

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Minutes
for meeting of

May 4, 2012

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

May 4, 2012

Technical Committee Minutes

1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the April 6 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved with a minor clarification to the fourth paragraph on page 2.

2. **Briefing on the Draft Final Regional Complete Streets Policy**

Mr. Farrell spoke to a hand-out and mail-out item on the draft regional Complete Streets policy. Chairman Rawlings approved of the changes made since the April TPB meeting.

Mr. Kirby said that the main outstanding issue was the degree of documentation in the TIP. The TIP is not the best place for detailed design.

Ms. Erikson noted that Mr. Farrell had made the changes requested at the State Technical Working Group meeting. The current version of the TIP description form is much more manageable.

Ms. Hoeffner wanted to know what type of projects would require bicycle and pedestrian facilities. VRE has many projects in the TIP for which it would need exemptions.

Mr. Kirby expressed confidence that the TPB would approved the current version without too many changes.

In response to a comment from Mr. Weissberg, it was agreed to change the word "agency" to "jurisdiction/agency".

Ms. Erikson noted that there would be two years to make changes to items such as the drop-down list if needed.

Mr. Erenrich noted that the old question #16, on accommodating specific modes, had been dropped from the TIP description form.

Mr. Kirby mentioned that he had recently gotten a comment from Mr. Snyder, regarding a failed attempt to adopt a Complete Street policy in Falls Church. Even when all the right of way belonged to the city there was a lot of resistance. Mr. Erenrich agreed that retrofitting sidewalks in older communities is often difficult. In Montgomery County they are frequently added in conjunction with bus stop improvements. Mr. Kirby noted that policies can be hard to put into practice.

Mr. Rogers asked what would happen if a project was exempt from the policy for multiple reasons. Mr. Erenrich suggested that we might provide an opportunity for the jurisdiction to elaborate on why a particular exemption, such as excessive cost, was being claimed. Mr. Kirby suggested that we might just give the agencies a blank space to explain their exemption, instead

of a drop-down list. A drop-down list makes it easier to track types of exemptions being claimed.

Mr. Erenrich expressed concern that the people filling out the TIP description forms are often not familiar with the project design. Mr. Kirby said that documenting implementation of Complete Streets in the TIP project description form is being done in response to a request from the Citizens Advisory Committee, with support from some TPB members, and that we will have to have some sort of documentation on Complete Streets in the TIP.

Mr. Kirby said that the CAC and the citizen activists are looking for a way to find out how well pedestrians and bicyclists are being accommodated, and to have an opportunity to have input. The TIP can't provide all the information they need, but it can help them flag projects and point them towards more information, so that they can find out when they should provide input.

3. Briefing on Household Travel Characteristics and Behavior in Seven Focused Geographic Subareas of the Region

Mr. Griffiths gave a revised Power Point presentation on the initial results from the Fall 2011 TPB Geographically-Focused Household Travel Surveys that incorporated suggestions given at the April Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Griffiths also reported that he was going to incorporate into his presentation the results from 2010 Arlington County Supplement Household Travel Survey that focused on the Crystal City, Shirlington and Columbia Pike areas in Arlington. The 2010 Arlington County Supplement Household Travel Survey was a collaborative effort between Arlington County and TPB staff.

Mr. Kirby suggested that the regional average for the entire TPB planning region be included for each data item included in the presentation.

Mr. Griffiths agreed to make this change and said that he would be making a few other refinements to his presentation before the May 16th TPB meeting.

4. Update on Reauthorization of Federal Surface Transportation Legislation

Mr. Kirby explained that the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) has been extended nine times since it expired on September 30, 2009, most recently through June 30, 2012. He said that 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. He said that a 47 member conference committee has been appointed to negotiate a final bill and that its first meeting is scheduled for May 8.

Mr. Kirby explained that a significant provision in MAP-21 calls for state DOTs and MPOs to use performance measures for performance-based planning and programming. Another major provision is an increase in the funding for the TIFIA loan program from \$120 million to \$1 billion. The funding levels for the other programs did not change much. He pointed out that the House

bill does not contain any policy changes but does include requiring the President to approve the Keystone pipeline, which could be a major obstacle.

Mr. Erenrich asked if any local Congressional representatives were on the conference committee.

Mr. Kirby replied that there did not appear to be any on the published list.

5. Briefing on the Draft Region Forward Baseline Progress Report and the Status of the Update of Regional Activity Center Map

COG Staff briefed the Technical Committee on the final Region Forward “baseline” Progress Report and the Regional Activity Center update. The COG Board established the Region Forward Coalition in 2011 to oversee the implementation of Region Forward, the region’s long-range comprehensive vision plan. Members were briefed on the Activity Center update first. The update better aligns local and regional planning which members agreed was an important element of the update.

Mr. Kirby asked if Centers are better characterized as employment or residential oriented. Mr. Mataya said centers are typically a mix with some centers having more employment or less. Centers are typically mixed-use; however, to get a sense of the housing and jobs mix staff will analyze the centers for a number of different purposes.

TPB staff and Committee members asked about the center sizes and if the TAZs should be redrawn. Mr. Mataya and Mr. Hand responded that there will be two types of boundaries this time around. The first will use uniform one-mile illustrative boundaries to indicate the general area of the center across the region. This illustrative center boundary is designed so that the centers can be used as a tool by a variety of groups and decision makers. The second set of boundaries will be drawn for analysis or technical purposes. The analysis geographies will include TAZs and Census boundaries and be used to track changes and show overall regional trends. The illustrative boundaries will inform how the analysis boundaries are drawn and depending on center proximity and geography may include more than one center.

COG staff has started meeting with individual jurisdictions to define these analysis geographies for the regional activity centers. The intent is to have a final product that will have boundaries that TPB staff can use for modeling purposes. Members were interested in staying updated on the progress of the activity center update.

Mr. Hand presented the Region Forward “baseline” Progress Report. Mr. Kellogg expressed some concerns about the transit share target being characterized as a minor challenge. Mr. Erenrich mentioned he felt like this was a major challenge. Mr. Hand said he would work with TPB staff to make the change characterizing transit share as a more significant challenge.

Committee members were interested in commenting on the report and comments have been received and incorporated into the final draft which is scheduled to go to the COG Board in June.

Ms. Erickson also summarized concerns expressed at the recent Region Forward Coalition meeting. The concerns were about amending future targets and incomplete data metrics. Mr. Hand said that COG staff is preparing a memo to accompany the Progress Report to address amending targets and incomplete data metrics when this is advanced to the COG Board.

6. Briefing on NCHRP Project 08-36, Integrating Performance Measures into a Performance-Based Planning and Programming (PBPP) Process

Mr. Randall presented an overview of TPB's participation, along with Maryland DOT, WMATA, and Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, in a National Highway Cooperative Research Program (NCHRP) study of performance-based planning and programming. The DC/Maryland Suburban region was selected as one of three pilot sites from across the nation for a study of how to improve inter-agency coordination and use of data to inform the planning and programming of transportation projects. Mr. Kirby also spoke to emphasize the purpose of the study is to consider practical application of the concepts of performance measurement now being discussed for the federal surface transportation reauthorization act.

Mr. Randall then walked the group through a presentation of the study objectives, the decision to frame the study around two specific locations, the data collected for those locations, and the hypothetical results of a benefit-cost analysis in considering transportation projects to benefit bus operations at one of the locations. He then concluded with the findings and recommendations from a recent workshop, which encouraged further data use, improved presentation to the public and decision-makers, and better agency prioritization and the use of dedicated funding for implementing transportation projects identified and advanced through a performance based process.

Mr. Lake inquired as the specific sources for funding for implementation of these identified transportation projects. Mr. Kirby responded that this is one of the key weaknesses of the federal reauthorization bill being discussed; the planning process is proposed to be modified, but the funding process stays the same. Without federal changes, even if projects are selected in this way, an agency would still have to work with current programs and connect multiple funding sources for each aspect of the project. The need for multimodal funding is clear, rather than the current disconnected silos of funding. Only TIGER at the federal level really meets the need and future opportunity for such performance-based funding for project implementation.

Ms. Erickson spoke to add emphasis to the point that these multi-modal projects are extremely complicated; otherwise, agencies would be executing them already. Mr. Kirby added that congressional staff expanded the initial proposal for performance based planning from asset management to include broader themes such as congestion, and that it will be a significant challenge for all agencies to respond to any incorporation of these proposals into reauthorization. It could change the way everyone at the table does business.

Mr. Randall concluded the discussion by mentioning the NCHRP final report should be published by the end of the year, and Mr. Kirby expressed his hope that both the day's discussion of the pilot project and the eventual report would be useful to attendees.

7. Update on the Status of the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP Inputs and Forms

Mr. Austin distributed draft tables for the FY 2013-2018 TIP to each agency. He said that PDF versions would be e-mailed out later along with a set of notes based on a preliminary review. He also noted that any project that did not have funds programmed between fiscal years 2013 and 2018 would not be shown in the next draft. He requested all updates be made via the iTIP database by the end of Friday, May 25. A final draft would be presented to the Technical Committee at their next meeting on June 1.

Ms. Erickson asked for clarification on which projects would be removed. Mr. Austin said that unless funds were added by the 25th, any project in this draft that did not show funding in the program years of the TIP would not be included in the next draft.

Ms. Erickson also encouraged Committee members to review the funding phase codes, noting that they had run into problems getting approval from FHWA for not indicating the proper phase of the project. Mr. Austin noted that the code "e" for "other" should be used sparingly and only on projects that do not involve planning/engineering, right-of-way acquisition or construction.

Mr. Ramfos asked if VDOT's portion of the TIP would include an appendix of grouped projects again, as it had in the past. Mr. Austin said that he had not yet received the appendix, but noted that the VDOT tables did include TIP grouping line items, so he expected to receive the appendix and include it in the next draft.

8. Status Report on the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program

Mr. Randall reviewed the status of the TPB's ongoing Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Discretionary Grant from USDOT for Priority Bus Transit in the National Capital Region. He reviewed the history of the grant, its requirements for completion, and then spoke briefly to the status of each participating agency's specific projects. In particular, he noted the City of Alexandria's progress on the Potomac Yard Transitway, which when complete in December 2013 will be one of the most obvious examples of the TIGER project. Many other projects are more technical in nature and will take longer to implement, such as transit signal priority and real-time passenger information, and will not necessarily be as apparent to the public when complete.

Mr. Kirby asked for more information on WMATA's project at the Pentagon. Mr. Randall responded with an update on the Pentagon's re-design of the parking arrangements and traffic flow at the Pentagon, which as it finalizes is being coordinated with WMATA's design efforts for construction of additional bus bays at the bus station.

9. Other Business

None.

10. Adjourn