

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

Technical Committee Minutes  
*for meeting of*  
January 7, 2011

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

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                    Mark Rawlings  
DCOP                    Colleen Mitchal

**MARYLAND**

Charles County        -----  
Frederick Co.         John Thomas  
City of Frederick     Tim Davis  
Gaithersburg         -----  
Montgomery Co.      Gary Erenrich  
Prince George's Co. Vic Weissberg  
Rockville             -----  
M-NCPPC  
  Montgomery Co.    -----  
  Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari  
MDOT                  Lyn Erickson  
MTA                    -----  
Takoma Park          -----

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria            Pierre Holloman  
Arlington Co.        Dan Malouff  
City of Fairfax        -----  
Fairfax Co.            Tom Biesiadny  
                              Robert Owolabi  
Falls Church         -----  
Loudoun Co.          George Phillips  
Manassas             -----  
Prince William Co.   Monica Backmon  
NVTC                  Greg McFarland  
PRTC                  Anthony Foster  
                              Eric Marx  
VRE                    -----  
VDOT                  Kanathur Srikanth  
VDRPT                David Awbrey  
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  
Jane Posey, DTP  
Andy Meese, DTP  
Feng Xie, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Monica Bansal, DTP  
John Swanson, DTP  
William Bacon, DTP  
Sarah Crawford, DTP  
Dusan Vuksan, DTP  
Greg Goodwin, DCPS  
Joan Rohlfs, DEP

**Other Attendees**

Art Smith, Loudoun Co.  
Randy Carroll, MDE  
Michael Weinberger, PRTC  
Bill Orleans

# TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

January 7, 2011

## Technical Committee Minutes

---

### 1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from December 3, 2010 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### 2. **Revised 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), revised since a previous presentation at the December Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the capital investments posited to enable PCN service in future years included garage costs as well as vehicle procurement. Mr. Kennedy stated that such costs were not included, but that he would add those in an update.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that a review of regional constraints, besides funding, be developed, such as traffic signal system procurements by Montgomery County and VDOT, which will enable more transit signal priority implementation.

It was also proposed and agreed that the hot spots for bus operation be listed on a separate slide. Mr. Mokhtari suggested that the criteria for the hot spots be specified as well.

In addition, the network of exclusive lanes used for the scenario analysis should be better described, including where such lanes would entail removal of a general traffic lane. Mr. Kennedy responded that the re-assignment of general lanes to bus only was developed based on traffic congestion levels, and that corridors where volume to capacity ratio exceeded 0.8 were dropped for bus lane consideration.

Mr. Biesiadny asked if any costs had been identified for hot spots improvements, or cost-benefit analysis conducted. Mr. Kennedy responded that such analysis was done when corridors were studied individually, and that most of the hot spots identified from AVL data had not yet been so evaluated.

Mr. Malouff further asked if the 10-minute service overlay modeled was entirely new service, or if it involved restructuring of current service. Mr. Kennedy again stated that such analysis was done at a corridor-level and had not been done for

the PCN network as a whole. The results shown are based on an aggregate model as an aspirations-type scenario rather than as a detailed investment analysis.

Mr. Foster asked if costs had been broken down by jurisdiction, for vehicles, operating costs, and bus priority improvements. Again, such detailed analysis has not been done. Mr. Foster also asked if the operating costs shown were net of passenger revenue.

Mr. Kennedy responded that these were gross operating costs, though certainly the addition of 100,000 new transit trips would bring in off-setting fare revenues.

Following some additional suggestions from Mr. Kirby on smoothing the presentation for the January TPB meeting, Mr. Kennedy thanked the committee for their input.

### **3. Briefing on the Version 2.3 Travel Demand Model**

Mr. Milone presented some background information about the history of the Version 2.3 travel model and discussed the subcommittee that provides oversight for models development work: the Travel Forecasting Subcommittee (TFS). The December and January presentations were about the TPB Version 2.3 travel model that was calibrated on the 3,722-TAZ area system using the 2007/2008 COG/TPB Household Travel Survey and other updated data sets. He also reviewed some of the reasons why so much time was needed to develop the model, such as the difficulties of moving to a new transportation analysis zone (TAZ) system containing almost double the number of zones. He also discussed some of the benefits of moving to the new zone system, including improved resolution of local development patterns, improved sensitivity to changes in transit service, and improved modeling of non-motorized (bike and walk) trips.

Mr. Milone presented examples in Tysons Corner, Virginia and Frederick, Maryland that showed the increase in both number of zones and detail of the highway network. He then reviewed the enhanced features of the Version 2.3 travel model over the current production travel model (Version 2.2), including:

- The number of trip purposes has increased from four to five;
- Non-motorized trip ends are estimated for all five trip purposes (it used to be for only home-based work trips);

- The choice set in the mode choice model has increased from five modes (e.g., transit, drive alone, shared ride 2-person, shared ride 3-person, shared ride 4+person) to 15 modes (including transit by mode of access – walk, park-and-ride, kiss-and-ride).
- The availability of transit assignment. In the Version 2.2 travel model, the mode choice model estimates the number of transit trips, but does not assign them to the transit network. In the Version 2.3 travel model, one has the option of assigning the estimated transit trips to the network. Although this capability will not be used or needed for every study, such as air quality conformity, it would be useful in some studies.
- The number of time-of-day periods used in traffic assignment has increased from three (AM peak, PM Peak, and off peak) to four (AM peak, PM peak, midday, and night time).

Mr. Milone then presented the schedule for finalizing the development of the Version 2.3 travel model (e.g., release to the TFS on January 21; testing and refinement in March – October 2011, using the air quality conformity networks; and, finally, TPB approval of the air quality conformity determination in November 2011, resulting in adoption of the Version 2.3 travel model). He finished the presentation with some conclusions and a discussion of how the model helps attain goals set by both COG and TPB. He added that we are not ready to share performance statistics yet; that will be presented on January 21 when the model is presented to the TFS. At the conclusion of his presentation, He asked for any comments, questions, or suggestions.

Mr. Srikanth said that the presentation was well laid out, but he suggested to add some technical details, for example, noting that although the Version 2.3 travel model on the 3,722-TAZ area system will not become the adopted model until November 2011, it is expected that there will be some people who request and obtain the model when it is released in draft form on January 21 and use it to conduct various studies, such as TransAction 2030 in Northern Virginia.

Mr. Erenrich said that it might be a good idea to give the TPB an idea of how much this travel model gets used, e.g., this is the travel model used as the basis for most transportation planning work done in the region, whether by consultants, local government, or the state DOTs. He said that a slide could be added that shows how the Version 2.3 travel model is better than the Version 2.2 travel model in the areas of fuel pricing, parking pricing, and tolls.

Mr. Phillips said that it might be useful to show what the model output looks like, e.g., bus trips, and traffic volumes. Although he did not feel it was necessary for the current presentation, he said that the local governments would like to have information about converting model outputs from the peak period to a peak hour. Mr. Milone indicated that the time-of-day factoring process is quite complex, but that he could probably provide a summary that would be useful.

Mr. Biesiadny said that slide #4 (“The consequence of using new data and a new TAZ system: Delay”) was fairly technical, and could, perhaps be put in an appendix, left out, or described in a less technical way. He also said that, although the presentation indicates that the new model has more detail than its predecessor, he felt it could better stress what that new detail provides for the analyst or decision maker.

Mr. Mokhtari mentioned that slide 5 discusses “activity centers” and “activity clusters,” two areas where one would expect bike travel to increase. Consequently, he suggested the presentation should address improvements in bike forecasts, if that was, in fact, the case.

Mr. Weissberg suggested the presentation should include concrete examples of what the new model can do, compared to the current travel model.

Mr. Meese asked if a bullet could be added to discuss freight. Mr. Milone indicated that he could add information about the new truck model and new commercial vehicle model, both of which are part of the Version 2.3 travel model.

Ms. Posey reminded the committee that project submissions for the 2011 CLRP are needed by January 21.

#### **4. Review of Outline and Preliminary Budget for TY 2012 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Miller distributed a memorandum with a preliminary budget, funding changes from FY 2011, and an outline for the UPWP for FY 2012 (July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012). He reviewed the overall budget estimates and said that at this point there is considerable uncertainty due to the lack of Congressional action regarding the USDOT FY 2011 budget and the re-authorization of SAFETEA-LU. He explained that we assumed that the FY 2012 funding allocations to be provided by DOTs will be the same as the current FY 2011 levels. In addition,

the budget estimate assumes \$1,120,700 of unobligated funds from FY 2010 will be available, which is the same as the unspent funds from FY 2009.

He explained that the basic work program budget is \$10,390,300 without carryover funds, which is the same as the corresponding current FY 2011 budget level as amended December 15, 2010. He said that Table 2 shows the changes from FY 2011. It identifies the Human Service Transportation Coordination work activity with a reduced budget of \$80,000 that was included in the FY 2011 budget for the evaluation of the TPB's JARC and New Freedom program. The \$80,000 is recommended for task 3.D to update the 2010 base year TAZ-level household and population estimates using the results of the 2010 Census. He pointed out that the technical assistance program budget is unchanged from the current FY 2011 budget level because these program budgets are based upon percentages of the estimated FY 2012 funding allocations which are unchanged from FY 2011.

Ms. Bansal reviewed the recommendation under task 1.C CLRP with no change in budget to include expanded environmental consultation activities, including the establishment of a new subcommittee or working group for environmental and resource agency and transportation planning staff coordination.

Mr. Biesiadny commented that his county planning and environmental staffs work closely with VDOT staff now on environmental reviews for projects. Ms. Erickson said that this coordination is not at the project level, but would help to address regional concerns such as off-site mitigation and changing federal regulations. Mr. Srikanth commented that local land use and planning and transportation staff also need to be involved at the regional level. Mr. Biesiadny expressed concern about the additional demand on local staff time to participate in a new subcommittee.

Mr. Kirby reviewed the proposed activities under task 3.C Regional Studies, including support for implementing the priorities plan work scope currently under development by the TPB Regional Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force and COG's FY 2012 Region Forward planning efforts. Ms. Erickson suggested that the bullet calling for the identification of regional priorities in 10-year increments was too specific at this stage. Mr. Kirby agreed to remove it.

Mr. Meese reviewed the main changes in five work activities under section 2. Coordination and Programs (A, B, C, D, E, and H). He pointed out that the

support for the marketing materials for the expansion of regional bike-sharing developed in FY 2011 would continue under E. Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning.

Ms. Constantine summarized the main changes in three work activities: 3.A Air Quality Conformity, 3.B Mobile Emissions Analysis, and 5.B Congestion Monitoring and Analysis. She highlighted a new effort to identify the most cost-effective combination of technology and means to monitor congestion on arterial highways.

Chairman Kellogg commented that WMATA has been monitoring bus speeds on its routes to identify congested segments. Mr. Kennedy said that Metro is working on developing a new project under its technical assistance program that will help local jurisdictions address the bus service budget “hot spots” that he described in his presentation under agenda item 2. Mr. Srikanth said that local jurisdictions have been working with VDOT at a number of locations and that the bus hot spots should be included.

Mr. Miller said that the first draft of the full document will be presented to the TPB at its February 16 meeting, and noted that the technical assistance programs for the DOTs and WMATA remain to be specified. He explained that some portions of the current work activities will be identified for carryover into FY 2011 in March. The TPB will be asked to adopt the program on March 16 and then it will be submitted to FHWA and FTA for their approval by July 1.

## **5. Briefing on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program**

Mr. Meese introduced the topic. TPB has asked for bimonthly briefings on MATOC, and the next briefing was scheduled for the January 19 meeting. At the last briefing, November 17, 2010 meeting, the TPB requested to hear more of MATOC's actual activities during a specific incident. Therefore, the upcoming January 19 briefing was being developed to focus on a specific incident, both from the MATOC standpoint and from the standpoint of an individual transportation agency that uses MATOC information to advise its own operations. Mr. Hutchinson, the MATOC Facilitator, was to give the MATOC perspective, and Mr. Marx (to be joined at the TPB meeting by his colleague Ms. Chism) was to give the agency perspective, in this case the perspective of bus transit operations by the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC).



Mr. Hutchinson briefly reviewed the background and status of the MATOC Program, including staffing and hours of operation. Through monitoring of a variety of information sources, the MATOC operations staff helps agencies maintain situational awareness of transportation-related incidents in the region.

Through its Operations Subcommittee, MATOC has identified criteria by which it is judged whether incidents are major enough to require notifications or other actions. Messaging formats are consistent and structured to meet the needs of the transportation agencies.

Mr. Hutchinson described an example incident occurring on January 4, 2011 on the Capital Beltway near the Telegraph Road interchange, walking through MATOC's incident detection and notification steps. Also included were graphics from MATOC's information systems showing an incident timeline, highway message sign postings, video camera captures, and traffic queue lengths.

Mr. Marx continued the presentation with an overview to familiarize the TPB with PRTC and its services. Of the services that PRTC provides, its commuter bus service is the most significant beneficiary of MATOC notifications. Timely notification of incidents is critical to PRTC because the more proactive they can be to mitigate some of the problems, the better the service can operate with on-time performance, the more people stay with them and do not trade back to their cars because the service is unreliable. In particular, the PM is especially volatile because of the distances to be covered. At one point, they had tried to operate services out of a more northerly facility, when Metro was operating the service under contract to PRTC, but it did not work out well. For the past eight years, PRTC operated all their commuter service out of the PRTC facility in Dale City, meaning they have about a 25-mile deadhead up to the core area. Because some of the buses drive up to the core area, provide their service, and then go back up to the core area for another trip; this results in 75-mile trips in the middle of rush hour, with a high possibility of encountering significant delay-inducing incidents along those 75 miles. PRTC has limited contingency resources for such incidents, including a couple of strategic vehicles that are positioned up north that they can put into place, but those resources are very limited, and dispatchers have to be frugal about how they use them. So the more the dispatchers know, the faster they know it, and the more accurate the information is, the more they are able to use those resources wisely.

Because dispatchers monitor a number of inputs and any situations at the same time, it is particularly helpful to them to have MATOC notify them when an

incident is particularly important for the dispatchers to pay attention to. Without MATOC's targeting of notifications, information ends up being white noise if there are too many inputs coming in. Mr. Marx particularly noted the ability to check with somebody at MATOC, not only to get a little more information if necessary, but to clarify things if they are hearing contradictory information, as well as to investigate with other agencies about what is going on, how soon it can be cleared, and related information.

Desired enhancements include that we would like more targeted notifications, to help avoid the issue of information becoming white noise. He looked forward to MATOC being able to track upcoming significant events, for example when we had the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) meetings in the past, sometimes there has been a protest, and streets have been closed. Having someone centrally tracking events in the region, letting agencies that are likely to be affected by it know about what will be happening, and then serving as a clearinghouse to run things to ground, find out if there is contradictory information, and keep it up to date were important. He further supported that MATOC play that role during true emergencies, being able to help PRTC find out what's going on, where it is going on, and keep information timely.

In response to a question from Mr. Erenrich, Mr. Marx said that PRTC would want notifications from MATOC on transit incidents. If the West Falls Church Station were closed, the sooner they find out about that, the sooner they can put in a plan to run either out of Vienna or East Falls Church. Mr. Erenrich suggested that the presentation slides include a couple of bullets on what kinds of transit incidents should be tracked, such as single tracking, track maintenance, or weekend major closures for work on tracks.

In response to questions from Mr. Mokhtari, Mr. Hutchinson noted that the example incident cited in the presentation started about 4 o'clock, and ended at 5:19 p.m., just at the beginning to middle of rush hour. MATOC is in regular contact with the traffic reporting media, including access to the media's internal radio communications with their own in-the-field spotters, which is where MATOC first learned of the example incident. From that first word, MATOC investigated the information, and contacted other agencies to help verify its existence, and subsequently sent MATOC notifications. Mr. Marx added that this illustrated why it is so critical having a system that is purpose-built, instead of trying to do multiple tasks at once. MATOC staff focuses on this all day long, that is their job, as opposed to being a task for someone who has too many other

competing duties. They are able to have the inputs from multiple places and target them to the people who need to know.

Mr. Srikanth noted that though some may assume that because information is posted in the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS), other agencies are taking appropriate action, but at agencies such as CHART or the Virginia Public Safety-Transportation Operations Center (PSTOC), there are lots of other things going on, so this is a helpful addition.

In response to a question from Mr. Marx on whether a diagram showing where everything fits in would be helpful, Mr. Kirby instead commended the value of Mr. Marx speaking from a real world perspective, just saying what he had said as an operator who is a beneficiary of this, and essentially articulating the value added of MATOC relative to what you would be getting without it. This conveys a real world perspective that we never really have presented to the TPB. It has all been bureaucratic. They have seen the diagrams; what they do not hear is someone like you saying this is valuable to me and here is why.

Mr. Srikanth suggested using an example incident that directly impacted PRTC. Mr. Marx responded that his colleague Ms. Chism, who was unable to attend today, would do that at the TPB meeting. Mr. Srikanth further suggested using just one example, and let that example tie in with PRTC.

## **6. Breifing on Priority Regional Freight Projects Recommended for the FY 2012-2017 TIP**

Ms. Foster said she had anticipated briefing the Committee on a draft list of priority freight transportation projects, however, the Freight Subcommittee meeting one day earlier decided that more time and an additional Subcommittee meeting were needed to develop the list. She said that the Freight Subcommittee had been working with a list of individual projects and at the meeting there was a wide feeling among members that it was important to identify longer-term regional needs in addition to shorter-term regional projects. For example, the Virginia Avenue rail tunnel is an important project, but is not effective in isolation without completing the entire set of long-term National Gateway corridor of clearance obstruction projects. She said the Freight Subcommittee will meet on February 3 and staff will keep the Committee abreast of the freight priorities project identification process. The goal is to have a final list before the Regional Freight Forum, which will be held April 27, 2011.

Mr. Weissberg, Chairman of the Freight Subcommittee, explained that the subcommittee was very engaged in conversation and very well attended. He also added that this is the first time a priority list was being created for freight and some challenges are to be expected.

Mr. Srikanth commented that he liked the idea to define both important long-term regional needs and shorter-term regional projects. He suggested more outreach with local jurisdictions because local jurisdictions also have an interest in freight movement.

## **7. A Review of the Transportation/Land Use Connection (TLC) Program**

Mr. Swanson reviewed a memorandum that summarized the 40 technical assistance project completed under the TPB's Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program from FY 2007 to FY 2010. He provided information about the project topics covered by the 40 projects, as well as the types of products that have resulted from the projects. He said that TPB staff has been in touch with the jurisdictions to obtain information on the projects that had capital improvements recommendations, and that preliminary summaries of these conversations were included in the memo. He said the national non-profit organization Reconnecting America had conducted an assessment of the TLC Program, which he summarized in addition to commentary from jurisdiction recipients about their experience participating in the TLC Program. He closed by summarizing possible next steps for the TLC Program. He said that there are many opportunities to provide a peer exchange in information learned through the TLC projects for FY 2012.

Ms. Crawford asked the Committee to review the attachments to the memorandum that detail the projects and topics, and to provide feedback.

Mr. Mokhtari provided additional information about the TLC project completed for pedestrian access to the New Carrollton Metro Station.

Mr. Thomas suggested that staff add in the FY 2011 project information when this information will be presented to the TPB.

Mr. Kirby said the solicitation for the FY 2012 technical assistance projects would occur in March and would be the appropriate time to add the FY 2011 projects.

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for  
Meeting of January 3, 2011**

---

Mr. Biesiadny said Fairfax staff would be happy to provide information about the implementation of the Fairfax projects. He said the work done by staff on the overview was excellent and asked how much was spent on the Reconnecting America component of the assessment of the TLC Program.

Mr. Swanson said less than \$10,000 was spent on the Reconnecting America assessment, noting it was intended to be a high level policy review of the TLC Program.

Ms. Barlow said she recalled an issue brought up by a TPB member regarding how the projects are analyzed and asked if anyone could contribute more to her recollection.

Ms. Crawford said she believes the issue was raised by a TPB member at the July TPB meeting, at which the TPB was asked to approve the FY 2011 projects. She said the issue related to the criteria and method by which the TLC projects were chosen for the FY 2011 round. She said this issue will be addressed by the TLC Selection Panel prior to the FY 2010 project selection.

Mr. Mohktari thanked MDOT for its continued support of the TLC Program.

Mr. Srikanth spoke to bullet number two under the options for enhancing the program in the memorandum. He said that he understands one of the benefits of the program to be funding smaller projects in smaller jurisdictions that do not necessarily have explicit regional benefits, but inherently benefit the region. He also noted that larger projects might not necessarily be appropriate for the program, as they tend to take longer than the timeframe established for the program. He added that the DOTs already have funding options for small-scale capital improvements and adding this component to the TLC Program would be redundant.

Mr. Kirby said that the City of Falls Church provides a good example of how a jurisdiction benefited from its TLC project and used the product to steer funding towards implementation of the project recommendations.

Mr. Srikanth said shovel ready recommendations are ripe for a number of funding sources already established.

Mr. Kirby reiterated that one of the benefits of the program is that it is quick and simple, while implementing capital project can often take considerable time.

**8. Briefing on the Development of Local Inputs for the EPA Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulation Model (MOVES2010a), and a Comparative Analysis of Emissions Inventories Calculated by MOVES2010a and Mobile 6.2**

Ms. Constantine reviewed her January 7, 2011 MOVES Task Force Progress Report memorandum. She explained that EPA has developed a new mobile emissions model to replace the current Mobile6 model. The TPB will be required to use the new model, MOVES, for SIP development and conformity starting in Spring, 2012. The model, as developed by EPA, provides national default data. She noted that the MOVES Task Force, with representatives from TPB and MWAQC, was charged with review of the new model and the development of regional input data. She stated that EPA has provided several updates since the initial MOVES model release.

Ms. Constantine ran preliminary sensitivity tests using the MOVES model with the 2010 CLRP travel demand model outputs, and she pointed out the results are shown in her memo. She noted that the emission values are very preliminary and are likely to change as staff reviews the model. She noted that with the MOVES model the region would likely adhere to the current emissions budgets for the 2020, 2030, and 2040 forecast years, but not for the 2011 forecast year.

Mr. Erenrich asked if it was necessary to analyze the year 2011. Mr. Kirby responded that it was not a requirement, but that we always have analyzed the first year of the TIP. Mr. Kirby noted that other regions around the country have had similar results and issues with the MOVES model. He said that there has been discussion regarding development of SIP budgets with the MOVES model; adjustment of the 2-year grace period to reflect 2 years after the release of the most current version of the model; and problems with hardwired national default data that cannot be changed. He mentioned that, with the current regulation, we can get an additional conformity run in using the Mobile6 model if inputs are approved by February 2012.

Mr. Biesiadny asked if we would pass conformity if we had to use the MOVES model now. Mr. Kirby replied that we would not.

Ms. Erickson asked whose decision it was to determine which TIP year to analyze. Mr. Kirby replied that it was the TPB's decision.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the new travel demand model would also have an effect on emission results. Ms. Constantine agreed, and noted that it will be a challenge

to incorporate both the new travel demand model (Version 2.3) and area system (3722 TAZ) with the new emissions model.

**9. Briefing on Journey to Work Results from the Census 2005-2009 American Community Survey (ACS)**

Deferred to February.

**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 was signed on Tuesday, December 14, with US Transportation Secretary LaHood signing for the federal government. Counterparts from the five project owners also attended and signed their subgrantee agreements. On Monday, January 3, the TEAM entry was approved by both FTA and COG, which officially executed the grant.

**11. Other Business**

Ms. Bansal provided a briefing on the TIGER II debriefing received by TPB staff from USDOT staff, Robert Mariner. This debriefing was requested by Mr. Holmes, Montgomery County, in a letter to the TPB in December 2010. Ms. Bansal stated that the debriefing was positive and that the TPB's TIGER II application for regional bike-sharing was one of the roughly 10% of the 1,000 applications received that was recommended and advanced for funding by USDOT reviewers.

Mr. Mariner indicated to TPB staff that the project was ultimately not funded because of reasons not pertaining to the strength of the application or bike-sharing concept, such as the need for geographic and modal equity in awards and the overall lack of funding for the program. As a result of the TIGER I award received by TPB, it was unlikely that the region would win a TIGER II award.

Committee members expressed the desire for feedback that could direct concrete changes to the application for future submission. She said that USDOT staff indicated that the proposal itself was recommended for funding and was very competitive. There was also an indication that the political

momentum for bike-sharing in some jurisdictions may be stalled as a result of the TIGER II outcome.

She indicated that USDOT encouraged the resubmission of the project and that perhaps pressure for geographic equity in a future TIGER III would be lessened since all fifty states had now received either a TIGER I or TIGER II award.

## **12. Adjourn**