



National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

Technical Committee Minutes

For the meeting of
October 5, 2018

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes

- 1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the September 7, 2018 Technical Committee Meeting**
- 2. Review of Comments Received to Date for Visualize 2045, The FY2019-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis**

Mr. Andrew Austin, COG TPB staff stated that approximately 70 comments had been received as of the morning of the meeting. He reported that most of the comments stated a desire to see the Capital Trails Network included in the bicycle and pedestrian Aspirational Initiative and/or in the constrained element. Other comments pertained to aspirational initiatives on BRT, express highway networks, and Metro expansion. Mr. Austin noted that comments were expected from the TPB's Access for All Committee and that comments had been received from the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee's Technical Advisory Committee (MWAQC TAC). He stated that the public comment period would close at midnight on Sunday, October 7. Following that, TPB staff would summarize the comments and provide responses to those comments pertaining to the TPB's planning process and would reach out to member agencies for responses on any project-specific comments. These comments and responses would be provided in a memo to the TPB that would be included in the meeting materials posted on Thursday, October 11.

Ms. Jane Posey, COG/TPB staff reported that the letter from MWAQC TAC stated that conformity attainment had been demonstrated but expressed concern that Tier 1 budgets were exceeded. She stated that TPB staff would be providing a response to this comment in a letter separate from the comments and responses memo.

Mrs. Lyn Erickson, COG/TPB staff provided a preview of the TPB's order of actions at the October 17 meeting. She said the board would be asked to review and accept the comments as part of the documentation of Visualize 2045, then to approve the Air Quality Conformity Analysis, Visualize 2045 long-range plan, and the FY 2019-2024 TIP in that order.

Mr. Mike Lake, Fairfax County, asked if any comments called for any northern river crossings. Mr. Austin stated that a few comments did remark on the need for additional Potomac River bridges.

Ms. Erickson walked the committee through the action items that the board will be asked to take. She noted that the comments and responses would be the only item the board had not been briefed on, so there wouldn't be significant amounts of time allotted to the other approval action items.

Ms. Erickson and Mr. Bob Brown, Loudoun County presented a draft resolution of support (Resolution TR1-2019) from the Technical Committee for Visualize 2045, that Mr. Brown had asked staff to develop in September. He asked for comments on the language in the resolution. Mr. Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County suggested additional language to clarify the Technical Committee's role in the development of the plan from inception and through the public involvement process. He also suggested changing "Compliments and thanks" in the first Therefore clause to "Congratulates." The committee voted unanimously to approve the resolution as edited.

3. Certification of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process for the National Capital Region

Lyn Erickson COG/TPB Staff provided a brief introduction of the agenda item noting that like the long-range plan and TIP, the certification document is also a part of the federal approval process in that every time an MPO approves a TIP and every time a state approved a STIP they are also required to self-certify that they are following the metropolitan planning process according to federal regulations.

She then drew the committee's attention to the certification document itself and instructed members to turn to the last 4 pages of the document where 10 regulation compliance points are listed which is prescribed by the federal regulation as per the federal metropolitan planning process. She then reviewed the 10 aspects of the requisite document. She then elaborated on the content of the entire document which identifies how we are meeting the federal planning process. She noted that there will be additional materials included in the document and that the four signatories (the board chair and state DOT oversight agencies) will complete the document with their signatures.

She will be presenting the complete certification package to the board and the board will be asked to endorse the appended statement. Once endorsed, the complete packet including the long-range plan will be submitted to the FTA who will then have 60 days to approve it. She emphasized that the January 5th deadline is tight for federal approval, so there can be no delays for TPB approval without tangible consequences. She concluded in reminding the committee that the final draft of the long-range plan will be posted on the 11th and if there are any remaining questions or suggestions regarding that document that these comments will need to be received immediately. Mrs. Erickson thanked members for their comments and opened the floor for questions.

4. Approval of Projects Recommended for Funding under the FY 2019 Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program for the District of Columbia

Mr. Michael Farrell, COG/TPB staff spoke to a PowerPoint on the Transportation Alternatives set-aside recommendation for the District of Columbia.

He noted that a share of the Transportation Alternatives funding is sub-allocated to the MPO for each of the three States. The MPO selects projects based on the TPB's regional goals, such as access to high capacity transit, expanding multimodal transportation options, equity emphasis areas, support for the National Capital Trail, and increased access for people with disabilities.

The TPB set-aside sub-allocation for DC is \$1,190,000, and we received requests for four projects equaling exactly \$1,190,000. It was non-competitive, and all four projects are recommended for full funding.

The four projects are the Glen Echo Trolley Trail design, the Capitol Crescent and C&O Canal – Georgetown Trail improvements, the Rock Creek Park Military Road feasibility study, and the Union Station restoration project for the Legionnaire statues and the interior.

The Glen Echo Trolley Trail follows the route of an historic trolley which once ran all the way to Glen Echo Park. The section which we are funding connects Georgetown with Foxhall Road. The most important element is the historic trestle bridge, which is in very poor condition and needs stabilization. The applicant, DDOT, is moving as fast as possible to complete the feasibility study and go to preliminary design.

The Capitol Crescent trailhead and C&O Towpath connection is a small project, consisting of a neglected dirt and gravel area, and a deteriorated staircase connecting that area to the towpath. The applicant is the Georgetown Business Improvement District. The trailhead would be paved, protected from motor traffic, feature landscaping and improved lighting, and an improved staircase. This project is part of the National Capital Trail and will connect two of the most intensely used trails in the region. The Georgetown BID is an experienced applicant that has been involved in numerous planning projects in this area. This project will tie many of those projects together for a quick win.

The Rock Creek Park Military Road feasibility study will examine the options for a multi-use trail on Military Road. Military Road currently has no pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Neighborhoods on the east side of the park have low auto ownership rates. This project will literally bridge a region divided. The National Park Service is the applicant.

Lastly, the Union Station project will involve the restoration of the exterior statues and the interior vestibules.

A member asked if the applicant must show the ability to provide their share of the funds. Mr. Farrell replied that the applicant had committed to providing matching funds.

Ms. Allison Davis, WMATA asked about the eligibility of the Union Station restoration project for Transportation Alternatives funding. Mr. Farrell replied that it was an eligible project. Transportation Alternatives is the typical funding sources for these kinds of historic restorations. This facility is massively used so we are happy to see funding going to put it into good condition. Ms. Erickson noted that this was a non-competitive process, so we did not have the opportunity to rank it against another project. The Transportation Alternatives program absorbed the old Transportation Enhancements program, which used to fund these types of projects.

Ms. Harris asked why there were only four applicants. Mr. Farrell replied that he did not ask that question; he just evaluated what was in front of him. Ms. Erickson added that DDOT leads the outreach for applicants, just as the other States do. The MPO only has a say over half the money, so while we do issue a project solicitation, the States typically take the lead.

5. Comments to US EPA and US DOT on the Safer Affordable Fuel Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles Proposed Rule for Model Years 2021-2026

Mr. Vuksan made a presentation on the Safer Affordable Fuel Efficient (SAFE) Vehicles proposed rule for Model Years 2021-2026. A draft comment letter from TPB/MWAQC/CEEPC was included in the packet. The SAFE Vehicle rule was proposed by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and recommends relaxing existing Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) and carbon dioxide (greenhouse gas, GHG) emissions standards for passenger cars and light-duty trucks by maintaining Model Year (MY) 2020 standards in place for this time.

The TPB will be briefed on the proposed rule and asked to approve a joint TPB/MWAQC/CEEPC letter urging the EPA to stand by its January 12, 2017 Final Determination and maintain the existing CAFE and GHG standards promulgated in 2012. The SAFE rule could impact the region by increasing mobile source NOx emissions, making it harder to conform to mobile emissions budgets, and making it more difficult to attain the region's environmental goals which include the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for criteria pollutants and reducing mobile source GHG emissions. Mr. Vuksan cited TPB and COG regional GHG planning efforts from the last decade.

Mr. Vuksan provided background on the current federal CAFE and GHG emission standards which were set in 2012 and the actions taken by the EPA and NHTSA which led to the proposed rule. The existing standards would result in average GHG equivalent mileage improving from 36.6 miles per gallon (mpg) for MY 2017 vehicles to 54.5 mpg for MY 2025 vehicles and average GHG emissions reducing from 243 grams per mile (gpm) to 163 gpm. The preferred alternative in the proposed SAFE rule would maintain the MY 2020 levels through MY 2026, which would result in an average GHG equivalent mileage of 41.7 mpg and an average GHG emission rate of 213 gpm for those model years.

MWAQC and CEEPC approved the draft letter in September. The TPB will review the letter and is expected to approve it on October 17th. The joint letter will be submitted to the federal docket before the October 26th deadline. Mr. Sunil Kumar, COG/DEP staff discussed some of the minor edits that were being reflected in the letter that MWAQC and CEEPC approved. Mr. Kanti Srikanth confirmed that the draft letter that was in the mailout was the version that MWAQC and CEEPC approved, and the comments that Mr. Kumar recapped will be added pending the MWAQC Executive Committee meeting approval on October 10th. The TPB mailout will include the version of the letter that the MWAQC Executive Committee approves on October 10th, but it will still be a draft and TPB members still can provide further edits if they so choose. Once the TPB acts, the chairs of all three committees will sign the letter and it will be submitted before October 26th.

6. Recommendations to Advance Endorsed Initiatives – Overview

Mr. Kanti Srikanth, TPB staff director, provided context to the next three presentations and the recommendations they offer. In January 2018, Chair Allen spoke about the TPB's interest and his focus on taking some constructive action on the endorsed transportation improvement initiatives which are now a part of Visualize 2045. Once these initiatives were endorsed there was a call for action by TPB member jurisdictions and member agencies to undertake projects, programs, and policies that would help realize the 7 ideas and to incorporate these ideas into future long-range planning activities. At the request of Chair Allen, TPB staff has facilitated this vision. Since the initial request, TPB staff have engaged various committees and their respective subject matter experts in discussions to enable the development of ideas and recommendations from these subject matter experts.

For example, in February of 2018, Mr. Srikanth made a direct appeal to the Commuter Connections Subcommittee (CCSC) in recognition of the committee's legacy of knowledge in transportation demand management (TDM) efforts, as TDM is one of the endorsed initiatives. CCSC members were asked what ideas they would like to share with decision makers of the region on the topic. The CCSC discussed the request and is prepared to share the results of these discussions and recommendations.

Chair Allen has indicated that he anticipates that the TPB will take some formal action on the recommendations. At a minimum, it will be the acknowledgment of the collective recommendations via an endorsement or resolution and a further call to action to TPB member jurisdictions.

Mr. Srikanth then introduced the presenters: George Clark of the Commuter Connections Subcommittee on TDM; Gary Erenrich of the Region Public Transportation Subcommittee on transit recommendations; and Cindy Engelhart of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee on Non-motorized recommendations.

Mr. Srikanth then opened the floor for questions. There was a clarifying question as to whether the recommendations to be presented were part of Visualize 2045 or follow-up work to begin implemented. Mr. Srikanth replied in the affirmative to the latter and gave a brief history regarding how the 7 initiatives were derived. He noted that what is expected from the recommendations is specific ideas

that contribute to an ongoing effort in hopes that every amendment and update to the plan will begin to reflect more of these types of recommended projects, programs, and policies.

Mr. Srikanth noted that one topic that will not be presented at this time is the bringing jobs and housing closer together initiative, which the Planning Directors Technical Committee, under the chairmanship of Eric Shaw, has been discussing. They will present more information later in the year.

Lyn Erickson also added that this is about how every one of our 44 members can be doing something. The package of recommendations that members will see isn't about one agency doing something versus another, the goal is to try to enable all 44 members to act. She encouraged committee members to frame the discussion of the recommendations to their respective board members in this light.

6A. TDM Recommendations: Commuter Connections Subcommittee

Mr. George Clark, Commuter Connections Subcommittee Chair introduced himself to the Committee and reviewed his role as a TDM practitioner with the Tri-County for Southern Maryland.

Mr. Clark then gave background on Commuter Connections. He stated that Visualize 2045 identifies Commuter Connections as the major transportation demand management component of the TPB's congestion management process. Commuter Connections is a regional network of over 30 independently run transportation TDM programs that provide commuter services and information to residents and employers within the Washington metropolitan region. These programs exist to help curtail the negative impacts of driving alone, high rates of which can lead to congested roadway conditions and increased emissions.

Mr. Clark stated that efforts to reduce high rates of single occupant vehicles traditionally include ridematching facilitation, administration of the Guaranteed Ride Home program, grassroots outreach efforts at employer sites, and coordinated marketing campaigns across the region. These efforts have successfully influenced travel behaviors in a manner that optimizes the efficiency of the existing transportation infrastructure: In fact, the 2016 *State of the Commute* report validated our efforts in finding over 3 million daily vehicle miles traveled were reduced because of Commuter Connections.

As a future reference point, the Commuter Connections network seeks to amplify the effectiveness of these tried-and-true strategies while also thoughtfully developing new, innovative programs that encourage the sustainable use of the existing transportation network. The memorandum to this committee in today's agenda packet outlines suggested TDM strategies for the TPB to consider for implementation purposes. Mr. Clark then revised the memorandum from the Commuter Connections *Long-Range Plan TDM Initiative Work Group*. He also thanked the Subcommittee volunteers who stepped forward to help develop these strategies, all of whom are listed on the first page of the memo.

Mr. Clark stated that the work group was guided by previous findings from the Phase 1 Baseline Report of the Long-Range Transportation Plan, which suggested further exploration of four SOV reduction strategies such as employer-based parking cash-out; expanded employer-based transit/vanpool benefits; expanded telework and flexible schedule adoption; and substantial increases in priced commuter parking in major Activity Centers throughout the region. Mr. Clark explained the connection to these base strategies in the

recommendations. The recommendations are consistent with the aspirational element of *Visualize 2045* to “provide more telecommuting and other options for commuting.”

As the work group discussed ways to enhance and grow TDM programs and policies, it became apparent that the recommendations could be grouped into one of two categories: They were either site-specific, micro strategies that could be implemented at worksites and/or activity centers, or they were broad overarching policy recommendations that could be incorporated into local jurisdictions’ comprehensive plans and/or city codes. These two “buckets” of strategies are broken down into one of two categories in the memo: Programming & Resources or Plans & Policies.

Mr. Clark then reviewed the programmatic and resource development recommendations in Category 1 of the memorandum.

Commuter Connections recommends developing pilot programs to be tested at targeted employers throughout the region. The beauty of pilot programs is that they can be carefully developed and implemented in a controlled manner at a specific worksite. Data from the various elements of these programs can then be identified, tracked, and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of various program elements. Based on the findings from this analysis, Commuter Connections can then enhance the overall effectiveness of the programs before packaging the pilot as a case study and expanding implementation at new worksites.

These pilot programs will be developed in accordance with TPB aspirations. For instance, Commuter Connections may partner with a worksite to develop a program that seeks to increase the percentage of employees telecommuting by 10%. Commuter Connections staff and local TDM representatives will work directly with the employer to create or update policies, incentives, gamification elements, etc. to help increase the number of employees teleworking at the worksite.

Mr. Clark went on to explain that perhaps a worksite aspires to develop a parking cash-out policy for its employees. In that case, Commuter Connections staff and local TDM representatives will work directly with the employer to draft a phased policy that carefully considers the unique interests of the employees. Our team will be there to monitor employee perception of the program and offer suggestions for enhancements throughout its duration.

While these are just a couple of examples, there are ample opportunities for pilot programs to take place at worksites throughout the region. It’s important to remember that the key enhancement for this recommended strategy is equipping our program with the resources to meet the specific needs of employers who participate in these pilot programs. Whereas Commuter Connections has succeeded in the past by offering one-size-fits-all information and commuter assistance to employees, we believe our effectiveness going forward will be dependent upon our ability to act as expert consultants in assisting employers with site-specific TDM programs and policies, from the development, all the way through to program implementation. We’ve found that employers are not always savvy with implementing TDM programs on their own, but our program experts can help pick up the slack.

Getting beyond site-specific pilot programs, Mr. Clark stated that Commuter Connections is recommending a higher level of collaboration with WMATA in the promotion of SmartBenefits to employers in the region. WMATA has recently committed to investing \$1.5 million dollars in the SmartBenefits program, and the Commuter Connections network can leverage this investment by enticing employers to participate in the program. SmartBenefits participants have shown to be more open to SOV alternatives due to the tax benefits or direct subsidy associated with the program. There may even be an opportunity to expand SmartBenefits to

other TDM initiatives such as incentives for carpooling or biking to work instead of driving alone. While the details of these advancements need to be developed in tandem with WMATA and are likely further down the road, the successful SmartBenefits program is a platform that can be leveraged for future TDM opportunities.

Collaborating with an improved SmartBenefits program is just one of many potential program enhancements made possible by technological advancements being realized in the transportation sector. Our committee is focused on leveraging technology to create new ways to influence behavior change away from SOVs. Commuter Connections anticipates continuing to enhance our real-time carpooling app CarpoolNow, our trip influencer app incenTrip which was developed in collaboration with the University of Maryland, and advanced incentive programs such as Flextime Rewards with improvements that consider behavioral economics concepts to help further encourage mode shift.

In addition to these existing efforts, Commuter Connections also has its ear tuned to emerging technologies such as TNCs, dockless bikes and scooters, automated vehicles, and Mobility as Service models of transportation delivery. We're aware of "doomsday" scenarios that may introduce Zero Occupant Vehicles within the *Visualize2045* plan horizon which is a scary thought for those of us who can agree that congestion is already bad enough as it is. To prevent unsustainable scenarios such as this, Commuter Connections recognizes the potential need to develop a public resource, program, and/or policies to encourage a shared-use model of mobility. Understanding these technological innovations and knowing how to use them to improve SOV-alternative commuting options will allow Commuter Connections to operate an impactful program well throughout the *Visualize2045* timeframe.

The final programmatic strategy focuses on the need to adapt flextime and telework resources to current standards. Efforts in the early 2000's were highly effective at introducing telework to the region. Now that telework is well-accepted among large employers, our strategies and implementation efforts can be evolved to help these employers expand their existing programs.

6B. Transit Recommendations: Regional Public Transportation

Mr. Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, a member of the Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee (RPTS) gave this briefing on behalf of the Chair, David Koch, who could not attend. The briefing included the recommendations of the RPTS for projects, programs, and policies to advance the endorsed aspirational initiatives.

In development of this briefing, the RPTS conducted a survey and held discussions over several meetings in the development of these recommendations for the initiatives. The RPTS was tasked with considering three of the initiatives: 1) Regionwide Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Transitways, 2) Access Improvements to High-Capacity Transit Stations, and 3) Metrorail Core Capacity Improvements / Move More People on Metro. The survey asked about impediments to realizing the full potential of the initiatives, what specific actions (including projects, programs, and policies) could be taken to advance these ideas, what resources are needed to enable these actions, and what actions can the region collectively take. For each of these initiatives, Mr. Erenrich briefed a slide summarizing the main discussion points among the RPTS members. For the first two initiatives, a recommendation was provided.

For the BRT initiative, the RPTS recommended identifying a definition of density (transit use, ridership, and land use) in the region as a standard for the feasibility of BRT. The creation of such a standard would enable the ability to measure progress in the development and implementation of BRT corridors and allow for a mapping out of potential BRT corridors,

specifically in terms of land use for future planning and implementation. Mr. Erenrich promoted the concept of people moving as the focus of transportation planning rather than moving vehicles. He also mentioned the recently launched WMATA Bus Transformation Project, which complements the objectives of the aspirations.

For the Access to Transit Station initiative, the RPTS recommended that agencies should prioritize the functionality of high capacity transit stations for all modes, prioritizing improvements to the efficiency of transit stations, which would result in improved reliability of buses and cars but be particularly beneficial to pedestrians. In addition, efficient stations would allow for optimal multimodal transfers from system to system. One component of improving the functionality of high capacity transit stations should be improving safety in and around the stations, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists. Gary suggested a matrix of responsible agencies be prepared for all the seven initiatives, to identify who would be the implementing agencies.

Gary spoke to some of the discussion about Metro Capacity initiative, for which discussion included the options of fare changes and subsidies for economically disadvantaged groups and reverse commuters to promote use. However, the RPTS did not reach consensus on any recommendations for this initiative.

Mr. Bob Brown, Loudoun County stated his agreement with the recommendation for improving the functionality of stations and suggested this would be a focus for Loudoun County as they prepare for Silver Line phase two to open.

Dan Malouff, Arlington County asked if there was any discussion about street space improvements during the standards discussion. The response was that the discussion did not get this detailed, but it seems it would be a natural outcome of setting standards. Mr. Erenrich also mentioned that a standard for a dedicated bus lane, whether forty buses per hour or several persons on buses per hour.

Allison Davis, WMATA added that such standards should not just be about service and transit operations, but also roadway agencies and enforcement agencies who must be included in implementing these recommendations.

Kanti Srikanth, COG/TPB suggested a set of performance standards might also be considered. He also hoped that the RPTS might further discuss a recommendation for the Metro Capacity initiative.

Bob Brown, Loudoun County asked about the work of NVTC and DRPT on metrics for transit reporting. Dan Goldfarb responded that NVTC has considered such work at a macro level; the goal is a report card that will help jurisdictions make decisions, such as Alexandria with their Transit Vision study. Ms. Ciara Williams, VDRPT responded that this work is in progress at DRPT and might be a topic for a future briefing.

6C. Non-Motorized Recommendations: Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee

Ms. Cindy Engelhart, Chair of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee spoke to a PowerPoint. Ms. Engelhart is also the District Bike/Ped Coordinator for Northern Virginia. Ms. Engelhart commended the TPB for its support for walking and bicycling and thanked the TPB for requesting its input on the nonmotorized initiatives.

The Subcommittee discussed its recommendations at two separate meetings. The loop route of the National Capital Trail was identified eight years ago by Jay Fisette, a former Chair of

the TPB. The inspiration for the National Capital Trail was the Atlanta Beltline trail. The consensus of the Subcommittee was that, while the National Capital Trail was accessible to many people and jobs, it is no longer visionary enough. Its scope is too limited, and it does not include the outer jurisdictions.

A local coalition, the Capital Trails Coalition, has been working on a regional trail plan for the last three years. Mike Farrell, COG/TPB staff has been working with them, helping to shape their goals and proposed network. The Subcommittee would like to expand on the work of the Capital Trails Coalition, and make it a TPB activity, expanding it to the outer jurisdictions.

The second recommendation of the Subcommittee concerned access to high capacity transit. There is considerable scope for improving pedestrian and bicycle connections to Metro stations. The Subcommittee's recommendation was to identify a list of transit stations for walk/bike improvements, considering critical gaps in infrastructure and potential for increased ridership, equity emphasis areas, activity, density, and safety.

Recommendation #3 was to expand the Transportation-Land Use Connections (TLC) program. The Subcommittee thought that this program is a very effective seed money program for walk and bike projects. The Subcommittee recommends a sharp increase in funding for the TLC program.

In sum, the Bike/Ped Subcommittee recommends that the National Capital Trail should be expanded into a Capital Trails Network incorporating all the TPB jurisdictions, that priority transit stations should be identified for walk/bike improvements, and funding should be increased for the TLC program.

Mr. Brown thanked Ms. Engelhart, and noted that a lot of effort has been going to station area planning in Loudoun, with nearly \$20 million going into improving walk/bike access around the Metro stations.

Ms. Davis asked that we make sure to acknowledge that high capacity transit is not just rail. Mr. Farrell noted that we deliberately used the phrase "high-capacity transit" and not "rail transit". Ms. Davis replied that bus transit was likely to be neglected if not mentioned specifically.

Ms. Davis asked what gap the TLC program filled – there is funding for planning, but often a lack of money for design. Mr. Srikanth asked whether the intent would be to use planning funds for project planning purposes – there may be federal limitations on the use of UPWP funding.

Mr. Farrell noted that the current TLC program covers up to 30% design. \$30,000 for conceptual plans, and up to \$80,000 for 30% design. The project needs to be completed within a year.

The feedback from the Subcommittee is that not all the jurisdictions have enough planning capacity needed to get conceptual plans together, and that having consultant support has been critical in getting conceptual plans done. The 30% design is a magic number in terms of getting questions answered that can help unlock further funds. The Subcommittee thought that this program offered pretty good bang for the buck and was a good place to put more resources.

Ms. Engelhart asked whether we need to rephrase recommendation #3. Ms. Erickson replied that we probably did not. The main point was "more", and we could have further discussions

about how much more, but we can all agree that the program is of good value. The Bike/Ped Subcommittee would not meet until after the November TPB meeting, but we could work with Ms. Engelhart. These recommendations will be revisited at the October TPB Tech meeting.

7. Performance Based Planning & Programming – Transit Safety Rule

TPB Planner Matthew Gaskin gave a presentation on the recent final rule for Transit Safety Agency Plans. The final rule was issued on July 19, 2018. It will become effective on July 19, 2019. This final ruling serves as a capstone for a collection of earlier rules and guidance covering the Public Transportation Safety Program. The final rule requires applicable public transportation agencies to develop and implement Public Transportation Agency Safety Plans (PTASP). Another requirement is the setting of Transit Safety Performance Measures. Mr. Gaskin gave a quick overview of the other rules and guidance that make up the Public Transportation Safety Program. The Transit Safety Measures (Fatalities, Injuries, Safety Events, and System Reliability) were also discussed. Transit agencies that receive or are subrecipients of 5307 grant funding and have more than 100 peak revenue vehicles in service are required to create a PTASP. Those smaller transit agencies (less than 100 peak revenue vehicles) and recipients/sub recipients of 5307 grant funding, may opt to either develop their own PTASP or have the state DOT office (i.e. MTA, DRTP) develop a PTASP for them.

Mr. Gaskin provided a current listing of those applicable agencies. PTASP creation is required by June 2020. Between now and then the TPB will continue to coordinate with agencies concerning PTASP and the Transit Safety Measures. After June 2020, Transit Safety Measures will need to be updated annually.

8. Nice Bridge Bicycle / Pedestrian Information Memo for Discussion

The Chair noted that this item was on WTOP this morning. Ms. Erickson noted that in May, Charles Allen asked staff to help TPB develop a position on bike and pedestrian accommodation on the Governor Harry Nice Bridge. The Chair will likely ask us to develop a letter to MDTA based on some of this information. The Nice Bridge may also provide a precedent for other bridge projects.

Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint outlining the contents of an informational memo on the Governor Harry Nice Bridge project. This memo also summarized the information from staff research on a few factors related to shared bicycle lanes vs. barrier-separated lanes, and provided information on TPB's precedent regarding bicycle-pedestrian accommodations across major river crossings. The Nice Bridge is a toll bridge, run by the Maryland Transportation Authority. It connects Charles County, MD with King George County, VA. It was built in 1938, has two narrow lanes, no shoulders, speed limit of 50 mph, and no bike or ped accommodation. Average daily traffic count is over 18,600 vehicles.

The need for the project is driven primarily by the age and deteriorating condition of the bridge. Maintenance costs are increasing, as are traffic disruptions due to maintenance, which requires closing at least one of the two travel lanes. Clearing crashes usually requires closing both lanes. The bridge is not consistent with the rest of US 301, which has four lanes with a median and wide shoulders. Routine congestion is not high but there are regular back-ups on summer weekends due to beach traffic. Truck volumes are also high.

MDTA is proposing two alternatives for replacement. The first is a 61-foot-wide design with four 12-foot lanes, no pedestrian accommodation, and shared lane access for bicyclists. The second is a 71-foot-wide design with four 12-foot lanes and an 8-foot barrier-separated pedestrian and bicycle path. The bidders will prepare detailed designs and cost estimates for these two alternatives, and the

MDTA board will make its decision in the Fall of 2019, with a construction start in FY 2020. The existing bridge will remain open during construction.

MDTA sent a representative, Will Pines, to present to the Bike/Ped Subcommittee in May. The TPB has requested additional information on the project, which this memo provides. The Bike/Ped Subcommittee believes that the shared lane alternative involves significant safety and best practices concerns for bicyclists. The shared lane alternative involves bicyclists riding in the middle of the lane on a 50-mph bridge.

The bridge will feature steep (4%) grades and heavy truck traffic. The speed limit will be 50 mph, the same as on the current bridge, even though the lanes will be wider, and the four-lane configuration will allow for passing. The subcommittee believes that operating speeds are likely to be higher than 50 mph.

There is abundant research showing that high speed differences lead to more fatal crashes, and as traffic speeds get higher than 50 mph the proportion of fatal bicycle crashes increases exponentially. Maryland prohibits shared lane use for bicyclists on roads with speed limits greater than 50 mph. Bicyclists are to operate on the shoulders of such roads. National design guidance calls for barrier-separation on long bridges of this type.

There are also related access issues for the shared lane alternative. There is no pedestrian access, and based on speed, we expect that only fit and fearless bicyclists will use it. Based on precedent from other bridges that MDTA runs, safety concerns and traffic growth are also likely to lead to severe day and hours of use restrictions for bicyclists.

For the barrier-separated alternative, MDTA projects no pedestrian use and 50 bicyclists per day, based on the population near the bridge. So essentially commuter use or local use. In making that projection MDTA did not consider non-DOT facilities such as the planned Dahlgren Trail in Virginia which will end within roughly a mile of the bridge. Long distance bicycle tourism and bicycle traffic on non-DOT facilities might increase the count. Moreover, the Nice Bridge is located within a 30-mile drive of the urbanized area of the Washington region. While the area is rural now, there is considerable potential for development within the 100-year life span of the new bridge.

MDTA did not yet consider the potential for long distance bicycle tourism or related economic development benefits. The Allegheny Passage trail in western Maryland attracts large numbers of overnight visitors, who are mostly bicyclists, who spend roughly \$125/per person/day in local businesses. The Subcommittee believes that there is considerable potential for long-distance bicycle tourism in Southern Maryland and in the Northern Neck of Virginia, which have many low-traffic, flat roads with shoulders, and numerous tourist attractions.

Virtually all the TPB's policy documents, from the Vision on, call for more walking and bicycling. The TPB's Complete Streets policy calls for safe and adequate accommodation for all users. The TPB's Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan calls for the use of current best practices and design standards. TPB helped secure a barrier-protected path on the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. Charles County's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan calls for barrier-separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the Nice Bridge. Finally, in a November 21, 2016 press release announcing funding for the bridge, the Governor stated that the new bridge would include a barrier-separated bicycle and pedestrian path. That statement has not been retracted.

Mr. Farrell showed diagrams of the proposed bridge cross-sections, and photo of the Francis Scott Key Bridge, which is like the shared-lane alternative that MDTA would like to build. Mr. Malouff mentioned that the 8-foot path was very narrow. The AASHTO recommendation is 14 feet. Was there any consideration of providing a wider path?

Mr. Farrell agreed that the 8 feet does not meet the AASHTO guidance, although the AASHTO guidance is not a requirement. Based on past MDTA experience, the rationale for having such a narrow path is that there will be essentially no pedestrian use, and only about 50 bicyclists per day, so passing events will be relatively infrequent. It's a cost-based compromise. Every foot of width adds cost.

The Subcommittee expressed concern that two bicyclists passing each other, especially at high speeds on the steep section, would pose a safety hazard. They suggested that bicyclists or pedestrians using this bridge are going to want to stop at the top to rest and enjoy the view. They suggested including a wide section or viewing platform at the top, to allow people to stop outside of the flow of bike traffic. Mr. Farrell said that he thought the view from the top of the bridge could be a significant attraction. This bridge is going to be tall enough to allow the passage of tall ships. People often stop to enjoy the view on the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. Mr. Farrell said that he believed that MDTA's focus has been very narrow in serving the interest of the motoring public, to the exclusion of other uses and purposes that such a facility may serve.

Ms. Snyder said that the two alternatives are what is going in the bid. That's the decision the Board has made, based on the needs of their toll-paying customers and the best return on investment for their users. MDTA is not part of the transportation trust fund; they depend entirely on toll revenue. Woodrow Wilson carries 250,000 vehicles per day and about 600 bicyclists and pedestrians. It connects two densely populated areas. Ms. Snyder said that she appreciates that this is important to the TPB, but this area has different needs, and different users.

This bridge replacement will never pay for itself in its life. It will be subsidized by other MDTA facilities, like the Baltimore tunnel and the Bay Bridge. Just getting a barrier-protected facility included in the bid is a major success since MDTA does not normally have bicycle or pedestrian accommodation on their facilities.

By 2040 the Nice Bridge may have 80,000 vehicles per day, which is much less than bridges within the urbanized area. The cost estimate for the 8-foot lane is roughly \$60 million.

Ms. Erickson said that MDTA has set aside a certain amount of money in the long-range plan, about \$700 million. The cost was reduced from the original \$1 billion, which was not financially feasible, mostly by narrowing the bridge and by shifting the navigation channel.

Another member asked if there was an existing bridge with a separated shared use path, of similar length and height, and projected ridership. Ms. Erickson said that Mr. Farrell had focused mostly on Maryland and Virginia examples. Mr. Farrell said that there are such bridges, such as the Golden Gate in San Francisco, and the new Tappan Zee Bridge over the Hudson in New York State, which will have an elaborate bicycle and pedestrian facility.

Mr. Farrell remarked that MDTA has been very convincing about the need for this project. While it's true that there is only a certain revenue projected at current toll levels, there is a high volume of truck traffic that needs to follow this route, and the detour is 105 miles. This project certainly has the potential to pay for itself.

Mr. Erenrich asked whether a shuttle system had been considered. Ms. Snyder replied that bicycle user groups had rejected that option when it was brought up.

Mr. Srikanth said that the point is for the TPB to express its preferences, using the information in this memo. The Chairman would like the TPB to reach a consensus, which will likely be expressed in a memo from TPB to the MDTA. MDTA will consider whether it can be funded.

Mr. Davis asked what would happen to the old Bridge. Ms. Snyder replied that it is scheduled to be demolished. There had been discussions with Charles County about taking over ownership and maintenance of the old bridge, but that Charles County is not financially ready to take that on. Ms. Erickson confirmed that. Another consideration is that one of the costs saving design changes resulted in shifting the shipping channel.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that this item should not be handled at the same TPB meeting as at Visualize. We don't want to jeopardize the adoption of Visualize, and there is no rush on the Nice Bridge memo.

Mr. Srikanth asked if we wanted the TPB's letter to the MDTA to include a mention of the option of retaining the existing bridge and using it as a bicycle and pedestrian facility? Mr. Malouff replied that the thing that matters is having a safe and useable facility, however that can be achieved. He expressed skepticism about the \$60 million cost estimate. The goal is separate from the strategy, with the caveat that whatever we recommend needs to be part of the bridge replacement project, not made a separate project.

Mr. Orleans expressed his support for a barrier-separated facility. TPB should go on record supporting one.

9. Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations Annual Conference Highlights

TPB staff talked about their activities at the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO). They summarized their presentations and what they learned from other MPOs regarding autonomous vehicles, public participation, and other MPO activities.

10. Other Business

- Tim Canan COG/TPB staff informed he committee of an FAA grant opportunity to evaluate and make recommendations to enhance the Regional Air Passenger Survey program. He announced that COG/TPB intends to pursue a grant opportunity for FAA funding to evaluate the COG/TPB air passenger survey and make recommendations for improving survey response rates.
- Lynn Winchell-Mendy reminded the committee of two FTA Grant Opportunities. One is called the Innovative Coordinated Access & Mobility Pilot Program (ICAM) that is available to grantees who are currently receiving enhanced mobility funding. The goal of the ICAM program is to improve access to healthcare through transportation. The total program is about \$3.9 million for recipients who are ready to implement capital projects. This grant requires a 20% match to the 80% federal contribution. The second grant opportunity is called the Human Services Coordination Research Program (HSCR) which is for \$2.4 million and is focused on innovation in the coordination of human service transportation. The program requires that recipients' activity be tied to a locally developed coordination plan. Both opportunities have an 18-month timeframe and are to be submitted through Grants.gov. The deadline to submit is November 13 at 11:59 pm.

11. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – October 5, 2018**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Kristin Calkins

MARYLAND

Charles County Beth Yeckley
Alex Waltz
Frederick County Charles Freeman
City of Frederick Timothy Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County Gary Erenrich
Prince George’s County Victor Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery County -----
Prince George’s County -----
MDOT Kari Snyder
Kandese Holford
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria -----
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County Malcolm Watson
Mike Lake
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas
NVTA Sree Nampoothiri
NVTC Dan Goldfarb
Prince William County Paolo Belita
PRTC
VRE Sonali Soneji
VDOT Norman Whitaker
Regina Moore
VDRPT Ciara Williams
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----
WMATA Allison Davis

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP
Lyn Erickson, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Tim Canan, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Anant Choudhary, DTP
Bill Bacon, DTP
Brandon Brown, DTP
Kenneth Joh, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Dan Sheehan, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Sergio Ritacco, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Lori Zeller, DTP
Abigail Zenner, DTP
Sunil Kumar, DEP
Lynn Winchell-Mendy, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Jinchul Park, DTP
Matthew Gaskin, DTP
Arianna Koudounas, DTP
James Li, DTP

OTHER

Alexandra Brun, MDE
Sunhil Kumar
Bill Orleans
Joseph Jakuta
Alexandra Catena
Sonali Soneji