



TPB REGIONAL PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Meeting Summary: February 28, 2017

ATTENDEES

Kyle Nembhard, MTA
Stephanie Dock, DDOT
Patricia Happ, NVTC
Pierre Holloman, Alexandria
Jonathan Parker, WMATA
Tim Roseboom, DRPT
Catherine Vanderwaart, WMATA
Randy White, Fairfax County
Steve Yaffe, Arlington

Burak Cesme, Kittelson & Associates
Kevin Lee, Kittelson & Associates
David Miller, Foursquare ITP
Deanna Archey, Montgomery County (phone)
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County (phone)
Rich Roisman, TPB
Arianna Koudounas, TPB
Ken Joh, TPB
Patrick Zilliacus, TPB
Bill Orleans, Public

AGENDA

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS, *Kyle Nembhard, Chair*

Call to order and introductions.

2. REGIONAL FARE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES, *Patricia Happ, NVTC*

- Spoke to a presentation.
- New work to replace NEPP, cancelled in April 2016.
- Focus on replacement of Driver Control Unit and Kontron boards, a proprietary hardware component no longer being supported.
- Current fareboxes will be out of spare parts by the end of 2017.
- DRPT grant application submitted February 1, modifying scope of regional fare systems grant.

Questions:

- Pierre Holloman: What is lifecycle for new DCU? Through end of 2021, by which time region will need new fare system solution. Any cost info yet? Not yet, still evaluating options for tablets and mounts which will determine cost.
- Eric Randall: Coordination with other agencies? Yes, participating in regional SmarTrip forum.
- Pierre Holloman: Looking at offboard solution? Where is SmarTrip going? Not at this time, immediate issue must first be resolved.
- Randy White: Tablet could handle more than just farebox functionality; is this being explored? No, short term urgent need.
- Kyle Nembhard: Tablet has GPS capabilities, would be a shame if other opportunities to use are not considered.

3. MWCOG BUS LANE ENFORCEMENT/SAFETY PRESENTATION, Rich Roisman, TPB Transportation Planner; Kevin Lee, Kittelson & Associate

- Rich Roisman introduced the agenda item. Noted that this a UPWP Technical Assistance funded study, with Ramona Buns of WMATA as project manager. About one-third of way into study, with completion anticipated in June.
- Kevin Lee then spoke to a presentation.
- Focus of study on enforcement, education, and safety.
- NYCT SBS often not in bus lane – showed video.
- Success factors; effective use of ROW/pavement
- Burak Cesme also spoke to literature review and agency interviews.
- Noted how Metroway BRT uses median lanes in Alexandria, curb lanes in Arlington.
- SFMTA is only agency that has done before-after studies of bus mounted enforcement.
- Findings that two levels of effectiveness,. Similar lessons to work zone enforcement.
- Kevin then spoke to the challenges of effective bus lane enforcement. Most studies only looked at one agency and one jurisdiction. Most operations for this region would be interjurisdictional. Seattle is one multi-jurisdictional example. WMATA recently had an internal collaboration meeting to discuss opportunities.
- Guidebook available, which recaps good planning and design as well as post-implementation follow-up.
- David Miller spoke to example of Everett, MA, with video on CityLab. Used traffic cones to create temporary bus lane; so successful that will move to implementation. The on-street parking was only used 30% of time, and is still available in one-direction.

Questions:

- Kyle Nembhard: Are there multiple paths to implementation? Yes., certain combinations would appear to be effective. For instance TSP along does not do much, but with bus stop relocation can be effective. So can signing, enforcement, and red paint for bus lanes. Whatever jurisdictions can do.
- Gary Erenrich: The MD state legislature plans to allow video enforcement, but must act by April. Bills to stop such enforcement have also been submitted, in the name of privacy concerns. Response: Arlington and Alexandria passed special legislation for ticketing on Metroway bus lanes. DC looked at it. School bus laws can also be adapted.
- Jonathan Parker: What level of fines provide an effective deterrence? What types of physical barriers are effective? Paris has mountable curbs. BAT – does it work? What if taxis, Uber or trucks can use the bus lanes? David Miller responded by mentioning Chicago, where tickets were authorized but none issued. Led to a 15 to 50 minute ride variability. In SF where fines are common, almost no repeat offenders. In Vancouver, taxis are allowed to drive in bus lanes but cannot stop in them. Overall in US there are few implementers but many variables. Hard to do cost-benefit analysis. Few after studies of effectiveness.
- Steve Yaffe: What if cameras are used for information rather than enforcement? Do lanes with contrasting pavement work well? Is red the required color? No.
- Stephanie: Have you looked at streetcar ROW enforcement? Known costs and issues. Different context, but should have some common principles. No, loading zone issues. . .
- Kyle Nembhard: Are lanes sued by both express buses and local buses? Yes, for Metroway. Also SBS, but there the express buses use farside stops while local buses use nearside stops. Operational practices will impact benefits.

4. DISTRICT MOBILITY PROJECT TRANSIT VISUALIZATION, Stephanie Dock, DDOT

- Spoke to the website: <https://districtmobility.org/>

- The website is a performance monitoring tool.
- Based on DC Council request and line item in 2016 budget., to study multimodal congestion in the district: define – measure – solutions.
- Not real-time data, but 2015 static data. To be updated with 2016 data.
- Website is a series of stories, with repeatable, reliable, accessible data. Congestion in this case is often intensity of use. Also use both access to destinations and access to modes (options).
- Congestion page: diamonds represent top 10 congested locations per period.
- Buses overcrowded when at 120% seated capacity at peak load point, averaged over time period.
- Pedestrian environments, based on GIS files and algorithm.
- Will be making data available on OpenData.
- Catherine Vanderwaart then spoke to the transit data. WMATA generated raw data and then the consultants processed it to come up with that results on the website. Davis Miller added that the initial step was to screen the raw data to see what was possible, and then make some modifications to the WMATA on-time performance data, breaking it into segment-level information.
- All-in-all a huge amount of data. Often samples used, such as for four Tuesdays in October as representative.

Questions:

- Pierre Holloman: Is there a layer for land use? This may be a future option? About two-thirds of DDOT studies are using the website; adding land use would be valuable for work in cooperation with DCOP. The study will become an ongoing programmatic effort.

5. VIRGINIA DRPT'S UPDATED TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT PLAN REQUIREMENTS, *Tim Roseboom, DRPT*

- Spoke to a presentation. Noted some corrections needed to dates.
- Alexandria also included WMATA in projects in Alexandria in their TDP.

Questions:

- Randy White asked for more detail about annual changes. Do these have to be signed by the accountable executive? What is the required content of the annual update, a letter? If the County Board approved the TDP, this may require the Board to also approve the annual update.
- Rich Roisman: Are there any requirements for surveys? Yes, but can be the same as those required to comply with Title VI.

6. WORK PROGRAM UPDATE, *Eric Randall, TPB*

- Spoke to a presentation. There were no comments.

7. ADJOURN

- Meeting topics for March were discussed. Montgomery County has already agreed to present an agenda item. Suggested theme is TDM.
- The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.

All meeting materials are available for download from the subcommittee's website:
<https://www.mwcog.org/committees/regional-public-transportation-subcommittee/>