

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - June 4, 2010**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick Co. John Thomas
City of Frederick -----

Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich
Prince George's Co. Vic Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC

Montgomery Co. Eric Graye
Prince George's Co. -----
MDOT Lyn Erickson
 Reena Mathews
MTA Joseph Madison
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Robert Owolabi
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. -----
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Monica Backmon
NVTC Greg McFarland
PRTC Anthony Foster
VRE -----
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT David Awbrey
 Mike Harris
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Mark Kellogg

FEDERAL/OTHER

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

COG Staff

Ronald Kirby, DTP
Mike Clifford, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Beth Newman, DTP
Bob Griffiths, DTP
Garth James, DTP
Tim Canan, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
Andy Meese, DTP
Karin Foster, DTP
Monica Bansal, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Wenjing Pu, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Rex Hodgson, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Darren Smith, DTP

Other Attendees

Randy Carroll, MDE
Bill Orleans, HAEK

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

June 4, 2010

Technical Committee Minutes

1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the May 7, 2010 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

2. **Report on “Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities”**

Mr. Kirby introduced the item, briefly providing an overview of the “Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities,” which was held on May 26, 2010.

Mr. Swanson described the handout summary of interactive discussions that occurred at the event. He explained that the summary was based upon a staff review of the notes taken at each of the seven discussion tables. This summary is intended to provide an overview of the range of comments made at the event, drawing out common themes and areas of agreement, as well as indicating points of difference.

Chairman Versoza noted that participants expressed frustration with the current system when Mr. Swanson described the first bullet in the summary. He said that CAC members were the only participants who expressed such frustration.

Mr. Swanson indicated that some other participants expressed frustrations as well as the CAC. He also noted that the summary report was designed to provide an overview of contrasting opinions which were summarized in the report.

Ms. Barlow asked staff whether any surprises occurred at the event.

Mr. Swanson said he was surprised that participants were fully engaged in discussing the TPB process, which was the purpose of the event, and did not focus on lobbying for their own priorities.

Ms. Erickson said she was surprised by the lack of knowledge of many participants. She said that before serious consideration is given to changing the process, a lot more lot of work that needs to be done in educating people about the existing process.

Mr. Srikanth agreed with Ms. Erickson. He said that at the table where he sat, he asked CAC members to explain how the CLRP process works and they replied that they had no

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of June 4, 2010**

idea. He said it is important to explain how extensively planning is conducted at the local level.

Chairman Verzosa noted that the process is complicated. He said that members of the CAC are not involved long enough in the process to really learn it.

Mr. Kirby said the summary document was intended to simply describe what happened at the Conversation. He said the key challenge now is to determine what next steps should be taken. He said a better job must be done of getting the facts out.

Mr. Swanson said he himself has a hard time explaining how projects get into the CLRP. He further asked why a person needs to be an expert to understand the process.

Mr. Erickson said it would be a good idea to provide a list of Capital Improvement Programs (CIPs) and the local and state levels, which is where the process is really grounded.

Mr. Swanson noted that CIPs largely reflect short-range priorities.

Ms. Erickson said this was not correct. The CIPs are also the sources of projects for the CLRP.

Mr. Srikanth noted his concern that participants at his table at the Conversation were fundamentally ignorant of the CLRP process and requirements. He said he was concerned that these people wanted unfunded projects to be included in the CLRP.

Mr. Weissberg spoke about financial constraint requirements.

Mr. Swanson noted that staff is currently working on developing an inventory of unfunded priority projects that have been identified in local and state plans.

Mr. Srikanth said that such an inventory can be developed fairly quickly. He said the source of unfunded priorities should be the county comprehensive plans.

Mr. Swanson said that he has been in touch with the jurisdictions regarding the inventory. He noted that the data sources for the inventory are not so obvious because some jurisdictions have numerous plans.

Mr. Erenrich said that Montgomery County has an exhaustive list of unfunded projects from the county master plan.

Mr. Weissberg said that Princes George's has something similar.

Ms. Erickson said it would be helpful to get the CAC report earlier than usual.

Mr. Owolabi suggested that perhaps staff should develop recommended next steps.

Mr. Kirby said that it was important at this stage to provide an objective summary of what happened at the Conversation. He said that everyone needs a chance to discuss the summary. He said that staff would likely provide next step recommendations in July.

3. Recommendations from the Strategic Plan for the Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Program

Mr. Meese reported, referring to the PowerPoint presentation that had been used for the May 19 TPB meeting, at which he gave a time-shortened presentation emphasizing the plan's recommendations. As advised by the Technical Committee on May 7, the Board presentation was brief and included graphics. TPB Chairman David Snyder requested that the plan be brought back as an action item for approval at the June 16 TPB meeting; originally it had been slated as an information item. Staff was preparing an executive package for the TPB for June 16, including a draft resolution and strategic plan executive summary. Only a few minor changes had been made to the strategic plan since the Technical Committee was briefed on May 7.

In response to a question from Mr. Srikanth on the strategic plan's discussion of seeking funding, Mr. Meese noted that the plan's recommendations included encouraging the funding of proposed projects, but that recommendation was intended not to go farther than a technical subcommittee (MOITS) should go regarding project advocacy. In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Srikanth on the role of the MOITS Policy Task Force in the strategic plan, Mr. Meese noted that the plan was a technical document produced by the MOITS Technical Subcommittee rather than by the MOITS Policy Task Force. Mr. Kirby added that this was a bottom-up effort at the initiative of the MOITS Technical Subcommittee, and subsequently Chairman Snyder and the TPB expressed interest in reviewing the plan.

Mr. Harris emphasized the importance of the role of the regional-level efforts and infrastructure identified in the strategic plan in supporting local needs and operations. Mr. Meese recognized Mr. Harris for his participation on the advisory working group for the strategic plan.

4. Briefing on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program

Mr. Meese reported, referring to a PowerPoint presentation. The presentation was a combination of updates on the MATOC Program, followed by a summary of the results of the recently completed benefit-cost analysis white paper for MATOC. MATOC Steering Committee Chair Zezeski of the Maryland State Highway Administration was slated to present this update at the June 16 TPB meeting. MATOC operations continued, and Mr. Zezeski was anticipated to present some highlights. The MATOC Facilitator position remained vacant, but was anticipated to be filled soon. A variety of funding sources had been identified for FY2011, so the program will continue.

The benefit-cost study showed a conservatively estimated 10 to 1 benefit-cost ratio for MATOC, based on technical analysis of three case studies. The presentation described the three case studies and explained the analysis methodology used, focusing on “modified trips” (e.g., another route, another mode, or trips not taken).

In response to a question from Mr. Thomas, Mr. Meese noted that the estimated number of incidents used in the benefit-cost study (approximately 20 per month) was based on earlier estimates, a total that was lower and more conservative than the number in which MATOC had been involved in recent months. In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Erenrich, Mr. Meese noted that the number of crashes reported (244 per day regionally) included all police-reported crashes, whether or not they impacted traffic, which was different data from a different source than the regional traffic-impacting incidents reported through MATOC. Mr. Meese agreed to clarify the differences between these data sources for the Board presentation.

Mr. Meese noted that the MATOC Steering Committee was exploring basing MATOC at the University of Maryland Center for Advanced Transportation Technology. Programs already based at the Center administratively include the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS), the Capital Wireless Information Net (CapWIN), and the I-95 Corridor Coalition. However, activities funded under the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for MATOC would remain under COG/TPB separate from the University.

Mr. Harris stated that he liked the proposed new structure since it would not be consultant-led as is the current system.

In response to a question from Mr. Owolabi, Mr. Meese noted that the \$100,000 of FY2011 CMAQ funds mentioned in the potential funding sources was from the NVTA allocation of CMAQ. Mr. Srikanth explained that NVTA develops the recommendations for these funds, but the funds are provided and administered by VDOT. The

recommendation was for \$100,000 from CMAQ with the remaining \$300,000 requested from Virginia for MATOC needing to come from another source.

In response to a question from Mr. Harris on whether the benefit-cost analysis included state "511" traveler information services, Mr. Meese noted that the MATOC Steering Committee has discussed but not finalized the level of effort that MATOC will undertake in providing information directly to the public. The RITIS system is able to provide information for incorporation into state 511 systems. Proactive use of the state 511 systems could further help over and above the activities analyzed in the benefit-cost study.

5. Status Report on the TPB 2010 Solicitation for Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom Projects

Ms. Newman presented a Status Report on the TPB's 2010 Solicitation for Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom projects. The briefing included a recap of the past three solicitations and highlighted a project from each solicitation, including the accessible taxicab project funded in 2008. She described the solicitation details, including funding amounts, outreach and priority projects that were encouraged by the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force. Also included were the selection committee process and a basic schedule for the 2011 solicitation. The 10 project recommendations will be presented to the TPB at its June 16 meeting for final approval.

Mr. Awbrey asked about the length of the projects, and Ms. Newman replied that they are two-year projects. Mr. Owolabi asked about the 100 taxi trips provided in March and whether wheelchair users are given priority. Ms. Newman responded that drivers are required to give priority to wheelchair users, and that the 100 trips were the number of wheelchair accessible trips provided, not the total trips.

6. Update on the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project Grant under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program

Mr. Canan briefed the Committee on the status of implementing the region's TIGER grant and informed members of key accomplishments since the last meeting. In May, the FTA approved the scopes, schedules and budgets of all project components included in the grant. These elements were incorporated into the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between FTA and COG, acting as the administrative agent for the TPB. Both FTA and COG signed the MOU on 19 May 2010. This action ensures that TIGER funding will be available for obligation for funding the project components.

The next milestones to complete in the coming weeks will include (1) executing sub grant agreements / MOUs between TPB and each of the five project owners; (2) developing an RFQ to solicit consultant support for program management; and (3) submitting grant applications for the project components to FTA to enable funding to flow toward project implementation.

Several questions were raised concerning the forthcoming sub grant agreements / MOUs between COG and project owners. Mr. Canan explained that the complete set of terms and conditions is still unclear; however, based on his understanding of ARRA reporting requirements and the fact that COG/TPB already has to comply with similar terms and conditions in the JARC and New Freedom programs, he believes he has sufficient understanding of the anticipated terms and conditions in order to develop the RFQ for consultant support.

Mr. Canan will provide an MOU to each of the project owners that will be similar to what he provided earlier, but it will contain more specific references to the project owner agencies, the project components, and the known FTA terms and conditions.

While there is not a strict deadline for agency review of the MOUs, COG/TPB will request a swift turnaround.

Finally, in response to a question on project coordination, Mr. Canan explained that coordination between project owners and other agencies that will play a role in the projects will be the responsibility of the project owners.

7. Briefing on a Proposed “TIGER II” Grand Application for a Regional Bike Sharing Project

Ms. Bansal presented a status update for the development of a TPB regional TIGER II grant submission. She provided a brief overview of the TIGER II program and its similarities and differences from the TIGER I program, such as the need for 20% local match under TIGER II and a minimum grant request of \$10 million. She also discussed the concept of resubmitting the unfunded bike-sharing portion of the TIGER I application, which was approved by the TPB at their May meeting. She provided an overview of bike-sharing, as well as an additional component of bicycle access improvements at transit stations that may be included.

Ms. Haldeman from WMATA provided a short description of what this component would entail, such as signage and other infrastructure at Metrorail stations. Ms. Bansal stated that these improvements are intended to directly intersect and complement the bike-sharing system.

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of June 4, 2010**

Ms. Bansal also said that staff was coordinating with the TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee to obtain initial expressions of interest in participating, but that a representative working group would be assembled for a meeting on June 9. She explained that TPB staff is looking to keep the grant request to the minimum of \$10 million in order to increase chances of being awarded funding.

Mr. Erenrich expressed possible interest in adding a project component for the TIGER II planning grants, which are distinct from the capital grants. Ms. Bansal replied that the planning grants will have a separate program and notice of funding availability, which may or may not be tied to HUD Community Challenge Planning grants; however, if DOT does not believe a project is ready for capital it may be awarded a planning grant.

Mr. Kirby said that the planning grants are likely to be more local in scale in accordance with the HUD grants.

It was also discussed that the bike-sharing interest to date was only at \$7 million, while the minimum grant request is \$10 million. The difference could be made up with the WMATA access improvements and also local infrastructure projects that directly complement the bike-sharing.

NEPA requirements were also discussed in that all projects included under the grant request, including projects with programmed money to be used as match, would be subject to NEPA. Ms. Bansal stated that the NEPA process would need to be completed 90 days before September 30, 2012 according to the notice of funding availability.

8. Update on Draft TPB Response to a Request by Martz National Coach for Federal Assistance for Commuter Bus Service between Fredericksburg and Washington DC

Chairman Verzosa explained that the NVTA recently met and discussed the draft TPB response letter and then distributed copies of the recommended changes to the letter. Mr. Ramfos also distributed an updated draft response letter that was prepared by COG/TPB staff in response to Martz National Coach's January 21, 2010 letter seeking Section 5307 funds in exchange for reporting their commuter bus mileage to the National Transit Database (NTD). Mr. Kirby reviewed the changes to the draft response letter and how it related to the changes in the NVTA draft letter.

Ms. Backmon said that the reference to the FTA Circular needed to be added back into the letter. Mr. Ramfos responded that the language had been in an earlier draft version of the letter but it was removed because Martz is not seeking to be a recipient or sub-recipient. Mr. Srikanth requested that the FTA Circular reference be added as a reference point in the letter.

Next, Mr. Foster said that it is expected that the same precedent used with PRTC would be used with Martz when it comes to the 5307 funds which are currently related to those reported miles outside of the WMATA compact. Mr. Foster recommended that this language be added to the letter. Mr. Kellogg asked that the language explaining the precedent that Section 5307 formula funds earned outside the compact area are the subject of a split letter calculation and the funds earned inside the compact area stay with WMATA be included in the response letter. Mr. Srikanth suggested that this information be added towards the end of the letter. Mr. Kirby agreed stating that this information was not in the form of a question to Martz but more of an informational item. TPB staff would consider these comments and prepare an updated version of the letter for the TPB's review.

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

Mr. Kellogg briefed the Committee with a Power Point presentation on WMATA's ongoing efforts to develop a Regional Transit System Plan for 2040. He said that the plan builds upon the region's 2009 CLRP to address key regional transit growth issues, including the core capacity of the Metrorail system; how to integrate rail transit with regular bus, streetcar, LRT, BRT, express bus, and HOV/HOT services; and the need to examine new and emerging markets to provide multimodal mobility options and facilitate transit-oriented development. He then presented the process to develop the plan and described the 9 transit strategies to be assessed. He concluded by reviewing the status of the plan and the next steps.

Mr. Kirby commented that this is a good example of a financially un-constrained regional plan that will present a set of priority transit projects such as the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) has advocated.

Mr. Erenrich said that this is a comprehensive study, but that there are transit issues that need to be addressed outside the core. He commented that new surface transit connections with both Maryland counties and Virginia are needed.

10. Briefing on the draft *National Capital Region Freight Plan 2010*

Ms. Foster briefed the Committee on the first Draft *National Capital Region Freight Plan 2010*. She provided an outline of the Freight Plan and noted the Freight Subcommittee objectives. She reviewed the link between the economy and freight transportation and highlights about from the four primary freight modes in the region: truck, rail, maritime, and air.

Mr. Foster explained that the Freight Database is a major element of the Freight Plan. She said the database represents a compilation of projects beneficial to freight movement in our region and includes 31 rail and 41 highway projects. The projects originate from varying sources, such as the CLRP, the Draft MDOT Maryland Rail Plan (MRP), and the I-95 Corridor Coalition Mid Atlantic Rail Operations) MAROPs study.

Ms. Foster concluded with a review of best practices, key findings, and recommendations. The recommendations aim to guide the Freight Program with the integration of freight into the transportation planning process.

Mr. Thomas requested that the freight database clarify which projects are under study or approved for construction.

Mr. Erenrich noted the loss of industrial lands and suggested a map showing where facilities are. He added it would be helpful to include rail lines and terminals.

Ms. Matthews suggested adding to a statement in the Plan that referenced total tonnage and total value of freight nationally to compare with the regional numbers.

Mr. Srikanth recommended reorganizing the presentation slides to focus on freight issues.

Mr. Weisberg encouraged Technical Committee members to come to the July 8 Freight Subcommittee meeting for further discussion of the Freight Plan.

11. Briefing on the Final Draft 2010 Congestion Management Process (CMP) Technical Report

Due to time constraints, this item was deferred to the July meeting.

12. Update on the Financial Analysis for the 2010 CLRP

Mr. Miller reported to the Committee on the status of the financial analysis for the 2010 CLRP. He said that the consultant, Cambridge Systematics, Inc. (CSI) had only recently received all of the necessary financial forecast data from the DOTs and that more time will be necessary to finalize the summary tables and prepared the final report. He said that more time and budget will be required to prepare a comprehensive and readable report and provide sufficient time for review and comment by the Technical Committee before it can be presented to the TPB. The report needs to not only document the analysis results showing that the CLRP is fiscally constrained, but clearly explain the implications for future transit and highway expansions.

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of June 4, 2010**

13. Other Business

None.

14. Adjourn