoicing before the September expiration of the funds and the beginning of performance monitoring requirements.

More information on the Regional Priority Bus Project and individual projects can be found in the Item 12 presentation and seven-page memo.

Chair Mendelson asked why the TPB and participating agencies needed five years to complete the project.

Mr. Randall responded that the completion of the project required new staff, design and procurement to facilitate new technologies not yet used in the region. Many of the projects fall under the jurisdiction of several different agencies across the region, each with varying levels of internal capacity. He said that coordination among the agencies has been challenging, but the goal of the grant was to create an incentive for the agencies to work together.

Chair Mendelson confirmed with Mr. Randall that the TPB was the sub-recipient of the grant, receiving funding from the Federal Transit Administration, and would be responsible for maintaining quality. The Chair asked whether the participating agencies are completing quality work and if the project will finish on time.

Mr. Randall remarked that all the unfinished projects are on track for completion and monitored through an extensive project management plan that details agency responsibilities. TPB staff has signed sub-grantee agreements and has assistance through the FTA for project management oversight. He also said that there is a monthly overall project meeting and additional meetings every month with each agency.

Chair Mendelson commented that TPB staff relies on the self-reporting of agencies for quality monitoring.

Mr. Randall confirmed that quality assurance and control are part of the project management plan. The TPB has additional reporting responsibilities to the federal government after the project is completed. He said as a planning organization, the TPB facilitates the work of the participating agencies, each having its own administrative processes. The TPB works collectively with the agencies to ensure project management and completion.

Chair Mendelson remarked that the District of Columbia contracted out funds for signal optimizations in the past, and the region had discussed signal optimization up to ten years ago as a Transportation Emissions Reduction Measure for air quality conformity. He asked about the length of time to complete optimization, when it would occur, and referred a third question to Mr. Randall presentation about optimization occurring in the spring.

Mr. Zimbabwe mentioned that the signal optimization projects are based on different implementation schedules. The District has specific zones with their own implementation schedules not tied to the season, but to project readiness. He also noted there are several components to the optimization project as part of a larger effort not completed in some time. He also remarked he would provide more information on these questions for the Chair.

Chair Mendelson asked if optimization is part of the TIGER grant for the District.

Mr. Randall said that part of the District's network optimization is critical to helping buses move through congested corridors, and looks toward efficiency for riders. TIGER is paying for a smaller segment of the District's larger signal optimization plan.

Mr. Kannan added that several agencies have been working to coordinate the new optimization technology across all the jurisdictions with separate power systems, different fleet requirements, and then implementation. He noted that length of time to complete the projects has not been due to any lack of effort, ill will, or malfeasance among the participating agencies.

Ms. Hudgens agreed that project coordination is difficult. As TPB staff encounters challenges, she asked at what point the TPB should consider elevating its concerns to higher-level decision makers for resolution.

Mr. Randall responded that WMATA has been the TPB's primary partner in elevating the project. The relationship with other agencies has been administrative, with WMATA taking primary responsibility for the transit signal priority project and improvements to Franconia-Springfield and Pentagon stations. He also stated the other projects have been handled on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Hudgens requested that the Board get more information on progress, to help identify ways to move the project forward if things are stuck.

Mr. Snyder requested the Bus Priority Project be a regular agenda item for each TPB meeting over the next three to four months. He said it appears that deadlines are not going to be met, and the Board should be prepared to ask for extension if needed. He also suggested regular updates from

participating agencies in addition to TPB staff.

A member asked for clarification on the deadline for the funding and performance.

Mr. Randall responded that the grant expires in September 2016, and the last day to submit an invoice is September 20. He also confirmed for Chair Mendelson that the working deadline is June 2016, to allow time for the processing of invoices.

Mr. Snyder asked if the June 2015 report would be sufficient if the project is not running smoothly.

Mr. Srikanth commented that TPB staff plans to brief the Board every two to three months on the balance of projects.

Chair Mendelson recommended a shorter project briefing in May and a longer briefing in July.

Mr. Srikanth added that staff would brief the board on pending projects on the stated months.

13. Briefing on Regional Bus Staging, Layover, and Parking Location Study

Mr. Roisman briefed the Board, referring to an on-screen presentation. He also provided printed copies of a summary memo and a link to the full report online. He noted that the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) had submitted some comments on the final report after it had been posted and mailed out to Board members.

In his presentation, Mr. Roisman explained the purpose and need for the study, pointing out that more than 1,000 buses enter the District and Arlington every day, most of them commuter buses or tour buses. He said the study found that commuter buses need more on-street staging locations in the afternoon, to avoid driving around waiting to pick up passengers, while tour buses need more long-term, mid-day off-street parking closer to the National Mall and other tourist sites. He explained that the study evaluated a number of potential sites based on size, availability, and location, among other factors, and identified 14 potential on-street staging locations and 15 potential off-street parking locations for further study.

Chair Mendelson opened the floor to questions.

Mr. Allen asked why the study did not find a need for more off-street parking for commuter buses. He also expressed concern that several of the on-street parking locations identified in the study were near schools, libraries, parks, or other sensitive community sites, and he said that the identification of potential staging and parking locations did not seem to be coordinated with existing development plans in the District.

Mr. Roisman responded to Mr. Allen by explaining that most commuter buses do not need off-street, mid-day parking because they return to their garages for maintenance and drive swap-out before coming back into the core in the afternoon to pick passengers up again. He also

acknowledged the critical importance of the location and coordination issues that Mr. Allen raised and said they would be considered as part of the post-study follow-up.

Mr. Way emphasized the importance of the study to the commuter bus operators from his and other jurisdictions. He also emphasized the importance of coordination between DDOT and the bus operators to take follow-up actions to the study and to implement a solution in the future. He noted the willingness of the commuter bus operators to compensate DDOT or other agencies for lost parking revenues that might occur from using on-street parking spaces for bus staging areas.

Mr. Emerine asked if post-study follow-up activities were included in the TPB's FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) discussed earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Srikanth explained that the scope of the current study ended with identifying sites for further study and that follow-up actions currently are not part of the UPWP for next year. He said that the next steps are for the appropriate agencies within the District government to work with the commuter bus operators to study the sites more closely and identify next steps. He said that TPB staff would be happy to assist in that effort, if requested, but that no plans currently exist to do so.

Mr. Roisman reiterated Mr. Srikanth's point in response to a request from Chair Mendelson for further clarification on who is responsible for follow-up action. He said that it is primarily up to DDOT and the bus operators to carry out next steps.

Ms. Stidham emphasized the importance of including the National Park Service in follow-up study of the potential parking and layover sites. She expressed concern that commuter and tour buses are already interfering with visitors' experience of several Park Service sites in the District, and that some of the potential parking and layover sites identified in the study are on or adjacent to Park Service property.

Mr. Canizales echoed Mr. Way's comments, noting the importance of providing commuter buses with adequate staging areas in the downtown core and the willingness of the commuter bus operators to negotiate with the District government to find a solution. He also encouraged further study of the potential sites identified in the study in order to deal with issues raised earlier by Mr. Allen.

Mr. Brown thanked TPB staff for facilitating the study, emphasizing its importance to commuters in Loudoun County, too.

Mr. Snyder asked that staff provide future updates to the Board on follow-up activities to the study, noting the importance of an efficient commuter bus system in achieving the kinds of transit ridership goals the region has set for itself.

Mr. Srikanth said that staff could look into providing an update at the May or June TPB meeting.

OTHER ITEMS

14. Other Business

No other business was brought before the Board.

15. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.