

**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 20, 2013**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County  
Melissa Barlow, FTA  
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County  
Dan Emerine, DC Office of Planning  
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County  
Lyn Erickson, MDOT  
Jason Groth, Charles County  
Rene'e Hamilton, VDOT  
Sandra Jackson, FHWA  
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County  
Shyam Kannan, WMATA  
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick  
Bill Lebegern, MWAA  
Tim Lovain, City of Alexandria  
Michael May, Prince William County  
Phil Mendelson, DC Council  
Bridget D. Newton, City of Rockville  
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT  
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt  
Paul Smith, Frederick County  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Kanathur Srikanth, VDOT  
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie  
Jonathan Way, Manassas City  
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County  
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park  
Scott York, Loudoun County  
Sam Zimbabwe, DDOT  
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County

---

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby  
Gerald Miller  
Robert Griffiths  
Nicholas Ramfos  
Andrew Meese  
Elena Constantine  
Rich Roisman  
Eric Randall  
Jane Posey  
Andrew Austin  
Wendy Klancher  
John Swanson  
Mark Moran  
Deborah Kerson Bilek  
Sarah Crawford  
Ben Hampton  
Bryan Hayes  
Debbie Leigh  
Deborah Etheridge  
Chuck Bean                   COG/EO  
Lewis Miller                 COG/OPA  
Paul DesJardin             COG/DCPS  
Betsy Self                 COG/DPSH  
Stuart Freudberg         COG/DEP  
Bill Orleans                HACK  
Randy Carroll             MDE  
Judi Gold                  Councilmember Bowser's Office  
Patrick Durany             Prince William County  
Christine Green            Greater Washington Region Safe Routes to School Network  
Wendy Duren               Arlington County Commuter Services  
Katrina Tucker            Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland  
Pierre Holloman          City of Alexandria  
Nick Alexandrow          PRTC  
Danielle Wesolek         WMATA  
Calvin Lam                 Fairfax County DOT  
Tom Jacobs                 UMD – CATT  
Taran Hutchinson         MATOC  
William Truong            MATOC  
Bob Chase                 Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance  
Sean Egan                 MD DOT  
Stephanie Leyka          Transportation Transit Raleigh/Durham  
Jasmy Methipara

---

## **1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities**

Mr. Chase applauded the improvements to regional air quality over the past 20 years, even as the population and vehicle miles traveled in the area continued to grow. He stated that the fastest growing jurisdictions in the region are located outside the beltway, which he said is a trend that he anticipates continuing for years. He encouraged employers to move beyond the beltway, which he said would reduce commutes and strengthen the regional economy. He also encouraged regional planners to emphasize projects that offer the most cost-effective solutions by supporting road and transit investments on facilities and services that promote the greatest time savings and congestion reduction. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

## **2. Approval of Minutes of February 20 Meeting**

Mr. Turner moved to approve the minutes from the February 20 TPB Meeting.

Ms. Smyth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

## **3. Report of Technical Committee**

Ms. Erickson said that the Technical Committee met on March 1 and discussed eight items on the TPB's agenda, including: the air quality conformity amendment that will satisfy the new EPA designation requirements; the Unified Planning Work Program for FY 2014; the Commuter Connections Work Program for FY 2014; and the next steps for designating the MWCOG and the TPB as designated recipients for the new MAP-21 5310 program. The Technical Committee also received briefings on MATOC, the MWCOG cooperative forecasting process, and the focused geographic sub-area household travel analysis results. She mentioned that four other items were discussed that were not included on the TPB agenda. These items were: a briefing on the new Transportation Alternatives Program under MAP-21; the Freight Around the Region project; the Street Smart Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Campaign; and MDOT's update of the statewide long-range transportation plan and bicycle and pedestrian master plan.

## **4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee**

Mr. Still thanked the TPB and said that it was an honor to be the 2013 CAC chair. He provided a brief history of his three years on the CAC, and outlined his experience with transportation commissions in Fairfax County. He currently works in airline fleet and network planning. He said that the first CAC meeting with the new members took place on March 20. He characterized this new Committee as a lively, spirited, and intelligent group. He reported all 15 members and most of the alternates were present, and that the meeting started with an opportunity for the members to get to know each other so that the group can learn to work together. He said the overall CAC goal for 2013 is to be action oriented, while also serving as a focus group for the TPB. He said that it is important that the CAC be informed by TPB staff. He provided an

---

overview of past CAC successes, including its advocacy on issues like the Regional Complete Streets Policy and the Priorities Plan. He emphasized that and he would like the CAC to be more involved in outreach.

He said that the CAC meeting agenda included a TPB staff presentation on the regional freight plan, because many people on the CAC were not familiar with freight issues in the area. He said that the CAC was interested in the interaction between increased freight in the region and other transportation modes, including private automobiles and bicycles. He identified public outreach about regional freight as a potentially important way to raise awareness about freight plans for the future. He said the meeting also included a discussion of what the CAC's goals for the year should be, which he said included: continuing momentum on existing projects like the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan and the Transportation Alternatives Program; and new projects like developing key performance measurement for connectivity within modes and across modes.

## **5. Report of the Steering Committee**

Mr. Kirby said that the Steering Committee met on March 1 and approved three resolutions that add funding to projects in the FY 2013-2018 Transportation Improvement Program. He reviewed the contents of the letters packet, which included a press release that COG distributed regarding the transportation bill passed by the Virginia state legislature, and two press releases announcing the expansion of the District's rollDC program for wheelchair-accessible taxicabs. He stated that the packet also contained two letters of support for the amendment to the Additional Air Quality Conformity Analysis.

## **6. Chair's Remarks**

Chair York commented on the transportation legislation recently passed by the Commonwealth of Virginia. He asked Mr. Kirby to draft a letter to send to Governor McDonnell and the General Assembly acknowledging the passing of this new legislation. Mr. York said that although there is still work to do to improve transportation in northern Virginia, the funding that this legislation makes available will benefit outstanding transportation projects in Loudoun County.

Mr. Turner mentioned that Maryland General Assembly is considering the Transportation Infrastructure Investment Act of 2013. He informed the TPB that the proposed legislation incorporates some ideas that the TPB proposed to Virginia, Maryland, and the District. He said that he is hopeful that this bill will become law.

Mr. Turner made a motion in support of submitting a letter to the Governor of Virginia in recognition of the recently passed legislation.

Ms. Krimm seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

---

## ACTION ITEMS

### **7. Approval of Amendment to the Additional Air Quality Conformity Analysis Conducted to Respond to the EPA Designation of the Washington Region under the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)**

Ms. Posey said that in December 2012 TPB approved an Air Quality Conformity Analysis that was required by the EPA's 2008 Ozone NAAQS. She said that part of this analysis included an air quality forecast of the 2012 CLRP and the FY2013-2018 TIP. She said that the EPA has since changed the EPA mobile budgets, and that the TPB is now required to amend the approved analysis to show that the mobile emissions for the 2012 CLRP and FY2013-2018 TIP are below the new EPA mobile budgets. She noted that two letters were submitted that comment on the proposed amendment, and said that those letters were included in mail out.

Chair York moved to approve Resolution R11-2013 to approve an amendment to the recent 2015 forecast year air quality conformity analysis of the 2012 CLRP and FY2013-2018 TIP which was conducted to satisfy the designation requirements of the EPA 2008 Ozone NAAQS.

Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **8. Approval of Amendments to the FY 2013 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), and Approval of the FY 2013 UPWP Carryover Funding to FY 2014**

Mr. Kirby explained that it is necessary to update the UPWP annually so that projects that will not be completed before the conclusion of the current fiscal year can continue into the next fiscal year. He said that the FY 2013 UPWP needs to be amended to move some incomplete projects to the FY 2014 UPWP. He said that the FY 2013 UPWP also needs to be amended to move the funds to the UPWP for FY2014.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the Board could approve the amendments for agenda items eight, nine, and 10 as one block because they are all related to the work program.

Mr. Kirby responded that items eight and nine are related to the UPWP and that Item 10 is about the Commuter Connections work program.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if items eight and nine were part of the same work program.

Mr. Kirby responded that items eight and nine address planning work programs that start on July 1, and said they could be grouped together.

Chair York supported combining items eight and nine.

Mr. Zimmerman moved that the Board approve the Resolutions R12-2013 and R13-2013 to approve the amendments to the FY 2013 UPWP and the FY 2013 carryover funding to FY 2014,

---

and to approve the final FY 2014 UPWP, put forward under Items 8 and 9.

Ms. Smyth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **9. Approval of FY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Item nine was approved as part of the previous agenda item.

### **10. Approval of FY 2014 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)**

Mr. Ramfos summarized the draft of the Commuter Connections FY 2014 work program that was included in the mailout. He said that this work program was presented to the TPB last month, and the public comment period has concluded. He explained that there was one change made to the work program from the previous month, which he said referenced funds that were allocated to staff a guaranteed ride home customer satisfaction survey in the Baltimore area. He said that data collection activities would occur during fiscal year 2014, and the findings of the survey will be reported in fiscal year 2015.

Mr. Zimmerman moved the approval of Resolution R15-2013 to approve the final FY 2014 CCWP.

Mr. Todd seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **11. Approval of Request for the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG), as the Administrative Agent for the TPB, to Become the Designated Recipient for the New Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program under MAP-21 in the Washington Region**

Ms. Klancher said that the TPB is being asked to approve a resolution authorizing Chair York to send a letter to Mayor Gray, Governor McDonnell, and Governor O'Malley requesting that they designate COG as TPB's administrative agent to be the designated recipient for this new MAP-21 program. The program supports operating and capital transportation services that would assist persons with disabilities and older adults in meeting their transportation needs. She said this request is based upon the TPB's successful implementation of the JARC and New Freedom programs. She said staff worked closely with the District Department of Transportation, the Maryland Transit Administration, and the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation to develop an implementation plan for this new program, which will be overseen by the TPB's Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force. She added that the TPB will continue to administer the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom programs with the expectation that all SAFETEA-LU funding will be expended this year. She said the current solicitation for those programs ends on April 17.

Mr. Zimmerman said he has many questions about the program administration and is skeptical

---

that the new structure of the old programs will be a good thing for the region. He said the only way the region will get this funding is to take this action, but that he does have some questions and a request. He said it would be helpful if staff would develop a document that clearly explains what is happening under the new program and how it is different from the old program structure. He said this document should explain how the change in programs will affect what agencies will be able to do with the funding and how they will be able to apply for the funding. He said the document should be clear enough, yet detailed enough, so that the average politician can understand it, particularly those who do not serve on the TPB and are not involved in transportation, but who have interests in issues related to the populations served through this program.

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to adopt resolution R16-2013. Mr. Wojahn seconded the motion.

Mr. Erenrich asked for clarification on future funding for the JARC program. He said it is his understanding that it will no longer be included in the funding the TPB administers, but that it will be available and eligible from the formula funding for which WMATA is the designated recipient.

Ms. Klancher said that the JARC program is eliminated under MAP-21. She said some additional funds for that purpose were added to the urbanized area 5307 program for which WMATA is the designated recipient and that the law says WMATA may spend that funding on JARC activities.

Mr. Erenrich requested that as the TPB sends this letter requesting that it be the designated recipient of the 5310 funding, it also send a letter to WMATA asking for a process for which the region may submit requests for the additional funding allocated to WMATA for JARC activities. He added that JARC activities have been successful throughout the region and that this should not be considered additional funding for 5307, but that it is new funding that is eligible for JARC activities throughout the region.

Mr. Zimmerman accepted the amendment to his motion.

Mr. Wojahn said that, as chair of the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force, he appreciates all the time and effort that went into developing this arrangement for the designation of this funding. He said there are a number of complexities within this program, which essentially consolidates two existing programs. He said staff has done a good job addressing the interests of all those vested in this program.

The motion passed unanimously.

---

## INFORMATION ITEMS

### **12. Update on the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program**

Mr. Jacobs provided a shortened presentation on the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program, noting that more detailed information about the program could be found in the meeting materials. He highlighted several aspects of the program, including day-to-day operations, operations during incidents or events, and the outlook for the MATOC program.

Mr. Jacobs said the annual budget for MATOC is \$1.2 million and is funded by DDOT, MDOT, and VDOT. He said the funding supports four core program elements: operations; the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS) operations and management; RITIS enhancements; and some special studies conducted by staff. He said there are currently 2000 registered users of RITIS, representing transportation, public safety, emergency management, and other disciplines. He said that one of the key benefits of the MATOC program is the strengthened relationship with emergency management officials and transportation agencies.

Mr. Jacobs summarized some key enhancements made to the program as a result of the January 26, 2011 winter storm. He said that MATOC now has an alert Twitter feed and a roam secure network. He summarized how MATOC staff responds to large-scale regional incidents and provides examples of how MATOC was involved during Hurricane Sandy and the 2012 presidential inauguration. He said MATOC staff notifies all agencies about what is happening across the transportation system. He said that during weather events or other planned events, staff conducts pre-event operations and ramps up to 24/7 staffing during the event.

Mr. Jacobs said staff will continue to build relationship with agency partners, conduct RITIS training, and perform a regional construction coordination study. He referenced several incidents that occurred earlier in the week and how MATOC staff provided information in a coordinated fashion. He said the a key value of the MATOC program is to be able to view incidents through a regional lens and provide information and recommendations that take into account the entire regional transportation network.

Mr. Mendelson asked how successful the MATOC program is in making recommendations to the departments of transportation in terms of having those recommendations carried out.

Mr. Jacobs said the recommendations have been well-received and implemented to a large degree, due in part to the relationships that have been built over time between the MATOC staff and operations staff at various agencies. He said agencies likely verify through their own information the recommendations provided to them before they implement the suggestions.

Mr. Mendelson referred to an event that occurred earlier in the week and asked if MATOC was making a number of recommendations to the agency staff.



---

Mr. Jacobs said that the nature of the event and the RITIS tool available around the region allowed agency staff to view one another's notes and responses as they developed on the incident. He said the information exchange occurs naturally through the tool. He said the MATOC operations chief, Mr. Hutchinson, was in attendance and could elaborate.

Mr. Hutchinson said most of the events that occurred in the previous few days were localized. He said MATOC staff was able to see the decision-making and interaction between agencies through RITIS. He said agencies were coordinating a response through the tool, but the incidents were cleared before the response measures became necessary.

Mr. Mendelson asked for clarification that MATOC staff could see the cooperation between the different jurisdictions.

Mr. Hutchinson said that is absolutely the case.

Mr. Mendelson asked about the status of 24/7 operations for MATOC. He asked if permanent 24/7 operations would be possible with more funding.

Mr. Jacobs said the ability to conduct 24/7 operations is a function of money, but that the necessity of 24/7 operations has evolved as MATOC was being implemented. He said that it was the goal to have 24/7 operations early in the planning phases of the program. He said that as the program was implemented, the focus became on peak periods when the highest amount of traffic is on the roads. He said MATOC staff works closely with the Regional Incident Coordination Committee, which is a 24/7 operation. He said it has been a question as to whether or not there is a need for monitoring in the overnight hours when there are not many traffic incidents. He said that MATOC staff is on call and can open operations from remote locations within 15 minutes of notification.

Mr. Mendelson confirmed that all the jurisdictions are providing their share of the funding and that money is not an issue.

Mr. Jacobs said that is correct.

Mr. Zimmerman said the MATOC program is certainly one of the most important programs in the region that nobody knows about. He said there have been a number of high-profile incidents that demonstrate the reason for greater regional coordination using information technology. He said that when the transportation network and interagency coordination don't work, people talk about it. He said it is harder to convey that delays are not happening because of good coordination – people do not talk about things that are functioning as they should. He said it is important to find a way for these efforts to be better understood in how they are working and making a difference, as well as critically thinking about how operations could be even better. He said he would like to see how the TPB could develop some kind of performance measure that would help demonstrate the benefits of the program, and he referenced information in the materials detailing \$13 million in travel time savings. He said the TPB and the public needs more examples such as this, but also more event-specific examples that measure the program's impact

---

and effectiveness. He said publicizing this information may bring the program under greater scrutiny, but it may also result in a greater appreciation for the things that are working. He added that it may also make it easier to secure the resources that the TPB struggled with for so many years to get the program off the ground.

### **13. Briefing on the COG Cooperative Forecasting Process**

Mr. DesJardins, referring to a PowerPoint presentation, described how the COG Cooperative Forecasting Process develops population, household, and employment forecasts for use in the regional transportation planning process. He said the cooperative forecasting program is a longstanding technical process carried out by COG that is overseen by the local government planning directors to provide a consistent set of local and regional population, household, and job growth projections. He said that major projection updates, or “Rounds” are conducted about every four years, with more modest updates conducted on an annual basis. He said that Round 8.2 will be used for the conformity analysis to be approved this year. He presented a conceptual design diagram and provided an explanation for how the “top-down and bottom up” forecasting process works. He said a regional econometric model gives the regional totals at the top, and the local forecasts conducted by each jurisdiction are from the bottom. There is then a reconciliation of the regional model projections with the local forecasts. He summarized the reconciliation for the Draft Round 8.2 forecasts and said they are within about 3 percent.

Mr. Griffiths said that TPB staff works closely with Mr. DesJardin and his staff to ensure that accurate transportation planning assumptions are properly derived from current and future population and employment estimates, which is a requirement for the federally mandated air quality conformity analysis conducted by the TPB. He added that assumptions about future development must be consistent with plans for the future transportation system. He said that TPB staff coordinates with the COG Cooperative Forecasting Committee to provide an assessment of the previous CLRP, as well as a briefing on anticipated major new projects, to ensure consistency in the forecasting process. He added that TPB staff works with jurisdiction staff to make sure that planned transportation improvements and associated land-use developments are incorporated into the cooperative forecast.

Mr. Griffiths also provided an overview of a typical schedule for a Cooperative Forecasting Round Update. He emphasized that the Cooperative Forecasts are not necessarily inevitable or preferred, but instead are projections that, absent future policy changes, represent a probable outcome based on current expectations. He added that for each major round, the econometric model is reviewed and a new set of benchmark projections for the 30-year forecasting period are developed based on the best available information. He mentioned that staff also relies on periodic Census data and household travel surveys to help account for changes in demographic trends.

Mr. Griffiths said that issues of uncertainty can be addressed with scenario analysis, which looks at possible future shifts in land use and changes in existing trends. He referred to the regional mobility and accessibility study that TPB conducted in 2006, and the TPB scenario study in 2010

---

that looked at comprehensive land-use and transportation scenarios based on the 2008 CLRP, as ways to examine future uncertainty. He concluded by saying that the TPB is scheduled to be briefed in April on the results of an update of the CLRP Aspirations Scenario with the Round 8.1 forecast, and with the new TPB transportation model that has a new finer grain transportation analysis zone system.

Mr. Elrich expressed discontent about the way employment and household forecasts are used. He expressed concern, particularly for Montgomery County, that some people do not recognize that these regional projections already take into account local planning efforts to accommodate future household and job growth.

Mr. Griffiths said that such issues have been discussed in the Cooperative Forecasting Committee. He added that the region, collectively, has not provided enough housing opportunities for workers who come to the region, particularly when it comes to affordable housing. He said that long commutes result from this dynamic, which adds stress to the regional transportation system.

Mr. Elrich replied that the demand for housing is based on income and the ability to pay for housing. He added that even if jurisdictions provided for housing by changing zoning in local plans, household income is a major factor that generates demand for – and subsequent building of – new housing. He emphasized this as a major conundrum of the forecasting process.

Mr. Griffiths replied that there is a general recognition among most jurisdictions that there is not enough provision of housing in local plans.

Mr. DesJardin commented that the Round 7 forecast added 130,000 additional households in the region to address the housing issue.

Mr. Griffiths emphasized the role of supply and demand, stating that collectively providing more housing opportunities will result in a lower cost of housing. Conversely, he said that providing fewer housing opportunities will result in driving growth further out of the region, where the cost of housing is more affordable, which causes long commutes.

Mr. Elrich commented that Montgomery County recently went through an explosive period of growth, and is now in the midst of a major recession.

Mr. Griffiths said that the demand for housing remains high throughout the region, and acknowledged that it often takes two income earners to support the high cost of housing.

Mr. Zimmerman, agreeing with Mr. Elrich, said that it takes less time to move to the region than it does to build a housing unit. He praised the presentation, and emphasized the importance for TPB members to understand how these forecasts are made, and the policy implications they present. He echoed Mr. Elrich's concerns about issues with the aggregation of data that combines individual jurisdictions' aspirational plans to create a regional forecast. He commented that, at the local level, it is appropriate to make assumptions about growth in planning, and said that

---

aggregating this information to develop a regional growth projection may not reliably predict what will happen in the future. He also addressed the limitations of a forecasting process that is reliant on previous data, which he said does not capture long-term shifts. He said a fundamental problem of this process is that forecasting is necessary to plan, but that planning is also necessary to forecast. He concluded by stating that there needs to be a more rational policy in place for regional planning in order to make regional forecasts relevant.

Mr. Kannan praised the presentation as one that provides a lot of information for both a lay audience and for a professional. He said he was encouraged that the TPB will be revisiting work from its Aspirations Scenario Study.

Mr. Kirby said that the Cooperative Forecasts are the best estimate of what may happen and that they reflect, to the greatest extent possible, the transportation investments that the region is making. He added that the forecasts are not necessarily optimal projections of future growth in terms of regional goals, which he said is one reason for considering scenario studies in the forecasting process.

Mr. Kannan addressed Mr. Elrich's concerns about government's fiscal capacity, and suggested two quantitative approaches: (1) consideration of increasing employment densities within office space, and (2) consideration of housing density, specifically the national trend of decreasing household and unit size.

Mr. Elrich responded to Mr. Kannan's suggested by asking if there was a way to frame these challenges beyond the number of housing units or vehicles. He said that optimum growth should be linked to a jurisdiction's physical ability to provide the required support for growth, which he said goes beyond measuring people and cars.

Mr. Kannan said this was a fascinating idea, and pointed out that physical impact could potentially be tied into the differing scenario outputs.

Mr. Kirby said that schools and the cost of local infrastructure are things to consider when analyzing demand on a transportation system. He said that congestion forecasts have been fairly well on target over the last 20 years. He acknowledged that there are forces that can't be accounted for, but said that these forecasts provide a pretty good benchmark for analyzing likely outcomes.

Chair York said he appreciated the conversation and its challenges. He pointed to the growth that Loudoun and Prince William Counties have experienced, and said it would be interesting to have a discussion about whether a jurisdiction considers housing and other needs when rezoning to attract businesses, or if that jurisdictions relies on other jurisdictions in the region to provide housing and related services. He emphasized the support and services that are needed to accommodate economic growth, and pointed out that Loudoun County has built 50 schools during his time on the County Board in order to keep up with regional growth.

---

## **14. Briefing on Household Travel Characteristics and Behavior in Seven Focused Geographic Subareas of the Region**

Mr. Griffiths briefed the Board on the initial findings of a new round of household travel surveys in seven focused geographic subareas of the region. He provided Board members with copies of the full presentation, but only spoke to a subset of the slides in the interest of time. He explained the purpose of the focused surveys: to make it possible to analyze differences in daily travel behavior in different communities having different densities, physical characteristics, and transportation options; to refine the regional travel demand model; and to assist local planners in their land use and transportation planning efforts. He listed the seven survey areas, which included the New York Avenue and Rhode Island Avenue corridor and the Friendship Heights area in the District of Columbia, the area around the East Falls Church and West Falls Church Metrorail stations in Falls Church and Fairfax and Arlington counties, the Beauregard corridor in Alexandria, the National Harbor/Oxon Hill area in Prince George's County, the area north of Dulles Airport in Loudoun County, and the St. Charles/Waldorf area in Charles County.

Mr. Griffiths explained the trends that emerge from the information on household characteristics, namely that the Beauregard corridor and the two study areas in the District of Columbia -- which have much higher population densities -- have higher proportions of single-person households, households without children, households living in apartments and condos, and households with no car compared to the study areas that are farther out and less dense - Dulles North, St. Charles/Waldorf, National Harbor/Oxon Hill, and East and West Falls Church. He also explained that those areas with higher densities have greater shares of daily trips and commute trips made by walking, biking, and transit compared to the less-dense areas. He also drew the attention of Board members to the shares of commute trips made by bike in the four densest study areas, which were all at least three times the regional average.

Mr. Griffiths told Board members that the challenge moving forward will be to provide family-friendly housing, amenities, and services in areas near transit, since those areas tend now to have much higher shares of single-person households and households without children compared to the rest of the region. He said that if the region hopes to have a significant amount of future population growth in activity centers near transit, they need to be more family-friendly.

Chair York thanked Mr. Griffiths for his presentation. He said it will be interesting to compare the recent results for the Dulles North survey area to 2019, when rail service opens in the Dulles corridor.

Chair York opened the floor to questions.

Mr. Zimbabwe asked Mr. Griffiths how the data collected from the most recent surveys would be used to refine the regional travel demand model. He specifically suggested comparing the output from the model to the trends observed in the survey data to identify any needed revisions. He also asked Mr. Griffiths whether staff could make the survey data available in disaggregated form for the local jurisdictions to use in their own analysis and planning activities. Finally, he commented on the conclusion that Mr. Griffith's presented regarding the New York

---

Avenue/Rhode Island Avenue corridor and its lack of housing for families with children. Mr. Zimbabwe said he thought the area actually did have a good supply of “family-friendly” housing and that the real question is whether there’s enough of the right housing stock to accommodate an aging population.

Mr. Griffiths said that staff will gladly provide the additional data, and that Mr. Zimbabwe was exactly right in his interpretation of the data on the New York Avenue/Rhode Island Avenue corridor: that the higher share of single-person households without children was more likely to be households with older adults with grown children rather than young, single professionals.

Mr. Emerine echoed Mr. Zimbabwe’s point about the New York Avenue/Rhode Island Avenue corridor having quite a bit of family-friendly housing. He said that more fine-grained surveys would probably show that certain parts of the survey area are actually mostly housing stock suitable for families with children, and that improved survey methods, like making the survey available online, could increase the sample size and make it easier to analyze results for such small areas.

Mr. Griffiths said that staff are currently working on making an online version of the survey available for future rounds.

Mr. Erenrich thanked Mr. Griffiths for his work on the focused household travel surveys. He said he thought that one of the most important pieces of information that the surveys provide is vehicle-miles of travel per household because it summarizes a lot of the differences in travel patterns that the other measures reveal. He asked Mr. Griffiths whether that data was available from this round of surveys.

Mr. Griffiths said that staff could provide that data.

Finally, Mr. Kirby pointed out to Board members that the results of the most recent surveys add to the ten that were conducted in 2010 and 2011, and that future surveys will add still more to the available data. He said that, increasingly, the information can be used to update the regional travel model and to aid in scenario studies.

## **15. Other Business**

There was no other business brought before the TPB.

## **16. Adjourn**

Chair York adjourned the meeting at 1:57pm.