

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
ITEM #1**

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
March 6, 2015

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – March 6, 2015**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick County -----
City of Frederick Timothy Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County John Thomas
Prince George's County Victor Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery County -----
Prince George's County Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT Lyn Erickson
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County Malcolm Watson
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
NVTA -----
NVTC Claire Randall
Prince William County James Davenport
PRTC -----
VRE Sonali Soneji
VDOT Maria Sinner
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

Jonathan Parker

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Chuck Bean, MWCOG
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Nick Ramfos, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Lamont Cobb, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Bryan Hayes, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Nicole McCall, DTP
Erin Morrow, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Wenjing Pu, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Sergio Ritacco, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Patrick Zilliacus, DTP
Sophie Mintier, DCPS

OTHER

Alia Anderson, Toole Design Group
Alexandra Krempanka, Maryland
Department of the Environment
Bill Orleans
Rob Prody, I-66 Consultant for VDOT

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Meeting

Technical Committee Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from March 6 Technical Committee Meeting

The minutes were approved as written.

2. Review of Final Draft FY 2016 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 2016 CCWP at the February 18, 2015 meeting. The document had also been released for public comment on February 12th. He stated that there were no additional comments or significant changes made to the draft document.

The final draft would be presented to the TPB for approval on March 18th.

3. Review of Final FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Griffiths stated that a draft of the FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) had been presented to the TPB Technical Committee for review in February. He noted that what was new this month were the descriptions of certain FY 2015 UPWP work activities that would be carried over from the FY 2015 UPWP to the FY 2016 UPWP. Mr. Griffiths said that staff had the identified work items in the FY 2015 UPWP that would not be completed by June 30th and were now formally requesting that the work items and the budgets for them be carried over to the FY 2016 UPWP.

Mr. Griffiths that explained the TPB at their March meeting would be asked to deprogram some funding for five FY 2015 UPWP basic work program items and eleven FY 2015 UPWP Technical Assistance work program items. The TPB would then be asked to amend the draft FY 2016 UPWP to add these deprogrammed FY 2015 work program items into the final FY 2016 UPWP.

Mr. Griffiths reported that a memorandum from Mr. Srikanth to the members of the Technical Committee identified the details of the work items and budgets to be carried over from FY 2015 to FY 2016. Mr. Griffiths stated that the total amount of funding to be carried over was about 1.7 million dollars, 1.1 million for the five basic work program items and 639,000 for the eleven Technical Assistance work items.

Mr. Rawlings noted that DDOT was still in the process of identifying project work scopes for some of the FY 2016 DC Technical Assistance work program and asked Mr. Griffiths about the deadline for submitting these project work scopes to staff so that they could be incorporated in the Final Draft FY 2016 UPWP before the TPB acted on it at their March 18th meeting.

Mr. Griffiths responded that the deadline for submitting project work scopes for the FY 2016 UPWP DC, MD, VA and WMATA Technical Assistance work programs was March 10th. Any remaining budget not programmed would be listed in an unprogrammed category. He added, that given the uncertainty regarding the reauthorization of the federal surface transportation act in May, it was recommended as much FY 2016 Technical Assistance funding as possible be left in this unprogrammed category. He noted that this funding could then be more effectively programmed later when more was known about federal surface transportation act funding levels.

Mr. Rawlings asked if there were any further questions on the final draft FY 2016 UPWP and there were no further questions or comments.

4. Update on a Briefing on the Regional Bus Staging, Layover, and Parking Location Study

Mr. Roisman presented his information on the Regional Bus Staging, Layover, and Parking Location Study. This study will be on the TPB agenda for this month, and the Technical Committee previously was briefed on the study findings at its January meeting. The study developed recommendations for regional bus staging, layover and parking within the District of Columbia and Arlington County. It analyzed existing conditions and future demand, screened potential bus facility locations and conducted a suitability analysis and evaluation, and developed a list of recommended sites for further investigation and advancement. Several post-study actions to advance the implementation of the identified sites (14 sites on-street and 15 off-street) are included in the study report. Further investigation of the sites will be required, as well as additional discussions with DDOT and the National Park Service.

Mr. Moktahri asked why consideration was not given to having outlying suburban Metrorail stations as both the staging location and terminal location for buses, rather than having direct bus service to the regional core. Mr. Roisman responded that the question pointed to a larger philosophical discussion about the nature and purpose of the regional transit network that was not part of the study scope; however, he would argue (and the transit operators would likely agree) that there is still a desire and need for single seat service from outlying areas to the regional core. Mr. Moktahri suggested that having the buses terminate at Metrorail and having riders transfer to reach their final destination might improve travel times for those riders. Mr. Malouff noted that most of the trips covered by the network in the regional bus staging study would not experience a travel time gain by being forced to use Metrorail; most of the origins and destinations served by commuter bus are not near a Metrorail station; furthermore, doing so would add more riders to the already constrained core portion of the Metrorail system. Mr. Malouff noted that most of the commuter bus service is focused on the west end of downtown Washington, while the commuter rail service is focused on the east end. Mr. Roisman indicated that parking for intercity buses is available at Union Station (on the east end), but the crosstown travel time makes those locations less desirable for commuter buses whose first stop location is on the west end.

Mr. Roseboom asked if the Arlington sites performed less well due to travel time across the river to destinations, and if the results would be different were the travel time criterion not as heavily weighted. Mr. Roisman stated that the criteria are independent of need or want for bus staging,

layover, and parking sites within Arlington; the sites available in Arlington are limited and fully utilized.

Mr. Griffiths suggested explicitly listing the members (agencies) of the study steering committee when presenting to the TPB. Mr. Roisman indicated that he would prepare a background memorandum on the study for TPB mail-out, and would include that information. Mr. Griffiths also suggested explicitly including the information about cost ranges for the sites as described in the report as part of the mail-out memo. Finally, Mr. Griffiths asked about post-study actions – would the steering committee continue to meet, and what were the next steps for the study? Mr. Roisman responded that the work of the steering committee and study consultant were complete; staff will be looking to the TPB for guidance as to next steps for further investigation. Whether or not that involves additional staff work or having the transportation agencies and transit operators simply take over is not yet clear. Mr. Griffiths asked if the TPB could help facilitate the discussion and post-study actions; Mr. Roisman responded yes.

Mr. Malouff asked if WMATA and NPS were on the study steering committee; Mr. Roisman responded that WMATA was included and that attempts to engage NPS did not get a response. He noted that their lack of participation is a challenge given that some of the sites are on NPS roadways and land; there is a TPB member from NPS, so hopefully that individual will respond to the presentation of the study findings so that NPS can be engaged in study follow-up actions.

5. Briefing on a Study to Identify Pedestrian/Bicycle Access Improvements at Select Rail Stations in the Washington Region

Mr. Swanson briefed the committee on the study which was funded through a federal grant from the Transportation, Community and Systems Preservation Program (TCSP). He said the study was premised on the idea that if we improve pedestrian and bicycle access to select rail stations, we can tap underutilized capacity on our transit system. He said the project identified 25 “opportune” stations that can accommodate new riders. The study developed an inventory of approximately 3,000 capital improvements for ped/bike access for the 25 opportune stations. He described the process for identifying the opportune stations.

Ms. Anderson from Toole Design explained that her company served as lead consultant for the project. She described the process for developing the database and the three different forms that the database has taken.

Mr. Swanson concluded by describing next steps which include conducting additional outreach, establishing a system to track implementation, coordinating with WMATA on new research, and integrating the study’s outputs with other TPB/COG programs.

Mr. Davenport asked if future analysis might include more VRE stations.

Mr. Swanson said that most commuter rail lines do not currently offer reverse commute services, so they could not be included in this study, although he noted that Woodbridge was included. However, he said that commuter rail presents opportunities for reverse commuting, so it might be possible to do analysis in the future to identify ped/bike access improvements.

Ms. Hoeffner said that VRE is planning reverse commute services in the future.

Mr. Weissberg said MARC is looking into reverse commute opportunities also.

Mr. Howard suggested this database might be integrated with the TPB Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.

Mr. Thomas suggested that Mr. Swanson's presentation should more explicitly reference the origin of the study, i.e., it was developed to provide a database for future grant applications.

Mr. Roseboom asked if Amtrak services at King Street were included. Ms. Anderson said yes.

Mr. Weissberg emphasized the importance of follow-up work to the study that will identify priority projects. Mr. Swanson agreed, noting that it is fortuitous that WMATA will be conducting analysis that will include prioritization.

Mr. Mokhtari expressed concern that this study does not get jurisdictions close enough to being ready for grant applications. Mr. Swanson agreed. He said it is important to complete the database records regarding status and it will be even more important to work with WMATA on prioritization analysis.

Ms. Soneji asked if bikeshare was included in the study. Ms. Anderson said the database did not include bikeshare as an independent attribute.

Mr. Rawlings asked if the study was linked to another TPB activity which is pulling together a list of unfunded transportation projects.

Mr. Swanson said that the two lists of projects were different in scale. He said the unfunded projects list, to which Mr. Rawlings referred, would largely concentrate on projects that would be in the CLRP if they were funded. In contrast, the database, which he had presented under this item, mainly identified small-scale ped/bike access projects, which would typically not be included in the CLRP. However, he said both projects could reflect a similar approach: let's look at our regional goals and identify projects that have been planned that could help us move toward our goals.

Mr. Griffiths said that the unfunded list of projects will include the Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Plan.

A comment was made that for the TLC Program consideration should be given to funding more preliminary engineering/design projects that are derived from this database.

A comment was made that the database should be presented and marketed to Bike/Ped Committees at the local level.

Mr. Griffiths said it is important that this study be presented to a number of committees at COG/TPB, particularly the Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee.

6. Briefing on the February Meeting of the Transportation Sector Group of the COG Multi-sector Working Group to Examine Greenhouse Gas Reductions

Mr. Griffiths reported that the COG Multi-Sector Working Group to examine greenhouse gas reductions was moving quickly. The initial kick-off of this group had been held on January 27th and a meeting of the Transportation Sector subgroup had been held on February 27th. He added that there was a lively discussion at the February 27th Transportation Sector subgroup meeting and a lot of good ideas and thoughtful strategies for reducing greenhouse gas had been suggested at this brainstorming session. He noted, however, that this was just an initial starting point and another meeting of the Transportation Sector subgroup was scheduled for March 27th. This second meeting would be a joint meeting with the Planning Directors Land Use Sector subgroup. This joint meeting had been proposed because there was a lot of synergy and overlap for greenhouse reduction strategies in these two sectors, especially when focusing on strategies to reduce daily vehicle trips and vehicle miles of travel (VMT).

Mr. Griffiths continued that the strategies discussed at the February 27th could be grouped into four major areas: Fuel Efficiency/Low Carbon Fuel, System and Operational Efficiency, Reduce Growth in VMT and Vehicle Trips, Other Sectors that Support Transportation Strategies. He added that the complete list of strategies discussed at this meeting could be found on the TPB Technical Committee website.

A member of the Technical Committee asked, given the large number of strategies suggested, how they all would be analyzed.

Mr. Griffiths responded that a consultant was being hired to help the Multi-Sector Working Group consolidate the various strategies into logical groupings and initially screen the list for those strategies likely to have the most significant impacts and those strategies would be further refined and put forward for more extensive analysis.

Mr. Griffiths added that approximately 15 potential consultants attended the pre-proposal meeting in response for the RFP issued for this project and he expected to receive between 6 and 10 proposals submitted in response to the RFP. He noted a proposal selection committee would be meeting on March 13th to evaluate the proposals submitted and he hoped that a consultant could be on board for the March 27th joint meeting of the Transportation and Land Use subgroups.

Mr. Rawlings encouraged the members of the Technical Committee Meeting to attend the March 27th joint meeting of these two subgroups.

7. Briefing on 2014 Peak Period Freeway Congestion in the Washington Region, and Changes Since 2011 and 2008

Mr. Sivasailam presented the findings of the Spring 2014 aerial survey study of the freeway system performance in the region. He discussed the layout of the draft report, performance of the system, improvements on certain facilities compared to the 2011 survey, the Top 10 congested segments, the Top 5 longest delay corridors, and comparison of congested lane miles for selected radial routes and the Capital Beltway. He listed the additional ongoing work of the

freeway congestion monitoring program and the next steps including a planned presentation to the TPB in April.

Mr. Weissberg pointed out that the inner loop and outer loop between MD 214 and US 50 is congested and asked staff to verify the notes in the draft report. Staff agreed to investigate the comment and make the appropriate changes to the report. The VDOT representative on the phone asked if the VA I-95 HOT Lane traffic is accounted for in the report. Staff responded the survey was completed during Spring 2014 prior to the opening of the Hot lane in December 2014.

Mr. Malouff wanted to study data going back 10 years and find out how quickly capacity improvements fill up. Staff mentioned they will provide the data and data collected 10 years back are available on the Data Clearinghouse.

Mr. Milone wanted to know if flow rate can be estimated in addition to the density information. Mr. Sivasailam replied it can be estimated but since the survey covers only 3 hours in the morning and 3 hours in the evening, it should be used with caution as there is no information on the shoulder hours of the peak period.

8. Update on the Development of MAP-21 Performance Measures

Mr. Randall updated the Committee on the latest developments regarding US DOT regulations on performance measures under MAP-21, speaking to a presentation. He reviewed the status of the proposed rules for the five categories of performance rules, emphasizing that no rules are yet final. He announced that the proposed Asset Management rule was published on February 20. This rule proposes standards for management of pavement and bridge condition. It is intended for State DOTs, with only brief mention of the role for MPOs. He concluded with a review of next steps for action by the TPB and the transportation agencies in the region, which will include identifying subject matter experts for each area at TPB and among partner agencies.

9. Update on the Development of a List of Unfunded Transportation Projects

Mr. Austin distributed a draft compilation of the list of projects that had been received to date. Mr. Griffiths provided a brief summary of what lists of projects and plans had been submitted thus far. This list included the Maryland county priority letters, the 2012 Highway Needs Inventory in Maryland, the Maryland Consolidated Transportation Plan, additional submittals from Frederick and Montgomery Counties, the NVTA Transaction 2040 projects, list of projects from the City of Alexandria, Loudoun and Prince William counties, VRE and WMATA.

Mr. Weissberg asked when the information was needed by. Mr. Griffiths stated that an updated draft would be presented at the April Technical Committee meeting and that an evaluation would be made at that time to determine if it was ready to be presented to the TPB.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if there were guidelines for what types of projects should be submitted. Mr. Austin stated that if the project were eligible to be included in the CLRP if funding were

available, then it should be included. If the project would not need to be in the CLRP, it should not be submitted.

Mr. Griffiths noted that staff will want to be able to map these projects, so spatial data will be a necessary part of the exercise at some point in the future. Mr. Austin added that the distributed list had not been proofed to remove any redundancies or normalize data across fields.

10. Other Business

None.

11. Adjourn