

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
ITEM #1**

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

---

## **Technical Committee Minutes**

For meeting of  
**May 2, 2014**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE – MAY 2, 2014**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT                                      Mark Rawlings  
DCOP                                      Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County                      -----  
Frederick County                    -----  
Gaithersburg                         -----  
Montgomery County                John Thomas  
Prince George's County            Lou Farber  
Rockville                              -----  
M-NCPPC  
    Montgomery County            -----  
    Prince George's County        Faramarz  
Mokhtari  
MDOT                                  Michael Nixon  
    SHA                                 Dami Kehinde  
    Matt Baker  
    MTA                                 -----  
Takoma Park                         -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria                            -----  
Arlington County                    Dan Malouff  
City of Fairfax                       -----  
Fairfax County                       Mike Lake  
    Malcolm Watson  
Falls Church                         -----  
Loudoun County                      Robert Brown  
Manassas                              -----  
Prince William County              -----  
NUTC                                  Claire Gron  
PRTC                                  Nick Alexandrow  
VRE                                    Christine  
Hoeffner  
VDOT                                  Kanathur  
Srikanth  
    Norman  
Whitaker  
VDRPT                                 Tim Roseboom  
NVPDC                                -----  
VDOA

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Gerald Miller, DTP  
Robert Griffiths, DTP  
Andrew Meese, DTP  
Sarah Crawford, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Lynn Winchell-Mendy, DTP  
Michael Farrell, DTP  
William Bacon, DTP  
Dzung Ngo, DTP  
Mark Moran, DTP  
Charlene Howard, DTP  
Rich Roisman, DTP  
Jane Posey, DTP  
Dusan Vuksan, DTP  
Ben Hampton, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP  
Patrick Zilliacus, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Greg Goodwin, DCPS

OTHER

Delania Hardy, AMPO  
Levon Boyagian, AMPO  
Stu Whitaker, Whitaker Associates  
Bill Orleans

WMATA

WMATA                                  Danielle Wesolek

---

## TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

### Technical Committee Meeting

---

#### Technical Committee Minutes

**1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from April 4 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

**2. Briefing on the Status of Reauthorization of the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act (MAP-21)**

Ms. Hardy, Executive Director of the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) provided an update the status of MAP-21, which provides federal funding for all surface transportation programs. MAP-21 expires on September 30, 2014, and the Highway Trust Fund will be unable to meet all its obligations before then. In addition, MAP-21 included various rulemakings on performance provisions and governance, many of which are still pending implementation or even release for comment as proposals.

Ms. Hardy spoke to the status of MAP-21 reauthorization legislation in both houses of Congress. In general, it appears both houses will focus on a reauthorization with few changes in policy; the challenge is in agreeing on the funding source for revenues to replenish the HTF, which needs some \$18 billion for next year. It appears likely that an agreement will be reached in July before the HTF is emptied. Alternatively, there may be a short-term fix to extend the legislation and funding until after the November elections.

Ms. Hardy also spoke to the Administration's GROW AMERICA proposal, which proposes several changes in the MAP-21 lay and has various new grant programs proposed. Several changes are proposed for metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs). Ms. Hardy also reviewed the status of anticipated MAP-21 rulemaking, including the soon-anticipated Metropolitan and Statewide Planning rule, the recently released Safety Performance Measures and the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) rules, and other forthcoming rules. In response to questions, Ms. Hardy noted that AMPO will be submitting comments on the proposed rules as they are published.

Mr. Srikanth noted that TPB staff is coordinating with State DOT staff on potential TPB comment on the performance rules.

Mr. Miller noted that the TPB meeting will include this briefing and feature a letter for the TPB to send to the regional congressional delegation.

**3. Briefing on Recommended Projects for Funding under the MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Program for FY2015 in Northern Virginia**

Ms. Crawford spoke to a presentation outlining the FY 2015 Transportation Alternatives Program project recommendations for Northern Virginia. She reviewed the solicitation processed administered by the Virginia Department of Transportation. She reviewed described the available funding, including carryover funding from FY 2014, and noted that all projects could be funded and that it is recommended that one project be partially funded due to funding limitations. She provided information about the funding assigned to project by the Commonwealth Transportation Board. She described the selection process and criteria used by the TPB's technical review committee in determining priority projects for funding. She said the TPB would be asked to approve the projects at its May 21 meeting. She provided an update on the status of the Maryland and District of Columbia TA Program solicitations.

Mr. Srikanth noted that VDOT tends to be ahead of the federal fiscal year in terms of preparing projects for this and other program, and added that FFY 2015 would not start until October 1. He asked if Maryland would be issuing its FY 2015 solicitation soon.

Ms. Crawford said that Maryland is in the midst of the reissuance of its FY 2014 solicitation, and that applications are due May 15. She said that since the FY 2013/2014 solicitation last spring was undersubscribed statewide, the Maryland Department of Transportation preferred to reissue the FY 2014 solicitation rather than carry over funding to FY 2015. She said that from her conversations with MDOT staff, she sensed that MDOT prefers to wait until a funding bill is introduced for FFY 2015 before issuing a call for projects for that funding.

Mr. Srikanth asked Ms. Crawford to describe how the projects compared with the selection criteria established by the TPB at the inception of the TA Program.

Ms. Crawford said the technical review committee ranked the projects using the criteria as a guide, and then divided the projects into high, medium, and low priorities related to the criteria. She said the committee felt all of the projects responded to the criteria, though that some were stronger than others. She said the lower priority projects were considered good projects; however the committee was concerned about those project's readiness and implementation ability.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the TPB received any transportation demand management projects and asked if that type of project could be considered.

Ms. Crawford said no applications for TDM projects were received and that she would have to check if TDM is an eligible activity.

Mr. Emerine said he was surprised to hear the program was undersubscribed and asked if staff knew why that might be.

Ms. Crawford said she believes that the trend across Virginia was that the program was in high demand. She said that due to additional funding from the CTB, it was the case this year that all Northern Virginia projects could be funded.

Mr. Srikanth added that the carryover from FY 2014 added to the TPB's ability to fund all projects, but that it would not have been able to solely relying on FY 2015 funds.

#### **4. Briefing on the Initial Assessment of the 2014 Update of the CLRP and the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)**

Mr. Swanson briefed the committee. He said that at the April 16 TPB meeting, he presented a qualitative assessment of how the priorities identified in the RTPP compare to the transportation system in the CLRP. As the next steps to follow up on the RTPP, he said that staff would 1) develop a second phase of the assessment for release in September; 2) conduct outreach with jurisdiction staff and stakeholders this summer; and 3) develop a scope for future analysis, potentially including new scenario analysis.

Mr. Srikanth congratulated staff on the initial assessment. He said he agreed with items 1 and 2 that Mr. Swanson highlighted as next steps. He particularly supported the proposed outreach. However, he disagreed with item 3, saying that it would be premature to develop a scope for future analysis at this time.

Mr. Malouff said the next phase of the assessment should identify gaps and shortcomings relative to the RTPP goals, as well as success stories.

Mr. Swanson asked if Mr. Malouff had any suggestions for identifying gaps.

Mr. Malouff said he would think about it.

Mr. Srikanth said he was not sure it was appropriate for gaps to be measured.

Mr. Emerine suggested that the CLRP Performance Analysis should be integrated with the RTPP. He also said he thought it could be useful to conduct scenario analysis in the future.

Ms. Hoeffner said that the initial assessment information about VRE funding was incomplete. She said that major critical investments to expand railroad capacity have not been funded.

Mr. Mokhtari suggested that as part of CLRP assessment, it might be helpful to look at how the goals in local plans are being met.

Mr. Srikanth said it would be helpful for TPB staff to provide information in advance of the meetings with the jurisdiction staff.

## **5. Transportation Impacts of the October 1-16, 2013 Federal Government Shutdown**

Bob Griffiths introduced the regional setting for this presentation, Mr. Zilliacus presented.

Chair Srikanth asked about slide 14 and the lack of dark green (most congestion relief) in the P.M. peak commute period. Mr. Zilliacus pointed out some along I-66 corridor, southern PG County MD 5/U.S. 301, BW Parkway.

Mr. Mokhtari asked about: slide 5 – decreasing? Was peak 4 hours or changed? Mr. Zilliacus answered that it was a consistent time period

Chair Srikanth asked about employment - is there any way to distinguish or can only lump together?

Mr. Griffiths explained that it can be broken down by industry type and that most employment growth has been in hospitality and leisure areas. Chair Srikanth commented about many federal contractors in suburbs.

Mr. Malouff said he would like to understand the causes of the VMT flatline trend over the past few years and that he is looking forward to seeing more about it.

Ms. Hoeffner remarked that even a greater percentage of VRE ridership are federal employees -- close to 70% with military. On the revenue side, the federal transit benefit change had a big impact on ridership.

Mr. Ramfos commented that Commuter Connections saw steep decline in applications and inquiries after the shutdown.

## **6. Congestion Management Process (CMP) National Capital Region Congestion Report (Draft), 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter 2013**

Mr. Meese introduced the context and motivation of this quarterly updated National Capital Region Congestion Report. Speaking to a presentation and the actual Report, Mr. Pu continued the briefing with the main contents of this Report, including congestion, travel time reliability, top 10 bottlenecks, quarterly spotlight, and

methodology. The committee was asked to comment on the Report by Friday, May 16, 2014, and then a final Report for the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter 2013 would be posted on webpage: [www.mwcog.org/congestion](http://www.mwcog.org/congestion).

In response to a question asked by Mr. Thomas, Mr. Pu explained that the results of this Report was produced by 1) staff in-house analysis such as the regional average Travel Time Index and Planning Time Index, and 2) the I-95 Vehicle Probe Project (VPP) Suite developed by the CATT Lab of the University of Maryland, such as the top 10 bottlenecks and the congestion maps. Data for non-National Highway System (NHS) arterials were obtained from INRIX, Inc. through the VPP Suite and INRIX's own website <http://i95.inrix.com/>. The data coverage on non-NHS had become part of the VPP a few years earlier.

Mr. Meese added that a lot of public agencies could access the VPP Suite and some of the easy-to-use tools but there were some limitations; staff was able to download large datasets from INRIX, Inc. and use specialized computers and statistical software to handle the data. Mr. Srikanth asked if such large data handling experience could be shared with localities and DOTs. Mr. Pu replied that staff was willing to share and informed the audience that the CATT Lab hosts trainings on the use of the VPP Suite every other week.

## **7. Update on the Development of MAP-21 Performance Measures**

Mr. Randall briefly reviewed the status of anticipated MAP-21 rulemaking for Metropolitan and Statewide Planning, as well as Transit Agency Representation on MPO Boards, as had been discussed at length earlier in Ms. Hardy's briefing (Item 2). The planning rule, to include information on performance measures, was now anticipated to be released in mid-May; no date had been announced for when the transit agency representation rule would be released.

Mr. Meese reviewed the rules that had already been released on Safety Performance Measures and the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). The safety rule defines the process by which states and MPOs will compile safety data and define targets; the related HSIP rule requires states to collect and use a set of proposed roadway data elements on which safety data will be based. A critical note was that the safety rule requirements apply to "all public roads", not (as anticipated for other MAP-21-related rules) limited to Interstates and the National Highway System. An April 28 meeting of the Transportation Safety Subcommittee discussed but did not yield a specific consensus on recommended TPB comments to the federal docket (deadline was June 9, but with a likelihood of being extended). The next steps were to await release of the planning rule in order to understand its interaction with safety rules, and to coordinate on comments drafted/submitted by member agencies.

Mr. Srikanth suggested that the Transportation Safety Subcommittee continue to work on this and report back to the Technical Committee as necessary.

**8. Other Business**

None.

**9. Adjourn**