

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
ITEM #1**

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

---

## **Technical Committee Minutes**

For meeting of  
**June 5, 2015**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE – June 5, 2015**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings  
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

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

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman  
Arlington County Dan Malouff  
City of Fairfax -----  
Fairfax County Mike Lake  
Malcom Watson  
Falls Church -----  
Fauquier County -----  
Loudoun County Robert Brown  
Manassas -----  
NVTA Keith Jasper  
NVTC David Koch  
Prince William County James Davenport  
PRTC Betsy Massie  
VRE Sonali Soneji  
VDOT Norman Whitaker  
Andy Beacher  
Bob Josef  
VDRPT Tim Roseboom  
Todd Horsley  
NVPDC -----  
VDOA -----

WMATA

Jonathan Parker

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

FHWA-DC Sandra Jackson  
FHWA-VA -----  
FTA Melissa Barlow  
NCPC -----  
NPS -----  
MWAQC -----  
MWAA -----

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP  
Robert Griffiths, DTP  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Andrew Meese, DTP  
John Swanson, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Bill Bacon, DTP  
Anant Choudhary, DTP  
Michael Farrell, DTP  
Bryan Hayes, DTP  
Charlene Howard, DTP  
Jessica Mirr, DTP  
Mark Moran, DTP  
Wenjing Pu, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Sergio Ritacco, DTP  
Rich Roisman, DTP  
Dusan Vuksan, DTP  
Feng Xie, DTP  
Patrick Zilliacus, DTP

OTHER

Alexandra Krempasanka, Maryland  
Department of the Environment  
Bill Orleans, Citizen  
Matt Tingstrom, MDOT

---

## **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

### Technical Committee Meeting

---

#### Technical Committee Minutes

**1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from May 1, 2015 Technical Committee Meeting**

The May minutes were approved as written.

**2. Briefing on the Transportation Planning Certification Review of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process for the Washington DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area**

Ms. Barlow from the Federal Transit Administration joined the meeting by telephone. She said the report for the certification review had been drafted and was pending final approval. She said that the current plan was that Mr. Lawson from FHWA would present the report to the TBB at its June meeting. She indicated that the draft report included a number of commendations as well as recommendations for improvement.

Mr. Srikanth thanked the federal agencies for their work on this report. Regarding the commendations, he acknowledged the contributions of the TPB's member jurisdictions. He described actions that were being taken to address recommendations in the report, including plans to conduct an evaluation on public participation and plans to improve the format of the obligation report for the TIP.

Ms. Massie noted that the obligation report must also include information from the transit agencies.

Mr. Rawlings asked if the obligation report is a separate document.

Mr. Srikanth replied that it is.

Mr. Mokhtari asked whether it would be valuable to make the obligation report a useful document for public information.

Ms. Erickson replied that the obligation report is a federal requirement and she did not think it would make sense to focus efforts on improving its accessibility for the public.

Mr. Srikanth added that since the obligation report is on the web it will be available for the public. He said that staff could take steps to make its availability better-known.

### **3. Briefing on the COG State of the Region Infrastructure Report**

Mr. Griffiths gave a PowerPoint presentation that summarized the key findings and recommendations contained in the COG 2015 State of the Region Infrastructure Report. He noted that this report represented the culmination of the COG Board's yearlong focus on infrastructure issues in 2014. He explained that TPB Chair Mendelson had asked that this report be placed on the TPB's June agenda as an information item. Mr. Griffiths stated that he and Deputy Executive Director Stuart Freudberg, the COG program manager for this effort, would be giving this presentation to the TPB. Mr. Freudberg would be providing an overall overview on this report and its recommendations and Mr. Griffiths would be presenting the key findings from the transportation section of this report.

Mr. Thomas asked about the information sources used to prepare the transportation section of this report.

Mr. Griffiths responded that much of the information for the transportation section of the report came from presentations to the COG Board by DDOT, MDOT, VDOT and WMATA on their current transportation infrastructure maintenance requirements. The information from these presentations was also supplemented by additional information from the National Bridge Inventory, Highway Performance Management System databases for DC, MD and VA and from follow-up calls to the state DOTs and WMATA.

Mr. Lake suggested the report understated regional transportation infrastructure needs because it did not include the costs of additional transit service and highway system operational improvements that would be needed for the Greenhouse Gas reduction strategies currently being discussed by the Multi-Sector Working Group.

Mr. Griffiths responded that the information in the infrastructure report was focused primarily on the costs for maintenance of existing transportation infrastructure and not system expansion needs. He noted that the costs of many of the additional transit and highway system operational improvements needed for Greenhouse Gas reduction strategies would show up in the regional list of unfunded transportation projects that would be discussed later on the agenda.

Mr. Mokhtari noted that WMATA's proposed core capacity improvements, including 8-car trains on all lines, were system expansion needs, but while they had been included in the infrastructure report, highway system expansion needs had not. He also noted that bikeway infrastructure needs had not been included in the report.

Mr. Griffiths responded that WMATA in its presentation to the COG Board had included core capacity improvements as a current infrastructure need to support continued ridership growth on the existing Metrorail and Metrobus systems.

Mr. Griffiths also responded that maintenance of existing bikeways were primarily local efforts and were not at comparable level to the highway and transit system maintenance requirements included in the report. However, he did note that unfunded bikeway projects would be included in the regional list of unfunded transportation projects that had been requested by the TPB.

Ms. Erickson commented that the members of the TPB Technical Committee should keep in mind that infrastructure report was a COG effort and the region's transportation agencies had limited involvement in its preparation. She suggested that rather than nitpick the information and numbers in the report, the committee members should see this report for what it is, a high level effort to raise public awareness about the importance of maintaining the region's existing infrastructure.

Mr. Skrikanth agreed with Ms. Erickson and noted that although the COG report talked about funding gaps for infrastructure maintenance, this did not mean that state DOTs and local transportation agencies were not anticipating these maintenance needs. While maintenance for highways and bridge infrastructure is only budgeted on an annual basis, it is recognized that in future years these costs and safety improvements must be funded first before any new system expansion projects. If safety and maintenance rise costs more than expected, it is the system expansion projects that get deferred, not the maintenance of the existing system.

Mr. Skrikanth did note that the 6 billion dollar funding gap shown in the report for WMATA's needed core capacity improvements was a real one. For the 2014 CLRP, the region's local jurisdictions were able to identify future funding for WMATA's 1 billion dollar a year "state of good repair" infrastructure maintenance needs, but full funding for the proposed core capacity improvements could not be found from existing revenue sources.

Mr. Emerine commented that he believed that discussion of innovative funding and financing strategies should also be included in the infrastructure report presentation to the TPB. He noted that it had been shown that small investments in infrastructure now can save much larger expenditures on infrastructure later. He suggested that this point should be emphasized rather than the large size of the identified funding gap.

Mr. Griffiths responded that the infrastructure report included recommendations on innovative funding and financing strategies and Mr. Freudberg would be including these recommendations in his part of the presentation to the TPB.

#### **4. Update on the Development of a Regional List of Unfunded Transportation Projects**

Mr. Griffiths referred to his memo to the TPB Technical Committee that provided an update on the status of the regional list of unfunded transportation projects. He noted that in response to comments from Committee members at the May

meeting, additional unfunded projects from the Maryland State Highway Administration Highway Needs Inventory and the TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan had been added to the list of unfunded projects. He also noted that costs shown for individual projects would only be presented by very wide cost grouping ranges.

Mr. Austin distributed an updated spreadsheet table containing the all of the unfunded transportation projects that had been compiled from all sources to-date and requested that the Committee members review this table to identify any duplicate project listings or other errors.

Ms. Howard demonstrated a web map application that mapped the locations of the unfunded projects for projects where GIS location data was available.

Mr. Rawlings noted that most of the unfunded bikeway projects in the TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan were also in the MoveDC plan and asked Mr. Austin if such duplications had been removed from the spreadsheet table listing.

Mr. Austin responded that he believed that such duplications had been removed, but asked Mr. Rawlings to also double check the spreadsheet table listing.

Mr. Mokhtari asked how situations where bikeways are included as part of larger highway projects were handled in the spreadsheet table listing.

Mr. Austin responded that bikeways included as part of larger highway projects were not broken out separately and thus, they continued to be included as a part of some highway projects.

Mr. Griffiths then discussed staff recommendations on how the TPB might use the regional list of unfunded transportation projects. These recommendations included: identifying the percentage of the region's total transportation needs that are currently being included in the TPB's Fiscally Constrained Long Range Plan, identifying a subset of projects from this list that could significantly improve the performance of the regional transportation system in the longer term, and motivating stakeholders to find innovative ways to fund and finance these impactful projects.

Mr. Austin again asked the committee members to review the updated spreadsheet table of unfunded projects to identify any duplicate project listings or other errors so the regional list could be finalized for presentation to the TPB at their June meeting.

Ms. Erickson commented that as many currently unfunded transportation projects or components of them move forward in the planning process there are always going to be some overlaps, additions, deletions and other changes. She suggested that we should never think of this draft list of unfunded projects as final.

Mr. Emerine noted that many of the projects in the spreadsheet table did not have the type of project filled in and suggested that it was important to have this piece of information included.

Mr. Austin stated that not all of the projects submitted for the current listing of unfunded projects had this information included, but staff would seek to obtain this information where possible for future versions of the regional list of unfunded transportation projects.

## **5. Briefing on Activities of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority**

Mr. Jasper presented an overview of the NVTA, including the agency's history, structure, and activities. The NVTA is the preeminent transportation coordination, planning, and programming and funding authority in Northern Virginia, and their jurisdiction is coincident with the portion of Northern Virginia contained in the TPB planning area (with the exception of the urbanized portion of Fauquier County and the Town of Warrenton that were recently added to the TPB). His presentation focused on two key activities of the Authority – preparation and adoption of the long range regional transportation plan for Northern Virginia, for which the currently adopted plan is known as TransAction 2040, and project selection and programming of transportation funds authorized under Virginia House Bill 2313 (approximately \$300 Million per year in pay-as-you-go funding; the NVTA also has bond financing authority). The TransAction update will begin shortly with consultant support and will include scenario planning and will likely use some of the TPB's analytical tools such as the regional travel demand forecasting model.

Mr. Srikanth reminded the group that the NVTA is a participating member of the Committee, and that he would like to invite Mr. Jasper back at a future date to brief the committee in greater detail on the technical aspects of the update of the TransAction 2040 plan. Mr. Srikanth highlighted for the committee the funding levels that the Authority programs as shown on slide 17 of Mr. Jasper's presentation, and noted that they are capital funds, not operating – it is important to be aware of what the NVTA brings to the regional table when discussing unfunded project needs. Mr. Srikanth also highlighted the diagram of the NVTA planning, programming and funding process shown on slide 6 of Mr. Jasper's presentation and noted that the technical aspects of that process that are controlled by the Authority could also be the focus of a future presentation.

Mr. Mokhtari asked how the NVTA resolved conflicting projects between regional plans and plans of individual NVTA jurisdictions. Mr. Jasper replied that close collaboration between jurisdictions and the Authority has ensured that no such conflicts have arisen to date, and provides a forum for working out such issues that may arise in the future; the Authority board members work well together to meet regional transportation challenges.

Ms. Massey reminded the committee that the HB 2313 revenues are all based on additional taxes in the NVTA jurisdictions that are explicitly collected to fund transportation improvements in Northern Virginia.

**6. Update on the Work of the Activities of the Transportation Sector Group of the COG Multi-Sector Working Group (MSWG) to Examine Greenhouse Gas Reductions**

Mr. Griffiths spoke to his May 14<sup>th</sup> memo to the TPB that provided a status report on the activities of the COG Multi-Sector Working Group (MSWG) established to identify and analyze potential strategies to reduce Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions in metropolitan Washington region. He noted that a list of 22 strategies had been recommended for detailed quantitative analysis, 10 strategies in the Energy/Built Environment Sector and 12 strategies in the combined Land Use and Transportation Sectors. He stated that the MSWG consultant was now beginning the detailed quantitative analysis of the combined list of 22 strategies and the results of this analysis were expected in July.

Mr. Griffiths reported that the next meeting of the MSWG would be held on June 18<sup>th</sup>. At this meeting the consultant would be presenting the results of 6 case studies on the establishment of GHG reduction goals and targets in other areas of the country. There will also be an initial discussion of some key considerations involved in exploring GHG goals and targets in general at this meeting. Exploration of potential multi-sector GHG goals and targets for the metropolitan Washington region will take place at the September 25<sup>th</sup> MSWG meeting after the members of the MSWG have had the opportunity to review the results of the consultant's detailed quantitative analysis of the combined list of 22 strategies expected to be completed in July.

Mr. Griffiths encouraged the members of the Committee to attend the June 18<sup>th</sup> meeting of the MSWG.

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

Mr. Eric Randall briefed the Committee on the US DOT regulations on performance measures under MAP-21, speaking to a presentation. He provided an overview of the status of the proposed rules for the five categories of performance rules. September should see the issuance of proposed rules for Highway System Performance and for Transit Asset Management and Safety, as well as the final rulemaking for State and Metropolitan Planning. He then spoke to coordination with the State DOTs and WMATA. TPB staff leads for each performance area have been identified, as have their counterparts at the State DOTs and WMATA. He then provided an overview of the concerns and issues TPB staff have identified for measuring performance and establishing targets, both for the MPO and in coordination with the State DOTs and WMATA. The plan is to hold topical discussions with these other agencies, and use the

information shared to develop the agenda for a workshop as offered by Federal Highway Administration.

Mr. Srikanth added that TPB staff will continue to work with the State DOT and WMATA staff on having more detailed discussion. He noted that there are considerable questions that must be addressed in each performance area. Once measures are done and targets set, the challenge will be in programming projects in the TIP and explaining how they contribute to meeting the established targets. He also generally invited interested agency staff to participate in the performance discussions, though the focus is on State DOTs at this time.

Ms. Massie asked how the local transit agencies are being incorporated into discussions of the transit performance rules. Mr. Randall responded that the Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee is the venue through which the local transit agencies are being included in the MAP-21 performance discussions.

**8. 2014 Regional HOV Report**

Mr. Zilliacus presented a summary of the draft report, *2014 PERFORMANCE OF HIGH-OCCUPANCY VEHICLE FACILITIES ON FREEWAYS IN THE WASHINGTON REGION*.

A member of the Committee asked about the scale in maps used to depict mean speeds on the U.S. 50 HOV and non-HOV lanes in Prince George's County.

Zilliacus said the scales in those maps will be changed to be identical with the scales for the other maps in the report.

**9. Other Business**

**None.**

**10. Adjourn**