

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

**Technical Committee Minutes**  
*for meeting of*  
**May 6, 2011**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - May 6, 2011**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                    Mark Rawlings  
DCOP                    Colleen Mitchal

**MARYLAND**

Charles County        -----  
Frederick Co.         -----  
City of Frederick     -----  
Gaithersburg         -----  
Montgomery Co.      Gary Erenrich  
Prince George's Co.   Lou Farber  
Rockville             -----  
M-NCPPC  
  Montgomery Co.     -----  
  Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari  
MDOT                  Lyn Erickson  
                             Reena Mathews  
MTA                    -----  
Takoma Park          -----

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria            Pierre Holloman  
Arlington Co.         Dan Malouff  
City of Fairfax        Alexis Verzosa  
Fairfax Co.            Robert Owolabi  
Falls Church         -----  
Loudoun Co.          -----  
Manassas             -----  
Prince William Co.   Monica Backmon  
NVTC                  -----  
PRTC                  Anthony Foster  
                             Nick Alexandrow  
VRE                    -----  
VDOT                  Randy Hodgson  
VDRPT                 Amy Inman  
NVPDC                -----  
VDOA                  -----

**WMATA**

WMATA                Mark Kellogg  
                             Tom Harrington

**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  
Huijing Qiang, DTP  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Andy Meese, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Feng Xie, DTP  
Sarah Crawford, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Karin Foster, DTP  
Dusan Vuksan, DTP  
Rex Hodgson, DTP  
Deb Bilek, DTP  
Rich Roisman, DTP

**Other Attendees**

Randy Carroll, MDE  
Mike Lambert, Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.  
Sean Kennedy, WMATA  
Michael Weinberger, PRTC  
Rahul Triveoll, VDOT  
Bill Orleans

# TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

May 6, 2011

## Technical Committee Minutes

---

### 1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from April 1, 2011 TPB Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### 2. **Briefing on Proposed Amendment to the FY 2011-2016 TIP to Include Virginia's FY 2012-2016 TIP**

Mr. Randy Hodgson spoke to a memo that accompanied the Draft Update to the FY 2011-2016 TIP. He stated that VDOT was updating the TIP to reflect funding programmed in the FY 2012-2015 STIP. He noted that this update did not include the FY 2012-2017 Six Year Plan currently under development. That Plan would not be approved by the Commonwealth Transportation Board until June of this year. Mr. Hodgson also pointed out that some projects in the TIP included negative dollar amounts. He explained that these were due to instances where funds were being deprogrammed for any number of reasons. Those funds were then reprogrammed to other phases or projects.

Mr. Austin said that this would be presented to the TPB as a notice item at this month's meeting and released for public comment. The TPB would then be asked to approve the update to the TIP at its June meeting. Mr. Austin also commented on the negative dollar amounts shown in the TIP and said that in the next draft, the negative amounts would not be included in the calculation of funding source totals.

Mr. Hodgson added that the TIP update also included project updates from the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation.

Mr. Kirby asked Mr. Austin to work with VDOT staff to develop a cover memo for the item when it is presented to the TPB. The memo should summarize the overall impact of the update and any significant changes. Mr. Austin pointed to Table C at the end of the TIP update handout which summarized the amounts programmed by funding source as a place to start with that memo.

### 3. **Report on the TPB Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force**

Mr. Kirby described the draft scope for the priorities plan. He explained in detail how the draft had been revised since the last meeting of the Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force in April.

Mr. Erenrich said it was important to explain how this effort will differ from the process to develop the CLRP.

Mr. Kirby went through an example of how the recommended process will be used to identify priorities.

Mr. Mokhtari said he was supportive of the use of cost-benefit analysis.

Mr. Erenrich said the improvements made since April were good.

Ms. Mitchell said the new version of the draft was much clearer. However, she said she was still uncertain about whether strategies would be a final output of the process. She said she had understood that the original purpose of a priorities plan would be to create a list of priority projects. She further said she understood this list would be dynamic and would be regularly updated.

Mr. Kirby said that cost-benefit analysis would be used to identify priorities. He said that the end result would be a list of 10-15 priorities.

Ms. Mitchell said that the draft should specify that the plan would result in a list of 10-15 priorities. She said that she was concerned that the process for developing the plan would be too labor intensive and therefore it will only be updated once every seven or eight years.

Mr. Kirby assured Ms. Mitchell that it will be a continuing process.

Mr. Erenrich described local planning processes and emphasized the need to incorporate the realities of those local decision making processes into the priorities plan.

Mr. Kirby spoke about the fact that some small projects can have a big regional impact.

Mr. Mokhtari spoke about the need to focus on projects not strategies.

Ms. Erickson said she wants the final priorities plan to be useful. She said the process should be used to identify projects that are linked to regional goals.

Mr. Kirby said the draft would be changed to reflect the conversation among Technical Committee members.

Mr. Owolabi suggested that when the Citizens Guide is referenced in the draft scope, a hyperlink should be provided to that document.

#### **4. Briefing on a the TPB Transportation Planning Process Certification Summary Report**

Ms. Barlow gave a PowerPoint presentation on the results of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) certification review (held in April 2010) of the transportation planning process for the Washington, DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area (TMA). She explained that the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) is covered in the certification review because a small portion of the TMA includes part of Stafford County which is in the FAMPO area. She highlighted the seven TPB planning elements that received commendations and summarized the 11 recommendations in the report. She then highlighted the FAMPO planning elements that received 4 commendations and 3 recommendations. She explained the 4 corrective actions that FAMPO must address. These actions require that FAMPO and the Virginia Commonwealth Transportation Board submit a joint letter confirming the FAMPO project selection process for RSTP and CMAQ projects and that FAMPO address three Title VI issues.

Mr. Erenrich inquired what would happen if FAMPO does not somehow comply to address its corrective actions and if this would affect TPB.

Ms. Barlow said that it could affect the TPB planning certification which is subject to implementation of all of the recommendations and corrective actions within 12 months. She stated that FAMPO staff and TPB staff are working on these issues now and she does not see a problem.

Mr. Kirby commended the federal team for conducting a very comprehensive and professional review. He expressed his appreciation for the team's help in coordinating the review of the earlier draft report and for their positive responses to TPB staff comments. He reviewed the relationship between FAMPO and TPB planning processes and the development of their 2004 planning agreement. He said that as recommend in the report TPB staff will review the 2004 agreement with FAMPO staff and coordinate the planning process as required. He said that TPB staff is working with FAMPO staff to rectify the FAMPO Title VI issues identified in the report regarding training, producing a plan, and analyzing impacts on different socio-economic groups.

#### **5. Update on the FY 2011 US Department of Transportation (DOT) Budget and the Reauthorization of the Surface Transportation Program**

Mr. Kirby, referring to a PowerPoint presentation, provided an update on the FY2011 USDOT budget and on the reauthorization of the federal surface transportation authorizing legislation.

He discussed the various budget extensions from FY2011 and the corresponding reductions to federal transportation funding. He also summarized proposed budget legislation that would fund the federal government for the duration of FY2011. He provided an overview of administration and congressional commitments to reauthorize SAFETEA-LU, the federal surface transportation authorizing legislation. He mentioned that the administration and Congress will have difficulty coming to agreement on the scope and details of the legislation, and summarized the administration's reauthorization proposal as reflected in the President's FY2012 budget request to Congress.

Mr. Erenrich made a clarification that some of the reduction in New Starts spending resulted from a cancelled project in New Jersey.

Mr. Verzosa asked about the kind of safety programs that would be included in any new legislation.

Mr. Kirby replied that proposed funding for safety included all kinds of safety initiatives.

Mr. Owolabi asked for clarification on what it means to be "TIGER ready."

Mr. Kirby clarified that, because funding was provided for a "TIGER III" program, it is important for the TPB to continue to develop and articulate a comprehensive set of transportation priorities for the region.

Mr. Foster asked about an increase in TIGER award funding.

Mr. Kirby said that Chairman Mica is a strong proponent of public-private partnerships.

Mr. Erenrich commented on public-private partnerships and the Montgomery County Transit network. He said that the purple line, like many other projects in Maryland, would not move forward without new money, which would require matching federal funds with other sources.

Mr. Mokhtari, referring to the second bullet in slide 12, asked what the region would do to apply for competitive grant programs. He said it is worth having strategic discussions early on to address what might become part of an application.

Mr. Kirby replied that although TIGER III would be a competitive program, it is not yet clear how the program would be structured.

Mr. Erenrich asked what the local match requirement would be under TIGER III.

Mr. Kirby replied that the local match would be 20% with a Federal contribution of 80%. He said that applications that provide higher match dollars would be considered more favorably.

Mr. Hodgson asked about formula funding under the new legislation.

Mr. Kirby discussed the gas tax as a method of funding the highway trust fund, and said that other funding would be needed to increase formula funding beyond the current levels.

## **6. Briefing on WMATA's Regional Transit System Plan (RTSP)**

Mr. Harrington presented the results to date of WMATA's RTSP, which evaluates future estimated ridership impacts on Metrorail and other transit modes for various transit scenarios, such as new rail lines, an expanded bus network, street car and light rail systems, and other visions for 2040. He emphasized that the primary reason for the plan is to address core capacity, with Metrorail demand expected to exceed the capability of the system, especially at the three river crossings (from Rosslyn, Pentagon, and Anacostia into downtown) and on the Red Line near Farragut North station. WMATA would also like to improve station access effectively, improve surface transit, and provide for new markets. Since the initial build-out of the system, expansion has been the responsibility of the respective jurisdictions, but now a regional look is needed once again.

Mr. Harrington then reviewed the key assumptions and findings of the various alternatives WMATA has evaluated to date, including new rail lines in downtown DC, interline connections, rail extensions, enhanced surface transit networks, and increased walkability around stations. Some of these increase rail ridership; others mitigate the anticipated demand on the subway system. Going forward, WMATA will host a series of public forums to get citizen input and then proceed with refinement of a limited number of scenarios that combine the alternatives considered.

Mr. Milone asked if new rail lines in downtown DC meant new tunnels. Mr. Harrington answered affirmatively, clarifying that the RTSP is a ridership analysis and not a cost-benefit analysis intended to assign a price-tag to any such project, which admittedly would be expensive. In addition, no analysis has been conducted of the effects on highway demand.

Mr. Malouff asked about commuter rail alternatives. Mr. Kellogg answered that some of the scenarios tested do consider additional service on the current commuter rail system. In many cases, some of the rail extensions modeled could possibly be better served by commuter rail rather than Metrorail.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that the RTSP work be tied to principles of the TPB Vision and Moving Forward, as many of the RTSP objectives are the same as regional goals.

Mr. Kellogg agreed that WMATA plans to do this, and will also be updating it with the latest demand model of the TPB.

There was general discussion that few alternatives have much impact on transit mode share. Any investment in a mature transportation network can only shift mode choice by a few percent, including both WMATA's analyses and the work Montgomery County has done on a BRT system.

Mr. Swanson asked about the walkability measure and how it was modeled. Mr. Kellogg described how the pedestrian access in downtown stations was duplicated around currently less-developed stations, to give an idea of how transit-oriented development might benefit ridership. Similarly, the TPB's CLRP Aspirations scenario has similar impacts, with both increasing transit ridership but in a more regionally and network balanced way. However, these goals are outside WMATA's purview, and emphasize the importance of regional conversation on integrated land-use and transportation development.

For the presentation to the TPB, it was recommended that more emphasis be placed on the goals and objectives of the RTPS work rather than scenario results. General strategies such as increased walkability or enhanced surface transit should be discussed along with general results.

## **7. Briefing on the Bus Priority Treatment Guidelines**

Mr. Lambert presented an overview of the guidelines document, which provides a general guide for the implementation of priority bus treatments within the Metropolitan Washington region. It is intended for professionals who oversee traffic operations or are involved in the management of roadways because the strategies needed to improve bus operations can have implications for traffic. Common physical and operational treatments applied along corridors to improve transit operations through decreasing travel times and improving reliability for the passenger are evaluated. The guidebook is intended to answer frequently-posed questions that state and local agencies may have about the use of a specific priority treatment being considered and the potential impacts on traffic operations of that treatment. General applicability and examples where these treatments have been effective in other cities are presented for user information.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the project was complete. Mr. Randall responded that the document was complete, and a webinar to present the results is planned. The document is available from the MWCOG website. A limited set of copies for participants in the work will be prepared and disseminated in the near future.



## **8. Update on the Release of the Draft Version 2.3 Travel Demand Model**

Mr. Milone informed the Committee that the Version 2.3 travel demand model development is continuing with the oversight of the TPB Travel Forecasting Subcommittee (TFS). He reminded the Committee that TPB staff intends to apply the new Version 2.3 model for the upcoming air quality conformity work. Staff anticipates the model will be formally adopted by the TPB in the fall (November) of 2011, after the conformity analysis is completed.

Following a special meeting of the TFS on April 29, the “draft” Version 2.3 model has been transmitted to several agencies wishing to review the new model. (TPB staff has thus far serviced five requests). Mr. Milone cautioned that the model will be subject to revision pending ongoing checks and sensitivity testing up until the time of its anticipated adoption. For those agencies reviewing the draft Version 2.3 model, TPB staff welcomes feedback regarding the model’s operation and performance. TPB staff is working with Cambridge Systematics, Inc. to refine the model over the next few months. He added that the Version 2.3 model’s existing computation times are substantially longer than that of the currently adopted Version 2.2 model. TPB staff is actively working to minimize model execution times by streamlining computer scripting code and by the use of distributed processing (i.e., applying the model across multiple computers working in parallel).

Mr. Foster inquired about the specific version of the new model that TPB staff is releasing to interested agencies and also asked about how the new model will affect studies that are currently in motion. Mr. Milone informed him that the version being distributed is known as Version 2.3 #17. TPB staff anticipates that future model versions (#18, #19, etc.) will be formulated as refinements are implemented in between now and November. Mr. Kirby added that if an existing project is nearing the end of its planned schedule, then the use of the adopted Version 2.3 model will not be possible. Agencies wishing to use the new model for project planning needs are advised to wait until its adoption in the fall.

## **9. Update on the Development of Bikeshare Marketing Brochures**

Mr. Rex Hodgson explained that marketing brochures were being developed in coordination with DDOT’s goDCgo. One brochure would outline the benefits of bikeshare for private companies and the other would outline the necessary steps for other jurisdictions to join the Capital Bikeshare program and bring bikesharing to their communities. The draft brochures are expected to be available for the Technical Committee to review at their June meeting.

Mr. Owolabi asked about what happens if a user checks out a bicycle and goes to a station where there are no empty docking stations to return the bicycle. Mr. Hodgson explained that users can notify the company from the kiosk of the full bikeshare station

And they will be granted an additional 15 minutes to return their bicycle to the nearest bikeshare station. Mr. Malouff mentioned that according to the contract, the company responsible for redistributing the bikes to ensure a balanced system will be penalized if bikeshare stations remain either full or empty for more than three hours.

Mr. Kirby asked about what would happen if a small jurisdiction further out in the region wanted to join Capital Bikeshare. Mr. Hodgson explained that there are a number of steps that any jurisdiction would need to follow in order to join the current bikeshare program, and that these steps will be outlined in one of the brochures. One of these steps is a discussion about terms and conditions under which the new jurisdiction would enter the bikeshare program. Mr. Malouff added that due to difficulty in servicing the bikeshare stations and bicycles, it may be more expensive to provide service to jurisdictions that are further away from the existing bikeshare service area.

**10. Other Business**

None.

**11. Adjourn**