

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

for meeting of

January 6, 2011

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - January 6, 2012**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Art Rodgers

MARYLAND

Charles County Jason Groth
Frederick Co. Ronald Burns
City of Frederick Tim Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich
Prince George's Co. Vic Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. -----
 Prince George's Co. -----
MDOT Lyn Erickson
 Vaughn Lewis
MTA Mark Baskin
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Jim Maslanka
Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Mike Lake
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. -----
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Monica Backmon
NVTC Clair Gron
PRTC Nick Alexandrow
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Randy Hodgson
 Mahkeen Khurshid
 Amr Ibrahim
VDRPT Anthony Foster
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Mark Kellogg
 Allison Davis

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC Jack Vandop
FHWA-VA -----
FTA -----
NCPC -----
NPS Tammy Stidham
 Peter May
 Ed Clark
MWAQC -----

COG Staff

Ronald Kirby, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Erin Morrow, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Andy Meese, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Anant Chardhary, DTP
William Bacon, DTP
Jim Yin, DTP
Wenjing Pu, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Johathan Rogers, DTP
Jinchul Park, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS
Joan Rohlfs, DEP
Sunil Kumar, DEP
Jeff King, DEP

Other Attendees

Carey Roessel, Marquise Management
Bill Orleans, HACK

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

January 6, 2012

Technical Committee Minutes

1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from December 2 TPB Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

2. **Briefing on Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2012 CLRP**

Mr. Austin spoke to the two documents posted for this item. He described the five projects included on the "Significant Additions and Changes" summary: the creation of Southeast Boulevard from 11th Street Bridge to Barney Circle, implementation of Bus Rapid Transit from Van Dorn Metro Station to Pentagon Metro Station, construction of an auxiliary lane on northbound I-395 from Duke Street to Seminary Road, the removal of a planned widening of US 29 from US 50 to Eaton Place in the City of Fairfax, and the construction of the Manassas National Battlefield Bypass. He added that additional changes were included in the Air Quality Conformity Inputs table and shown with shading. He also noted that the Duke Street BRT project shown on page 6 of the conformity table should say "Study" instead of "Construct" and show "Not Coded" rather than a completion date of 2022.

Mr. Austin asked for any comments and edits by the end of the day on Monday, January 9. He said the project inputs would be released for public comment on Thursday, January 12 and that the TPB would be briefed on the projects at their meeting on January 18.

Mr. Erenrich inquired about the funding for the Van Dorn to Pentagon BRT project. Mr. Maslanka stated that funding was coming from several sources, including a new commercial tax levied by the City of Alexandria, private sources, and either New Starts or Small Starts federal funding.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the bus improvements shown for WMATA were valid since the Metro Board had yet to approve the FY 2013 funding. Ms. Posey indicated that some small changes for bus improvements were exempt. Mr. Austin also noted that these were not new improvements submitted for this update, but were improvements that had been included for the 2011 CLRP update, approved last November. Mr. Erenrich requested that Mr. Kellogg review the inputs to make sure they were accurate.

Ms. Erickson stated that the Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC) had approved their project updates. Ms. Posey said the BMC updates had not been incorporated into the table yet, but would be soon.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the completion date shown for the Takoma/Langley Park Transit Center should be delayed. Ms. Erickson agreed that it should be.

Mr. Kirby asked about the status of the Duke Street BRT project. Mr. Maslanka said that this project was still under study and the route and headways were not yet defined enough to allow for inclusion in the conformity analysis.

Mr. Srikanth gave some background information on the I-395 auxiliary lane project. He noted that when VDOT performed a traffic simulation analysis for the inclusion of an HOV ramp at Seminary Road for last year's CLRP update, they also tested alternatives that included an additional general purpose lane in the northbound direction. The analysis showed significant improvements, so VDOT is hoping to complete the NEPA process by the end of the year.

Mr. Verzosa spoke to the removal of the planned widening project in the City of Fairfax. He noted that during the preliminary engineering stages, there were significant issues identified with right-of-way acquisition that would leave many lots insufficiently deep for development purposes. The City Council had decided to leave US 29 as a 4-lane facility and make spot improvements and construct turn-lanes where necessary.

Mr. Srikanth discussed the history of the Manassas National Battlefield Bypass project. He stated that routes 29 and 234 inside the park experience significant congestion during peak periods, and that the roads interfere with the user-experience at the park. He noted that FHWA performed a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and identified a locally preferred alternative. VDOT was hoping to complete the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) this year. Mr. Srikanth added that VDOT had worked with local jurisdictions and found an alignment of the Tri-County Parkway that coincided with an alternative for the Battlefield Bypass. Additionally, a planned widening of VA 234 that was already included in the CLRP would be incorporated into the Bypass alignment. Mr. Srikanth noted that the project needed to be included in the CLRP before the FEIS could be completed.

Mr. Kirby inquired about the funding for this project. Mr. Srikanth stated that a federal law, passed in 1988, stipulates that the Secretary of the Interior will ensure funding for the project. It was also noted that the incremental cost of the new segment of the Bypass was \$180 million. Mr. Clark noted that VDOT had made a commitment to the project by putting up \$4 million to complete the preliminary engineering for the Bypass. Mr. Kirby expressed concern that there was no further proof of funding beyond the law passed in 1988. He suggested including language from the law in the project description form that states that the Secretary of the Interior is directed by law to provide funding. Mr. Srikanth said he would modify the project description to include that language.

Mr. Erenrich asked about the acceleration of the completion dates on many segments of the auxiliary lanes on I-495 in Virginia. Mr. Austin noted that these changes would be included on the "Significant Changes and Additions" summary when it was released for public comment. Mr. Erenrich asked why there weren't included last year. Mr. Srikanth stated that funding agreements were not yet finalized for those segments in time for last year's project submissions.

3. Briefing on Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2012 CLRP

Ms. Posey noted that the scope was posted for the meeting. She reviewed Table 1, and listed the similarities and differences from the 2012 CLRP conformity analysis. This year's analysis will include the use of the Version 2.3 travel demand model and the Mobile6.2 emissions model with adherence to the same mobile budgets as last time. New inputs include updated (Round 8.1) Cooperative Forecast data and new (2011) VIN data. She also mentioned that transit fare updates and toll changes will be included in the analysis. She stated that analysis years are: 2007, 2017, 2020, 2030, and 2040. She reviewed the schedule on page 7, and noted that the public comment period begins on January 12 and ends on February 11. She also noted that the current schedule calls for completion of the analysis and adoption by the TPB in July.

Chairman Rawlings asked why 2017 was an analysis year. Ms. Posey replied that it is a requirement to include a TIP year in the analysis, and 2017 was selected as it is consistent with the upcoming PM2.5 maintenance SIP.

4. Briefing on Proposed Performance Measures for the TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)

Mr. Kirby spoke to a PowerPoint and corresponding handout, the RTPP *Draft Interim Report I*. The CAC requested a RTPP. In May 2010, the TPB hosted the Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities. In July 2010, the TPB voted to form a task force to determine the scope for a RTPP. On July 20, 2011, the TPB approved a schedule and scope for developing a RTPP.

Mr. Kirby spoke about the increasing legislative and federal government focus on performance measurement. He noted the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee unanimously approved their Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) transportation bill in November 2011 that included numerous references to performance management. The federal government has sponsored several recent conferences and studies on performance measurement.

Mr. Kirby discussed the National Cooperative Highway Research Program Project (NCHRP) 08-36/Task 104 currently underway. The objective of this project is to "move the conversation [on performance-based planning] from that of a conceptual framework to realistic examples relating national-level measures to the state and regional level. The National Capital Region was selected as one of three pilot sites; this pilot will examine the use of measures to inform decisions regarding bus priority corridors in Maryland.

Mr. Kirby noted the 2009 U.S. DOT Federal Highway Administration International Scan Report. A scan of four countries examined how these countries with experience in performance management link transportation performance and accountability.

Next, Mr. Kirby spoke about TPB goal areas and performance measures with respect to the RTPP. The RTPP goals are drawn from the *TPB Vision and Region Forward*.

Performance measures are assessed based on three criteria: 1) data currently available; 2) meaningful to the interested public; and 3) actionable, however staff determined it best to consider “actionable” as a pre-screening item and dropped it as a criterion. Of 49 performance measures proposed, 21 were selected for analysis. Mr. Kirby used Goal 1 as an example to describe the challenges associated with each performance measure that met the criteria and to describe strategies to meet those challenges. Mr. Kirby noted that a new strategy was added, “Identify and implement cost-effective bus priority treatments.”

Mr. Kirby outlined the public outreach schedule from January 2012 to June 2012. Listening Sessions with regional stakeholders and citizens as well as a web-based comment form are scheduled for January 2012. A final *Interim Report 1*, incorporating feedback received is scheduled for February 2012. Focus Groups are scheduled for April 2012. In June 2012, the Technical Committee, TPB, and CAC will be briefed on a Draft Interim Report 2 and a proposed public outreach schedule through June 2013. The Final Interim Report 2 is scheduled for July 2012.

Mr. Verzosa asked about the funding for the NCHRP pilot project. Mr. Kirby commented that the TPB is providing only in kind support.

Mr. Maslanka asked why the Commute Mode Share 2009 table was removed from Measure 1.3, page 13 in the handout. Mr. Kirby replied that the table was not comparable because the geographies are very different and the definitions do not match our data in the pie charts shown on the same page.

Mr. Erinrich asked whether the percent of the region’s bus stops fully accessible (ADA) within one-half or one-quarter mile of the population should be included as a performance measure. Another suggestion was to consider total employment or total residents within one-half or one-quarter mile of a bus stop. Mr. Kirby noted that coverage measures, such as Mr. Erenrich’s suggestions, are partially covered under Goal 1 and 2 with the focus on Activity Centers, however, he noted Activity Centers are important but a small part of the region’s total geography.

Mr. Erenrich also suggested that transit level-of-service and other measures be used. Mr. Malouff made the point that there could be less geographic transit coverage at a higher service level. He suggested a headway measure. Mr. Erenrich commented that different headways are appropriate based on different land uses. A suburban neighborhood is not the same as an urban area.

Mr. Kirby responded that the International Scan found that best practice was to carefully limit the number of measures. He noted that some countries use customer satisfaction survey results as a comprehensive measure that incorporates many other specific measures. Ms. Erickson commented that customer satisfaction surveys results are incorporated into the Maryland Attainment Report.

Mr. Weissberg emphasized the importance of measures that reflect access to jobs.

Mr. Rogers, District of Columbia, suggested the RTPP process aim for measures that value different modes equally. Mr. Kirby responded that planning time index is one example of this, the measure of how much time commuters have to add, whether using

transit or auto, to ensure they arrive at their destination on time regardless of congestion or typical delays.

Mr. Maslanka suggested the total number of buses beyond their useful life could be a useful measure, as well as roads beyond their useful life. Mr. Kirby responded that optimal fleet age shows up in reliability numbers and roads beyond their useful life is analogous to percent of roads in good condition.

Chair Rawlings summarized comments by stating there seemed a consensus that a transit coverage performance measure should be included. He also emphasized that a state-of-good repair measure for transit should be included.

Mr. Kellogg commented on Goal 3, WMATA passenger injury rate. He said that Metro should not be the only transit operator or indeed mode represented in this measure. Mr. Kirby responded that the focus is currently on readily available data, and the data from WMATA is the best data available, but that future efforts can go into collecting this data from other operators and modes.

Mr. Kirby responded in conclusion that the proposed measures are very much a work in progress and that this and other feedback will be collected over the next several months. At this time he is most interested in the Committee's agreement on the process, to which there seems to be general agreement.

5. Update on the Development of a Draft Regional Policy on Complete Streets

Mr. Farrell spoke to a handout. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee has recommended that the region develop a guidance document rather than a "policy", and that a stakeholders workshop be held in order to bring in more agency representatives in addition to the members of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee. A stakeholders workshop will be held during the week of January 30th, with a final date to be announced as soon as the speakers' availability can be determined.

Mr. Srikanth asked what the purpose and target audience of this document would be. The DOT's already have Complete Streets policies of their own. He suggested that a policy template might be useful for some of the smaller jurisdictions. Mr. Kirby suggested that the TPB be advised that a stakeholder workshop is taking place. Ms. Erikson promised to send a representative to the workshop.

Chair Rawlings suggested that an inventory of existing Complete Streets policies in the region be made available. The DOT's and a majority, but not all, of the TPB member jurisdictions, have one. However, the specific content varies. Mr. Kirby suggested that the regional guidance document could serve as a statement of best practices.

6. Briefing on an Assessment of Job Access Reverse Commute for Low Income Individuals (JARC) Program and the New Freedom Program for Persons with Disabilities in the National Capital Region

Ms. Klancher of the TPB staff spoke from a PowerPoint presentation and provided an overview of the findings and recommendations from the assessment of the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom programs administered by the TPB. Mr. Nygaard conducted the assessment in 2011. The draft report was electronically provided to the Technical Committee prior to the meeting. The Assessment did not call for any major changes to the administration or oversight of the program by the TPB. The report suggested changes to the Federal Recommendations that could improve program efficacy, such as lowering the match requirements to twenty percent for all project types.

Mr. Maslanka asked about the possibility of the programs being eliminated in the next reauthorization. Ms. Klancher replied that discussions about consolidating JARC, New Freedom and Section 5310 (Elderly and Disabled) into one program in the next reauthorization are occurring, but did not know of proposals to eliminate the programs altogether.

Mr. Srikanth commented on the finding that most of the grants 50 percent or more complete did not meet the estimated number of people to be served originally provided in the application and asked how COG and TPB could provide assistance to help the grantees meet their goal, such as providing marketing. Ms. Klancher replied that it would be possible for the grantees to advertize their services on the newly launched Reach a Ride website. Mr. Srikanth noted that the PowerPoint presentation states that grantees found that administration of the grant took longer than expected, and he stated that finding should be taken into account when considering the recommendation that grantees do more reporting on performance.

Mr. Foster asked if FTA has commented on the findings and recommendations from the Assessment; Ms. Klancher replied that FTA has not commented.

Mr. Verzosa asked that the presentation highlight more of the positive findings from the assessment.

Mr. Rodgers commented that if there is more demand for the services provided by the grant than the funding will allow for, that additional demand should be documented. Mr. Rodgers also asked that the presentation include the types of agencies that received grants.

Mr. Kellogg applauded the assessment, the work of the staff and the Task Force and stated it was an important report.

Mr. Erenrich stated that the assessment was worthwhile and noted that there was a lot of Committee discussion about funding the work a year ago. He also suggested that the presentation include information on the amount of savings by public agencies from the grants that provide choices other than MetroAccess.

Ms. Backmon commented that the title of slide 12 was confusing and suggested it be rewritten to clarify.

Chair Rawlings asked that the report stress that the TPB has been able to obligate all of its JARC and New Freedom funds.

7. Review of Outline and Preliminary Budget for FY 2013 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Miller distributed a memorandum with a preliminary budget, funding changes from FY 2012, and an outline for the UPWP for FY 2013 (July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013). He reviewed the overall budget estimates and said that at this point there is considerable uncertainty due to the lack of Congressional action regarding the USDOT FY 2012 budget and the re-authorization of SAFETEA-LU. He explained that we have assumed that the FY 2013 funding allocations to be provided by DOTs will be the same as the current FY 2012 levels. In addition, the budget estimate assumes \$950,000 of unobligated funds from FY 2011 will be available, which is the same as the unspent funds from FY 2010.

He explained that the basic work program budget is \$10,390,300 without carryover funds, which is the same as the corresponding current FY 2011 budget level as amended October 19, 2011. He said that Table 2 shows the changes from FY 2012. It shows a \$50,000 reduction in the Public Participation work activity and a \$50,000 increase in the Regional Studies activity. This is to account for the need for less public outreach in FY 2013 in support of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP), which is funded under Regional Studies. Mr. Kirby then highlighted the RTPP activities scheduled for FY 2013.

Mr. Miller indicated that the financial analysis for the 2014 of the CLRP would be split-funded to begin in the Spring of 2013 with completion in FY 2014. He pointed out that the technical assistance program budget is unchanged from the current FY 2012 budget level because these program budgets are based upon percentages of the estimated FY 2013 funding allocations which are unchanged from FY 2012 .

Mr. Miller said that the first draft of the full document will be presented to the TPB at its February 15 meeting, and noted that the technical assistance programs for the DOTs and WMATA remain to be specified. He explained that some portions of the current work activities will be identified in March for carryover into FY 2013. The TPB will be asked to adopt the program on March 21 and then it will be submitted to FHWA and FTA for approval by July 1.

Mr. Erenrich inquired whether more resources would be needed to broadcast voice or video of TPB meetings.

Mr. Kirby said that COG is looking into this for the COG Board of Director meetings and that there would be minimal new costs for TPB meetings.

Mr. Erenrich commented that it would be desirable to monitor the impacts of the reduction in the employer provided transit pass subsidy that came into effect in January since it may influence how transit ridership is modeled.

Mr. Griffiths reported that on page 29 under the Household Travel Survey work item there was a proposed list of six focused geographic subareas to be surveyed in FY 2013. He said that he tried to identify areas in Activity Centers that will not have been surveyed by then and asked members for comments on the list.

Mr. Foster suggested that the new tasks in the outline be show in bold.

Mr. Miller commented that the full draft document will provide more detail. Mr. Kirby said that most of the work activities are the same, but the new ones will be pointed out in February when the Committee and TPB are briefed on the draft work program.

8. Briefing on the Initiation of the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program Website and the National Capital Region Web Portal

Mr. Meese briefed the Committee on two recently initiated websites that help address recommendations of the post-January 26 COG Incident Management and Response Steering Committee: the MATOC public website, and the National Capital Region web portal for emergency information. Screen captures from these sites were reviewed. The MATOC public website underwent a soft launch in December 2011 at the address www.matoc.org. The landing page has the basic information page for MATOC. New features were under a tab labeled "Traveler Information" linking to a page of real-time transportation information resources, including links to the MATOC Twitter feeds and Facebook page, the Maryland and Virginia statewide 511 services, the DC transportation information page, and the WMATA Ride Guide. Also on this page was a new and highlighted "Traffic View" feature.

At the December 2011 Technical Committee meeting, Mr. Pack of the University of Maryland had demonstrated the features of the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS), a detailed, multi-featured web site for use by agency staffs for real-time transportation information. The new Traffic View feature of MATOC now enables the general public access to the real-time transportation information that RITIS compiles.

Similar to RITIS, the MATOC top page has both a list of current transportation incidents and a dynamic regional map. Map features include incident locations, color-coded traffic speeds, overhead message signs, some of the region's traffic cameras, and many other items. Clicking on an icon, such as an incident icon, brings up additional information about that item. Mr. Meese noted that the MATOC page can only have information that has been made available to it. For example, camera feeds are currently available only for Maryland State Highway Administration cameras. The system will add other such features and information sources as they become available from the source agencies.

The presentation then turned to the National Capital Region emergency web portal at www.CapitalRegionUpdates.gov. Developed by the region's public information officers (PIOs), this website is intended to aid communications with the public during weather

events and other emergencies. Oversight was from the COG PIOs committee, also known as RESF-15 in the nomenclature of the regional emergency preparedness committees' structure. The vision was that there could be a one-stop website for emergency messages and related information for the public. The PIOs have also referred to this with a technical name of a Virtual Joint Information Center, or V-JIC, though this is not the name used for public outreach. This site is multi-functional in nature, including not only transportation information but also many kinds of public safety or emergency information.

The technical structure of the site is automated – the concept is that during an emergency, all the individual jurisdictions and agencies will post emergency messages on their own individual websites, and this NCR site will automatically amalgamate all those emergency messages onto this site. Non-emergency messages will also be mixed in and seen on the site, but the emergency messages should remain clear as emergency messages.

Also through this site, a member of the public can sign up for alerts, such as email or text alerts to their mobile phone, or can subscribe to a Twitter feed. It was noted that many members of the public may have already subscribed to emergency messages from longstanding services provided by their own jurisdiction or from one of the transportation agencies.

The site features buttons for key topics, including emergency alerts, weather, traffic, and utilities. These buttons take you to pages that amalgamate available information or alerts in those topic areas, if such information or alerts have been put out by originating agencies. The traffic button displays among other information the output of the MATOC Twitter feed.

Overall, it was anticipated that these two just-launched websites will undergo continuing improvement and expansion, but represent significant steps to improve the availability of information to the public.

In response to a question from Mr. Srikanth regarding whether this presentation would be taken forward to the TPB, Mr. Meese stated that such a presentation may be timely sometime after the next meeting of the COG Incident Management and Response Steering Committee, currently scheduled for February 22. Mr. Srikanth noted that this would be an opportunity to show the progress that has been made after many years of effort.

In response to an additional question from Mr. Srikanth, Mr. Meese reviewed how the www.CapitalRegionUpdates.gov website links to the page for members of the public to sign up for alerts to be sent to them, also available directly at www.capitalalert.gov.

In response to a question from Mr. Kirby, Mr. Meese noted that currently the link to take a user from www.CapitalRegionUpdates.gov to the MATOC website directed users to the MATOC Twitter page, as opposed to the MATOC main page or MATOC Traffic View page, but it was anticipated that in the future there would also be a link to the MATOC Traffic View page. Both websites are new, and improvements will continue to be made.

9. **Other Business**

None.

10. **Adjourn**