

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes
For meeting of
December 3, 2010

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - December 3, 2010**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Colleen Mitchal

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick Co. John Thomas
City of Frederick -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich
Prince George's Co. Vic Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. -----
 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT Mike Nixon
 Renna Mathews
MTA -----
Takoma Park Flona Blanchard

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny
 Robert Owolabi
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. -----
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. -----
NVTC -----
PRTC Anthony Foster
VRE -----
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT -----
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Mark Kellogg
 Sean Kennedy

FEDERAL/OTHER

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

COG Staff

Ronald Kirby, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Bob Griffiths, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Andy Meese, DTP
Beth Newman, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Monica Bansal, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Abdul Mohammed, DTP
Gareth James, DTP
Jennifer Coady, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Jim Yin, DTP
Sunil Kumar, DEP

Other Attendees

Art Smith, Loudoun Co.
Randy Carroll, MDE
Brent Barnes, Louis Berger Group
Bill Orleans

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

December 3, 2010

Technical Committee Minutes

1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from November 5, 2010 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

2. **Update on the Amendment to the FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Revise the Budget and Certain Work Tasks.**

Mr. Kirby said that he briefed the TPB on November 17 on an amendment to the FY 2011 UPWP to revise the budget to reflect funding increases and modify certain work tasks for the last half of the fiscal year. He said that the TPB will be asked to approve it on December 15. He explained that he presented to the TPB an alternative to the TPB staff proposal to allocate \$80,000 for work activity 2 G. Human Service Transportation Coordination. Under the TPB staff proposal, an independent consultant would be engaged to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the TPB activity that has funded 35 projects since 2007 under the Job Access and Reverse Commute for Low Income Individuals (JARC) program and the New Freedom Program for Persons with Disabilities. The assessment would identify the project impacts and benefits, lessons learned, and potential improvements for future project solicitations.

He explained that the Technical Committee alternative to this assessment was that the \$80,000 in funding be utilized under work activity 6. C. Travel Surveys and Analysis. The additional funding would add a seventh focused geographic subarea where a sample of new household travel survey data would be collected. This would respond to the strong interest expressed by local jurisdiction users of the 2007/2008 regional household travel survey in more intensive data collection and analysis of household travel characteristics and behavior to examine specific growth and transportation impacts at selected geographic subareas throughout the region.

Mr. Kirby distributed a more detailed work scope for the JARC/New Freedom assessment and presented a number of points supporting its value. He concluded that the cost of an independent assessment was reasonable.

Ms. Klancher reviewed the details in the new work scope and said that it was being reviewed by the Human Service Transportation Coordination (HSTC) Task Force. She pointed out that Chairman Snyder had inquired earlier this year about why the TPB was not getting larger, regional JARC/New Freedom projects to fund and that the assessment would examine this concern.

Mr. Biesiadny commented that he was not opposed to evaluating the program but the budget seems excessive. He suggested that staff could review the projects and identify

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of December 3, 2010**

lessons learned and could wait for the results of the San Francisco MPO evaluation of its program.

Ms. Klancher said staff is very involved with the projects and an independent view is needed to identify what works and how to do things differently and better.

Ms. Mathews commented that MDOT supports doing the assessment and suggested that it also identify what types of projects should be proposed for future funding.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that project templates for the desirable projects could be prepared to aid project sponsors in the application process.

Mr. Srikanth said after funding 35 projects now is the time to examine how effective they are and to identify ways to fund better ones.

Mr. Biesiadny said that he was not convinced that staff could not do the assessment.

Mr. Mokhtari supported MDOT's comments and said that it would be good to provide guidance and project templates to potential project sponsors.

Mr. Kellogg summarized WMATA's comments on the work scope for the assessment.

Mr. Erenrich explained that a survey of the White Flint subarea is needed this year as a base line. He also suggested that more resources for surveying additional subareas should be considered in future UPWPs.

Mr. Kirby said the he hopes that the committee can reach a consensus to take to the TPB.

Mr. Griffiths explained that the 6 subareas are a good regional sample.

Mr. Srikanth asked if it were possible to survey White Flint this year and Friendship Heights in the District and Montgomery County the next year.

Ms. Mitchell said that District would be a team player and the survey of Friendship Heights could wait until FY2012.

Mr. Kirby thanked everyone for their comments and suggestions and said that a consensus had been reached. He said that \$80,000 would be allocated for the assessment rather than fund the collection of household travel survey data for a seventh subarea. In addition, the White Flint subarea in Montgomery County would be included in the list to be surveyed this Spring, replacing the Friendship Heights subarea in DC and Montgomery County which will be surveyed in FY 2012.

3. Briefing on Light Rail and Streetcar Projects and Proposals for the Washington Region

Mr. Randall gave a presentation on light rail and streetcar projects and proposals, summarizing a memorandum that was distributed to attendees. Projects covered included: DC Streetcar, Purple Line, Corridor Cities Transitway, Columbia Pike Streetcar, and Crystal City Streetcar. Implementation considerations were then reviewed, including: funding requirements, roadway impacts, integration with bus services, and connectivity issues: vehicle, track/station, and technological.

Mr. Malouff articulated that the presentation came across as too negative. While there are many challenges for light rail and streetcar implementation, these can be solved. He said that more of the positive attributes and benefits of streetcars need to be included before the memorandum and presentation go to TPB. He also asked who had reviewed the material. Mr. Randall responded that draft versions had been circulated by e-mail and presented and discussed at the previous week's Regional Bus Subcommittee meeting, which included representatives from Arlington County.

Mr. Erenrich added that federal operating cost funding – Section 5309 – should be mentioned. The regional formula currently gives all the money to WMATA, but this arrangement will likely need to change once other rail services begin operation. He also suggested that the information be given to the Regional Priorities Task Force at their December meeting.

Mr. Biesiadny suggested that more of the concepts for light rail be mentioned, specifically those in the 2030 plan and the Bailey's Crossroads to Tysons Corner route. Mr. Randall responded that a map will be added, but was not yet ready for this meeting.

Members then discussed the status of vehicle design and procurement, including the DC Streetcar vehicles that have already been delivered and those proposed for the Purple Line. Mr. Kellogg responded that these considerations are part of the reason WMATA has begun the *Light Rail and Streetcar Interoperability Study* mentioned.

4. Briefing on the Metrobus Priority Corridor Network (PCN) Evaluation Study

Mr. Kennedy, WMATA Office of Long Range Planning, gave a presentation on the study of the Metrobus Priority Corridor Network (PCN). To improve the speed and reliability of Metrobus, WMATA has evaluated the impact of making improvements to the 23 corridors that carry half of all Metrobus ridership. Two evaluation exercises were performed supported by version 3.2 of the regional transportation demand model:

1. The first exercise involved identifying and then analyzing dedicated transit only lanes using two model runs based on the year 2030 transportation demand. A run entitled "Full Build", evaluated the impact of providing 10 minute frequency service

on all PCN corridors and assumed that a general purpose lane of traffic would be re-dedicated to transit only operations along all 235 miles of the network. The entire PCN was then divided into 2 mile, homogeneous segments. Results obtained from the full build model run noted above were then analyzed on each two mile segment based on warrant thresholds of 1) adjacent automobile v/c ratios and 2) transit rider impacts. If the 2030 model reflected that taking a lane for transit created gridlock or if transit ridership increases were not high enough to justify a lane (i.e., 1,000 transit riders per hour), then it was assumed the segment would remain in a mixed traffic operation. Using this analytical method, approximately 90 miles of the 235 mile PCN were identified as transit only lane "warranted". The second model run, the "Modified Network", assumed 90 miles of transit only lanes (as identified from the Full Build analysis) and 145 miles of transit spot improvements including queue jumpers and transit signal priority. This Modified Network is the conclusion of the first evaluation exercise.

2. The second evaluation involved analyzing 2030 model results obtained by implementing the 10 minute frequent service with no running way improvements.

Both evaluations estimated that 100,000 daily new transit riders would ride the bus; however if the runningway improvements were implemented an additional 90,000 daily passengers would be diverted from Metrorail to bus. The running way provisions also result in considerable operating and capital cost savings.

Several subsequent studies have been prompted by the completion of the PCN Evaluation. Since the entire 90 miles of running way identified in the study will only be implemented in stages, WMATA has begun to prioritize sections of the network that would be most beneficial, specifically in relation to on-going budget concerns. One study sighted looked at bus speed data obtained from the Bus AVL system. The data was used to identify corridor segments where bus speeds were significantly below normal. The segments were then compared to service levels to identify "hot spots" where slow speeds were affecting major service corridors. Improvements to the runningway in these hot spots would provide significant benefits to bus riders, and reduce jurisdictional subsidies. Thus, the study results of the hot spot analysis gives Metro funding partners an alternative to cutting Metrobus service in order to balance the operational budget. Improving bus running time and reliability equates to a reduction in operating costs.

In response to questions about the status of the report, Mr. Kennedy replied that color copies of the "hot spots" maps were available, and that the report was available on the WMATA website.

Mr. Meese stated that the hot spots data was very useful for congestion management analysis, and asked if additional Metrobus AVL data was available for mining. Mr. Kennedy replied that the database is not that user-friendly, but that WMATA plans to do an analysis every six months now that the process has been

developed. Not many changes in hot spots data are expected in the course of a half-year.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if there was any impact on vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from the larger bus ridership. Mr. Kennedy responded that in fact there was no regional change in VMT. On a local basis at the corridor level, VMT actually increased, as automobile users took longer routes to avoid bus corridors with restricted turn lanes and transit signal priority.

Questions were asked about the operating and capital cost savings of the plan. Mr. Kennedy responded that operating cost savings were \$360 million as reported, but that no estimate had been done of the capital cost savings from reduced bus procurement, though such a number could be quickly calculated based on 250 buses at seven hundred thousand dollars apiece.

Mr. Srikanth asked if the exclusive bus lanes took away general purpose lanes (GPLs). Mr. Kennedy responded that yes, the model included this assumption of 90 miles of bus lanes. These were chosen for corridor segments where vehicle volume to capacity (v/c) ratios were not adversely impacted; essentially no such corridors were identified in Virginia. Based on the model results, without these runningway improvements, 100,000 new riders still get on the high frequency service, a considerable number, but few riders switch from Metrorail to bus.

Another questioner asked if the analysis considered environmental impacts and fuel savings, given possible increases in oil prices. Mr. Kennedy responded that such considerations were beyond the scope of the evaluation.

Mr. Malouff asked if any cost to benefit comparisons of the PCN improvements versus other transportation alternatives were performed. Other attendees responded that such analyses were performed in corridor studies, and that comparisons should be looked at on a case-by-case basis.

5. Briefing on Priority Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects Recommended for the FY 2012-2017 TIP

Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint presentation on the top priority unfunded bicycle and pedestrian projects for the national capital region, identified by the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee.

Mr. Kirby noted that this list would be presented to the TPB as an information item with no action needed.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the list was smaller than last year's. Mr. Farrell replied that it was about the same size.

6. Briefing on “Moving Metro Forward” Report of the Joint WMATA Governance Review Task Force

Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee on the Report of the Joint WMATA Governance Review Task Force issued November 17, 2010. He explained that the task force was established by the Greater Washington Board of Trade and COG, and distributed a copy of the membership. He distributed the executive summary of the report and reviewed the major recommendations for a number of improvements to the WMATA governance structure. He said that Mr. James Dyke, chairman of the Board of Trade and co-chair of the task force would brief the TPB on December 15.

Several committee members had comments on the report’s recommendations.

7. Briefing on the 2010 Update of the Ground Access Element of the Regional Airport System Plan

Mr. Griffiths gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the Update of the Ground Access Element of the Regional Airport System Plan that had been approved by the Aviation Technical Subcommittee in October. He reported that, between 2010 and 2030, local originating air passenger ground access trips to the region’s three commercial airports were forecast to increase by 66% and the greatest increases would be at Dulles and BWI Thurgood Marshall Airports. He noted that currently 82% of local originating air passengers used auto or taxis to get to the region’s airport and that many of these airport access trips occurred in the AM and PM periods. He stated that because air passenger and air cargo trips represented high-value and time-sensitive travel, airport ground trips were particularly impacted by congestion on local roadways. He added that it was especially important, as stated in TPB Vision Goal #8, to maintain convenient access to the region’s airports because of the large economic impact of the airports on the region’s economy.

Mr. Griffiths reported that the “good news” in the Update of the Ground Access Element of the Regional Airport System Plan was that the top five transportation improvements for maintaining good airport access were scheduled for completion between now and 2020. These improvements were (1) the Inter County Connector (ICC), (2) the construction of the HOT lanes along I-495 in VA, (3) the Metrorail Silver Line Extension to Dulles Airport, (4) the widening of the Dulles Access Road and (5) the widening of I-95 from the Prince George’s/Howard County line to I-695. He reported that the “less good news” was that many important transportation improvements that would improve ground access to the region’s airports, especially access to Dulles Airport from the south and west, have been delayed until to the 2025 to 2035 time period. He further reported that the Aviation Technical Subcommittee believed that any further

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of December 3, 2010**

delay of these planned improvements would negatively impact airport access and, if additional transportation revenues became available in the next few years, these planned projects should be accelerated.

Mr. Erenrich stated that he believed the 80% auto air passenger ground access figure overstated auto access trips because taxis were a public shared-ride mode.

Mr. Griffiths responded that the 80% figure included privately owned auto, rental cars and taxis because they represented auto vehicle trips to the airports as opposed to bus and rail airport access trips.

Mr. Srikanth asked about the source of the forecast 66% increase in airport ground access trips.

Mr. Griffiths responded that this forecast increase was based on an FAA forecast of enplanements at the region's airports that was developed from assumptions about the future growth in the nation's economy and other factors affecting the growth of air travel nationally and internationally.

Several members commented that these assumptions should be noted in the presentation given to the TPB.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the mode shares for air and passenger railroad (AMTRAK) to the New York Metropolitan area were known.

Mr. Griffiths responded that the number of air passenger trips from the region's airports could be obtained from the air passenger survey, but obtaining railroad passenger totals would be difficult. He stated that he would look into this question.

Mr. Weisberg noted that the I-95 widening project was not in Prince George's County, but in Howard County and Baltimore County in the Baltimore Metropolitan area. He suggested that an asterisk and footnote be added to the "Critically Important Transportation Improvements" slide to clarify that this highway project was in the Baltimore Metropolitan Council area.

Mr. Griffiths agreed to add asterisks and footnotes for the airport ground access transportation improvements that were in the jurisdictions served by the Baltimore Metropolitan Council.

Mr. Griffiths thanked the Committee members for their comments and agreed to incorporate their suggestions into the presentation to be given to the TPB.

8. Update on the TPB Regional Bike Sharing Activities

Ms. Bansal provided an update on the regional bikesharing activities being undertaken by TPB staff, which consists of an application for a Kaiser Permanent HEAL grant to expand bikesharing and the development of marketing materials to assist local jurisdictions in attracting sponsorships from developers and employers. She provided an overview of the Kaiser Permanente HEAL grant application and briefed the Committee on the results of the application. She explained that while the application was not funded, there was interest from Kaiser in the concept of bikesharing and willingness to work with TPB staff on two major issues prior to the next round in February: cost and ability to reach the underserved community.

Ms. Bansal also provided an update on staff progress in developing marketing materials for bikesharing as requested at the October TPB meeting. She briefed the Committee on feedback received from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee on what type of materials to produce that would be most useful for them. They requested educational materials for developers to include as part of the development review process and space requirement schematics. She also discussed how this meeting brought up larger issues of whether there should be a regional process for expanding bikesharing into other jurisdictions with well-defined criteria for joining.

Comments included the potential for using Commuter Connections as a tool to promote Capital Bikeshare regionally. Other questions included whether statistics on the current use of Capital Bikeshare were available, such as specific demographics, which could be used in the Kaiser grant process.

9. Update on the Version 2.3 Travel Demand Model Development

Although the agenda listed Mr. Milone as the presenter for this item, Mr. Milone delegated this presentation to one of his staff, Mr. Moran, who began by distributing printed copies of his presentation. Mr. Moran indicated that TPB staff had made two prior presentations to the Technical Committee within the last 13 months: one on current activities of the Travel Forecasting Subcommittee (TFS) and one about the Version 2.3 travel model. He discussed some of the new features of the Version 2.3 travel model on the 3,722-TAZ area system, including: 1) a 70% increase in the number of zones in the modeled area; 2) calibration with newly released data, including the 2007/2008 COG/TPB Household Travel Survey (HTS), numerous transit on-board surveys, and INRIX highway speed data; 3) Updated medium and heavy truck models; 4) a nested-logit mode choice model that is more sensitive to changes in transit services and which has a three-fold increase in the number of travel modes in the choice set (15

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of December 3, 2010**

compared to the previous five); 5) the subdivision of non-home-based trips into two trip purposes, (NHB work and NHB other); 6) Improved treatment of non-motorized modes (walk and bike); and 7) an enhanced traffic assignment process that should lead to better-converged solutions and less noise in the loaded-link highway networks.

In his last slide, Mr. Moran presented the schedule for upcoming events in the release of the Version 2.3 travel model on the 3,722-TAZ area system, including: 1) January 2011: Release of the draft model to the TFS, along with documentation; 2) March to October 2011: Testing of the new travel model using the air quality conformity (AQC) networks; 3) October 2011: Draft results to the Technical Committee; and 4) November 2011: TPB approval of the AQC determination, resulting in the Version 2.3 travel model becoming the adopted TPB model.

Mr. Biesiadny asked whether the transit assignment capability of the Version 2.3 travel model on the 3,722-TAZ area system was better than that of the Version 2.2 travel model, which runs on the 2,191-TAZ area system. Mr. Moran responded that the Version 2.2 travel model has no transit assignment capability, whereas the Version 2.3 model does. In terms of estimating transit trips before conducting a transit assignment, the new travel model should be more sensitive to changes in transit service and includes 15 travel modes in its choice set, whereas the existing travel model includes only five travel modes in its choice set. Mr. Biesiadny suggested that Mr. Moran might want to add a bullet about transit assignment on slide 7 of the presentation, given the fact that this was a new capability of the travel model.

Given that the Version 2.3 travel model is likely to become the adopted model in November 2011, but also given the fact that a draft version of the model is to be released in January 2011, Mr. Srikanth wanted to know whether outside agencies would be able to get a copy of the new model before it becomes the adopted model. Mr. Kirby indicated that that would be determined on a case-by-case basis, but cautioned that agencies may want to wait till November 2011, since the model might undergo changes/updates between its draft release in January 2011 and its final adoption in November 2011. Mr. Srikanth also wanted to know how consistent the Version 2.3 travel model would be with its predecessor, the Version 2.2 travel model. Mr. Milone responded that it would be very consistent, in terms of matching observed VMT, but added that final comparisons had not yet been performed, since the new model is still being calibrated.

10. Update on the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project Grant under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program

Mr. Randall gave an update on the TIGER Bus Priority project. The TIGER Grant Agreement between COG and FTA has been finalized. A signing ceremony is scheduled for Tuesday, December 14, with Secretary LaHood scheduled to attend. Counterparts have been invited from the five project owners. He also reported that subrecipient agreements were with the project owners for final review, and that the TEAM system portion of the TIGER grant agreement was in review by FTA and Department of Labor.

11. Other Business

Mr. Kirby thanked Chairman Verzosa for his leadership during the past year and announced that Mr. Kellog, from WMATA, had agreed to chair the Technical Committee for 2011.

12. Adjourn