

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

**Technical Committee Minutes**  
*for meeting of*  
**September 9, 2011**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - September 9, 2011**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                    Mark Rawlings  
DCOP                    Colleen Mitchell

**MARYLAND**

Charles County        -----  
Frederick Co.         Ronald Burns  
City of Frederick     -----  
Gaithersburg         -----  
Montgomery Co.      Gary Erenrich  
Prince George's Co.  Vic Weissberg  
Rockville             -----  
M-NCPPC  
  Montgomery Co.    -----  
  Prince George's Co. -----  
MDOT                 Lyn Erickson  
MTA                    -----  
Takoma Park         -----

**VIRGINIA**

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

**WMATA**

WMATA                Mark Kellogg

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

FHWA-DC             -----  
FHWA-VA             -----  
FTA                    Melissa Barlow  
NCPC                  -----  
NPS                    -----  
MWAQC                -----

**COG Staff**

Ronald Kirby, DTP  
Gerald Miller, DTP  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Robert Griffiths, DTP  
Michael Farrell, DTP  
Andy Meese, DTP  
John Swanson, DTP  
Rich Roisman, DTP  
Sarah Crawford, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Ben Hampton, DTP  
Deb Bilek, DTP  
Jim Yin, DTP  
Yu Gao, DTP  
Daniel Son, DTP  
Erin Morrow, DTP  
Sunil Kumar, DEP

**Other Attendees**

Randy Carroll, MDE  
Matthew Zych, WMATA  
Rick Rybeck, Just Economics LLC  
Marti Ann ReinFeld, DDOT  
Bruce Gartner, MDOT  
Thomas Webster, MDOT  
Kristen Weiss, MDOT  
Art Rodgers, DC Office of Planning  
Bill Orleans

# TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

September 9, 2011

## Technical Committee Minutes

---

### 1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from July 8, 2011 TPB Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### 2. **Update on the Rail-Volution Conference in Washington DC October 16-19**

Ms. Reinfeld, member of the National Steering Committee for the Rail~Volution conference and Rail~Volution Local Host Chair, spoke to committee members about the Rail~Volution conference, which will be held in Washington, DC, from October 16 to 19. She said the conference is a series of mobile workshop, panel sessions, and charrettes, and includes a half day focused solely on the Washington region. She said there is a small scholarship fund, but that the half day session is open to everyone. She said she may be reached at [railvolution@dc.gov](mailto:railvolution@dc.gov) with further questions.

Mr. Kirby asked how many people are expected to attend. Ms. Reinfeld said they are hoping for 1,200. Mr. Erenrich asked if all events will be in the Wardman Park Marriot.

Ms. Reinfeld said yes, but that mobile workshops will be offsite. Mr. Foster asked if participants must register for the workshop or charrettes. Ms. Reinfeld said participants must register for the workshop, but that the charrettes are open to the public.

Ms. Crawford said that TPB staff submitted two proposals for panel sessions. She said both were accepted and that TPB staff would be speaking on the TPB's Community Leadership Institute during a session on regional public involvement and on the TPB's Transportation/Land-Use Connections Program during a session on regionalism.

### 3. **Briefing on the Proposed TPB Project Application for Funding Under the FY2011 Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Competitive Grant Program**

Mr. Randall spoke to a presentation on the proposed TPB application for funding under the FY 2011 TIGER discretionary grant program. He outlined the TPB's concept, approved by the TPB on July 20. He described the projects to be included in the TPB application, as well as the solicitation process and documentation provided by the project sponsors. He provided information about the pre-application and application deadlines and requirements. He closed by describing the data needs for the Benefit Cost Analysis component of the application.

Mr. Rawlings said DDOT submitted its project proposal for improvements around the Fort Totten Metro station at the last minute and thanked TPB staff for including the project. He said the project will strengthen the TPB's application by providing for a truly regional submittal. He said the project is consistent with the TPB criteria, fully funded and ready for implementation.

Ms. Backmon thanked TPB staff for managing the solicitation process and compiling the application. She noted that the VRE application includes projects from jurisdictions not typically represented in fully regional efforts, which she said is a benefit to the application.

Ms. Erickson said MDOT will provide letters for support for the Montgomery County and City of Rockville projects, noting MDOT was involved in the proposals for these projects early on. She said that MDOT was contacted later in the process by Prince George's County and that MDOT is seeking clarification on the projects and will review once it has all information. She said MDOT also found out about the Bowie project later, but is working with the City to determine if funding can be identified for construction. She said MDOT would have preferred that all projects be vetted with the state prior to the TPB deadline.

Mr. Erenrich said he is aware of the high cost of the Forest Glen project and noted that Montgomery County staff is looking at a bridge alternative that would reduce the construction cost. He said the NEPA process contains the tunnel.

Mr. Kirby asked for clarification that the tunnel/bridge alternative would not be decided prior to submitting the application. Mr. Erenrich responded that that was correct.

Mr. Kirby said the application package is already on the high end and that the TPB needs to maximize its chance to receive funding. He said all projects support the TPB's theme and suggested the application be structured to provide a menu of project options from which US DOT could select should it choose not to fund the entire package. He asked if FTA would be prepared to drill down to a level of splitting an application submission into smaller components. Ms. Barlow said she has not been part of those discussions and could not comment. She added that the reviewers do look at all the project details.

Mr. Verzosa said he understands the NOFA language stipulates that an application should not contain a mix of unrelated projects. He asked if there is a strong enough theme between the projects around which to characterize the TPB application.

Mr. Kirby said the theme is to provide better multimodal access to rail stations throughout the region and make better use of the existing regional rail infrastructure. He said each of these projects contributes to that theme. He said the project puts forward in July as part of the TPB strawman were perhaps more complementary, but that it is important to provide a slate of projects that are fully developed.

Mr. Weissberg said it takes a lot of additional effort to get from the point of a TLC study to a TIGER ready project. He said Prince George's staff has done that, but needs to solidify a couple more details for MDOT review. He said he has reached out to a developer related to the New Carrollton project and that the County is finalizing the details on the West Hyattsville project.

Mr. Kirby said that the NOFA stated that the applications must demonstrate a rationale for the projects and not merely close funding gaps.

Mr. Verzosa said the NOFA indicated that projects should be innovative.

Mr. Kirby said that US DOT wants to see that projects resulted from community involvement and a planning process. He said that is why staff proposed using TLC projects. He said many of the projects meet that objective and the TPB criteria, adding that if this federal funding is not available, the projects might not be implemented.

Ms. Barlow asked if the projects could not be completed using other funding sources. Mr. Kirby responded that traditional funding sources operate under modal silos and that many of the projects do not fit neatly into a single mode. He said there is not always an intuitive funding source for these types of multimodal projects.

Mr. Erenrich added that the Forest Glen project would have been an Earmark request in previous years.

Ms. Hoeffner said the bicycle lockers are nearly impossible to fund within the VRE funding structure. She said these improvements fall to the local governments to provide.

Ms. Erickson asked staff to clarify what it needs from the Committee to move forward with the application.

Mr. Kirby said it may be necessary to trim down the list of projects if some prove not to be ready by the TPB mailout date. He said the next goal is to strengthen the application with letters of endorsement, including community support for the individual projects, formalize the match funding, and solicit developer support. He added that there is some concern about the ROW acquisition component of the Forest Glen project.

Mr. Erenrich said so long as ROW acquisition is part of a project to construct something, it should be considered fine.

Mr. Kirby said the main pitch of the TPB's application is that this project package represents improvements that would otherwise fall through the crack of traditional funding streams. He suggests staff move forward with the project package and be in a position related to project information that the TPB can support a solid application by the September meeting when they are asked to approve the pre-application submission.

Ms. Barlow said the bikesharing application submitted by the TPB in the first and second rounds of TIGER funding was interesting and asked why it was not considered for the FY 2011 round of funding.

Mr. Kirby said some bikesharing elements are in the application. He said there was talk about reusing the bikeshare application, but since it was submitted twice and not funded either time, the TPB felt it was time to move on to something else, particularly since bikesharing is no longer innovative for the Washington region.

Mr. Randall said there are \$500,000 bikesharing components in each of the Forest Glen and Arlington proposals.

Mr. Kirby articulated that bikesharing is a component of larger projects rather than a single system unto itself.

Mr. Erenrich suggested adding a bikeshare component to the Rockville project and said he would investigate that possibility.

Mr. Srikanth said it is his understanding that the Committee is comfortable moving forward with all of the projects and asked when it would be determined if the Bowie project is a viable option.

Ms. Erickson said she will confirm the inclusion of Bowie prior to the TPB meeting.

Mr. Erenrich observed that it seems to be the trend of the future that funding is available for ready-to-go projects and that all partners need to do a better job getting projects in shape for immediate funding opportunities.

Mr. Kirby echoed that it does take time and money to get projects ready-to-go, and that is a lesson learned from this process that could be revisited through future TPB efforts.

Mr. Randall said information about data needs for the Benefit Cost Analysis would be sent later that day with a due date of September 17.

#### **4. Briefing on Housing and Transportation Cost Study for the Washington Metropolitan Area**

Mr. Rodgers, referring to a PowerPoint presentation, provided a briefing on the final report for the Housing and Transportation Cost Study for the Washington Metropolitan Area, which was prepared by the DC Office of Planning and the Center for Neighborhood Technology (CNT). He discussed expanding the definition of affordability, and noted that transportation expenses are typically 18% of household budgets. He discussed keeping transportation costs below 15%, with a goal of a combined household and transportation cost to total less than 45% of household income. He cited that this is one of the goals outlined in Region Forward, and that a quick analysis suggests that the regional average combined housing and transportation cost is approximately 44%.

Mr. Rybeck said that the trend shows that when transportation costs are added, more areas become less affordable. He asked if there are areas that become more affordable.

Mr. Rodgers replied that the report does not look at cost per square foot.

Mr. Malouff suggested that the presentation include a map showing the core of the region.

Mr. Srikanth asked if the numbers in the report were specific to the region, or if they pertain to the nation as a whole. He also inquired about the level at which the analysis was conducted.

Mr. Rodgers replied that the numbers are nation-wide, and that the analysis is down to the block-group level. He said that transportation costs vary by location, and that the analysis looked to focus on neighborhood characteristics, including residential density, gross density, average block size in acres, transit connectivity index, job density, and average time journey to work. He added that the three household variables were income, size, and number of commuters per household. He mentioned that DC will use this study as a way to create a tool to

develop planning scenarios as they pertain to streetcars, increased households, and increased jobs.

Mr. Rybeck asked if the results shown were for new or all existing homes.

Mr. Rodgers replied that the results shown were for all households.

Mr. Erenrich inquired if this would encourage gentrification.

Mr. Rodgers replied that this could be an alarm for gentrification, but could also help.

Mr. Rybeck said that increasing accessibility while decreasing transit costs suggests that housing costs will increase.

Mr. Griffiths asked if the model can predict housing costs.

Mr. Rodgers said that this has not yet been done, but could be a great topic for further study.

Mr. Srikanth asked about the difference between the development of the general and more refined models.

Mr. Rodgers replied that the refined area study looked at land-use diversity because this data was not very strong at the regional level. He asked for feedback on the presentation in preparation for the TPB briefing on September 21.

Mr. Kirby replied that the presentation should be simplified so that it tells the main story, which is the combined cost of housing and transportation as a way to reconsider affordability.

Mr. Srikanth added that many of the charts and tables are very technical.

Mr. Erenrich suggested adding a slide on the new model tool and how the TPB may use it.

## **5. Briefing on Household Travel Survey of Fourteen Geographic Subareas of the Region**

Mr. Griffiths gave a Power Point presentation on the FY 2012 project to collect new household travel survey data from 4,800 households in fourteen geographically-focused subareas of the region. He identified the seven geographic areas that would be surveyed in the fall of 2011 and the seven geographic areas that would be surveyed in the spring of 2012. He noted that the seven geographic areas to be surveyed in the spring of 2012 were subject to review and refinement by the local jurisdiction planning staff. He reported that the fall 2011 survey interviewing would begin in mid-September and would be completed by mid-November.

Mr. Griffiths explained that the purpose of this project was to collect additional household travel survey data in specific small subareas of the region to (1) permit detailed analysis of the daily travel behavior in communities with different densities, physical design characteristics and

transportation options, (2) assist local planners with current local land use and transportation planning efforts in these areas and (3) build a household travel survey database that can measure changes in local community travel behavior over a period of time that would enable before and after comparisons after major transportation and/or land use changes.

Mr. Griffiths also noted that the design of the geographically-focused household travel survey lent itself to an ideal follow-on to the DC Office of Planning Housing and Transportation Cost Study presented in the previous agenda item. He stated that housing cost data for the households in the fourteen travel survey subareas could be assembled and combined with the household travel survey transportation data collected for the households in these subareas. This follow-on could provide useful, specific community level housing and transportation cost comparisons for different geographic areas in the region. This individual disaggregate-level household follow-on analysis would be a significant complement the DC Office of Planning Housing and Transportation Cost Study that used aggregate-level Census data.

## **6. Briefing on the Transforming Governance of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority: Phase 1 Recommendations Report by the Governance Work Group (GWG) Appointed by the Governors of Maryland and Virginia and the Mayor of the District of Columbia**

Mr. Webster of MDOT on the GWG staff provided background on the GWG, which was established in January 2011 by the two Governors and the Mayor to make recommendations to improve governance at WMATA. The GWG work has three phases over a two year period. He said that the WMATA Board has made promising changes since July. The draft Phase 1 report recommendations were released on July 21 and the public comment period on the report ended August 25. Phase 2 recommendations will be developed over the next few months. In Phase 3, recommendations will be presented that require legislative and WMATA compact changes.

Mr. Strauss of DDOT on the GWG staff summarized the Phase 1 recommendations.

Mr. Webster said that Phase 2 is focusing on two big issues that are structural and require more discussion. These are the role of alternate board members and the size of the board, and the jurisdictional veto. He explained these issues and said that they are seeking consensus on the recommendations to address them. He also summarized the public comments on the Phase 1 report and said that they were generally supportive of the findings and recommendations. He said that staff will provide the governors and mayor their recommendation in time for possible legislative consideration in 2012.

Mr. Erenrich said that Maryland counties are very interested in the role of alternates. He commented that at yesterday's WMATA Board meeting, there was some parochialism and micromanaging regarding bus route changes. He asked if there is a means of monitoring the meetings and committees to see if change is taking place, and how to evaluate the board's performance.

Mr. Strauss replied that it is going to take time for people to get used to their new roles and that it is a new board with many new members. He suggested that outside groups have some responsibility to monitor the board and provide feedback.

Mr. Kirby commented on the evaluation of the performance of the board. He said that if a year from now, its performance has not changed the only oversight is from the people who appoint the members. He said that the signatories to the WMATA compact need to have a formal structure to monitor the board.

Mr. Strauss said that there have been discussions that the governors and mayor meet periodically to discuss WMATA. Ultimately, the appointing people need to pay attention to how their appointees are doing. He said that if term limits are established, it could require the appointing authorities to do more review of their members.

Mr. Holloman inquired if there was a recommendation on criteria for monitoring the board over time.

Mr. Strauss said that the board needs to evaluate itself and annual retreats have been discussed for this purpose.

## **7. Status Report on Study of Public Attitudes Toward Road-Use Pricing**

Mr. Swanson said that in February 2011, the TPB, in partnership with the Brookings Institution, launched a study to investigate issues related to the public acceptability of road-use pricing. The TPB has received a grant from the Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Value Pricing Program to conduct this research. This project will use invitation-only deliberative forums to explore attitudes toward a variety of pricing options, ranging from variably priced toll roads to system-wide vehicle-based pricing systems. These forums will occur this fall. The forums will be designed to include between 60 and 70 members of the general public and will last approximately four hours. At these events, participant feedback will be recorded and monitored as information is shared and discussions ensue. By engaging the public in an extended exchange of ideas, opinions and reactions, the project will identify challenges and opportunities that decision makers would face if they were to move forward with implementing options for road-use pricing.

Mr. Swanson said the following dates had been established for the forums: October 15 in New Carrollton; November 5 in Rockville; November 19 in Chantilly; December 3 in Springfield; January 21 in Washington, DC. He said that Brookings had been contracted to serve as a partner on the project and the non-profit AmericaSpeaks had been competitively awarded a contract to conduct the deliberative forums. He said that staff conducted a series of listening sessions over the summer to inform the content and design for the forums.

Mr. Rawlings asked why only one session had been scheduled in the District. Mr. Swanson said that every effort was being made to ensure the five forums are roughly representative of region as a whole.

Mr. Erenrich asked how many people would be attending the forums. Mr. Swanson said that 60-70 participants were expected.

Mr. Foster asked when the results would be released. Mr. Swanson said the final report was scheduled to be presented to the TPB in April.

Ms. Backmon asked where in Chantilly the session would be held? Mr. Swanson said that precise locations had not yet been determined. He said staff hoped to attract participants from Prince William to both Springfield and Chantilly. He added that participants will each be paid a stipend of \$100. Mr. Swanson said the study was intended to reach out to the general public.

Mr. Orleans, a citizen, asked how participants were being recruited. Mr. Swanson said that America Speaks has a lot of experience with recruitment. They will be getting applicants by canvassing door to door, going to shopping malls, using various web outreach methods, etc.

## **8. Briefing on the Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2012 CLRP and FY2013-2018**

Mr. Austin presented the draft Call for Projects document. He stated that there were no significant changes to the text of the document since last year's version.

Mr. Austin directed the Committee to the schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment. He noted that the schedule was fairly aggressive, with projects inputs due on December 16. This deadline would be for any new projects, plus changes to completion dates or project scopes of existing projects. The schedule would conclude on July 18, 2012 with the TPB's adoption of the CLRP, TIP and Air Quality Conformity Assessment.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the accelerated schedule was done to eliminate any possible issues with required model updates in 2012. Mr. Austin said that this was part of the reason for the early start.

Ms. Erickson stated that Maryland Department of Transportation's Fall Tour was beginning, which would lead to the developments for their Consolidated Transportation Program and eventually the TIP. She said the schedule for the tour would be made available at the upcoming CAC meeting and the TPB meeting. She listed the following tour stops: Montgomery County on September 15, Prince George's County on September 22, Frederick County on October 5 and Charles County on October 8.

Mr. Srikanth noted that VDOT was also conducting a public event, called the Fall Multimodal Transportation Meeting on October 25. The purpose of the meeting was to give the public an opportunity to indicate what projects they would like to see funded in Virginia's next Six Year Improvement Program. He also noted that representatives from the TPB would be invited to set up a booth to present information on TPB projects and programs.

Ms. Backmon asked which version of the travel demand model would be used for the 2012 CLRP update. Mr. Kirby stated that when the TPB approves the 2011 update in November, they will also approve the version 2.3 model, which will become the adopted model moving forward.

## **9. Update on a Draft Regional Policy on Complete Streets**

Mr. Farrell announced that the draft Complete Streets policy had been posted on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee web site. The TPB Chair has directed the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee to develop the policy. Access for All and other Subcommittees will be reviewing

the draft policy and given opportunity to comment. A regional policy cannot be completely consistent with all the various State and local policies. The regional policy will be voluntary.

The major outstanding issue is the type and volume of documentation of compliance by the executing agencies, and where it will be required, for example in the Transportation Improvement Program, or in some other self-reporting format.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee is currently submitting its comments, which will be incorporated into the draft policy. The Bus and Access for All Subcommittees will be given an opportunity to comment, after which the draft policy will be presented to the TPB Technical Committee, and then to the TPB for approval, likely in November.

#### **10. Briefing on a New Sensitivity Test for the CLRP Aspirations Scenario**

Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee on the results of a new sensitivity test for the CLRP Aspirations Scenario Study. He referred to a technical memorandum, which was part of the mail-out, and a presentation. He noted that when the final results for the Aspirations Scenario were presented in September 2010, there were comments made that the tolling was too extensive and there were questions about whether it could be scaled back to have less capacity and fewer interchanges. The "Streamlined" Variably Priced Lane (VPL) Network Sensitivity Test was designed to address those concerns. Referring to the results slides in the presentation, he pointed out that the streamlined VPL network preformed almost as well as the full VPL network for much less cost. The analysis showed that the streamlined VPL network could more than pay for itself.

Mr. Kirby told the Committee that the analytical work for the sensitivity test is complete and it will be brought back to the Committee for more discussion at the October meeting.

Mr. Rybeck asked if the costs included the bus rapid transit system and the additional transit. Mr. Kirby responded that it did and the BRT could be supported out of the toll revenue.

Mr. Srikanth remarked that this was a good analysis. He noted that land use and transportation improvements cannot be looked at individually, but rather the combination should be kept in mind when developing a priorities plan. He referred to the technical memorandum and noted that the land use sensitivity test performed well in some of the metrics, but the scenarios with land use, VPL network, and transit improvements performed well in the majority of the metrics. Mr. Kirby responded that the streamlined variably priced lane network was designed to support concentrated activity centers.

#### **11. Update on Amendments to the FY 2012 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Revise the Budget, Respond to the Federal Transportation Planning Certification Review, and Incorporate the Scope and Process to Develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.**

Mr. Kirby referred to the memorandum in the mailout on the proposed changes. He reminded the Committee that at the July 8 meeting it was briefed on an amendment to the 2012 UPWP budget to reflect changes in new FY 2012 funding and adjustments in the unobligated FY 2010

funding provided by DDOT, MDOT and VDOT. He said that the Committee was also briefed on amendments to the FY 2012 UPWP to implement the recommendations and corrective actions included in the federal certification report on the transportation planning process for the Washington DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area.

Mr. Kirby said that since July, MDOT has informed us that its FHWA allocation of FY 2012 funding was reduced. He said that as described in the memorandum, the funding in the core work program will need to be reduced by about \$250,000. He said that to account for this reduction, it is proposed to reduce the budget for work activity 4.C Models Development for the work element set aside to provide consultant assistance to design a framework for applying a tour-based and/or activity-based travel demand model (ABM) for the Washington region. He also said that text would be added to certain work activities to address the new topic of adaptation to climate change.

Mr. Kirby said that these draft amendments to the FY 2012 UPWP will be reviewed with the Committee again in October and presented to the TPB for approval at its October 19 meeting.

**12. Other Business**

None.

**13. Adjourn.**