

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
ITEM #1**

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
March 7, 2014

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE -March 7, 2014**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
 Jameshia Peterson
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick Co. Ron Burns
City of Frederick -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich
 John Thomas
Prince George's Co. -----
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. -----
 Prince George's Co. -----
MDOT Lyn Erickson
 Dami Kehinde
MTA
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax Co. Mike Lake
 Malcolm Watson
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Robert Brown
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. -----
NVTC Claire Gron
PRTC Nick Alexandrow
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
 Norman Whitaker
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Danielle Wesolek

FEDERAL/OTHER

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

COG Staff

Gerald Miller, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Sarah Crawford, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Jinchul Park, DTP
Yu Gao, DTP
William Bacon, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Dzung Ngo, DTP
Jessica Mirr, DTP
Jon Schermann, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS

Other Attendees

Jillian Linnell, NVTC
Bill Orleans

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Meeting

Technical Committee Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from February 7 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on Project Submissions for Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2014 CLRP

Mr. Austin spoke to a revised version of the memorandum that had been included in the materials posted online. He stated that the Inputs for the Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP would be released for public comment on Thursday, March 13. He reviewed the major new projects and changes to existing projects that had been highlighted in the memorandum.

During the discussion of the removal of two planned Peak Period Bus Only lanes in the District, Mr. Erenrich asked what “removed, pending further study” meant. Mr. Austin replied that their status in the Conformity Inputs table would be changed from “implement” to “study/not coded” and that they would not be included in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis.

Pertaining to the update of the VRE System Plan, Mr. Austin asked if the cost that had been provided was specifically for the Washington region only. Ms. Hoeffner responded that it was. Mr. Miller asked about the time frame for implementation. Ms. Hoeffner said the System Plan runs through 2040. Mr. Erenrich commented that elements of the plan that need to be modeled should be specified, both for the VRE System Plan and MARC Growth and Investment Plan. He also inquired how statewide elements are handled. Ms. Erickson said that the Growth and Investment Plan was split 50/50 between the Baltimore and Washington regions to avoid double counting. Chair Srikanth added that prior to release for public comment, agencies would work with TPB staff to enhance the descriptions for the two plans. He suggested language that describes how the plans covered operations and maintenance, as well as some capacity improvements which had been itemized in the Conformity Inputs.

Mr. Miller asked if the widening of US Route 1 in Virginia was a BRAC-related project. Chair Srikanth indicated that he had reached out to project managers with that question, but had not received a response yet. He did acknowledge that the project did run through military property, but he was unaware if there was any DOD funding attached to the project.

Mr. Austin discussed the proposal in the memorandum to release two elements of the Metro 2025 plan for public comment as an alternative in hopes that funding would be identified for them by the time the TPB would be asked to approve the inputs in April. Ms. Erickson remarked that the cost shown for those two elements was not reflective of the total financial request being put forth by WMATA. Ms. Wesolek said that this represented a compromised minimum, given the uncertainty in ongoing discussions of the CLRP financial analysis. Several suggestions were made to include additional language in the description explaining the full amount being requested by WMATA in order to provide a sense of scale for these two elements. Mr. Erenrich asked if this included the elimination of turn-backs on the Red Line for modeling purposes. Ms. Wesolek replied that she believed that the turn-backs were eliminated in last year's CLRP without 8-car trains. Mr. Erenrich suggested that these, along with the rail plan updates could use additional illustrative language. Chair Srikanth suggested that since the memorandum is focused on new or changed elements for the CLRP and major financial investments being made in non-capacity increasing areas, that it should avoid discussions of elements that are outside the possible realm of funding. He added that language could be included that described operations and maintenance, State of Good Repair. Ms. Wesolek agreed, stating that this document might not be the ideal place to describe the backstory and status of the ongoing financial discussions. Ms. Hoeffner noted that the amount shown for the VRE System Plan is only the portion that they have identified funding for, but that the entire System Plan costs over \$3 billion. She said it should be made clear that not everything on the System Plan is being included in the CLRP.

Ms. Posey reviewed the Conformity Inputs table that had been distributed. She requested updates be submitted to her by email by the following Tuesday.

3. Briefing on the Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP

Ms. Constantine briefed the Committee on the draft scope of work of the 2014 Air Quality Conformity Determination. While the milestone years of analysis will remain the same (i.e., 2015, 2017, 2020, 2025, 2030 and 2040), she noted that the 2011 Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) database will be used for the last time as a new VIN database will be developed for the 2015 CLRP Air Quality Conformity Determination. She also pointed out that a new land use assumptions will be used (i.e. Round 8.3). Responding to Mr. Erenrich about the start of the modeling process for this year's air quality conformity cycle, Ms. Constantine stated that the model runs will not start until an agreement is reached among the participating parties on the financial plan because it would affect the transit capacity in the core area of the region and certain projects in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). In this context, it is anticipated that model runs will be completed in August or early September 2014.

Following up on his previous question Mr. Erenrich inquired how quality controls are incorporated in the network coding process. Ms. Posey explained that an automated process is used to update all the projects in the network database based on the conformity table. A manual process of spot checking is also applied and a comparative review of the networks and travel-related outputs vis-à-vis different analysis years and CLRP analyses from previous air quality conformity cycles. Ms. Constantine added that numerous quality control reviews are routinely performed along the various stages of the analyses.

Chair Srikanth urged the participating state and local agencies to review their respective project listings and to report potential project discrepancies in their jurisdictions. Mr. Brown asked whether Loudoun County can have a copy of the model to help improve the regional network. Chair Srikanth confirmed it.

Mr. Malouff asked whether Maryland and DC also have their own local models. Mr. Erenrich responded that Montgomery County Park and Planning Commission has its own travel demand model, which is not based on the latest MWCOG/TPB model version. Mr. Roisman added that Prince George's County also has its own travel demand model.

4. Discussion of an Initial Comparative Assessment of the 2014 Update of the CLRP and the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP) and a Proposed Schedule for RTPP Outreach and Coordination with Related COG Activities

Referring to a handout and PowerPoint slides, Mr. Swanson briefed the Committee on a proposed approach for conducting a comparative assessment of the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). He also spoke about future outreach on the RTPP and efforts to coordinate future work related to RTPP and COG's Places + Opportunities report.

Mr. Holloman asked if the assessment would be conducted on an annual basis. Mr. Swanson said that an annual review would be appropriate.

Chair Srikanth noted that TPB staff conducts a performance analysis of the CLRP on an annual basis, and it would be appropriate to coordinate the CLRP/RTPP assessment with that work.

Mr. Griffiths said that the assessment would provide information that would inform the annual Call for Projects for the CLRP.

Mr. Emerine asked if staff had identified content for the assessment. Mr. Swanson said that staff had identified some preliminary material for inclusion. Ms. Hoeffner asked when staff would like to receive comments from Committee members regarding the proposed approach that Mr. Swanson had described.

Mr. Swanson said the deadline would be the following Tuesday. Mr. Miller noted that a number of important strategies that were highlighted in the RTPP are not typically reflected in the CLRP.

Mr. Erenrich said that every jurisdiction probably has some sort of existing conditions assessment. He suggested that such an assessment might be developed at the regional level to identify the degree to which state-of-good-repair is being met. Chair Srikanth said that was a point well taken. He warned that the assessment should not be exhaustive, but should highlight good examples. Ms. Erickson said the Maryland Attainment Report contains useful information and offers an approach that might be worth emulating to some degree.

Chair Srikanth noted the importance of land use in driving the performance of the CLRP.

Mr. DesJardin called attention to the Place + Opportunity report, which highlighted the importance of activity centers.

5. Review of Final Draft FY 2015 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

Mr. Ramfos referred to the handout that was in the agenda packet and reviewed the information that was released at the TPB on the draft FY 2015 CCWP at the February 19, 2014 meeting. He stated that there were no additional comments or significant changes made to the draft document.

The final draft document was released public comment on February 13 and the final draft would be presented to the TPB for approval on March 19.

Mr. Ramfos also briefed the Committee on the Commuter Connections 40th year anniversary. He stated that a new logo would be developed and deployed along with a theme which would revolve around Commuter Connections' trusted ridematching services that have been provided since 1974. He also stated that there would be an earned media outreach effort made as well as a social media campaign that would involve the general public and network members.

Mr. Ramfos asked Committee members to search their archives and share any original photos dating from the inception of the Commuter Connections program which was originally founded as the Commuter Club. In researching archives of the TPB, Mr. Ramfos stated that he had an opportunity to review the original memorandum pitching the idea of forming a regional rideshare matching service. The inaugural committee meeting to form the Commuter Club was held at COG on June 28, 1974. The General Services Administration and The Greater Washington Board of Trade also lent their organizational support to start up the regional service. There were also letters of support from all three of the state departments of transportation.

Mr. Ramfos stated that a celebratory event would be held around the July time frame involving the TPB members and Commuter Connections network members, and there would also be acknowledgement of the 40th year anniversary during the Commuter Connections Employer Recognition Awards event which will be held in June.

Mr. Ramfos also reported that one area of focus for the 40th year anniversary would be how the program has evolved with technology given that the original rideshare matching was conducted through punch cards and then through a mainframe system which led to the development of software on PCs and to today's system of a fully integrated web based matching system.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that there also be information included on how Commuter Connections plans on using technology in the future. Mr. Ramfos stated that he would also include information on the recent deployment of the updated Commuter Connections web site that is now accessible through any mobile device and the deployment of a new mobile app that will allow for current Commuter Connections account holders to access services via a smart phone or tablet.

6. Review of Final Draft FY 2015 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Miller reviewed the draft of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY 2015 (July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015) which was released for public comment on February 13 at the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting. He said this draft was essentially complete except for the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia Technical Assistance project descriptions. He explained that the work activities in the District, Maryland, and Virginia Technical Assistance Programs will be quite similar to the current ones and the project and budget details were being finalized and would be included in the final version for the TPB. The final version would be presented to the TPB for approval at its March 19 meeting and then it will be submitted to FHWA and FTA for approval by July 1.

He reviewed the overall budget estimates and said that at this point as in past years there is uncertainty regarding the final USDOT FY 2014 budget and appropriations for MPO planning funding from MAP-21 which needs to be extended beyond September 30, 2014. He explained that it is assumed that the FY 2015 funding allocations to be provided by DOTs will be the same as the current FY 2014 levels. In addition, the budget estimate assumes the level of unobligated funds from FY 2014 will be the same as the unspent funds from FY 2013. As in past years, the TPB will be asked to amend the budget in the fall once the final FY 2015 funding allocations are determined.

Mr. Miller distributed a memorandum on FY 2014 carryover work statements and budgets and explained that seven projects and funding in the current FY 2014 basic

program and several projects in Technical Assistance Programs of the District, Maryland, Virginia and WMATA that would not be completed by June 30 will be identified for carryover to FY 2015. He reviewed the changes to the work statements and budgets for the seven projects and said that the total funding of \$1,170,000 would be removed from the FY 2014 program and included in the new FY 2015 program. He said that about \$600,000 would probably be removed from the Technical Assistance program and put in the FY 2015 program. He said the carryover projects and budgets would be incorporated into the final version of the FY 2015 document after TPB approval at the March meeting.

Mr. Griffiths explained that under the Household Travel Survey work item funding for the Spring survey of 2,400 households in six focused geographic subareas would be carried over to the fall of 2014.

7. Briefing on the District Department of Transportation's Draft Strategic Vision Plan Called *moveDC*

Referring to the PowerPoint presentation, Ms. Hawkinson briefed the Committee on *moveDC*, the District's long-range transportation plan. Chair Srikanth said the presentation was very good, but he warned Ms. Hawkinson that she may not have as much time for her TPB presentation.

Mr. Roseboom asked if water taxis were included. Ms. Hawkinson said that water taxis were not deemed to be feasible in the short term, but they might be considered in the future. Mr. Malouff noted that there is not a lot of development along the waterfront currently, but that could be different in the future.

Mr. Erenrich asked whether DDOT coordinated with other jurisdictions to identify the assumptions in the plan related to other jurisdictions. Mr. Zimbabwe said that such coordination occurred. Chair Srikanth spoke about managed lanes on bridges. He noted that a coordinated interface would need to be worked out between the states, but at the very least, *moveDC* provides a starting point for such discussions.

Ms. Wesolek asked which specific WMATA projects were included in the plan. Mr. Emerine said the projects that were modeled were inside the Beltway. Mr. Thomas said that from the presentation, it was not clear which projects or programs contributed to which results. He noted that some of the changes that were forecast in *moveDC* were quite dramatic. He questioned to what degree these changes were the result of pricing.

Chair Srikanth noted that road pricing in DC will affect trips coming in and out of the District. Mr. Zimbabwe acknowledged that the plan anticipated new demands on transit. Mr. Miller asked about the cost for the road pricing components of the plan.

Mr. Zimbabwe said the cost per vehicle would be roughly equivalent to a round-trip fare on Metro.

Mr. Ramfos asked about pickoff/dropoff points for vanpools. Ms. Hawkinson said that such details, in general, were not looked at.

8. Update on the TCSP Study: High-Impact Complete Streets Access Improvements for Rail Station Areas in the Washington Region

Ms. Crawford spoke to a memorandum and provided an update on the status of the TPB's Transportation, Community, and System Preservation (TCSP) Grant to identify strategic recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian access improvements around rail stations with underutilized capacity that complement employment. She said staff completed the rail capacity analysis for all station areas and completed the employment and low-income/transit-dependent analysis for a subset of stations with available capacity. Staff identified 25 opportune station areas with both existing or anticipated employment density and/or a concentration of transit-dependent populations at stations with available capacity. The TPB procured a consultant, Toole Design Group, to complete station-area analysis to identify non-auto needs and bicycle and pedestrian projects around these station areas. She said the project will likely be completed by the end of the calendar year.

Ms. Wesolek noted that FHWA just released the latest TIGER grant solicitation. She asked if any specific projects have been identified around which to build a regional TIGER application.

Ms. Crawford said that the timing is not ideal in that specific projects would not be identified until late spring or early summer, after the TIGER deadline.

Mr. Thomas asked what radius is being used for the station-area analysis.

Ms. Crawford responded that a 1-mile radius would be used to identify pedestrian gaps and projects and a 3-mile radius would be used for bicycle gaps and projects.

Chair Srikanth asked if the project identified in the next portion of the project would be consistent with local plans and would be considered "ready to go".

Ms. Crawford said that the consultant will gather information about the station areas from local jurisdictions, WMATA, and other agencies, and that the project would likely be existing, approved planning documents. The consultant will perform on-the-ground

work to ensure no new gaps exist from the time the plans were adopted. She said the consultant would also identify costs for the projects.

9. Update/Briefing on the Proposed MAP-21 Statewide and MPO Planning Rule

Mr. Randall gave a presentation on the recent updates to the schedule for release of the MAP-21 performance provisions. The anticipated date of release for the draft rulemaking for Statewide and Metropolitan Planning is now April 4. The Safety rule was expected March 7, but no sign of it was yet apparent.

Mr. Randall then reported on a Notice of Funding Availability for the 2014 TIGER Discretionary Grant Program, published March 3. Applications are due April 28, and there is \$600 million available for funding capital projects. He noted that additional non-federal funds make applications more competitive. To date, federal funds have leveraged 3.5 times as much in local funding. He noted that there will be three USDOT webinars on applications offered in March, as which point it was noted these were already fully subscribed.

Mr. Randall also reported that up to \$35 million is available for planning grants (the first eligibility for TIGER planning grants since 2010). Eligible activities are the planning, preparation, or design of surface transportation projects, including: highway/bridge, public transportation, passenger & freight rail, port, and intermodal projects. Planning grant applications should also be related to multidisciplinary projects or planning, including: connections to jobs for disadvantaged populations, access to affordable housing, multimodal freight and port development, and programmatic mitigation for multiple projects regarding communities and the environment.

Chair Srikanth asked if there would be a regional grant application led by TPB. The response is that there does not currently appear to be a ready slate of regional projects that would fit the criteria of the grant program. Once some of the current studies conclude, there may be a future opportunity. COG's community planning office is also evaluating the planning grant opportunity.

Several agencies reported consideration of applying for a grant, including Virginia DOT, Montgomery County to make up the last wedge of funding needed for South Bethesda metro entrance improvements, DDOT to continue the Long Bridge analysis, and VRE for station improvements and planning for third-tracking.

Mr. Erenrich noted that a support letter from the TPB Chair is necessary, stating that a project can be added to the CLRP and TIP if awarded a grant.

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

Mr. Farrell spoke to a hand-out. Free PSA placement, especially on transit properties, has been an important component of the campaign in the past, and staff has requested PSAs for the Spring at the Bus Subcommittee. PSA placement on transit likely

accounts for greater success in reaching pedestrians than in reaching motorists. This Spring the Street Smart program will be running more pumptopper ads to try to reach motorists. Direct outreach will consist of street teams with billboards on their backs, rather than booths, except at venues that lend themselves to a fixed booth.

The deadline for free PSA placement is March 18th, but staff could probably accommodate requests for bus cards after that date. At this point staff is still requesting PSA space and enforcement. Ms. Williams is the contact for PSAs.

Mr. Erenrich asked who among the bus agencies has responded so far to the request for PSA placement.

Mr. Farrell replied that Ms. Williams was gathering those responses, but said that response has been excellent in the past and he expected to duplicate that response this spring.

Mr. Erenrich said that he needed to know who had pledged PSAs in order to know if he needed to call someone. He suggested that every bus operator on the Committee should be asked to respond one way or another to this request for PSAs, and a list of respondents and responses should be presented to the TPB.

Mr. Farrell said a status report on the PSA pledges will be provided to the Committee within one week.

There was a question about the web presence of the campaign. Mr. Farrell replied that there was on a huge on-line presence, including a twitter feed and a digital toolkit, including web banners, tweets, and Facebook posts which encourages them to put it on their social media, which is provided to partners, but it's not a large budget item. Staff likes the transit and drive-time radio advertising because it reaches people close to the time and place of the behavior. Mr. Holloman suggested that we look into in-vehicle apps.

11. Other Business

At the end of the meeting the recruitment profile for replacing Mr. Kirby was distributed to Committee members.

12. Adjourn