

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

for meeting of

October 5, 2012

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - October 5, 2012**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
 Anthony Foster

DCOP -----

MARYLAND

Charles County Jason Groth
Frederick Co. Ron Burns
City of Frederick Tim Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. -----
Prince George's Co. Daniel Dornan
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich
 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT Lyn Erickson
 Vaughn Lewis
MTA Rick Kiegel
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Mike Lake
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. -----
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Monica Backmon
NVTC Claire Gron
PRTC Nick Alexandrow
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT -----
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Mark Kellogg
 Danielk Wesolek
 Matthew Zych

FEDERAL/OTHER

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

COG Staff

Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
William Bacon, DTP
Wenjing Pu, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP

Other Attendees

Randy Carroll, MDE
Lucas Cruse, Toole Design Group
Chris Holben, DDOT
Brian Laverty, Parsons Brinckherhoff
Bill Orleans, HACK

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

October 5, 2012

Technical Committee Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the September 7 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Update on an Additional Air Quality Conformity Analysis to Respond to the EPA Redesignation of the Washington Region under the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)

Ms. Posey stated that the EPA designated this region as a marginal non-attainment area for the 2008 ozone NAAQS. She noted that the designation requires a conformity analysis that includes the region's new 2015 attainment year. She mentioned that the work scope had gone out for public comment in September, and that the TPB is scheduled to approve the scope in October. She noted that the draft report would go out for public comment in November, with TPB approval in December. She also noted that FHWA just approved the 2012 CLRP and conformity analysis.

Mr. Erenrich asked what was the federal deadline for the conformity analysis. Ms. Posey said that it had to be completed within 1 year.

3. Update on the Draft call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2013 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP

Ms. Posey noted that the Call for Projects document is out for public comment, and that the TPB will be asked to approve the document this month. She mentioned that the only change since the group had seen the document last month was that the "Complete Streets" item was included in the TIP form. She stated that it was not necessary to fill in the "Complete Streets" information for projects currently in the database, but that people should fill out the information for new projects. She noted that the deadline for inputs for the conformity analysis is December 14th.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the CCT had new assumptions. Ms. Erickson responded that it does, and they will be included with the 2013 CLRP inputs.

Mr. Rawlings clarified that all the information for the Complete Streets would not be included at first. Ms. Posey agreed.

Mr. Rawlings asked when the detailed transit assumptions were due. Ms. Posey said that inputs are due in December and transit coding details by February.

4. Update on the Regional “Street Smart” Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign

Mr. Farrell spoke to a hand-out and mail-out item on the Street Smart pedestrian and bicycle safety program, including the activities and evaluation results for FY 2012, and plans for FY 2013.

Mr. Davis asked how Capital Bikeshare is affecting safety. Mr. Farrell replied that safety results from the bikeshare program so far were good; bike share users have a lower crash rate than the general population. The bikes are of a heavy, slow design with built-in generator lights, a significant safety feature. Bicycle crashes overall have been rising in DC, though more slowly than the increase in bicycle use.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the improvement in safety awareness shown in the surveys was worth the money spent, whether results could be correlated with the amount of money spent, and whether a survey could be done six months after a campaign to measure the persistence of the benefits.

Mr. Farrell replied that the 2002 level of awareness is what we had before spending anything. Long-term improvements as measured by questions common to all the surveys show the long-term persistence of the benefits. Repetition is needed for these kinds of messages, both for long-time residents, and also to reach new residents, of which this region has many due to growth and population turn-over.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the program was cost-effective. Mr. Farrell replied that it was. The amount of local money being invested is relatively small compared to the federal component, and the program earned nearly \$1 million in free publicity and in public service announcements (PSAs), more than the program budget. Mr. Meese added that this program has to compete for funding every year, and the funding agencies are happy with the results.

Mr. Erenrich asked how the program supported safe access to transit. Mr. Farrell replied that there are specific bus safety messages, and that \$150,000 per year is spent on advertising on WMATA.

Mr. Erenrich asked why the identity of the new contractors was named in the presentation and if they would be presenting to the TPB. Mr. Farrell replied that they would probably not present to the TPB, but the fact that there is a new contractor is important, since the contractor will have considerable influence on the shape of the campaign. Mr. Meese added that the new contractor won the bid in part because of their proposal and record in getting PSAs placed. Mr. Farrell mentioned that WMATA often leaves ads up even after the paid period had expired.

Mr. Rawlings remarked that DDOT remained committed to renewing its funding for the program. Mr. Rawlings noted that this item had taken 30 minutes, and

recommended that the presentation be shortened for the TPB, by eliminating most of the survey evaluation results and focusing on the schedule and what is new.

5. Overview of Local and National Bus on Shoulder Experience

Mr. Randall gave a presentation on Bus On Shoulders (BOS) experience in the region and elsewhere. BOS is an arrangement by which buses providing public transportation service operate on designated highway shoulders, when safe and practical to do so, in order to circumvent peak traffic congestion. Current local experience with BOS includes bus operation along a short section (1.3 mi) of VA-267 (the Dulles Toll Road), for bus access to the West Falls Church Metrorail Station, and along the shoulders of US-29 near Burtonsville, MD. Previously, bus service operated along the Maryland portion of the Capital Beltway in the vicinity of the American Legion Bridge where buses were permitted to operate on shoulders; however, this service was discontinued in 2003.

Looking ahead, VDOT is conducting an assessment of the potential of BOS along I-66. In addition, several other cities across the United States also have BOS service; of these, Minneapolis has the most-developed network with over 280 miles of BOS corridors. Mr. Randall reviewed the policy and implementation experience of Minneapolis, and then listed and discussed in brief the key operational and other challenges for successful BOS implementation. He concluded by reviewing the work plan and the invited organizations for the first task force meeting, which will take place on October 17, the morning before the TPB meeting.

Ms. Erickson asked how many transit operators there were in the Minneapolis region. Mr. Randall responded that there were five to six making use of BOS there.

Mr. Erenrich asked how the map of the BOS network in Minneapolis compared to the Washington metropolitan region. Mr. Randall responded that the Minneapolis network was approximately 30 miles east-west and 50 miles north-south. Mr. Erenrich clarified that he was interested in how the BOS network made connections into urban areas. It was his understanding that there was not BOS into the dense, built-up areas. Mr. Randall agreed that this would appear to be the case from his understanding, though more information would be needed to assess this fully.

Mr. Holloman asked about enforcement and the police role in BOS. Mr. Randall responded that the literature emphasized the importance of early police involvement, and that TPB staff were discussing possible invitees to attend a task force meeting and discuss the challenges of BOS, which are also important for emergency response organizations as well.

Mr. Erenrich asked if operating plans were being considered, and how BOS would impact travel times and operating schedules. He also asked who was

responsible for maintaining the BOS infrastructure. Mr. Randall responded that the task force is likely to focus on a more policy-level discussion, and that these details are important but it is not anticipated they will be more than mentioned on the technical memoranda that will be prepared.

Mr. Groth asked for information on whether only limited-access highways were possible routes for BOS. In Charles County, roads like Route 301 have continuous turn lanes that might be used for BOS. Mr. Randall responded that BOS is not necessarily limited to limited-access highways, but that the definition starts becoming fuzzy, as BOS might be analogous to a series of queue jumps for bus priority when looking at these types of roadways.

Ms. Erickson asked for comparative information on the timeframe it takes to implement BOS. Mr. Randall responded that Minneapolis has been steadily expanding its system since 1991, at a rate of four to eight miles a year, and that it would take continued investment and time to implement a similar system in this region.

Mr. Verzosa and Mr. Davis asked for clarification on the operating rules and requirements in the Minneapolis region. Mr. Randall clarified that buses were permitted to use the shoulders at any time of day. He also clarified that buses had to be forecast to save an average of 8 minutes per mile over the course of a week, for BOS to be implemented on a policy basis.

Mr. Erenrich noted that it would be easy to reach the Minneapolis policy of 6 buses per day for BOS implementation, as Ride-On and other operators have as many as 15 buses per hour on I-270.

Mr. Srikanth asked if a representative from FHWA was going to participate in the task force, as their approval would be needed for any design exceptions. Mr. Randall responded that they had not yet extended a targeted invitation to FHWA, but could do so. Certainly a speaker from FHWA would be important for perhaps the second meeting of the task force, planned for January 2013. Mr. Srikanth expanded upon his remarks, noting that VDOT is just assessing the feasibility of BOS currently on I-66, as a follow-up to the previous multi-modal study, and they hope to take some study results to the engineers soon for consideration. But that federal approval is the critical step, and that this takes time to set up.

Discussion concluded with Mr. Randall repeating a request for representatives to attend and participate in the October 17 task force meeting.

6. Briefing on the Implementation of Capital Bikeshare

Mr. Holben spoke to a PowerPoint on the Capital Bikeshare program, reviewing the history of the program to date, including system of operation, ridership, and costs to implement. He also noted that DDOT is looking to increase revenues by sell one side of the station panels for advertising.

Mr. Burns wondered if Bikeshare would compete with private bike rental firms.

Mr. Holben said that most users did not use helmets. The system is popular with visitors.

Mr. Mokhtari noted that the District does not count costs to administer the program.

Mr. Holben explained that each station has twice as many docks as bikes.

Mr. Groth suggested that the system could be better known among travel agents.

Mr. Holben replied that DC is working with various agencies to publicize the program, and to encourage users to bring their own helmets. Capital Bikeshare is also providing free and low-cost helmets. Mr. Carroll asked for data on helmet use. Mr. Holben responded that there isn't good data on helmet use by casual users.

Mr. Orleans asked whether three-wheeled bicycles could be made available for those with balance issues that might prevent them from riding two-wheelers. Mr. Holben replied that only one model of bikeshare bike is currently available from the vendor.

Mr. Erenrich noted that there are numerous challenges to expansion of the system into new jurisdictions. The bikes have only a five year life span, so they can't be bought with capital funds, and there were problems in Montgomery County with using the COG rider, so they had to use a sole-source contract.

Mr. Ramfos suggested that the presentation be condensed for the TPB.

7. Briefing on the Draft 2012 Congestion Management Process (CMP) Technical Report

Mr. Meese introduced the Congestion Management Process (CMP). The CMP is a federal requirement for designated MPOs including the TPB. The official CMP component is fully integrated into the CLRP, and the CMP Technical Report is a compilation of information from a wide range of metropolitan planning actives, including the latest congestion and reliability status obtained from the I-95 Corridor Coalition Vehicle Probe Project/INRIX data analysis.

Mr. Pu presented the ten key findings and twelve recommendations of the 2012 CMP Technical Report and outlined the review schedule. According to INRIX data, the delay on the region's freeway system decreased from 2009 to 2011. The congestion on 4,600 route-miles of arterials in the region was examined all at once for the first time based on 2010 INRIX data.

Mr. Erenrich asked what the coverage of the INRIX data is. Mr. Pu showed a map (Figure 1 on page 9 of the Report) to address the question.

Ms. Hoeffner asked why there was decreasing congestion in 2009 – 2011. Mr. Pu replied by first stating that it is difficult to definitively identify the causes of congestion reduction, and then pointing to two possible reasons: the economical situations and the trend of less driving observed in developed countries by *The Economist*. Mr. Ramfos echoed that the decreasing congestion was also observed in some surveys by the Commuter Connections program.

Mr. Lake asked what the Report says about incident management. Mr. Meese replied that the Report documents what we have, for example, incident information sharing, the MATOC program and public safety coordination.

Mr. Erenrich asked how the peak versus non-peak direction was treated in calculating the percentage of congested road miles. Mr. Pu clarified that all the miles are directional route-miles so there is no need to differentiate peak versus non-peak directions.

Mr. Srikanth asked about the data coverage and hotspots analysis. Mr. Pu replied that the 2012 CMP Technical Report was based on the data available as of early 2012, which includes 2009-2011 data for freeways and 2010 data for the 4,600 route-miles of arterials. The Report includes only the preliminary analysis of the arterial data, and more analysis results are expected as the Arterial Travel Monitoring Program is currently undertaking more analysis. In early September, the I-95 Corridor Coalition Vehicle Probe Project was expanded to cover all freeways and major arterials (technically, all TMC-coded roads) in DC, MD and VA. It is expected that the next CMP Technical Report will include the analysis results from the expanded data coverage.

8. Briefing on Results from the 2011 Washington-Baltimore Regional Air Passenger Survey

Mr. Roisman presented his slides on the results from the 2011 Washington-Baltimore Regional Air Passenger Survey. Mr. Erenrich asked why there was such a large difference in the 2040 air passenger forecasts between BWI and Dulles. Mr. Roisman responded that Dulles has more physical room to expand to accommodate additional air traffic.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the Metrorail Silver Line had any impact on the forecast. Mr. Roisman responded that his understanding of the FAA forecasting methodology is that it did not look at ground access to the airports but focused solely on demand for air travel, so the Silver Line did not have any impact on the forecasts; however, the completion of the Silver Line will increase accessibility to Dulles and may make it more attractive to some air passengers.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if information could be shown on time-of-arrival distribution for air passengers at the three airports. Mr. Roisman responded yes, that it could be shown. Mr. Foster asked if the survey showed how many passengers traveled to the airports using Metrobus. Mr. Roisman responded that yes, it did and is contained in the survey report, and the proportion of trips using Metrobus was very small. A TPB staff member added that at Dulles Metrobus is used by many airport employees, but since those riders are not air passengers they do not show up in the survey.

Mr. Foster asked a question regarding rental car usage, if the survey counted people who were just using the airport as a car rental location. Mr. Roisman responded that unless those people are actually boarding an aircraft, the survey does not capture them. A TPB staff member suggested that to avoid reader confusion, the source information be placed on the slide showing the air passenger forecasts, since they come from FAA and not from the air passenger survey. Mr. Roisman agreed to make that change to the presentation.

Mr. Erenrich noted that BWI set a record this past summer for air passenger volumes. Mr. Roisman noted that yes, BWI is growing, and the airport is in the middle of a multi-year capital improvement to improve the security checkpoints and connectivity between piers (terminals).

9. Briefing on the Metrorail Station Access Alternatives Study

Mr. Zych and Mr. Lavery gave a presentation on the Metrorail Station Access Alternative study completed as part of the FY 2012 UPWP. Mr. Zych described the current mode of access used by Metro passengers, and how by 2040 this would lead to a demand for 29,000 more parking spaces, for which the cost of construction and land takings would be prohibitive. WMATA is therefore very interested in how to provide more cost-effective means of access for Metro customers given predicted increases in ridership. Mr. Lavery spoke to the methodology of the study, which used five case study stations of different typologies and then applied several sets of strategies to identify the most effective means by which to meet forecast travel demand. Mr. Zych then focused on the parking strategies WMATA is considering to improve the use of WMATA's spaces or to provide other alternatives to auto users accessing the Metro system.

Mr. Srikanth asked for clarification on how WMATA developed its ridership forecasts; do the models show parking as constrained, or the system as a whole constrained by core capacity limits? It appears that the model does not show parking as constrained, and that people will drive after parking is full. Mr. Lavery responded that the model assumed that parking was not constrained for forecasts, as the model wants to identify the full need for access given Metro's forecast ridership. Mr. Srikanth posited that this was a false assumption, as people will stay in their cars once the lots are full. Mr. Lavery clarified that the model presumed the lots filled up at all stations, and that after this limit is reached people stayed in their cars and drove to their final destination. This is

what leads to such high benefit-cost ratios at Shady Grove, as the cost of diverting those trips back to auto all the way has such considerable impacts for the drivers and congestion. Mr. Kellogg added that this study is different than a customer demand study, which might identify different numbers for ridership and mode of access to the Metro system.

Mr. Srikanth added that any analysis needs to look at the capacity of stations and the system as a whole. Mr. Mokhtari added that WMATA knows Metro will not be able to handle predicted 2040 demand, and that therefore this limit needs to be taken into account. Mr. Kellogg responded that WMATA believes it will be able to come very close to meeting 2040 demand except in certain locations during very limited periods of time, and that therefore overall the general assumptions still apply.

Ms. Erickson noted that transportation demand management strategies do work, and that this study is a start towards identifying what is needed in the region and by WMATA. Mr. Ramfos responded that it would be good to present this briefing to the Commuter Connections Subcommittee, and also clarified that he had participated in the meetings for the study.

Mr. Malouff noted that the focus of the study appears to be on parking. Mr. Zych responded that this was only part of the study, but the topic he chose to focus on for the presentation, as other strategies are more straightforward. Discussion concluded with some questions on the specific case study station characteristics.

10. Briefing on an Application to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) to Implement Web-based Transportation Option Information to Access to the National Parks in the Washington Region

Mr. Ramfos stated that a Notification of Funding Availability was issued by the FTA on August 28th for the Paul S. Sarbanes Transit in Parks discretionary grant program. He stated that the proposals were due on September 28th based on the fact that this was the final round of funding availability for the program and that the Transit in Parks Program was not included in the new MAP-21 Transportation bill. There is approximately \$12 million dollars in funding available nationally; therefore, the chances of getting a project funded will be quite slim. It is expected that project awards will be announced in December of this year.

Mr. Ramfos then described the proposal submittal. The project is aimed at developing a web site and a responsive web design for smart phone applications which will provide transportation information to access national parks in the TPB planning area. In particular, the project will be aimed at underserved citizens in the region, the active transportation community, and visitors. The funding requested was \$410,000 and does not require a local match. He also explained that COG/TPB staff received a letter of support from the National Park Service

which was submitted as part of the grant application. A demonstration of financial sustainability was one of the requirements of the grant application. A detailed budget representing the proposed project's capital and operating costs and proposed revenue sources was part of the application.

Mr. Ramfos noted that the financial plan included future expansion of the application to state and local jurisdiction parks and that on-going capital and operating expenses would be covered through the annual Commuter Connections Work Program.

11. Other Business

None.

12. Adjourn