

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**  
Technical Committee Minutes  
*for meeting of*  
October 7, 2011

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - October 7, 2011**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                    Mark Rawlings  
DCOP                    -----

**MARYLAND**

Charles County        Jason Groth  
Frederick Co.         Ronald Burns  
City of Frederick     Tim Davis  
Gaithersburg         -----  
Montgomery Co.       Gary Erenrich  
Prince George's Co.   Lou Farber  
Rockville             -----  
M-NCPPC  
  Montgomery Co.     -----  
  Prince George's Co. -----  
MDOT                  Lyn Erickson  
MTA                    Mark Baskin  
Takoma Park          -----

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria            Pierre Holloman  
Arlington Co.         Jennifer Fioetti  
City of Fairfax        Alexis Verzosa  
Fairfax Co.            Mike Lake  
Falls Church         -----  
Loudoun Co.            -----  
Manassas              -----  
Prince William Co.    Monica Backmon  
NVTC                    -----  
PRTC                    Nick Alexandrow  
VRE                     -----  
VDOT                    Kanathur Srikanth  
VDRPT                  David Awbrey  
NVPDC                  -----  
VDOA                    -----

**WMATA**

WMATA                 Mark Kellogg

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

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

**COG Staff**

Ronald Kirby, DTP  
Gerald Miller, DTP  
Mark Pfoutz, DTP  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Robert Griffiths, DTP  
Michael Farrell, DTP  
Andy Meese, DTP  
Jane Posey, DTP  
Wenjing Pu, DTP  
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Daniel Son, DTP  
Erin Morrow, DTP  
Joan Rohlf, DEP  
Sunil Kumar, DEP

**Other Attendees**

Randy Carroll, MDE  
Khattab Shammout, Prince William Co.  
Rick Rybeck, Just Economics LLC  
Vaughn Lewis, MDOT  
Carey Roessel, Marquise Management  
Bill Orleans, HACK

# TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

October 7, 2011

## Technical Committee Minutes

---

### 1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from September 9 TPB Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### 2. **Briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2011 CLRP**

Ms. Posey noted that copies of the summary conformity report were available in the back of the room. She reviewed the conformity analysis using a power point presentation. She discussed the technical approach used in the conformity analysis, including detailing changes to the travel demand model since the last conformity analysis. She noted that trips and VMT increase through time, but that emissions decrease through time until 2040, when they start to rise again. She reviewed the emissions criteria for each pollutant, and showed bar charts displaying the pollutant levels for all forecast years as compared to the motor vehicle emissions budgets. She noted that staff is currently preparing a memorandum explaining the travel demand and emission changes since the previous conformity analysis and stated that the memo would be available at the beginning of the public comment period. Ms. Posey reviewed the schedule, and noted that the public comment period starts on October 13, and that the TPB will be asked to approve the conformity analysis and adopt the 2011 CLRP at the November meeting.

Mr. Srikanth asked Ms. Rohlfs if it was premature to remove the budget line in the tables showing fine particles pollutants. Ms. Rohlfs replied that the lines should not be removed, as there is a chance that EPA might approve the submitted PM budgets before a PM maintenance SIP [currently being developed] is approved.

### 3. **Briefing on the Draft 2011 CLRP**

Mr. Austin talked about the projects described in the materials titled, Significant Additions and Changes to the 2011 Update to the CLRP. He noted that the projects included three in Virginia that had been approved in July 2011 as amendments to the 2010 CLRP. He stated that these were included in the current materials to be consistent with the descriptions released at the beginning of the update cycle. These projects included the I-395/I-95 HOV/HOT Lanes project limit changes, the I-395 HOV Lanes reversible ramp at Seminary Road, and the widening of I-66 to include both HOV and general purpose lanes. The projects would be released for a 30-day public comment period at the Citizens Advisory Committee on October 13, along with the Air Quality Conformity Analysis. Following that the TPB would be asked to approve the projects for inclusion in the CLRP on November 16. Mr. Austin noted that since moving to a two-year cycle, there would be no TIP to accompany this update.

Mr. Srikanth asked if a brochure would be produced to accompany this update, as had been done in previous years. Mr. Austin confirmed that there would be.

#### **4. Briefing on the Draft TPB Project Application for Funding Under the FY 2011 Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Competitive Grant Program**

Mr. Randall distributed and spoke to a presentation on the status of development of the TPB's application for a TIGER grant in support of Multimodal Access Improvements for Rail Station Areas in the Washington Region. The pre-application was submitted on Friday, September 30, and the complete application is due on October 31. He reviewed the various elements needed for the application, including the outline of the narrative. The seven component projects that form the TPB's application were reviewed. Mr. Randall then discussed the required benefit-cost analysis in further detail and presented draft results for the analysis of the Forest Glen Metro Access project in Montgomery County.

Mr. Awbrey asked if pedestrians would still use the street-level crossing if the pedestrian tunnel under Georgia Avenue was built. Mr. Randall clarified that some 85% of the pedestrian traffic is associated with the Metro and these users are all assumed to use the tunnel, but that other pedestrians would continue to cross at street level. The fewer numbers would reduce total signal time and delays for traffic. .

Mr. Erenrich elaborated that an alternative to the tunnel project is a bridge overpass. This would be cheaper in construction cost, and avoid traffic disruption during construction. He would like to see a benefit-cost analysis of this alternative as well. Mr. Randall responded that this should be feasible.

Chairman Kellogg asked for clarification on what would be presented to the TPB at their October meeting, due to interest in such economic analysis. Mr. Randall responded that staff would like to complete and review the analysis in more detail, and the schedule for completing that is still uncertain.

Mr. Rawlings asked if the proposed funding request would change. Mr. Randall said that the application would be in a menu format, enabling USDOT to individually consider each component project. This could lead to a grant amount different from the funding request. This is also easier for analysis, though there will be some network effects considered, and should make the application more competitive.

Ms. Erickson asked if TPB staff were still considering a video of the proposal. Mr. Randall stated there is still interest in this, but acknowledged that time and resources are limited.

Ms. Backmon asked if there were any comments received on the pre-application. Mr. Randall stated that these are still being reviewed by USDOT staff. He then elaborated that Ms. Jackson of the FHWA had contacted TPB staff to provide an initial review schedule for applications following submission, and that TPB will likely be responding to questions in November about the application and in December about the NEPA status and the benefit-cost analysis.

Mr. Shammout asked if the Forest Glen tunnel could be shorter than proposed. Mr. Erenrich responded that the south-side alternative is the shorter path, as opposed to the original diagonal proposal, and is a better option for persons traveling to and from the hospital on the connecting paths. He added that Montgomery County is working with the landowner, a church, and anticipated their full support of the project, which would include a letter to the TPB.

**5. Briefing on Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP**

Mr. Austin discussed the schedule for the 2012 Update to the CLRP, the FY 2013-2018 TIP, and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis. He emphasized that project inputs for conformity analysis were due on December 16, 2011 and that inputs for the TIP were due on May 1, 2012. He also stated that the language in the Evolving Policy Context and Direction for the 2012 Plan section had been updated.

Mr. Srikanth stated that the early schedule allows for TPB approval of inputs prior to the proposed March 3 deadline set by EPA to begin using the MOVES model, allowing the TPB to continue using the MOBILE 6 model. He also noted that EPA had received extensive comments and recommendations to delay that deadline. Ms. Constantine confirmed that EPA had announced that it would extend the deadline to March 2013. She noted that TPB staff were ready for the new model, but that the institutional framework to support it was missing, so the delay was beneficial.

**6. Briefing on Amendments to the FY 2012 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Revise the Budget, Respond to the Federal Transportation Planning Certification Review, and Incorporate the Scope and Process to Develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan**

Mr. Miller distributed a Powerpoint handout and referred to the memorandum in the mailout on the proposed changes. He reminded the Committee that at the September 9 meeting it was briefed on this amendment to the 2012 UPWP budget to reflect changes in new FY 2012 funding and adjustments in the unobligated FY 2010 funding provided by DDOT, MDOT and VDOT. He said that the Committee was also briefed on text changes to implement the recommendations included in the May federal certification report on the transportation planning process for the Washington DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area. He then presented a ten-page Powerpoint on the proposed budget changes and amendments to work activities in the program. He said that Mr. Kirby would give this presentation to the TPB at its October 19 meeting when it will be asked to approve the budget revisions and work activity text amendments.

Chairman Kellogg asked about the TPB funding commitment for the HUD Sustainable Communities Planning grant application that COG had recently submitted. Mr. Miller said that this UPWP includes funding for TPB staff involvement in this effort through June 30, 2012. Depending on when COG is awarded this multi-year grant, the funding for TPB staff involvement will need to be revisited for the FY 2013 UPWP.

Mr. Erenrich commented on the amendments to respond to the federal review recommendations for the public participation activity. He asked if the federal review team had identified which MPOs were best in doing public outreach. Mr. Miller said that the federal team had not identified other MPOs that are doing these recommended activities.

Ms. Erickson commented that her experience at the federal reviews of the MPOs in Maryland suggests that the federal team shies away from specific examples and is always calling for doing more in the future.

## 7. Briefing on a New Sensitivity Test for the CLRP Aspirations Scenario

Ms. Morrow, speaking from a handout, presented the results of the “Streamlined” Variable Priced Lane (VPL) Network Sensitivity Test for the CLRP Aspirations Scenario. A draft technical memorandum for this item was in the mailout. She recapped the CLRP Aspirations Scenario which had three components – land use shifts, a regional network of variably priced lanes, and supportive transit which included a regional BRT network on the priced lanes. The results of the full scenario and a sensitivity test, which analyzed the land use changes alone with the adopted transportation networks, for forecast year 2030 were presented to the TPB in September 2010. The Streamlined sensitivity test with a VPL network with less lane and interchange construction was conducted in response to concerns about the cost and extent of the VPL networking in the Aspirations Scenario.

Ms. Morrow presented metrics for all three scenarios (full Aspirations, land use sensitivity, and streamlined VPL) such as regional travel indicators, congestion indicators, mode share, and air quality as compared to a 2030 Baseline (2008 CLRP + Round 7.2 Land Use). Overall, the Streamlined VPL Network Sensitivity Test showed significant reductions in vehicle hours of delay and travel, similar to that of the full CLRP Aspirations scenario, and it could be financially feasible in that toll revenues cover highway and transit costs, but capital and operating, which was not the case with the full scenario.

Mr. Erenrich questioned why, on slide 11, in the land use sensitivity test, VMT decreased, but vehicle trips increased, and that the slide should be explained better. Ms. Morrow said that there is more congestion in the land use sensitivity test. Mr. Sivasailam further explained that there is more population in the land use sensitivity test (as compared to the CLRP baseline) which drives the number of vehicle trips. Mr. Erenrich questioned why, given the results, the region should do anything beyond the land use changes. Mr. Srikanth responded that that slide 12 (Congestion Indicators) showed that the region cannot reduce congestion with land use changes alone.

Mr. Erenrich said that the Streamlined VPL network is not buildable as Montgomery County will not add lanes to the Capital Beltway and one loses credibility by presenting a scenario that would assume otherwise. Mr. Srikanth responded by saying that the TPB authorized the development of a scenario to see what “could” be done. He went on to say that one year ago, a scenario was presented with regional VPL and BRT network that could not pay for itself; however, with the Streamlined VPL Sensitivity shows that such a scenario could be financially viable.

Chairman Kellogg noted the increase in transit ridership (13.9%) in the full and streamlined scenario compared to baseline conditions and asked what happens to Metrorail downtown as it is forecasted to be at capacity in the core. Ms. Morrow said that the scenarios were modeled with the transit constraint that is used in modeling the CLRP, but the Version 2.2 model does not have transit assignment so it cannot show where the new trips are occurring. Mr. Milone said that will be addressed with the Version 2.3 model. Mr. Srikanth commented that if one looks at the regional BRT network, there are many suburb to suburb routes and that is where the trips likely are, not necessarily in the District of Columbia. Chairman Kellogg noted that the land use

shifts alone increased transit ridership by 10.5 percent over baseline forecasts. Mr. Sivasailam pointed out that the inclusion of BRT in the two scenarios (full and streamlined) account for the additional increase of 3.5% in transit trips.

Ms. Backmon asked when the Version 2.3 model would be used for scenario work. Mr. Miller responded that it is in the FY2012 UPWP and should be done this spring. Ms. Backmon responded that the analysis could then show where the transit increases are.

## **8. Update on the Regional “Street Smart” Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign**

Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint on the Street Smart pedestrian and bicycle safety campaign, including the activities and evaluation results from FY 2011, as well as funding and proposed activities for FY 2012.

Mr. Milone asked about speed cameras, and the charge that they are primarily revenue generators. Mr. Farrell replied that he believed that speed cameras were an effective enforcement tool, though they could not catch driver/pedestrian infractions such as failure to yield.

Ms. Backmon asked why the Fall 2010 press event had reached more people than the Spring 2011 event. Mr. Farrell replied that the Fall event in Arlington had included live law enforcement, a major draw for the television news, while the Spring event in the District did not.

Ms. Erenrich asked if Mr. Farrell could give the citation breakdown between motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Mr. Farrell replied that he did not have that information with him, but that very few citations had been given to bicyclists.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that we might want to focus more on bicyclists. Mr. Farrell replied that one of our posters urged cyclists to “Obey signs and signals”, but acknowledged that the campaign focused mostly on motorists and pedestrians. Mr. Erenrich suggested that bicycle crashes might increase due to the growth of Capital Bikeshare.

Mr. Rawlings asked about slide 17, the State funding item. The asterisk notes that this funding is federal funding administered by the States. The States are not providing any of their own money. Mr. Srikanth noted that the federal funds were coming from the States.

Mr. Farrell replied that he had to track which funds are federal for purposes of providing local match funds, since we cannot match federal funds with federal funds. We also have soft match, such as free PSA’s, but cash looks more convincing. Chairman Kellogg suggested that we not show the funds administered by the States as federal funds in this presentation.

## **9. Update on COG’s Regional Major Incident Response Action Plan**

Mr. Meese reported. At its March 9 meeting, the COG Board had formed a Major Incident Management and Response (IMR) Steering Committee in response to

the January 26 snowstorm, chaired by Councilmember Andrews of Montgomery County. It had been agreed to provide periodic update briefings on the IMR activities to both the COG Board and the TPB. Chairman Andrews was originally scheduled to brief the TPB at the October 19 meeting, but this briefing had been recently postponed to the November 16 TPB meeting. The reason for the postponement was that the IMR Steering Committee IMR committee was still engaged in substantive discussions on the content and recommendations of the Committee's report.

The IMR Committee had met four times: April 28, June 29, August 4, and September 28, and had scheduled upcoming meetings on October 12 and October 26.

The IMR Committee and COG staff were continuing to work on a report of findings and recommendations; this report had not yet been released for public comment. Although there was a delay in releasing the report for comment from early October to late October (date to be determined), the IMR Committee still intended to keep on its original schedule of completing its work before the November 9 COG Board of Directors meeting.

The change of schedule of release of the document, however, now meant that there would not be a TPB meeting between document release and the proposed November 9 date of the COG Board approval (though there would be a comment period in late October and early November). There was an anticipation that if there were major concerns heard from stakeholders after the release of the report, the November 9 COG Board approval date could be pushed back another month.

In response to a question from Mr. Erenrich regarding the time needed to implement recommendations before snow season, Mr. Meese responded that the report was anticipated to include both short-term and long-term recommendations with appropriate schedules. Mr. Erenrich noted that many jurisdictions' snow summit meetings for the upcoming season may already have occurred or were to occur soon.

In response to a question from Mr. Srikanth, Mr. Meese anticipated that the report would be shared with the Technical Committee for its November 4 meeting.

Mr. Kirby noted that there was some uncertainty in the IMR Committee's schedule, depending on the results of a revised draft report, designed to answer their earlier comments and requests, to be delivered to them for their October 12 meeting. If the new draft were accepted, then the report would be released sooner; if the IMR Committee felt that more work was needed, then the release date would be later, in conjunction with their October 26 meeting. The goal in any case was that the October 26 meeting would be the IMR Committee's final approval.

In response to a question from Mr. Srikanth, Mr. Kirby noted that a likely scenario was that the TPB would have to comment on an October 26 draft of the report between October 26 and November 9, with no opportunity for a TPB briefing on the draft during the comment period. This was contingent, however, on the outcome of the October 12 meeting. There was a strong preference by the IMR Committee to complete the report before the next snow season. Mr. Kirby agreed that the report would be shared with the Technical Committee when it became available to expedite comment.

Mr. Kirby noted that the draft report was anticipated to recommend greater resources to coordination and communication before and during snow events. The goal is to have better coordination between the people who have to handle transportation demand and the people who are influencing transportation demand (e.g., personnel and school decisions). Since the major changes recommended could not be implemented quickly, the report was anticipated to include short-term actions that could be implemented quickly to help with this upcoming snow season regarding communications and coordination.

In response to a question from Mr. Rawlings, Mr. Kirby confirmed that the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program was represented on the IMR Committee. Furthermore, the IMR Committee members had learned a great deal about MATOC and had a better appreciation for the things MATOC has accomplished. Anticipated related report recommendations included expanding MATOC operations to 24/7 (now only 5 days per week, 16 hours per day), and sharing MATOC information with the public, not just with other agencies. The links between MATOC and other sectors involved in snow and other events will need to be strengthened. In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Rawlings, Mr. Kirby noted that the new snow coordination functionality was not anticipated to be subsumed into MATOC, because it was multi-functional responsibility, whereas MATOC is focused on transportation.

#### **10. Briefing on the Draft National Capital Regional Congestion Report – A Congestion Management Process (CMP) “Dashboard”**

Mr. Pu, referring to a memorandum, introduced the draft National Capital Region (NCR) Congestion Report, which aims to provide timely (quarterly-updated) and dashboard-style highway performance measures and a quarterly spotlight on programs of the TPB and its member jurisdictions that would have an impact on congestion. This effort was largely driven by the emerging private sector probe-based traffic speed data made available through the I-95 Corridor Coalition Vehicle Probe Project. The report primarily focuses on the region's freeway system, with limited information from arterials due to the data coverage limitation imposed by the Vehicle Probe Project. Nor does this report include transit-related congestion information because a “Metro Scorecard” is already provided by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) on its web site. The draft Congestion Report tracks eight highway performance measures from the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2008 (when the Vehicle Probe Project started) to the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2010, and features a quarterly spotlight of incidents/events information extracted from the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS) and the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program.

Mr. Pu then went to a PowerPoint presentation of the draft NCR Congestion Report and explained more details about the performance measures, format, and challenges.

In response to Mr. Erenrich's question regarding the meaning of the arrows (in blue) on the first page of the report, Mr. Pu explained that the value of the performance measure is compared to that of the same time last year: a down arrow indicates a decrease and an up arrow increase. The number in the arrow indicates the change in percentage. Pages 2 and 3 provide the previous year data.

Mr. Erenrich asked the possible reasons for the percentage drops of the congested lane-miles and delay as indicated by the arrows. Mr. Pu replied that one of the challenges of the report is that the causal factors influencing congestion levels this quarter compared to the same quarter last year cannot be definitively determined. But a notable factor was different weather conditions (a major snow storm hit this region on December 19, 2009 and the impacts lasted for multiple days). Mr. Meese added that data for highway performance measures used to leave out major events/incidents, but the data used in this report include day-to-day changes and possible impacts of occurred events.

Mr. Erenrich asked whether it is possible to get more arterials data. Mr. Meese replied that the arterials data are provided by the Vehicle Probe Project, and currently there is no other sustainable data sources that can be used by this Congestion Report.

Ms. Constantine asked why the congestion on arterials increased in 2010 compared to previous years while such an increase was not observed on freeways. Mr. Pu said a possible reason would be the major constructions on freeways such as the Virginia Mega projects had directed freeway traffic to arterials. But he also admitted that there is no data to support this reasoning and only 2.5 years data are available after all.

Mr. Griffiths asked why the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI) Urban Mobility Report says the traffic had become worse in 2010 while this Congestion Report indicates the freeways were better. Mr. Pu replied that the discrepancies could be a result of the differences in data coverage (both spatially and temporally) and methodology. TTI used a lot of assumptions and estimates, while this Congestion Report sticks to the field observed data as closely as possible.

Mr. Srikanth complimented that this is excellent work. He suggested that the information provided in this report could be also useful to travelers. He asked the source of data for this report. Mr. Pu said the data include traffic speed from the Vehicle Probe Project (INRIX, Inc.), vehicle volume from state DOT detectors and traffic.com, and incident/events from the RITIS and the MATOC program.

Mr. Srikanth also complimented the measures on pages 8 and 9 of the report (travel time of the last or first 5 miles to or from the Beltway) and suggested that it would be useful to also show river-cross freeway stretches.

Mr. Lake asked what this report would say comparing with the TTI Urban Mobility Report. Mr. Pu replied that the TTI report focuses on national rankings while the NCR Congestion Report focuses on factual data to investigate more details of congestion in specifically the Washington region. Mr. Srikanth added that the NCR report is not a comparative analysis. Mr. Lake praised the NCR report since it is an inside view of this region's congestion problem.

Mr. Kirby later added that the TTI report is just an overview of the region's congestion and does not provide location and time specific information, which is the focus of the NCR report. The TTI report draws media's attention every time when the ranking changes while the causes of change could be methodology updates or performance measure changes.

Mr. Kirby said that the NCR Congestion Report is a good effort towards performance based planning and programming process, something that is expected to be addressed in the new reauthorization of the transportation bill. The TPB is selected by a NCHRP project as a pilot study agency for performance based planning in the aspect of congestion/operations. This NCR Congestion Report will play an important role in this study.

Mr. Lake suggested that the information provided in this report could be also useful to general travelers and questioned why the report is not scheduled to report to the TPB. Mr. Meese replied that the report will go to the TPB sometime, but currently there still are issues to be addressed such as the consistency of data source and methodology.

Mr. Srikanth thought the duration of congestion of the top 10 most severe bottlenecks on page 6 is shorter than what would be expected. Mr. Pu said the duration is averaged to all days including weekends and holidays. Mr. Srikanth suggested that those non-work days should be taken out. Mr. Pu agreed.

Mr. Erenrich suggested to look at congestion by day of the week, and to investigate the weather or incident effect on corridor travel time. Mr. Pu thanked him for the suggestions and said that could be done in the future.

Mr. Srikanth asked the meaning of "Congestion Alert", one of the event types summarized on page 10. Mr. Pu replied that it includes both recurring and non-recurring congestion. Those congestion alerts were generated by traffic operators at Traffic Management Centers and recorded by the RITIS. This report just borrowed the RITIS records and calculated the summary statistics. In a future report, the incidents/events portion could be replaced by another quarterly spotlight.

Chairman Kellogg asked if the speed data can differentiate HOV lanes and general purpose (GP) lanes. Mr. Pu replied that only the HOV lanes along I-395 and I-95 in Virginia can be separated from GP lanes. If there is no barrier between HOV and GP lanes (e.g. US-50, I-270), the speed data is an average of both types of lanes. Mr. Erenrich added that the travel time saving provided by the HOV lane on I-270 from I-370 to Germantown, MD is about 5 minutes.

## **11. Update on Regional Car Free Day 2011**

Mr. Ramfos distributed a PowerPoint presentation and then gave background information on World Car Free Day which was held on September 22<sup>nd</sup>. He stated that the Washington DC regional goal was to obtain 10,000 pledges from individuals who would go car free or "car-lite" on the 22<sup>nd</sup>. He then summarized some of the events that were held in various jurisdictions as well as retail promotions that were geared towards the event day. Next, he presented results from event pledge participation going back to 2007. There was a 70% increase between 2010 and 2011 in the number of pledges received for the event. In 2010, there were about 6,900 pledges and in 2011 there approximately 11,800 pledges.

Mr. Ramfos stated that the increase in pledges was not surprising given recent dramatic increases in both ridematching and Guaranteed Ride Home applications

received through Commuter Connections. Two slides were presented which showed a 50% increase in the number of ridematching applications received from January to June of this year compared to last year during the same time period and a 65% increase in the number of Guaranteed Ride Home applications received during the same time periods.

Mr. Ramfos then showed the number of pledges received for Car Free Day by jurisdiction. The District of Columbia followed by Montgomery and Fairfax County all had a significant number of pledges. All jurisdictions in the region had individuals that pledged. Mr. Ramfos then discussed the web site and statistics regarding web site visits that were received during the promotional period for the Car Free Day event.

Mr. Ramfos also covered the mode splits of those who pledged for the event. Bicycling and Walking garnered over 60% of the mode split, followed by transit use at 25% and then carpool/vanpool at 8% followed by telework at 5%. Mr. Ramfos then reviewed the transportation and emission impacts resulting from the event.

Mr. Rawlings asked whether or not the pledge goal was met for the 2011 event. Mr. Ramfos responded that the goal was exceeded based on the 11,787 pledges received and tabulated. Ms. Erickson asked how the impacts were calculated. Mr. Ramfos stated that the information on each participants current mode travel and pledged mode travel on Car Free Day was factored into the calculation. Ms. Fioretti asked how individuals who typically take car free or car-lite modes were handled in the calculation. Mr. Sivasailam stated that the current mode of the event participants are taken into account as part of the overall calculation of the impacts.

**12. Other Business**

None.

**13. Adjourn.**