



National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

Technical Committee Minutes

**For the meeting of
July 12, 2019**

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the June 6, 2019 Technical Committee Meeting

The minutes of the June 6, 2019 Technical Committee Meeting were approved unanimously.

2. Regional Car Free Days 2019 Proclamation

Nicholas Ramfos, TPB staff, spoke to the group regarding the Commuter Connections Car Free Day scheduled for 2019. Mr. Ramfos stated that the origins of Car Free Day began in Europe in 1995 and is now a world-wide event that is observed in 1,500 cities spanning 40 countries. The event coincides with European Mobility Week which is an annual campaign in sustainable urban mobility celebrated from September 16 – 22. The goal of that campaign is to improve public health and quality of life through clean mobility and sustainable urban transport. Mobility Week culminates with Car Free Day on September 22 and many participating cities set aside one or more areas for pedestrians, cyclists and public transportation users for the entire day.

He noted that the Washington, D.C. event is covered well by the local media and began as a DC-only event in the District of Columbia in 2007. It expanded regionally through COG in 2008 and is now designed to promote alternative forms of transportation including “car-lite” methods such as carpools and vanpools in addition to telework options.

Mr. Ramfos stated that the event is open to all residents who need to make a trip during Car Free Day and ordinarily travel in a single occupant vehicle. Since September 22 falls on a Sunday this year, the event has been renamed to Car Free Days and will be held over a three-day period from September 21 – 23 in order to capture both weekend travel and weekday commuting travel. The goal is to have 10,000 resident pledging to go car free or car-lite during one, two, or all three days.

The TPB will be asked to approve a proclamation for the 2019 Car Free Days event this month.

Mr. Ramfos stated that the call to action will be for local jurisdictions to adopt similar proclamations as well.

He shared that the event’s website (www.carfreemetrodcc.org) is up and running and ready to accept pledges. There will be a leaderboard on the site to show the status of those pledging and the type of mode they pledge to take during Car Free Days. Those who are already car free are also welcomed to pledge. There are promotional materials such as a poster which will be sent to employers and is also available to download from the Car Free Day web site. The event also has Facebook and Twitter pages and will be using both to promote the event via messages and paid advertising. Blog influencers will also be used to promote the event which is similar to last year’s efforts. Pandora and You Tube channels will also be used to market the event to residents in the region.

Continuing Mr. Ramfos noted that the event also has many corporate sponsors offering prize opportunities for those pledging. During last year’s event, anyone who pledged was able to receive a discount code from District Taco for a discount rate on an online food order. Complimentary transit ad space promoting Car Free Days will be donated by Arlington, Fairfax, Montgomery, Prince George’s, and WMATA.

Commuter Connections network members also hosted numerous promotions and events to celebrate Car Free Day. Commuter Connections also forged partnerships with the American Lung Association, the American Heart Association and Clean Air Partners to promote the event through their local networks.

Last year’s event also included the “Capital Area Car Free College Campus Challenge” to promote the event on college campuses throughout the region. A promotional tool kit was developed and

distributed to colleges and universities throughout the Washington Metropolitan Area. Several hundred pledges were made with .edu email addresses, and 1st place went to Georgetown University.

Concluding Mr. Ramfos informed members that last year, over 2,700 people took the Car Free Day pledge resulting in transportation and emission impacts and that the number one mode used was bicycles followed by rail and bus.

3. FY 2021-2024 TIP and Visualize 2045 Updates: Inputs for the Air Quality Conformity Analysis and Air Quality Conformity Scope of Work

Jane Posey, TPB staff, reminded the group that she had reviewed the conformity inputs and Scope of Work at the June meeting of the technical committee. She stated that the TPB would be asked to approve the inputs and Scope of Work at the July meeting. She noted that there were two documents posted for this item.

She noted that the first document included the conformity project input table and Scope of Work, as well as a list of technical corrections that had been made since last month's presentation. She reviewed the technical corrections. She noted that the results of the conformity analysis would be presented to the Technical Committee in February, and that the TPB would be asked to approve the conformity analysis, TIP and Plan in March.

The second document was a letter from Kanti Srikanth to Mr. Norman Whitaker at VDOT that discusses the results of a sensitivity test done for VDOT. VDOT had asked TPB staff to assess the potential impacts of minor updates to the Beltway HOT lanes project on the regional conformity analysis of the Visualize 2045 Plan. The sensitivity test showed that the proposed project updates would result in a non-substantive change in regional emissions. Ms. Posey reviewed the letter and the results of the sensitivity test. She noted that staff had presented the proposal and the letter with MWAQC TAC. There were no questions.

4. FY 2020 Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program for Maryland TPB Jurisdictions

John Swanson, TPB staff, presented a slate of projects that a selection panel had recommended for funding under the Maryland Transportation Alternatives Set Aside (TA Set-Aside) Program. He explained that under federal law, the TPB is responsible for selecting projects using sub-allocated TA Set Aside funding for Suburban Maryland, Northern Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

Mr. Swanson shared that for this current round of funding in Maryland, MDOT SHA launched the solicitation process on April 15. Applications were due to MDOT SHA on May 15. For applicants from the TPB's Maryland jurisdictions, the MDOT SHA application included a supplementary form requesting information about how projects responded to the TPB's regional priorities including promoting non-motorized circulation within Activity Centers, enhancing access to transit stations, and increasing multimodal transportation options. For the TPB's Maryland jurisdictions for FY 2020, MDOT SHA received seven eligible applications representing a total of \$3,690,174 in requested funding. The TPB was sub-allocated a maximum of \$1,217,150 for decision-making at the MPO level.

Continuing, Mr. Swanson noted the TPB's selection panel met on July 8 and that to provide a basis for discussion, each member provided general rankings for each project application based on the numerical score they gave each project. The group discussed each project individually and asked the MDOT SHA representative for additional information regarding the applications. The panel then determined funding recommendations based on these rankings. The final recommendations are the result of consensus. The recommendations are jointly decided and do not simply reflect a quantitative sum of each panelist's individual scores.

Mr. Swanson explained the panel discussion was informed by new rules established by MDOT SHA which are designed to ensure that projects which are awarded funding are achievable. These new

rules: 1) prohibit MPOs from funding projects on a partial bias; and 2) require projects to complete key phases in their development before they qualify for a subsequent phase. Projects seeking construction funding are now required to have completed 30% design. Projects seeking design funding are now required to have completed a concept-level plan.

Mr. Swanson shared these new rules and the fact that there was only a limited amount of funding available contributed to a limited consideration of options for distribution of funding by the TPB selection panel. Large projects were difficult to include as the projects needed to be funded in their entirety, and those large projects did not provide a scalable option to award lesser funding. Other projects were subject to concerns about eligibility. After considerable deliberation, the panel decided it would not award \$528,918 of its allocation this year. These funds will be rolled into next year's sub-allocation or portions of this funding may be used, if needed, to supplement projects that have been previously awarded by the TPB.

At the end of the meeting on July 8, the review panel recommended four projects for \$688,232.00. Mr. Swanson said that those recommendations would be presented to the TPB for approval on July 24.

Mr. Swanson described the four projects recommended for funding:

- Chamber Avenue Green Street/Complete Street Project, Town of Capitol Heights, \$250,000.00
- University Park Elementary School Safe Routes to School Plan, Town of University Park, \$77,738.00
- Takoma Park Safe Routes to School Improvements, City of Takoma Park, \$80,494.00
- North Stonestreet Avenue: Street and Sidewalk Improvements, City of Rockville, \$280,000

Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County shared that his jurisdiction strongly supports the Chamber Avenue project in Capitol Heights. He also provided additional detail about that community's plans and accomplishments.

Kanti Srikanth, TPB staff director emphasized that the portion of the sub-allocation that was not being used would be rolled into next year's sub-allocation for the TPB to which Mr. Swanson affirmed this fact.

5. FY 2020 Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program for the District of Columbia

John Swanson, TPB staff, explained that his presentation was for the same federal program as Item 4, but it would cover project recommendations for the District of Columbia instead of Maryland. He shared that for FY 2020 in D.C., DDOT informed TPB staff that the TPB has responsibility for project selection for up to \$1.15 million. DDOT has discretion for decision-making over an additional \$1.15 million, which will be used for Safe Routes to School projects. He noted that federal regulations typically prohibit state DOTs from receiving TAP funding. However, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has ruled that DDOT, in its function as a department of local government, is eligible to apply for TAP funding. DDOT is officially the applicant for all three projects this year, although in all three cases, the applications and concepts were developed by other organizations that are listed as "project advocates" on the applications. These project advocates will act as the de facto project sponsors in close coordination with DDOT.

Continuing, Mr. Swanson acknowledged that DDOT conducted the project solicitation for the FY 2020 TA Set-Aside funding between March 26 and May 17. The DDOT application included a supplementary form requesting information about how projects address the TPB's regional priorities, including promoting non-motorized circulation within Activity Centers, enhancing access to transit stations, and increasing multimodal transportation options.

Mr. Swanson shared that DDOT received three applications, representing a combined total of \$695,680, which is far below the amount available for TPB project selection. Because there was

sufficient funding for all this year's applications for the DC TA-Set Aside Program, TPB staff determined it would not be necessary to convene a selection review panel. Nonetheless, a thorough review of the applications was conducted to ensure they are appropriate for funding and will help to promote the region's transportation policies.

He said the review process was conducted in two ways:

- 1) Application review: In addition to conducting an internal staff review, TPB staff sought input from our agency partners who would typically have been asked to participate in a selection panel. In recent years, these panels have typically included representatives from the two state DOTs that are not the location of the applications under consideration. Therefore, staff asked representatives from the Maryland Department of Transportation and the Virginia Department of Transportation to provide comments about the applications and submit questions for further investigation.
- 2) Interviews with applicants: TPB and DDOT staff jointly conducted conference calls with the project advocates to discuss the details of their proposals, get answers to questions that were raised in our review of the applications, and explore the ways in which these projects serve regional policies.

Mr. Swanson described the three projects recommended for funding:

- Prather's Alley Safety Improvements, District Department of Transportation/Mount Vernon Triangle Community Improvement District, \$169,600
- Protected Mobility Lanes on M Street, SE, District Department of Transportation/ Capital Riverfront Business Improvement District, \$150,000
- Union Station Masonry Restoration Project, District Department of Transportation/Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, \$549,182

6. Visualize 2045 Initiatives: Ped/Bike Station Access Update

John Swanson, TPB staff, briefed the committee. He stated that the outcome of this project would be to identify a limited list of transit station areas that will be regionally prioritized for pedestrian and bicycle improvements. These locations will be places with significant opportunity to improve walk and bike access to transit. He explained that this work activity is being undertaken to advance the TPB's aspirational initiatives and in response to TPB's directive noted in Resolution R10-2019, which is described below. More specifically, the TPB will use this list as a tool for project selection for TLC and TAP funding. In the future, it may also be used as the basis for pursuing funding at the regional level, perhaps through a federal TIGER grant application or some other opportunity. Most fundamentally, local jurisdictions and the states will be encouraged to use the priority designations to support efforts to seek funding in capital programs and/or from developers or other sources.

Continuing, Mr. Swanson noted that staff began the analysis with a baseline list of stations that met these conditions: The transit at the stations must be classified "high-capacity" (Metrorail, commuter rail, BRT, light rail, streetcar); the stations must be in place by 2025; and the stations must be in Activity Centers. Staff found that 199 stations met these conditions.

He also shared that the actual analysis is looking at three key criteria (below):

- 1) Where is it difficult to walk or bike to transit? Staff has used a walkshed analysis to identify stations with deficient pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.
- 2) Where is there significant potential demand for walking and biking? Staff identified stations with high employment/population density.
- 3) Where are vulnerable populations concentrated? Staff identified station areas that are in Equity Emphasis Areas.

Based on these criteria, staff is currently working on a draft list that is likely to include 40-50 station areas for the region. Using this preliminary list, staff plans to meet with local jurisdiction staff individually in the coming months to compare the draft regional list with each jurisdiction's priorities. Based on these conversations, staff will adjust the list, as appropriate.

Mr. Swanson said that staff expects to take a final draft list to the TPB for board approval at the end of 2019.

Sonali Soneji, VRE, suggested that the methodology might consider mode share for station access and that stations that many people access by car might be prioritized.

Mr. Swanson expressed appreciation for the suggested and noted that information about conditions at the individual stations would be welcome during the meetings with the jurisdictions.

Ms. Soneji asked if VRE would be included in the outreach to jurisdictions to which Mr. Swanson welcomed the agency's participation.

Nicholas Ramfos, TPB staff, asked if the project was making a distinction between work trips and all trips to which Mr. Swanson replied that the project was not focusing on work trips and Nicole McCall, TPB staff noted that the methodology used both employment and housing forecasts to determine demand.

Ron. Burns, Frederick County asked how much flexibility the process offered for changing the stations that were included in the preliminary staff list. Mr. Swanson replied that the purpose of the individual meetings with the jurisdictions was to find out whether the stations identified through the regional methodology made sense from a local perspective and that staff broadly hoped to keep the number of stations limited for each jurisdiction. There would be some flexibility in determining which stations to include.

Mike Lake, Fairfax County, asked who the points of contact would be for setting up the meetings with the jurisdictions. Mr. Swanson noted the technical committee members would be the first points of contact.

Kristin Calkins, DOP, asked if land-use forecasts for 2025 were being used to which Ms. McCall replied in the affirmative. Ms. Calkins suggested that this work would be interesting to the Planning Directors.

Ms. McCall then provided a briefing on a webmap that had been developed as a separate product as part of this project. She said the map showed walksheds for all the high-capacity transit stations currently in place in the region. She noted that the project to identify priority stations that Mr. Swanson described would include stations that would be in place by 2025, but this webmap did not include those. In addition, she noted that the webmap included walksheds that were not in Activity Centers, but those stations would not be part of the project that Mr. Swanson described. She encouraged technical committee members to use the map.

7. Bus Transformation Project: TPB Comments

Kanti Srikanth spoke to this item and a draft letter prepared by staff. At the June TPB meeting, the Bus Transformation Project Draft Strategy was presented by the project consultant team. There are twenty-seven recommendations grouped under six strategy elements, twenty-four of which directly affect bus service while the last strategy element speaks to longer-term actions.

Following the briefing, TPB members expressed interest in providing feedback and the sentiments of the board through a formal comment letter. The consultant presenter, Rich Davey, indicated that what would be most helpful would be the TPB's feedback on which recommendations could garner consensus and could be implemented in a relatively short time.

Mr. Srikanth worked with the three officers of the board to develop the draft comment letter, which is out for comment among the TPB members. The officers felt it better to focus on the strategic elements

rather than the specific recommendations. Many of the recommended actions are already being implemented at a local level, particularly the recommendations included in the first three strategy elements which are the most likely to gain regional consensus. Again, the officers looked at the greatest potential for consensus and which recommendations could be implemented soon.

In addition, the approach to comments considered the question of how could the TPB help, for instance, by using the TPB Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee (RPTS) or existing activities and programs. While the TPB does not get involved in individual projects or programming activities, this is not the TPB's mission, recommendations could be identified for which the TPB is already involved at a regional level. For instance, in regard to the recommendation of marketing bus at a regional level, the TPB is already involved in comparable efforts such as Commuter Connections and the Street Smart safety campaign. These could be leveraged to support marketing for bus. Another is expanding transit benefits for employees, which was studied as part of the long-range plan task force and is incorporated in the Aspirational Initiatives, and is another recommendation which the TPB could support and which is already being implemented by Commuter Connections. Finally, as part of the Aspirational Initiatives discussion, last year the RPTS recommended developing a set of guidelines for BRT systems, which was included in this year's unified planning work program. If more resources were added, this activity could be expanded to address the Draft Strategy recommendation for development of regional guidelines for bus priority across the region. Of course, any action by the TPB would require consensus by the members and the locating additional resources.

It was noted that several of the TPB members' jurisdictions were not included in the Bus Transformation Project, so Mr. Srikanth worked with the Project team and with WMATA to collect comment letters and the documentation of the work of the project, and that information has been disseminated to the board members. The board will discuss the letter at the next meeting, so attendees are asked to brief their members. The letter does not need to be approved at the July meeting, but the WMATA board will be briefed the next day, so the officers may take the opportunity to finalize the letter if the discussion at the meeting permits.

Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County commented that he had hoped the letter would be more far-reaching. The TPB has various activities such as the Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee as well as regional reporting and functions that could be used to strengthen regional ties and coordination. As far as marketing, not enough money is spent and there should be some guidance on appropriate budget, which should probably be two to three percent of operating budgets. There is some really low-hanging fruit which could be commented on in the letter. For instance, the new WMATA pass is quite innovative and can be a big advantage for transit users with free bus for any rail passes. But there was no effort to collaborate with the local operators on the new pass, which was a totally inadequate effort. More regional coordination is needed, and opportunities are being missed right and left, which could be addressed effectively through better coordination using the forum that TPB provides.

Mr. Srikanth responded by noting the long-term development of the marketing campaign at Commuter Connections, which took years to develop and which is based on needs rather than guidelines. Nothing limits jurisdictions from spending more on marketing for their bus systems but how much is the correct range? Perhaps a marketing consultant could figure this out, and Commuter Connections serves as a model and could also help figure out the first step. In terms of regional cooperation, there are many things happening in public transportation, in local bus, commuter rail, Metrobus and Metrorail. There is so much happening that TPB does not have the resources to collect and determine what the region should be doing. The letter does urge members to commit to regional coordination and collaboration, and we do need to work on this as a region, including all of the TPB members and not just those covered in the project study.

Nicholas Ramfos, TPB staff added that the Commuter Connections committees do try to collect information on new products and services and disseminate that to attendees, and that this was done for the new WMATA pass. However, not all jurisdictions or agencies participate or attend. It is a priority to collect this information and coordinate to inform commuters across the region.

Citizen Bill Orleans expressed the opinion that the study has been a closed process and should have been opened up and should be opened up going forward. He added that there should be more study of any transition of Metrobus routes to local jurisdiction operation. Once the study is completed and elements are advanced for implementation, he believes WMATA will need to conduct public hearings or face litigation. The goal is more and better bus services, and this could have been determined without all these meetings, consultants, and litigation.

8. Notice of Proposed Amendment to Update Projects and Funding in the District of Columbia Section of the FY 2019-2024 TIP

Andrew Austin, TPB staff stated that DDOT had requested an amendment to update its section of the TPB's FY 2019-2024 TIP. He shared that the amendment would be presented as a notice item on the TPB's July meeting agenda, which would effectively begin a 30-day public comment period. The board would be asked to approve the amendment at its September meeting. Mr. Austin stated that the amendment did not include any new projects that were not included in the Visualize 2045 Air Quality Conformity Analysis, approved in 2018. He noted that the amendment added approximately \$304 million dollars to the District's portion of the TIP, and described some of the changes in funding sources.

Ms. Erickson then explained that this item was presented to the technical committee, would be sent to the board as a notice item, and released for public comment because it was a complete update of the District's section of the TIP. She noted that some other TIP amendments are sometimes sent to the TPB for approval due to the amount of funding involved or the high-profile nature of a project involved, but that most amendments are handled by the TPB's Steering Committee.

9. Safety Study: Scope of Work And Status Update

Jon Schermann, TPB staff, briefed the committee on the progress of the Regional Safety Study and on when various safety-related agenda items are likely to be discussed by this committee and by the TPB.

On June 3, COG signed a contract with Cambridge Systematics, Inc. to do the study. A kickoff meeting with the consultant team and the Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) was held on June 26.

The five primary objectives of the regional safety study are:

- to better understand the factors contributing to crashes in the region;
- to determine where crashes are over-represented on the region's transportation network;
- to identify and recommend proven effective countermeasures that address the crash contributing factors;
- to provide the TPB and member jurisdictions specific recommendations to improve safety; and
- to inform future Safety Subcommittee and Street Smart Campaign efforts.

He explained that the study is organized into five primary tasks: 1) project kick-off and ongoing coordination, 2) benchmark peer evaluation, 3) collection and analysis of safety data, 4) synthesize findings and report creation, and 5) final report and presentation. He informed the committee that the consultant team has completed the kickoff meeting and is in the process of winnowing the initial list of potential peer MPOs to a final three. They have also conducted initial outreach to the three state DOTs to acquire the necessary crash data. The study is expected to be completed by February 2020.

He also reviewed the timing of future safety-related items likely to be on the committee and the TPB agendas between now and February 2020. Mr. Schermann then requested that Technical Committee members let him know about any safety-related campaigns initiatives, or activities in place at the jurisdictional level so these activities could be included in the study report. He also noted that he would follow up with an email request for this information.

In response to questions about how the study will affect the setting of regional safety targets, Mr. Schermann noted that the study will not directly affect our target setting process. Mr. Srikanth further clarified that the last slide of the presentation simply described the three separate safety agenda items on the docket for the technical committee and TPB and was not a further discussion of the safety study.

10. Enhanced Mobility Solicitation

Sergio Ritacco, TPB staff, briefed and requested assistance from the Technical Committee in publicizing the TPB 2019 solicitation for grant applications under the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program (referred to as “Enhanced Mobility”).

He explained that the Enhanced Mobility program aims to fill gaps in transportation for older adults and persons with disabilities by providing matching grants for services that go above and beyond traditional public transit and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary paratransit service. Eligible projects include travel training, vehicle acquisition and volunteer driver programs specifically serving people who have mobility impairments.

He noted that the TPB will conduct a solicitation for grant applications beginning on September 1 to November 4, 2019. Approximately \$5.6 million in federal funds are available for capital and operating grants that improve transportation for people with disabilities and older adults. These funds must be matched by the applicant: 20% for capital or mobility management grants and 50% for operating grants. Matching funds must be identified by the time of application.

TPB staff will be holding five pre-application conferences to provide potential applicants with information on eligible projects, the online application process, how to use the grant budget templates, the federal requirements, and the TPB’s selection process. Every applicant must attend a session and registration is required; details are at mwcog.org/enhancedmobility.

To ensure as many potential applications are aware of this opportunity throughout the region, staff requested that technical committee members share the attached Solicitation-at-a-Glance flyer within their agencies, external contacts, and engage TPB members to assist in promoting in communities.

Bob Brown, Loudoun County inquired on the type of projects eligible for funding, including existing projects, some who may have funding needs after the grant period, or just for new projects. Mr. Ritacco replied that it is not limited to just new programs or projects. In addition, the question using federal funded monies for previously locally-funded projects could add new requirements and regulations.

Victor Weissberg, Prince George’s County requested clarification on the deadline, which Mr. Ritacco confirmed as being November 4.

Mr. Brown inquired on the requirements on keeping a program operable after the funding period ends. Mr. Ritacco responded that no such requirement exists.

Mr. Srikanth stressed the bi-annual nature of the program, with the next opportunity to seek funding in CY 2021.

11. Draft State of Public Transportation Report

Matthew Gaskin, TPB staff, provided a brief presentation on a draft of the 2018 State of Public Transportation Report. He shared that the document is a first effort by the Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee (RPTS) to produce a report that provides an overview of the major public transportation services offered in the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Area. He noted that it includes information on transportation operations, customer and financial facts, recent accomplishments, and upcoming planning activities. Also, the report is divided into five major sections.

Mr. Gaskin stressed that this is a first effort on producing such a report, and that in the future the process of obtaining the needed information would become more streamlined.

Bob Brown, Loudoun County asked several questions about the report, namely the lack of information on Loudoun County transit services. Kanti Srikanth explained there has been extreme difficulty obtaining the requested data from some service providers. Mr. Srikanth went on to explain how this was also a significant issue when a report similar to this was attempted in 2015. Mr. Brown suggested that in the future, when reaching out to staff members (jurisdictional) that members of the technical committee should also be advised, to ensure that information is received. Mr. Srikanth stressed the importance of making sure that jurisdictional contacts are updated. Dan Malouff, Arlington County suggested a SOP in making contact with staff members.

12. COG Title VI Plan

Zach Packard, COG General Counsel, began by introducing himself along with his presentation. He noted that he will share details regarding the Civil Rights Act, and the COG Title VI Plan and the COG Title VI Program.

He then elaborated on the federal definition of Title VI from 42 U.S.C. Section 2000d which prohibits discrimination of any person under any program or activity that receives federal financial assistance.

He noted that COG, including its subrecipients, is obligated to comply with these regulations. He provided examples of programs and activities that are obligated to comply with federal law including grant recipients and other programs.

He distinguished the difference between intentional and disparate impact discrimination. Intentional discrimination is directed at an individual because of some protected class attribute and the other is that even through a neutral process, outcomes are disproportionate for minorities.

He shared some keys Title VI compliance. The goal is to ensure that service recipients receive equal treatment, equal access, equal rights, and equal opportunities without regard to their race, color, or national origin, including Limited English Proficiency (LEP).

He encouraged the audience to ensure that all staff are aware of the importance of their organization's Title VI plan and that failure to update and follow the plan can lead to termination and/or the withholding of future federal funds.

Mr. Packard provided the link to COG's Title VI plan which was recently updated and approved by the COG board. He shared some of the components of the plan in addition to minor updates including updates to the attachments to the plan to reflect COG's policies and composition.

Additionally, he shared details regarding COG's Title VI program which is also required by the FTA and reviewed every three years. He noted that the program focuses on ensuring all populations are evenly served based on the demographic profile of area. This includes procedures for identifying mobility needs of minority populations and considering them in the planning process, the generation of maps showing the impacts from the distribution of aggregate funding for public transportation projects, and the analysis of investments that identifies and addresses any disparate impacts.

There were a few clarifying questions from Bob Brown and Mike Lake regarding the overall applicability of COG's Title VI program on jurisdictions. Ms. Erickson and Mr. Srikanth elaborated on the relationship of the TPB to COG, and that the Enhanced Mobility program is the only grant program that TPB staff monitor in respect to subrecipients and their compliance with the law.

13. Other Business

- **Nice/Middleton Bridge**

Lyn Erickson reminded members that the Nice/Middleton Bridge amendment item will return to the board for a vote. MDOT will not be providing a presentation but updated materials will be provided. She also noted that VDOT will have multiple TIP amendments in need of approval.

- **Census Transportation Planning Products (CTPP) Training Announcement**

Nicole McCall announced the dates for the Census Transportation Planning Products (CTPP) Training on August 5 and 6. She noted that the training will be all day and that there will be are training modules for attendees to complete prior to day one. The training will consist of subjects such as understanding and dealing with data Issues, transportation data and how to get it, what kind of data is collected and where it is located, understanding and using census and CTPP geography and CTPP data access software. Members were encouraged to participate and spread the word about the training to contact Greg Grant of TPB staff with any questions.

- **CAVs related activities**

Andrew Meese shared that for the FY 2020 work program there is a CAV component and staff has been engaged in regional discussions and events concerning CAVs. Also, staff would like to gather an advisory panel to develop plans for a CAV forum this fiscal year and he encouraged members with interest in participating on the panel to reach out to him.

- **Briefing on the Transportation Climate Initiative (TCI)**

Erin Marrow introduced the Transportation Climate Initiative TCI. She noted that the effort was a regional collaboration of Northeast and Mid-Atlantic states to which Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia belong. with the goal reducing carbon emission from transportation. She noted that TCI plans to complete a policy design process by the end of 2019 and that it could be modeled after the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative. She shared that TCI has held public workshop and seminars to gather public input and that the next workshop will be on July 30 at the University of Baltimore. She directed member's attention to a link where more information can be found.

- **Request for presentations on local projects which exemplify the seven endorsed initiatives**

Lyn Erickson reminded members of the ongoing effort to bring presentations to the committee from jurisdictions that capture the goals of the aspirational element of the Visualize 2045 long-range plan.

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – July 12, 2019**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings

DCOP Kristin Calkins

MARYLAND

Charles County -----

Frederick County Ronald Burns

City of Frederick -----

Gaithersburg -----

Montgomery County Gary Erenrich

Prince George’s County Victor Weissberg

Rockville -----

M-NCPPC

MDOT Kari Snyder

Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Jim Maslanka

Arlington County Dan Malouff

City of Fairfax -----

Fairfax County Mike Lake
Malcolm Watson

Falls Church -----

Fauquier County -----

Loudoun County Robert Brown

Manassas -----

NVTA Sree Nampoothiri

NVTC Dan Goldfarb

Prince William County Paolo Belita

PRTC -----

VRE Sonali Soneji

VDOT Norman Whitaker

Regina Moore

VDRPT Ciara Williams

NVPDC -----

VDOA -----

WMATA Jamie Carrington

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

FHWA-DC -----

FHWA-VA -----

FTA -----

NCPC -----

NPS Laurel Hammig

MWAQC -----

MWAA -----

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP

Lyn Erickson, DTP

Tim Canan, DTP

Andrew Meese, DTP

Mark Moran, DTP

Abigail Zenner, DTP

Andrew Austin, DTP

Arianna Koudounas, DTP

Brandon Brown, DTP

Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP

Dusan Vuksan, DTP

Eric Randall, DTP

Erin Morrow, DTP

Greg Grant, DTP

Jane Posey, DTP

Jinchul Park, DTP

John Swanson, DTP

Jon Schermann, DTP

Kenneth Joh, DTP

Matthew Gaskin, DTP

Michael Farrell, DTP

Nicole McCall, DTP

Patrick Zilliacus, DTP

Sergio Ritacco, DTP

Stacy Cook, DTP

William Bacon, DTP

OTHER

Bill Orleans

Clinton Edwards, VDRPT

Alexandra Brun, MDE

Ashley Sharp, PGC