



National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
September 9, 2016

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the July 8 Technical Committee Meeting

The Minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on the State of the Commute Report

Mr. Ramfos gave a PowerPoint presentation on the preliminary results from the 2016 State of the Commute (SOC) survey conducted through the Commuter Connections program. The SOC survey serves several purposes. First, it documents trends in commuting patterns, such as commute mode shares and distance traveled, and prevalent attitudes about transportation services that are available in the region. Second, the SOC survey collects data needed to estimate the impacts of several Commuter Connections' TERMS that might influence the population-at-large. Third, the survey examines how other commute alternative programs and marketing efforts might influence commuting behavior in the region. The survey explores commuters' opinions about and interest in current transportation initiatives.

The survey is a triennial survey and was first conducted in 2001. The 2016 survey included respondents that use traditional landline phones, cell phones, and a pilot program which included Internet respondents. The confidence level of the survey was 95% at plus or minus 1.3%. Survey responses will also be made available at the jurisdictional level. A little over 5,000 surveys were conducted by phone and 874 were through the internet. The cell phone interviews totaled 751 to ensure "cell phone only" households in the region were included in results. The jurisdictional results were expanded to the regional population of workers. The results were also weighted to adjust for cell phone/landline availability, race/ethnicity, and age. Mr. Ramfos stated that the survey data was collected by CIC Research, Inc. and the data analysis was conducted by LDA Consulting.

Mr. Ramfos then reviewed the continued survey topics in the 2016 SOC questionnaire which included commute patterns, telecommuting, awareness and access to transit, HOV and Park 'N Ride lots, transportation satisfaction, mass marketing awareness and influence, awareness of Commuter Connections and regional and local commute services, and employer commute assistance provided to respondents at the work site. New sections for the 2016 survey included questions on extra time to account for travel delays, episodic telework, quality of life ratings, and interest in an incentive to shift work hours outside of the peak period.

Mr. Ramfos then stated that the preliminary that would be reviewed in the presentation included commute patterns, telework, travel facilities, commute ease and satisfaction, awareness of Commuter Connections, and Employer Services.

Mr. Ramfos then covered mode splits and stated that between 2004 and 2016, the drive alone percentage fell by 10 percentage points from 71% to 61%. Telework and transit use increased, while other modes remained flat. About 60% of commuters are driving alone to work and 40% rideshare or telework. When looking at the drive alone rates for the inner core compared to the middle and outer suburbs for both home and work, there is a much smaller percentage of commuters that drive alone to work.

The average commute distance from the 2016 survey is 17.3 miles and commuters are traveling an average of 39 minutes to work. This was a bit higher than the 2010 survey. More than a third of respondents traveled fewer than 10 miles and 32% traveled 20 miles or more.

Commuters were asked how many minutes they build into their typical commute time to ensure that they nearly always arrive at work on time. Overall, eight in ten commuters built extra time in their schedule. The average of 12 extra minutes was about 30% of the total thirty-nine-minute average commute.

The next area is on teleworking and 32% of commuters are currently teleworking with equates to about 877,000 teleworkers in the region. This is up from 675,000 in 2013. Those teleworking do so on an average of about 1.5 days per week. Most of the growth in the type of employer teleworking has been with the federal government which is more than likely due to the Telework Enhancements Act of 2010 which required federal agencies to have telework programs. There has been some growth with both the private and non-profit employers, but state and local government employer's percentage remained flat.

Mr. Ramfos reported that the work schedule arrangements in 2016 were very similar to those in 2010 in terms of full time and self-employed workers as well as assigned work days, average travel days, and those using compressed work week schedules. Full time teleworking also remained at 3%.

One in ten teleworkers received telework information from Commuter Connections which was about the same in 2013. Most learned about telework opportunities from their employer (73%). There is still potential for more growth in teleworking as 518,000 commuters could and would telework if they were given the opportunity to do so by their employer.

The 2016 survey explored episodic teleworking. The survey found that half of commuters who were not teleworkers but had telework appropriate jobs said they worked at home all day at least one regular work day last year. This equates to 367,000 commuters who don't regularly telework, which is an additional 13% of commuters. This shows that the region has significant potential for additional teleworking given that about 90% of teleworkers and 80% of non-teleworkers who sometimes worked from home due to disruptions such as snowstorms, or a major or special event such as the Pope's visit, are likely to telework on days when traffic would be disrupted.

The next focus of the presentation was on travel facilities. Commuters were asked about awareness of both bus and train station stops. Two-thirds of commuters said that they lived less than a mile away from a bus stop. 17% of commuters live less than one mile from a train station and 40% live less than three miles from a train station.

In terms of access and use of HOV and Express Lanes, 30% of commuters said they had access to HOV Lanes vs. 15% for Express lanes, and about one-third use HOV lanes, while more than half use the Express Lanes. In terms of use of HOV and Express Lanes and travel time savings, fewer commuters have access to Express Lanes than to HOV, however, they use them at a much higher rate when available. 48% said HOV and Express Lane Availability influenced their commute decisions. Additionally, commuters that used HOV/Express Lanes Saved an average of 20 minutes on their commutes. Higher percentages of middle and outer ring commuters have access to HOV lanes while commuters in outer suburbs use HOV lanes at a much higher rate.

Next, Mr. Ramfos discussed satisfaction among respondents that used alternative modes. Benefits mentioned in the 2016 survey were generally similar to those noted in 2013, but saving energy was mentioned less often in 2016 and that the use was good for the economy

and would help reduce greenhouse gas emissions were mentioned more often. For those commuters that were using alternative modes, saving money was the leading benefit cited followed by the avoidance of stress. Travel time savings was not cited as often for transit users vs. those that used carpools or vanpools.

Having a more difficult or easier commute was defined by the commuter. 22% of respondents reported a more difficult commute than a year ago which was the same as in 2013. Inner core workers and commuters with long commutes were most likely to experience more difficult commutes.

In terms of satisfaction, almost 60% of the respondents were satisfied with their commute, but this was lower than in 2013 and 2010. More than 73% of commuters with an easier commute were satisfied with their commute compared with 31% who said they had a more difficult commute.

In reviewing the results of commute satisfaction by mode, walkers and bicyclists are the most satisfied. While Metrorail and Drive Alone commuters are the least satisfied and both Metrorail and Commuter Train riders had dramatic drops in satisfaction in 2016 vs. 2013. The drop in transit satisfaction was more than likely due to safety related issues on Metrorail and not tied in to SafeTrack given that the survey was conducted well before SafeTrack began.

Commuters were also asked how satisfied they were with the transportation system in the Washington metropolitan region and only 36% stated that they were satisfied which is lower than the 2013 and 2010 surveys. Transportation satisfaction also was lower than commute satisfaction (58%) suggesting commuters had found an acceptable commute, but were not as happy with transportation options overall. Transportation satisfaction declined dramatically for transit riders from 2013 and satisfaction was also lower for those driving alone. Carpoolers/vanpoolers and bicyclists and walkers were about as satisfied with regional transportation in 2016 as in 2013.

Half of commuters that used alternative modes to and from work said they performed work-related tasks during their commute at least some days. 37% said that they performed work tasks most days.

Mr. Ramfos then reviewed results on marketing and advertising and stated that 54% of respondents recalled hearing/seeing commute related advertisements in the past year which was similar to the results from 2013. 67% who were aware of the ads could name a specific message such as use the bus/train, call for carpool information, or that there are new trains/buses coming. Over 60% of regional commuters knew of Commuter Connections which was about the same share as in 2013. Use of Commuter Connections increased from 5% of commuters in 2010 to 7% in 2016.

Finally, the last few slides surrounded employer provided commute benefits. The survey showed that more than half of commuters have access to employer commute services. The availability of these services was lower than in 2010 and 2013 which suggests that employers that cut back on services during the recession had not re-started them. The most widely used employer provided commute benefit was the transit/vanpool subsidy followed by the offering of travel option information.

Some new questions that were asked on the survey focused on the availability of flex-time and 60% of respondents said they were permitted to flex and/or adjust their start and end times at work. About half of those commuters would consider shifting their work hours outside the peak period to receive a \$3 a day incentive. This is something that Commuter

Connections is looking in to further as a possible way to shift some drivers out of the peak period.

Mr. Ramfos then reviewed the next steps of the survey which included a final review of the draft Technical report by the Commuter Connections Subcommittee on September 20th and then finalizing the report during FY2017. Staff would then prepare a general public report that would be printed in early FY2018. Individual statewide and jurisdictional data sets would then be produced early next year

Pierre Holloman asked about the use and access of HOV and Express lanes included respondents that were HOV and non-HOV users. Mr. Ramfos stated that all respondents were asked whether or not they had access to the lanes and of those that had access whether or not the lanes were used. The data between HOV and non-HOV mode users would more than likely be available for the Express Lanes.

Gary Erenrich asked whether or not the data from the 2016 SOC report could be correlated to the data set of Metro origin and destination rail data stating that travel is taking longer. Mr. Ramfos stated that staff could take a look at this. Mr. Erenrich stated if there was a way to first identify all of the datasets. Mr. Srikanth stated that staff was taking a look at data sets through the travel trends analysis which is pulled from various data sources including WMATA's. The most recent presentation made included data from 2009 to 2015.

Sonali Soneji stated that the overall satisfaction with Commuter Rail was the 2nd highest and should be moved up on the slide even though the satisfaction rate has dropped. Mr. Ramfos stated that the results for Commuter Rail satisfaction are region-wide. Ms. Soneji stated that VRE also conducts its own satisfaction surveys and she would check and share the results.

3. Briefing on Mitigation Actions and Experiences from WMATA's Safetrack Surge Activities

Mr. Randall briefed the committee on plans to brief the board at its next meeting on activities and events for WMATA's SafeTrack plan. A slide of the current surge schedule was displayed, but he noted a new schedule was about to be issued for the surges that will take place in upcoming months and in 2017. Surge #9 would begin next week, before the board meeting, however the focus for the board briefing will be on Surge #10, which is a complete shutdown of the Red Line between NoMa and Fort Totten, which will affect over 100,000 trips per day. Accordingly, MCDOT, DDOT, and WMATA will be asked to specifically discuss plans for Surge #10 at the September board meeting, plus WMATA can add any other info they want to disseminate. The TPB briefing in July, with two slides from every jurisdiction or agency involved in SafeTrack, was well-received, but the briefing for September will be more specific.

Ms. Davis was asked if she had additional information. She emphasized that once the new schedule is published it will be widely disseminated. Mr. Roseboom noted that the WMATA website is a great source of information, but Ms. Davis responded that the jurisdictions also have their own webpages, which have good information too.

4. Briefing on Federal Planning Regulations

Mr. Srikanth briefed the committee on the proposed rulemaking on MPO planning area reform. Published on June 27, this rulemaking would affect MPOs by revising metropolitan transportation planning regulations. A map of the TPB planning area and other MPOs, along with the urbanized areas defined by the US Census, was displayed. The proposed rule would require multiple MPOs in a single planning area to jointly prepare the unified planning products, including a single metropolitan transportation plan, a single transportation

improvement program (TIP) and a single air quality conformity analysis. It would also require a jointly established set of performance targets. Comments on the proposed rule were due on August 26, and the board was briefed at its July meeting on the rule and that comments would be drafted. The TPB chair and vice chairs reviewed the comments letter and approved it. This letter as well as the July memo to the board are available.

Mr. Srikanth noted that AMPO, AASHTO, and other organizations were very involved in coordinating comments on this rule. Over 500 comments were submitted to the docket, some short and others quite extensive. AMPO, along with NADO and NARC, posted a 34-page comment document. He said some of the comments questioned the legal basis for this proposed rule, as well as its impracticality. He also noted comments by members of Congress, including the leadership of the House Transportation Committee, which stated the proposed rule went beyond the intent of legislators.

Mr. Srikanth recapped the gist of the TPB's comments. He said the TPB is in agreement with the proposed rule's intention to strengthen the role of the MPO in transportation planning. However, the TPB is already very active in coordinating and conducting metropolitan planning activities, and this rule would be challenging to implement and the changes could adversely affect coordination. He highlighted the three chief concerns and/or reasons why the this NPRM should be withdrawn that were in the letter.

First, he said, replacing the existing consultative process of defining Metropolitan Planning Area (MPA) boundaries with a "one-size-fits-all" approach would ignore local needs and processes. Encompassing the contiguous urban area, looking twenty years into the future, could lead to planning area having to extend south to Fredericksburg and north all the way through Wilmington and into Philadelphia. A single MPO would be hugely impractical. Local mobility needs might well be overlooked in such a large.

Secondly, Mr. Srikanth said that conducting metropolitan planning over more expansive areas would lead to less efficient and less effective planning and decision-making, with many more local jurisdictions having to be involved. Planning based on urban area boundaries would be separated from local jurisdiction boundaries, even though they are the primary transportation decision-making bodies, which would make things more complicated. It is important that local jurisdictions have the ability to set their own, especially when no agreed-upon process for forecasting urban areas twenty years into the future. Each jurisdiction has its own decision-making process, and reaching joint agreements or a single air quality conformity analysis across a vast area would be very challenging from a practical, implementation standpoint. Multiple states and jurisdictions are also on their own cycles, and completing a single TIP that satisfied every state and jurisdiction in a vast area would be complicated. Public input would also be very difficult to gain in a meaningful way.

Thirdly, Mr. Srikanth said that coordination between adjacent or affected MPOs is already occurring. Existing planning rules and practices do not preclude further efforts to strengthen such coordination. If U.S. DOT wants this, they can work with individual MPOs through the current rules to do this. The TPB does this with FAMPO already, including on cooperative forecasts and on specific projects like the I-95 Express Lanes.

Accordingly, Mr. Srikanth said the TPB's letter asked the proposed rulemaking be withdrawn and that U.S. DOT work with MPOs on a better rule. He noted that the MDOT and joint VDOT and DRPT comments were also distributed. The board will be briefed at their September meeting on this proposed rulemaking, which could have huge impact.

Mr. Whitaker asked about conversations with other MPOs. Mr. Srikanth said he spoke with AMPO and with FAMPO and BRTB several times. He noted that there was discussion that the rule would be final by the end of the year. Based on the number of comments though, it may take more time. Hopefully U.S. DOT will go back to the drawing board and revisit this rule.

Mr. Eric Randall then gave a presentation on the performance planning and programming rulemaking, speaking to a presentation. He gave the latest schedule for publication of the proposed and/or final rulemakings for the five categories of performance rules. The final Statewide and Metropolitan Planning rule was published in May and the System Performance draft rule was published in April. TPB comments on the latter were submitted

in August, as briefed to the committee in July. One will be administrative, on rules for measures for metropolitan areas versus those for urbanized areas. Three are more technical, on how to calculate average traffic speeds, the freight congestion speed threshold, and excessive delay speed threshold. Mr. Randall noted that over 7,500 comments were submitted on this rulemaking, so it unlikely the final rule will come out in January 2017.

Mr. Randall then focused on the new final rulemaking on transit asset management (TAM). He offered a definition and the basic requirements of TAM, spoke to the timeline for the rule, and then its applicability to regional providers. There are four performance measures, for which transit providers will have to set targets annually for the forthcoming fiscal year, reported via the National Transit Database asset inventory module. The first set of targets must be set by the accountable executive by the end of this year for fiscal year 2018. MPOs then have to adopt targets in turn for the metropolitan region, which in the TPB's case will likely be by May 2017.

Mr. Randall emphasized that the final rule applies to pretty much every transit provider in this region, as almost everyone gets federal transit funds directly or through an agency like MTA or DRPT. He said this also includes MWCOG's 50310 subrecipients, which includes the taxi companies that have received federal funds to get wheelchair-equipped cabs. He showed the listing of providers for each of the two tiers of reporting, noting that smaller providers can be grouped or reported on by the state or an organization like NVTC. He noted how Alexandria DASH doesn't use any federal funds, but as the city is taking federal funds to build the Potomac Yard station and also funds DASH, DASH will also have to report under this rule. In response to a question, he responded that MARC and MTA Commuter Bus would be reported on a state level, as mostly outside this region and as funded by the state.

Mr. Randall reviewed how the transit targets are coordinated with MPO planning, including target setting and eventually the TIP and CLRP. This process will need to be documented formally between the MPO and each transit provider. So the next step will be a letter going out from the TPB to request agencies to designate formal points of contact to work on developing and documenting agreed upon responsibilities for the PBPP process for TAM.

Ms. Davis asked how long the targets will be put in effect. Mr. Randall responded that these targets will be set every year for the upcoming fiscal year, along with a narrative report on progress towards targets.

5. Update on Long-Range Plan Task Force

Ms. Erickson and Mr. Swanson presented the inputs and analysis for the All Build scenario to inform the next quadrennial update of the long range plan. Ms. Erickson presented the overview of new projects included in the All Build scenario which consists of all unfunded projects jurisdictions submitted. The inputs were placed in the context of the Regional

Transportation Priority Plan's (RTPP) strategies. Mr. Swanson presented the analysis of the All Build scenario in comparison to the Planned Build (2015 CLRP) and existing conditions (on the ground in 2015). He said that highlights include the following findings: The All Build scenario would result in higher accessibility to jobs, more transit trips, and more connectivity between Activity Centers in comparison to the Planned Build. The next steps are for this analysis to be presented to the Long Range Plan Task Force before the next TPB meeting, and to determine in the near future how a limited list of projects will be selected for inclusion into the new long range plan.

Ms. Snyder recommended that if emissions analysis were to be added, it would fit well in slide 51.

Mr. Whitaker expressed support for using the RTPP because it provides a policy framework for the long range plan as opposed to being driven just by projects. Mr. Srikanth echoed that the RTPP will be used going forward to evaluate projects in the context of the region's policy goals.

Mr. Erenrich noted that the costs presented in the presentation only cover capital costs and that maintenance and operations would require many times more funding. He also discussed how the land use assumptions built into the cooperative forecast have a big impact on the analysis presented today, and the performance analysis could be swayed by even more investment in growth around transit stations. Mr. Erenrich asked if new development that is approved but not yet built was being double counted. Mr. Srikanth answered that the cooperative forecasts do account for zoned growth that hasn't yet been built, and that this analysis provides an opportunity to look at jurisdictions' planned growth and desired transportation projects to see if this is the best approach for this region in terms of land use and transportation.

Mr. Brown asked if it would be possible to meet with staff between now and the Long Range Plan Task Force so that he can gain a more in-depth understanding in order to help brief his board member. Mr. Srikanth said anyone on the Technical Committee is welcome to make an appointment with staff. He added that we want to hear back from Technical Committee members by close of business September 13 with recommendations for changes or clarifications before the Long Range Plan Task Force meeting.

Ms. Davis stated that at previous Long Range Plan Task Force meetings, members of the task force said they wanted to be sent the presentations in advance in order to spend time digesting them, which would help reduce the amount of time staff would spend presenting materials and would open up more time for discussion. Mr. Srikanth responded that the presentation during the task force meeting will be brief.

Mr. Whitaker recommended that staff should present a brief idea of how to make the leap from this analysis to identifying a handful of significant projects, and that staff should stress that the purpose of this analysis was to help lead into project selection.

Mr. Orleans asked what jurisdiction submitted the Purple Line extension project and if each mile had been justified and if there had been an environmental justice analysis of each mile added in the All Build scenario. Mr. Swanson said Prince George's County submitted the Purple Line extension project, that all the projects in the All Build scenario come from the plans of member jurisdictions, and that an environmental justice analysis will be done regionwide but individual project impacts will not be studied for this exercise. Mr. Erenrich added that the master plans identify long-term needs and Mr. Srikanth added that this framework is too high level for individual project-level environmental impacts.

6. Briefing on the FY 2017-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the TIP Forum

Mr. Austin distributed copies of preliminary draft TIP tables for the District, Maryland, Virginia, and WMATA. He noted that the tables were populated with the baseline information carried forward from the FY 2015-2020 TIP as amended through August, and that the only inputs received beyond that baseline were from MDOT. Mr. Austin also distributed a report of each agency's records in the TIP database along with their status on being included in the TIP. He

stated that future drafts would include projects sorted or indexed on performance-based planning areas, funding, and possibly other measures. Mr. Austin said the TIP projects should be available in a GIS-based map on the CLRP website at some point prior to approval.

Mr. Austin gave a brief description of the agenda of the upcoming Public Forum on the TIP and described how it had been publicized.

Mr. Austin requested that any adjustments to the TIP projects or funding be submitted by the end of September in order to be included in the draft released for public comment on October 13, 2016.

7. Briefing on Environmental Justice Analysis Requirements of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO'S)

Ms. Klancher, provided an overview on federal requirements for MPOs related to Title VI and Environmental Justice (EJ) analysis, past approaches to the analysis of the Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP), and the revised approach including the identification of "Communities of Concern."

Mr. Holloman asked if there were any additional data sources that could better identify low-income and minority populations, given the constant change in community demographics. Ms. Klancher noted the review of additional data sources and the need for a consistent and comprehensive data source for demographic characteristics across the TPB planning area.

Mr. Davenport asked if the proposed "Communities of Concern" could be shared. Ms. Klancher said yes, the draft information could be shared.

8. Update on the TPB's Draft 2016 Congestion Management Process (CMP)

As a follow up to the July 8 presentation to the committee on the draft 2016 CMP Technical Report, Mr. Pu provided an update on the five comments received and a new approach for ranking the region's top bottlenecks. Speaking to a presentation, Mr. Pu first provided responses to each of the five comments received. Three of the comments suggested more analysis for transit congestion and park & ride facilities. The CMP has identified a Transit-Significant Road Network (TSRN) with the Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee. He said the overall performance of the network is tracked by both the CMP Technical Report and the quarterly-updated Congestion Dashboard. He said that in the future, the CMP could further investigate the bottlenecks on the TSRN and other metrics suggested by the comments once data become available from transit agencies and Park & Ride facility owners. One comment suggested that person throughput should be included in the congestion analysis. In the new bottleneck method, Annual Average Daily Traffic volumes (AADT) are included in the ranking. The MAP-21 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) regarding traffic congestion also would require that vehicle-hours of delay per capita be calculated. So in the 2018 update of the CMP Technical Report, person throughput, or some

form of it, will likely be included as a congestion measurement. The last comment was on the top 10 bottlenecks identified in the draft report, which used the Vehicle Probe Project (VPP) Suite bottleneck ranking method. This list was somewhat inconsistent with the top 10 bottlenecks identified in the 2014 Aerial Photography Survey of the freeway systems.

Mr. Pu then focused on explaining and presenting the new method and the new top bottlenecks lists and maps. The new method takes Travel Time Index, bottleneck length, and

AADT into account and produced lists of top bottlenecks for both “all time” -24/7/365 in the year of 2015 and “peak periods” – non-holiday weekday 6:00-9:00 am and 4:00-7:00 pm. This region’s top bottleneck for both “all time” and “peak periods” was I-495 Inner Loop from VA-267 to the American Legion Bridge.

Mr. Russel Provost noticed that the free flow speed provided by INRIX could slightly vary over time and asked if TPB staff has any insights regarding this observation. Mr. Pu replied that so far no free flow speed analysis has been carried out at TPB but this might be something worth investigating in the future.

After this meeting, the 2016 CMP Technical Report is considered final and will be posted online in the near future.

9. Announcement Regarding the TPB Traffic Incident Response Conference

Mr. Meese, provided a brief announcement on the planned TPB-sponsored conference in the October/November time frame (currently proposed for October 25, subject to change) to discuss opportunities for improving traffic incident response. Proposed as a policy-level event, its goal is to identify barriers and opportunities in this region for improving traffic incident response, including a look at best practices by other MPOs throughout the country. Mr. Meese noted he hoped to have a date set and a draft agenda by the next TPB meeting and clarified this is not solely focused on transit operations and issues but all traffic incident response policy and strategy.

10. Briefing on DDOT’s Multimodal Congestion Study

Ms. Dock, DDOT, briefed the Committee on a study of multi-modal congestion in the District, speaking to a presentation. The study was mandated last year by the DC Council with a due date of the end of September. The study has been conducted to:

- Assess the current state of congestion in the District, including by defining the state of “multimodal congestion” and the appropriate metrics and data to measure that;
- Collect data that demonstrates average commute times for District residents;
- Identify, evaluate, recommend and prioritize management strategies for remedying existing congestion problems;
- Develop a web -based interface to communicate conditions and enable future updates; and
- Develop one-year, 3-year, and 5-year plans for implementing the recommendations.

She cautioned that this was not a planning study, but rather a performance assessment effort to identify congestion mitigation strategies. Data on DC residents and workers and their travel patterns was shown. She referred to the moveDC plan and mentioned key areas of interest were how to improve the condition and use of current assets and human capital. Study staff looked at ways to improve the understanding of congestion. Multiple performance metrics for auto, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian were developed and data mapped against

those. Visualization for these measures was then put into a website tool to portray the congestion. The bicycle level of stress was one particularly innovative performance measure calculated and displayed. She showed the design structure of the visualization tool and several website screenshots. Future data measures were also suggested.

Ms. Dock then spoke to use of the study and the visualization tool, by decision-makers, staff, and the public. Ideally it will lead to better understanding of what's happening now with transportation and congestion, what data and measures to use, improve the discussion of future investments and activities against current congestion hot spots for prioritization, and continue data collection in the future for further development and refinement of the tool. In addition, DDOT hopes to use the tool and data to inform projects and DDOT hopes that others will use similar measures and data. Again, the tool will be delivered to the council by September 30, with the website going live in a few days.

Staff from Montgomery County mentioned that they are also using similar metrics and GIS analysis, specifically to look at congestion around schools. They asked if the work was done in-house by DDOT staff. Ms. Dock responded that Kittelson was the prime consultant, along with the CAT Lab and Foursquare Integrated Transportation Planning.

11. Briefing on the Implementation of the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program

Mr. Randall briefed the committee on the progress of the TPB's TIGER Grant. He noted that only two weeks remain in the grant period, with \$2.4 million in invoices pending to use up all the remaining funds. The two big projects still being wrapped up are the Takoma Langley Transit Center, and the WMATA work at the Franconia Springfield station. An update memo will be provided to the board this month, and then they will be briefed on the grant close-out at a subsequent meeting.

Mr. Srikanth repeated that all the TIGER funds will be used up, the 100% federal money for the grant, but that any invoice questions needed to be addressed as soon as possible.

12. Update on the Multi Sector Working Group (MSWG) on Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions

Mr. Sivasailam provided an update on the status of Multi-Sector Working Group activities. He said that staff has completed the analysis of the survey results and has prepared a memo including a summary of the results of the survey. He expects the MSWG Policy Task Force to meet and prepare a recommendation for the COG Board to adopt a set of strategies which would then be taken up by the individual policy boards such as the TPB and CEEPC for development of an action plan. Mr. James Davenport asked if dates have been decided and when the action plan will be adopted. Mr. Sivasailam responded that no date for the meeting has been set and no strategies have been recommended for the action plan at this time.

13. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – September 9, 2016**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County Jason Groth
Ben Yeckley
Frederick County -----
City of Frederick -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County Gary Erenrich
Prince George’s County Anthony Foster
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery County -----
Prince George’s County -----
MDOT Kari Snyder
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
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
Patricia Happ
Prince William County James Davenport
PRTC Betsy Massie
VRE Sonali Soneji
VDOT Norman Whitaker
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA Allison Davis

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

FHWA-DC -----
FHWA-VA -----
FTA -----
NCPC -----
NPS -----
MWAQC -----
MWAA -----

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP
Lyn Erickson, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Nick Ramfos, DTP
Bill Bacon, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Ken Joh, DTP
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Jessica Mirr, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Erin Morrow, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Wenjing Pu, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Sergio Ritacco, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Jon Schermann, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Lori Zeller, DTP
Abigail Zenner, DTP
Greg Goodwin, DCPS
John Kent, DCPS

OTHER

Alex Brun, MDE
Stephanie Dock, DDOT
Bill Orleans
Nancy Smith