

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
6/6/2014

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – June 6, 2014**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT	Mark Rawlings
	Jameshia Peterson
DCOP	-----

MARYLAND

Charles County	-----
Frederick County	Ron Burns
City of Frederick	Tim Davis
Gaithersburg	-----
Montgomery County	John Thomas
Prince George's County	Vic Weissberg
Rockville	-----
M-NCPPC	
Montgomery County	-----
Prince George's County	Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT	Lyn Erickson
SHA	Dami Kehinde
	Matt Baker
MTA	-----
Takoma Park	-----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria	Pierre Holloman
Arlington County	-----
City of Fairfax	-----
Fairfax County	Mike Lake
	Malcolm Watson
Falls Church	-----
Loudoun County	Robert Brown
Manassas	-----
Prince William County	Ricardo Canizales
NVTA	Denise Harris
NVTC	Claire Gron
PRTC	Nick Alexandrow
VRE	-----
VDOT	Kanathur Srikanth
	Norman Whitaker
VDRPT	Tim Roseboom
NVPDC	-----
VDOA	

WMATA

Danielle Wesolek

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Gerald Miller, DTP
 Robert Griffiths, DTP
 Andrew Meese, DTP
 Eric Randall, DTP
 Lynn Winchell-Mendy, DTP
 Wendy Klancher, DTP
 Rich Roisman, DTP
 Elena Constantine, DTP
 Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
 Andrew Austin, DTP
 Wenjing Pu, DTP
 Ron Milone, DTP
 John Swanson, DTP
 Jon Schermann, DTP
 Sergio Ritacco, DTP
 Erin Morrow, DTP
 Marco Trigueros, DTP
 Feng Xie, DTP
 Jeff King, DEP
 Isabel Ricker, DEP

OTHER

Katie List, Foursquare ITP
 Michael Weinberger, Foursquare, ITP
 David Skites, Vectre Corporation
 Bill Orleans

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Meeting

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from June 6 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

2. **Briefing on 2014 Regional Bike to Work Day**

Nicholas Ramfos gave an overview of the results from the regional Bike to Work Day event held on May 16th. Marketing materials created and distributed for the event included rack cards and posters. Employers and bicycle shops in the region used these materials to promote the event. The regional Bike To Work Day site was also promoted to encourage commuters to register for the event. T-shirts were also given to those registering for the event and a radio advertisement was produced to encourage participants to register for the event. Mr. Ramfos reported that there were nearly 17,000 registrants for the May 16th event and that about a third participated given the inclement weather. There were 79 “pit stop” locations throughout the region which was seven more than last year’s event. Chair Wojahn also participated in the event by bicycling to the College Park pit stop and then to the NoMa Bid pit stop which is COG’s neighborhood pit stop.

Mr. Ramfos reported that \$54,000 was secured in cash and in-kind sponsorships, surpassing the cash sponsorship goal of \$35,000 by almost 28 percent. In addition, in-kind sponsorships totaled \$9,325. Media relations played a large role in the event and there were 120 media placements across print, internet, radio and television outlets before, during and after the event. COG/TPB staff used Bike to Work Day Twitter and Facebook pages to promote the event through social media. 237 social media mentions were counted on Facebook, Twitter, Tumblr, Flickr and YouTube, an increase of more than 110 percent over the previous year.

Next, Mr. Ramfos showed photos of some of the pit stop locations including one of USDOT Secretary Anthony Foxx with COG’s Executive Director at DC’s Freedom Plaza pit stop. Mr. Ramfos reported that Bike to Work Day coverage expanded its reach to minority publications, including Afro American, to promote bicycling as a fun, healthy and environmentally friendly commuting option and to drive traffic to the event website. COG also reached out to its Police Chiefs to let them know about the Bike To Work Event for safety and security purposes. Given the pending weather report prior to event day, all registrants were contacted the day before with a message that Bike to Work Day is a rain or shine event and asking them to consider their own safety first and foremost before deciding whether to ride, just as they would any other day.

Ms. Erikson commented that she had noticed a flurry of media activity the day of the event due to the inclement weather. Mr. Weissberg stated that the Baltimore region had a rain date established and asked whether or not there were any thoughts about establishing a rain date policy for this region. Mr. Ramfos responded that the Bike to

Work Day Steering Committee could entertain the establishment of a rain date; however the cycling community felt that Bike to Work Day and bicycling is a rain or shine event.

Chair Srikanth commented that if the intent of the event is to entice first-time cyclists to participate in the event, then it may be worthwhile discussing back-up options.

3. Briefing on the implementation of the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (Tiger) Program

Mr. Randall briefed the committee on the progress of the TPB's TIGER Grant, awarded in 2010 and ongoing for the past three-and-a-half years. He noted that sixty percent of the grant period of performance has gone by, with thirty percent of the funds expended to date. Much of the past several years has been spent in developing technology for deployment and in completing final design for construction projects, so it is anticipated the rate of expenditures will increase in the year to come. However, effectively only two years remain in the period of performance, with time also needed to complete invoicing and get reimbursement from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) before the grant funds expire on September 30, 2016. Mr. Randall then spoke to a presentation on the progress of the major component projects being funded by the TIGER grant. He ended by noting several areas of concern, including needed federal approval for three proposed project revisions, the complexity of the transit signal priority project, and the need to complete work by June 2016.

Mr. Weissberg asked if there was an option for the University Boulevard project to extend up Adelphi Road. Ms. Erickson responded that this was not possible. Mr. Thomas asked about the proposed elimination of the Veirs Mill Road queue jump. Mr. Randall responded that the isolated nature of this single traffic signal no longer made sense on its own absent the University Boulevard project, and that Montgomery County staff has asked it be removed, also in consideration of other likely transit projects for the corridor.

Mr. Holloman asked if there would be an analysis of the TIGER Grant. Mr. Randall responded that each of the sixteen component projects had one 'before' report submitted, to be followed by two sets of 'after reports' documenting changes in transit ridership and bus on-time performance. Mr. Holloman clarified that he was more interested in the organizational aspects of the inter-agency projects, and if there were any valuable lessons to be learned and shared. Ms. Erickson responded that the project was intended to be replicable, but has developed with much more complexity than anticipated. The project stakeholders have had a big learning curve, from which there may be some lessons to be learnt, but it will be several years before this might take place.

Chair Srikanth suggested that the briefing for the TPB be focused on the first six slides and the last slide of the presentation. In addition, a table or matrix of the budgets and progress for the various projects would be useful to summarize the data.

Ms. Erickson congratulated the COG staff and their consultants, Foursquare ITP, on their management of the TIGER grant, stating that without them the projects would not be nearly as advanced.

4. Briefing on an Update of the Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan and new 5310 Enhanced Mobility Project Solicitation Details

Ms. Klancher presented the Key Elements of the Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan and details of the upcoming solicitation under the 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program that will be presented to the TPB this month.

Mr. Burns asked if Charles & Frederick Counties would be eligible for the funding. Ms. Klancher confirmed they would as long as the proposed service ends or begins in the Washington DC-VA-MD Urbanized Area as defined by the 2010 Census. If the service ends and begins outside of the Washington DC-VA-MD Urbanized Area, then agencies in Charles and Frederick could apply for the Enhanced Mobility Funds that the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) administers for rural and small urbanized areas. Ms. Erikson of MTA concurred.

Chair Srikanth suggested that the key elements of the Coordinated Plan and the solicitation details be separated when being presented to the TPB because the amount of information and perhaps the June TPB presentation solely focus on the Coordinated Plan.

Mr. Roseboom asked for clarification of eligibility for geographic areas within the TPB planning area that are small urbanized or rural areas. Ms. Klancher responded that as long as the proposed service ends or begins in the Washington DC-VA-MD Urbanized Area, the proposed project would be eligible for the Enhanced Mobility Funds. If the proposed service does not end or begin in the DC-VA-MD Urbanized area, the agency would have to apply to the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) for Enhanced Mobility funding that Virginia has for small urbanized and rural areas.

Chair Srikanth asked for clarification about the recommended \$250,000 minimum grant application and the possibility the some agencies would not be able to apply for that large of a grant. Ms. Klancher replied that the \$250,000 minimum is a recommendation over a two-year period and that potential applicants will be encouraged to partner with other agencies that may have more intuitional capacity to identify matching funds and administer an FTA grant. Ms. Klancher also stated that applications for less than \$250,000 will still be evaluated by the Selection Committee. Ms. Erickson added that the TPB's Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force, Chaired by Tim Lovain, has reviewed the recommended grant amount and concurred, and that smaller agencies have been represented on the Task Force, as have the jurisdictions. Ms. Erickson also said that the focus of the presentation to the TPB in June should be on the Coordinated Plan, and that the July presentation to the TPB focus more on the solicitation details.

5. Discussion of Proposed MAP-21 Rulemaking on Statewide and MOP Planning, Representation by Transit Agencies on the MPO board and Update on the Development of Performance Measures

Mr. Randall briefed the committee on the newly published MPO representation guidance, which requires board representation by providers of public transportation. He spoke to a presentation which highlighted the reasons for the guidance, the key items in the guidance, and suggested a plan forward for how the guidance can be implemented by the TPB.

Chair Srikanth noted that a special meeting to discuss MPO representation would need to have high-level participation, even attendees at the board level. Discussion about using the Regional Bus Subcommittee to advise on the selection of the transit agency representation may not match the level of personnel involved in that subcommittee. He suggested the special meeting be sooner rather than later in order to facilitate agreement by September for the TPB.

Mr. Brown noted that in Loudoun the county staff administers the transit service, with all the operations contracted. He said that Loudoun is not looking for more representation on the MPO board, and does not understand how a separate transit agency representative could otherwise represent Loudoun's transit interests. Mr. Srikanth responded that this is what needs to be decided: the number and composition of the transit agency representative. If there were only three transit agencies, it would be easy, but larger urban areas have many transit agencies and it will be complex deciding how to represent their interests. For example, if DRPT was chosen as the Virginia representative, how would it cooperate with the local Virginian transit agencies with which it sometimes has significant differences.

Ms. Erickson noted that Baltimore is not planning to make any changes to its board, which has an appointed representative from the MTA. The local transit agencies will continue to have their interests represented by their local elected officials. In the Washington region, it's different, and discussion is needed.

Ms. Wesolek noted the importance of determining an exhaustive list of the eligible providers of public transportation. This would provide clarity on how their interests might be represented and who should be invited to a special meeting. Mr. Griffiths responded that one interpretation is that practically every provider in the region is eligible. Mr. Miller added that this question of eligibility will need to be clarified with federal staff. He suggested there may be several meetings to develop a means by which to represent the interest of the transit agencies. However, he emphasized that this does not all have to be done in the next two or three months; instead, as much time as is needed will be used to reach cooperative agreement on meeting the guidance.

Mr. Canizales suggested that NVTa and other agencies should be included in the discussion. Mr. Srikanth responded that it is not the intent to exclude anyone. Mr. Griffiths added that any opening of the by-laws, as required by the guidance, will focus on meeting the requirements of the guidance, but that the discussion may be lengthy. Chair Srikanth noted that the federal guidance did provide several options for meeting the new requirement. In addition, while the guidance specifically states that Governor

sign-off on the changes to the metropolitan planning agreement are not required, it may be that the two Governors and the Mayor have to be consulted.

Mr. Weissberg inquired if there were any implications to not meeting the October first date, to which Mr. Miller responded that there were not.

Mr. Randall continued with his presentation, providing an update on the status of anticipated MAP-21 rulemaking, including the long-anticipated proposed Metropolitan and Statewide Planning rule, recently released. He noted some of the changes in the proposed rules, though the overall focus is simply on adding performance management requirements throughout the planning process.

Mr. Meese spoke to review of proposed Safety Performance Measures. Following subcommittee review and other discussion, at this time it does not appear the TPB will submit any comments. He noted the comment period was extended to June 30 by the federal agencies to allow time to comment in parallel with the planning rule.

Mr. Miller noted that comments on the proposed planning rule is due by September second. In the meantime, there will be discussion and webinars led by AASHTO, AMPO, and other interest groups. If there are any questions about clarity in the rules, the TPB may submit comments, but there don't appear to be any major items in the rule suggesting TPB comment, unless it is to ask for more flexibility than provided. If there are comments that come up at the intervening meetings, they will be discussed, but right now there does not appear to be any current movement to comment.

Mr. Griffiths noted that some specific questions are posed in the planning rule, to which it may be appropriate to respond. Mr. Srikanth added that VDOT, and no doubt other DOTs, are looking and may submit comments; he also noted that there are no substantive changes to the UPWP work program. Instead, the rules are more about the long-term use of visionary goals and the application of performance management to the planning process.

Ms. Erickson announced that she is coordinating all Maryland comments statewide, and to please contact her with any suggestions.

6. Briefing on an Update of the TPB Participation Plan

Mr. Swanson said a discussion draft of the Participation Plan was being distributed to the Committee. He said the draft would be discussed at the CAC on June 12. A revised version would be released for a 45-day public comment period on July 10. He said the TPB will be asked to adopt the updated plan at its September 17 meeting. He said the new draft leaves the structure and strategic direction of the 2007 Participation Plan largely in place. He described additions to the new draft, including information on recent TPB participation activities and enhancements that were suggested by federal agencies.

Mr. Thomas asked if Title VI will be referenced in the document.

Mr. Swanson said language regarding Title VI will be included in the document that will be released for public comment on July 10.

Ms. Wesolek asked when Mr. Swanson would like comments from the committee.

Mr. Swanson said that staff would like comments in two weeks.

Mr. Orleans suggested that the plan should more explicitly call for more community meetings with members of the general public.

7. Update on the Forms Received on the 2014 CLRP, the 2015-2020 TIP, and Congestion Management Documentation

Mr. Austin reported that only two projects submitted for the 2014 CLRP update required Congestion Management Documentation forms, and that those were expected to be received shortly.

Mr. Austin provided a brief status report on submissions of data for the FY 2015-2020 TIP. He urged committee members to pay attention to the Bicycle/Pedestrian Accommodation and Complete Streets fields, as well as the cost and completion date fields as they review their entries. Mr. Austin reported that staff would be looking at additional ways to summarize the funding and projects in the TIP for this year's documentation. He stated that a draft of the FY 2015-2020 TIP would be presented at the next Technical Committee meeting on June 27, 2014, and requested that entries for that draft be complete by June 20.

A public forum on the FY 2015-2020 TIP was scheduled for July 10, 2014. Mr. Austin noted that staff from the three DOTs and WMATA would be invited to participate. The draft TIP would be released for public comment on September 11, 2014 and the TPB would be asked to adopt the FY 2015-2020 TIP at their meeting on October 15.

Ms. Erickson raised concerns about releasing TIP projects and funding amounts at the July 10 public forum, since MDOT's CTP would not be approved by that time. Representatives from VDOT and WMATA echoed that concern. It was suggested that the forum focus more on the process of developing the TIP rather than the actual projects.

8. Briefing on the Draft "The Goldbook: State and Local Government Initiatives to Clean the Air"

Mr. King and Ms. Ricker spoke to the presentation on the Gold Book which is a compilation of local voluntary actions and measures that are being implemented to improve air quality in the region. The actions and measures are based on best practice research by DEP staff and applicable items from the COG Climate Change Report and Action Plan. Mr. King asked for comments on the draft to be submitted by the end of June, but added that the Gold Book was envisioned as a "living document."

Mr. Brown noted that Loudoun County was using a TIGGER grant to install solar canopies over parking spaces at county transit hubs.

Mr. Mokhtari inquired if a program similar to the Transportation-Land Use Connections program could be developed to solicit project ideas and find funding to kick-start them. Chair Srikanth suggested that was a good strategy for MWAQC or CEEPC to consider.

9. Briefing on the Draft 2014 Congestion Management Process (CMP) Technical Report

Speaking to a [memorandum](#) and a [presentation](#), Mr. Meese introduced the background of the Congestion Management Process (CMP) and the [2014 CMP Technical Report](#), which represented the 4th biennial report since 2008 and served as a background document to the official CLRP/CMP, providing detailed information on data, analysis, strategies, and regional programs involved in congestion management.

The 2014 CMP Technical Report had been presented to the Management, Operations and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Technical Subcommittee, the Commuter Connections Subcommittee, and the Freight Subcommittee. Comments had been received the Report had been revised accordingly in its latest version dated May 30. Mr. Meese asked members of the Technical Committee to review the report and provide any comments by June 18. The Report was tentatively scheduled to be finalized at the Technical Committee June 27 meeting.

Mr. Pu continued the presentation on the findings of the State of Congestion, congestion management strategies, and key recommendations. Overall, the Washington region experienced decreasing congestion in the last four years from 2010 to 2013, but the pace of congestion decrease slowed down significantly in 2013. The region observed steady improvement in travel time reliability over the course of the same four years. Congestion management strategies such as the programs carried out by the Commuter Connections and traffic incident management activities continued to play indispensable roles in combatting congestion and improving quality of life. Mr. Pu lastly laid out the fifteen recommendations in the 2014 CMP Tech Report.

Mr. Srikanth concluded this item by reminding members of the Technical Committee to review the full report and provide comments, if any, by June 18.

10. Other Business

None.

11. Adjourn