

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes
for meeting of
June 3, 2011

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - June 3, 2011**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP -----

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick Co. John Thomas
City of Frederick Tim Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich
Prince George's Co. Vic Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. -----
 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT Lyn Erickson

MTA -----
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington Co. Jennifer Fioretti
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Mike Lake
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. -----
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Monica Backmon
NVTC -----
PRTC Nick Alexandrow
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT Anthony Foster
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Tom Harrington

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
FHWA-VA -----
FTA Melissa Barlow
 Dan Koenig

NCPC -----
NPS -----
MWAQC -----

COG Staff

Ronald Kirby, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Bob Griffiths, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andy Meese, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Clara Reschovsky, DTP
Sarah Crawford, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Rex Hodgson, DTP
Beth Newman, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Joan Rohlfs, DEP

Other Attendees

Randy Carroll, MDE
Ron Burns, Ferderick County
Art Rodgers, DC Office of Planning
Bill Orleans

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

June 3, 2011

Technical Committee Minutes

1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from May 6 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written with the clarification of one of the VDOT attendee's names.

2. **Update on Amendment to Update Projects and Funding in the Virginia Section of the FY 2011-2016 TIP**

Mr. Srikanth referenced the memo that had been included with the meeting materials. He stated that this was VDOT's annual update to the TIP to reflect the latest FY 2012-2015 STIP and to update transit funding. He noted that this did not reflect VDOT's proposed new FY 2012-2017 Six Year Plan which is currently under development. He added that the proposed TIP update was out for public comment and that the TPB would be asked to approve it at their June meeting.

Mr. Srikanth pointed to Tables A and B following the memo, which showed an increase of just over \$1.5 billion over the six years of the TIP. He noted that this increase in funding was primarily from the inclusion of funding in the out years of the TIP. He also referenced Table C which demonstrated that the proposed update was fiscally constrained and that estimated revenues were sufficient to meet proposed commitments. He added that corrections had been received from VDRPT and VRE and would be incorporated into the proposed TIP tables prior to TPB's approval. He asked members to review the document and provide any additional comments to himself and Mr. Austin on TPB staff.

Mr. Verzosa noted that the amount of local funding proposed – about \$4.5 billion was about half of the total. Mr. Srikanth explained VDOT's funding strategy and noted that federal funds were continually being applied to projects, so that the numbers may change. He also noted that due to budget cuts, VDOT had cut funding to many projects and that local jurisdictions had frequently stepped in to fill the gap with bonds, proffers and private funds.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the additional \$1.5 billion was coming from new funding sources. Mr. Srikanth explained that it was not new funding. Mr. Austin pointed out that the current TIP shows very little funding in Virginia beyond FY 12, whereas this update includes an additional three years of funding through FY 15.

Ms. Erickson stated that MDOT will most likely not be requesting a major update of the TIP this year.

3. Status Report on the CY 2011 Solicitation for Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom Projects

Ms. Newman presented a status report on the TPB's 2011 Solicitation for Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom projects. The briefing included a recap of the past four solicitations and highlighted a project from each jurisdiction, including the accessible taxicab project funded in 2008. She described the solicitation details, including funding amounts, outreach and priority projects that were encouraged by the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force. Also included were the selection committee process and a basic schedule for the 2012 solicitation. The project recommendations will be presented to the TPB at its June 15 meeting for final approval.

Mr. Weissberg asked about process for applicants to address questions or concerns for unfunded applications. Ms. Newman described an appeal process whereby applicants can request a meeting with staff or the Selection Committee Chair to discuss their application.

Mr. Rawlings asked about outreach efforts in light of the fact that money has been carried over from year to year. Ms. Newman responded that new organizations come to the table every year, and the number of applications received this year is the highest of any year.

4. Report on the Scope and Process to Develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan

Mr. Kirby asked staff to report on two TPB programs before his report on the scope for the priority plan.

Ms. Crawford reviewed a memo on the TLC program with the Committee.

Mr. Kirby described a memo on the TPB's FHWA-funded project on the public acceptability of road-use pricing.

Mr. Srikanth noted that a listening session for the pricing acceptability project had already occurred. He asked if he could get a copy of the transcript from that session. He also suggested that the study team might want to get the state DOTs' perspectives on pricing.

Mr. Kirby said the focus of the study would be on public acceptability, not necessarily the positions of the DOTs.

Ms. Erickson supported Mr. Srikanth and said she would be like to get information as early as possible regarding the pricing project.

Mr. Swanson said a summary of the preparatory research, including the listening sessions, would be prepared and provided to interested parties.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the deliberative forums, which will be the main activity for the pricing study, will be conducted throughout the region.

Mr. Swanson said that staff anticipates that the deliberative forums, which will probably number between three and five, will be geographically spread throughout the region.

Mr. Kirby then described the draft scope for the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. He indicated that he had prepared responses to comments submitted by the Citizens Advisory Committee regarding the draft scope. He went through his PowerPoint presentation on the scope and he also described a proposed concept for an application for the federal Transportation, Community and Systems Preservation (TCSP) Program.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the TCSP grant would only be for planning activities.

Mr. Kirby confirmed that it would only be for planning.

Mr. Erenrich asked if a match would be required.

Mr. Kirby said that an 80/20 match would be required. He explained how COG funds would be used.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that it would be useful to know if other jurisdictions in our region are planning to submit TCSP applications.

Mr. Kirby said it could be difficult to coordinate that information because of the tight timing.

Ms. Backmon asked whether the priorities plan would be updated every 4-5 years.

Mr. Kirby answered that yes, his intention would be for the priorities plan to be updated prior to every major CLRP update, which currently happens every four years.

Mr. Srikanth said that it would be useful to update the priorities plan regularly. He suggested that future updates will be easier once the process for developing the priorities plan has been established.

Mr. Kirby described some key aspects of the draft scope. He emphasized public involvement issues.

Mr. Srikanth said that the scope needs to emphasize that currently there are many public involvement opportunities related to the development of priorities at the state and local levels.

Mr. Kirby said that the process will clarify that those opportunities are available at various levels.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if priorities will be established by mode.

Mr. Kirby said that the priorities plan will not be set up to establish priorities within modes.

5. Briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis of an Amendment to the 2010 CLRP to Modify the I-95/395 HOV/HOT Lanes Project and Add a Ramp from the HOV Lanes of I-395 to Seminary Road

Ms. Posey discussed the results of the air quality conformity analysis of the VDOT amendments to the 2010 CLRP. She mentioned that there had been an update to the report included in the mailout. The new report is dated June 2, and includes minor changes to exhibits 11 and 12. She used slides to review the results. She showed a map of the amended projects, and described the changes on I-66 and I-95/I395 as compared to the original 2010 CLRP. She noted that the technical approach was the same as that used for the original 2010 CLRP conformity analysis. She reviewed emission results, and noted that all forecast emissions meet specified criteria for each pollutant.

Ms. Posey compared analysis results (VMT, VHD, vehicle trips, and transit trips) from the amended CLRP with those of the original 2010 CLRP. She went over the schedule, pointing out dates for public comment and expected TPB approval.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if a more detailed corridor analysis was done. Ms. Posey replied that it was not, but that it could be.

Mr. Srikanth thanked staff for the expedited conformity analysis, and noted that there was nothing counter-intuitive about the results. He reminded the group that any corridor analysis for the HOT lanes using these conformity networks would include the other network changes.

Mr. Kirby agreed that any additional analysis of the results would include effects from both projects, but noted that jurisdiction level changes could be identified.

Mr. Srikanth suggested that the model shows that if we get to a certain level of congestion, that we will reach a “tipping point”, and that people will look for jobs elsewhere in the region.

Mr. Kirby stated that only the CLRP will be amended at this time, and that references to the 2011-16 TIP will be removed.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the TIP amendments will be made when the financial plan is worked out in more detail.

6. Briefing on WMATA's Regional Transit System Plan (RTSP)

Mr. Harrington presented an overview of WMATA's RTSP study, incorporating feedback from the previous presentation in May. The RTSP evaluates future estimated ridership impacts on Metrorail and other transit modes for various transit scenarios, such as new rail lines, an expanded bus network, street car and light rail systems, and other visions for 2040. Mr. Harrington emphasized that the primary reason for the study is the issue of core capacity, with Metrorail demand expected to exceed the capability of the system soon after 2020. WMATA would also like to improve station access effectively, improve surface transit, and provide for new markets. Within each of these four themes, he mentioned the main issues and the possible alternatives for WMATA. Going forward, WMATA will host a series of public forums in mid-July to get citizen input and then proceed with refinement of a limited number of scenarios that combine the alternatives considered.

Mr. Holloman asked for clarification that the RTSP is focused on fixed-route service, not paratransit. Mr. Harrington agreed that he should clarify this up-front.

Mr. Mokhtari requested that the topic of suburb-to-suburb commutes be expanded upon. This is the fastest growing area of travel demand, while "through" travelers add to demand on the Metrorail core.

In response to questions about specific projects or alignments being evaluated, Mr. Harrington explained that this level of detail is available on the WMATA Planning Office's website: www.planitmetro.com

Mr. Srikanth asked if the transit constraint of the CLRP was removed. Mr. Harrington affirmed that this was the case; this was required to fully and consistently evaluate alternatives. The current year at which Metrorail will reach core capacity has been delayed somewhat by the current economic situation, but will likely take place soon after 2020.

Continuing, Mr. Srikanth suggested some additional information should be included in the presentation, such as next steps that WMATA is taking to implement improvements, including the TIGER project and Priority Corridor Network (PCN) plan for bus operations. Mr. Harrington agreed, and further mentioned he would link the RTSP to the regional priorities plan that will be presented to the TPB, and suggest how some of the possible alternatives would be incorporated into the planning process.

Ms. Backmon added that some of the alternatives in Virginia are being incorporated in the 2040 TransAction plan, and that Mr. Kellogg of WMATA is participating in this effort. Mr. Harrington agreed, but noted that while many folks are discussing possible Metrorail extensions, there are no plans for core capacity expansion even though this is the primary issue WMATA faces.

Mr. Kirby expressed that this should be clarified in the presentation; there is possible confusion over whether these are near-term plans or long-term proposals, especially any concepts for new rail alignments in downtown DC.

There was general discussion that suburb-to suburb travel is also served by – and indeed requires – additional core capacity. Mr. Kirby suggested that the proposed interlining connections may be a very cost-effective way to improve Metrorail service.

The issue of access to Metrorail stations was also generally discussed, as pedestrian improvements are some of the most cost-effective projects that can be undertaken. Too many persons parking at Metrorail stations are coming from distances under three miles, indeed often under one mile. The TPB is submitting a TSCP application today that will look at some of these issues for under-utilized rail stations across the region – how to move travelers around without using cars.

7. Review of the Draft 2010 CLRP Document

Mr. Hodgson started out by reminding the Committee members about the ways in which the CLRP has been documented over the past few years and went on to explain that the summary document for the 2010 CLRP would be somewhat expanded to include additional details on aspects of the regional transportation planning process that were not highlighted in the past few CLRP brochures. He then talked his way through the document, describing the content of each of the sections. Comments on the draft document were requested by June 10, 2011, so that revisions could be made and the document could be presented at the TPB meeting in July.

Mr. Erenrich said that he'd like to see some kind of dashboard with figures (e.g. population, lane miles, HOV miles, transit ridership, number of buses, miles of bike lanes, number of bike projects), similar to what Metro does under the performance monitoring section of their website. This will provide people with some kind of perspective regarding the size of the transportation system in the region. Mr. Hodgson pointed out that page 57 of the document includes a table that summarizes population and employment changes over intervals of the plan horizon, as well as information about highway and transit travel.

Mr. Srikanth stated that the report doesn't need to list the number of buses, but some information on bus and rail ridership, highway congestion, lanes miles, and the breakdown of funding could be useful. Also, the discussion should highlight progress the region has made and some of the challenges it continues to face (e.g. transit capacity

constraint). This information could either be included as part of this brochure or documented on the CLRP website. Mr. Kirby suggested including an executive summary for the document and possibly adapting one of the articles from The Region magazine to serve as the summary of progress and challenges.

Mr. Srikanth asked if the document could be revised to include a mention of the 2010 CLRP amendments currently under consideration. Mr. Austin responded that a sidebar and footnotes could be used to describe the proposed amendments, but that the focus of the report and the performance analysis would remain on the 2010 CLRP as adopted in November 2010.

Mr. Srikanth suggested renaming Chapter 5 to be more direct and descriptive of the content of this section, which focuses on plan performance.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if there was a reason that in Chapter 3 revenue is shown by mode and jurisdiction, but expenditures are only shown by mode. Mr. Austin replied that the chart will look very similar to the revenue, and that expenditures for WMATA would need to be allocated to the jurisdictions.

Mr. Harrington asked if transit congestion could be included in the same section of the document that deals with highway congestion. Also, the transit capacity constraint is discussed under the financial section, but it might also be helpful to discuss this in the section that talks about travel demand.

8. Briefing on the Housing and Transportation Cost Study for the Washington Metropolitan Area

Mr. Rodgers gave a PowerPoint presentation on the methodology and results of the Housing and Transportation Cost Study for the Washington Metropolitan Area prepared By the DC Office of Planning and the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT). He explained that CNT has customized a planning tool that estimates a housing plus transportation (H+T) affordability index at the neighborhood block level with updated local data for the Washington region. He said this index provides a more complete picture of affordability for planning purposes. He reviewed the 6 neighborhood and 3 Household variables used to estimate car ownership, car usage and transit usage which results in total transportation costs.

Mr. Milone said the final report on the study would be available in mid-June.

Mr. Kirby commented that staff would be very interested in reviewing the mythology in the report since it is scheduled to be presented to the Technical Committee on July 8

and then to the TPB on July 20. He said that the presentation seems to focus only on transportation costs and does not provide much information on how housing costs in the index.

Mr. Erenrich complemented the study and suggested that for the presentation to the TPB that a specific examples be given in order to illustrate how the tool could be used.

Mr. Rodgers said that the report contains specific examples. He said that the tool is focused on the District now but it can be made available for others in the region.

9. Briefing on the Spring 2010 Regional HOV Study

Ms. Reschovsky described the data collection process and presented the findings of the 2010 Regional HOV Study. Findings show that the I-395/95 corridor is the most successful HOV facility in the region with about 40 minutes saved by using the HOV lanes. Interstate I-66 shows the most congestion, which has worsened since 2007. Furthermore, the travel times on I-66 are not reliable. Auto occupancies are largely unchanged since 2007. She said future work will need to consider the HOT lanes which will be opening on the Beltway and I-95.

10. Briefing on the Development of Bikeshare Marketing Brochures

Mr. Hodgson explained that marketing brochures were developed in coordination with DDOT's goDCgo. One brochure outlines the benefits of bikesharing for private companies and the other outlines the necessary steps for other jurisdictions to join the Capital Bikeshare program and bring bikesharing to their communities. Content for the draft brochures were reviewed by the TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee and the Commuter Connections TDM Marketing Subcommittee. The draft brochures would also be shared with these groups again. Any comments from Technical Committee members were requested by June 10, 2011.

11. Other Business

None.

12. Adjourn