

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Minutes
for meeting of
November 2, 2012

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - November 2, 2012**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
 Anthony Foster

DCOP -----

MARYLAND

Charles County -----

Frederick Co. Ron Burns

City of Frederick -----

Gaithersburg -----

Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich

Prince George's Co. Abul Hassan

Rockville -----

M-NCPPC

 Montgomery Co. -----

 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari

MDOT Lyn Erickson

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

 Tim Roseboon

NVPDC -----

VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Mark Kellogg
 Tom Harrington

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----

FHWA-VA -----

FTA Melissa Barlow

NCPC -----

NPS -----

MWAQC -----

COG Staff

Ron Kirby, DTP

Gerald Miller, DTP

Elena Constantine, DTP

Andrew Austin, DTP

Dan Sonenklar, DTP

Mark Pfoutz, DTP

Robert Griffiths, DTP

Rich Roisman, DTP

Jane Posey, DTP

Andrew Meese, DTP

John Swanson, DTP

Wendy Klancher, DTP

Eric Randall, DTP

Jinchul Park, DTP

Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP

Jonathan Rogers, DTP

Sarah Crawford, DTP

Ben Hampton, DTP

Wenjing Pu, DTP

Dusan Vuksan, DTP

Joan Rohlfs, DEP

Sunil Kumar, DEP

Paul DesJardin, DCPS

Other Attendees

Moji Jimeh, WMATA

Randy Carroll, MDE

Bill Orleans, HACK

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

November 2, 2012

Technical Committee Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the October 5 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on an Additional Air Quality Conformity Analysis to Respond to the EPA Redesignation of the Washington Region under the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)

Ms. Posey reviewed the summary conformity report for the air quality conformity update for the 2012 CLRP and FY2013-2018 TIP. She reminded the group that the region was designated as marginal non-attainment for EPA's 2008 Ozone NAAQS, and that all non-attainment areas are required to run a conformity analysis within a year of the final designations. She noted that since there are no changes to the 2012 CLRP inputs, that it was only necessary to complete an analysis of the 2015 attainment year for the conformity analysis. Ms. Posey pointed out that the summary conformity report is very similar to that completed for the original conformity analysis of the 2012 CLRP, except for the addition of data associated with the 2015 analysis year. She noted that for the ozone season bar charts (exhibits 6 & 7) that the benefits from TCMs were removed from the emission totals. She stated that the full report would be available at the beginning of the public comment period on November 15, and that the TPB would be asked to approve the conformity analysis in December.

Ms. Erickson asked if having no TERMS or TCMs in the emission totals was a change. Ms. Posey responded that TERMS have not been included in the totals for a number of years, but that TCMs were just removed. Mr. Kirby noted that the TERMS and TCMs need to be reviewed since some are out-dated. Credit may only be taken for projects with benefits after the 2007/2008 survey for the calibration year of the Version 2.3 demand model. He also noted that projects need to be reanalyzed using methodologies consistent with the MOVES emission model, instead of the Mobile model as was done in the past. He said that the updated list of TERMS would be shorter than in the past. Ms. Constantine stated that staff will be contacting agencies in the next month to seek people to review TERMS. Ms. Erickson said that we have been reviewing TERMS every year and asked what is different now. Mr. Kirby responded that outdated projects need to be moved to the baseline. Ms. Erickson asked if staff was going to make a "first cut" list. Mr. Kirby responded yes. Ms. Posey added that all creditable projects had not been listed in recent years because the TERMS have not been needed to meet conformity requirements. Mr. Kirby said that staff would prepare a memo, and that the item should be discussed at Tech Committee next month. Ms. Constantine said the projects would be listed in broad cut categories.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the emission results had been reviewed, as the emissions totals do not indicate a straight line between 2015, 2017, and 2020. Mr. Kirby responded that the changes are mostly due to fleet turnover, the (currently creditable) benefits of which are decreasing thru time. Ms. Posey noted that the emission rate bar charts on page 10 give a graphical representation of this.

Mr. Verzosa asked if Exhibits 8 & 9 (the PM emissions bar charts) will have a new budget line. Ms. Posey responded that we will continue to show reductions from the 2002 base until EPA approves PM mobile budgets—probably those scheduled to be submitted by MWAQC for the PM maintenance plan. We will use the mobile budgets for the 2013 CLRP if those budgets are approved before the TPB approves the 2013 CLRP.

3. Briefing on the Draft 2012 CLRP Brochure

Mr. Austin distributed copies of the draft 2012 CLRP summary brochure, designed to accompany the full documentation on the CLRP web site. He noted that the document would be a little less comprehensive than the 2010 CLRP report which was done to document the four-year update.

Mr. Austin covered an outline of the brochure's content: development of the CLRP, TPB planning activities, new projects and significant changes, major highway, transit and HOV/HOT projects, and a financial analysis. He requested that agencies review the major project maps in particular.

Mr. Sonenklar spoke to the performance analysis portion of the CLRP brochure and used a presentation to highlight the data graphics and maps. He explained that this analysis used the new 2.3 travel demand model which is validated to the '07-'08 Household Travel Survey and uses a finer-grained geography with 3,722 travel analysis zones (TAZs) instead of the 2,191 TAZs used in previous models. He also noted that this new model allowed for some new measures including mode share projections. Mr. Sonenklar added that all data shown in this performance analysis was for the TPB Planning Area whereas previous analyses had used the Metropolitan Statistical Area. Ms. Backmon asked if this included areas in FAMPO's jurisdiction. The answer was that, while these people and others outside the region are factored into the model, the numbers reported here only reflect the TPB member jurisdictions.

Mr. Sonenklar stated that the CLRP assumes a 24% increase in population between 2013 and 2040, or approximately 1.3 million people. Mr. Erenrich expressed curiosity about the population projections that Metro is using which are closer to 2 million new people in the region. Mr. Sonenklar said that employment was expected to grow by about 37% through 2040. He noted that the population growth will be more dispersed in 2040, while jobs will continue to be concentrated on the western side of the region.

Mr. Sonenklar covered travel demand data that showed a 78% increase in lane-miles of congestion, and mode share projections that remain relatively unchanged between 2013 and 2014. Ms. Backmon asked if the model accounts for hybrid SOV drivers in the HOV lanes. Mr. Sonenklar responded that the carpooling mode share figures expressly represented cars with more than one person riding in them. Mr. Foster asked why there is no growth in transit commute mode share between 2013 and 2040. Mr. Sonenklar answered that it was partially due to the transit constraint imposed on Metro, but he added that that is still 24% of a population that has grown by 1.3 million people, so transit is at least keeping pace with population growth. Mr. Kellogg added that when Metro, which carries 70% of the region's transit riders, reaches full capacity it will be up to the providers that cover the remaining 30% to keep up with growth.

With existing transit constraints, Mr. Sonenklar noted that four of the five Metrorail lines will be either congested or highly congested by 2040. Mr. Kirby emphasized that the 3rd column in the Metrorail congestion chart indicates that if full funding were available for 100% 8-car trains, that much of the worst congestion could be mitigated.

Looking at the highway congestion maps, Mr. Sonenklar stated that severe congestion and stop-and-go conditions are expected to grow throughout the region's highways. Though he did note that some relief was expected along the Capital Beltway in Virginia due to the new HOT lanes. Mr. Erenrich noted that the brochure was lacking a legend for these maps. Ms. Erickson asked why the morning rush hour was being depicted as opposed to the evening rush hour which is usually worse. Mr. Kirby noted that the morning rush hour is a sharper and more easily defined period and is more reflective of a commuting period, whereas the evening rush hour has spread out and contains significantly more non-work trips.

Mr. Sonenklar spoke to the Accessibility to Jobs slides. He noted that the average number of jobs accessible within 45 minutes by auto is expected to decrease by 2040 with the biggest reduction on the eastern side of the region. He stated that this was due to increases in system-wide congestion and to the continued concentration of jobs on the west side of the region. Mr. Erenrich asked why the 300,000 range was used for the distribution of accessibility. Mr. Sonenklar said that figure was roughly 20% of the growth in jobs throughout the region and results in a relatively even distribution. Mr. Erenrich observed that the resulting change in accessibility was due to a combination of land use and transportation. Mr. Sonenklar noted that the average number of jobs accessible via transit will grow, but that the overall number is still significantly less than the number of jobs accessible by auto.

The air quality charts showed reductions in all three pollutant measures; NO_x, VOCs and PM_{2.5} Direct and Precursor NO_x emissions between now and 2030, with a very slight increase between 2030 and 2040. Mr. Sonenklar noted that even with that increase in the out year, the region is still projected to be well within the established budgets for mobile emissions. He said that CO₂ emissions are not projected to meet regional goals

set by COG and that emissions are currently projected to grow slightly between 2013 and 2040. However, he also noted that the current model does not account for recent fuel economy standards that have been set by the federal government. He said these standards should be incorporated into the next version of the model and that a general reduction in CO2 emissions is expected at that time.

Ms. Erickson asked if it was likely that these performance measures could be used to meet new requirements laid out in MAP-21. Mr. Kirby said that we should be able to use a lot of what we're already doing, saying that this will be discussed further under a later item in the agenda.

Ms. Backmon suggested including the increase in the number of TAZs used in the modeling process in the text of the brochure.

Mr. Erenrich wondered if the accessibility by transit map was misleading if the model used scheduled bus speeds rather than actual bus speeds. Mr. Vuksan replied that the model includes a speed degradation factor for buses based on congestion levels. Mr. Erenrich suggested that the data in the accessibility maps should be shared with the Region Forward committees.

Mr. Austin thanked Mr. Vuksan and Ms. Posey for their contributions to the modeling for the performance analysis. He added that the final page discussed the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan and the 2014 CLRP. The draft brochure would be presented to the TPB as an information item later this month. Mr. Austin asked for any comments on the brochure by Friday, November 9.

4. Briefing on the New Transportation Alternatives Program under MAP-21

Referring to a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Swanson briefed the Committee on the new Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), which is a formula program established under the new federal reauthorization bill known as MAP-21. He said the program consolidated three programs – the Transportation Enhancements (TE) Program, Safe Routes to Schools, and Recreational Trails – that have funded small capital projects, such as pedestrian and bicycle improvements. He said that legislative language from MAP-21 states that Metropolitan Planning Organizations with an urbanized area with a population of more than 200,000 (such as the TPB), “shall select projects carried out within the boundaries of the applicable metropolitan planning area, in consultation with the relevant State.” He described a TPB staff proposal for implementing a project selection process in the National Capital Region using the funding sub-allocated to our region.

Ms. Erickson noted that the TAP is a construction program, not a planning program, which adds to the complexity of implementing it in our region.

Ms. Hoeffner noted that Transportation Enhancements funds have been used by VRE for security and safety improvements, and she hoped that such uses would continue.

Ms. Bachmon said that she understood that VDOT intended to use the program to fund the backlog of projects from the Transportation Enhancements Program. She said she also understood that the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority would be eligible to receive the sub-allocated funds.

Mr. Swanson said that TPB staff had been in touch with the Richmond office of VDOT. He said he understood that VDOT had different ideas for moving forward with the TPA, and these differences would need to be resolved.

Mr. Kirby stressed that the TAP is a new program with new rules and new funding that are different from the previous programs. He reiterated that the new law requires a new role for large MPOs. He said the challenges in our region are especially complex because of the three states. He emphasized that it would be important to discuss the details with VDOT staff.

Mr. Erenrich noted that Maryland had required a 50% local match for the Transportation Enhancements Program. He asked if the match requirement would be lowered to 20% for TAP.

Ms. Erickson said that preliminarily, she thought the Maryland match would likely be reduced to 20%. She spoke in support of the TPB staff proposal presented by Mr. Swanson, saying it was generally consistent with MDOT's proposed approach.

Mr. Brown noted that this program does not provide a lot of money and he said that staff should be careful not to underestimate the complexities of setting up a new program. He encouraged staff to make this process as simple as possible and not "reinvent the wheel." He suggested it might be best for the TPB to hire a consultant to manage it. He emphasized the importance of screening applications for eligibility.

Mr. Kirby agreed that it was important to keep the process as simple as possible. He emphasized the importance of using regional criteria.

Mr. Swanson said that the TPB staff would have to work closely with the state DOTs throughout the process, including the initial determination of project eligibility of the applications received.

Mr. Emerine asked if the TPB would be briefed in December.

Mr. Kirby said yes.

Mr. Mokhtari asked again if the match requirement for Maryland would be reduced.

Mr. Kirby said that TPB staff hoped the match requirement would be reduced to 20%.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the program could be linked to the TPB's Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) program.

Mr. Swanson said that Mr. Mokhtari's suggestion made sense.

Mr. Malouff noted the importance of using the TE funds for trails. He said the same types of projects would be funded under the new program. He also said that under the TE Program, states had trouble spending the funding fast enough. He said that states had the opportunity to shift TE funding into other categories.

Mr. Kirby said that some TAP funding could be shifted into other categories, but funds from other categories could also be shifted into the TAP.

5. Briefing on the New Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program under MAP-21

Ms. Klancher briefed the Committee on the New Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program under MAP-21 using a PowerPoint presentation. On October 10, 2012, FTA issued interim guidance on MAP-21 which states that the MPO should initiate discussions on the designated recipient for the new Section 5310 program. TPB staff is sponsoring on-going discussions with DDOT, MTA, DRPT, WMATA and the Chair of the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force, Mr. Wojahn, on this topic.

MAP-21 combined New Freedom and the old Section 5310 program into the new Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility program, and eliminated the JARC program. The New Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility program has an Large Urbanized Area apportionment, and the Washington DC-VA-MD.

Urbanized Area is expected to receive about \$2.6 million per year. MAP-21 requires 55% of the program be spent on purchasing wheelchair-accessible vehicles, (such as vans for non-profit agencies).

Given COG/TPB does not have the institutional capacity to administer large capital procurements under onerous Federal rules, the TPB staff is proposing a Joint Designated Recipient arrangement. The Joint Designated Recipient would be between the TPB, DDOT, MTA and DRPT: TPB would develop the required Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan and solicit and select projects for the new 5310 Enhanced Mobility program with input from DDOT, MTA, and DRPT. DDOT, MTA and DRPT would receive funds directly from FTA, and administer and oversee the projects in their jurisdictions.

Ms. Barlow asked how regional projects could be funded under this proposal. Ms. Klancher replied that regional projects could be funded through WMATA or if a DOT agreed to be the lead agency.

Mr. Verzosa asked how NVTC could apply for projects. Ms. Klancher stated that under the proposal, NVTC or an agency in Northern Virginia, would apply to the TPB for a project, the project would go through the TPB selection committee, and after consultation with DRPT, the project would be forwarded to the TPB for approval. After the State DOT consultation and TPB approval, the project would be implemented for a Northern Virginia agency by DRPT. DRPT would receive the funds directly from FTA.

Mr. Erenrich asked if non-profit agencies would apply directly through the MPO. Ms. Klancher replied that yes, non-profits in the Washington DC-VA-MD Urbanized Area would apply to the TPB under this proposal. Mr. Orleans asked what the timeframe was for making a decision on the designated recipient. Ms. Klancher said that she expected it would take a couple of months to decide on the Designated Recipient arrangement, and that the region has several years to spend the funds before it lapses. Mr. Orleans stated that there are six MPO's in Maryland and asked how funding will be determined for each urbanized area. Ms. Klancher stated that the funding is determined by formula. Ms. Erickson said that the proposal is for the Washington DC-VA-MD area, and that the TPB is proposing to do the selection process for the funding that is going directly to this specific urbanized area. Mr. Orleans suggested that the Joint Designated Recipient (DR) should be between TPB and WMATA. Ms. Klancher replied that WMATA can apply for the funds from the TPB if they are not a DR.

Ms. Barlow stated that consideration for how the projects would be included the TIP and STIPs should be addressed under a Joint DR arrangement.

6. Briefing on an Amendment to the FY 2013 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Revise the Budget and Work Elements

Mr. Miller referred the Committee to his memorandum on the proposed amendment. He explained that since the FY 2013 UPWP was approved in March, the funding allocations provided by DDOT, MDOT and VDOT have been revised to reflect changes in new FY 2013 funding and adjustments in the unobligated FY 2011 funding. The changes to the new FY 2013 funding totals provide a net decrease of \$547,641 while the changes to the unobligated FY 2011 funding totals provide a net increase of \$478,271. This results in the total budget decreasing by \$69,420.

Mr. Miller explained that the technical assistance funding level for each state is an agreed percentage of the total new FY 2013 funding provided through the respective state, and the technical assistance funding level for WMATA is an agreed percentage of the new FTA 2013 funding. He pointed out that the budgets for the technical assistance programs in the District and Maryland will decrease by \$68,982 and \$24,976 respectively, while the Virginia and WMATA programs will increase by \$20,021 and \$5,982 respectively. He then explained that because the total for all of the technical assistance programs decreases by \$67,955 the net total funding for the core work program will decrease by \$1,465. He said to account for this small core program budget

reduction of \$1,465, the budget for work activity 1.1 DTP Management will be reduced by \$1,465.

Mr. Kirby commented that since this a minor amendment to the UPWP the TPB will be asked to approve it at its meeting on November 28.

7. Briefing on MAP-21 Requirements for performance Based Planning and Programming

Mr. Kirby explained that MAP-21 calls for MPOs and DOTs to establish and use a performance-based approach to transportation decision making to support seven national goals. It calls for MPOs to establish performance targets and for USDOT to establish performance measures related to seven national goals for planning processes. He distributed 16-page copies of portions of the relevant text from the legislation and briefed the Committee on the specifics of the national goals, and how the performance-based approach using performance measures and targets will affect the MPO planning process, the TIP and the long range plan. He said that the focus is on safety and the condition and operations of the transportation system and away from long range investments. He also commented on the status of USDOT activities to establish measures.

Mr. Kirby said that after the USDOT sets a number of specified performance measures for the Interstate and National Highway Systems the states will have one year to establish performance targets.

Mr. Srikanth commented that USDOT had just conditionally approved VDOT's expanded NHS system designation and there will be more time for the state and MPO review and consultation.

Mr. Kirby concluded by reviewing the MPO requirements for including performance measures and targets in the update of the transportation plan.

8. Status Report on the TPB Website "Transportation Planning Information Hub for the National Capital Region"

Deferred to the December Meeting.

9. Briefing on WMATA Strategic Plan Update Momentum

Mr. Harrington gave a presentation on WMATA's development and public outreach for its strategic plan, which will also be presented by General Manager Sarles to the TPB in December. Momentum provides a mission, vision, and goals for WMATA. The WMATA Board also endorses COG's Region Forward plan as a framework for the development of

the region as a whole. Momentum ties together the strategic plan and the Regional Transit Systems Plan into one public outreach effort on WMATA's future. While much of WMATA's recent attention has been on achieving a state of good repair, Momentum will articulate the significant challenges WMATA faces and outline ways by which to address them, including needs not funded in the CLRP. He spoke to a range of short-term and long-term strategies, and to the use of MindMixer as a community engagement tool now in its second round of questions for the public. The first round of MindMixer was a positive conversation with stakeholders and the public, which showed a good understanding of the issues and challenges, but a less than full understanding of the responsibilities of WMATA versus state and local governments.

Mr. Kirby asked how far WMATA had gone in developing the costs and impacts of some of these unfunded strategies, such as pedestrian tunnels or all 8-car trains. Mr. Harrington responded that they have done some work over the past 10 years and are currently updating much of the calculations now. Some costs, such as increased capacity at Union Station, are well known with the project in the preliminary engineering phase. Other costs are less well defined, though all 8-car trains is in the region of \$1.5 billion. WMATA hopes to develop order of magnitude ranges for most potential projects shortly.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the WMATA Board is willing to tie the \$5 billion in unfunded needs to a priority list of projects. It would be important to list six to eight regional projects that would improve customer service and capacity. The bottom line is that WMATA's proposals need to be tied to the regional transportation priorities and Region Forward, including smaller projects with considerable benefits such as station capacity enhancements. He also mentioned concerns with the population and employment data being used by WMATA versus the TPB's CLRP figures presented earlier in the meeting.

Mr. Mokhtari asked about circumferential transit and what reception it received on MindMixer. While core capacity is the critical issue, moving circumferentially is important to many folks. Mr. Harrington responded that there was interest in both core capacity and circumferential transit, such as the Purple Line, and specifically there was interest in getting more information on the cost and benefits of each, figures for which are still in development.

Mr. Emerine asked if there was any discussion of user fees, fares, and parking costs. WMATA always has an operating budget shortfall, and the lack of financial stability impacts goals of ridership and general benefits. Mr. Harrington responded that it had only been touched on, but that the next round of outreach will include more finance questions. To date, most discussion has been on fare technology and ensuring it is regionally seamless and robust, rather than on fare pricing and its impacts.

10. Update on the Final 2012 Congestion Management Process (CMP) Technical Report

Mr. Meese reported. The 2012 CMP Technical Report had been presented to the Committee at the October 5 meeting, with a request for comments on the draft report by October 19. The report had also been previously circulated to a number of the subcommittees. No further comments had been received by the October 19 deadline, so the report remained unchanged from the version presented October 5. Therefore the report was presented here as final, and will be posted as a reference document/accompanying document to the CLRP. It was not planned to take the technical report for presentation to the TPB in this format, but portions may be included as part of future performance measurement presentations to the TPB.

Mr. Kirby noted that a lot of the work in the CMP Technical Report will be relevant to considerations of performance-based planning, because congestion and reliability are two of the seven national goals identified in MAP-21, and we have done a lot of work on those here. Thus we have a good contribution to make to that conversation.

11. Other Business

None.

12. Adjourn