

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes
For meeting of
July 9, 2010

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - July 9, 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 -----
 Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
 Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
 City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
 Fairfax Co. Robert Owolabi
 Tom Biesiadny
 Falls Church -----
 Loudoun Co. George Phillips
 Manassas -----
 Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
 NVTC -----
 PRTC Anthony Foster
 VRE Christine Hoeffner
 VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
 VDRPT David Awbrey
 NVPDC -----
 VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Mark Kellogg

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
 FHWA-VA Ivan Rucker
 FTA Melissa Barlow
 NCPC Michael weil
 NPS -----
 MWAQC -----

COG Staff

Ronald Kirby, DTP
 Mike Clifford, DTP
 Gerald Miller, DTP
 Mark Pfoutz, DTP
 Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
 Deb Bilek, DTP
 Bob Griffiths, DTP
 Sarah Crawford, DTP
 Tim Canan, DTP
 Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
 Andy Meese, DTP
 Andrew Austin, DTP
 Michael Farrell, DTP
 Karin Foster, DTP
 Monica Bansal, DTP
 John Swanson, DTP
 Rex Hodgson, DTP
 Jane Posey, DTP
 Darren Smith, DTP
 John Mataya, DCPS
 Jeff King, DEP
 Paul Desjardin, DCPS

Other Attendees

Aaron Overman, DDOT
 Greg Steverson, PWC
 Nuelie Dominguez, Fairfax Co. DOT
 Alex Block, DC Office of Planning
 Randy Carroll, MDE
 Bill Orleans, HAEC

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

July 9, 2010

Technical Committee Minutes

1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the June 4, 2010 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written with a change to Item 2 to clarify Mr. Srikanth's statement on page 2, paragraph 10.

2. **Briefing on the Final Draft *National Capital Region Freight Plan 2010***

Ms. Foster presented on the *National Capital Region Freight Plan 2010*. She explained the link between the economy and freight transportation and discussed the pending expansion of the Panama Canal as one example. The Freight Database was a major effort of the Freight Plan. The database is a compilation of projects beneficial to freight movement in our region. Ms. Foster concluded with Freight Plan recommendations. The recommendations aim to guide the Freight Program with the integration of freight into the transportation planning process.

Mr. Erenrich asked how the air quality impacts of freight were characterized in the subcommittee objectives. Ms. Foster noted that the Freight Subcommittee objective to "recognize how freight can reduce air quality impacts" was suggested by the rail community with the aim to recognize the potential for truck to rail diversions. Mr. Kirby noted the investments in rail technology have a real capacity to help shift freight from trucks. He considered, what will happen if we cannot do a major project like the Virginia Avenue Tunnel—how many more trucks will be on the road in our region?

Chairman Verzosa suggested that more information on how freight can improve air quality should be included in the presentation to the TPB.

Mr. Biesiadny asked for further explanation of what is meant by "jurisdictional freight profiles" in the recommendations. Ms. Foster explained that this may include TPB staff outreach to jurisdictional staffs who will be involved in freight planning to be aware of freight generators, clusters, and corridors in each jurisdiction.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the Plan had information on the cost of congestion. Mr. Kirby noted that a good example of this was the expansion of the Panama Canal by 2014, and the implication this will have if the CSX upgrades are not complete. Ms. Foster noted that cost of congestion numbers are in the Plan from an American Transportation Research Institute Survey.

Mr. Srikanth asked about roundabouts being a truckers concern. Ms. Foster noted that the Maryland Motor Trucking Association has raised this in the past; primarily the concern is that roundabouts are constructed large enough to accommodate trucks.

3. Briefing on Regional Car Free Day 2010

Mr. Ramfos used a PowerPoint presentation to brief the Committee on Car Free Day which will be held on September 22nd. He gave background information on the world wide event that will be celebrated in 1,500 cities in 40 countries. He also spoke about the origins of Car Free day in the Washington metropolitan region that began with a regional rollout event spearheaded by the TPB officers in 2008. He also stated that the event is also geared towards a "car-lite" theme whereby event participants can pledge to use carpools, vanpools, transit or work for home. Mr. Ramfos then covered some of the activities from the car free day event held in 2009 as well as the resulting media coverage.

A web site has been developed for the event and can be accessed at www.carfreemetrodc.com. Web site visitors will be able to pledge to go car free and Mr. Ramfos explained that the primary target market for the event are individuals who ordinarily drive alone by car for work, errands and classes. Secondary groups include those already in car free travel modes. There were 6,200 pledges received in 2009.

Mr. Ramfos then reviewed the promotional materials and outreach efforts for the event. The goal for 2010 is to obtain 10,000 pledges. A proclamation will be presented to the TPB for review and signature this month and members will be asked to pledge and perhaps provide information on their activities for the event through a COG Podcast.

Mr. Phillips asked whether or not those pledging, who changed their travel mode for the event permanently changed their travel behavior. Mr. Ramfos stated that those pledging are asked to provide their current mode of travel and what they plan to do on Car Free Day. Longer term, information is captured through surveys data collection efforts for Commuter Connections such as the State of the Commute to determine permanent travel change.

Mr. Biesiadny asked whether or not COG was tracking transit ridership for the event. Mr. Ramfos responded that ridership numbers before, during, and after the event could be obtained from transit agencies that could indicate whether or not there was an increase in ridership for that day.

4. Briefing on Proposed Recipients Under the FY 2011 Transportation/Land Use Connection (TLC) Program

Ms. Crawford provided a presentation on the proposed projects for the FY 2011 Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Technical Assistance Program and the proposed timeline for FY 2011 project completion. She noted that at the close of the FY 2010 round of the TLC Technical Assistance Program, the TPB completed 39 technical

assistance projects in 19 jurisdictions for a total of \$1,030,000: six projects were completed in the District of Columbia, 19 projects were completed in Maryland, and 14 were completed in Virginia.

Ms. Crawford said the TPB issued a call for projects for the FY 2011 round of TLC technical assistance on March 12, 2010, with a deadline of May 12, 2010. She said TPB staff conducted an application workshop on April 1, 2010, which provided an overview of the purpose of the TLC Technical Assistance Program, reviewed lessons learned from past projects, detailed the TLC application process, and highlighted the evaluation criteria used by the selection panel to review the applications. She said that for this application cycle, \$220,000 from the TPB's FY 2011 UPWP is available for technical assistance projects, and MDOT committed \$100,000 from their technical assistance account for projects in Maryland, with special emphasis on projects relating to transit-oriented development (TOD). She said the TPB received 13 applications from a diverse array of TPB member jurisdictions: the District of Columbia submitted two applications; Maryland jurisdictions submitted nine applications; and Virginia jurisdictions submitted two applications.

Ms. Crawford said the TLC Selection Panel met on June 15, 2010, to review the project applications and develop a list of recommended projects for the FY 2011 round of TLC technical assistance. She said the panel selected a list of eight project recommendations that the selection panel endorses as the most locally and regionally beneficial, cost-effective combination of projects. She reviewed these eight projects. She said the five projects that the selection panel recommended for funding in Maryland were forwarded to MDOT on June 16, 2010 for staff review and that MDOT staff supports the approval of these projects for funding under the FY 2011 round of TLC technical assistance. She said that on July 21, 2010, the TPB will be asked to approve the proposed slate of projects for completion under the FY 2011 TLC Technical Assistance Program.

Ms. Crawford added that staff is reviewing an external assessment of the TLC Program conducted on the FY 2009 and FY 2010 rounds of technical assistance that was undertaken in spring 2010 and will be available later this calendar year.

There were no questions.

5. Briefing on Proposed Next Steps from "Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities"

Mr. Kirby went through the memo describing staff responses to the proposed next steps following the Conversation.

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of July 9, 2010**

Mr. Verzosa asked why a follow-up conversation would be necessary. He said the event in May was really just for the CAC.

Mr. Kirby said there was consensus that the conversation needs to continue.

Ms. Barlow said she thought the formation of a task force would essentially be the continuation of the conversation.

Mr. Kirby said these two items are separate.

Mr. Biesiadny said he would like to see greater emphasis placed on Item 4, which called for better information about the current planning process.

Mr. Kirby agreed.

Mr. Srikanth said he supported the memo. He also said he believed the consortium established to oversee the potential HUD grant, discussed in Item 9, would essentially serve as the task force that the CAC would like to see established.

Mr. Kirby said he envisioned that a task force on transportation would need to be formed anyway if the HUD grant proposal is successful.

Mr. Srikanth said the CAC needs to be informed of meetings at the local and state levels related to key transportation planning activities.

Mr. Kirby said the CAC is more interested in how regional goals affect local and state decision-making.

Mr. Owolabi said that staff should provide orientations for new CAC members, which is what they do for Fairfax County Commissioners.

Mr. Swanson said that TPB staff provide orientation sessions for new members every year.

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

Mr. Canan reported on the status of implementing the region's TIGER grant. He began by introducing Mr. Randall who recently joined TPB staff as a Senior Transportation Engineer and will provide a lot of support the TIGER grant effort.

Mr. Canan informed the Committee that although FTA and COG, acting as the administrative agent of TPB, have executed the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the TIGER Grant, the MOU itself does not constitute the formal grant agreement between COG and FTA. Staff was informed by FTA Washington Office that because FTA is still in the process of defining the terms and conditions, it is not yet ready to execute a formal grant agreement with COG for TIGER. Because of the status of the COG-FTA grant agreement, COG legal counsel believes it would be premature to develop sub-grant agreements with project owners until there is a clearer understanding of what will be included in the grant agreement. As a result, staff intends to provide sub-grant agreements to the project owners for their review and approval after the COG-FTA grant agreement is executed.

As part of our effort to implement the TIGER Grant, staff intends to hire a consultant to provide the necessary support to administer the grant with project owners and comply with all reporting requirements. While staff still awaits the terms and conditions of the grant to fully understand the reporting requirements, staff has reviewed ARRA reporting requirements, compliance requirements of other FTA grant programs, and preliminary requirements of the TIGER grant based on FTA correspondences to develop what it believes is a reasonable estimate of 3.5% needed for grant administration. As a result, this is the likely percentage that COG will request from each of the project owners from their respective components.

As part of the TIGER Grant Agreement between COG and FTA, COG will be required to submit a detailed performance measurement and reporting plan for review by the Office of the Secretary of Transportation (OST). To accomplish this, staff will ask that project owners identify what level of effort will be needed to collect the information required and/or to identify other performance measurement and reporting needs.

Finally, Mr. Canan informed the Committee that that FY2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is scheduled to be amended later today by the Steering Committee to include identification of TIGER funds that can be expended for the remainder of the current TIP program before the FY2011-2016 TIP will be adopted this fall. The total amount of TIGER funds that will be used for the Regional Priority Bus Project will be included in the FY2011-2016 TIP.

There were no questions or discussion for this item.

7. Briefing on the Pre-Application for a Regional Bike Sharing Project Grant under the "TIGER II" Program

Ms. Bansal presented the proposal for the TPB regional TIGER II grant submission. She provided a brief overview of the project, which includes the expansion of bike-sharing in

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of July 9, 2010**

DC, Arlington County, Alexandria, Montgomery County, Fairfax County, College Park, and University of Maryland College Park's campus, as well as two bike storage facilities in Reston and Silver Spring. She provided an overview of how bike-sharing works, the benefits of bike-sharing, the alignment of these benefits with TIGER II criteria, and the necessary conditions for implementation success. Finally, Ms. Bansal presented staff recommendations on the components to include in the regional submission based on the alignment of individual jurisdictional submissions with TIGER II criteria and bike-sharing best practices. She also presented information on five components not recommended for inclusion. All projects not recommended for inclusion either did not meet bike-sharing best practice or did not link to the bike-sharing network. Ms. Bansal stated that the approved submission will be submitted in a pre-application to US DOT by the pre-application deadline on July 26.

Questions were raised about potential cost recovery for operations and maintenance costs and how they were factored into jurisdiction submittals. Ms. Bansal stated that the "fare box" recovery for bike-sharing is estimated at around 20% for the first year, 40% for the second year, and so on with potential full cost recovery after the fourth year; however, jurisdictions were asked to be conservative and assume little-to-no cost recovery in their planning since bike-sharing in its current form is still a relatively new concept.

Questions were also asked about how the project would be scaled back if the project was only partially funded. Mr. Kirby stated that this probably will not be an issue since our grant request is so close to the minimum grant request.

There was discussion regarding the unfunded Livability Bus grant submitted by WMATA in collaboration with TPB and potential inclusion of those components in the TIGER II submission. Mr. Kirby stated that the TPB was aiming to stay close to the minimum TIGER II grant request in order to remain competitive, which precludes the addition of components from the Livability Bus application.

Mr. Srikanth requested comment from the jurisdictions whose projects were not recommended for inclusion in preparation for approval by the Steering Committee. Mr. Beisiadny stated that although the projects in Fairfax County were needed, he was comfortable with the rationale for not including them as long as all like projects were treated equally as recommended in the staff memo.

Mr. Weissberg spoke for the Prince George's County projects and concurred, stating that although the project submitted is a top priority for the county, he understood the issue with including it in the regional package.

8. Briefing on an Overview of Local and Regional Transit Systems Serving the Washington Metropolitan Area

Mr. Overman, speaking to a slide presentation, provided the Committee with an overview of ridership and operating cost information for the transit systems serving the region. This information was requested by the TPB at their March meeting in order to provide a better understanding of the regional transit picture, and more specifically a better understanding of the role of the local bus transit operators.

Mr. Srikanth suggested adding a slide at the end that discusses some of the recent activities and work items of the Regional Bus Subcommittee. He also asked if there was any explanation for Slide 11 and the changes in ridership and operating costs. Mr. Overman noted that this needed to be explained better, but that growth in local jurisdictions and the addition of new local service likely played somewhat of a role in those trends.

Mr. Biesiadny suggested adding a slide that explains why there are 17 bus systems operating in the region, and pointing out that even though there are so many different bus operators they function as one system, an example of this is that they all accept SmarTrip cards for payment. He suggested taking out Slide 11, which shows that annual operating cost is increasing faster than annual ridership. He also asked that a footnote be added to the table on Slide 12 explaining that there was a strike in 2009 that impacted Fairfax Connector service. Also, it was suggested that the term commuter bus, instead of express bus, be used in the presentation.

Mr. Erenrich noted that there is a newer bus fleet and suggested adding a slide about the average age of vehicles in the fleet and the fact that TIGER I included funding for bus replacement. New buses, including hybrids, are better for air quality. Also, additional issues include: the challenge with placing new facilities for buses, particularly garages, and increased traffic congestion is contributing to increased costs for transit. Mr. Erenrich pointed out that the data contained in this presentation was recently reported on in the news and it needs to be articulated that transit operators face certain challenges but are efficient in their work.

Mr. Malouff stated it is important to distinguish that these are the public providers of transit service, but there are private providers as well.

Mr. Kellogg said that he was not happy with the presentation and that there are other stories that should be told about bus and transit service instead of being preoccupied with the costs of the services. The presentation should include information about how growth outside the compact area and resulting trips patterns have changed, while challenges around the placement of bus garages have increased.

Chairman Versoza said there is no need to go to TPB now and that this should be presented to the Committee again in September.

9. Update on the Submission by COG of a Grant Application to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program

Mr. Mataya gave a briefing on current plans to submit an application to the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for a grant under the Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program. Under the grant, COG would develop a Regional Plan for Sustainable Development that would help integrate planning for housing, transportation, environmental and economic development. He said the grant proposal was due on August 23. He said the COG board would be asked to approve the application in concept on July 14 and the TPB would be asked approve the same concept on July 21.

Mr. Srikanth said Mr. Mataya's PowerPoint presentation was useful. He said he would like a copy to distribute. He said he understood that the end product of the proposed plan would be focused on implementation and "deliverable." He asked whether this end product would include, or imply, commitments on the part of the states to implement the results of the plan.

Mr. Mataya confirmed that COG was intending to apply for Category 2 planning funds under the grant, which called for the development of an implementation plan, not simply the development of a vision, which was already achieved in the Greater Washington 2050 planning activity. However, he said that the plan could not be expected to require a commitment from participants.

Mr. Kirby said that he understood the application would emphasize the approach "think regionally, act locally." He said he did not expect the end product to place undue expectations on transportation; the plan would be just as likely, or more likely, to call for land-use changes.

Mr. Erenrich asked about the HUD challenge grants program.

Mr. Mataya explained that the challenge grants program is similar to the regional grant program, but targeted to local jurisdictions with site-specific applications. The challenge grant program is funded at \$40 million, while the regional program is funded at \$100 million.

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of July 9, 2010**

Mr. Biesiadny said the presentation was good. He said this application is important and he encouraged the members of the Technical Committee to be involved in the process of its development.

Mr. Kirby noted that the timeline for developing the application is very short. He noted that the program requires a 20-percent match in leveraged resources. He said this is an opportunity for potential partners to be pro-active. He said the TPB resolution will include an indication of commitment from the Department of Transportation Planning, probably identified with a dollar-amount limit in contributed leveraged resources.

Mr. Srikanth asked if the consortium overseeing the proposed planning project would be required to include participation of the states.

Mr. Kirby answered that there is no requirement for state participation, but there is a requirement for MPO participation, and therefore the state DOTs would be represented through the TPB.

Mr. Srikanth suggested that the work of the TPB, particularly the scenario study, needs to be incorporated into the grant application. However, he noted that there is very little interest in finding funding for new transportation systems.

Mr. Kirby said the challenge in this region is not to put together a new plan as much as it is find commitment to implementation.

Mr. Awbrey asked about the proposed application's focus on equity.

Mr. Mataya said that the focus on equity will be linked to the proposal's complete centers approach.

Mr. Robertson reiterated the schedule and process for developing the grant application.

10. Briefing on the Results of the 2010 State of the Commute Survey for the Washington Region

Mr. Ramfos used a PowerPoint presentation to brief the Committee on the preliminary results from the 2010 State of the Commute Survey. He first described the survey methodology then survey topics which were continued from the first survey that was conducted in 2001 as well as new topic areas used for the 2010 survey.

Next, He covered the highlights from the following sections of the survey: commute patterns, telework, travel facilities, commute ease and satisfaction, awareness of Commuter Connections, and employer services. He Ramfos then explained the next steps of the project which will be to review and finalize the Technical Survey report this fiscal year and then prepare and finalize a general public report in FY 2012.

Mr. Srikanth stated that there was a great deal of information and that the TPB agenda will have time constraints. Mr. Ramfos stated that the presentation would be shortened to accommodate the time allotment for this agenda item. Mr. Erenrich asked how the data correlates with the Household Travel Survey. Mr. Griffiths responded that there are differences in the way the questions were asked in the Household Travel Survey as well as the fact that respondents in the State of the Commute survey are all employed workers. However, an "apples to apples" comparison would be possible.

11. Briefing on the Metrobus Priority Corridor Network (PCN) Evaluation Study

Delayed until September.

12. Update on the Status of the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP Inputs and Forms

This item was deferred. Mr. Austin made copies of the Draft FY 2011-2016 TIP available to Committee members.

13. Briefing on the Draft Update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region

Delayed until September.

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

Delayed until September.

15. Briefing on the Round 8.0 Cooperative Forecasts

Delayed until September.

16. Other Business

None.

17. Adjourn