

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290 (202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202

MEETING NOTICE

Date: May 16, 2012
Time: 12 noon
Place: COG Board Room

AGENDA (BEGINS PROMPTLY AT NOON)

- 12 noon 1. **Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities**
.....Chairman Turner
- Interested members of the public will be given the opportunity to make brief comments on transportation issues under consideration by the TPB. Each speaker will be allowed up to three minutes to present his or her views. Board members will have an opportunity to ask questions of the speakers, and to engage in limited discussion. Speakers are asked to bring written copies of their remarks (65 copies) for distribution at the meeting.
- 12:20 2. **Approval of Minutes of April 18 Meeting**
.....Chairman Turner
- Minutes
- 12:25 3. **Report of Technical Committee**
.....Mr. Rawlings
Chair, Technical Committee
- Technical Committee Meeting Highlights
- 12:30 4. **Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee**
.....Ms. Slater
Chair, Citizens Advisory Committee
- 12:40 5. **Report of Steering Committee**
..... Mr. Kirby
Director, Department of
Transportation Planning (DTP)
- Steering Committee Actions
- 12:45 6. **Chair's Remarks**
.....Chairman Turner

*Alternative formats of this agenda and all other meeting materials are available upon request. Email: accommodations@mwkog.org. Phone: 202-962-3300 or 202-962-3213 (TDD). Please allow seven working days for preparation of the material.
Electronic versions are available at www.mwkog.org.*

ACTION ITEMS

- 12:50 7. **Approval of Complete Streets Policy for the National Capital Region**
..... Mr. Farrell, DTP
At the April 18 meeting, the Board was briefed and provided comments on a revised Complete Streets Policy document which reflected several months of discussion by state and local government agencies and interested citizens. The Board will be briefed on the enclosed draft final Complete Streets Policy and asked to approve it.
- Action:** Adopt Resolution R15-2012 to approve the Complete Streets Policy for the National Capital Region.
- Complete Streets Policy
- 1:00 8. **Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2011-2016 TIP to Include the WMATA FY2013 Capital Improvement Program**
..... Mr. Bottigheimer
The Board will be briefed on and asked to approve an amendment to FY 2011-2016 TIP to include WMATA's FY2013 Capital Improvement Program.
- Action:** Adopt Resolution R16-2012 to approve an amendment to the FY 2011-2016 TIP to include the WMATA FY2013 Capital Improvement Program.
- FY 2011-2016 TIP Amendment for WMATA

INFORMATION ITEMS

- 1:05 9. **Briefing on Household Travel Characteristics and Behavior in Ten Focused Geographic Subareas of the Region**
..... Mr. Griffiths, DTP
In Spring 2011, 2,200 households in seven focused geographic subareas of the region were surveyed by TPB staff to obtain demographic information and travel data for more intensive analysis of specific growth and transportation issues. Subareas included Metrorail station areas, highway corridors with recent or planned major improvements, proposed light rail study areas, and regional activity centers with specific characteristics. Previously, in the Spring of 2010, Arlington County in collaboration with TPB staff conducted a similar survey of 400 households in three subareas of Arlington County. The Board will be briefed on the household travel characteristics and behavior identified in the ten subareas of the region surveyed to date, and on the schedule for surveying additional subareas.
- Household Travel Survey Memo
- 1:35 10. **Briefing on the Results of Recently Completed Projects under the Continuous Airport Systems Planning (CASP) Program**
..... Mr. Roisman, DTP
The CASP program supports the planning, development and operation of airport and airport-serving facilities for the Baltimore Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport, the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, and the Washington Dulles International Airport. The Board will be briefed on the results of recently completed projects under the CASP program, including trends and forecasts for air passenger originations and air cargo, and ground access travel times to the three airports.
- CASP Memo

1:50 11. **Update on Reauthorization of Federal Surface Transportation Legislation**
.....Mr. Kirby
The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) enacted on August 10, 2005 has been extended nine times since it expired on September 30, 2009, most recently through June 30, 2012. On March 15, 2012 the Senate approved MAP-21, a two-year reauthorization proposal, and on April 18 the House approved HR 4348, a reauthorization proposal including an extension of SAFETEA-LU through September 30, 2012 along with other provisions. A conference committee has been appointed to negotiate a final bill. The Board will be briefed on the likely schedule for further Congressional action.

1:55 12. **Other Business**

2:00 13. **Adjourn**

2 hours

Lunch will be available for Board members and alternates at 11:30 am

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

777 North Capitol Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20002-4226
(202) 962-3200

**MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
April 18, 2012**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jennie Forehand, Maryland Senate
Tawanna Gaines, Maryland House of Delegates
Jason Groth, Charles County
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax County
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
John Jenkins, Prince William County
Emmett V. Jordan, City of Greenbelt
Garrett Moore, VDOT
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
Jonathan Way, Manassas City
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County DPW&T
Tommy Wells, DC Council
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Sam Zimbabwe, DDOT
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby
Gerald Miller
Robert Griffiths

Nicholas Ramfos	
John Swanson	
Andrew Austin	
Wendy Klancher	
Sarah Crawford	
Deborah Kerson Bilek	
Gareth James	
Eric Randall	
Ben Hampton	
Michael Farrell	
Karin Foster	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Nicole Hange	COG/EO
Betsy Self	COG/DPSH
Bill Orleans	Citizen
Jim Maslanka	City of Alexandria
Randy Carroll	MDE
Judi Gold	Councilmember Bowser's Office
Patrick Durany	Prince William County
Nick Alexandrow	PRTC
George Clark	Tri County Council for Southern Maryland
Frank Johnson	FHBP
Bernadette Beffard	Herndon/FFX Co.
Barbara Ditzler	Montgomery County
Michael Proffitt	CLI – Frederick Area Comm. For Transportation
Ryan Kelly	VDOT
Mike Lake	Fairfax County DOT
Greg Billing	Washington Area Bicyclist Association
Tracy Hadden Loh	DC Resident – Ward 6
Ashley Halsey	Washington Post
Peter Pennington	CAC
Allen Muchnick	Virginia Bicycling Federation
Bonnie Moore	Leadership Conference
Stewart Schwartz	CSG

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Allen Muchnick, a board member of the Virginia Bicycle Federation and a member of the TPB's Citizen Advisory Committee, spoke about the draft Regional Complete Streets Policy and Complete Streets Guidance and Policy Template. He said that the latest revision of the policy, while incorporating much of the feedback received to date, still fails to establish a standard policy. He recommended that a question be added to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) project description form that asks agencies to describe not just what modes a particular

facility will accommodate but how it will accommodate them. He said that implementing agencies should be easily able to report this information to the TPB at the TIP submission stage.

Stewart Schwartz, Executive Director of the Coalition for Smarter Growth, spoke in reference to a recommendation he made at a previous Board meeting to study the feasibility of transit on the American Legion Bridge (I-495) between Montgomery County, Maryland, and Fairfax County, Virginia. He acknowledged a memorandum written by TPB staff regarding previous experiences and studies of transit on the route (included in the “Letters Sent/Received” packet for the April 18 Board meeting), but still urged the TPB to move forward with the study. Mr. Schwartz also commented on a presentation to be given later in the Board meeting by VDOT staff regarding a study of collecting tolls on I-95 south of Fredericksburg. He said he looked forward to the study and its results, and suggested that VDOT look at whether it might be possible to use some of the toll revenue for improvements to other travel modes in the corridor, especially commuter rail and Amtrak intercity passenger routes.

2. Approval of Minutes of March 21 Meeting

Chair Turner entertained a motion to accept the minutes of the March 21 meeting as presented. So moved and seconded, the minutes of the March 21 TPB meeting were approved.

3. Report of Technical Committee

Mr. Rawlings said that the Technical Committee met on April 6 and reviewed five items for inclusion on the agenda for the TPB’s April meeting: this year’s Bike to Work Day on Friday, May 18; comments received and proposed responses on the Regional Complete Streets Policy and Complete Streets Guidance and Policy Template; a briefing on comparisons of the household travel characteristics and behavior identified in different parts of the region; a briefing on the results of the Continuous Airport Systems Planning (CASP) program; and, an update on reauthorization of federal transportation legislation. Two additional items were presented for informational purposes: a briefing on the update of the geographic extent and population of the region’s urbanized area using Census 2010 data; and, a briefing on activities to date on the development of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP).

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Ms. Slater said that the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) met on April 12. At the meeting, the CAC: received a briefing on the TPB’s Household Travel Survey; briefly talked about the Regional Complete Streets Policy; elected two vice-chairs; discussed topics the CAC would like to focus on in the coming year; and, passed a resolution recommending that the TPB establish a working group to provide input on the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP).

Ms. Slater reported that Bob Griffiths of TPB staff gave the briefing on the TPB’s 2011

Household Travel Survey of seven focused geographic sub-areas in the region. She said that John Swanson of TPB staff led the CAC in a focus group-style feedback session following Mr. Griffiths' presentation, and that many CAC members made substantive comments about the data and recommendations for future studies. (The main feedback from that session is available in the April 2012 CAC Report, available online.)

Ms. Slater also reported that the CAC appreciates the new draft Complete Streets policy and its responsiveness to previous CAC comments. She said that the Committee is pleased that the draft now includes a document that is explicitly called "Complete Streets Policy." She also noted that the Committee elected two vice-chairs during the April meeting: Veronica Davis from the District of Columbia; and, Stephen Still from Virginia. And she said that the Committee would like to be more involved in the planning of next year's Street Smart campaign, that the Committee continues to support assembling a comprehensive list of unfunded transportation projects in the region, and that the Committee would like to receive briefings on Bike to Work Day, the TPB's study of the public acceptability of congestion pricing, transportation issues related to low-income and minority communities, bikesharing in the region, and how land-use forecasts are made.

Finally, Ms. Slater reported that the Committee discussed its role in developing the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). She said that several members expressed confusion about the current state of development of the RTPP and expressed their desire to be more actively involved in the plan's development, including design and implementation of outreach activities, methods for identifying priorities, and the use of performance measures. The Committee unanimously passed a resolution calling on the TPB to reestablish the task force that in 2010 and 2011 oversaw the development of the scope for the RTPP, or to establish some new structure to provide regular and substantive input in the development of the RTPP, and that either oversight group include members of the CAC.

Chair Turner thanked Ms. Slater for her presentation, and noted that the task force that developed the scope for the RTPP had ceased to meet once its recommendations had been completed. He said, however, that he was supportive of providing continuing opportunities for participation, both by the TPB and the CAC.

Mr. Kirby said that when the TPB approved the scope and process for development of the RTPP, it was decided that oversight for the process would come from the TPB as a whole and that no ongoing task force would be established. He recommended that an informal work session prior to the June 2012 TPB meeting take place to serve as an opportunity for the TPB, the CAC, and other stakeholders to provide feedback on development of the RTPP.

Chair Turner expressed his support for the idea of holding a work session prior to the June TPB meeting, and asked Ms. Slater to extend to the CAC an invitation to attend and participate in it.

5. Report of Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby reported that the Steering Committee met on April 6. At the meeting, the Committee acted on three resolutions: one, to amend the TIP to include funding for preliminary engineering on the auxiliary lane project on northbound I-395 between Duke Street and Seminary Road that was added to the CLRP last year; two, to add funding for MARC preventive maintenance, requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation; and, three, to amend the Unified Planning Work Program to modify two project budgets for the WMATA Technical Assistance Program.

Mr. Kirby pointed out two of the letters that were mailed out to the Board prior to today's meeting: a letter of support from Senator Webb for the TPB's recent FY2012 TIGER application; and, a one-page summary of the Spring 2012 Street Smart media event. He said that staff would provide a more detailed report of the entire Street Smart campaign at a later meeting.

The third item in the mailout packet that Mr. Kirby described was a memorandum written by staff in response to a recommendation made at a previous meeting to study the feasibility of transit service across the American Legion Bridge on I-495. He said the memorandum reviews some of the things that have happened there, that have been planned, or that have been studied: Metrobus 14 service, which was discontinued in 2003 due to low ridership; existing vanpool service; a 2003 license plate study to determine origins and destinations of those crossing the bridge each day; the 2009 West Side Mobility Study that looked at the physical capacity of the bridge; the TPB's own CLRP Aspirations Scenario, which includes bus rapid transit (BRT) and express lanes on the bridge; and, a WMATA study of demand for rail service.

Mr. Kirby pointed out a couple of other important considerations with regard to the feasibility of transit on the American Legion Bridge that were included in the memo: the need for improved circulation at the destinations served by transit in order to make it a viable option; and, the need to address the provision of free or low-cost parking in destination areas as part of a package deal to encourage ridership. He said there are some ongoing regional studies on this topic and he suggested bringing the results to the TPB later in the calendar year.

Mr. Zimmerman asked Mr. Kirby whether a recent story that aired on WTOP radio about the memo had accurately reflected the memo's findings.

Mr. Kirby responded by saying that he thought the story may have mischaracterized the memo somewhat, and that the story seemed unnecessarily negative about the potential for transit on the bridge.

Mr. Zimmerman highlighted WTOP's use of the example of the eventual discontinuation of Metrobus 14 included in the memo as evidence of a lack of demand for transit across the bridge. He pointed out that its low ridership probably had a lot to do with the fact that VDOT would not allow buses on the route to use exclusive shoulder lanes, enabling them to bypass congestion (whereas MDOT had allowed such use). He also pointed out that transit service and demand for transit has grown tremendously since the route was discontinued in 2003. He also commented on

the memo's findings related to the dispersed origins and destinations of those using the bridge. He said that transit service across the bridge would not have to serve even a majority of travelers; serving just a small percentage of travelers could have a significant impact on congestion since congestion is sensitive to very slight changes in demand. He said that allowing buses to use exclusive lanes across the bridge is probably one of the most effective, low-cost things that could be done to improve traffic conditions on the bridge.

Mr. Erenrich said that Montgomery County believes a transit connection between Montgomery County and Fairfax County is very important, and that the County has been studying a regional bus rapid transit system for years. He said the County has made comments on the Environmental Impact Statement for the Dulles Metrorail project that a provision should be made to allow high-capacity links connecting Maryland to the Silver Line and Orange Line in Virginia. He encouraged staff to look at how the TPB can use regional work program funding to study how such concepts and services can all tie together and what benefits the region as a whole can enjoy from such connectivity.

Ms. Hudgins also voiced support for studying additional transit connections between Montgomery County and Fairfax County, citing the regional need for such connections and the savings that some transit services offer as compared to other far more expensive and impractical options that could be pursued.

Mr. Kirby completed his report by mentioning or describing the remaining "Letters Sent/Received" that were not included in the mailout, but that had been distributed during today's meeting: a handout describing a forum held in Arlington about infrastructure banks, attended by Mr. Kirby and Stuart Freudberg of COG's Department of Environmental Programs; a letter from the City of Greenbelt to the Federal Highway Administration expressing opposition to the widening of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway; the agenda for the most recent Community Leadership Institute, held on March 29 and March 31; the final version of the letter from TPB to Chairman Mendelson of the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee; a letter from TPB to the Federal Transit Administration supporting an alternative analysis request by Charles County to look at the MD Route 5/US 301 corridor from Branch Avenue to Waldorf and White Plains; and, finally, a letter to Chair Hudgins of the WMATA Board from the TPB's Access for All Committee on the fare changes that are being considered by WMATA.

6. Chair's Remarks

Chair Turner welcomed Delegate Gaines and Senator Forehand upon their return from the Maryland General Assembly, which had concluded its 90-day session. He thanked those who attended the Street Smart event, which occurred on March 28 in Prince George's county. He said the event went very well, and that the TPB will continue to look forward to it annually each fall. He also said that he and Mr. Kirby made a presentation about the TPB to the COG Board of Directors, which came at a request from the COG Board. He acknowledged the recent activity of the US House of Representatives, and said that the federal surface transportation legislation had been authorized for an additional three months. He then turned his attention to the TPB

Community Leadership Institute (CLI), citing that the most recent CLI, which was held on March 29 and 31, was the ninth installment of the program. He added that 21 citizens from around the region participated in the CLI, which was facilitated by Kathy Porter, who he said is the former mayor of Takoma Park, former Chair of the TPB, and current member of the WMATA Board. He invited Ms. Loh, a CLI participant and current alternate member to the CAC, to make a few remarks about her CLI experience.

Ms. Loh, acknowledging the attendance of several CLI alumni, thanked the TPB for the opportunity to participate in the CLI. She said the program is valuable, described some lessons learned, and discussed the value of participating in a program that attracts diversity from throughout the region.

Chair Turner thanked Ms. Loh, and mentioned that he participated in the CLI program when he first became a TPB member. He said the program was instrumental and informative, and commented about the relationship between his previous CLI participation and his current TPB chairmanship. He then called up the members of the CLI who were in attendance, and presented them with certificates of completion.

ACTION ITEMS

7. Approval of Regional Bike to Work Day 2012 Proclamation

Mr. Ramfos gave a presentation summarizing the 2012 Bike to Work Day event and the survey of participation trends of Bike to Work Day since its inception about a decade ago. He said that Bike to Work Day will be on May 18 and the goal is to attain at least 12,500 participants, which would be about a 13 and a half percent increase from last year. He said there will be nine more pit stops for 2012 Bike to Work Day, totaling 58 pit stops throughout the region: 12 pit stops in the District of Columbia, 21 in Maryland, and 25 in Virginia.

Mr. Ramfos said Commuter Connections has partnered with the Washington Area Bicyclist Association (WABA) to sponsor a dedicated website for Bike to Work Day that provides information that would help employers, participants, and persons who have never participated in the event. He displayed the marketing materials and said there will be a poster in Spanish for 2012 Bike to Work Day. He said the committee received nearly \$45,000 in contributions from sponsors for the event. He recognized Greg Billings from WABA, acknowledging the strong partnership in planning for the event.

Chair Turner thanked Mr. Ramfos for his efforts in organizing Bike to Work Day. He said he has participated the last several years and encouraged all TPB members to participate in the event, whether they bike to work or show support at a pit stop. He signed the proclamation immediately following the meeting.

INFORMATION ITEMS

8. Briefing on Comments Received and Proposed Responses for Revising the Regional Complete Streets Guidance and Policy Template

Mr. Farrell provided a presentation on the history of Complete Streets, noting that there has been a trend in policy at the federal, state, and local levels towards providing better accommodation on roadways for a diversity of users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists. He said 25 states have enacted Complete Streets legislation with policies, and 31 MPOs and over 200 cities have enacted policies. He said that in the Washington region, the three state-level jurisdictions have a form of Complete Streets policy and most of the TPB member jurisdictions have a policy or are in the process of developing one.

Mr. Farrell said that in June 2011, the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) suggested that the TPB develop and approve a regional policy on Complete Streets. He said the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee took the lead on developing the policy and worked with numerous committees to get feedback. He summarized the changes to the policy, guidance document, and TIP Project Description Form since they were presented at the March TPB meeting. He said the policy is open for public comment and the TPB is scheduled to approve the document at its May 16 meeting. He reviewed the implementation schedule for the components of the policy.

Chair Turner thanked Mr. Farrell, as well as the CAC for bringing this subject to the attention of the TPB.

Ms. Backmon asked Mr. Farrell to clarify previous discussion regarding consistency of language with local jurisdictions' comprehensive plans.

Mr. Farrell said there is an exemption on the TIP Project Description sheet that addresses this concern. He added that the proposed template is meant to be adapted to meet the needs of specific jurisdictions.

Ms. Tregoning thanked Mr. Kirby and his staff for being so responsive to the comments of the TPB from its March meeting. She said she believes the revised version of the document is the right direction for a regional policy.

Mr. Beacher asked Mr. Farrell to clarify what he meant when stating the template is just a template, and asked if jurisdictions would be expected to adapt current policies towards that template and if this adaptation must occur within a certain timeframe.

Mr. Farrell said the document would demonstrate that the TPB endorses the concept of Complete Streets and suggests that its member jurisdictions adopt something along the lines of the proposed guidance and template. He said it is not a requirement that a jurisdiction adopt every provision of the guidance. He said those who drafted the guidance thought it would be valuable to give member jurisdictions a very clear picture of what the TPB has in mind without making it mandatory.

Mr. Erenrich said the proposed template is an improvement. He said he is concerned about using

the term “Complete Street” rather than something more inclusive, such as “Complete Transportation Facility.” He said he struggles with making the distinction between how funding for a roadway will be differentiated from that for a bus purchase or maintenance facility. He wondered why a jurisdiction would have to create a policy and then constantly have to ask for exemptions because projects are obviously not part of a street. He suggested that the policy focus on roadway right-of-ways and that nothing else be included in the policy. He cited several examples that would require exemptions: purchase of buses, funding for commuter rail, and funding for trails. He said the policy should be defined differently so that when projects are evaluated in the future, the majority of projects are not exempt, which in his opinion would not look very good.

Mr. Farrell said the TIP Project Description sheet was designed to filter out the non-applicable projects up front, which would define those projects as not applicable. He said the language of the inclusions section of the template was vetted through a large group of stakeholders and contains a variety of inclusions. He said the language could be altered to state “all transportation projects” instead of “all roadway projects.” However, he said there was concern with the definition of roadway, particularly related to FHWA’s Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), which defines roadways as only being curb to curb, not including the associated right-of-way. He said he proposed defining a Complete Street as a roadway and its associated right-of-way, but that not all parties agreed. He said, for example, that VDOT preferred language that does not define Complete Street but merely states that a Complete Street safely and adequately accommodates all users as appropriate.

Mr. Wojahn thanked the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee. He said the TPB Access for All (AFA) Advisory Committee sent a memo to the Subcommittee in October incorporating its recommendations and he noted most of the recommendations have been incorporated. He said one of the AFA comments that has not been clearly conveyed in the document is the notion that access to a transportation facility should be continued during construction or maintenance of the facility. He said these comments focused specifically on people with disabilities, but could apply generally to making sure the roadway remains complete during construction.

Mr. Wojahn said he thinks the policy is good in general terms, but that it is not very specific in terms of providing guidance on accessibility once a construction project is complete. He asked if there is a plan to make any technical assistance available to local jurisdictions to ensure that streets are complete for people with disabilities and the elderly. He added that there are a lot of technical issues that are not always clear, but are important for engineers to keep in mind.

Mr. Farrell agreed that there are a lot of details that need to be clarified when moving towards implementation with such a policy. He said it was the feeling of those involved in developing the policy that a shorter document would be more powerful and general statements were preferable to specific guidance. He said the general feeling was that it was not appropriate to reproduce an entire design manual within the policy and tie the region to specific guidelines. He said that the statement that facilities “should be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained so that all users” have access covered those sentiments. He said TPB staff plans to hold a follow-up training session within about six months of the adoption of the policy, which would allow for those responsible for implementation of Complete Streets to obtain resources for this task. He

added that implementation would likely be a very localized effort in terms of design work and staff training.

Mr. Wojahn said that the language regarding facilities needing to be constructed in a way that maintains accessibility can be read two ways. He said one reading implies that it should be constructed so that the end result is accessibility, and that it needs to be clear that this statement also means that the construction itself must be done in a way that maintains accessibility throughout the construction process.

Mr. Way asked if the TIP Project Description form would be applicable to small streets in residential areas, or only for projects that are in the CLRP.

Mr. Farrell said the form would be used strictly for projects that are in the TIP, and noted that there are myriad smaller local projects that are not included in the TIP.

Mr. Zimbabwe said this policy and accompanying documents represent a great step forward since the March TPB meeting. He said he would encourage that the TIP submission form include as much documentation as possible to provide an opportunity for people to view all related project documents in one location.

Chair Turner said this item will come back before the TPB for adoption at its May 16 meeting. He said that the document is designed to be flexible and relevant to TIP project submissions over time. However, he added that it is also not meant to be static and that there will likely be changes to the policy document as the TPB learns more about its implementation. He said it is important to encourage TPB member jurisdictions to adopt a formal Complete Streets policy. He said it is also important that the TPB set the standard for the jurisdictions to ensure that they have the flexibility to be able to implement a policy while also having some level of accountability through the TIP process.

Mr. Way suggested that the documentation directly state that this form is only applicable to projects that are in the CLRP.

Mr. Farrell said the form is simply one of several methods the TPB is using to document implementation of Complete Streets principles in the region. He said the policy statement and guidance template to which it refers is more comprehensive and does not only relate to projects in the CLRP. He said it refers to all projects for which a public agency is going to assume maintenance responsibilities.

Mr. Way asked if there is any roadway or project that would be explicitly exempt because it does not fall within the bounds of a local Complete Streets policy.

Mr. Farrell said that any facility that does not provide access to the public, such as a bus maintenance depot, would not be applicable under a Complete Streets policy. He said railways and trails would also be exempt because access to motorists would be restricted on those facilities.

9. Briefing on the Possible Addition of Tolling on I-95 in Virginia

Mr. Estes said the objective of his presentation is to make sure that the MPOs in Virginia are informed on VDOT's process to develop a pilot program for submission to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to add tolling on I-95, and to open dialogue for feedback on the process. He said that this was his fourth meeting with MPOs along the I-95 corridor. He explained that the process is still in the preliminary phases, and is not yet to the point of determining where the tolls might be, or how much they will be. He reviewed the FHWA Interstate System Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Pilot Program (ISRRPP), and provided an overview of the VDOT ISRRPP application to FHWA. He discussed benefits of tolling revenue, as well as ongoing activity, including the vision plan, environmental scoping analysis, traffic and revenue study, project development/facility management plan, tolling structure and strategy, and outreach and coordination. He also provided a preliminary schedule, and said that the intent was to execute a tolling agreement with FHWA in the Winter of 2012, which would then lead to discussions about project implementation.

Mr. Jenkins asked about the I-81 corridor, and indicated concern that it may become a pass-through over I-95 for big trucks.

Mr. Estes said he shared Mr. Jenkins' concerns, and that the Commonwealth Transportation Board has emphasized reviewing diversion to the entire network in the Commonwealth of Virginia as part of the studies relating to this effort.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for confirmation that one main reason for this effort is to generate funds necessary for improvements to the I-95 corridor for safety and capacity improvements.

Mr. Estes confirmed Mr. Zimmerman's remark, citing that generating revenue is a critical piece of this effort.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if there was something beyond generating revenue that would contribute to tolling I-95.

Mr. Estes replied that part of the process is to demonstrate the need on the corridor, and to ascertain other means that might bring in revenue to offset the demonstrated need.

Mr. Zimmerman reiterated that this project focuses on resources for facility improvements. He continued by referring to page 16 of the report, which was included in the mailout, and pointing out that Goal 3 for this project is Mobility. He pointed out that the first listed strategy under this goal was to reduce single occupant vehicles along urbanized areas of the I-95 corridor. He said that the map that runs alongside this goal in the report has highlighted segments along the I-95 corridor in the area of Fredericksburg and between Fredericksburg and Richmond, and asked if the goal for Mobility and the map were connected.

Mr. Estes replied that the highlighted segments of the map refer to the extension of the HOV lanes as well as widening the road between Fredericksburg and Richmond, both of which he said

are identified as part of the long-range plan and statewide plan.

Mr. Zimmerman said that these plans more likely refer to Goal 2, System Maintenance and Preservation.

Mr. Estes agreed that this is the case for general purpose lanes.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for confirmation that the strategy to reduce single-occupant vehicles along urbanized areas of the I-95 corridor would include at least the areas of Northern Virginia through Fairfax, Alexandria, and Arlington.

Mr. Estes replied in affirmation.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for examples of expected improvements that would result in reducing single-occupant vehicles along urbanized areas.

Mr. Estes clarified that the Vision document to which Mr. Zimmerman referred aims to obtain illustrative examples to meet set goals. He said that the HOV extension identifies a need, and that toll revenue could potentially accelerate a response to this need. He added that the study aims to review improvements to the Interstate, such as ITS programs, and to communicate to the traveling public to provide options that may encourage less single-occupant vehicle use on the I-95 corridor.

Mr. Zimmerman strongly suggested that the most congested parts of the corridor would benefit from a review of possibilities that would increase transit capacity in the corridor. He referred to Mr. Schwartz's previous testimony, and mentioned the need to consider VRE, Amtrak, and other rail options as a functioning part of the corridor. He emphasized that the areas with the heaviest congestion are the ones that are going to need the biggest solutions.

Mr. Kirby asked if there was any sort of limitation within the Interstate System Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Pilot Program on how much can funding could be put towards increasing capacity.

Mr. Estes replied that the program requirements have a focused priority on reconstruction and rehabilitation. He added that in speaking with FHWA, it has become clear that capacity improvements are also an area to be reviewed. He said that part of the process at this point is to find the perfect blend between reconstruction, rehabilitation, and increased capacity.

Mr. Zimbabwe asked if there are any restrictions on where revenues could be spent outside of the I-95 corridor, such as restrictions on spending for Amtrak or local transit improvements.

Mr. Estes replied that a strict interpretation indicates that this program is solely facility-based. He added that that VDOT is working with FHWA to expand this interpretation.

Chair Turner asked for confirmation that the authority that has been granted to toll the corridor is

part of a pilot program from the federal government.

Mr. Estes replied in affirmation.

Chair Turner asked Mr. Kirby about the information that has been collected on tolling throughout the region as part of the TPB sponsored study on the public acceptability of road-use pricing, and inquired how this might relate to any input the TPB might have on this matter.

Mr. Kirby replied that it would be good for the TPB to consider what to contribute in the way of input for the study, including how specific to be, now that a formal invitation has been extended.

Mr. Estes said he did not discuss this presentation with Mr. Kirby ahead of time, and added that some more definitive data may be available in late May. He offered to come back to the TPB and share this information, and said that there is a fairly aggressive timeframe for this project, with hopes to create an application in late summer. He reiterated that any input and guidance from the TPB would be of great value.

Chair Turner said that this item should appear on a future agenda once more information is available. He added that he would be curious to hear from jurisdictions, particularly in Virginia, about what their input on this proposal may be.

10. A Briefing on Household Travel Characteristics and Behavior in Six Focused Geographic Subareas of the Region

The briefing on household Travel Characteristics and Behavior in Six Focused Geographic Subareas of the Region, was postponed.

11. Update on Reauthorization of Federal Surface Transportation Legislation

Mr. Kirby reported that the US House of Representatives has approved their version of the legislation, which is another 90-day extension that goes through September 30 and includes language on the Keystone Pipeline. He added that this bill go to conference with the Senate's version of the bill. He said that more information would be available next month.

12. Other Business

There was no other business to bring before the TPB.

13. Adjourn

Chair Turner adjourned the TPB meeting at 2:00 p.m.

TPB Technical Committee Meeting Highlights**May 4, 2012**

The Technical Committee met on May 4 at COG. Three items were reviewed for inclusion on the TPB agenda on May 16.

- TPB agenda Item 7

At its April 18 meeting, the TPB was briefed and provided comments on a revised Complete Streets Policy document which reflected several months of discussion by state and local agencies and interested citizens. The Committee was briefed on the draft final Complete Streets Policy and recommended that it be presented to the TPB for approval at its May 16 meeting.

- TPB agenda Item 9

In Spring 2011, 2,200 households in seven focused geographic subareas of the region were surveyed to obtain demographic information and travel data for more intensive analysis of specific growth and transportation issues. These subareas include Metrorail station areas, highway corridors with recent or planned major improvements, proposed light rail study areas, and regional activity centers with specific characteristics. The Committee was briefed on the household travel characteristics and behavior identified in different subareas of the region, and on the schedule for surveying additional subareas.

- TPB agenda Item 11

On March 15, 2012 the Senate approved MAP-21, a two-year reauthorization proposal, and on April 18 the House approved HR 4348, a reauthorization proposal with an extension of SAFETEA-LU through September 30, 2012 along with other provisions. A conference committee has been appointed to negotiate a final bill. The Committee was updated on the likely schedule for further Congressional action on the reauthorization of Federal surface transportation legislation.

Four items were presented for information and discussion:

- The COG Board established the Region Forward Coalition in 2011 to oversee implementation of the Region Forward report's vision, goals and Compact. At their April 27th meeting, Coalition members were briefed on the final draft Baseline Progress Report on the targets and indicators, and work to date by the Planning Directors and Coalition members to update the Regional Activity Center maps. The Committee was briefed on the final draft baseline report and the status of the regional activity centers update.
- The National Capital Region was selected as one of three NCHRP Project 08-36 pilot sites for a study of the Performance-Based Planning and Program (PBPP) process, with a focus on congestion and the use of performance measures to

inform decisions regarding capacity improvements along bus priority corridors in Maryland. Cambridge Systematics Inc. is conducting the study and held two workshops in December 2011 and April 2012. Participants included staff from TPB, Maryland DOT, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), and Montgomery and Prince George's Counties. The Committee was briefed on the workshop activities and schedule for the completion of the study.

- The schedule for the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP calls for the CLRP and TIP inputs and required Congestion Management forms to be submitted by May 1. The Committee was updated on the status of the CLRP and TIP inputs and received an initial draft TIP for review. A final draft TIP will be produced for the June 1 Technical Committee meeting and then released for public comment at the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting on June 14. After the 30-day comment period, the TPB will be asked to approve the 2012 CLRP, FY 2013-2018 TIP and Air Quality Conformity Assessment at its July 18 meeting.
- The Committee was briefed on the current status of the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project which includes 16 project components being implemented by five project owners under a \$58 million TIGER grant administered by FTA.

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - May 4, 2012**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Art Rodgers
Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County Jason Groth
Frederick Co. -----
City of Frederick -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich
Prince George's Co. Vic Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery Co. -----
Prince George's Co. Harold Foster
MDOT Lyn Erickson
Renna Mathews
Roy Gothie
MTA -----
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Mike Lake
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Robert Brown
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Gregg Steverson
NVTC Claire Gron
PRTC Nick Alexandrow
VRE -----
VDOT -----
VDRPT Amy Inman
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
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Andy Meese, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Andrew Austin DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Huijing Qiang, DTP
Wenjing Pu, DTP

Other Attendees

Michael Weinberger, CMR Transit
Danielle Wesolek, WMATA
Randy Carroll, MDE
David Rodgers, MD SHA
Bill Orleans, HACK

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board


777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290 (202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202 TDD: (202) 962-3213

Item #5

MEMORANDUM

May 10, 2012

To: Transportation Planning Board

From: Ronald F. Kirby 
Director, Department of
Transportation Planning

Re: Steering Committee Actions

At its meeting of May 4, 2012, the TPB Steering Committee approved the following resolutions:

- SR28-2012: Resolution on an amendment to the FY 2011- 2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that is exempt from the air quality conformity requirement to update FY 2013 funding for six system preservation projects, as requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT).
- SR29-2012: Resolution on an amendment to the FY 2011- 2016 TIP that is exempt from the air quality conformity requirement to include additional funding for the Sunnyside Avenue Bridge replacement project, as requested by the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)

The TPB Bylaws provide that the Steering Committee "shall have the full authority to approve non-regionally significant items, and in such cases it shall advise the TPB of its action."

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
777 North Capitol Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

**RESOLUTION ON AN AMENDMENT TO
THE FY 2011- 2016 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)
THAT IS EXEMPT FROM THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY REQUIREMENT
TO UPDATE FY 2013 FUNDING FOR SIX SYSTEM PRESERVATION PROJECTS IN
ORDER TO MATCH THE CONSOLIDATED TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AS
REQUESTED BY THE MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (MDOT)**

WHEREAS, the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB), which is the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Washington Region, has the responsibility under the provisions of Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act - A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) for developing and carrying out a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Metropolitan Area; and

WHEREAS, the TIP is required by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as a basis and condition for all federal funding assistance to state, local and regional agencies for transportation improvements within the Washington planning area; and

WHEREAS, on November 17, 2010 the TPB adopted the FY 2011-2016 TIP; and

WHEREAS, in the attached letter of April 27, 2012, MDOT has requested an amendment to the FY 2011-2016 TIP to update funding information and amounts in FY 2013 for six System Preservation projects to match MDOT's FY 2012-2017 Consolidated Transportation Plan, as described in the attached materials; and

WHEREAS, these projects are exempt from the air quality conformity requirement, as defined in Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations "40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments: Flexibility and Streamlining; Final Rule," issued in the May 6, 2005, *Federal Register*;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Steering Committee of the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board amends the FY 2011-2016 TIP to update funding information and amounts in FY 2013 for six System Preservation projects to match MDOT's FY 2012-2017 Consolidated Transportation Plan, as described in the attached materials.

Adopted by the Transportation Planning Board Steering Committee at its regular meeting on May 4, 2012.



Maryland Department of Transportation

The Secretary's Office

April 27, 2012

Martin O'Malley
Governor

Anthony G. Brown
Lt. Governor

Beverley K. Swaim-Staley
Secretary

Darrell B. Mobley
Deputy Secretary

The Honorable Todd M. Turner, Chair
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300
Washington DC 20002

Dear Chairman Turner:

The Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) requests an amendment to the State Highway Administration (SHA) portion of the FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as described in the attached memo. The purpose of this amendment is to reflect MDOT's new 2012-2017 Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) funding for the System Preservation Program, which was recently approved by the General Assembly. Due to the nature of these projects, we cannot wait until the new TIP is approved this summer.. This amendment reflects cash flows for six area-wide "grouped projects" for FY 2013, as summarized below and detailed in the attached TIP sheets. These projects are exempt from the requirement to determine air quality conformity.

MDOT requests that this amendment be approved by the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) Steering Committee on its May 4, 2012 meeting.

The following represents the total amount of funding being added to FY 2013 for each of the six area-wide categories that are the subject of this amendment request:

- 1) Environmental Projects (TIP ID 3038) – \$6,423,000
- 2) Safety and Spot (TIP ID 3084) – \$14,688,000
- 3) Resurfacing and Rehabilitation (TIP ID 3082) - \$16,647,000
- 4) Bridge Replacement (TIP ID 3081) - \$19,386,000
- 5) Urban Reconstruction (TIP ID 3083) - \$1,242,000
- 6) Congestion Management (TIP ID 3085) - \$1,317,000

The revised funding status of these projects will not impact scheduling or funding availability for other projects in the current TIP, which continues to be fiscally constrained. The cost does not affect the portion of the federal funding which was programmed for transit or any allocations of state aid in lieu of federal aid to local jurisdictions.



The Honorable Todd M. Turner
Page Two

We appreciate your cooperation in this matter. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact Ms. Lyn Erickson, at 410-865-1279, toll-free at 888-713-1414 or via email at lerickson@mdot.state.md.us. Of course, please feel free to contact me directly.

Thank You,



Michael W. Nixon, Manager
Office of Planning and Capital Programming

Attachment

cc: Ms. Mary Deitz, Chief, Regional and Intermodal Planning Division, SHA
Ms. Lyn Erickson, Manager, Office of Planning and Capital Programming,
Maryland Department of Transportation
Ms. Heather Murphy, Deputy Director, Office of Planning and Capital Programming
Maryland Department of Transportation



Martin O'Malley, *Governor*
Anthony G. Brown, *Lt. Governor*

Beverley K. Swaim-Staley, *Secretary*
Melinda B. Peters, *Administrator*

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mr. Don Halligan, Director
Office of Planning and Capital Programming, MDOT

ATTN: Mr. Mike Nixon, MDOT
Ms. Lyn Erikson, MDOT

FROM: Mary Deitz, Chief *MD*
Regional and Intermodal Planning Division

DATE: April 23, 2012

SUBJECT: Amendment Request to the Fiscal Year (FY) 2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the National Capital Region

RECEIVED
APR 26 2012

**OFFICE OF PLANNING &
CAPITAL PROGRAMMING**

The State Highway Administration (SHA) hereby requests to amend the FY 2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the six area-wide categories under the System Preservation projects as summarized below and detailed in the attached TIP sheets. The Maryland Department of Transportation's current (FY 12-17) Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) was updated in January 2012, subsequent to the adoption of the FY 2011 TIP. This amendment reflects cash flows for FY 2013, as presented in the updated CTP.

The following represents the total amount of funding being added to FY 2013 for each of the six area-wide categories that are the subject of this amendment request:

- 1) Environmental Projects (TIP ID 3038) – \$6,423,000
- 2) Safety and Spot (TIP ID 3084) – \$14,688,000
- 3) Resurfacing and Rehabilitation (TIP ID 3082) - \$16,647,000
- 4) Bridge Replacement (TIP ID 3081) - \$19,386,000
- 5) Urban Reconstruction (TIP ID 3083) - \$1,242,000
- 6) Congestion Management (TIP ID 3085) - \$1,317,000

The revised funding status of these projects will not impact scheduling or funding availability for other projects in the current TIP, which continues to be fiscally constrained. The cost does not affect the portion of the federal funding which was programmed for transit or any allocations of state aid in lieu of federal aid to local jurisdictions.



The following table compares the new proposed funding total for FY 2013, the current TIP amount for FY 2013, and the difference:

MDOT/SHA System Preservation Projects	2013 New - Proposed Amendment \$000s	2013 Current FY 11 TIP \$000s	Difference \$000s
Environmental Projects - TIP ID 3038			
National Highway System	\$4,805	\$370	\$4,435
Surface Transportation Prog.	\$4,844	\$3,283	\$1,561
National Recreational Trails	\$426	\$0	\$426
<i>Subtotal</i>	\$10,076	\$3,653	\$6,423
Safety and Spot - TIP ID 3084			
National Highway System	\$9,610	\$4,831	\$4,779
Surface Transportation Prog.	\$27,370	\$16,888	\$10,482
Interstate Maintenance	\$1,515	\$2,919	-\$1,404
Congestion Mitigation / Air Quality	\$1,240	\$0	\$1,240
Hwy Safety HSIP&SRTS	\$5,511	\$5,920	-\$409
<i>Subtotal</i>	\$45,246	\$30,558	\$14,688
Resurfacing and Rehabilitation - TIP ID 3082			
National Highway System	\$9,688	\$4,520	\$5,168
Surface Transportation Program	\$24,180	\$16,575	\$7,605
Interstate Maintenance	\$12,915	\$9,041	\$3,874
<i>Subtotal</i>	\$46,783	\$30,136	\$16,647
Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation - TIP ID 3081			
BRR	\$31,000	\$15,485	\$15,515
Surface Transportation Prog.	\$659	\$432	\$227
Interstate Maintenance	\$276	\$144	\$132
National Highway System	\$1,659	\$1,288	\$371
Local Bridge	\$3,875	\$0	\$3,875
ARRA	\$1,395	\$2,146	-\$751
<i>Subtotal</i>	\$38,863	\$19,495	\$19,368
Urban Reconstruction/Revitalization - TIP ID 3083			
Surface Transportation Prog.	\$2,248	\$1,006	\$1,242
<i>Subtotal</i>	\$2,248	\$1,006	\$1,242
Congestion Management - TIP ID 3085			
National Highway System	\$1,163	\$360	\$803
Surface Transportation Prog.	\$736	\$98	\$638
Congestion Mitigation / Air Quality	\$2,367	\$2,490	-\$123
<i>Subtotal</i>	\$4,265	\$2,948	\$1,317
TOTAL	\$147,481	\$87,796	\$59,685

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or Reena Mathews, Regional Planner, SHA at 410-545-5668 or via email at rmathews@sha.state.md.us.

Attachments

cc: Mr. Vaughn Lewis, Regional Planner, SHA
Ms. L'Kiesha Markley, Assistant Chief, Regional and Intermodal Planning Division, SHA
Ms. Reena Mathews, Regional Planner, SHA

**SUBURBAN MARYLAND
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
CAPITAL COSTS (in \$1,000)**

Source	Fed/St/Loc	Previous Funding	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	Source Total
--------	------------	------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------------

MDOT/State Highway Administration

Other

System Preservation Projects

TIP ID: 3085	Agency ID:	Title: Congestion Management								Complete: 2010
Facility:	CMAQ	80/20/0	2,162 c	2,277 c	2,310 a		4,440 c		29,207	
From:					2,420 b					
To:					17,760 c					
	CMAQ.	100/0/0				768 a			2,077	
						21 b				
						1,288 c				
	NHS	80/20/0	637 c	100 a	376 c	430 a	890 c		4,432	
				1,903 c		12 b				
						721 c				
	STP	80/20/0	174 c	3,879 c	103 c	272 a	243 c		4,960	
						7 b				
						456 c				

Total Funds: 40,676

Description: Congestion management program includes projects associated with the following: traffic management - new or reconstruct signals, signing and lighting; signal systemization; commuter action - engineering and construction of Park-n-Ride facilities; CHART - engineering and construction of ITS projects; and intersection capacity improvement - engineering and construction of intersection improvements.



Amendment - Change Funding	Requested on:	5/6/2011
Add \$1.25 million in NHS and state funds, and \$3.7 million in STP and state funds, for construction (\$4.95 million total) and \$100,000 in NHS funds for engineering in FY 2011.		
Administrative Modification - Change Funding	Requested on:	9/30/2011
Transferring \$2.2 million for PE and \$2.2 million for ROW in FY12 from Construction		
Amendment - Add Funding	Requested on:	12/2/2011
Add CMAQ funds for PP/PE: \$90,000 each in FY 2012 and FY 2013. Add CMAQ funds for RW: \$200,000 each in FY 2012 and FY 2013.		
Amendment - Modify Funding	Requested on:	5/4/2012
Added the following amounts to FY13 (\$000s): NHS \$803; STP \$638 CMAQ \$1,240. Reduced the following amounts in FY13 (\$000s): CMAQ \$123.		

**SUBURBAN MARYLAND
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
CAPITAL COSTS (in \$1,000)**

		Source	Fed/St/Loc	Previous Funding	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	Source Total
TIP ID: 3084		Agency ID: Title: Safety and Spot Improvements									Complete: 2010
Facility:		ARRA	100/0/0	13,172 c	12,671 c	4,255 c					16,926
From:		CMAQ	100/0/0				372 a				1,240
To:							25 b				
							843 c				
		HSIP	90/10/0	5,920 c	1,000 b	5,920 c	827 a	10,840 c			26,436
					5,920 c		55 b				
							1,874 c				
		IM	90/10/0	3,242 c	2,466 c	2,536 c	455 a	4,822 c			11,339
							30 b				
							1,030 c				
		NHS	80/20/0	4,771 c	3,712 c	3,991 c	2,883 a	9,928 c			27,241
							192 b				
							6,535 c				
		SRTS	100/0/0				826 a				2,754
							55 b				
							1,873 c				
		STP	80/20/0	13,838 c	12,241 c	1,596 a	7,661 a	334 a			82,679
						1,263 b	511 b	31,503 c			
						10,205 c	17,365 c				

Total Funds: 168,615

Description: Roundabouts, geometric improvements, slope repairs, pedestrian crossings, rail crossings, safety improvements, intersection realignment, drainage improvements, pavement marking and joint sealing.



Administrative Modification - Change Funding	Requested on:	3/30/2011
SHA is transferring \$1.0 million in funds from FY14 to FY11 for R/W funding from the HSIP funding category.		
Administrative Modification - Change Funding	Requested on:	9/30/2011
Transferring \$1.263 million for PE and \$1.263 million for ROW in FY12 from Construction		
Amendment - Add Funding	Requested on:	12/2/2011
Add STP funds for PP/PE: \$333,000 in each of FY 2012 and 2013; \$334,000 in FY 2014 Add STP funds for Construction: \$100,000 in FY 2012; \$1.5 million in FY 2013; \$1.4 million in 2014 TIP#3084 Safety and Spot - \$1,000,000 for PP/PE; \$3,000,000 for CO		
Amendment - Modify Funding	Requested on:	5/4/2012
Added the following amounts to FY13 (\$000s): NHS \$4,779; STP \$10,482; CMAQ \$1,240; Reduced the following in FY13 (\$000s): IM -\$1,404; HSIP&SRTS -\$409		

**SUBURBAN MARYLAND
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
CAPITAL COSTS (in \$1,000)**

		Source	Fed/St/Loc	Previous Funding	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	Source Total
TIP ID: 3083	Agency ID:	Title: Urban Reconstruction								Complete: 2010	
Facility:		STP	80/20/0	3,361 c	5,500 a	304 a	337 a				14,931
From:					3,533 c	304 b	67 b				
To:						3,043 c	1,843 c				

Total Funds: 14,931

Description: Rehabilitation or reconstruction which would include drainage, curb and gutter, pavement milling and resurfacing, streetscapes, sidewalks, signs, markings, and lighting.



Administrative Modification - Change Funding	Requested on:	3/30/2011
Transferring \$3.37 million from FY14 to \$1.68 million in FY11 and \$1.68 million FY12.		
Amendment - Change Funding	Requested on:	5/6/2011
Add \$5.5 million in STP and state funds in FY 2011 for streetscaping and pedestrian safety.		
Administrative Modification - Change Funding	Requested on:	9/30/2011
Transferring \$304,000 for PE and \$304,000 for ROW in FY12 from Construction		
Amendment - Modify Funding	Requested on:	5/4/2012
The following additions were made to FY13: (\$000s): STP \$1,242		

		Source	Fed/St/Loc	Previous Funding	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	Source Total
TIP ID: 3082	Agency ID:	Title: Resurfacing and Rehabilitation								Complete: 2010	
Facility:		ARRA	100/0/0	48,359 c	11,100 c						11,100
From:											
To:		IM	90/10/0	4,573 c	3,846 c	7,631 c	904 a	20,821 c			45,213
							129 b				
							11,882 c				
		NHS	80/20/0	2,286 c	1,923 c	3,815 c	678 a	10,410 c			25,836
							97 b				
							8,913 c				
		STP	80/20/0	8,384 c	7,051 c	1,399 a	1,693 a	38,172 c			83,394
						1,399 b	242 b				
						11,192 c	22,246 c				

Total Funds: 165,543

Description: Pavement milling overlay concrete patching.



Administrative Modification - Change Funding	Requested on:	9/30/2011
Transferring \$1.399 million for PE and \$1.399 million for ROW in FY12 from Construction		
Amendment - Modify Funding	Requested on:	5/4/2012
The following additions were made to FY 13 (\$000s): NHS \$5,168; STP \$7,605; IM \$3,874		

**SUBURBAN MARYLAND
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
CAPITAL COSTS (in \$1,000)**

		Source	Fed/St/Loc	Previous Funding	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	Source Total
TIP ID: 3081		Agency ID: Title: Bridge Replacement/Rehabilitation									Complete: 2010
Facility:		ARRA	100/0/0	3,700 c	6,179 c	4,588 c	251 a				12,162
From:							42 b				
To:							1,102 c				
<hr/>											
		BR	80/20/0	19,743 c	21,554 c	1,834 a	5,580 a	9,792 c			82,898
						1,834 b	930 b				
						14,507 c	24,490 c				
<hr/>											
		IM	90/10/0	161 c	180 c	145 c	50 a	357 c			958
							8 b				
							218 c				
<hr/>											
		Local	0/0/100				698 a				3,875
							116 b				
							3,061 c				
<hr/>											
		NHS	80/20/0	321 c	360 c	1,000 a	119 a	1,000 a	1,000 a	1,000 a	6,025
						291 c	20 b	715 c			
							520 c				
<hr/>											
		STP	80/20/0	482 c	540 c	437 c	119 a	1,073 c			2,709
							20 b				
							520 c				
											Total Funds: 108,627

Description: Structural replacements, bridge deck rehabilitation, superstructure replacements, bridge parapet reconstruction, and painting.



Administrative Modification - Change Funding	Requested on:	3/30/2011
This modification decreases funding by \$30.9 million in order to create 3 new line items for bridges in the Washington region:		
- I-270 at MD 80/Bennet Creek - Bridge Deck Replacement (\$8.8 million)		
- I-495 over Northwest Branch - Bridge Deck Overlay (\$9.0 million)		
- US 15/Motter avenue - Bridge Replacement (\$13.0 million)		
Administrative Modification - Change Funding	Requested on:	9/30/2011
Transferring \$1.83 million for PE and \$1.83 million for ROW in FY12 from Construction		
Amendment - Modify Funding	Requested on:	12/2/2011
Add NHS funds for PP/PE: \$1.0 million each in FY 2012 through FY 2016. Reduce BRR funds for CO: \$167,000 in FY 2012, \$2.678 million in FY 2013; and \$2.210 million in FY 2014.		
Amendment - Modify Funding	Requested on:	5/4/2012
Added the following amounts to FY13 (\$000s): BRR \$15,515; STP \$227; IM \$132; NHS \$371; Local Bridge \$3,875. Reduced the following amount in FY13 (\$000s): ARRA -\$751.		

**SUBURBAN MARYLAND
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
CAPITAL COSTS (in \$1,000)**

		Source	Fed/St/Loc	Previous Funding	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	Source Total
TIP ID: 3038	Agency ID:	Title: Environmental Projects								Complete: 2010	
Facility:		ARRA	100/0/0	777 c	333 c	74 c					407
From:		ARRA/TIGER	100/0/0	3,024 c							
To:		NHS	80/20/0	2,035 c	1,369 c	370 c	1,826 a 48 b 2,931 c	370 c			6,914
		NRT	80/20/0				162 a 4 b 260 c				426
		STP	80/20/0	4,415 c	8,909 c	4,950 a 193 b 7,444 c	1,841 a 48 b 2,955 c	175 a			26,515
Total Funds:											34,262

Description: Noise abatement, wetland replacement, reforestation and landscape planting.



Administrative Modification - Change Funding SHA is transferring \$5,898 from FY14 to FY11 in order to add money for the Total Maximum Daily Load Requirement.	Requested on:	3/30/2011
Amendment - Change Funding Add \$5.7 million (construction) and \$4.2 million (engineering) in STP and state funds in FY 2011 for Total Maximim Daily Load Projects.	Requested on:	5/6/2011
Administrative Modification - Change Funding Transferred \$5.7 million (Construction) and \$4.2 million (planning/engineering) in STP for TMDL projects from FY11 to FY12. For FY12, Transferred \$193,000 from Construction to R/W.	Requested on:	9/30/2011
Amendment - Add Funding Add \$750,000 in STP funds for PP/PE in FY 2012 Add \$925,000 in STP funds for PP/PE in FY 2013 Add \$175,000 in STP funds for PP/PE in FY 2014 \$1,850,000 for PP/PE	Requested on:	12/2/2011
Amendment - Modify Funding Added the following amounts to FY13 (\$000s): NHS \$4,435; STP \$1,561; NRT \$426	Requested on:	5/4/2012

**NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
777 North Capitol Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002**

**RESOLUTION ON AN AMENDMENT TO
THE FY 2011- 2016 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)
THAT IS EXEMPT FROM THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY REQUIREMENT
TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE SUNNYSIDE AVENUE BRIDGE
REPLACEMENT PROJECT, AS REQUESTED BY THE PRINCE GEORGE'S
COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION (DPW&T)**

WHEREAS, the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB), which is the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Washington Region, has the responsibility under the provisions of Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act - A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) for developing and carrying out a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Metropolitan Area; and

WHEREAS, the TIP is required by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as a basis and condition for all federal funding assistance to state, local and regional agencies for transportation improvements within the Washington planning area; and

WHEREAS, on November 17, 2010 the TPB adopted the FY 2011-2016 TIP; and

WHEREAS, in the attached letter of April 24, 2012, DWP&T has requested an amendment to the FY 2011-2016 TIP to include an additional \$6.991 million in Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation and local matching funds, as described in the attached materials; and

WHEREAS, this project is exempt from the air quality conformity requirement, as defined in Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations "40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments: Flexibility and Streamlining; Final Rule," issued in the May 6, 2005, *Federal Register*;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Steering Committee of the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board amends the FY 2011-2016 TIP to include an additional \$6.991 million in Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation and local matching funds, as described in the attached materials.

Adopted by the Transportation Planning Board Steering Committee at its regular meeting on May 4, 2012.



Rushern L. Baker, III
County Executive

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY GOVERNMENT



Department of Public Works and Transportation
Office of the Director



April 24, 2012

The Honorable Todd M. Turner, Chairman
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20002

Dear Chairman Turner:

The Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) requests an amendment to the FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to allow for an increase from \$5.225 million to \$12.216 for replacement of the Sunnyside Avenue Bridge over Indian Creek. This project currently is included in the Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP), the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and approved air quality conformity analysis.

Originally built in 1946 as a steel beam bridge with a concrete deck measuring 24 feet wide and 33 feet long, the existing bridge is deteriorating and the approaches to it are prone to flooding, necessitating frequent closings of the roadway. In addition to the bridge replacement, this project also includes widening of the roadway east of the CSX crossing to Kenilworth Avenue (MD 201).

Eighty percent of the funding for the bridge replacement comes from federal aid for bridge design and construction. The remaining 20 percent is funded by Prince George's County. Additionally, it is anticipated that right-of-way acquisition, wetlands mitigation, and roadway reconstruction within the approach limits to the bridge will be entirely funded by the County.

Prince George's County respectfully asks that the requested amendment be approved by the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) Steering Committee at its May 4, 2012, meeting. Your cooperation in and attention to this matter is appreciated. Should you have questions or comments about this request, please contact me or Victor Weissberg at 301.883.5600,

Sincerely,

Haitham A. Hijazi
Director

Attachment

Chairman Todd Turner
April 24, 2012
Page 2

cc: Carla Reid, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Prince George's County
Aubrey Thagard, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer, Prince George's
County
Ronald Kirby, Director of Transportation, Metropolitan Washington
Council of Governments
Andre' Issayans, Deputy Director, DPW&T
Victor Weissberg, Special Assistant to the Director, DPW&T
Donald A. Halligan, Director, Office of Planning and Capital Programming,
Maryland Department of Transportation
Lyn Erickson, Manager, Office of Planning and Capital Programming,
Maryland Department of Transportation
Michael Nixon, Manager, Office of Planning and Capital Programming,
Maryland Department of Transportation

**SUBURBAN MARYLAND
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
CAPITAL COSTS (in \$1,000)**

Source	Fed/St/Loc	Previous Funding	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	Source Total
--------	------------	------------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	--------------

Prince George's County

Bridge

Sunnyside Avenue Bridge Replacement

TIP ID: 5808	Agency ID:	Title: Sunnyside Avenue Bridge Replacement							Complete:
---------------------	------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------

Facility:	BR	80/0/20	923 a	348 a	300 a	50 a	50 a	23 a	12,216
From:				100 b	25 b	4,660 c	4,660 c	2,000 c	
To:									Total Funds: 12,216

Description: This Project replaces the Sunnyside Avenue Bridge over Indian Creek and widens the roadway west of the CSX crossing to Kenilworth Avenue (MD 201). The original bridge design was built in 1946, and rehabilitated in 1966 and 1974. Funding is anticipated to be 80% Federal Aid for bridge design and construction. Right-of-way, wetlands mitigation, and roadway reconstruction beyond the bridge and approach limits are anticipated to be 100% County-funded.

Amendment - Modify Funding	Requested on:	5/4/2012
Increase BR funding total in Fiscal Years 2011-2015 from \$5.225 million to \$12.216 million.		

ITEM 7 – Action

May 16, 2012

Approval of Complete Streets Policy for the National Capital Region

Staff Recommendation: Receive briefing on the enclosed draft final Complete Streets Policy and adopt Resolution R15-2012 to approve it.

Issues: None

Background: At the April 18 meeting, the Board was briefed and provided comments on a revised Complete Streets Policy document which reflected several months of discussion by state and local government agencies and interested citizens.

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
777 North Capitol Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002

RESOLUTION APPROVING
THE COMPLETE STREETS POLICY FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

WHEREAS, the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB) has been designated by the Governors of Maryland and Virginia and the Mayor of the District of Columbia as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Washington Metropolitan Area; and

WHEREAS, the TPB Vision, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region, and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Government's *Region Forward* have goals to encourage walking, bicycling, and the use of public transportation as safe, convenient, environmentally friendly, and economical modes of transportation that promote health and independence for all people; and

WHEREAS, the concept of "complete streets" is defined in this resolution and attachments as follows: "a complete street safely and adequately accommodates motorized and non-motorized users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, freight vehicles, emergency vehicles, and transit riders of all ages and abilities, in a manner appropriate to the function and context of the facility;" and,

WHEREAS, many but not all TPB member jurisdictions have Complete Streets policies, or are in the process of revising existing policies; and

WHEREAS, at the June 15, 2011 TPB meeting, the Citizens Advisory Committee requested that the TPB develop and approve a regional policy on Complete Streets; and

WHEREAS, at the June 15, 2011 TPB meeting, the TPB Chair requested that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee of the TPB Technical Committee advise the development of a regional policy on Complete Streets with input from the Access for All Committee, the Bus Subcommittee, the Citizens Advisory Committee, and members of the general public; and

WHEREAS, on January 30, 2012, a public workshop with regional state and local transportation agency representatives reviewed their existing Complete Streets policies and experiences; and

WHEREAS, the Access for All Committee, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, the Bus Subcommittee, the Freight Subcommittee, and the Citizens Advisory

Committee were briefed and provided comments on draft versions of the Complete Streets policy; and

WHEREAS, on March 21, 2012, a TPB work session was held prior to the TPB meeting to discuss ongoing Complete Streets activities in the region and a draft Complete Streets Guidance and Policy Template; and

WHEREAS, at its March 21 and April 18, 2012 meetings, the TPB was briefed and provided comments on draft versions of a Complete Streets Policy and supporting documents; and

WHEREAS, on May 4, 2012, the TPB Technical Committee was briefed on a draft Complete Streets Policy and supporting documentation and recommended favorable action on the policy,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD approves the attached Complete Streets Policy for the National Capital Region.

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290 (202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202

MEMORANDUM

TO: Transportation Planning Board

FROM: Michael Farrell, Transportation Planner
Department of Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: Comments Received and Revisions to the Regional Complete Streets Policy and Template

DATE: May 7, 2012

Background

At the April 18th meeting, TPB members provided comments on a draft regional Complete Streets Policy and Template. The Citizens Advisory Committee and the Virginia Bicycling Federation also submitted comments on the draft document.

The overall response from the TPB was favorable towards the changes made since the March 21st meeting. There were numerous questions and suggestions, however. A member suggested that a provision should be added to the template to clarify that access to existing facilities should be maintained during construction projects. Another member suggested that a provision should be added to the policy template providing for exempting projects from providing access to particular user groups if doing so would be inconsistent with local, State, or agency laws, policies, or plans. Some members suggested changing the definition of a Complete Street to reduce the number of exempt or non-applicable projects, and adding links to additional documentation in the TIP form.

The Citizens Advisory Committee was broadly supportive of the changes. The Virginia Bicycling Federation representative suggested that agencies should describe how they will accommodate each user group in the TIP project description form, not just whether they will accommodate.

The TPB Technical Committee reviewed the draft at its May 4th meeting, and recommended that the TIP description form track implementation of TPB member Complete Streets policies, rather than implementation of the TPB's Policy Template.

Changes based upon comments received

Based on comments received, the attached revised draft includes the following changes:

1. Under "Inclusions", in Attachment A, the policy template, the following sentence was added: "Access to existing facilities, especially for persons with disabilities, should be maintained during construction."

2. Under IV.3 of the documentation section of the Complete Streets policy, TPB member jurisdictions and agencies are now to document their implementation of their own Complete Streets policies in the TIP project description form.
3. The TIP project description form, attachment B, now requires documentation relative to agency or jurisdiction Complete Streets policies rather than regionally defined Complete Streets principles. Agencies are no longer asked whether they will accommodate specific user groups. Agencies are asked to provide a project URL, project manager name, and email, if that information is available.

Responses to other comments received

Responses to three other suggested changes are as follows:

1. An exemption in the Policy Template for projects for which providing access to a particular user group would be inconsistent with a current agency plan or policy.

This exemption has been added to the TIP project description form, but not to the Template. The Template is only a suggested language, not binding on the TPB members, and agencies are free to add or remove exemptions when they develop their own policies.

2. Change the Complete Streets definition to reduce the number of exempt or non-applicable projects.

The provisions for exempt or non-applicable projects in the TIP document have been streamlined to address this concern without requiring any change in the Complete Streets definition.

3. Add more details on type of accommodation in the TIP project description form.

Detailed information on how users will be accommodated on particular facilities is best provided through the regional information clearinghouse or the individual project manager, rather than the TIP.

Complete Streets Policy for the National Capital Region

I. Background

The Transportation Planning Board wishes to encourage walking, bicycling, and the use of public transportation as safe, convenient, environmentally friendly, and economical modes of transportation that enhance economic development and promote physical activity, health and independence for all people. These goals are embodied in the TPB's *Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region* (2010), *COG's Region Forward* (2010) and the *TPB Vision* (1998). The TPB also believes that the most cost-effective way to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users is to integrate them into the design of transportation facilities from the beginning, rather than retrofit facilities to accommodate them later.

On June 15th, 2011 the Citizens Advisory Committee requested that the TPB develop and approve a regional policy on Complete Streets, and the TPB Chair directed staff to work with the relevant subcommittees to create a proposal. The resulting *Complete Streets Policy and Guidance* documents have been drafted with extensive input from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, the Citizens Advisory Committee, the Bus Subcommittee, the Freight Subcommittee, a Stakeholders Workshop, and the TPB Technical Committee.

II. Definitions

(1) COMPLETE STREET.

A complete street safely and adequately accommodates motorized and non-motorized users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, freight vehicles, emergency vehicles, and transit riders of all ages and abilities, in a manner appropriate to the function and context of the facility.

(2) COMPLETE STREETS POLICY.—The term “complete streets policy” means

A directive at the local, state, regional, or federal level that ensures the safe and adequate accommodation, in all phases of project planning, development, and operations, of all users of the transportation network, including pedestrians and transit riders of all ages and abilities, bicyclists, individuals with disabilities, motorists, freight vehicles, and emergency vehicles, in a manner appropriate to the function and context of the relevant facility.

(3) COMPLETE STREETS PRINCIPLE;—The term “complete streets principle” means

A specific component of a Complete Streets policy.

III. Policy Statement

The National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board endorses the concept of Complete Streets and strongly encourages its member jurisdictions and agencies that do not already have a Complete Streets policy, or who are revising an existing policy, to adopt a Complete Streets policy that includes common elements that the TPB believes reflect current best practices, as represented by the attached *Complete Streets Guidance and Policy Template*.

IV. Documentation and Reporting

1. Within 120 days of the adoption of this policy, and every two years thereafter, Transportation Planning Board staff will conduct a survey of the TPB member jurisdictions and agencies regarding their adoption and implementation of Complete Streets policies.
2. Within 120 days of the adoption of this policy, and every two years thereafter, Transportation Planning Board member jurisdictions and agencies will report in the regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Project Database on the pedestrian and bicycle facilities that have been newly created or substantially improved.
3. Within two years of the adoption of this policy, implementation of member jurisdiction and agency Complete Streets policies will be documented in the regional Transportation Improvement Program, using the attached TIP submission form.
4. Within two years of the adoption of this policy, the TPB will create a regional information clearing house, which will provide access to state and local project web sites where detailed and timely information on the design of transportation projects can be found, so that the public may judge whether and how well such projects implement Complete Streets principles.

V. Promotion

With six months of the adopting of this policy, the TPB will sponsor training on Complete Streets best practices for personnel responsible for the design, construction, and maintenance of streets.

Attachment A

Complete Streets Guidance and Policy Template

I. Complete Streets Guidance: Ten Elements of an Ideal Complete Streets Policy

The following ten elements, which are endorsed by the National Complete Streets Coalition, should be part of a comprehensive Complete Streets policy. An ideal Complete Streets policy:

- Includes a vision for how and why the community wants to complete its streets.
- Specifies that “all users” includes pedestrians, bicyclists and transit passengers of all ages and abilities as well as trucks, buses and automobiles.
- Encourages street connectivity and aims to create a comprehensive, integrated, connected network for all modes.
- Is adoptable by all agencies to cover all roads.
- Applies to both new and retrofit projects, including design, planning, maintenance, and operations for the entire right of way.
- Makes any exceptions specific and sets a clear procedure that requires high-level approval of exceptions.
- Directs the use of the latest and best design standards while recognizing the need for flexibility in balancing user needs.
- Directs that complete streets solutions will complement the context of the community.
- Establishes performance standards with measurable outcomes.
- Includes specific next steps for implementation of policy, such as
 - Revising agency procedures and regulations to reflect the policy
 - Developing or adopting new design guides
 - Offering training for staff responsible for implementing the policy
 - Gathering data on how well streets are serving different user groups

II. Complete Streets Policy Template

Beginning on the effective date of this policy, all transportation projects in (insert Jurisdiction or Agency) shall accommodate the safety and convenience of all users in accordance with Complete Streets principles.

Inclusions

1. Roadways, shoulders, sidewalks, shared use paths, street crossings, pedestrian signals, signs, street furniture, landscaping, lighting, transit stops and facilities, rail crossings, and all connecting pathways should be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so that all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit vehicles and riders, freight vehicles, emergency vehicles, motorists, and people with disabilities, can travel safely and independently. Access to existing facilities, especially for persons with disabilities, should be maintained during construction.
2. Transportation projects should address the need for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross facilities as well as travel along them. The design and construction of new facilities should not preclude the provision of future improvements to accommodate future demand for walking and bicycling, especially in order to access transit.
3. Transportation projects should comply with up-to-date design standards, particularly standards relating to providing access for individuals with disabilities.
4. Complete Streets principles should be applied in due consideration of the urban, suburban, or rural context in which a project is located, as well as applicable federal, state, local environmental requirements, and the effects of right of way widening on adjacent property owners and residents. While all users should be accommodated, modal priorities may vary by area and facility.

Exemptions

Project-specific exemptions shall be approved by a senior manager of the responsible agency.

This policy does not apply:

1. To a new transportation facility construction or modification project for which, as of the effective date of the adoption of the policy, at least 30 percent of the design phase is completed.

2. To a transportation facility which prohibits, by law, use of the facility by specified users, in which case a greater effort should be made to accommodate those specified users elsewhere in the travel corridor.
3. When the cost to the exempted project in achieving compliance with the applicable complete streets policy would be excessively disproportionate (as per FHWA guidance), as compared to the need or probable use of a particular complete street.
4. When the existing and planned population and employment densities or level of transit service around a particular roadway are so low that there is a documented absence of a need (as per FHWA guidance) to implement the applicable complete streets policy.
5. To passenger and freight rail projects, which shall not be required to accommodate other motorized users in the railway right of way, although safe and adequate rail crossings for motorized and non-motorized users should be provided.
6. To transportation projects which do not provide for direct use by the public, such as maintenance facilities, drainage and stormwater management facilities, education and training, transportation security projects, beautification, and equipment purchase or rehabilitation.

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR FY 2013-2018 PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM



BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Submitting Agency:
2. Project Name (from CLRP Project):
3. Phase Name:

	Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier
4. Facility:				
5. From (_ at):				
6. To:				

7. Description:
8. Agency Phase ID:
9. Projected Completion Year:
10. Project Status: New Project
 In previous TIP, proceeding as scheduled
 In previous TIP, delayed or reprogrammed
11. Completed:

Environmental Review

12. Type: PCE; CE; DEA; EA; FONSI; DEIS; FEIS; F4; N/A
13. Status: Proposed for preparation; Under preparation; Prepared for review; Under review; Approved

Complete Streets

14. Bicycle/Pedestrian Accommodation (Choose from the drop-down menu)
 - Bicycle/pedestrian accommodations included
 - No bicycle/pedestrian accommodations included
 - Not Applicable
 - Primarily a bicycle/pedestrian project
15. Does your jurisdiction or agency have a Complete Streets Policy?
 Yes No If Yes, answer #16.
16. Choose one of the following:
 - Complete Streets policy is not applicable to this project.
 - This project advances our Complete Streets policy goals.
 - This project is exempt (Identify the exemption from the dropdown menu)
 - Grandfathered
 - User group prohibited by law
 - Excessive cost
 - Absence of need
 - Environmental
 - Historic Preservation
 - Accommodation of user group contrary to jurisdiction/agency policy or plans
 - Other (Explain: _____)

Capital Costs

CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

FISCAL YEAR	AMOUNT	PHASE	SOURCE	FED	STA	LOC

17. Project URL: _____

18. Project Manager Name: _____

19. Project Manager Email: _____

ITEM 8 – Action

May 16, 2012

Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2011-2016 TIP to Include the WMATA FY2013 Capital Improvement Program

Staff

Recommendation: Adopt Resolution R16-2012 to approve an amendment to FY 2011-2016 TIP to include WMATA's FY2013 Capital Improvement Program.

Issues: None

Background: The purpose of this amendment is to modify project budgets and sources of funds in the TIP for FY 2013 in order to match those in WMATA's FY 2013 grant applications to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) that were submitted on March 31, 2012. WMATA has submitted its grant applications at this time with the goal of receiving the funding by July 1, 2012.

**NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
777 North Capitol Street, N.E.
Washington, D.C. 20002**

**RESOLUTION ON AN AMENDMENT TO
THE FY 2011- 2016 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) THAT IS
EXEMPT FROM THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY REQUIREMENT TO UPDATE
PROJECT INFORMATION FOR FY 2013 IN ORDER TO MATCH THE PROPOSED
FY 2013 CAPITAL BUDGET, AS REQUESTED BY THE WASHINGTON
METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY (WMATA)**

WHEREAS, the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB), which is the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Washington Region, has the responsibility under the provisions of Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act - A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) for developing and carrying out a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process for the Metropolitan Area; and

WHEREAS, the TIP is required by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as a basis and condition for all federal funding assistance to state, local and regional agencies for transportation improvements within the Washington planning area; and

WHEREAS, on November 17, 2010 the TPB adopted the FY 2011-2016 TIP; and

WHEREAS, in the attached letter of May 9, 2012 WMATA has requested an amendment to the FY 2011-2016 TIP to update funding information and amounts in FY 2013 to match WMATA's proposed FY 2013 Capital Budget, as described in the attached materials; and

WHEREAS, the proposed changes are exempt from the air quality conformity requirement, as defined in Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations "40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 Transportation Conformity Rule Amendments: Flexibility and Streamlining; Final Rule," issued in the May 6, 2005, *Federal Register*;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board amends the FY 2011-2016 TIP to update funding information and amounts in FY 2013 to match WMATA's proposed FY 2013 Capital Budget, as described in the attached materials.



May 9, 2012

The Honorable Todd Turner
Chairman, National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 North Capitol Street, N.E.; Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002-4201

RE: Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2011-2016 TIP to Update Project Information for FY 2013 in order to match the Proposed FY 2013 Capital Budget of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)

Dear Chairman Turner:

The region's six-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) outlines the schedule for obligating federal funds to state and local projects. The purpose of this amendment is to modify project budgets and sources of funds in the TIP for FY 2013 in order to match those in WMATA's FY 2013 grant applications currently being submitted to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). WMATA is submitting its grant applications at this time with the goal of receiving the funding as soon as possible. This would allow WMATA to use the funds at the beginning of its fiscal year, and be consistent with its expenditure-based budget process. Because the changes for FY 2013 would cause changes in future years, this TIP amendment includes updated project allocations for FY 2014-2016 as well, consistent with WMATA's proposed capital improvement program (CIP) for FY 2013-2018.

Attachment A is a summary of the proposed FY 2013 project budgets and funding-source information for this TIP amendment. These funding sources include only new federal and local funds, and exclude funding that will be carried forward from prior years. Attachment B shows the FY 2013 project budgets that were amended most recently in 2011 as part of the currently adopted TIP as

**Washington
Metropolitan Area
Transit Authority**

600 Fifth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001
202/962-1234

*By Metrorail:
Judiciary Square-Red Line
Gallery Place-Chinatown
Red, Green and
Yellow Lines*

*A District of Columbia
Maryland and Virginia
Transit Partnership*

well as the proposed changes to each budget. The TIP's overall FY 2013 capital program for WMATA would be increased from \$735.6 million to \$775.3 million, reflecting the availability of federal, state and local funds, including the federal funds authorized under the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008 (PRIIA), and the funding to match the federal funds. These TIP projects do not affect the currently approved air-quality-conformity analysis because these projects are either exempt or not regionally significant in terms of air quality.

WMATA's submission for this FY 2011-2016 TIP amendment is structured into nine major categories, with 13 individual capital programs, as shown in Attachment A. The FY 2011 and 2012 capital projects and funding levels are consistent with WMATA's approved FY 2012 capital budget. The FY 2013-2016 capital projects and funding levels shown are consistent with the FY 2013-2018 CIP that has been proposed by WMATA's General Manager and Chief Executive Officer, and is under consideration by the WMATA Board. Earlier this year, WMATA held public hearings on its proposed operating and capital budgets, including the proposed sources and uses of its capital funds.

In addition to the requirement of consistency with an approved TIP, the FTA requires that agency grant applications match the corresponding State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for that agency. WMATA's TIP is considered part of DC's STIP. If approved by the TPB, WMATA will request that this amendment be reflected in DC's STIP as soon as possible, to enable the FTA review that is anticipated to require 60 days.

If any changes are made to funding sources or to WMATA's FY 2013-2018 CIP, WMATA will request additional TIP amendments as needed.

WMATA requests that the TPB approve this amendment at its May 16, 2012 meeting.

Sincerely,



Nat Bottigheimer
Assistant General Manager
Department of Planning and Joint Development

Attachments

Attachment A

Proposed Amendment to the FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program - Funding Sources FY 2013

May, 2012

Attachment A

(in YOE \$ Millions)

Category	Project	FY 2013	Federal 5307 Grants	Federal 5309 Grants	Federal PRIIA Grants	CMAQ, Bus Facility, Bus Safety, Safety/Security	Local Funding
Vehicles/Vehicle Parts	Rail Cars - Replacement, Rehabilitation, & Enhancements	\$47.2	\$0.0	\$7.6	\$18.4	\$0.0	\$21.2
	Buses - Replacement, Rehabilitation, & Enhancements	\$144.5	\$91.0	\$0.0	\$12.6	\$5.0	\$35.9
	Access & Service Vehicles	\$16.6	\$10.1	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$6.5
Rail System Infrastructure Rehabilitation	Rail Line Segment Rehabilitation	\$147.1	\$0.0	\$58.6	\$31.0	\$0.0	\$57.6
Maintenance Facilities	Bus Garages - Systemwide Maintenance, Expansion, Rehabilitation, and Replacement	\$38.2	\$30.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$8.0
	Rail Yards - Systemwide Maintenance, Expansion, Rehabilitation, and Replacement	\$61.4	\$0.0	\$2.4	\$29.2	\$0.0	\$29.8
	Bus and Rail Facilities Maintenance Support - Systemwide Support Equipment, Environmental Compliance Projects, and Administrative Support	\$15.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$4.2	\$10.8
Systems and Technology	Systems and Technology	\$84.4	\$2.7	\$10.1	\$0.0	\$1.5	\$70.1
Track & Structures	Track and Structures	\$57.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$26.1	\$0.0	\$30.9
Passenger Facilities	Passenger Facilities	\$100.2	\$3.8	\$22.2	\$11.0	\$1.0	\$62.3
Maintenance Equipment	Maintenance Equipment	\$53.0	\$1.6	\$0.4	\$21.6	\$0.0	\$29.4
Other Facilities	Other Facilities	\$8.0	\$0.0	\$0.2	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$7.9
Project Management and Support	Credit Facility	\$2.5	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$2.5
Total Capital Improvement Program:		\$775.3	\$139.4	\$101.3	\$150.0	\$11.8	\$372.9

* Note: Figures do not include funding from previous years.

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Proposed Amendment to the FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program - Changes in FY 2013 Funding

May, 2012

Attachment B

(in YOE \$ Millions)

Category	Project	Approved FY 2013 TIP Budget as Amended July 2011	Proposed FY 2013 TIP Budget May 2012	Change
Vehicles/Vehicle Parts	Rail Cars - Replacement, Rehabilitation, & Enhancements	\$49.9	\$47.2	(\$2.7)
	Buses - Replacement, Rehabilitation, & Enhancements	\$125.7	\$144.5	\$18.8
	Access & Service Vehicles	\$17.1	\$16.6	(\$0.5)
Rail System Infrastructure Rehabilitation	Rail Line Segment Rehabilitation	\$61.9	\$147.1	\$85.2
Maintenance Facilities	Bus Garages - Systemwide Maintenance, Expansion, Rehabilitation, and Replacement	\$106.8	\$38.2	(\$68.6)
	Rail Yards - Systemwide Maintenance, Expansion, Rehabilitation, and Replacement	\$15.5	\$61.4	\$45.9
	Bus and Rail Facilities Maintenance Support - Systemwide Support Equipment, Environmental Compliance Projects, and Administrative Support	\$16.5	\$15.0	(\$1.5)
Systems and Technology	Systems and Technology	\$57.2	\$84.4	\$27.2
Track & Structures	Track and Structures	\$57.8	\$57.0	(\$0.8)
Passenger Facilities	Passenger Facilities	\$77.7	\$100.2	\$22.5
Maintenance Equipment	Maintenance Equipment	\$134.8	\$53.0	(\$81.8)
Other Facilities	Other Facilities	\$6.4	\$8.0	\$1.6
Project Management and Support	Credit Facility	\$5.3	\$2.5	(\$2.8)
	Total Capital Improvement Program:	\$732.6	\$775.3	\$42.7
Other/ Federal Earmarks	Bus and Bus Facilities	\$3.0	\$0.0	(\$3.0)
	Total:	\$735.6	\$775.3	\$39.7

* Note: Figures do not include funding from previous years.

**WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
CAPITAL COSTS (in \$1,000)**

Proposed for Amendment: 5/16/201

			Source	Fed/St/Loc	Previous Funding	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	Source Total
Transit												
Maintenance Equipment												
TIP ID: 5861	Agency ID:	Title: Maintenance Equipment										
Facility:		Local	0/0/100		876 e	4,030 e	7,260 e	4,009 e	712 e	300 e		17,187
From:		PRIIA	50/0/50		37,018 e	127,917 e	43,282 e	61,763 e	51,226 e	34,808 e		356,014
To:		Section 5307	80/0/20		2,732 e		2,016 e		3,345 e	3,841 e		11,934
		Section 5309	80/0/20		521 e	2,853 e	490 e				14,223 e	18,087
											Total Funds:	460,573

Description: Provides funds for
a. Rail Maintenance Equipment: purchase and/or replacement of equipment to maintain the rail system.
b. Bus Repair Equipment: purchase and/or replacement of repair equipment.
c. Business Facilities Equipment: purchase and/or replacement of equipment that supports the business process of the agency.

Maintenance Facilities												
TIP ID: 5857	Agency ID:	Title: Bus Garages - Systemwide Maintenance, Expansion, Rehabilitation, and Replacement										
Facility:		Local	0/0/100		2,276 e	50,578 e	428 e	17,443 e	3,086 e	5,820 e		79,631
From:		PRIIA	50/0/50		18,879 e							18,879
To:		Section 5307	80/0/20		35,240 e	56,271 e	37,794 e	46,903 e	20,923 e	3,526 e		200,657
											Total Funds:	299,167

Description: Provides funds for
a. Rehabilitation and Replacement of Bus Garages: upgrades, rehabilitation, and/or replacement of bus garages and maintenance facilities.
b. Maintenance of Bus Garages: maintenance of bus garages/maintenance facilities.
c. Expansion of Bus Garages: expansion of bus garages to meet storage and maintenance needs of growing fleet.

TIP ID: 5866	Agency ID:	Title: Rail Yards - Systemwide Maintenance, Expansion, Rehabilitation and Replacement										
Facility:		PRIIA	50/0/50		5,154 e	15,499 e	58,426 e	77,412 e	52,401 e	26,979 e		235,871
From:		Section 5309	80/0/20				3,000 e					3,000
To:												
											Total Funds:	246,505

Description: Provides funds for
a. Maintenance of Rail Yards: maintenance and/or rehabilitation of rail maintenance yards.
b. Rail Maintenance Facilities: construction and/or replacement of rail maintenance facilities.

**WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
CAPITAL COSTS (in \$1,000)**

Proposed for Amendment: 5/16/201

			Source	Fed/St/Loc	Previous Funding	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	Source Total
TIP ID: 5867	Agency ID:	Title: Facilities Maintenance Support – Systemwide Support Equipment, Environmental Compl Projects and Adm Support										
Facility:		Local	0/0/100			3,957 e	6,129 e	10,821 e	12,804 e	7,235 e	7,629 e	48,575
From:		Section 5307	100/0/0					4,208 e				4,208
To:		Section 5309	80/0/20			1,999 e			3,000 e	2,014 e		7,013
											Total Funds:	79,711

Description: a. Environmental Compliance Projects: facility or equipment upgrades and/or replacements required to comply with environmental regulatory requirements or directives.
 b. Maintenance Bus & Rail Facilities: upgrades, rehabilitation, and/or replacements of systemwide support equipment, financial planning, and project administration.

Other Facilities

TIP ID: 5862	Agency ID:	Title: Other Support Facilities										
Facility:		Local	0/0/100			1,819 e	3,626 e	7,820 e	2,427 e	1,283 e	5,548 e	22,523
From:		PRIIA	50/0/50			2,127 e	2,524 e					4,651
To:		Section 5307	80/0/20			625 e						625
		Section 5309	80/0/20			2,689 e	227 e	194 e				3,110
											Total Funds:	37,616

Description: Provides funds for
 a. Business Support Facilities: facilities that support business operations functions.
 b. MTPD Support Facilities: upgrade, rehabilitation, and/or Metro Transit Police Department facilities and other such facilities.

**WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
CAPITAL COSTS (in \$1,000)**

Proposed for Amendment: 5/16/201

			Source	Fed/St/Loc	Previous Funding	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	Source Total
Passenger Facilities												
TIP ID: 5860	Agency ID:	Title: Passenger Facilities										
Facility:		Local	0/0/100		25,910 e	10,069 e	44,884 e	8,306 e	10,834 e	21,976 e		121,979
From:		PRIIA	50/0/50		8,233 e	23,424 e	21,949 e	27,957 e	35,801 e	27,379 e		144,743
To:		Section 5307	80/0/20		4,010 e	3,445 e	4,693 e	26,593 e	5,399 e	9,576 e		53,716
		Section 5309	80/0/20		30,135 e	40,769 e	27,703 e	14,153 e	16,915 e	11,826 e		141,501
		Section 5317	80/0/20					996 e				996
											Total Funds:	613,998

Description: Provides funds for
 a. Elevator/ Escalator Facilities: rehabilitation of elevator and escalators and expansion of elevator capacity.
 b. Maintenance of Rail Station Facilities: upgrade, rehabilitation, and/or replacement of station area components.
 c. Bicycle/ Pedestrian Facilities: rehabilitation, replacement and expansion of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
 d. Rail Station Capacity/ Enhancements: expand the capacity of rail stations, improve passenger access, and protect exposed assets.
 e. Bus Priority Corridor Improvements: bus stops, runningway enhancements, street operations management and safety strategies to produce more reliable bus.
 f. Rail Station Equipment: purchase of equipment to be used in rail stations, including police emergency management equipment and other related.

Project Management and Support												
TIP ID: 5863	Agency ID:	Title: Credit Facility										
Facility:		Local	0/0/100		5,000 e	5,290 e	2,500 e	3,000 e	3,000 e	3,000 e		21,790
From:												
To:												
											Total Funds:	27,741

Description: Provides funds to maintain a line of credit to meet cash flow needs.

Rail System Infrastructure Rehabilitation												
TIP ID: 5856	Agency ID:	Title: Rail Line Segment Rehabilitation										
Facility:		Local	0/0/100		12,211 e		11,922 e	7,672 e				31,805
From:		PRIIA	50/0/50		34,546 e	20,685 e	61,988 e	37,502 e	2,007 e	16,652 e		173,380
To:		Section 5307	80/0/20									
		Section 5309	80/0/20		44,799 e	41,169 e	73,194 e	54,332 e	94,513 e	92,092 e		400,099
											Total Funds:	812,081

Description: Provides funds for rehabilitation of segments of Metrorail system.

**WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
CAPITAL COSTS (in \$1,000)**

Proposed for Amendment: 5/16/201

			Source	Fed/St/Loc	Previous Funding	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	Source Total
Systems and Technology												
TIP ID: 5858	Agency ID:	Title: Systems and Technology										
Facility:		Local	0/0/100			16,737 e	21,143 e	66,917 e	52,304 e	88,827 e	74,555 e	320,483
From:		Section 5307	80/0/20			5,250 e		4,904 e	1,283 e			11,437
To:		Section 5309	80/0/20			34,411 e	36,057 e	12,563 e	37,308 e			120,339
											Total Funds:	578,196

Description: Provides funds for
 a. Rail Power Systems: upgrade of rail system's power supply.
 b. Operations Support Software: purchase and/or replacement of software that supports the transit system.
 c. Business Support Software & Equipment: purchase and/or replacement of software and equipment that supports the agency's mission.
 d. Rail Fare Equipment: purchase and/or replacement of fare equipment for the transit system.

Track & Structures												
TIP ID: 5859	Agency ID:	Title: Track and Structures										
Facility:		Local	0/0/100			1,198 e		4,743 e	47 e			5,988
From:		PRIIA	50/0/50			59,429 e	57,781 e	52,254 e	46,023 e	52,653 e	64,427 e	332,567
To:		Section 5309	80/0/20			1,997 e						1,997
											Total Funds:	469,092

Description: Provides funds for
 a. Track Rehabilitation: maintain and rehabilitate track and track infrastructure.
 b. Station/Tunnel Rehabilitation: repair of water leaks in stations, vent shafts, air ducts, tunnels, tunnel liners, and other areas in the system.

**WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY
TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM
CAPITAL COSTS (in \$1,000)**

Proposed for Amendment: 5/16/201

		Source	Fed/St/Loc	Previous Funding	FY 11	FY 12	FY 13	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	Source Total
Vehicles/ Vehicle Parts											
TIP ID: 5853	Agency ID:	Title: Rail Cars - Replacement, Rehabilitation, Expansion, & Enhancements									
Facility:		Local	0/0/100		11,076 e		917 e		222 e	2,477 e	14,692
From:		PRIIA	50/0/50		123,795 e	47,718 e	36,850 e	36,497 e	103,205 e	129,167 e	477,232
To:		Section 5307	80/0/20		15,241 e					20,242 e	35,483
		Section 5309	80/0/20		10,079 e	2,159 e	9,439 e	20,954 e	20,847 e	20,847 e	84,325
											Total Funds: 1,105,987

Description: Provides funds for
a. Replacement of Rail Cars: replacement of the rail fleet, including the 1000-Series and 4000-Series rail cars.
b. Rehabilitation of Rail Cars: mid-life rehabilitation of rail fleet.
c. Rail Fleet Expansion: expansion of the rail fleet to meet ridership growth.
d. Rail Enhancements: enhancements to the rail fleet that improve safety, reliability, and passenger comfort.

TIP ID: 5854	Agency ID:	Title: Buses - Replacement, Rehabilitation, Expansion, & Enhancements									
Facility:		CMAQ	80/0/20				5,049 e	1,613 e	4,800 e	4,800 e	16,262
From:		Local	0/0/100		25,124 e		500 e	18,254 e	512 e		44,390
To:		PRIIA	50/0/50		10,819 e	3,852 e	25,252 e	12,847 e	2,707 e	588 e	56,065
		Section 5307	80/0/20		100,752 e	103,746 e	113,714 e	84,918 e	136,036 e	139,811 e	678,977
											Total Funds: 1,078,153

Description: Provides funds for
a. Replacement of Buses: replacement of the bus fleet.
b. Rehabilitation of Buses: mid-life rehabilitation of the bus fleet.
c. Bus Enhancements: purchase and/or replacement of equipment that upgrades or enhances the capability of the bus fleet.
d. Bus Fleet Expansion: expansion of the bus fleet to meet ridership growth.

TIP ID: 5855	Agency ID:	Title: MetroAccess and Service Vehicles									
Facility:		Local	0/0/100		523 e	407 e	4,000 e				4,930
From:		Section 5307	80/0/20		12,967 e	26,860 e	12,586 e	12,483 e	19,108 e	13,695 e	97,699
To:		Section 5309	80/0/20			11,545 e					11,545
											Total Funds: 156,764

Description: Provides funds for
a. MetroAccess Vehicles: purchase/ replacement of Metro Access vehicles.
b. Replacement of Service Vehicles: purchase/ replacement of vehicles that will be used Authority-wide for service activities.

ITEM 9 - Information

May 16, 2012

Briefing on Household Travel Characteristics and Behavior in Ten Focused Geographic Subareas of the Region

Recommendation: Receive briefing on the household travel characteristics and behavior identified in ten different subareas of the region, and on the schedule for surveying additional subareas.

Issues: None

Background: In Spring 2011, 2,200 households in seven focused geographic subareas of the region were surveyed to obtain demographic information and travel data for more intensive analysis of specific growth and transportation issues. Subareas included Metrorail station areas, highway corridors with recent or planned major improvements, proposed light rail study areas, and regional activity centers with specific characteristics. Previously, in the Spring of 2010, Arlington County in collaboration with TPB staff conducted a similar survey of 400 households in three subareas of Arlington County.

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290 (202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202 TDD: (202) 962-3213

MEMORANDUM

May 9, 2012

To: Transportation Planning Board

From: Robert E. Griffiths,
Technical Services Director, DTP

Subject: Household Travel Surveys in Focused Geographic Subareas of the Region

Project Objective

The objective of the Geographically-Focused Household Surveys work item in the TPB work program is to collect additional household travel survey data in smaller geographic subareas of the region for the purposes of : (1) permitting more intensive analysis of differences in daily travel behavior in a wide variety of communities with varying densities, physical characteristics, demographic characteristics and transportation options, (2) assisting local planners with current land use and transportation planning efforts and to provide information and illustrative examples that can also be used by all local jurisdictions in their future planning, (3) building a household travel survey database that can be used to measure changes over time in local community travel behavior resulting from major transportation improvements and/or significant shifts in the pattern of new development in these local communities.

Project Background

The conduct of Geographically-Focused Household Surveys began as a follow-on to the successful 2007-2008 TPB Household Travel Survey (2007-2008 TPB HTS). The 2007-2008 TPB HTS was primarily conducted for the development of the new regional travel demand model. While the 11,000 household sample size for 2007-2008 TPB HTS was sufficient for modeling all large counties and cities in the entire TPB model area, it did not provide enough household samples to permit analysis of daily travel behavior in smaller member jurisdictions or specific subareas within the region's larger jurisdictions.

The need for additional household travel survey samples to examine the travel patterns within specific smaller geographic areas was first expressed by Arlington County transportation planners in 2009. These planners were very interested in learning how the new higher density residential and commercial development occurring in the Jefferson Davis Highway/Crystal City/Pentagon City and the Village of Shirlington areas of the County was affecting the daily travel behavior of existing and new residents in these areas. These planners were also interested in obtaining additional household travel survey samples in the Columbia Pike Corridor for the planning of a light rail line in that corridor. Consequently, in the spring of 2010, Arlington County in collaboration with TPB staff completed the collection of additional household travel survey interviews with 400 households in these three subareas of the County. These survey interviews were completed using the exact same methodology as was used in the 2007-2008 TPB HTS and the

additional data collected was used to supplement the household travel surveys previously collected in these subareas. Arlington County directly paid the survey firm for the additional survey interviewing and data collection. TPB staff processed the collected survey data and prepared the final survey data files for Arlington County and their consultants. Arlington County is now using these data for its local planning efforts and TPB staff is using these data for more intensive analysis of the travel behavior of households residing in regional activity centers and other higher density residential areas.

Following the Arlington County supplemental effort, transportation planners in other TPB member jurisdictions expressed similar needs for the household travel survey data for smaller geographic areas to support their local planning efforts. Out of these discussions grew a strong recommendation by the members of the TPB Technical Committee that the TPB include in its Unified Planning Work Program a continuing Household Survey work item that would conduct Geographically-Focused Household Travel Surveys in three to seven areas of the region each fiscal year depending on the amount of funding available. The geographic areas selected to be surveyed in each fiscal year would be suggested by TPB and local planning staff and reviewed and approved by the members of the TPB Technical Committee. Thus, beginning in FY 2011 the conduct of Household Travel Surveys in Focused Geographic Subareas of the Region was added to the TPB work program. In the fall of 2011 the first wave of these household travel surveys was conducted. The second wave, spring 2012, is now underway and a third wave is currently being planned for fall 2012.

Fall 2011 TPB Geographically-Focused Household Travel Surveys

In the fall of 2011, household travel survey data were collected from 2,200 households in seven geographically-focused subareas of the region to permit more intensive analysis of local land use and transportation issues in these areas. The seven areas selected for the survey interviewing in the fall 2011 wave were reviewed and approved by the members of the TPB Technical Committee. Households in the selected areas who agreed to participate in this survey were asked to provide some basic demographic information about their household and to record and report on all travel by each member of their household for a specified 24-hour period.

The seven geographic subareas surveyed in the fall of 2011 between mid-September and mid-November were:

1. The Logan Circle area (the 14th St NW Corridor from Massachusetts Ave NW to north of Florida Ave NW) in the District of Columbia
2. The White Flint area in Montgomery County, Maryland
3. The Purple Line International Corridor in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland (University Blvd from south of I-495 to Adelphi Rd)
4. The Largo area in Prince George's County, Maryland
5. The City of Frederick, Maryland
6. The Reston area in Fairfax County, Virginia
7. The Woodbridge area in Prince William County, Virginia

Some initial results of the survey interviewing in these seven areas are now available and will be presented to the TPB at its May 16, 2012 meeting.

Spring 2012 TPB Geographically-Focused Household Travel Surveys

Survey interviewing for the spring 2012 wave of the Geographically-Focused Household Travel Surveys is currently underway in the following seven areas:

1. Friendship Heights in the District of Columbia and Montgomery County, Maryland
2. New York Avenue NE Corridor in the District of Columbia
3. St. Charles Urbanized Area in Charles County, Maryland
4. National Harbor in Prince George's County, Maryland
5. The Beauregard Corridor in the City of Alexandria, Virginia
6. East Falls Church and West Falls Church Metrorail Station areas in Arlington County, the City of Falls Church and Fairfax County, Virginia
7. The Dulles North Area in Loudoun County, Virginia

Fall 2012 TPB Geographically-Focused Household Travel Surveys

Survey interviewing for the fall 2012 wave of the Geographically Focused Household Travel Surveys is currently being planned for the following six areas:

1. Federal Center/southwest/Navy Yard in the District of Columbia
2. H Street NE Corridor in the District of Columbia
3. Silver Spring in Montgomery County, Maryland
4. US 1/Green Line Corridor in Prince George's County, MD
5. City of Fairfax in Virginia
6. City of Manassas in Virginia

The six areas selected to be surveyed in the fall 2012 wave of the Geographically-Focused household travel surveys are subject to further review, refinement and approval by the members of the TPB Technical Committee.

Proposed fall 2013 TPB Geographically-Focused Household Travel Surveys

Thinking ahead to FY 2014, the St Elizabeths/Anacostia, Greenbelt and the Tysons Corner areas are three additional geographic areas for which focused household travel surveys would considerably add to the TPB's knowledge base about travel behavior changes in regional activity centers where significant increases in residential and commercial development are about to occur and will be served by existing or new Metrorail stations. These and other potential geographic areas to be surveyed in the fall of 2013 will be subject to further review and refinement by the members of the TPB Technical Committee and the availability of FY 2014 funding.

Conduct of TPB Geographically-Focused Household Travel Surveys

Westat, a nationally recognized survey research firm headquartered in Rockville, MD with local call centers in Montgomery and Frederick Counties, MD, has been retained to conduct the household travel survey interviews. The households selected to participate in this survey are randomly selected from residential address lists and contacted both by mail and telephone. A website

is also available for participating households to schedule their survey interviewing at a time convenient for them. Household survey materials are printed both in English and Spanish and telephone interviews can be conducted in either English or Spanish in response to the household's preference. All survey procedures have been designed to make this survey as representative as possible of all population groups residing in the selected geographic subareas.

ITEM 10 - Information

May 16, 2012

Briefing on the Results of Recently Completed Projects under the Continuous Airport Systems Planning (CASP) Program

Staff

Recommendation: Receive briefing on the results of recently completed projects under the CASP program, including trends and forecasts for air passenger originations and air cargo, and ground access travel times to the three airports.

Issues: None

Background: The CASP program supports the planning, development and operation of airport and airport-serving facilities for the Baltimore Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport, the Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, and the Washington Dulles International Airport.

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290

(202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202 TDD: (202) 962-3213

MEMORANDUM

TO: Transportation Planning Board

FROM: Richard I. Roisman, AICP
Continuous Airport System Planning Program Manager

DATE: May 9, 2012

RE: Background for TPB Meeting of May 16, 2012 – Agenda Item #10

At its May 16, 2012 meeting, the Board will receive a briefing on recently completed projects under the Continuous Airport System Planning (CASP) Program. Staff has prepared this memorandum for inclusion in the mailout packet to provide Board members with background information on the CASP Program prior to the briefing on the 16th.

CASP has been part of the TPB work program since 1978. Funding for the program does not come from the FHWA and FTA funds that support the rest of the region's Unified Planning Work Program; rather, COG (as the entity that provides staff to the TPB) is the recipient of an annual planning grant from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Airport Improvement Program (AIP, which is 90% federal funds with a 10% local match). AIP funds are used for air systems planning in the Washington-Baltimore region, which extends beyond the TPB planning area and includes all three area commercial service airports: Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport (DCA) Washington Dulles International Airport (IAD), and Baltimore-Washington International Thurgood Marshall Airport (BWI [see shaded area of Figure 1, attached]). COG must re-apply for FAA funding each year.

The CASP Program is developed, implemented and monitored with the assistance of the Aviation Technical Subcommittee of the TPB Technical Committee. The Subcommittee is composed of representatives from the District Department of Transportation, the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (the owner and operator of both DCA and IAD), the Maryland Aviation Administration of the Maryland Department of Transportation (the owner and operator of BWI), as well as a representative from FAA and the Virginia Department of Aviation. While the primary focus of the CASP program is on the three commercial service airports in the region, smaller airports are represented on the Subcommittee by staff from the City of Frederick and City of Manassas, both of which operate general aviation airports in their respective cities. In addition to program oversight, the subcommittee is responsible for the integration of airport system planning with the regional transportation planning process.

The goal of the CASP program is to provide a process that supports the planning, development and operation of airport facilities and transportation facilities that serve the airports in a systematic framework for the Washington-Baltimore region. In support of the CASP program, the Aviation Technical Subcommittee develops an Airport Capital Improvement Program (ACIP). The ACIP, a five-year program, identifies airport system planning projects expected to be accomplished during the program period with anticipated available AIP funds and is a required element of COG's annual grant application to FAA.

In general, the airport system planning process consists of a continuous cycle that begins with a regional air passenger survey. Since 2005, the survey has been performed every two years. Staff is currently processing the 2011 survey and anticipates presenting findings from it to the TPB sometime in the fall of this year. The results from the survey are then used to develop forecasts of future air passenger travel and the ground travel of these air passengers to and from the region's three commercial airports. These forecasts are then integrated with the regional travel demand forecasting model, and in turn lead to the development of a revised airport ground access plan for the region. The issues identified in the revised airport ground access plan are then integrated into the next update of the TPB's regional Constrained Long Range Plan.

In addition to the planning cycle described above, periodically the CASP program also includes a regional analysis of air cargo, and a study of highway travel times from regional activity centers to the three commercial airports. The staff presentation on the 16th will review the results of the 2011 travel time survey and compare them with the previous analysis performed in 2003. Finally, staff routinely tracks data on air passenger enplanements (trips) at the three regional airports as well as air passenger forecasts produced by the FAA. This information will also be included in the presentation to the Board.

The three commercial airports are of great importance to the economy of the region, and airport access is included as a goal in the TPB Vision. In addition, airport-related measures will be addressed in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.

