

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes
For meeting of
November 5, 2010

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

November 5, 2010

Technical Committee Minutes

1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from October 1, 2010 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

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

Ms. Posey noted that she had reviewed the draft report that was included in the mailout at the previous meeting, so she would not go over it again. She reminded the group that the public comment period went from October 14th through November 13th, and that the TPB was scheduled to approve the conformity analysis, and adopt the CLRP and TIP at their November meeting.

She distributed a draft comment letter from MWAQC on the conformity analysis. She reviewed the letter, noting that MWAQC was pleased that the 2010 CLRP and FY2011-2016 TIP conform to the applicable motor vehicle emissions budgets tests, as well as to proposed attainment budgets that are not yet required. She mentioned that MWAQC noted the upturn of emissions in 2040, and that the committee encourages investment in public transit, ridesharing, transit oriented development, and other such programs to reduce the future growth in SOV trips and VMT. The letter also mentions EPA's future tighter new standards and the MOVES model, and the subsequent need for more emission reductions to meet those more stringent standards. Ms. Posey informed the group that the draft MWAQC letter was scheduled to be finalized at the MWAQC Executive Committee meeting on November 6th and then sent to the TPB.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that new budgets should be set using the MOVES model. Ms. Posey replied that that would not happen for a few years. Mr. Srikanth pointed out that the MWAQC letter encourages the continued commitment to past TERMS. Mr. Kirby noted that there would be a tightening of the 8 hour standard as well as the change from the MOBILE to the MOVES model. Mr. Biesiadny pointed out that the letter referred to MWAQC's support of "new reductions", not just committed TERMS. Mr. Srikanth stated that the most significant reductions come from systemic measures such as fuel programs. Mr. Kirby reminded the group that out years are still well within the budgets. Mr. Srikanth noted that budgets could be lowered. He mentioned that the MOVES Task Force is preparing emissions for the 2010 CLRP using the MOVES model and that results may be available in December. Mr. Kirby stated that the bottom line is that there is no problem for the current analysis. Mr. Srikanth cautioned that we need to be prepared for more stringent standards.

3. Briefing on the Contents and Performance of the Draft 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP

Mr. Kirby stated that there would be significant time for a briefing and approval of the CLRP on the TPB's agenda later in the month. He stated that this was a much broader presentation on the performance of the CLRP than the Board has received in the past and asked committee members to be mindful of how their Board members might receive the information.

Mr. Austin spoke to the presentation and described the land use forecasts, financial constraint and project inputs that shaped the 2010 CLRP. The presentation covered the performance of the Plan as it pertained to the goals of reducing VMT per capita, reducing congestion, meeting federal air quality standards, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, increasing accessibility to jobs and increasing the rate of construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The presentation concluded with a financial summary of the FY 2011-2016 TIP.

Questions were raised about whether the congestion charts should use the peak rush hour or an average of congestion during the rush hour period. Mr. Vuksan explained that this was the same measure that has been analyzed for the past several years. He said he suspected that if a wider period was looked at, a similar trend would be observed. Mr. Srikanth concurred, noting that as peak congestion increases, the spreading of congestion around the peak would also increase. Mr. Vuksan said it may be possible to reevaluate this measure when the new travel demand model is introduced. Mr. Erenrich agreed that this would be useful.

Further discussion centered around the benefits of better land use and investment in transit, noting that even though mobility by highway is decreasing, access to jobs is increasing, particularly by transit.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if it was possible to determine the breakout between bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the TIP. Mr. Austin said that there no way to break down this category with the available information. He suggested that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, recently approved by the TPB, might be a better place to find that information.

Referring to a slide that presented the amount of funding by jurisdiction or agency, Mr. Austin clarified that those were the amounts programmed in the TIP by those respective states or agencies – not that they were the source of those funds. Mr. Erenrich suggested the funding amount shown for transit could be broken down by each state. Mr. Miller said this break down was available in the full Financial Analysis report of the CLRP, but that a such a breakdown may not be useful for the purposes of this presentation.

Representatives from WMATA indicated that they could provide data for congestion on Metro using passengers per car to incorporate into the presentation.

Mr. Biesiadny suggested that the summary of significant changes to projects in the CLRP include maps for the major projects.

4. Briefing on the Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2011 CLRP and FY 2012-2017 TIP

Mr. Austin spoke to the Call for Projects document. He noted that there were no changes to the document since it had been presented to the Committee the previous month.

Ms. Posey briefed the Committee on her memo that had been distributed regarding transit assumptions for the 2011 CLRP. She asked Committee members to review the transit assumptions and to submit any changes to existing service or any new service by the March 2011 meeting of the Technical Committee.

Mr. Erenrich noted that he expected to see further constraints placed on transit service due to funding shortfalls.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the assumptions for transit service on I-95/I-395 HOT lanes were based on recommendations from the Northern Virginia Transit Advisory Committee.

Mr. Sivasailam reported that the TERMS tracking sheet would be posted with the Technical Committee's meeting documents on the web.

Mr. Biesiadny expressed concern that the travel demand model might overcompensate for increases in transit fares, noting that they didn't necessarily see the decrease in ridership expected when fares went up. Mr. Kirby suggested that this was a modeled result and that many factors could be at play. He noted that time would tell if the model was accurate or should be reevaluated.

5. Briefing on an Amendment to the FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Revise the Budget and Certain Work Tasks

Mr. Miller distributed a memorandum on an amendment to the FY 2011 UPWP to revise the budget to reflect funding increases and modify certain work tasks for the last half of the fiscal year. He said that the TPB will be briefed on this amendment at its November 17 meeting and asked to approve it on December 15. He provided the background on the conservative assumptions in the budget that the TPB approved in

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of November 5, 2010**

March. He explained that since then the final FHWA funding allocations provided by the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia Departments of Transportation (DDOT) have changed and there is an additional \$722,800 for the budget.

Mr. Miller said that the technical assistance funding level for each state is an agreed percentage of the total funding provided through the respective state. Thus, the budgets for the technical assistance programs in the District, Maryland and Virginia will increase by \$4,000, \$70,500 and \$24,000, respectively. He said that the increase in total funding for the core work program is \$624,350.

Mr. Meese reviewed the proposed budget increases and new work activities for three work tasks: Congestion Management Process, \$50,000 to expand regional roadway speed data by purchasing supplementary INRIX, Inc. data; Transportation Safety Planning, \$25,000 to conduct a feasibility and scoping study on a web-based crash analysis, visualization and data mining tool; and Freight Planning, \$20,000 to conduct outreach to develop jurisdictional freight profiles and to hold a regional freight forum in the Spring.

Mr. Miller explained that for a proposed budget increase of \$80,000 in the Human Service Transportation work activity an independent consultant would conduct a comprehensive assessment of the TPB activity that has funded 35 projects totaling \$10.2 million since 2007, under the Job Access and Reverse Commute for Low Income Individuals (JARC) program and the New Freedom Program for Persons with Disabilities. He said the assessment would include a review of project impacts, benefits and costs, lessons learned, comparisons with other regions, and potential improvements for future project solicitations.

Mr. Biesiadny commented the scope for the assessment is not very clear and the budget seems excessive. He suggested that staff could identify lessons learned and limit the consultant role.

Mr. Kirby said that the assessment needs to review the program administration as well as the projects to recommend improvements, and it is good to get an outside objective view.

Mr. Kirby reviewed the proposed new activities under Regional Studies with a budget increase of \$200,000. He said that the increase would provide staff support for the TPB Regional Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force and for initial work to develop a regional priorities plan. He then explained that it would provide staff support for COG's FY 2011 Region Forward regional planning efforts.

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of November 5, 2010**

Mr. Erenrich supported these new activities and said that he would also like to see funding to prepare marketing materials to assist local jurisdictions in presenting the regional bike-sharing concept to developers and employers. He said that maybe not all of the \$80,000 would be necessary for an assessment of the JARC and New Freedom projects. He supported the increase in the budget for more household travel survey data in focused subareas like the White Flint area in Montgomery County because real travel behavior data is very useful for planning and presenting to citizens.

Mr. Biesiadny said that these are useful activities and suggested that budget for the assessment could be reduced and used for one of the other proposed activities.

Mr. Griffiths explained that in March 2010, the TPB approved the FY 2011 UPWP with the notation in the Household Travel Survey work task that if additional funding of \$250,000 became available, household travel survey data would be collected for 1,200 more households in three additional focused geographic subareas, bringing the total number of subareas to six. He reviewed the potential geographic subareas to be surveyed. They include: (1) Federal Center/Southwest/Navy Yard in DC (2) Friendship Heights in DC and Montgomery County (3) Largo and Purple Line International Corridor in Prince George's and Montgomery Counties (4) City of Frederick, MD (5) Reston, VA and (6) Woodbridge, VA.

Mr. Erenrich said that he would like to see these surveys conducted every year in subareas throughout the region. Each jurisdiction could identify which ones to survey.

Mr. Malouff said he also supported this type of survey every year.

Mr. Erenrich requested that \$20,000 be identified to prepare marketing materials to assist local jurisdictions in presenting the regional bike-sharing concept to developers and employers.

Mr. Kirby replied that preparing these regional bike-sharing materials can be included in the Regional Studies activity. He then said that the cost for a geographic subarea household travel survey is \$40,000.

Mr. Srikanth suggested that perhaps the \$80,000 the assessment of the JARC and New Freedom projects could be reduced to \$40,000.

Mr. Miller said that the TPB program has provided \$10 million for JARC and New Freedom projects since 2007 and that a comprehensive assessment of project benefits and costs, and how the program can be improved in the future would be worthwhile.

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of November 5, 2010**

Committee members requested a more detailed scope of work for the assessment. Mr. Kirby said it would be prepared for the December 3 meeting.

The Committee recommended adding a seventh focused geographic subarea survey, and reducing the budget by \$40,000 for the assessment of the TPB program funding JARC and New Freedom.

Mr. Kirby said that this \$40,000 option would be presented to the TPB at its November meeting.

(After the November 5th meeting, Mr. Kirby realized that he incorrectly informed the Committee that a geographic subarea household travel survey would cost \$40,000. Staff found that surveying a new subarea would actually cost \$80,000. Thus, adding a new subarea would require that the JARC and New Freedom assessment be dropped entirely. This option to drop the assessment in order to add a seventh subarea was included in the briefing on the UPWP amendment at the November 17 TPB meeting.)

6. Briefing on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program

Mr. Meese reported, referring to a draft of the November 17 TPB meeting PowerPoint presentation. The presentation covered the background of MATOC, the current status of its funding, estimated impacts of the program, and a discussion of recent incidents. In response to comments from the TPB at the September 15 meeting, a discussion of enhancing MATOC's coverage of transit and urban areas had been added to the presentation. Mr. Meese also anticipated that the incident information slides would be updated closer to the time of the TPB meeting.

Mr. Biesiadny pointed out a mathematical error in the funding summary slide, which Mr. Meese agreed to correct. The correct total committed FY2011 funding should have been shown as \$1.24 million.

Mr. Verzosa suggested that the presentation should identify the recipients of MATOC notifications. He also noted that at the very moment of this presentation, there was a notification of a train derailment just outside of Union Station potentially affecting Amtrak, MARC, and freight train movement.

In response to a question from Mr. Mokhtari, Mr. Meese noted that MATOC staff are in contact with traffic reporting media, exchanging information. Though MATOC does not yet have a delivery mechanism of information directly to the public, MATOC's information is already helping better inform the media's reports to the public. A website serving the public was a future goal of MATOC. Mr. Mokhtari encouraged including

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of November 5, 2010**

those facts in the presentation. Mr. Kirby agreed that it was important to include the current status and future plans of how MATOC will be getting information to the public.

Mr. Erenrich commented on the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS) component of the MATOC Program, and suggested that a presentation on its impressive features would be worthwhile for a future TPB meeting.

Mr. Malouff suggested MATOC explore the use of social media systems such as Twitter. Mr. Meese agreed to raise this suggestion with the MATOC Steering Committee and staff.

7. Briefing on the District of Columbia's Transit Future System Plan

Ms. Torruellas gave a power point presentation to the Committee on the District of Columbia's 2010 Transit Future System Plan which was completed this Spring. The representation reviewed the proposed phases for the entire System Plan which consists of a 37-mile network of eight new interconnected streetcar lines in addition to a supporting network of thirteen Metro Express bus lines. She also distributed copies of a 90 page report on the plan which contains comprehensive data on routes, ridership projections, costs and a proposed financial plan.

Ms. Torruellas answered several questions regarding proposed service levels, vehicle storage and maintenance facilities, interaction with street parking and future expansion.

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

Mr. Randall gave an update on the Tiger Bus Priority project. The primary task in progress is to reach agreement with the FTA on the TIGER Grant Agreement. This agreement is currently being reviewed by FTA Region III, following which it will need to be reviewed and approved by USDOT office of the Secretary. COG/TPB is looking for approval by December 15, following which there is likely to be a signing ceremony, potentially including Secretary LaHood. He also reported on the status of the subrecipient agreements and other grant administration items outstanding. He concluded with a graph showing the relative budgets for each of the 169 project components and a graph showing the projected expenditures per month, pointing out the major work by each of the five project owners.

9. Other Business

None

10. Adjourn

