

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
ITEM #1**

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
12/6/2013

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - December 6, 2013**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

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

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax Co. Mike Lake
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Robert Brown
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. George Phillips
NVTC Claire Gron
PRTC Nick Alexandrow
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Norman Whitaker
VDRPT -----
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Danielle Wesolek

FEDERAL/OTHER

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

COG Staff

Gerald Miller, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
William Bacon, DTP
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Dan Sonenklar, DTP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS
Lyn Winchell-Mendy, DTP
Joan Rohlf, DEP
Jeff King, DEP
Sunil Kumar, DEP

Other Attendees

Bill Orleans
Cindy Petkac, USRC

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

January 3, 2014

Technical Committee Meeting

Technical Committee Minutes

1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from December 6, 2013 Technical Committee Meeting**

The Committee observed a moment of silence in honor of Ronald K. Kirby for his 26 years of service to the Transportation Planning Board and the Technical Committee.

The minutes were approved as written.

2. **Update on the Performance Analysis of the 2013 CLRP and the Draft 2013 CLRP Brochure**

Mr. Austin announced that staff was producing a brochure for the 2013 Update to the CLRP. He stated the brochure would follow the same format as the 2012 CLRP brochure and include the updated projects, maps and performance analysis. The brochure would be published electronically, without printing any hard copies.

Mr. Sonenklar spoke to the presentation on the performance analysis of the CLRP, specifically referencing slides that had been updated since the previous presentation to the Committee. The slide on "Daily Travel Mode Share" (10) had been modified to show all trips in addition to work trips. The Highway Congestion AM Peak Period slide (13) had been changed to highlight where congestion is projected to get better or get worse, and the Air Quality – Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) slide (17) was added to the presentation.

Mr. Erenrich noted that slide 10 should indicate that the numbers shown are in thousands.

Mr. Holloman asked if the eastbound portion of I-66 was assumed to be HOV only in the modeling process. Mr. Sonenklar responded that it was.

Mr. Erenrich suggested an additional slide to accompany the Highway Congestion information with a table listing where congestion was improving or not along with projects likely to be responsible. Mr. Sonenklar said that was possible to do for areas where congestion is being reduced, but not really where it's getting worse.

Mr. Brown asked if the Dulles Toll Road and Dulles Airport Access Road were combined for the purposes of the model. Mr. Milone stated that the facilities were coded separately, so the congestion information shown is only on the Toll Road.

Mr. Erenrich praised the Daily Travel Mode Share slide, noting that an increase in transit share from 6% to 7% in the inner suburbs and from 1% to 2% in the outer jurisdictions was very important.

3. Update on the TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)

Mr. Swanson briefed the Committee on the TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). He said a revised draft RTPP was released on November 21, which included Mr. Kirby's final edits. He said that since that time, staff had conducted extensive outreach to determine how to address outstanding comments and concerns. He said this outreach included a special work session on December 5. He said that staff intended to work over the weekend to revise the document. He said a revised version would be released for public comment on December 12. The TPB would be briefed on the new draft on December 18. Approval of the document would be scheduled for January 15.

Mr. Swanson discussed a list of key points that had been distilled from the numerous comments that had been received. He described how staff intended to revise the document to address those comments.

Mr. Weissberg said it was important to highlight regional balance in the document and the opportunities for development on the eastern side of the region, particularly near Metrorail stations.

Mr. Emerine said he was pleased with the discussion that had occurred on December 5. He said he was pleased with the proposed revisions to priority three in the final chapter.

Mr. Malouff thanked staff for the efforts they had taken to get input.

4. Update on the Call for Projects and Status of the Financial Analysis for the 2014 CLRP

Mr. Miller provided an update on the call for projects and the status of the financial analysis for the 2014 CLRP. Project submissions are due by Friday, December 13. The current schedule is that the CLRP project submissions would be released for public comment on January 9, 2014 and the TPB briefed on January 15. The public comments period would end February 8 and the TPB would review the public comments and be asked to approve project submissions February 19. However, it appears this schedule will slip, which could lead to approval of the 2014 CLRP being delayed from July until September 2014.

Chair Erickson spoke to the progress of the Financial Analysis discussions, taking place between the states and WMATA. Maryland DOT has provided financial projections, however VDOT and DDOT are still developing their projections. In the short term, WMATA is looking for commitments to fund the capital investments for state of good repair, including continuation of the PRIIA Federal-state match beyond 2020, as well as funding for capacity expansion per their Momentum Metro 2025 campaign. MDOT is also looking at what funding is available for the Metro 2025 projects. However, overall there will not be many changes from MDOT for the CLRP. This may change if the local jurisdictions identify some projects, but these will be smaller-type projects.

Mr. Erenrich stated that Montgomery County is focusing on smaller projects, such as sidewalks, given the longer-term uncertainty of transportation funding. Mr. Weissberg added that Prince George's County position is the same.

Mr. Erenrich went on to state that the big picture issue is that in the long run there is minimal funding available for new projects. Federal funding is likely to be flat in dollar terms, which represents a decrease in real terms. The Maryland tax increase will fund some more projects in the near term, but these were usually in the CLRP already. Long-term, the funding is not there for new projects, so the guidance for what projects are getting funded may change.

Mr. Erenrich also noted that the Metro 2025 proposal would require a 50% increase in state and local funding to WMATA, which does not appear to be politically feasible.

Mr. Miller added that the funding for projects for the near term, such as the Purple Line, will obligate all the new state revenue for the next two to three years. In the long-term the history of the last five years for federal transportation funding is not good, and it appears unlikely there will be a significant increase in such funding in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Rawlings reported that DDOT expects to complete its project submission information today and should be able to get it approved for formal submittal by December 13. DDOT is still putting together its numbers for the financial analysis; again, the big issue is funding for WMATA.

Mr. Miller asked if any of DDOT's projects would affect conformity, to which the answer was yes. Ms. Posey added that while bike lanes are not coded in the transportation mode, if they take away a lane of traffic that does lead to a change in coding.

Mr. Srikanth provided an update on VDOT's project submissions, noting that the agency is coordinating with the Northern Virginia localities. There will not be any significant new projects. In regard to the financial analysis, the updated costs for projects in the CLRP are being reviewed, as well as forecast state revenues. These will be distributed to the localities, including anticipated funding for WMATA.

Mr. Brown noted that Loudoun County gets most of its transportation funding from private developers. However, this is the first time in which they have dedicated funding through the new state transportation law which will allow them to start work on park & ride lots for the Silver Line in 2018 as well as possibly connecting missing links in the roads built by developers.

Mr. Lake reported for Fairfax County that there will be two or three new projects, including improvements to US-29. Some other phases of current projects will be advanced. New projects are still under discussion, such as to VA-7 and in and around Tysons. There is a continuing dialogue with the public, including a proposal for VA-214.

Ms. Hoeffner stated that VRE will have some additions that may affect conformity.

Mr. Srikanth noted that VDOT anticipates an increase in projects over the next several years, once the NVTA and jurisdictions make decisions on how to use the new state and regional funds

that will be available. However, there is a section of the law that specifies funding be committed to congestion relief; how this is applied in practice is still under consideration.

Mr. Miller then reviewed the status of the financial analysis. He noted that the critical piece is funding for transit to meet estimated state of good repair needs through 2040. There is not yet agreement on extending the PRIIA funding of \$300 million per year; however, this would only fund a portion of the state of good repair needs. Identifying sufficient funds for state of good repair is critical to remove the transit core capacity constraint, which has been a feature of the travel demand model since 2000, and which was used to respond effectively to the Environmental Defense Fund lawsuit regarding lack of sufficient state of good repair funds in the CLRP. He added that state of good repair funding is also likely to be a key topic for federal approval of the CLRP, given the emphasis on state of good repair in MAP-21. Accordingly, most of the discussion of the financial analysis is focused on the preliminary figures for WMATA. Stakeholders will meet again next week to review the figure. At least one more month is needed to confirm and reconcile the numbers.

Mr. Srikanth agreed that more time is needed to discuss and reach agreement on how to remove the “transit constraint” assumption; the effort needed to be able to do this is tied with the CLRP financial plan and our ability to figure out a way of funding WMATA’s state of good repair needs. The region needs to take the time to fully understand the funding needed for this and work with the three states and localities to see if this funding can be included in the CLRP’s financial plan. He agreed to the plan by which the projects and conformity input table will be released for public comments in February rather than January, even though this will mean the TPB adopting the 2014 CLRP in September instead of July 2014.

Ms. Wesolek asked if the deadline for the call for projects would be extended. Mr. Miller responded that no, December 13 is still the due date, though it is rare that 100% are received by the due date. However, it is critical that all projects be submitted promptly, as the figures will affect the financial analysis.

Mr. Austin reiterated that accordingly the release for public comment will be delayed. Mr. Thomas asked if this would affect the conformity analysis, to which the response was not substantially.

Ms. Wesolek noted that WMATA is planning for funding of both all state of good repair needs and the Metro 2025 projects, with the assumption that that there will be an extension of PRIIA past 2020, even though this will not likely be confirmed for several years nor are there yet commitments from DC and Virginia to fund their share of PRIIA past 2020.

5. Briefing on Priority Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects Recommended for the FY 2015-2020 TIP

Mr. Farrell spoke to a hand-out. Every year the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee selects this short list of projects. It came out of the regional bike plan, which has over 500 projects, which are not prioritized. A short list of unfunded projects made sense. Projects are nominated by the TPB member jurisdictions, but should respond to a number of selection factors.

Mr. Farrell said there are four new projects on the list since last year. Three projects from last year's list were funded, including the regional bike share project, now known as Capital Bikeshare. This was originally a regional federal TIGER grant application, which was not funded but which has since been largely funded from other sources.

Mr. Weissberg said that there had been a successful TIGER grant application for the Anacostia River Trail. Mr. Farrell replied that regional bike sharing was a different TIGER grant.

Mr. Farrell said that there is still some information to be filled in with respect to budget numbers, but the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee has seen and approved this list.

Mr. Weissberg asked whether the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee could discuss the difficulties of putting bike sharing at Metrorail stations? One of the concerns has been terrorism insurance relating to the trucks which pick up bicycles and relocate them to other stations. Mr. Farrell replied that it had not been, but it certainly could be. There is a WMATA representative on the Subcommittee. There are numerous bikeshare stations near Metro in the city, but they are not on WMATA property.

Mr. Austin suggested that a summary of the projects submitted and those funded could be included on a brochure for the FY 2015-2020 TIP. Mr. Farrell said that this list will be brought to the TPB at some point as an information item.

Mr. Malouff said that bicycle planning in many places had moved to cycle tracks, and this list seemed to be mostly trails. Mr. Farrell replied that cycle tracks are a new idea. DDOT is building them, but DDOT chose the Metropolitan Branch Trail as their priority. For some of the projects, such as the MaCarthur Boulevard bikeway, if you drill down to the design details, you may find some things that look like cycle tracks, as well as on-street bike lanes and separated side paths on various segments. Northern Virginia is mostly using separated side paths, due to a number of factors including higher speeds on many of the roads, and a desire to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists on the same facility.

Mr. Emerine agreed. DC's cycle tracks are largely funded, but as the Vision plan is wrapped up they may identify corridors for cycle tracks that are not yet funded, and which could end up on this list.

6. Briefing on the Federal Notice/Request for Comments on the Draft Initial Designation of the Highway Primary Freight Network (PFN)

Mr. Meese presented, distributing a handout that had not been in the mail-ahead package. The MAP-21 legislation called for national designation of a highway "Primary Freight Network" (PFN). On November 19, 2013, the *Federal Register* published a draft initial PFN and related information, with comments are due to FHWA from stakeholders by January 17, 2014. The purpose of today's presentation was to review the draft PFN and discuss regional actions and coordination, if any, regarding commenting.

Mr. Meese reviewed the federal definitions as follows. The Primary Freight Network (PFN) is a USDOT-designated network of highways critical to freight movement, legislatively limited to

27,000 miles nationally. Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFCs) are to be designated by states using federally-defined criteria (e.g. truck annual average daily traffic). The National Freight Network (NFN) was defined as the combination of the PFN, the CRFCs, and the portion of the Interstate Highway System not designated on the PFN. Currently these designations were tied to anticipated performance reporting and strategic planning, but not to categorical funding. Additionally, there was the Comprehensive Freight Network (CFN); not legislatively defined, this is the initial freight network developed by FHWA based on defined criteria, about 41,000 miles nationally, before applying the 27,000-mile legislative cap. The PFN and CFN were drafted by FHWA with technical criteria that had been defined in MAP-21, including such factors as truck traffic levels and access to energy exploration areas.

Mr. Meese reviewed maps of the draft PFN as defined in the National Capital Region, which was essentially the region's Interstate highways, excepting portions of I-66, and including no roadways in the District of Columbia except for the D.C. portion of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge.

The *Federal Register* notice invited stakeholder comment particularly on a number of areas including specific route additions or deletions; the methodology used to create the draft network; how the PFN could be used by stakeholders; how this would highway-based system would fit into a multi-modal system; and suggestions for an urban-area route designation process. Mr. Meese raised points of consideration for potential commenting. The Congressional limit of 27,000 miles inevitably means that many important roads will be left off the designation. This would be a zero-sum exercise – additions would have to be balanced by subtractions. It would be more difficult to consider segments that were also not on the 41,000 mile draft network. The primary current use for performance reporting would recommend keeping with roads for which we will have sufficient data.

The question at this time was the potential for coordination among TPB and the states (and any other member agencies interested in commenting) regarding comments. Mr. Meese noted he had received a draft copy of comments DDOT was planning to submit. It needed to be decided whether the MPO was going to submit comments, and if so, how to coordinate those with state comments. Mr. Meese asked for a point person from each state, and suggested he would create a draft comment letter, in coordination with the state point persons, that he could bring back to the January TPB Technical Committee for review.

Mr. Rawlings noted, as Mr. Meese had stated, that DDOT had drafted comments and would support MPO coordination.

Mr. Thomas reported on behalf of MDOT and SHA. Maryland planned to comment. MDOT, the Maryland Transportation Authority, and SHA were coordinating their comments together. There was to be a meeting on December 20 to cross-check the three agencies' comments. At that point, they could share those comments with TPB. In general, they were concerned about gaps in connectivity, and not to add too much on the performance measure side. They were also anticipating reviewing and commenting on federal notice on performance measures after the first of the year, which will be critical. They hoped outside of Maryland there would be comments on the gaps on I-66 including near I-81, as well as Maryland's gap on I-83. Maryland was also, as part of this process, designating their CRFCs.

Mr. Roisman questioned that the CFN 41,000-mile network included some designated access roadways around BWI Airport, but included no similar access coverage around Dulles Airport.

Mr. Whitaker of VDOT noted he would look into VDOT's plans, likely to be coordinated by him or Ms. Allahdoust. He was also concerned about the gap in Dulles Airport access coverage. Another concern was the high level of congestion on the region's highway freight network.

Mr. Malouff asked the reasoning behind the coverage gaps on I-66 in Prince William County, especially the reasoning behind having non-connected/stub portions of the roadway. Mr. Meese noted it was likely based on the technical criteria that FHWA used to define the draft network, such as levels of truck AADTs meeting, perhaps not meeting a statistical threshold. Other parts of the country had similar or even more surprising gaps. Whether to remove such a stub would be the type of comment the FHWA was inviting.

Chair Erickson noted that this was to be brought back for discussion at the January meeting.

7. Status Report on the Development of MAP-21 Performance Measures

Mr. Randall distributed a draft comment letter prepared to respond to the Federal Register Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) on MAP-21 Transit Safety and State of Good Repair performance provisions. This letter was prepared to specifically comment on the section of the ANPRM that discusses the role of the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) in regard to the planning process and setting performance targets for safety and state of good repair for transit providers.

Under the rulemaking, transit agencies will have to measure their safety performance and asset conditions, and MPOs will have to set targets for each measure. Mr. Randall then discussed some of the specific questions asked in the ANPRM of MPOs, including whether regional targets or individual agency targets are preferred. In response, the comment letter states that the TPB wants the flexibility to choose between having one target for the region or to have a target for each agency, depending upon the performance measure.

Mr. Miller added that the TPB's response as a multi-state MPO, both to this ANPRM and other rules that will be coming, will emphasize the need for flexibility in applying the performance provisions and in setting targets. Prescriptive rules could be unduly burdensome and difficult to apply given the wide variety of transit providers and MPOs across the country.

Mr. Erenrich asked if it would make sense to track staff resources to meet the MAP-21 requirements. Mr. Miller responded that the changes in MAP-21 are spread across and will affect all aspects of the metropolitan planning process, so that it is not practical to track such effort separately.

Ms. Wesolek noted that WMATA is drafting their own comments letter.

Mr. Ramfos noted that interim guidance has also been published on the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program, which staff will also be reviewing as well as discussing with other MPOs.

Mr. Randall noted that no new information has come out on the other rulemakings scheduled for the MAP-21 performance provisions. Comments on the Transit Safety and State of Good Repair ANPRM are due to the FTA by January 2, so any member comments on the draft comments letter were requested by December 13.

8. Ron Kirby: Life and Accomplishments

Technical Committee members shared their memories of Ron Kirby. Comments were made by Lyn Erickson, Danielle Wesolek, Mark Rawlings, Christine Hoeffner, Dan Malouff, Nick Alexandrow, Pierre Holoman, Mike Lake, Ron Burns, John Thomas, Dan Emerine, Bob Brown, Gary Erenrich, Norman Whitaker, Vic Weissberg, George Phillips, Bill Orleans, Bob Griffiths, and Jerry Miller.

9. Other Business

Chair Erickson announced that the 2014 Chair of the Technical Committee would be Mr. Srikanth from VDOT.

10. Adjourn