

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
9/5/2014

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – September 5, 2014**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
Jameshia Peterson
Norman Gross, Jr.
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

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

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County Mike Lake
Malcolm Watson
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County Marie Scheetz
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
Prince William County Ricardo Canizales
NVTA Denise Harris
Keith Jasper
NVTC Claire Gron
PRTC Betsy Massie
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Norman Whitaker
Dan Painter
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
NVPDC -----
VDOA

WMATA

Danielle Wesolek

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Kanti, Srikanth, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Anant Choudhary, DTP
Lamont Cobb, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Yu Gao, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Bryan Hayes, DTP
Eulalie Lucas, DTP
Jessica Mirr, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Jinchul Park, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Wenjing Pu, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Sergio Ritacco, DTP
Jon Schermann, DTP
Daniel Son, DTP
Dan Sonenklar, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP

OTHER

Bill Orleans

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Meeting

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from June 27 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on the Update of the TPB Participation Plan

Mr. Swanson briefed the committee on the draft 2014 Update to the Participation Plan. He described the plan's purpose and conceptual framework. He noted that the plan is federally required. He said it was released for a 45-day public comment period on July 10. He said that a revised draft would be released on September 11, which responds to three comments that were received. He said the TPB would be asked to approve the plan at its meeting on September 17.

Mr. Holloman asked if staff has plans to more actively push out information and notifications instead of relying upon the public to come to the website to seek out information and data.

Mr. Swanson said this was a good point. He said the document broadly supports such a pro-active approach.

Mr. Hampton said that staff is making more use of social media. He also said the new COG website would encourage better information sharing.

Ms. Erickson said these are good ideas, but she believed that such specific details about such enhancements would not need to be included in the Participation Plan document itself. She asked Mr. Swanson what information would be included in the mailout.

Mr. Swanson said the mailout would include the draft plan, a draft resolution, and a memorandum explaining comments received and changes made in the draft document.

Mr. Mokhtari said the plan does a good job in supporting engagement for people who are already involved in the TPB process, but he said he was concerned that not enough is being done to engage people who are not currently involved.

Mr. Swanson said this is an important point and a big challenge. He said the plan emphasizes the need to reach out to community leaders who are active at the local level and could benefit from participation in regional planning.

Ms. Massie asked if language satisfying FTA's Section 5307 Program of Projects requirements, which had been recommended by FTA staff and requested by Virginia and Maryland transit agencies, would be included in the plan.

Mr. Swanson said yes, that language would be included.

3. Briefing on a Draft Resolution on Planning Representation by Public Transportation Provider on the TPB

Mr. Srikanth briefed the Committee on the continued development of a response to the MAP-21 requirement for representation by providers of public transportation on MPO policy boards, including the TPB. A draft resolution for the board to consider was included in the mail-out, to which he referred. He reviewed the actions taken to date to get inputs, including the webinar conducted by TPB staff and the efforts by the DOTs in each state to reach out to their stakeholders. The topic was also discussed at previous technical committee meetings as well as those of the regional bus subcommittee.

The most important point is that the TPB is already in compliance with the requirement, as it includes WMATA as a voting member. He mentioned previous TPB actions in support of transit, including the TIGER Grant funding the Crystal City Potomac Yard Transitway, for which staff developed the application, were awarded the grant, and are helping to manage the administration of the grant. This is just one example of how much attention public transportation gets. He noted that local transit providers are represented through their elected officials.

To meet the October 1 deadline of MAP-21 and to respond to the federal guidance on their requirement, the TPB will follow a two-step process. Firstly, a resolution will be adopted that declares that the MAP-21 requirement is met. Secondly, the TPB will engage in a process in future months to engage stakeholders and determine how to improve the process by which transit stakeholders are represented and their interests and issues are transmitted to the TPB policy board. Presuming a consensus is reached, changes would then be made in the TPB's processes and procedures. In particular, broadening the role of the regional bus subcommittee, established in 2007 to get more input on bus service issues and future bus networks, to also serve as a forum for rail and other transit needs and issues, will be recommended.

Ms. Massie noted that the interests of PRTC may vary from those of the elected officials of just one jurisdiction, as it operates across and has a board of multiple jurisdictions. PRTC would prefer having a state representative for transit to ensure their needs can be

addressed. Mr. Srikanth responded that the conversation is still in progress, and there will be opportunities beyond the TPB resolution on September 17 to determine what works best for everyone.

Ms. Hoeffner noted that VRE has very similar concerns, with multiple jurisdictions and indeed states in which they operate. She encouraged a cooperative discussion to address issues and to get a wider forum for transit issues and representation. Specifically, there are special transit needs and operational experience that should be considered in any discussion of transit issues. Mr. Srikanth responded that it is staff's intention to get this very type of comment, and move the conversation forward.

Mr. Malouff asked if there was a timeline or schedule for the cooperative discussion. Mr. Randall noted that this could take years, as MAP-21 rules are finalized and other changes take place, all of which must be considered in any changes to the TPB's processes and procedures. Mr. Srikanth noted that the MAP-21 performance rules still have two years to be implemented even after finalization, and that this will be the critical period in which transit agencies will need to have their interests represented.

Ms. Wesolek noted WMATA's concern with the two-hat rule whereby officials should not represent two agencies, and how it might affect TPB membership. Mr. Griffiths responded that the federal guidance is only that, not a requirement, and that many MPOs have concern with that section of the guidance.

It was also suggested that the private providers be included in future cooperative discussion on representation of transit issues.

4. Briefing on the Draft 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP

Mr. Austin spoke to the presentation on the CLRP and to the TIP documents that had been mailed out to committee members. He concluded the presentation noting that the draft 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP would be released for public comment on September 11th and that the TPB would be briefed at their meeting on September 17th. Approval was scheduled for October 15th.

Mr. Thomas suggested the financial analysis for the TIP showing funding in only the first year could be expanded to show more information on out years. Ms. Erickson echoed the comment suggesting showing the first and second years explicitly.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the numbers shown really just reflect a snapshot of this moment, and that they will continue to be updated through the amendment and modification process. He also reminded the committee how federal agencies use the TIP and, by extension, the STIP, primarily for funding in the first year (annual element), and

then in the second year, if necessary, and that the out years are primarily for information only.

Mr. Brown asked if there was a comprehensive list of all projects in the CLRP. He stated that a project's status of being "in the CLRP" was quite important to a number of processes. Mr. Srikanth suggested that that list would be comprised of all of the projects listed in the Air Quality Conformity Inputs for the 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP, as well as the projects listed in the TIP itself. Mr. Austin noted that the CLRP database should be able to provide a list of CLRP projects, following some data clean-up efforts by staff.

Mr. Brown also asked about projects in Virginia impacted by HB 2 and their status in the TIP. Mr. Srikanth stated that the MPO TIP reflects projects that have funding commitments from the agencies. He noted that if the funding status of a project is changed, it would be removed or adjusted via the amendment or modification process, once the agency is notified by the programming department.

Mr. Canizales echoed Mr. Brown's request for a list of CLRP projects. He also added that it would be helpful to see new regional funds broken out in the state/local funding portion of the analysis and perhaps highlight projects funded with those funds as a part of the presentation.

Mr. Srikanth noted that FY 2014 funds had been programmed for NVTVA, but those would be historical from the perspective of the FY 2015-2020 TIP, and might not show up in the analysis.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if it was possible to include any major bicycle/pedestrian projects in the CLRP project highlights.

Ms. Erickson responded that those projects are not on the same scale. Mr. Austin said those should be left to the briefing on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan update.

Ms. Wesolek asked for a deadline for inputs to update the TIP. Mr. Austin requested all inputs be completed by close of business on the following Monday.

Mr. Painter asked if the projects from Fauquier County had been included. Mr. Austin replied that they had not, and stated he would work with Mr. Painter and Mr. Whitaker to get those included if possible.

5. Briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP

Ms. Posey presented the findings of the 2014 CLRP air quality conformity analysis. The criteria pollutants analyzed were: Ozone season – comprising of VOC and NO_x, Fine Particles –comprising of PM_{2.5} Direct and Precursor NO_x -- and Wintertime CO.

Ms. Posey said that in terms of designation, the Metropolitan Washington DC (DC-MD-VA) currently is: (1) marginal non-attainment for Ozone season; (2) non-attainment for Fine Particles; and (3) in maintenance for Wintertime CO. While regional monitors have demonstrated that the region has attained the maintenance standard for Fine Particles, and a Fine Particles Maintenance Plan is currently in the final stages of review by EPA, the designation of the region in terms of Fine Particles remains non-attainment until the Maintenance Plan is approved by EPA. For conformity determinations purposes, however, EPA has issued an adequacy finding of the mobile budgets contained in the Fine Particles Maintenance Plan that is currently under final review. Therefore, the PM_{2.5} Direct and Precursor NO_x budgets of the Maintenance Plan currently apply and as such they were used for the current conformity determination.

Ms. Posey reviewed the key technical inputs of the analysis including: (1) New population/employment/household projections (i.e., Round 8.3 Cooperative Forecasts); (2) New project submissions; (3) New regional travel demand model (i.e., Version 2.3.57), which is an operational upgrade of the previous year's model; (3) The same vehicle population database (i.e., the 2011 VIN database) in conjunction with an updated methodology for deriving future year vehicle population projections; and (4) The same mobile emissions estimating model (i.e., MOVES2010a).

Ms. Posey subsequently reviewed a series of charts graphically illustrating the mobile emissions inventories relatively to their respective budgets, and she emphasized that all mobile emissions inventories are below the applicable mobile budgets. She also reminded the committee members of the existence of two tiers of mobile budgets for Fine Particles, and she clarified that only Tier 1 mobile budgets currently apply. She concluded the presentation with emissions reductions attributable to Transportation Emissions Reduction Measures (TERMs), which were analyzed as part of the current conformity cycle although TERMS credits were not necessary to meet conformity at present time.

Ms. Erickson suggested removing the Tier 2 mobile budgets references from the pertinent charts for more clarity. Mr. Srikanth added that the removal of the Tier 2

references in the charts will also be discussed with the members of the MWAQC TAC, and Mr. Griffiths suggested adding a footnote reference to Tier 2 budgets.

Ms. Erickson suggested including reference to the existence of Tier 2 mobile budgets in the technical documentation of the air quality conformity instead of the charts. Mr. Kumar added that input from the MWAQC TAC membership should be sought, as there was a contentious debate about the development of the two tier-system of fine particles mobile budgets.

Ms. Constantine reviewed an updated methodology for deriving future year vehicle population projections. As a contextual background, she explained that vehicle population projections for the analysis years of conformity play a more pivotal role when using MOVES as the emissions estimating model comparatively to past years when Mobile6.2 was the emissions estimating model of choice. This is because MOVES bases Start Emissions – emissions generated when a vehicle starts, and a significant portion of the total emissions by pollutant – on the vehicle population projections. Mobile6.2 used to base the Start Emissions on vehicle trips projections derived from the regional travel demand model, thus vehicle population projections did not play such a pivotal role in the total mobile emissions inventories.

Ms. Constantine explained the updated methodology is based on the same statistical concept as the original one – a “best fitting” linear regression line among scattered data points (i.e., historic data points). The updated approach, however, utilizes a much larger sample of data (i.e., spanning the 1975 - 2011 period) than the original one (i.e., spanning the 1975 - 1989 time period), and it includes much more recent data than the original one. In addition, the updated approach derives future year vehicle population projections directly from the “best-fitting” linear regression line (i.e., the linear regression line equation) for each jurisdiction instead of a fixed annual growth rate as was the case in the original approach. Since there is a nine-year gap in the databases (i.e., 1990- 1999), various combinations of data points were tested for statistical significance, before concluding that utilizing the entire sample of available data points (i.e., spanning the 1975- 2011 time period despite the 1990-1999 data gap) was statistically preferable to using a smaller data point sample size. The only exception was the District of Columbia where using 1999 - 2011 data points yielded a “better fitting” linear regression line.

She said that the updated approach at a regional level has its advantages over the previous approach: (1) uses a statistical method and a larger set of data points; (2) the

linear regression line and equation by jurisdiction are systematically refreshed – as new data become available every three years -- thus resulting in continuously updated future year vehicle population projections.

Ms. Constantine subsequently reviewed a series of charts graphically illustrating the “best fitting” regression lines and resulting equations by jurisdiction, which were included in a technical memorandum that supplemented the presentation. She concluded the introduction of the updated methodology with a comparative analysis between the original and the updated approaches assessing: (1) criteria pollutant emissions inventories yielding from the two approaches; and (2) vehicle population projections for the 2014 CLRP air quality conformity analysis years yielding from the two approaches. The comparative analysis concluded that the differences in mobile emissions inventories and vehicle population projections were marginal and statistically insignificant.

Mr. Malouff asked why the results of the previous methodology in vehicle population comparison table are not consistent with the trend line in the charts.

Mr. Srikanth answered that the previous results are based on a fixed growth rate rather than the regression trend line of old historical points. Ms. Constantine further contributed to the clarification by adding that the resulting “best fit” regression lines for the City of Alexandria and Arlington County yielded lower R^2 coefficients than other jurisdictions, an indication of a possible data inconsistency over time. The observation was attributed to vehicle registration data from Reagan National Airport, which may have been accounted in one or the other jurisdiction over the time period that was analyzed.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if all historical points are used for the District of Columbia in the new methodology.

Mr. Srikanth clarified that in this case only data from the 1999 - 2011 period was used (a detail that did not become obvious during the presentation of the updated methodology).

6. Briefing on the Draft Financial Analysis for the 2014 CLRP

Mr. Randall presented a briefing to the committee on the draft financial analysis for the 2014 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP), updating his presentation from June 27, which had only modest changes including a slight increase in available revenues due to

additional information from the Maryland jurisdictions. He once again reviewed the financial plan requirement, the methodology for conducting the financial analysis, and key assumptions for the 2014 update including for Metro. Pie charts for the draft revenues and expenditures were then presented, as well as a comparison of the 2014 and 2010 results. The briefing ended with next steps, with the draft financial plan and related documents to be released publicly in September and briefed to the board, with board approval in October.

Ms. Erickson noted that the initial inputs for the financial analysis were developed a year ago, and thanked staff for their work in getting the analysis completed.

Mr. Srikanth also thanked staff and asked committee members to brief their board members on the analysis. He emphasized the new revenues in Maryland and Virginia, including funding for the NVTVA. Otherwise, the full commitment to funding WMATA's operations and state of good repair needs is a significant step forward for the region, and was not previously the case as per the 2010 analysis. Again, he emphasized the tremendous contribution of all the jurisdictional staff in producing the necessary estimates and projections.

7. Briefing on a Performance Analysis of the Draft 2014 CLRP

Mr. Sonenklar gave a presentation on the performance analysis of the 2014 CLRP and used a power point presentation to highlight the data in graphics and maps. He gave an overview about what was included in the plan, then went through a series of 25 slides that contained information on the following: expected population and job growth region-wide and in regional activity centers, mode share and growth in trips for all daily trips, mode share and growth in trips for commute trips, expected changes in transit and roadway congestion, forecast changes in accessibility to jobs throughout the region, and forecast levels of pollutants and carbon emissions.

Ms. Erickson pointed out that given the limited time to work through the details of this presentation in the upcoming TPB meeting, committee members should take the information and work with their respective board members to make sure they understand some of the major findings of this analysis. Mr. Srikanth followed, saying that we plan on speaking with the TPB Steering Committee to approve a work session to be held before the September TPB meeting that would give some extra, dedicated time to exploring the performance analysis.

Mr. Brown asked if the network that is used to analyze the performance of the plan uses networks that reflect when CLRP projects are slated to be built. Mr. Sonenklar responded that yes, the analysis is based on changing transportation networks that reflect the CLRP.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if it is possible to show forecast congestion levels inside vs. outside activity centers. Mr. Griffiths responded that since the Activity Centers are so small

analysis of congestions information on roadways inside of these areas is unfortunately not possible at this level.

Ms. Wesolek stated that it would be very helpful to have this document electronically in order to share it with others. Mr. Srikanth responded that it will be posted after the meeting. He also noted that the analysis was done way ahead of normal timing, and acknowledged the staff effort put into expediting the process.

Mr. Malouff offered complements to staff, saying that graphics in the presentation were compelling and tell a very clear story. He then asked if TPB staff can create dot density population projection from 10 to 15 years ago in order to show how our forecasts have changed over the years. Mr. Sonenklar responded that we could likely do this, but not in time for the TPB meeting.

Ms. Massie commented that the presentation should have a slide that defines the regional core, inner, and outer jurisdictions. She followed by asking Mr. Srikanth if we moving toward a process with a feedback loop by presenting these documents ahead of time in anticipation of approving the CLRP.

Mr. Srikanth confirmed that yes, we are moving toward such a process.

8. Briefing on the Draft Assessment of the 2014 CLRP and the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)

Mr. Swanson passed out a draft of the Priorities Plan Assessment of the 2014 CLRP. He said an initial version of this document had been presented to the TPB in April. He briefed the committee on the draft assessment.

Mr. Srikanth said that staff was preliminarily planning outreach to inform the TPB members about the Priorities Plan.

Mr. Mokhtari observed that the “take-aways” section of the draft did not include a comment about the transportation implications of regional economic disparities. He said that point should be added.

Mr. Srikanth said that Priority 2 calls for increased public confidence and fairness. He noted that the TPB process includes a number of activities designed to improve accountability and increase confidence, but he said that much of the work in this regard actually occurs at the state and local levels.

Mr. Mokhtari said that in addition to the topics Mr. Srikanth described, Priority 2 also incorporates the issue of economic disparities. He noted that auto accessibility to jobs

from the eastern side of the region is forecast to decrease. He reiterated that the “take-aways” section should address this point.

Mr. Weissberg supported Mr. Mokhtari’s point. He said that addressing the east-west economic divide can provide opportunities for the region to decrease road congestion and take better advantage of the existing transit system.

Ms. Erickson noted that transportation enhancements alone will not address the effects economic disparities.

Mr. Weissberg said that is true, but he was simply saying that the transportation side of this problem should not be forgotten.

9. Briefing on the Draft Update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region

Mr. Farrell announced that the regional bicycle and pedestrian plan was being updated, something which is done every four years. He said that the Subcommittee reviewed the draft plan in July, and requested some changes, particularly to the project database, for which not all the projects had been entered. The members have provided comments, and the Subcommittee will review the full draft plan on September 16th. He said the plan is scheduled to go to the TPB as an information item in October, and as an action item in November.

10. Update on the Development of MAP-21 Performance Measures

Mr. Randall provided a short update on MAP-21 rulemaking to the committee. He noted that the comments due date for the proposed Statewide and Metropolitan planning rule has been extended by one month, from September 2 to October 2. TPB staff does not expect to submit any comments. Other proposed rules have yet to be published, with the next expected towards the end of October.

There were no questions from the committee.

11. Other Business

None

12. Adjourn

