TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes
for meeting of

May 3, 2013

TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - May 3, 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.	Gary Erenrich
Prince George's Co.	Kevin Thornton
Rockville	-------
M-NCPPC	
Montgomery Co.	-------
Prince George's Co.	-------
MDOT	Lyn Erickson
	John Thomas
	Vaughn Lewis
MTA	-------
Takoma Park	-------

VIRGINIA

Alexandria	Pierre Holloman
Arlington Co.	Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax	Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co.	Mike Lake
Falls Church	-------
Loudoun Co.	Robert Brown
Manassas	-------
Prince William Co.	Monica Backmon
NVTC	Claire Gron
PRTC	Nick Alexandrow
VRE	Christine Hoeffner
VDOT	Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT	Amy Inman
NVPDC	-------
VDOA	-------

WMATA

WMATA	Danielle Wesolek

FEDERAL/OTHER

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

COG Staff

Ron Kirby, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Dan Sonenklar, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
William Bacon, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Karin Foster, DTP
Joan Rohlfs, DEP

Other Attendees

Bill Orleans, HACK
Randy Carroll, MDE
Eulois Cleckley, DDOT

1.   **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from April 5 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

2.   **Briefing on the April 8 Workshop on Green Streets in the Washington Region**

Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint on the April 8th Green Streets workshop.

Chair Erikson said that page 45 of the PowerPoint lists jurisdictions and Green Streets policies.   She asked that since each Maryland jurisdiction is required to adopt stormwater runoff standards from the State Stormwater Act, how is that reflected in this slide?   Does it make sense to take the time to adopt a policy if the jurisdictions already have to follow the law?

Mr. Farrell replied that this was similar to the situation with Complete Streets, in that many agencies and jurisdictions already had policies in place.   The applicability of a regional Green Streets policy to Maryland might be limited.   However, Prince George's County felt it was worthwhile to develop and adopt its own Green Streets policy.   The idea was to make it clear that all the agencies and departments in the jurisdiction have to work together on the problem.

To some extent a regional policy would be duplicative.   But there are different ways of approaching stormwater runoff requirements, and a regional policy might encourage agencies to look at "green" approaches, rather than some of the more highly engineered solutions that don't generate the secondary benefits that can be had from Green Streets.   It is to be expected that different jurisdictions and agencies will have different levels of interest in Green Streets, depending on their own circumstances and needs.   Philadelphia has an interest in reducing urban heat because they have limited tree canopy, high summer temperatures, and many people without air conditioning to whom high temperatures are life-threatening. Philadelphia expects that its Green Streets policy will save one to two lives per year.

Mr. Erenrich said that the Montgomery Count master plan has specific design guidelines with respect to stormwater management. Montgomery's policy is part of its master plan.

Mr. Srikanth said that he hoped that one of the lessons learned is that the DOT's and jurisdictions already have stormwater management policies, even if they don't call

them Green Streets policies, and have been doing for the past couple of decades. That should be acknowledged. It's a big cost factor with development, and some developments do not go forward because of it. The table on slide 45 which shows certain jurisdictions not doing anything could be misconstrued.

Mr. Kirby said that some people on the environmental side think that we are not doing enough. At a minimum there needs to be some education on what is being done, and some discussion of the trade-offs.

Green Streets is on the Board Agenda. In response to the request in December, we've gathered information on what is being done. The question is what the TPB should do. Should there be a regional policy? Maybe the first thing that should be done is education on what is being done now.

Mr. Erenrich agreed. We likely won't present the survey. Mr. Malouff said that the presentation was good for the Technical Committee but too long for the TPB. It needs to be shortened significantly. Mr. Farrell agreed, though he pointed out he had 30 minutes on the Tech agenda. For the TPB it should be about 1/3 as long.

Mr. Kirby asked what we should tell the TPB. Mr. Erenrich said that we should tell the TPB that we are following good storm-water practices in all of our activities, and spending a lot of money on it. Ms. Inman said that her agency's design guidelines incorporated the green element to address storm-water management. Mr. Emerine said that the trade-offs issue should be emphasized, as well as integration with Complete Streets. To the extent that there would be a benefit to a regional policy, it would be to emphasize the inter-agency and inter-stakeholder benefits and responsibilities, to realize the best and most cost-effective solutions. Mr. Kirby said that we should discuss integration across sectors and partnerships, including partnerships with developers. Education could make people aware of the benefits and opportunities.

Chair Erikson asked whether we would pursue a regional policy now, or education? Mr. Kirby suggested that we pursue education for now. We don't have to decide right now whether we need a policy. We should present this information to the Board and hear what they have to say.

3. **Briefing on Changes in Regional Commuter Patterns since 2007**

Mr. Griffiths gave a PowerPoint presentation on changes in regional commuting patterns between 2000 and 2011. He stated that (1) the number of long distance in-commuters to jobs in the region increased by 40% between 2000 and 2007, but had remained constant since then, (2) the share of workers driving alone to work in

single occupant vehicles had declined slightly, but steadily since 2000, while the share of workers commuting by carpooling had declined significantly, (3) the transit mode share increased in every jurisdiction from 2000 to 2011 and increased regionally by 30%, (4) the bike mode share increased in DC, Arlington, Alexandria and Montgomery County since 2000, and (5) the percent of workers working from home increased in all jurisdictions between 2000 and 2011 and most significantly in Loudoun County.

Ms. Backmon asked if the large increase in the number of DC workers who bike to work was because of the Capital Bike Share program.

Mr. Griffiths responded that it played some part, but in his view this large increase in the DC bike to work mode share was primarily because of the large increase in the number of 20 to 35 year workers choosing to live in DC and the significant expansion of bike lanes in the District that makes biking to work an attractive option for these workers.

Mr. Holloman noted the large increase in the number of Alexandria workers working from home between 2007 and 2011 and pointed out that about 50% of the workers at the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) in Alexandria primarily telecommuted on a daily basis.

Mr. Erenrich questioned this connection because Mr. Griffiths' presentation was on commuting patterns by jurisdiction of residence, not by jurisdiction of work.

Mr. Griffiths agreed that the commuting data shown was by place of residence and not place of work. He added that some of the large increase shown for Alexandrians working from home could be attributed to sampling error because the commuting data for Alexandria was from a relatively small household sample.

Mr. Kirby suggested that Mr. Griffiths should note the potential for sampling error in some of the commuting data when he gave his presentation to the TPB.

4. Update on the Development of the TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)

Mr. Kirby gave a presentation updating the Technical Committee on the progress that has been made in developing the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). The presentation focused on the activities that have been conducted since the second interim report presented to the TPB on July 18, 2012.

Mr. Kirby gave a detailed overview of a web-based survey that is currently being conducted with a representative sample of 600 individuals throughout the region. This survey is being completed to learn which challenges are most significant in people's minds, and which strategies members of the public think will best address the region's challenges. The survey was designed by a company called MetroQuest, a public engagement firm that has worked with numerous other MPOs and public agencies to solicit input on planning related projects. MetroQuest and their propriety software was chosen because it communicates a large amount of information in an attractive and engaging way, and allows for participants to submit input in a number of ways including rankings, open ended comments, and opportunities to suggest new ideas.

Mr. Kirby explained how the survey appears to participants and highlighted the updated content that is used to describe the region's transportation goals, challenges to achieving those goals, and strategies that can be pursued to address the challenges. He also highlighted the questions that are posed to the participants throughout the survey.

Mr. Kirby concluded the presentation with a discussion of 'next steps', and what to expect over the next few months:

- On June 19, 2013 a draft outline will be presented to the TPB;
- On July 17, 2013 a draft plan will be presented to TPB and a work session will be held prior to the TPB meeting;
- Between July and August 2013 the draft will be available for public comment and COG/TPB citizens committees, community groups, and advocacy organizations will be engaged for comments and suggestions;
- On September 18, 2013 a final draft of the RTPP will be presented to the TPB

Mr. Thomas asked if the results of the survey would be able to be summarized by location in order to see how the opinions of those who live in different parts of the region differ. Mr. Kirby responded that the sample size only allows us to summarize the results at the regional level, and that the responses would not be summarized by location.

Mr. Srikanth said that from where we started a year ago, a lot of work has been done to develop this plan. He expressed his appreciation for the fact that the plan will be identifying regional priority strategies and not specific projects. He also said that the near vs. long term classification of strategies helps bring some discipline on where to go from here.

Ms. Wesolek asked about how long term strategy B was developed, specifically she was curious if the aspirations scenario sensitivity test B also included expanded transit elements. Mr. Kirby answered that long term strategy B was based on the sensitivity test B that was run for the aspirations scenario and does include transit capacity improvements.

Mr. Emerine stated that it would be helpful to know more details about what is going into the scenario packages in order to understand them better. Mr. Kirby replied that the scenarios are based on the aspirations scenario and sensitivity tests, and other variations are possible to test other long term strategies. Mr. Emerine also commented that the benefit of "new road capacity" that is shown as an outcome of the long term strategies in not necessarily a positive result to many people.

5.   **Update on a Survey on Traffic Signal Optimization in the Washington Region**

Mr. Meese presented, referring to handout memorandum. At the February 20, 2013 meeting, the Transportation Planning Board requested a status report on traffic signal timing/optimization in the region, as well as a review of the TPB's discussions of the topic in conjunction with a 2002-2005 Transportation Emissions Reduction Measure (TERM) addressing optimization (as well as subsequent data updates). The Traffic Signals Subcommittee convened and discussed the request at March 5 and April 2 meetings. The discussions included the history of the signal timing topic as a TERM, and advice on how best to compile information and reflect evolution in engineering practice since the set-up of the 2002 TERM, particularly the movement to active management of signals rather than solely periodic retiming.

Based on the Traffic Signals Subcommittee discussions, TPB staff designed a survey to compile regional signal timing information. The survey was distributed to the region's signal agencies on April 17 and 18, with results requested by May 1. As of this presentation, most of the region's major signals agencies have responded to the survey; staff was following up with those agencies that had not yet responded. Staff was in the process of analyzing survey results, and may follow up with agencies on a case-by-case basis if there are further questions about a given agency's responses.

Staff was to present and review the draft survey findings at the next Traffic Signals Subcommittee meeting, scheduled for May 14, as well as briefly at the Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Technical Subcommittee meeting that same day. It was anticipated that the draft survey results will be presented to the TPB Technical Committee at the June 7 meeting, and, if agreed, to the TPB at the June 19 meeting. It was also being explored to have one or two representatives from the Traffic Signals Subcommittee present examples of their

agency signal timing activities along with the presentation of survey results at the TPB briefing, to help illustrate the breadth of these activities.

6. **Briefing on the Update of the Virginia Statewide Functional Classification System**

Mr. Srikanth gave a comprehensive PowerPoint presentation on the statewide VDOT update of its road and highway functional classification system last updated in 2005. He explained what functional classification is and how it is used. He reviewed the purpose of the update and the new federal guidelines and criteria. He explained that MAP-21 required the expansion of the NHS and that VDOT has a conditionally approved expanded NHS pending the functional classification update and stakeholder consultation. He concluded by showing a new web GIS tool which enables users to review all of the proposed functional classification changes. He said that the TPB will be asked to approve the functional classification in Northern Virginia in July prior to VDOT submittal of the final functional classification inventory to FHWA.

Mr. Verzosa asked how the update would affect VDOT funding for roads in a locality. Mr. Srikanth said that it depends on what changes occur in the functional classification and that funding could increase or decrease.

Mr. Erenrich commented that there are no multi-modal criteria in this road classification. Mr. Srikanth replied that it is based upon federal guidelines and design standards.

Ms. Inman said that DRPT is working with VDOT and localities and has developed guidelines for multi-modal corridors and centers that could affect roadway design. She offered to give a presentation on the new guidelines. Mr. Emerine supported having a presentation.

Mr. Kirby asked what Maryland and the District are doing regarding functional classification.

Mr. Lewis said that SHA has a different approach and is currently working with localities to adjust the urbanized boundaries to reflect the 2010 Census. The Steering Committee will be asked to approve these boundary adjustments today. SHA this summer will start on updating the functional classification system which may take two years statewide.

Mr. Rawlings said that DDOT did an update of its system last year.

7. Update on the Status of the 2013 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP Inputs and Forms

Mr. Austin stated that final documentation for any CLRP projects, including CMS Documentation Forms and TIP forms for new Conformity-related projects were due that day. He noted that most agencies had already submitted any necessary documents. He said the draft projects would be released for public comment along with the Air Quality Conformity Assessment on June 13th and that the TPB would be asked to approve them at their meeting on July 17th.

Mr. Miller asked if VDOT would make a selection on the alternatives proposed for the Western Access Improvements to Dulles Airport prior to releasing the information for public comment. Mr. Srikanth responded that he was unsure if VDOT would have made a decision by that time.

Chair Erickson and Mr. Srikanth both noted that MDOT and VDOT were beginning preparations to update their respective portions of the FY 2013-2018 TIP and to release that for public comment in June, with approval slated for July. Ms. Wesolek indicated that WMATA's TIP update would not occur in the May/June time frame, but possibly in the June/July time frame along with MDOT and VDOT.

8. Briefing on the New Commercial Curbside Loading Zone Program in the District of Columbia

Mr. Cleckley spoke to a PowerPoint titled "Commercial Curbside Loading Zone Program." Following City Council Bill 18-153 to establish a curbside loading zone program, DDOT has been studying how to implement such a program. DDOT has studied curbside use and conducted a survey of shippers/carriers on their use as part of an effort to create a sustainable urban freight system.

Survey results found most deliveries occur between 6am and 6pm, with the 10am to 2pm window representing the most deliveries. Survey results also revealed that the permit and pay-by-phone options ranked as the most favorable among shippers for a new program. The Commercial Loading Zone Program goals are to: 1) Maximize use of curbside space; 2) Generate real-time occupancy data; 3) Provide real-time traveler information; 4) Improve traffic flow; and 5) Provide freight efficiency. The Program's approach will standardize loading zones for consistency, establish a method of payment, ensure proper enforcement, and provide the ability to track performance. Fines also have been increased to ensure greater enforcement that the loading zone space if used only for loading.

In summary, the District anticipates the program will increase the use of commercial curbside space and decrease congestion.

In response to a question from Mr. Holloman about real-time information, Mr. Cleckley responded that the information provided from the program is not real-time; however, DDOT was awarded a FHWA grant to explore dynamic parking pricing sensors and would provide real-time information.

9. **Update on the New TPB Website "Transportation Planning Information Hub for the National Capital Region"**

Mr. Swanson briefed the Committee on the draft website called the "Transportation Planning Information Hub for the National Capital Region," which will be a clearinghouse on the region's transportation planning activities. He reminded the Committee that the origin of the website was an event in May 2010 called "The Conversation" in which numerous stakeholders recommended that the TPB develop a new tool for explaining the regional transportation planning process to the public. He gave Committee members a brief tour of the site, including its three main sections: Planning Process; High-Profile Projects; and Documents and Resources. He said he was asking Tech Committee members to review the content for accuracy. He said that staff planned to launch the site in May.

Mr. Kirby asked how the site would be updated.

Mr. Swanson said that preliminarily staff had planned to update it on a quarterly basis. He also noted that many links on the site were funneled through one common webpage, which would mean that updates could be made once in such cases.

Chair Erickson noted that a new website for Region Forward also would require regular updating from jurisdiction staff. She suggested that TPB staff might want to coordinate with COG staff to determine how such an updating process might be made easier.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that staff might consider including a "Frequently Asked Questions" section and a user guide.

Mr. Kirby said the Hub presentation should be given to the Citizens Advisory Committee.

Mr. Brown emphasized that the content on the site still needs to be reviewed by the jurisdiction staff, so if the site is presented to the CAC, staff should emphasize to Committee members that the link should not be shared with outsiders.

10.   Other Business

None.

11.   Adjourn