

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - May 7, 2010**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
 Aaron Overman

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. -----
MDOT Lyn Erickson
 Reena Mathews
MTA Joseph Madison
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

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

WMATA

WMATA Mark Kellogg

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
FHWA-VA -----
FTA -----
NCPC -----
NPS -----
MWAQC -----
FEMA/DHS -----

COG Staff

Ronald Kirby, DTP
Mike Clifford, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Erin Morrow, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Bob Griffiths, DTP
Deb Bilek, DTP
Tim Canan, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
Andy Meese, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Jim Yin, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Rex Hodgson, DTP
William Bacon, DTP
Darren Smith, DTP
Joan Rohlf, DEP
Paul Desjardin, DCPS

Other Participants

Arlee Reno, Cambridge Systematics
Randy Carroll, MDE
Bill Orleans, HAEK

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

May 7, 2010

Technical Committee Minutes

1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the April 9, 2010 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

2. **Update on Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP**

Mr. Austin referred to the memo that described the Proposed Significant Changes to the 2001 CLRP and said that there were no changes to this document since it was released for public comment on April 15. Ms. Posey distributed copies of the revised Draft Air Quality Conformity Inputs table and noted that items with yellow shading are new this year and were included in the original inputs prior to April 15, while items shaded in pink were corrections made since the April 21 TPB meeting.

Mr. Erenrich noted that in the Significant Changes memo, the M-83, Mid-County Highway project and the Middlebrook Road project should not be included in the list of projects to be removed from the CLRP. Mr. Austin noted the corrections and said they would be updated prior to the TPB meeting.

Mr. Srikanth noted that VDOT would be making a few technical corrections to dates. Mr. Biesiadny asked that a Park-and-Ride lot listing on page 3 be modified to reflect that it was in Prince William County.

Mr. Austin asked about the status of the South Capitol Street bridge project in the District of Columbia. Mr. Miller noted that if funding was no longer identified for the bridge widening that it should be removed. Mr. Rawlings said he would follow up with engineers from DDOT and respond to TPB staff.

Ms. Erickson asked TPB staff to provide an electronic version of the Air Quality Conformity Inputs for review. Ms. Posey said she would include any edits received and transmit the spreadsheet by the end of the day. Ms. Posey requested that any final changes be submitted by the end of the day on Tuesday, May 11.

Mr. Austin said that most of the comments received to date were in support of the Bike Lane Pilot Project, submitted by DDOT. Mr. Srikanth noted that at the April TPB meeting, DDOT had been requested to provide additional assessment and analysis of the Bike Lanes and their impact on traffic. Mr. Rawlings stated that this response would be included in the Letters Sent/Received packet for the TPB's May 19 meeting.

3. Update Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP

Ms. Posey reviewed the conformity scope of work that had been included in the mail out items. She pointed out Table 1 (Summary of Technical Approach), and noted that the process will be the same as in the last conformity analysis except for updated, Round 8.0, cooperative forecast files and a new forecast year, 2040. She mentioned that staff does not have all the Round 8.0 TAZ level forecasts yet, but have been assured the data will be provided in time for the analysis. She stated that staff hopes to be able to reflect the updated transit fares in the conformity travel demand runs, but if new fare information is not available by mid-June then staff will use current fares in the matrix.

Mr. Biesiadny said he expected that the fare information would be available by mid-June. Mr. Erenrich asked how parking costs are dealt with in the model. Mr. Milone answered that parking is a function of employment and zone density. Mr. Erenrich asked, and Mr. Milone confirmed, that transit fares, but not parking costs, are directly input in the model.

4. Briefing on the Results for the “What Would it Take?” Greenhouse Gas Reduction Scenario

Ms. Bansal presented the final results of the “What Would it Take?” scenario, including an overview of the scenario purpose, baseline forecast, sources of GHG emissions, strategies analyzed, results of groupings of strategies, conclusions, and potential action items. Staff also explained the review process for strategies and that the technical report is being reviewed by the Travel Management Subcommittee.

Committee members stated that the presentation was a good summary of the work done to date. Suggestions to improve the presentation were given, including simplifying slides where both tables and graphs were shown and providing a clearer depiction of the CO₂ by speed curve. Staff indicated that the curve could be shown with a VMT distribution by speed.

A concern about the continued benefit from signal optimization was also raised because, particularly on arterials, traffic can only be improved to a certain extent with current congestion levels. Questions were also raised regarding the definition of the social cost of carbon. Staff explained that this is a measure of the value of reducing a ton of CO₂ based on the cost of damages avoided. This value can be used to compare strategies across sectors. Committee members also suggested removing the TIGER grant proposals from the cost-effectiveness bar chart in order to simplify the chart. Staff also indicated a potential issue with the CAFE analysis under the scenario not matching EPA analysis and that it is being looked into.

5. Update on the Washington Region Transportation Planning Process Certification Review

Mr. Kirby thanked the Committee members for their participation in the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) meetings as part of the certification review of the transportation planning process for the Washington region on April 15, 19-20, 22, and 29, 2010. He mentioned that TPB staff had provided the federal reviewers with written responses to 150 questions before the meetings. He said that overall it was a very comprehensive review and that the productive discussions covered the important topics. He said that he expects a draft certification report in about two months and the full report in the fall. He then reviewed a handout letter on additional information TPB staff provided to the federal review staff in response the three observations presented to the TPB on April 21.

Mr. Srikanth commented that the letter with additional information was very good. He said that he hopes to see some positive comments in the certification report because there were many made during the review meetings that he attended, and he noticed that the presentation to the TPB did not highlight them.

Mr. Biesiadny inquired if TPB staff will respond to the draft report. Mr. Kirby said he looked forward to the full report and that staff would review it carefully and provide clarification comments if necessary.

6. Update on “Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities,” May 26, 2010

Mr. Kirby introduced the item explaining that the TPB would be hosting an event on May 26 called “A Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities.” The event would be invitation-based and would include members of the TPB, the Technical Committee, the Citizens Advisory Committee and the Access for All Advisory Committee. The event was intended, in part, to respond to the CAC’s recommendation that the TPB should develop a long-range transportation priorities plan.

Mr. Swanson and Ms. Bilek of the TPB staff briefed the committee on the draft presentation that had been developed for the three TPB officers. They went through the slides quickly explaining the flow and intention of the presentation.

Ms. Backmon said it seemed that the presentation did not directly address the CAC’s criticism about the inadequacies of the TPB process.

Mr. Swanson said the slides relating to the CLRP process were designed to address those concerns.

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of April 9, 2010**

Mr. Kirby said that the TPB process combines top-down and bottom-up decision-making. It is not a centralized process because the funding streams are not centrally controlled.

Mr. Biesiadny said the experience in developing the TIGER grant application demonstrated the real presence of regional coordination at TPB. He said this experience should be cited in response to the CAC's comment that there is no regional coordination. He suggested the TPB officers' presentation should more directly address the CAC's report from last year.

Mr. Srikanth agreed with Mr. Biesiadny. He complimented the presentation, saying it was balanced. He expressed concern that it will be hard to address the CAC's concerns in such a short meeting. He said he was concerned that there would be a mismatch between the CAC presentation and the TPB officers' presentations. He asked what the CAC presentation will include.

Mr. Smith of the TPB staff said the CAC presentation will provide a reiteration of the committee's recommendation from past years calling for the TPB to develop a regional transportation priorities plan. He said the CAC was not planning; however, to develop a precise description of what such a plan would look like, how it would be developed or what it would include.

Mr. Erenrich said the presentation should mention Commuter Connections. He also said the officers' presentation should include a number of other megaprojects, including the Woodrow Wilson Bridge and the Springfield Interchange.

Mr. Owolabi also suggested including the Intercounty Connector.

Mr. Srikanth asked for the source of slide 9. He also suggested that slide 18 should include a measure of congestion on transit.

Mr. Swanson said he would make necessary adjustments.

Mr. Ramfos suggested including "transportation demand management" on slide 16.

Mr. Erenrich suggested looking at the RSVP list to ensure no jurisdiction is under-represented.

7. Briefing on Draft Overview of Local and Regional Transit Systems Serving the Washington Metropolitan Area

Mr. Overman, speaking to a slide presentation, provided the Committee with an overview of ridership and operating cost information for the transit systems serving the region. This information was requested by the TPB to provide a better understanding of the regional transit picture, and more specifically a better understanding of the role of the local bus transit operators. He said that the Regional Bus Subcommittee had provided the most recent data through FY 2009 for the presentation.

Mr. Erenrich provided additional back ground information on the TPB request, explaining that a conversation about Martz and Section 5307 money led some TPB members to ask for more information on the local transit operators in the region to better understand their scale of operations and their contribution toward the overall regional transit network.

Mr. Srikanth noted that it would be good to either include a bullet or have a slide title that “tells the story” and explains the key takeaways from each of the charts. Mr. Biesiadny suggested explaining to the TPB why it is that we have all these different transit operators, distinguishing between regional service provided by WMATA and the local service that serves each of the jurisdictions. Also, he noted that commuter rail is important and needs to be in the appropriate charts. Mr. Kirby suggested adding a slide that introduces the Regional Bus Subcommittee. Mr. Weissberg commented that these data can present a good story about the local bus providers in the region.

Mr. Kirby recommended that this item come back to the Technical Committee in June and then be presented to the TPB in June.

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

Mr. Canan reported on grant implementation activities that have occurred since the last meeting of the Technical Committee, and described next steps that will be taken in the near future. The five project owner agencies met with FTA and TPB staff on 15 April 2010 to discuss required elements to be included in the project components’ scopes, schedules and budgets to be submitted to FTA for approval. During that meeting FTA explained that once the scopes, budgets and schedules are approved, FTA and COG, as the administrative agent for TPB, will execute a grant agreement because the grant will be administered by COG, which in turn will execute MOUs between itself and each of the five project owner agencies. All scopes, schedules and budgets have been

submitted to FTA, including responses to questions of clarification from FTA. As a result, it is anticipated that FTA will approve these elements shortly and incorporate them into the grant agreement with COG in mid-May. Shortly afterward, COG will enter into sub-agreements with each of the project owners.

In response to a question from Mr. Owolabi, Mr. Canan explained that project administrative costs will be eligible expenses, and have been included in the budgets submitted to FTA. Mr. Canan further explained that FTA has approved the inclusion of a nominal percentage of grant costs to be used for administrative purposes by COG in the management of the TIGER grant.

9. Briefing on the “TIGER II” Grant Program

Mr. Kirby informed the Committee that USDOT released an Interim Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for a \$600 million discretionary surface transportation grant funding to be known as TIGER II. Many of the features of this grant program are similar to those of TIGER I; however, Mr. Kirby did mention several notable differences. Projects to be funded under TIGER II will be \$600 million, as opposed to \$1.5 billion under TIGER I. At least \$140 million of the \$600 million will be awarded to rural areas. In addition, \$35 million will be available for transportation planning grants. Mr. Kirby reported the selection criteria for projects under TIGER II will be the same as those used to select projects under TIGER I. USDOT anticipates the TIGER II Discretionary Grant program to be just as competitive as TIGER I, and given the lower funding availability under TIGER II, this round of grant award selections may be even more competitive.

Because of the higher level of competitiveness and the lower amount of available grant awards, Mr. Kirby suggested that the region consider submitting the regional bike sharing project in a TIGER II grant application. This project has already been packaged as part of a TIGER grant application and could be readily included in a subsequent TIGER II application. The Committee could also consider including roads and trails that provide access to Metro and the bike sharing system as part of the application. Members of the Committee asked if such locally-funded projects already in the planning stages could be included in the application to fulfill the local match requirements. These projects could be included in the application as part of the project.

Ms. Bansal mentioned that she has already contacted agencies that were included in the original bike sharing project included in the TIGER I application to determine whether they would be interested in pursuing grant funding for this endeavor under TIGER II. While she had not heard from everyone yet, she did receive positive feedback from those who responded.

Mr. Kirby will suggest this approach at the May TPB meeting to determine if the region should pursue discretionary grant funding through the TIGER II program.

10. Briefing on Request by Martz National Coach for Federal Assistance for Commuter Bus Service between Fredericksburg and Washington DC

Mr. Ramfos distributed a draft response letter that was prepared in response to Martz National Coach's January 21, 2010 letter seeking Section 5307 funds in exchange for reporting their commuter bus mileage to the National Transit Database (NTD). Mr. Ramfos reviewed issues and concerns regarding the request and in particular focused on the Capital District Transportation Committee MPO in Albany which is currently including Section 5307 funding in its TIP for mileage being reported by private commuter bus operators to the NTD. The Albany region's designated recipient is the Capital District Transit Authority (CDTA) and they are responsible for overseeing the private carriers that are reporting their mileage to the NTD.

Next, Mr. Ramfos reviewed some of the highlights of the response letter including the designated recipient administrative responsibilities, the adherence to FTA Charter regulations for the sub-recipient, the anticipation of other private providers participating in similar arrangements, the reduction in Section 5307 funds to the designated transit recipients in the region, the documentation of anticipated administrative costs, and the request for the possible resulting public benefit(s) associated with this type of an arrangement.

Mr. Kirby stated that he would like to have the draft response letter be presented to the TPB as an information item this month. Mr. Biesiadny stated that the Charter regulations need to be added to the first point in the letter. Ms. Backmon stated that there is a new FTA Circular dated May 1, 2010 which was released stating that both the designated recipient and sub-recipients need to be public bodies (FTA C 9030.ID). She requested that this information be included in the letter.

Mr. Ramfos stated that the necessary corrections would be made to the draft response letter to Martz for presentation to the TPB.

11. Briefing on the Strategic Plan for the Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Program

Mr. Meese reported, referring to a PowerPoint presentation. The draft MOITS Strategic Plan was developed over the August 2009 – April 2010 time frame by a consultant team and TPB staff. Developing such a plan was recommended by MOITS Technical Subcommittee members. The main desired outcomes of the Strategic Plan were to guide upcoming MOITS activities, and to provide a list of potential regional projects for future funding opportunities. TPB Chairman Snyder had expressed strong interest in the results of the Strategic Plan, and had requested that the TPB be briefed.

The Strategic Plan recommended that the MOITS committees continue in their role to advise the TPB and its other subcommittees on transportation management, operations, and technology issues, as well as to serve as a forum for information exchange on these topics among members. It should coordinate with other key related regional activities, including the Regional Emergency Support Function 1 (RESF-1) Committee (transportation emergency preparedness planning), the MATOC Program (which handles real-time information coordination), and WMATA committees that address transit operations and technology efforts.

Two goals from the TPB Vision (1998), along with their associated objectives and strategies, were the key goals for MOITS: management, performance, maintenance, and safety (Goal 3); and technology to maximize system effectiveness (Goal 4). The MOITS Strategic Plan built upon the TPB Vision by identifying four additional “tactical actions”: provide regional situational awareness of transportation system conditions; regionally coordinate operating procedures; inform travelers’ decision-making; and integrate systems and processes.

Features of the Strategic Plan included emphasis areas (technical topics that are in the MOITS purview and lend themselves to a regional-level focus); best practices (anticipated to be especially effective in achieving desired outcomes); performance measures; how MOITS-related activities will directly benefit the public; a list of proposed projects/strategic efforts; and key recommendations to guide the future activities of the MOITS program.

The draft MOITS Strategic Plan was slated to go to TPB for the May 19 meeting. Once finalized, the plan will serve as a major guide for upcoming MOITS activities, and as a source for prioritized project proposals as funding opportunities arise.

Mr. Erenrich asked whether WMATA staff had been involved in the development of the draft Strategic Plan. Mr. Meese responded that Mr. Kennedy of WMATA staff was the 2010 Chair of the MOITS Technical Subcommittee, and had participated in the plan’s review.

Mr. Biesiadny noted that the current presentation was wordy, and would benefit from being briefer, and from the addition of graphics, when presented to the TPB.

12. Briefing on the Draft 2010 Congestion Management Process (CMP) Technical Report

Mr. Meese and Mr. Pu reported, referring to a PowerPoint presentation. The Congestion Management Process (CMP) is a requirement in SAFETEA-LU and its associated 2007 federal regulations for metropolitan planning. The TPB’s official CMP document is the

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of April 9, 2010**

CMP element that is wholly integrated into the CLRP. The CMP Technical Report is a supporting technical document to that official CMP.

The main features of the draft 2010 CMP Technical Report were the description of the state of congestion in the region; the description of the consideration and implementation of Congestion Management strategies; evaluations of Congestion Management strategies, and an explanation of how results of the CMP are integrated into the CLRP. The report both compiled information from a wide range of already-existing metropolitan transportation planning activities for purposes of documenting them for the CMP, as well as providing some additional CMP-specific analyses, particularly on travel time reliability and non-recurring congestion. The key new activity was the analysis of probe vehicle speed data for a portion of the region's freeways, with data obtained free of charge from INRIX, Inc., through a contract with the I-95 Corridor Coalition.

Report findings regarding congestion included that congestion increased from the second half of 2008 to the second half of 2009 on the sampled freeways. With "mile-hours of congestion" as the congestion indicator, there was 14% increase in peak periods, and a 24% increase daily. Congestion varied seasonally and daily. The most congested and unreliable month was June. The least congested and most reliable month was January. The most congested and unreliable AM hour was Tuesday 8-9 AM. The most congested PM hour was Friday 4-5 PM. The most unreliable PM hour was Friday 5-6 PM. Congestion steadily increased from January to June 2009, and then fluctuated in the second half of the year. Additionally, travel time reliability was been examined in the CMP for the first time. From the second half of 2008 (which had historically high fuel prices) to the second half of 2009, travel time reliability decreased.

The draft report had five recommendations regarding activities addressing congestion. These recommendations were to continue the Commuter Connections Program; to continue the MATOC program and agency/ jurisdictional transportation management activities; to consider variable pricing and other management strategies for capacity increasing projects; and to encourage implementation of congestion management for major construction projects. There were also four planning/analytical recommendations: to continue and enhance the use of continuous, probe-based congestion monitoring data; to integrate probe-based congestion monitoring data and location-fixed sensor data; to continue travel time reliability analysis; and to explore the use of INRIX and other emerging data sources to produce online quarterly snapshots of regional congestion.

The deadline for comments was May 28. It was anticipated that the report will be finalized at the June 4 Technical Committee meeting.

In response to a question from Mr. Erenrich concerning the lack of INRIX data for Frederick, Loudoun, and Montgomery Counties, Mr. Meese noted that the Maryland State Highway Administration was considering a statewide data purchase, if funding can be identified, that would provide the Frederick and Montgomery data.

13. Briefing on the Draft Report on the Financial Analysis for the 2010

Mr. Reno of Cambridge Systematics, Inc. (CSI) provided a brief update following his April 9 presentation to the Committee on the financial analysis for the update of the 2010 CLRP. He said that the consultant team is currently working closely with MDOT and DDOT to determine the federal and state distributions of their revenues and expenditures and then prepare the summary tables for the analysis. He distributed three sample summary tables with an improved format from the 2006 analysis. He explained that these tables make clear the local, state, federal and private sources of revenues for highway, local transit and WMATA capital and operating through 2040. He pointed out that local and state funding for transit are growing sources.

Mr. Kirby commented that for the TPB and public the key facts from the analysis need to be presented in pie charts and other simple graphic pictures. He said that the key changes from the 2006 analysis such as the growth in the percentage of total expenditures devoted to operations and preservation and the decline for expansion need to be highlighted.

Mr. Kellogg asked about the footnote to the tables regarding WMATA funding that stated "An additional \$7.5 billion in potential federal (\$3.75 billion) with state matching funds for 2021 to 2040 are yet to be finalized at this time." Mr. Reno explained that this is based upon the Committee's recommendation in April that the conservative assumption is that the federal legislation authorizing \$1.5 billion plus match of \$1.5 billion from 2010 to 2020 will expire in 2020 with no further funding. Mr. Kellogg commented that \$7.5 billion is a major portion of WMATA's needs beyond 2020 and will affect more than just the rail core capacity.

Mr. Kirby commented that this is a big question that we must address in order for the TPB to approve the 2010 CLRP in November.

14. Briefing on WMATA's Regional Transit System Plan (RTSP)

Scheduled for the June 4 meeting.

15. Other Business

None.

16. Adjourn