

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

*for meeting of*

February 3, 2012

# TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

February 3, 2012

## Technical Committee Minutes

---

### 1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from January 6 TPB Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### 2. **Update on Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP**

Mr. Austin briefly reviewed the six projects included in the Significant Additions and Changes to the 2012 CLRP memo. He noted that the list had been updated since last month's meeting to include the Date Changes on Segments of the I-495 HOT Lanes and Auxiliary Lanes. These projects along with the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP Air Quality Conformity Inputs table were released for public comment on January 12, 2012. That comment period would end on February 11. Mr. Austin noted that one comment had been received to date, pertaining to the Manassas National Battlefield Park Bypass.

Mr. Austin asked members to review the Significant Additions and Changes and the Conformity Inputs tables. He said any technical corrections could still be accepted through February 11. He also noted that Ms. Posey would be updating the Inputs table to include projects from the Baltimore Metropolitan Council. The TPB would be asked to approve the inputs at their meeting on February 15.

Mr. Srikanth noted two technical corrections. He said that the I-495 HOT Lanes project and the I-495 Auxiliary Lanes project were distinct projects and that the description should be edited to make that clearer. He also noted that the funding sources shown for the Manassas National Battlefield Park Bypass did not reflect the latest information submitted on the CLRP description form.

### 3. **Update on Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP**

Ms. Posey noted that the draft scope of work was included in the mailout. She mentioned that there had been no changes to the scope since the prior meeting, but reminded the group about the conformity schedule. She noted that the scope was currently out for comment along with the conformity inputs. There were no questions from the Committee.

### 4. **Briefing on Mobile Emissions Inventories for Fine Particle Pollution (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) for the 2012 Redesignated Request and Maintenance Plan**

Ms. Rohlfs provided an introduction to the fine particle pollution issue, followed by an overview of the regulatory framework of the 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan, inclusive of a history of past activities and a tentative schedule of

upcoming actions. She also explained the connections between achieving maintenance status and having approved mobile emissions budgets by EPA and air quality conformity. Ms. Constantine continued the presentation by going over the findings of the technical analyses, which developed precursor NO<sub>x</sub> and primary PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions inventories for milestone years 2002, 2007, 2017 and 2025 as part of the upcoming 2012 PM<sub>2.5</sub> Maintenance Plan.

For informational purposes, year 2040 emissions inventories were also developed. The key findings were as follows: on-road precursor NO<sub>x</sub> emissions inventories have been declining since 2002, with 2025 levels projected to be just 22 percent of what they were in 2002; on-road PM<sub>2.5</sub> emissions inventories have also been declining since 2002, with 2025 levels projected to be just 33 percent of what they were in 2002; on-road precursor NO<sub>x</sub> emissions inventories in suburban Maryland are projected to decline between 2025 and 2040, while in northern Virginia are projected to slightly increase for the same period.

Mr. Kirby pointed out that 2040 is an out year for the long range plan and needs to be tested for conformity.

Mr. Mokhtari sought clarification on why the 2025 emissions inventories estimates for Northern Virginia were shown in a pink background while the corresponding figure for suburban Maryland was shown in a blue background. Ms. Constantine explained that the different colors indicated increasing and decreasing trends respectively between 2025 and 2040.

Mr. Erenrich asked whether the VA and MD columns were flipped on slides 6 and 7, since Virginia has more VMT than Maryland. Ms. Constantine responded by saying that the estimated emission inventories are not the product of VMT alone, but a whole range of other factors. Mr. Kirby added that geographically, Maryland is bigger.

As a follow up to the discussion on the roles of tire wear and brake wear in emissions inventories, Mr. Erenrich asked whether there are standards for brakes and tires. Ms. Constantine answered that there are not and Mr. Kirby elaborated by saying that emissions inventories attributed to brake wear and tire wear increase in all jurisdictions as vehicle use increases throughout the region. He also mentioned that substantial emissions reductions from running exhaust have offset increases from other processes.

Ms. Rohlf's noted that the safety margins shown in the presentation are concepts and proposals. Ms. Constantine replied that technically they should not be construed as proposals but as examples for further discussion in order to put into context the numbers shown.

Mr. Rodgers sought a clarification on why higher precursor NO<sub>x</sub> emissions reductions were calculated for suburban Maryland. Ms. Constantine replied that the derived precursor NO<sub>x</sub> reductions for suburban Maryland were attributed to the California Clean Car Program, which was instituted in Maryland but not in Virginia.

Mr. Kirby said that the issue of setting budgets will be brought to TPB later in the month (on February 15). He acknowledged that with a changing and aging vehicle fleet over time, new versions of the mobile emissions model MOVES on the way, and not substantial new vehicle technologies to offset regional VMT growth, emissions inventories will most likely increase in the future. Under these conditions, it would be challenging to meet air quality conformity for the out years of the CLRP if emissions budgets are set at year 2025 inventories levels. He expressed hope that everyone in attendance understood the significance of this issue.

Mr. Erenrich asked whether transportation control measures (TCMs) would need to be discussed. Mr. Kirby replied that this issue would not be discussed at present time. Ms. Rohlf added that there will be also a lot of emission reductions from power plants.

Mr. Srikanth summarized the highlights of the discussion by emphasizing the importance of setting emissions budgets carefully since they will be governing air quality conformity for the next 10 years. In this context, he said that VDOT will request air agencies to consider inclusion of safety margins in the Maintenance Plan because of the uncertainties associated with non transportation related matters which cannot be ignored. He said that the inability to meet air quality conformity in the region is an issue of concern to him. Ms. Constantine added that there are not effective technologies that we can rely upon to counterbalance future emissions increases from brake wear and tire wear processes and as such careful budget setting is a necessity.

Ms. Erickson said that MDOT will work internally with MDE to communicate and discuss the issues of concern identified during this meeting. Mr. Erenrich then asked who will be making the decisions on budgets. Mr. Kirby answered that MWAQC is the designated body.

Mr. Srikanth informed the group that if MWAQC is unable to reach consensus among its members, then another body called the IAQC representing the MD and VA governors and the DC mayor, would make the final decision. In light of the importance of the emissions budgets, Mr. Kirby proposed a work session for interested TPB members in February, during which they will be briefed on the issues.

## **5. Briefing on a Draft Regional Complete Streets Policy Template**

Mr. Farrell spoke to a handout on the Complete Streets Policy Template and said that a workshop on Complete Streets is proposed to take place before the March TPB meeting. The draft template has been broadly distributed, and numerous comments have been received.

Mr. Rogers asked whether the Complete Streets policy template dealt with land use. Mr. Farrell replied that the policy template itself dealt with transportation. The reasons for a Complete Streets policy, including supporting walkable, mixed-use activity centers, are incorporated in the draft resolution.

Ms. Erikson added that a broad variety of people use different modes to work and shop, and should be accommodated. The DOT's have provided extensive comments, and at this point are largely in agreement with the draft.

Mr. Mokhtari asked how the purposed survey of TPB members on their Complete Streets policies would be used. Mr. Farrell explained that the survey had not yet been developed, but it would ask about adoption of and changes to local Complete Streets policies. Ms. Erikson said that the survey would probably not be annual.

Mr. Mokhtari asked how this would affect the regional performance measures. Mr. Kirby replied that it would not have much effect, but that citizens could take this policy template to the local level and use it to advocated for local Complete Streets policies.

Mr. Burns asked if the policy template acknowledged the importance of freight movement. Mr. Srikanth suggested that the Freight Subcommittee should be given an opportunity to comment on the draft template.

Chairman Rawlings suggested that the Complete Streets policy template will help those jurisdictions without one to develop one, and will help those with one to revise it.

Mr. Malouff asked how implementation would be measured. Ms. Erikson replied that we want to track both policy and implementation.

## **6. Update on Reauthorization of Federal Surface Transportation Legislation**

Mr. Kirby reviewed the recent occurrences in Congressional bills covering surface transportation reauthorization. While the Senate Environment and Public Works subcommittee's plan was released last year, the House Transportation and Infrastructure subcommittee only released its draft bill on January 31. The proposal moved out of the subcommittee in the early hours of February 3, and has a number of proposals that are contentious, including the elimination of funding for pedestrian and bicycle projects. The House bill continues to provide transportation funding at near current levels; the biggest hurdle, however, remains the source of the revenue to maintain this funding.

Mr. Randall then spoke to the January 31 notice of funding availability for the FY 2012 Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Discretionary Grant Program. In contrast to previous rounds, this grant opportunity has a very short turnaround time, with the pre-application due February 20 and the application due March 19; six weeks instead of the previous cycles' four months. There are also some changes in the required application information.

Mr. Randall then reported on the debriefing of the TPB's FY 2011 TIGER Grant application. USDOT reviewers were very complimentary of the TPB's application. USDOT said the application concept focusing on multimodal connections that foster development and walkability and leverage the rail investment provided for an excellent application. To make the application more competitive, USDOT staff emphasized showing firstly, project readiness and secondly, local commitment. Related to project readiness, USDOT recommended providing more information showing that the projects are ready to go, the schedules are fixed, and all environmental requirements have been met. Congress did not push back the obligation deadline, which makes quick construction very important. In terms of local commitment, obviously financial match is important, with TIGER FY 2011 applications providing a 65 percent local match to 35

percent Federal funds on average. However, local commitment can also be demonstrated through government actions such as recent zoning changes in support of Transit Oriented Development, new development plans in cooperation with private developers, etc. USDOT also wants to see private entities involved when there are private benefits received, as this demonstrates the proposed project is a worthwhile investment.

Mr. Randall stated that TPB staff proposes to re-submit the previous application, *Multimodal Access Improvements for Rail Station Areas in the Washington Region*, for the FY 2012 TIGER Grant opportunity. This presumes local partners are still interested in the previously proposed component projects, and that ideally the application can be improved upon to make it more competitive. A meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 7, to discuss the grant opportunity. The TPB application, project components and funding levels will have to be approved at the February 15 TPB meeting.

Ms. Erickson said that MDOT would likely resubmit several projects for the FY 2012 TIGER Program that it had submitted for the FY 2011 TIGER Program.

Mr. Erenrich asked if USDOT provided feedback on the total cost of the TPB's application.

Mr. Kirby said USDOT did not say the TPB's application package request was too high, however he noted that no FY 2011 TIGER project received more than \$20 million in federal funding. He reiterated that the TPB was encouraged to resubmit the application and that USDOT staff also noted that they appreciated the opportunity to pick and choose between project components, providing funding flexibility that they appreciate.

Mr. Erenrich said that there was some discussion at the WMATA Board meeting on working with the TPB to submit a TIGER application for bus stop spot improvements.

Mr. Kirby said this would be most appropriately funded under the FTA Bus Livability Grant Program and that one bit of feedback from USDOT emphasized that projects eligible for funding under other programs not apply for TIGER funds. He added that there is no time prior to the pre-application deadline to develop new project components for the TPB application.

## **7. Review of Draft FY 2013 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)**

The Fiscal Year 2013 draft Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP) was in the agenda packet for today's meeting. A presentation was then given by Mr. Ramfos which covered background information on Commuter Connections, the benefits of Commuter Connections, statistical information on new ridematching applications received by Commuter Connections an overview of what is new with the program and budget, and next steps for the CCWP.

First, Mr. Ramfos explained that Commuter Connections is a network of public and private transportation organizations, including COG, state funding agencies, and local organizations, that work together to help reduce congestion and improve air quality in the region. Commuter Connections benefits local jurisdictions by helping to manage and reduce congestion which will then allow commuter, tourist, and goods mobility as well as

promote sustainability. The program also helps reduce emissions and helps support local economic development efforts that lead to recruiting and retaining employers.

Commuter Connections also provides commuting options that help reduce stress, costs, and the time it takes for the region's workforce to get to and from work and helps to support quality of life for the region's commuters.

Mr. Ramfos then discussed the Commuter Connections service area and stated that it is much larger than the MSA for workers eligible for the guaranteed ride home (GRH) program, and larger still for workers who can access the Commuter Connections ride-matching services. He also showed a chart with American Community Survey Census rankings for carpools and transit use for MSA areas. The Washington DC region ranks 3rd in the nation in total percentage of carpoolers and transit users, placing us behind the New York Metropolitan region.

Next, the total daily impacts of the Commuter Connections program for VT, VMT, NOx, and VOC were given. Mr. Ramfos stated that these numbers were recently calculated based on the results from the Commuter Connections TERM Analysis Report which was recently completed and released. He then explained that Federal planning regulations require the TPB to approve a congestion management process which includes Transportation Demand Management as part of the metropolitan transportation plan. Commuter Connections is the major demand management component of the region's congestion management process (CMP). Commuter Connections also provides transportation emission reduction measure benefits for inclusion in the air quality conformity determination approved by the TPB. This is part of the annual update of the region's CLRP and TIP. Impacts from the program may be needed to address future regional or national transportation green house gas emission targets.

Commuter Connections has been shown to be a highly cost-effective way to reduce vehicle trips (VT), vehicle miles of travel (VMT), and vehicle emissions associated with commuting in the Washington metropolitan region. The overall cost-effectiveness for the Commuter Connections program which is based on the results of the Commuter Connections TERM Analysis for VT, VMT, NOx, and VOC was reviewed.

A month to month comparison chart for new ridematching applications Commuter Connections received between 2010 and 2011 was shown. Mr. Ramfos reported that there was a 20% increase in the number of new ridesharing applications in 2011. A trend line chart was then shown with 2011 monthly gasoline prices compared to new rideshare applications received and another on the Consumer Price Index and new rideshare applications received. In both charts, the trend lines show an increase in the number of rideshare applications received as the price of gasoline increased and the CPI climbed during 2011. New rideshare applications decreased with price decreases in both charts as well.

Mr. Ramfos then showed the comparison of the FY 2012 CCWP budget to the proposed FY 2013 CCWP budget and stated that there are some slight variations for some of the program areas. Mr. Ramfos stated that there is a twelve percent increase in the budget from FY 2012. The budget breakdown includes about 29% of the costs going to COG/TPB Staff & Overhead, 53% of the cost for private sector services, 8% of the costs

are passed through to local jurisdiction TDM programs, and 10% of the costs for direct costs.

Next, The FY 2013 CCWP also has some new features and projects, including the expansion of the 'Pool Rewards' incentive program to include vanpooling, data collection for the 2013 State of the Commute survey and production of a technical report, data collection for the 2013 GRH applicant surveys for both the Washington and Baltimore regions and production of draft reports, and the review and update of the TDM Evaluation Framework Methodology document which is the blueprint document of how data is collected and evaluated for the CCWP TERMS. Mr. Ramfos also pointed out some clarifications that were made on Pages 3 and 22 of the draft FY 2013 CCWP including added language to clarify the relationship between the Commuter Connections State TDM Work Group and the TPB Technical Committee, Commuter Connections Subcommittee roles and responsibilities, and the contents of campaign summary documents under the TDM Marketing project.

Lastly, Mr. Ramfos discussed the next review and approval steps for the document.

Mr. Foster asked whether the new ridesharing applications were broken out by jurisdiction. Mr. Ramfos stated that for purposes of the presentation, they were not but that data is available.

Mr. Mokhtari asked whether or not there was a similar breakdown for Guaranteed Ride Home. Mr. Ramfos stated that there was but it was not included in the presentation.

Mr. Verzosa asked whether or not the Guaranteed Ride Home trips can be broken down by jurisdiction and what the costs are for the rides. Mr. Ramfos stated that trip results are presented in a regional manner and not by jurisdiction. Guaranteed Ride Home costs have been on the increase because of energy cost and cab fare increases. In FY 2011, the rides budget went over by about \$40,000 and more trips than ever had been given. Mr. Ramfos explained that new marketing strategies have been employed this fiscal year to focus on registration to the program versus using the program since it's more of an insurance policy.

Mr. Erenrich asked how Commuter Connections could work with developers and/or employers to get more travel information out to the public through flat panel screens in buildings or other technologies that would stream the information in real time. Mr. Ramfos stated that this is one area of interest that is being reviewed by TPB staff given the information that will be available from MATOC. Commuters may have the option to set up an opt-in to receive the latest incident information or other helpful construction information that could help them make travel decisions.

Mr. Meese stated that the technology is evolving and that at some point customers will be able to create accounts and private sector sites can obtain this type of information.

## **8. Review of Draft FY 2013 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Miller distributed a draft of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY 2013 (July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013). He said the final draft of the FY 2013 UPWP will

be presented to the Committee for review at its March 2 meeting and to the TPB for approval at its March 21 meeting. He reviewed the overall budget estimates and said that at this point there is considerable uncertainty due to the lack of Congressional action regarding the USDOT FY 2012 budget and the re-authorization of SAFETEA-LU. He explained that we have assumed that the FY 2013 funding allocations to be provided by DOTs will be the same as the current FY 2012 levels. In addition, the budget estimate assumes \$950,000 of unobligated funds from FY 2011 will be available, which is the same as the unspent funds from FY 2010.

Ms. Crawford distributed a memorandum on a proposed enhancement to the Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) technical assistance program for FY 2013. She said the proposal is to dedicate up to \$80,000 of the \$220,000 in TLC technical assistance for one pilot project that would address conceptual design/preliminary engineering for a completed TLC or jurisdiction planning study. She said the concept came out of the development of the FY 2011 TIGER application on capital improvements to rail station areas throughout the region. She said many of the TLC planning studies that were used as examples for potential TIGER project components were not at a level of design necessary to be included in the TPB's application, demonstrating a void along the planning, design, and construction continuum. She said it would also be possible to use the funding to complement local funding for design. She said the goal of the conversation with the Committee is to determine if this is a useful addition to the TLC Program, if the funding is sufficient, and if staff should move forward and incorporate this concept in the FY 2013 TLC technical assistance project solicitation.

Mr. Foster said he did not think \$80,000 is enough for this type of project.

Mr. Kirby said the concept could be included in the solicitation, and that if the TPB does not receive any viable applications, the funding would be used to fund planning studies.

Ms. Crawford added that the funding could be used to leverage local funding to create a more robust project.

Mr. Foster asked if the projects would have to be completed in the same timeframe.

Ms. Crawford said it is hoped that the projects could be completed in the same nine month window as the planning studies, but that it is possible to carry over the funding if necessary.

Mr. Rodgers said DCOP has not found the planning grants to be particularly useful, as they have sufficient planning money, but that it would be really helpful to get some funding to complete some portion of the design work.

Ms. Erickson asked for the local perspective on how the funding might work for smaller projects.

Mr. Mokhtari said he thinks the concept is strong enough that it should be attempted for the FY 2013 round of funding, and that if it is not well-subscribed or if the TPB does not receive compelling projects, it would not be continued.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that this type of funding could be used to carry forward some of the recommendations from the Bus Hot Spots Study and could tie into some of the work

completed through TLC to demonstrate a greater connection between transportation and land use for this study.

Mr. Malouff said Arlington often has trouble identifying design funding for bicycle trail projects and that there are a number of projects he knows of that would benefit from 30% design work. He noted that the project Arlington submitted for inclusion in the TPB's TIGER grant was at 30% design and that the structure of the TIGER program allowed the County to apply for the remaining design work to be completed along with construction.

Mr. Kirby reiterated that it is certainly possible to test the concept during the project solicitation process and that the \$80,000 could always be used for the planning projects.

Ms. Erickson mentioned that MDOT will likely contribute \$130,000 to Maryland TLC technical assistance and said she is not sure if MDOT will use any of its funding for the new conceptual design concept. She said she is concerned that the PL monies available to the TPB could not be used for PE, but said that taking a project through 30% design should be within reason. She also asked how the projects would be selected and what criteria would be used.

Ms. Crawford said that the TLC selection panel has two engineers among the industry experts and would be qualified to select the projects. She said the criteria would be developed based on the existing project selection criteria, but expanded to include points related to conceptual design work.

Mr. Srikanth suggested forming a separate selection panel for the design project and suggested using representatives from the DOTs.

Mr. Rodgers noted that this funding could be useful for smaller projects, particularly those spearheaded by the ANCs or other community groups.

Ms. Erickson reiterated that only completed planning studies would be eligible for this funding.

Mr. Rawlings said it sounded like the concept is a good idea, that it should be included in the FY 2013 TLC project solicitation, with the understanding that the funding may not be used for the design pilot project if a compelling application is not submitted, and that staff should move forward implementing the concept.

Mr. Miller reported that a draft of the full document will be presented to the TPB at its February 15 meeting, and noted that the technical assistance programs for the DOTs and WMATA remain to be specified. He explained that some portions of the current work activities will be identified in March for carryover into FY 2013. The TPB will be asked to adopt the program on March 21 and then it will be submitted to FHWA and FTA for approval by July 1.

## **9. Update on COG Incident Management and Response (IMR) Action Plan Transportation Recommendations**

Mr. Meese briefed the Committee. The background of this item was that COG had formed the IMR Steering Committee in the wake of the disruptive January 26, 2011

snow and ice storm. The IMR Steering Committee oversaw development of a findings and recommendations report, accepted by COG Board on November 9, 2011. A successor IMR Steering Committee was slated to hold quarterly follow-up meetings, starting February 22, 2012. The briefing was to make the TPB aware at its February 15 meeting of the transportation-related information to be shared with the IMR Committee at its February 22 meeting.

Among the topics covered in the IMR Action Plan were employee release decisions, utilities issues, the longstanding "COG Snow Call" conducted for winter weather events, and, notably, the creation of a new Regional Incident Coordination (RIC) Program including a regional 24-hour "watch desk" for weather events and other potential emergencies.

Additionally, the IMR Action Plan included recommendations pertaining to the transportation sector, notably (1) to expand MATOC operations from the current 16 hours, five days per week to 24 hours a day, seven days a week, as well as to enhance the information provided by MATOC; and (2) to conduct an assessment of and expeditiously install back-up power for major traffic signals.

Regarding the 24-hour operations proposal, Mr. Meese noted that the MATOC Steering Committee had discussed but had not finalized a response to this IMR recommendation. The current status was that MATOC already ramps up to temporary 24/7 operations on an as-needed basis (and did so during the January 26, 2011 storm). The future outlook was for the ability for the 24/7 RIC Program to request off-hours activation of MATOC on an on-call basis.

Regarding enhancing MATOC information, Mr. Meese noted that a MATOC Snow Mobilization Coordination Effort was being conducted at the direction of the MATOC Steering Committee. This effort was convening key snow response managers from transportation agencies, advising what MATOC staff can do to help transportation agencies in winter storm events, and, significantly, developing how MATOC can facilitate the transportation sector's communications with the larger regional decision-making process (i.e., the COG Snow Calls) for such events. Included was exploring a role for a MATOC spokesperson in the Snow Call process to better communicate transportation conditions and recommendations.

Focus areas for the MATOC snow group also included developing coordinated regional terms to describe roadway and transit conditions and inter-agency sharing of weather information from a variety of agency-specific sources and detection systems. Exercises had been held, and initial messaging was already being tested during this winter's weather events.

Regarding power back-up systems for traffic signals, Mr. Meese reported that TPB staff had conducted a regional survey on signals power back-up systems. The Traffic Signals Subcommittee reviewed and discussed the survey at a December 20 meeting, and was to further discuss the survey at an upcoming February 9 meeting. Though the Traffic Signals Subcommittee reviews and discussions were still in process, draft survey results were available to be shared. It was emphasized that the data were in draft form, still under review and subject to change.

Maintenance and operational responsibility were reported by 19 separate jurisdictions or agencies around the TPB region, accounting for over 5,000 signalized intersections. About 20% of the region's signals were reported to already be equipped with a back-up system: approximately 15% with battery-based systems (instant-on but limited duration), and another approximately 5% with generator-ready systems (generators must be transported to the site when needed). For further consideration, battery-based back-up systems were of particular interest due to their instant-on capability, as opposed to generator-ready systems, which had a lag time in deployment. It was emphasized that agency-specific details vary widely, from many agencies with 0% battery-based coverage to one agency with 100% battery-based coverage. The Committee reviewed draft summary tables of survey results.

Additional notable points from the survey were reviewed. Reported battery-based back-up system duration ranged from four hours to 18 hours, a wide variation depending on the type of systems installed. Battery replacement frequency was reported to be three-to-five years, though swaps and offsite storage for battery recharging would have to be done much more frequently. It was reported by respondents that signal timing and coordination generally was maintained during back-up power operations, but generally there were no automatic alarms sent back to signals agencies to alert them to power failures. Working with utilities for power restoration was generally handled by phone calls. A wide range of estimated installation costs (\$12,500 to \$25,000 per intersection) and annual maintenance costs (\$1,000 to \$3,000 per intersection per year) were reported.

The presentation concluded with the anticipated next steps of the IMR follow-up items. For the traffic signals power back-up issue, the Traffic Signals Subcommittee was to continue examination of survey results, including refinement of cost estimates for installation, maintenance, and operations. Staff was to follow up with the Subcommittee to develop options and budget estimates for strengthening regional capabilities.

Regarding MATOC operating hours, the MATOC Steering Committee was anticipated to continue consideration of this issue at its future meetings. The MATOC snow mobilization group was continuing to meet, and was looking forward to coordination with the new RIC Program.

Mr. Erenrich suggested putting a date on the data tables since they were likely be updated in the future.

Mr. Muktari suggested that critical traffic corridors should be considered for power back-up systems. Mr. Kirby noted that this information was being taken to the TPB for the February 15 meeting, and to the IMR Steering Committee for a February 22 meeting, and it was anticipated that there would be calls for further recommendations and prioritization considerations.

Mr. Erenrich raised the issue of whether signal power back-up systems would be considered capital projects or operating expenses, and Mr. Kirby noted that they were both capital and operating. Mr. Kirby also noted that signals agencies apparently were receptive to the concept of having power back-up systems, but they inevitably had considerations of prioritization of limited resources with other needs. Also noted was the complexity that 19 separate agencies were responsible and involved.

Mr. Erenrich suggested including information about the level of investment that would be needed, the order of magnitude of which would be \$50 million to \$100 million to provide back-up systems to all of the region's signalized intersections.

**10. Briefing on the Regional "Street Smart" Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign**

Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint on the Street Smart Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Campaign, and showed a storyboard version of the draft television ad for Spring 2012. Mr. Kirby asked whether the ad was blaming the pedestrian. Mr. Farrell replied that it was intended to be neutral regarding fault.

Mr. Mokhtari suggested that the campaign direct that traffic laws be obeyed, show a crosswalk. Mr. Farrell replied that surveys show that rules are mostly known, but there is less certainty over what one can get a ticket for.

Mr. Mokhtari asked about the outdoor campaign. Mr. Farrell replied that posters would be targeted at high-incidence areas as much as possible, and customized to different jurisdictions.

Mr. Malouff suggested that it not just be an anti-jaywalking campaign. Mr. Meese replied that drivers would be included.

Mr. Farrell reported that the media campaign will start March 18<sup>th</sup>.

**11. Update on Proposed Performance Measures for the TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)**

With limited time, Mr. Kirby briefly spoke to the PowerPoint handout. He noted the schedule for developing the RTPP. The RTPP regional goals were drawn from the TPB Vision (1998) and Region Forward (2010). He added that in order to move forward with analysis, a performance measures must meet two criteria: (1) Meaningful to the interested public; and (2) Data currently available. He also discussed the outreach activities scheduled, including listening sessions with diverse stakeholder groups scheduled later in the month. The Committee would be briefed again in June with a draft Interim Report 2 that would incorporate feedback from outreach. A final Interim Report 2 is scheduled to be presented to the TPB in July.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the RTPP looks into the region divide issue. Mr. Kirby responded that Goal 2 is focused on Activity Centers, and to the extent that the region can develop more Activity Centers in Prince George's County with transit access, the performance measures will reflect that. He also noted that 90 percent of all work trips go to Activity Clusters.

Chairman Rawlings requested a TPB work session on the RTPP after April.

**12. Other Business**

**None.**

**13. Adjourn**