

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

Technical Committee Minutes  
*for meeting of*

**April 5, 2013**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - April 5, 2013**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                    Mark Rawlings  
                              Anthony Foster  
DCOP                    -----

**MARYLAND**

Charles County        Jason Groth  
Frederick Co.         -----  
City of Frederick     -----  
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  
                              John Thomas  
MTA                     -----  
Takoma Park          -----

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria            Pierre Holloman  
Arlington Co.         Dan Malouff  
City of Fairfax        Alexis Verzosa  
Fairfax Co.            Mike Lake  
Falls Church         -----  
Loudoun Co.          Robert Brown  
Manassas              -----  
Prince William Co.   Monica Backmon  
NVTC                  Claire Gron  
PRTC                    -----  
VRE                    Christine Hoeffner  
VDOT                  Valerie Pardo  
VDRPT                 Tim Roseboon  
NVPDC                 -----  
VDOA                  -----

**WMATA**

WMATA                Mark Kellogg

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

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

**COG Staff**

Ron Kirby, DTP  
Gerald Miller, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Erin Morrow, DTP  
Mark Pfoutz, DTP  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Andrew Meese, DTP  
Charlene Howard, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Feng Xie, DTP  
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP  
Michael Farrell, DTP  
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP  
Sarah Crawford, DTP  
Karin Foster, DTP  
Joan Rohlf, DEP  
Paul DesJardin, DCPS

**Other Attendees**

Bill Orleans, HACK  
Randy Carroll, MDE  
Matt Baker, MDOT  
Jameshia Peterson, DDOT

# TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

April 5, 2013

## Technical Committee Minutes

---

### 1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from March 1 TPB Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved with the addition of Mr. Alexandrow to the list of attendees.

### 2. Briefing on Regional Bike to Work Day 2013

Mr. Ramfos distributed a PowerPoint presentation regarding upcoming activities for the region's Bike to Work Day event. He stated that Bike to Work Day will be held on Friday, May 17th and the event was implemented regionally by Commuter Connections over a decade ago. Participation in the event began with about 1,000 commuters and last year there were over 13,000 event participants.

Next, Mr. Ramfos stated that a regional survey is conducted of Bike to Work Day event participants every three years as part of the Commuter Connections TERM Analysis. The purpose of survey is to measure impacts of event participation and to assess use of bicycles for commute travel before and after event. He stated that survey results are used in the regional TERM Analysis Report. The last survey was administered in 2010 via e-mail to approximately 9,000 event participants and 3,038 completed questionnaires were received, representing a 34% response rate.

Mr. Ramfos reviewed additional results from the survey including that 2010 was the first Bike to Work Day event for 32% of the respondents. Seventeen percent of the respondents never commuted by bike before participating in Bike to Work Day. Ten percent of participants started riding to work after the event and 22% started riding more often.

Next, Mr. Ramfos stated that there are several elected officials, including TPB members, that participate in the regional Bike to Work Day event and showed photographs of some of those participating at the pit stops from last year's event.

Mr. Ramfos said that Bike to Work Day coincides with National Bike to Work week. The event participation goal set for 2013 is a 10% increase from last year and translates to 14,000 event participants. The TPB is slated to review and approve a Proclamation during their meeting this month. There will be a record 72 "pit stop" celebrations throughout region. There are approximately a dozen new pit stops throughout the region this year.

Next, Mr. Ramfos showed a chart of the event's progression since 2002. The chart showed the dramatic increase in the number of event participants as well as the number of pit stops. Then he showed the marketing materials as well as the web site and Facebook and Twitter pages.

Mr. Ramfos stated that the event is free and open to all commuters in the region. This year there were a record number of corporate sponsors that were recruited to support the event. Interested participants can register at [www.biketoworkmetrodc.org](http://www.biketoworkmetrodc.org). Participants will receive free t-shirts, refreshments, and a chance to win free donated bicycles.

Mr. Ramfos said that there is also an employer focus to the event. The event encourages the business community to support bicycle-friendly culture and participating bicyclists collectively work for over 1,000 various employers throughout region. He stated that bicycling to work benefits employers through reduced parking overhead and better employee health and fitness by lowering absenteeism and health care costs. He also stated that an "Employer Challenge" luncheon will be held for one of five employers that have the highest amount of participants. The winner will be selected through a prize drawing after the event. The purpose of the event will be to honor those employees from that employment site that participated in the event with the luncheon. There is also a donated bicycle rack that will be raffled off to an employer in the region.

Next, Mr. Ramfos stated that the Washington Area Bicyclist Association (WABA) forms Commuter Convoys led by experienced bicyclists to help empower commuters to try bicycling to work. Free Bike to Work guides are also available from Commuter Connections as well as free Confident City Cycling classes offered by WABA. Mr. Ramfos stated that those biking to work are also covered under Commuter Connections' Guaranteed Ride Home program.

Mr. Erenrich asked about the status of the bicycle routing application. Mr. Ramfos stated that it has been taken offline for updating and will more than likely be available later this year.

### **3. Briefing on Activities to Increase Ridership on the Metrobus System**

Mr. Kellogg gave a presentation summarizing WMATA's efforts to improve Metrobus service and increase ridership. This is an item that will go to the TPB at their April 17 meeting, in response to a request by DC Councilman Mendelson. Mr. Kirby had reviewed a memo on some specific issues regarding Metrobus at the February TPB meeting, but it was asked that the information be expanded upon. Mr. Kellogg walked through technology programs, planning efforts, and outreach to customers, all of which WMATA is using to improve Metrobus service and use.

Mr. Malouff asked if all the Metro Extra buses on Route 79 on Georgia Avenue are transit signal priority equipped. Mr. Kellogg responded that only twelve buses are

equipped, and that he is not sure if daily work scheduling of the buses ensures they are all in use on this route and corridor.

Ms. Pardo asked if the REX bus on Richmond Highway / US-1 also used transit signal priority. Mr. Kellogg responded that he would validate transit signal priority status across WMATA for the TPB presentation.

Mr. Erenrich gave a long list of suggestions on items to consider for inclusion in the presentation to the TPB. Firstly, the presentation should start with more positive information or recent accomplishments. On-time performance has improved, and this should be mentioned, including WMATA's tracking and the dashboard that publicly presents this data. The age of the fleet and its state of good repair has improved. Mean distance between failures is down. More alternative fuelled vehicles are in service. WMATA is conducting service adjustments to improve service reliability, and introducing the limited stop Metro Extra service on the priority corridor network (PCN). Service standards have been developed and adopted, and WMATA is facilitating regional coordination on a number of bus programs, including Bus Rapid Transit on the Potomac Yard Transitway and Montgomery County's BRT plans. WMATA as the regional transit operator has developed a strategic plan that lays out a vision for the future. Regarding technology, he suggested adding some screenshots of the online services available, as well as a slide with a list of all the third party and jurisdictional (i.e., such as Ride-On's) real-time information and apps available: DC Rider, Google, etc. Mr. Kellogg agreed that many of these would be good to add; naturally there is a limited time for the presentation at the TPB meeting, but he will see what can be done.

Mr. Meese added to the list, suggesting a stronger orientation of the presentation towards the customer point-of-view. What is better now for customers; what's new. The picture of the technology onboard the bus is too much for this presentation. He also suggested adding a slide on Nextbus terminology to clear up the confusion on the shutdown of the third party app last year.

Mr. Alexandrow added that WMATA should explain their outreach efforts to market customer information technology, and also suggested adding more info on the extent of the bus network.

Mr. Foster suggested adding more info on the branding and marketing of the services, including Metro Extra and, in the near future, BRT.

Mr. Holloman suggested adding info on the customer surveys at stops and onboard buses, and how these are used to improve services to the customers.

Mr. Malouff mentioned the new bus maps, with high-frequency service emphasized, and how these help customers.

Mr. Groth asked about the appendix slides, which portrayed fleet size and projections and the capacity of the garages. He suggested that these either need more explanation or should be removed as confusing.

Chair Erickson closed the discussion by noting the new practice of providing longer read-ahead presentations in the mail-out to the TPB, with the actual meeting presentations being significantly condensed and just hitting the highlights. WMATA will have to consider how to best do this.

#### **4. Briefing on Update of the CLRP Aspirations Scenario**

Mr. Kirby presented an update of the CLRP Aspirations Scenario Study. The analysis was conducted with newly available tools using basically the same inputs as the previous analysis. There was a Powerpoint presentation and a paper handed out at the meeting.

The CLRP Aspirations Scenario is the culmination of a number of years of looking at different types of scenarios including land use scenarios and toll network scenarios. The Scenario Study Task Force oversaw the framing of the scenarios. The original work on the CLRP Aspirations Scenario was based on the 2008 CLRP and combined a land use component based on the findings of the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study and a variably priced lane network based on the findings of the Value Pricing Study. Mr. Kirby emphasized that the CLRP Aspirations Scenario is a scenario which is free of all political and engineering constraints to see if there are positive outcomes from the scenario that the region can learn from in order to decide whether to move in that direction. Although the scenario was designed to be “within reach,” in reality, the CLRP Aspirations could be very difficult from both policy and construction perspectives to implement. Mr. Kirby detailed the timeline of the CLRP Aspirations Scenario Study.

Major presentations to the TPB occurred in September 2010 and October 2011. Since October 2011, many updates have been made including the migration of the work to the 2012 CLRP and Round 8.1 Cooperative Forecast as a baseline, utilization of horizon year 2040, and modeling the scenario with the Version 2.3 Travel Forecasting Model. In addition, the priced lane network was edited to reflect the restrictions in the MAP-21 legislation for tolling of existing general purpose lanes. Mr. Kirby went over a slide showing growth in regional demographics between 2015 and 2040.

Mr. Kellogg asked if the Metrorail transit constraint was used in the analysis and Mr. Kirby responded that it was and at a presentation to the TPB late last year, this topic was discussed, and transit mode share for work trips would be approximately half a percent higher without the transit constrained to 2020 levels.

Mr. Kirby described the components of the scenario. The CLRP Aspirations Scenario has two components – land use and transportation. The land use component shifts future

growth in jobs and households to targeted growth areas including the regional activity centers and areas around existing and planned transit stations. The transportation component has two pieces – a regional network of variably priced lanes and an extensive regional BRT network.

Mr. Erenrich asked what the red dashed line on the Maryland portion of the Beltway on the variably priced lane network map meant. Mr. Kirby responded that it was assumed that two lanes would be constructed with two to four toll lanes in merging sections. He reiterated that this is a scenario and there could be engineering challenges to construct a network reflecting the assumptions in the scenario; however, this scenario is modeled for the year 2040 and many of the roads in the assumed priced lane network would need to be essentially rebuilt by that time allowing for the possibility of engineering innovations.

The analysis consisted of a baseline (2012 CLRP and Round 8.1 Cooperative Forecast) and three scenarios for year 2040. Scenario 1 has the transportation component of the CLRP Aspirations Scenario and baseline land use assumptions, Scenario 2 has land use component of the CLRP Aspirations Scenario and the baseline transportation assumptions, and Scenario 3 is the CLRP Aspirations Scenario.

Mr. Kirby reviewed the results of the analysis. It was assumed that the tolls would be set to maintain free-flow conditions in the priced lanes, and that the transit system could meet the transit demand. In regards to the transit constraint, as he stated before, it is in this analysis, but in the future, it would be removed from the scenario. He showed the percentage change in regional travel and regional mode choice between each of the three scenarios and the baseline. One of the biggest impacts of the CLRP Aspirations Scenario was on regional vehicle-hours of delay. He discussed the percentage change in person trips for commuter trips noting the ability of the Version 2.3 model to separate out different modes including HOV2, HOV3+, Metrorail-only, bus/Metrorail, and commuter rail.

Mr. Erenrich noted that although the percentage of HOV trips goes up significantly, the increase in the total number of HOV trips is less significant compared to other modes. Mr. Kirby responded that although the CLRP Aspirations Scenario has extensive changes as compared to the baseline, the overall regional changes as shown in this analysis are small as there is a large base. If an individual corridor or area is studied, as staff plans to do as follow-up work, more significant changes will be shown. For example, it will be possible to see where biggest reductions in vehicle-hours of delay occur (likely outside the Beltway) or where there are the biggest increases in non-motorized trips travel (likely in the Activity Centers).

Mr. Kirby noted the decrease in commuter rail trips in Scenarios 1 and 3 as the BRT is direct competition to most of the commuter rail lines in the region. Mr. Mokhtari asked if the reason that the BRT took away ridership from commuter rail was because the BRT

is on arterials and expressways acting like commuter rail, and by putting BRT where the people are, if there would be a more reasonable mode share. Mr. Kirby responded that in the scenario, jobs and households were concentrated in some of the longer corridors, like I-95, I-66, and I-270, but there are still people living in outer suburbs like Frederick.

Mr. Mokhtari commented that the land use component in the CLRP Aspirations Scenario does not change the east-west divide that much. Mr. Kirby responded that there was a shift to help with the balance, but there is still growth on the western side of the region.

Mr. Mokhtari noted that many of the local jurisdictions are working on bus networks on the local arterials connecting activity centers which may show a different result than the CLRP Aspirations BRT network. Mr. Kirby responded that the results shown with respect to the reduction in commuter rail trips have to do with the nature of commuter rail being generally in longer corridors with few stops and the BRT runs parallel to commuter rail in many major corridors. Additionally, even without the BRT network, Scenario 2 shows a decrease in commuter rail trips as some of that market has been brought closer in.

Mr. Malouff agreed with the earlier comment that many jurisdictions in the region are looking at BRT on arterials and suggested that maybe another scenario is needed to reflect those plans. Mr. Kirby responded that this CLRP Aspirations Scenario has significant improvements to some of the major arterials in the region. Mr. Randall said that all of the WMATA PCN corridors have a 10% increase in the transit speed assumed. He was asked if the Montgomery County BRT network was included and Mr. Randall responded that if it is not in the CLRP it is not included. Mr. Kirby stated that there are improvements in the arterials as well as the freeways in the Aspirations Scenario and there are circulator buses around the Activity Centers.

Mr. Malouff responded that there are a lot of BRT-related plans being studied and it would be helpful there was a scenario looking at those. Mr. Kirby responded that the CLRP Aspirations Scenario is a scenario and there are plans in place for bus service on the freeways in the region including the Express Toll Lanes in Virginia on I-495 and I-95, and on the ICC in Maryland. He said that staff could provide more details on the bus improvements off the freeway system that are assumed in the CLRP Aspirations Scenario.

Mr. Mokhtari suggested looking at a hybrid bus network with the CLRP Aspirations BRT network and the addition of some of the regional BRT being studied.

Chair Erickson asked what it would take in time and cost to analyze a scenario with local BRT systems such as the one that Montgomery County is studying that she expects would have a big impact on the region. Mr. Kirby felt the best approach would be to detail what is already in the CLRP Aspirations bus network and then think about what



kind of increment would be wanted in terms of some of these other proposals that are also very ambitious.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that everything that is in the CLRP in 2040 and in the CLRP Aspirations bus network be documented and then each of the counties could determine what they feel comfortable testing as part of that, get more refined, and see what the impact is at the regional level. If there are already assumptions of higher speeds on the bus priority corridors, in some cases we will not see higher speeds.

Mr. Erenrich addressed another issue with BRT which is the impact of non-specific attributes. He said that the ridership on BRT sky-rockets because of such attributes as off-board fare collection, level boarding, vehicles, and passenger information systems that are probably not accounted for by the travel forecasting model. There is a difference in running a bus priority corridor and getting a 10% improvement in speed and having it be called and operated as BRT with limited stops and other amenities. Mr. Erenrich continued by stating that the FTA says that the impact of the non-specific attributes can be added. He did not know if considering the non-specific attributes would make a significant change, but he believed that BRT ridership would go up a lot more and therefore the statement could be made that the BRT service is more than just improving the local bus service. Mr. Kirby responded that at this time, staff should detail what is in the network and then any additional increment could be determined.

In terms of the financial analysis, Mr. Kirby stated that a broad brush financial analysis was completed and both Scenario 1 and Scenario 3 have a cost-recovery ratio of about 40%. In a previous analysis, the scenario had approximately an 80% recovery rate because pre-MAP-21, many miles of existing general purpose lanes, like the parkways, were tolled. A conservative 20-year annualization of costs was assumed, but there are other ways of financing the priced lane network such as public-private partnerships that can get a better cost recovery because the private sector has access to funds and tax breaks that the public sector does not.

Mr. Kirby noted that there has been a hiatus in scenario work due to the significant time required to code the network and update the land use files for the Version 2.3 model. Now that the initial coding has been completed, it is possible to do sensitivity tests on the work that has been done. For example, it is relatively easy to test different land use scenarios or change some of the BRT lines. Also, analysis can be conducted at more focused geographic areas to see, for example, where congestion reduction is occurring or what is happening in Activity Centers in terms of growth in non-motorized travel. Mr. Kirby said that he is interested in the committee's thought and appreciated the suggestions that were already made. This work will be presented to the TPB this month to inform them that this work has been done and present the broad brush numbers.

Mr. Kellogg asked if it would be feasible to transition the land use component to the new set of Activity Centers when they are released. Mr. Kirby asked Mr. DesJardin to

comment on the progress on the new Activity Centers. Mr. DesJardin said that he expected that the Planning Directors will sign off on the new map in late spring or early summer. Mr. Kellogg commented that he did not expect that the numbers would change tremendously, but it would be good to be in sync.

Mr. Erenrich said that when this presentation is given to the TPB there may be questions about the feasibility of the toll lane network and he suggested that Mr. Kirby highlight the message that there is a new model and new tools to conduct scenario analyses and sensitivity tests, and present the CLRP Aspirations Scenario as an example of how those new tools can be used. Mr. Kirby agreed and said that he wants to invite suggestions for new scenarios and work on scenario analysis on a continuing basis.

There was a question about the jobs and households that are coming into the region. Mr. Kirby responded that those jobs and households are being brought into the region and then located into the targeted growth areas. It was noted that a lower percentage of jobs than households was being brought in. Mr. Verzosa asked if that would increase the unemployment rate. Mr. Kirby responded that the region actually has more jobs than workers and we import workers. The CLRP Aspirations Scenario was designed to correct that to some degree.

## **5. Update on the Activities of the TPB Bus on Shoulder Task Force**

Mr. Randall gave a presentation on the activities of the Bus On Shoulder (BOS) task force, reviewing the purpose and accomplishments of the task force to date. He then previewed the agenda for the final April 17 meeting of the task force. Discussion that day will include display of a benefit-cost analysis model, and an illustrative example was shown. He then closed the presentation with a review of outcomes expected from the third meeting and final steps for the task force.

Mr. Thomas asked for the source of costs shown in the illustrative example. Mr. Randall said these were developed from some rough estimates by Maryland SHA, that are being refined.

Mr. Erenrich asked for information on any service plans for increased bus service. It is unrealistic to assume benefits without first positing increased bus service and how there would be more bus passengers. He also asked for sensitivity analysis that would indicate how many bus passengers would be needed to make the benefit/cost ratio for a project greater than 1.0. He also suggested that delay data from accidents should be included in the model; perhaps one accident per month might stem from BOS operations. Mr. Randall responded that the model figure for ridership is taken from current data but is an input value that can be changed, and the sensitivity analysis will be conducted as Mr. Erenrich suggested. Regarding accident data, there is no conclusive evidence that BOS operations would increase or decrease accident and safety impacts one way or the other. Assumptions could be made either way, but as several

studies have not found any such impacts, the model does not include accidents as a factor.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the model results for continuing BOS on I-270 and then along the Capital Beltway to Virginia are available. Maryland has done significant work on the Westside Mobility Study for the American Legion Bridge, Beltway, and I-270 corridor. He would also like to see the results for continuing to Dulles, and also for Route 50 to the Anacostia bridges. Chair Erickson responded that this study is a first cut at studying the issues associated with BOS, and that SHA has only been able to research the I-270 and MD-5 corridors to date. There is no available funding for further study at this point, and the Westside and Southside mobility studies on the Beltway are out of date.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the portrayed cost for the segments was a per mile cost, to which Mr. Randall responded affirmatively, with SHA providing the information.

Mr. Malouff noted that any significant implementation of BOS across the region would be on a step-by-step basis over many years. For the highway agencies to undertake the studies, conduct preliminary engineering, get approvals, and everything else would take time.

Chair Erickson added that the work of the task force to date has been to focus on the general feasibility of BOS operations. Any actual project would require much more work to get to implementation. Rather, the task force discussion has been to highlight issues that would have to be addressed and develop some indication of what it would take.

## **6. Briefing on TPB Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Responsibilities under MAP-21**

Mr. Kirby spoke to a PowerPoint on the Performance-Based Planning and Programming (PBPP) requirements under MAP-21. He began with the MAP-21 National Goals and Performance Management Measures Declaration of Policy that "Performance management will....provide a means to the most efficient investment of Federal transportation funds by refocusing on national transportation goals...and improving project decision making through performance-based planning and programming." He also reviewed the new National Goals from MAP-21 and how they are similar to the existing Scope of the Metropolitan Planning Process and the PBPP Implementation Timeline and responsibilities.

Mr. Kirby noted some PBPP coordination efforts underway, such as the January 8<sup>th</sup> FHWA Performance Management Listening Session on Target Setting with state DOTs, transit agencies, and MPOs via national video conference. Additionally, both AASHTO and AMPO have submitted letters to DOT with recommendations on how the PBPP should be carried out. Both letters addressed the concern that the PBPP should rely on

existing data. Mr. Kirby noted that the PBPP process brings new requirements for states, transit agencies, and MPOs and these additional responsibilities must be completed under the same budget levels for MPOs. He concluded with some questions for attendees to consider as the PBPP process moves forward.

Mr. Brown asked about the subregional county-level requirements for carrying out the PBPP. Mr. Kirby replied that the responsible agencies are the DOTs, transit agencies, and MPOs.

Ms. Barlow noted that the American Public Transportation Association (APTA) was involved in the national conversation on performance measures. Mr. Kirby noted that he had not heard about a formal communication from APTA, such as the AASHTO and AMPO letters.

Mr. Erenrich expressed concern about a level planning field and that the report on performance could impact funding.

Ms. Backmon asked if the performance measures were going to be the same for the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). Mr. Kirby responded that the RTPP process is 18 months underway and the DOT has yet to establish performance measures, thus, they may not be similar. The DOT performance measures will be national broad brush measures.

Mr. Kellogg expressed concern that a national congestion measure could not be a one size fits all measure.

Ms. Inman mentioned the Virginia Trans2035 project and its goals and performance measures. She also commented on administration changes and the timing of the guidance from MAP-21. She noted the Virginia Transportation Plan has a statewide database and a backlog of state of good repair projects. She expressed concern for setting targets under limited budgets. She also recommended that the TPB send a strong message that congestion is not a universal measure.

Mr. Kirby noted that these comments and issues are welcome and should be identified early, as TPB staff discuss with the feds, states, and transit agencies the measures and target setting process.

## **7. Briefing on a New Study to Identify High-impact Complete Streets Access Improvements for Rail Station Areas in the Washington Region**

Ms. Crawford provided an overview of the work plan for the TPB's TCSP grant, "High-Impact Complete Streets Access Improvements for Rail Station Areas in the Washington Region." She said the goal of the project is to develop a "go-to" list of projects that enhance the functionality of the rail system. She said these projects would be located around up to 25 rail station areas that have the opportunity to capitalize on available ridership capacity, especially in the reverse commute direction; provide access to employment; and create non-auto connections for low-income and transit-dependent workers. She reviewed the tasks in the work plan and highlighted two opportunities for stakeholder input on the project. She said the project budget is \$200,000 and that the project will be completed by June 2014.

Chair Erickson asked when the opportunities for stakeholder input would be.

Ms. Crawford responded that she expects the first opportunity would be in the fall of 2013 and the second would be in the spring of 2014.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that the study not focus on rail station areas for which master plans have been recently completed. He suggested focusing on inventorying station areas with older plans. He also suggested tying this work into that of the Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program.

Ms. Crawford said the ultimate purpose of the project is not to inventory projects around station areas, but to demonstrate which projects around key station areas can positively impact access and use of the rail network.

Mr. Mokhtari said it would be useful to look at station areas that have plans because those plans demonstrate a jurisdiction is further along in its planning for the station area and those projects could be easily implemented.

Mr. Kirby said this project could help to highlight planned projects that are not currently moving forward due to lack of available funding.

Chair Erickson said a goal of the project is to assist the jurisdictions in determining priorities for limited funding.

Mr. Kirby asked if reverse commuting is an option on commuter rail lines.

Ms. Hoeffner said there is limited service on the Manassas VRE line. She said VRE is currently beginning a system planning effort that will look into the feasibility of reverse commute, as well as run through services at Union Station. She said the capacity of the Long Bridge is a major impediment to both concepts. She said VRE is hoping to build regional support for these services.

**8. Update on the Development of Transportation Emissions Reduction Measures (TERMs) for the Washington Region**

Ms. Constantine provided an overview of the process followed thus far with respect to the development of Transportation Emissions Reductions Measures (TERMs) for the air quality conformity determination of the 2013 CLRP and FY2013-18 TIP. She reminded the Committee members that the topic was first introduced during the December 2012 meeting and it was followed by a meeting of a technical workgroup in late January 2013. Subsequently, the members of the technical workgroup representing the three state departments of transportation and local jurisdictions provided project inputs for inclusion in an updated list of TERMS.

Ms. Pardo suggested that the working title of MATOC be expanded to include all types of ITS projects in addition to the incident management functions of MATOC.

Mr. Erenrich asked how to take advantage of the new fuel requirements. Mr. Kirby replied that the new fuel requirements will eventually be captured by the MOVES model.

**9. Briefing on the Summary Guide for the FY 2013-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Austin distributed some display copies of the final draft of the Summary Guide and he stated that it was also posted online. He briefly described the purpose and contents of the document. He noted that some changes had been made based on prior Committee feedback, including omitting the portion that specified numbers of projects, and adding in portions on grouped projects and a brief glossary of terms and abbreviations. Mr. Austin noted that the Summary Guide would be particularly valuable as a PDF document, as the listing of TIP projects would include hyperlinks to find out more about each project in the online CLRP/TIP database. He said this would be the final time the document would be brought to the Committee before going to print and he requested any further comments be submitted by Friday, April 19.

**10. Update on Regional “Green Streets” Discussions**

Mr. Farrell reviewed the agenda for the April 8th Green Streets Stakeholders Workshop.

**11. Other Business**

None.

**12. Adjourn**

