
TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

July 7, 2023

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

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

2. APPROVAL OF MEETING RECAP FROM THE JUNE 2 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING

There were no questions or comments regarding the June Technical Committee meeting. The summary was accepted as final.

ITEMS FOR THE BOARD AGENDA

3. CAR FREE DAY PROCLAMATION

Mr. Nicholas Ramfos, COG/TPB staff, discussed the Commuter Connections Car Free Day project for 2023 with the Committee. He explained that Car Free Day began in Europe in 1995 and is now a worldwide event that is observed in 1,500 cities in approximately 40 countries. The event is held in tandem with European Mobility Week which celebrates sustainable urban mobility from September 16 – 22. The campaign’s goal is to introduce and promote sustainable transportation measures as alternatives to driving an automobile. Mobility Week in Europe closes with Car Free Day on September 22nd and most participating cities set aside areas for pedestrians, cyclists and/or public transportation users for the whole day.

The event in our region began in 2007 as a DC centric event and was then expanded to the rest of the region in 2008. The regional event aims to promote the use of alternative forms of transportation including “car-lite” methods such as carpools and vanpools in addition to teleworking.

Mr. Ramfos stated that the event is open to all residents who need to make any type of a trip during Car Free Day and ordinarily travel in a single occupant vehicle. This year’s event pledge goal is 5,000 residents to go car free or “car-lite.”

A regional Car Free Day participant survey was conducted in 2022. Mr. Ramfos stated that 97% of the survey respondents stated that they had used a car-free or car-lite option during the event. The use of transit and bike/scooter was slightly less than what was pledged but the travel options used were generally in line with the options pledged. 59% of the survey respondents who changed their commute mode on Car Free Day would most likely have driven alone to work that day. 31% of respondents increased the use of car free and/or car-lite options for non-work trips after the event. The average frequency for car free and car-lite use for work trips stayed the same from before Car Free Day to afterwards at 3.6 days per week.

The TPB will be asked to approve a proclamation for the 2023 Car Free Day event this month. Mr. Ramfos stated that the call to action will be for local jurisdictions to adopt similar proclamations. The event is usually well covered by the media although the past few years have not been covered extensively as in the past due to the pandemic.

The website for the event is www.carfreemetrodc.org and will be up and running in early August to accept pledges. A leaderboard showing the status of those pledging and the type of mode they

pledge to take during Car Free Day will be prominently featured. Promotional materials will include a poster which will be sent to employers and will also be available to download from the Car Free Day web site. The event also has Facebook and Twitter pages, and both will be used to promote the event via messages and paid advertising. Digital ads will also be used to promote the event.

The event also has many corporate sponsors offering prize opportunities for those pledging. Radio support and Pandora as well as social media influencers and sponsored articles and text messages have been used to market the event in the region.

Commuter Connections network members also hosted numerous promotions and events to celebrate Car Free Day. The event also includes a "Capital Area Car Free College Campus Challenge" to promote the event on college campuses throughout the region. A promotional tool kit was developed and is distributed to colleges and universities throughout the Washington Metropolitan Area. Several hundred pledges were made with an.edu email addresses, and 1st place went to the University of Maryland in 2022.

4. FY 2024 MARYLAND TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES SET ASIDE PROGRAM PROJECT APPROVAL

John Swanson briefed the committee on the project recommendations for the Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program (TAP) in Maryland for FY 2024. He said that MDOT conducted a solicitation for projects from April 14 to May 15. Seven eligible applications were received for the TPB region. A TPB selection panel individually reviewed and scored the applications and then the committee met twice to determine its recommendations.

John Swanson said the panel was recommending funding for approximately \$3.3 million for seven projects. He described the projects. He said the TPB would be asked to vote on the recommendations at the board meeting on July 19.

Bob Brown asked if the recommended funding included the required local matches.

John Swanson said the matches, which are a minimum of 20%, were additional to the funding recommendations.

Bob Brown suggested that the board presentation should include information about the local matches, as well as an indication as to whether the funding for each project was for construction or design.

John Swanson agreed.

5. DRAFT NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION FREIGHT PLAN

Andrew Meese introduced the topic of the Draft National Capital Region Freight Plan being provided this month for Technical Committee and TPB review, with TPB approval anticipated in September.

Laura MacNeil, Chair of the TPB Freight Subcommittee, provided introductory comments. The TPB Freight Subcommittee has provided advice to the TPB and TPB Technical Committee on freight matters since 2007. The subcommittee gathers both public sector and private sector participants, making for a great information exchange at subcommittee meetings, including unique private sector perspectives. The Chair and TPB freight planning staff person Janie Nham develop the subcommittee's bimonthly meetings around focus areas, which have included trucking, rail, technology, food and agriculture, curbside deliveries, and many other topics. Anyone who would like to be added to the Freight Subcommittee distribution list should let TPB staff know. The draft Freight Plan on this agenda is the third edition of the plan that the subcommittee has advised, going back to 2010 and 2016.

Walker Freer of ICF, consultant to TPB for development of the Freight Plan, reviewed highlights of the

draft plan, referring to a PowerPoint presentation. The version of the draft plan presented this day reflected input from the TPB Freight Subcommittee since an initial spring review of the document. Mr. Freer described the structure and topics which make up the eight chapters of the draft plan. Key points included the federal, state, and local context of freight planning; the dominance of trucking as a freight movement mode in the region; changes since the 2016 plan including technology, supply chain patterns, and pandemic impacts; and the importance of freight planning for TPB members and for the region's economy.

Mr. Freer reviewed information on the region's freight transportation roadway and rail network, plus air cargo, waterborne, and pipeline considerations; regional freight movement by weight and value; federal forecasts for freight movement from now to 2050; freight enabling the region's livability; and equity impacts of freight movement, including for the region's Equity Emphasis Areas (EEAs; for example, 23% of major roadway mileage [where trucks are common] was found to be within EEAs compared to 26% of the region's population within EEAs).

Mr. Meese discussed the topic areas of the regional freight policies included in the plan. The topics were the same as those in the 2016 plan, with a few wording updates. These policies and the Freight Plan in general were informed by the most recent Visualize 2045 plan, and hopefully the next Visualize will be informed by this Freight Plan.

Mr. Meese further discussed the plan's recommendations for regional freight planning activities, which are ongoing, in contrast to the "snapshot" nature of a particular plan. Recommended activities included continuation of the Freight Subcommittee, hosting more regional forums on freight topics, maintaining relationships with stakeholders, continuing to look at equity, looking at curbside topics, and monitoring overall trends.

Mr. Meese reviewed next steps, including welcoming quick comments (e.g. identifying typos) by the following Tuesday, July 11; TPB review at their July 19 meeting; a comment period from July 19 to (approximately) August 21; and returning to the Technical Committee on September 8 in preparation for anticipated approval at the September 20 TPB meeting.

Robert Brown commented on whether US 15 in Loudoun County should be included in the TPB Regionally Significant Freight Network defined in the plan, plus asked the significance of the Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 designations within that network, and whether that has anything to do with federal funding. Mr. Meese welcomed the question and these types of comments on the draft plan and agreed to follow up with Loudoun County on the potential inclusion of US 15 on the Regionally Significant Freight Network. The Regionally Significant Freight Network was derived by TPB staff from other networks (often with legal standing) such as the National Performance Freight Network, state freight plans, and state-designated truck routes. The Regionally Significant Freight Network is not used for operational or funding purposes, but rather is used by TPB in regional Congestion Management Process analyses. The plan document provides definitions of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3, which are related to roadway functional classification and whether the route serves freight through-traffic or just local freight generators (e.g., last mile connections). There are no funding or legal implications of the tier designations.

Amir Shahpar asked if there was data on delays experienced by trucks due to congestion. Mr. Meese replied that a section of the plan (Section 5.1) shows congestion cost data from the American Transportation Research Institute (ATRI – in the most recent data available [2016], the Washington metropolitan area [geography as defined by ATRI and not identical to the TPB membership area] was ranked 6th in the nation in congestion costs for trucks among major metropolitan areas, estimated at over \$1 billion per year).

Kanti Srikanth commented on the use of TPB developing a Regional Freight Plan, to provide a broader context. Freight planning is federally required, but we do more than just fulfill this requirement. For example, TPB has identified roadway fatalities in particular and roadway safety in

general as a priority area. When we developed this freight plan, we reflected the TPB's policy priorities by looking at the fatality data involving trucks. Hopefully, this will be helpful at agency and local levels where roadway systems are designed, and operations are managed – that is an added value from our perspective. Equity is also an important area; the TPB developed EEAs, and we compared how freight movement may impact EEAs versus outside of EEAs. There is more that can be done. Additionally, we need federal action on greenhouse gas emissions from truck traffic. He noted that it was reported in this day's Washington Post that major truck manufacturers had reached an agreement with the State of California on banning diesel big-rig sales starting in 2036, affecting both greenhouse gases and particulate matter.

6. ENHANCED MOBILITY GRANT SOLICITATION

Nicholas Ramfos (COG) filled in for Mohammad Khan (COG) to present an overview of information regarding the new round of Enhanced Mobility funding available in the region. He stated that there is approximately 10.8 million dollars of funding available for governments, non-profits, and private organizations serving the Washington Metropolitan Urbanized Area (UZA). The goal of the program is to improve mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities. The matching grants for the program go above and beyond traditional public transit and ADA paratransit services.

Funding for the project includes both Operating and Capital and Mobility Management. There is a 50% match for operating projects and a 20% match for capital and mobility management projects. The projects are slated to run for a two-year period and seek to improve transportation for people with disabilities and older adults as well as those with low-income.

There will be three mandatory pre-application conferences to which interested applicants must sign up for one, including, one in Silver Spring, Maryland, one at the COG offices in Washington DC, and one in Tysons Corner, Virginia. The solicitation period will open on August 1st and end on September 30th at 3 PM. Mr. Ramfos asked the audience to spread the word in their communities and to eligible organizations that may be interested in the UZA area.

Mr. Ramfos stated that there is an on-line application that will be reviewed during the pre-application conferences. The application is very extensive and comprehensive. Projects submitted must benefit the populations in the designated Urbanized Area and the map shown is from the 2010 Census and is in the process of being updated. The next round of Enhanced Mobility will be using the new map. Mr. Ramfos pointed out that any projects benefiting individuals outside of the UZA are covered by Section 5310 programs in Maryland and Virginia.

Mr. Ramfos then discussed the selection process that will be used for the submitted projects which will include a selection committee of local representatives chaired by a TPB member. The process is established through the TPB's Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan. The goal is for the TPB to approve the recommended projects by December. Mr. Ramfos then reviewed the selection criteria and the priority projects confirmed by the AFA Committee that respond to the most significant unmet transportation needs.

Bob Brown, Loudoun County, asked a question on whether the latest urbanized area map was not released yet to which Nicholas Ramfos responded that the upcoming solicitation will utilize the 2010 census map and the new map is not available but will be utilized during the next solicitation in 2025. The maps are not too different. Kanti Srikanth, COG/TPB staff, confirmed that the map indeed is not too different, and the changes will be due to the process of "smoothing" that the states have to complete.

Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, asked if the County were to do a project in Poolesville or Damascus even though Poolesville isn't in the UZA but is a small, urbanized area, we would not be eligible based upon the map? If the service connects to Shady Grove Hospital would that then be eligible? Mr. Ramfos responded that if the population is within this area that you are targeting then yes, the project would be eligible. Mr. Srikanth stated that if the project will serve the population within this area but also include another urbanized area that in of itself would make that project ineligible if your targeted population is not within the urbanized area. Mr. Erenrich then discussed a new transit service that will be introduced that goes to Poolesville, but there are mainly volunteer drivers taking people to medical facilities in the Shady Grove area. He stated that an internal discussion will be held, and staff will reach out with any questions. Mr. Ramfos stated that the County is encouraged to reach out with any questions. Mr. Srikanth recommended for Montgomery County staff to attend the Enhanced Mobility pre-application conferences to learn more and ask any further questions as that is a requirement to apply for the program.

Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County, asked if areas not in the UZA of the 2010 census map, would be eligible for rural funding. Mr. Ramfos stated that they would not be through this program and that Maryland has an existing Section 5310 program through MTA and Virginia has one through VDRPT that would handle areas outside of the UZA. Mr. Weissberg asked whether rural areas that had sections that touched the areas outside of the UZA but were still within the county could be considered. Mr. Ramfos responded that if the project is serving the Urbanized Area the application can be through COG otherwise, an application can be made through MTA's program. Sergio Ritacco, COG/TPB staff, provided the appropriate contact information for the MTA's program to the group.

7. TRANSPORTATION PLANNING CERTIFICATION REVIEW FOR THE WASHINGTON REGION

Mr. Dan Koenig of FTA provided brief remarks on the federal certification review process and the TPB's results. Mr. Koenig described the review process as a site visit from FTA and FHWA that occurs every four years wherein the federal agencies conduct a detailed desktop review, a site visit, and exchanges of information. Mr. Koenig stated that in January and February, the federal team began reviewing the TPB's planning materials that were available online. Mr. Koenig stated that there are three potential findings that come from the review process: 1. Corrective actions – An MPO is failing to fulfill some requirement; 2. Recommendations – The MPO is meeting compliance but there are process improvements to be made; and 3. Accommodations – There is something the MPO is doing very well.

Mr. Koenig stated that the TPB recommendations from 2019 had been fulfilled. After completion of the TPB's federal review, Mr. Koenig stated that the team identified several accommodations for the TPB in areas of high performance. In the metropolitan transportation plan, Mr. Koenig described the future factors of equity, climate change, and transportation safety as "innovative." The review team was also impressed with the TPB's environmental justice focus and the staff's methodology for creating the Equity Emphasis Areas (EEAs) and the overall equity framework. Mr. Koenig continued to say that the TPB also performed well in public participation, particularly with the Voices of the Region survey. Moreover, the congestion management plan's data management, the performance-based planning's regional targets and measures, the financial plan's tool applications, and the TPB's emphasis on climate change and resiliency also stood out as accommodations to the review team. Mr. Koenig then summarized the recommendations that the review team identified. The recommendations include: 1. More clearly communicating the many goals and their relations to the work products so that the public can better understand how they guide the RTP; 2. Creation of an ADA transition plan; 3. Keep inflation in mind when updating the plan to have reasonable assumptions for project costs. No corrective actions were identified in the federal review process.

The following comments were given:

Ms. Lyn Erickson commented that the Federal review took a lot of effort from everyone and that it is a significant task. Ms. Erickson then thanked everyone who was involved in the process.

Mr. Kanti Srikanth thanked the member agencies and jurisdictions for their help in completing the review process and in pushing the TPB to excel in its many focus areas. Mr. Srikanth concluded that the TPB will continue to go above and beyond the federal requirements thanks to the staff, member jurisdictions, and increased funding opportunities.

INFORMATION ITEMS

8. VISUALIZE 2050: COMMENTS RECEIVED TO DATE, OTHER UPDATES

Marcela Moreno provided an overview of comments submitted to the Visualize 2050 Initial Project List Feedback Form from May 31, 2023 at 5PM until July 5, 2023 at 5PM. She said that the TPB received 185 submissions and 539 individual project comments. She added that comments were received for projects in the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia.

Andrew Austin provided a status report on the provision of PDF and Excel data files containing data on projects from the Project InfoTrak database to assist with the re-entering of data for the inputs to Visualize 2050 and the FY 2026-2029 TIP. Files had been produced and distributed to DDOT and MDOT. Then final production was under way for county agencies in Maryland, VDOT and Virginia transit agencies.

9. REGIONAL COORDINATION ON TRANSIT ON-BOARD SURVEYS

Mr. Canan delivered a PowerPoint presentation highlighting TPB staff activities to coordinate the region's 25 transit providers to collect transit on-board trip information needed to estimate, calibrate, and validate TPB's travel demand forecasting model and to analyze the characteristics of transit trips in the region. The presentation included information on the purpose and benefits of a transit on-board survey (TOBS), previous approaches taken in the region, TPB staff's proposed approach for the upcoming fiscal year, and services that can be provided to the region's transit operators by TPB. The approach proposed by staff entails TPB playing a coordinator role, supporting the region's transit operators conducting their own on-board surveys with TPB staff providing coordination and support, when needed. This will include processing data collected from the survey, developing a regional TOBS dataset, and performing data analysis that can be used by both TPB, its members, and other transit operators.

Mark Philips (WMATA) announced that WMATA is fully committed to supporting the regional coordination approach presented during this item. Gary Erenrich (Montgomery County) asked about the timing for the project and Mr. Srikanth indicated that it is staff's intention to meet with each of the region's 25 transit operators before the end of the calendar year to solicit their commitment to participate so work can commence in the first half of 2024, with the total project taking several years to complete.

10. COG ROUND 10 COOPERATIVE FORECASTS OF POPULATION, HOUSEHOLDS, AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr. DesJardin briefed the Committee on the Round 10 Cooperative Forecasts, noting that the COG Board approved them at their June meeting. Mr. DesJardin also stated that, prior to their adoption, staff had briefed the COG Board on Round 10 at both their April and May meetings. Regarding the

new Forecasts, Mr. DesJardin spoke to PowerPoint, noting that the region would add about 1 million more jobs, 1.5 million more people, and 700,000 new households by 2050. Mr. DesJardin also noted that, compared to the prior Round 9.2 Forecasts, employment in each future year is about 200,000 fewer jobs than previously anticipated while population and household growth are equivalent to Round 9.2

Mr. Erenrich inquired about slowing growth and whether the Round 10 Forecasts reflect the a 'delay' in achieving the prior projections, i.e., prior projections for 2025, might now not be achieved until 2030. Mr. Nampoothiri asked about variations in the local Forecasts. Mr. DesJardin noted that there are many changes at the local level and that he will provide the Committee with comparison tables for Round 9.2 and Round 10.

11. OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Lyn Erickson led the introduction of other business items.

Andrew Austin gave an update on the VDOT amendment that was introduced last month at the TPB meeting. Right before the June TPB meeting, the amendment was released for public comment. The Board will be asked to approve the amendment in July. All jurisdictions should review the amendment and submit any corrections, since this submission includes the entire Virginia portion of the TIP.

Andrew Meese informed the committee we were planning a Bottlenecks Analysis Workshop with the Vehicle Probe Data Users Group. Originally the tentative date was July 13th. Unfortunately, that date will be moved. This date is depending on the University of Maryland Probe Data Analytics Suite schedule and technical issues. The new tentative date is September 21st.

Lyn Erickson spoke to the committee on behalf of John Swanson. Lyn mentioned that the Transit Within Reach deadline has the incorrect date listed. The deadline is not August 3rd. Lyn provided information about the program. The program provides funds for design and preliminary engineering projects. The program will help improve bike and walk connections to the high-capacity transit stations. Lyn mentions there's a total of \$250,000 available for program projects. These projects can be funded for up to \$80,000. We are looking to fund up to 3 projects for the next 2-year cycle. Application selection will start this fall and funding will be distributed early next year. For more information, please contact John Swanson.

Staff updates were provided. Mark Moran is currently recruiting for a Transportation Engineer II/III to be in the Model of Development Group. Please go to COG job listings and make an application.

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT	
Samuel Brooks – DDOT (virtual) Mark Mishler – Fredrick County (virtual) Gary Erenrich – Montgomery County (in-person) Bob Brown - Loudoun County (in-person) Rob Donaldson – Loudoun County (in-person) Brian Leckie– City of Manassas (virtual) Regina Moore – VDOT (virtual) Silas Sullivan – (virtual) Kelley Dolan – (virtual) Hannah Pajewski – NVTA (virtual) Christine Hoeffner – VRE (virtual)	Sree Nampoothiri – NVTA (virtual) Megan Landis – Prince William County (virtual) Amir Shahpar – VDOT (in-person) Mark Phillip – WMATA (virtual) Dan Koenig – FTA (virtual) Walker Frecer – ICF (in-person) Victor Weisberg - Prince George's Co. (virtual) Bill Pugh – (virtual) Laura McNeil - DDOT (virtual) Amy Garbarini – VDRPT (virtual)
OTHERS / MWCOG STAFF PRESENT	
Kanti Srikanth Lyn Erickson Kim Sutton Dusan Vuksan Sergio Ritacco Eric Randall Jane Posey Paul DeJardin Marcela Moreno Maia Davis	Janie Nham Leo Pineda Tim Canan Mark Moran Rachel Beyerle John Swanson Katherine Rainone Andrew Messe