**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY**

March 4, 2022

Materials for this meeting can be found here: mwcog.org/events/2022/3/4/tpb-technical-committee

1. WELCOME, VIRTUAL PARTICIPATION PROCEDURES, AND MEMBER ROLL CALL PROTOCOL

Staff described the procedures and protocols for the virtual meeting and conducted a roll call. Meeting participants are documented in the attached attendance list.

2. APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 4 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

There were no questions or comments regarding the February Technical Committee meeting. The summary was approved.

ITEMS FOR THE BOARD AGENDA

3. BRIEFING ON THE DRAFY FY 2023 UNIIFED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Ms. Erickson said that this is the last presentation on the UPWP, and that she would talk about the actions the Board would be asked to take and the changes that have been made to the materials. There were no comments received. The carry over funding, which contains projects/tasks that will not be completed between now and the end of June, is unchanged. We have not received the final revenue numbers on the new federal funding and the expended funding. Pens down is Monday March 7 and the final document that will be shared with the TPB will have the final numbers. There will be 2 actions: 1) amend the current FY 2022 UPWP to take out the carry over funding and carry the funding over from FY 2022 to FY 2023, and 2) approve the FY 2023 UPWP.

4. BRIEFING ON THE DRAFY FY 2023 COMMUTER CONNECTIONS WORK PROGRAM

Mr. Ramfos stated that the latest version of the FY 2023 Work Program in the meeting agenda packet had been presented to the committee last month and to the Board and there were no comments that had been received or significant changes made to the draft document. He stated that the next steps would be to present the final document to the TPB on March 16 and if the document is approved, then the funding amounts would be verified in the current TIP. COG/TPB staff would then work with the state funding agencies to secure funding commitments and the program should be ready for implementation on July 1.

5. PERFPRMANCE-BASED PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING: 2022 TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT TARGETS

Mr. Randall briefed the Technical Committee on the draft final transit asset management (TAM) targets for the region. The committee and the TPB received a detailed briefing in February. No comments were received on the proposed draft targets. He noted that not all information on recent performance is available, so the report will include previous data.

Mr. Srikanth encouraged committee members to make sure recent TAM performance data information was submitted to Eric.

6. DRAFT 2022 UPDATE OF THE BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

Mr. Farrell and Mr. Meese spoke to a memo outlining changes in the draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Mr. Meese introduced the memo. This plan succeeds the plan adopted in 2015. It will go to the TPB this month as an information item. Mr. Farrell briefed the Citizens Advisory Committee, the Access for All Advisory Committee, the Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee, and member of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee. Access for All had a number of comments relating to Micromobility, and we added an expanded discussion of Micromobility. The Community Advisory Committee had questions about signs and signals for pedestrians, so an expanded discussion of the bicycle signs and signals was added to the section on the MUTCD. Another change was to eliminate the table showing the breakdown of the buffer analysis by jurisdiction. The buffer analysis did not include existing facilities, so some jurisdictions that already have well-developed networks appeared to be under-served. We also added a table to Chapter 6 explaining the differences between the plan's low-stress bicycle network and the National Capital Trail Network. The low-stress network non-prioritized layer of is all facilities in the plan of a type considered to be low stress. The National Capital Trail Network is a prioritized network, and it includes both planned and existing facilities. We also added a brief section on the regional travel demand model. Mr. Meese noted that these two networks overlap substantially.

Ms. Howard presented the interactive map and data dashboard. The interactive map enables users to zoom to a particular project, click on it, and pull up the information we have on it.

Mr. Srikanth said that the tool will be made available to the public on the COG web site.

Ms. Howard demonstrated the interactive map and data dashboard. The charts show the mileage of the different project types, and a search function is available. The map has multiple layers of features that can be turned on and off. Project records from searches can be exported as a table.

Chair Arcieri asked when a link to the interactive map might go out.

Ms. Howard replied that it would likely be ready within a few weeks.

Mr. Brown asked whether "projects" refers to existing facilities? Or to projects that are in planning or design as well? Will you be able to add actual planned projects?

Ms. Howard replied that every project in the plan comes from an agency plan. Nothing in this plan should exist, although there may be some projects that were completed recently.

Mr. Brown also asked if there was a layer of existing facilities on this map, like the W&OD trail.

Ms. Howard replied that we may be able to add that to the map as a reference layer, but jurisdictions could add these layers to their own GIS maps.

Mr. Shahpar asked how he could reach out to get some of these layers, and whether count data could be added to this map.

Ms. Howard replied that it would not be done on this map, since counts apply to existing facilities. This is a plan application right now, but we could add tabs with additional data and layers.

Mr. Srikanth noted that this tool currently displays only planned facilities.

Ms. Howard agreed, and said that this map is a companion to the bicycle and pedestrian plan.

Mr. Shahpar replied that it would be good to see how the planned network will connect to existing facilities.

Ms. Howard replied that there were still a few data issues that she wanted to clean up, but that this layer of planned facilities will be made available to the jurisdictions for use in their own projects.

7. COOPERATIVE FORECASTIGN STATUS UPDATE

Mr. DesJardin presented a PowerPoint summarizing the Round 9.2 Cooperative Forecasts, noting that employment would grow by 26 percent, population growth of 23 percent, and households by 25 percent. He noted that the 9.2 Forecasts were less than 1 percent higher overall for the region than the prior projections, Round 9.1a. He summarized the jurisdictional employment and household forecasts, noting in particular that 80 percent of the 2045 forecasts already existed in 2020, meaning the opportunity to influence future growth is limited given the already large base.

Mr. DesJardin also presented slides depicting several key current trends in office occupancy, future office lease renewal volumes, telework preferences by age, and principal reasons listed by home buyers for their moves during COVID. He discussed the major proposed elements for developing Round 10.0 – the next major update to the Cooperative Forecasts. To assist with specific tasks to support development of Round 10.0, He noted that staff is engaging the TPB on-call consultant to assess changing trends in household size; development of a range of regional econometric benchmark projections; and examining potential changes to future housing location patterns and commercial space utilization by workers.

Mr. Erenrich inquired about the major transportation facilities assumptions for Round 10.

Mr. DesJardin noted that the TPB staff provides the list of funded transportation facilities from the financially-constrained element of the Plan.

INFORMATION ITEMS

8. PERFORMANCE-BASED PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING: UPDATE ON HIGHWAY ASSET AND HIGHWAY SYSTEMS PERFORMANCE MEASURES AND TARGETS

Mr. Randall provided an update on performance data required under the federal performance-based planning and programming (PBPP) requirements in the areas of pavement and bridge condition and highway system performance. He spoke to a presentation and opened by stating that this year was a big year for PBPP, as performance data was now available for many of the four-year targets established back in 2018 for the period 2018-2021. State DOTs and MPOs are required to report on progress versus those targets in reports due to the FHWA by October 1. In addition, State DOTs and MPOs need to set new four-year targets and submit reports on those as well. He then reviewed the purpose of PBPP and the requirement for State DOTs, transit agencies, and MPOs to set targets and report progress in five areas for a total of twenty-six performance measures. He then moved into presenting newly available performance data for 2020 and 2021, for performance measures of pavement condition and bridge condition, travel time reliability and truck travel reliability (freight), and finally the CMAQ Program Traffic Congestion: Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) measure.

Mr. Randall said that regarding highway asset performance for pavement, data is only available through 2020. It appears the region will miss its good condition targets but meet its poor condition targets for pavement condition. In contrast; bridge performance data for 2021 is available and targets have been met. Regarding travel time reliability the impacts of the pandemic are evident, and the 2021 targets were easily met. For truck travel time reliability though the 2021 target was not met; the development of the target was likely too optimistic. For the PHED measure the 2021 target was also met; data for the other CMAQ Program targets will be available in the next couple of months.

Mr. Randall closed the presentation by noting that the Visualize 2045 LRTP requires the inclusion of a system performance report, which will review performance and how the region is doing. The TIP also must include a discussion of the PBPP targets, and the projects included in the TIP. In addition, staff will need to complete the MPO CMAQ Performance Plan with MPO progress towards targets and submit it to State DOTs by September. Next steps include coordinating with the three State DOTs and the two adjoining MPOs on recent performance and the methodology that will be used to set the new four-year targets. New targets for adoption will be brought to the board in May and June for the three CMAQ Program measures and in the fall for the highway asset and other highway system performance targets.

Mr. Brown asked about how the requirement to report on performance versus projects is met.

Mr. Randall clarified that staff discuss the region's projects as a whole or by other grouping. For example, the federal Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) funding is a specific federal grant program. So TPB staff review all the HSIP funding in the region and the types of projects that are being funded with HSIP funds. The same is also be done for other federal funds groups, such as bridge or pavement (NHPP) funding.

Mr. Brown asked if there are any consequences for not making targets, for example if safety targets are not met. Would HSIP funding or uses have requirements put on those funds? What about air quality targets or other targets?

Mr. Randall responded the intent and focus of the federal program is that PBPP become a process that DOTs and MPOs incorporate into their way of doing business in transportation decision-making and programming project funding. More specifically, there are no consequences for MPOs for missing targets in any performance area. However, the same is not true for State DOTs; in fact, one of the few potential consequences is that use of HSIP funding could be constrained if State DOTs do not meet highway safety targets. But for TPB it's more about understating State DOT and other agencies' project decision-making and selection process and how the projects address performance.

9.   VISUALIZE 2045: HIGHLIGHTING CONSTRAINED ELEMENT PROJECTS

Ms. Cook briefed the committee on the draft chapters of the Visualize 2045 update. After reminding committee members that the FY 2023-2026 TIP inputs are due March 11, 2022, the presentation focused on the plan outline and contents, particularly on the elements of the plan in which the project sponsor responses to regional policy questions are integrated into the plan. She reviewed how examples of actual projects in the constrained element are cited in the plan to highlight how projects advance TPB planning and policy focus areas. She referenced materials that staff are to provide to technical members via email for review and comment. Comments or edits are due back to TPB staff March 10, 2022.

Mr. Brown asked about the TIP due dates and requested to confirm that VDOT was providing the TIP inputs to the TPB.

Mr. Austin confirmed.

Mr. Erenrich of Montgomery County, MD, indicated he had not received information about the TIP updates.

Mr. Austin noted he would follow up with Mr. Erenrich.

Ms. Snyder of MDOT asked if the TPB staff would be providing results of the performance analysis.

Ms. Cook indicated that on April 1st, at the TPB Technical Committee meeting, the TPB will provide an overview of the plan, TIP, Air Conformity Analysis, Financial Plan, and Performance Analysis. This is the same day that the 30-day public comment period will begin.

10. CLIMATE CHANGE ELEMENTS IN THE LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN – SEEKING MEMBER INPUT ON SPECIFICS

Mr. Srikanth gave a status update on the climate change mitigation questionnaire. On February 28, TPB staff sent out the climate change mitigation questionnaire with a cover memo to the primary members of the TPB (or the first alternate if the TPB position is vacant). The cover memo contained a password to access the online survey. TPB members were encouraged to share the pdf copy of the questionnaire and discuss with fellow members of their governing entity so that the questionnaire response reflects the position of the jurisdiction/agency, not just the TPB member. TPB Technical Committee members also received the questionnaire for their reference.

Mr. Srikanth said that the questionnaire responses are due April 1. The questionnaire was sent to all 44 TPB members, which includes non-voting members like federal agencies. There will be a 90-minute, in-person work session prior to the also in-person April TPB meeting. There are only approximately 10 days between receiving the responses from the questionnaire and the mailout for the April TPB meeting and work session.

Mr. Srikanth said that two items will be presented at the work session – the results of the questionnaire and the two climate change mitigation planning elements (i.e. goals and strategies) that the TPB could adopt to include in the Visualize 2045 planning document and include in the TPB's planning priorities, similar to the 1998 TPB Vision document and the Aspirational Initiatives. A TPB Staff recommendation on the first element, whether the TPB should adopt on-road transportation sector specific greenhouse gas reduction goals, will be proposed based on the responses to Part A of the questionnaire. This means that, for example, if the majority of the questionnaire responses say that the TPB should adopt on-road transportation sector-specific greenhouse gas reduction goals and the goals should be 50% by 2030 and 80% by 2030, that is what TPB Staff will recommend. If a majority of responses say that the TPB should consider on-road transportation specific goals, but perhaps not at the 50% by 2030 or 80% by 2050 level, then that is what TPB staff will present to TPB members at the work session, and then hopefully TPB members will discuss what the goal should be and what action they may choose to take. A TPB Staff recommendation on the second element, a set of specific transportation actions or strategies the TPB would adopt as planning priorities, will also come from the responses from Part C of the questionnaire that asked about 15 strategies from the TPB's Climate Change Mitigation Study of 2021. He said that staff expects the responses to fall into three groups – strategies that majority of members support adopting now; strategies that majority support adopting but not at the levels currently assumed, and strategies that need further discussion before being adopted.

Mr. Srikanth acknowledged that that there may not be enough time at the April work session for all the discussion that are expected to take place and the TPB could ask for another work session in May. The discussions may continue even beyond May, which is fine. He noted that these discussions are not an endpoint on the topic, but rather a beginning of conversations as well as actions being taken at the state and local jurisdictions and agencies. He said that he would really like for the TPB to take action by May on both elements so they can be officially included in the Visualize 2045 document, but he will defer to the TPB. Whatever actions that are taken by May will be included in the plan document and any additional actions will be added to the plan as a supplemental amendment to the plan. He said that because this update is the federally mandated quadrennial update, it is very important to adhere to the schedule the TPB adopted last year, which means adopting the updated Plan in June of this year.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Srikanth to elaborate on the definition of "planning priorities" and how jurisdictions would show that they are meeting the TPB's planning priorities in the project submission process.

Mr. Srikanth responded that it means the same thing as when the TPB adopted the TPB Vision in 1998 and later adopted the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP), as well as the federal planning guidelines for MPOs from Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration. He said that the TPB has various goals and priorities to inform its transportation plan and acknowledged that no project will likely hit all of the goals and planning priorities. Unless the TPB decides something else, the climate change mitigation strategies would be added to the other strategies that the TPB has adopted and its members will be expected to implement projects, programs, and policies to advance those strategies.

Mr. Brown asked for clarification on how the TPB's voting on the climate change mitigation elements will work.

Mr. Srikanth replied that the TPB's bylaws dictate how the TPB takes up any action and there will be no change to that process for an action on the climate change mitigation planning elements.

Mr. Erenrich noted that he thinks it is difficult to decide on an on-road transportation sector greenhouse gas reduction goal until you decide on a greenhouse gas reduction strategy. Based on this, he thought the vote should be whether the TPB wants to adopt COG's regional greenhouse gas reduction goals without an on-road transportation sector specific goal or develop a set of on-road transportation sector goals. In order to have a transportation sector specific goal, there needs to be a set or range of strategies and did not feel that the strategies being discussed and will have a consensus on will be sufficiently robust to meet those goals [50% by 2030 and 80% by 2050].

Mr. Srikanth responded that he does not disagree with the notion that if we are going to be adopting goals, we should be looking to commit ourselves to implementing a set of strategies so that a goal can be achieved. He continued to say that the TPB has already endorsed COG's multi-sector regional goals. The question now is whether the TPB wants to take a step further and adopt an on-road transportation sector specific goal. He said that to Mr. Erenrich's point, one approach is to see what strategies the TPB members are willing to implement and then staff can analyze those strategies and estimate the greenhouse gas reductions and set that as the goal the TPB adopts. He noted that when the region adopted its first greenhouse gas reduction goals, the COG Board did not wait for a set of strategies. Nor did the IPCC start with a set of strategies when they identified the maximum increase in global temperature. He said that past TPB studies have examined reducing on-road GHG emissions by the same percentages as the region's multi-sector goals. That is why the survey suggests, as an option, adopting the same set of region's aspirational goals for on-road transportation sector as well. If the TPB wants to adopt something different, it is certainly up to them.

Mr. Erenrich noted that we need to allot enough time for the discussion to take place.

Mr. Nampoothiri, following up on Mr. Brown's point, said that NVTA's members have asked what having climate change elements will mean for NVTA-funded projects. Will it mean in the future that those projects cannot move forward?

Mr. Srikanth responded that the project description submission sheets already have over 30 questions on planning priorities such as congestion, safety, and bicycle/pedestrian. Climate change mitigation (greenhouse gas reductions) would be added to that.

Ms. Sinner noted that the long-range transportation plan is systemwide and the projects/programs/policies should not be singled out so that no one mode is at a disadvantage. The reporting or goals need to be reported systemwide for the region because one project may mitigate the impacts of another. She said she has heard from some TPB members on this issue and clarity on that question is necessary.

Mr. Srikanth responded that since 2010, the TPB has reported greenhouse gas emissions forecasts with the performance analysis of the plan. The TPB's work is always done at the regional level for all the projects in the long-range transportation plan. TPB staff do not have the capacity or capability, at this time, to evaluate each of the almost 580 projects in the plan on an individual basis.

Ms. Sinner also asked about the decision to change the language in the questionnaire from "surface transportation," which includes transit and rail, to "on-road transportation."

Mr. Srikanth responded that the draft questionnaire used "surface transportation" with an explanation of what that means in parenthesis. The TPB only does on-road transportation and staff felt that using "on-road" was more appropriate on the questionnaire.

Ms. Sinner noted that "on-road" does not include Metrorail or commuter rail.

Mr. Srikanth responded that the strategies that were analyzed will depend on certain actions being taken on rail transit, but the greenhouse gas emissions that were reported in the study do not include emissions from rail.

OTHER ITEMS

11. OTHER BUSINESS

COG hybrid/in person meeting status report and alternating in person and virtual TPB meetings

Staff updated the Technical committee on some logistics regarding in-person meetings. COG staff has returned to the office. The March TPB meeting is scheduled to be an in-person meeting on March 16 for members only. An alternate may be present if their TPB member cannot make it to the meeting. TPB staff will not be invited to the board meeting and can attend virtually with members/alternates that choose to attend online. Board members and alternates will need to RSVP to attend in-person. The RSVP will be used to help with seating, food, and printed materials.

The April Technical committee meeting will likely have an option to attend in-person and will also use the RSVP system. The April Board meeting will have an in-person work session preceding the meeting. Members of both the Technical committee and Board are encouraged to attend meetings in-person.

Regional Roadway Safety Program abstract due February 11 and applications due March 18

Staff informed the Technical committee that the application period for the 3rd round of the program is currently open. The applications are due Friday, March 18. Link to the program: mwcog.org/transportation/planning-areas/management-operations-and-safety/roadway-safety/regional-safety-program

The next application period will not be until January 2023.

VDOT Statewide Assets and Performance Flier

Staff shared a four-page flyer from VDOT showcasing statewide assets and performance with the Technical committee.

Staff also reminded the Technical committee that TPB staff can provide letters of endorsement to localities and agencies applying for federal grants.

Resiliency Webinars

Staff informed the Technical committee that the TPB will be hosting a four-part resiliency webinar series. The first webinar is being planned for April and information will be sent to members later in the month. Staff encouraged members to register for them and to share the webinars with others. The webinars will offer AICP credits.

DC and Maryland TAP applications due

Staff informed the Technical committee that the Maryland TAP application period is opening from April 15 to May 16. Projects that will build on past work that was funded through the TLC program, Regional Roadway Safety program, or the Transit Within Reach program are encouraged to apply. Other projects that are encouraged are projects that serve activity centers, high capacity transit stations, transit access focus areas, equity emphasis areas, and the National Capital Trail network.

The DC TAP application period is delayed until the fall.

Staff Update

Staff welcomed Kim Sutton to the TPB staff as the new board clerk. She will assist with organizing and running meetings and managing membership as well as working on other related tasks.

12. ADJOURN

No other business was brought before the committee.

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT	
Amir Shahpar - VDOT	Maria Sinner – VDOT
Chloe Delhomme – City of Manassas	Mark Mishler – Frederick County
Ciara Williams – VDRPT	Mark Phillips – WMATA
Dan Malouff – Arlington County	Mark Rawlings – DC DOT
David Edmondson - City of Frederick	Matthew Arcieri - City of Manassas
Eric Graye – Montgomery County	Meagan Landis – Prince William County
Gary Erenrich – Montgomery County	Nick Ruiz - VRE
Jason Groth – Charles County	Regina Moore – VDOT
Kari Snyder - MDOT	Robert Brown – Loudoun County
Katherine Youngbluth - VDRPT	Sophie Spiliotopoulos - NVTC
Kristin Calkins – DCOP	Sree Nampoothiri – NVTA
Malcolm Watson – Fairfax County	Victor Weissberg – Prince George's County

OTHERS / MWCOG STAFF PRESENT	
Andrew Meese	John Swanson
Kanti Srikanth	Jon Schermann
Lyn Erickson	Kim Sutton
Mark Moran	Leo Pineda
Nick Ramfos	Michael Farrell
Tim Canan	Paul DesJardin
Andrew Austin	Rachel Beyerle
Bryan Hayes	Sarah Bond
Charlene Howard	Sergio Ritacco
Eric Randall	Stacy Cook