

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
November 6, 2015

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – October 2, 2015**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick County David Whitaker
City of Frederick -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County John Thomas
Prince George's County Victor Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery County -----
Prince George's County -----
MDOT Lyn Erickson
Kari Snyder
Samantha Biddle (SHA)
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County Malcom Watson
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
NVTA Sree Nampoothiri
NVTC David Koch
Prince William County James Davenport
PRTC Betsy Massie
VRE Sonali Soneji
VDOT Norman Whitaker
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

Allison Davis

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Bill Bacon, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Bryan Hayes, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Eulalie Lucas, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Erin Morrow, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Wenjing Pu, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Sergio Ritacco, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Jon Schermann, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Steve Walz, DEP
Amanda Campbell, DEP
Jeff King, DEP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS
Greg Goodwin, DCPS
John Kent, DCPS

OTHER

Alex Brun
Bill Orleans
Rick Rybeck, Just Economics LLC

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the October 2 Technical Committee Meeting

The minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on the Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the 2016 CLRP Amendment and FY 2017-2022 TIP and Discussion on Detailed Transit

Mr. Austin spoke to the draft Call for Projects policy document and brochure that had been included in the meeting materials. He reviewed the schedule and noted that the deadline for project submissions would be on January 22, 2016 and that the TPB would finally approve the 2016 CLRP amendment in November 2016. Mr. Austin stated that the online database was ready to start accepting project submissions, and he reminded members that new projects would require both a CLRP record and a Conformity record to be established.

Mr. Brown asked Mr. Whitaker when Northern Virginia jurisdictions should have their projects turned into VDOT. Mr. Whitaker asked for that information to be submitted by January 15. Mr. Brown also asked if it was possible for Virginia localities to enter information directly into the online database. Mr. Austin said it was possible to upgrade users from a “reviewer” to “editor” settings so that they could enter project information. Mr. Whitaker requested that he be notified of any new projects submitted.

Ms. Posey spoke to the memo on future year transit assumptions that had been included in the meeting materials. She asked for committee members to review the existing transit assumptions to ensure they are still correct, and to provide the same level of detail for any new transit projects that may be submitted in the 2016 amendment. She requested that updates to existing assumptions be submitted by March 4, 2016. She stated that if there was a new major transit project, that information would be required by January 22, in order to be included in the materials released for public comment.

Mr. Holloman asked if consideration had been given to including bike-share projects. Ms. Posey replied that this stage of the process was related to projects that are coded in the transportation network, noting that bicycle projects are not currently coded in the model.

Mr. Brown asked if transit route information was best transmitted as text or in a GIS shape file. Ms. Posey indicated that shape files were an excellent source of information. She added that she would only need that information for new service, and that information on existing transit service would have already been obtained. Mr. Srikanth asked if transit service information was typically provided on planned routes by local transit agencies that were not part of larger multi-modal projects. Ms. Posey said that information had been received from local agencies. Mr. Srikanth encouraged local jurisdictions to review their transit plans and make sure they were included in the transit assumptions.

Mr. Brown asked if there was any distinction on the transit information for service that was federally funded versus those that weren't. Ms. Posey said there was no difference.

Mr. Whitaker asked if it was acceptable to place a large project in the submissions as a “study.” Mr. Austin said this was possible and had been done before. He noted that large

enough studies would be included in the materials released for public comment, but that it would be made clear that the projects were not yet included in the CLRP for construction, and that they would not be included in the air quality conformity analysis. Mr. Srikanth noted that the project would not be listed in the Conformity Table.

Mr. Whitaker requested a listing of all of the CLRP projects in the database so that they could review. Mr. Austin said he would provide this list. Mr. Brown also noted that the CLRP website features a map of the major CLRP projects that had been developed by Ms. Howard.

Mr. Austin requested any comments on the Call for Projects policy document and brochure by November 11.

3. Briefing on an Amendment to the FY 2016 UPWO to Revise the Budget and Work Elements

Mr. Srikanth briefed the committee on an amendment to revise the budget and work activities to reflect the final FY 2016 funding allocations provided by MDDOT, VDOT, and VDRPT. He said the TPB would be asked to approve this amendment at its meeting on November 18. He said that because the federal FY 2015 budget had not been finalized in February 2015, in time for the FY 2016 UPWP to be approved by the TPB in March, the funding amounts for the new FY 2016 FTA Section 5303 and FHWA Sec 112 funds had previously been assumed to be the same as in the previous year. However, since March 2015, the federal FY 2015 MPO planning allocations were finalized and MDOT, VDOT, and VDRPT have advised the TPB staff of their final funding allocations for the FY 2016 UPWP. There were no changes in the funding amounts from DDOT or in FAA CASP funds. He said that final result of various changes showed that funding for the UPWP Core program would increase by \$245,438. He said that staff proposed that this net additional Core Program funding be added to the budget for the UPWP work activity "TPB Support and Management."

Mr. Rawlings asked if the UPWP included adequate funding for Environmental Justice analysis. He noted that the DC Office of Planning had specially inquired about this.

Mr. Srikanth said this analysis was already covered in the UPWP. He said this work was already underway, and would continue into the next fiscal year.

4. Preview of a Presentation on Metrorail Safety Oversight: Current Practice and Planned Changes

Mr. Srikanth stated that this is an information item for this month's TPB meeting and it is a topic that the Committee has not discussed previously; however the TPB has expressed an interest on this matter and asked that COG/TPB staff reach out to the states for a briefing. This topic is not part of the UPWP or regional planning activities. The memorandum in today's agenda packet will assist committee members in briefing their respective board members. Mr. Srikanth explained that this is a topic that relates to WMATA and any urban area that has a fixed rail service in operation that is not regulated by the US Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) is regulated by the state. For instance, both VRE and MARC commuter rail services are overseen by the FRA. Metro is not regulated by the FRA which means that the three states are required by federal law to provide an oversight of the safety of Metrorail. In 1997, the three states created an entity to provide this oversight called the Tri-State Oversight Committee (TOC) and COG has been providing administrative support to the TOC since 1999.

The TOC works closely with WMATA on safety operations and plans, investigates safety incidents, makes recommendations on safety improvements and works with WMATA on a

daily and weekly basis in these areas. These entities are called State Safety Oversight Agencies (SSOA's) but without enforcement authority. MAP-21 legislation recognized the lack of the SSOA's authority and requires that the entities obtain legal authority and become an independent entity. The TOC is not currently independent of the three state agencies. In the past the SSOA's had not been receiving federal funds; however MAP-21 made federal funding available. On page two of the memorandum, Mr. Srikanth explained that the FTA examined the TOC and determined that it was not a legal independent agency and the MAP-21 federal funds could not go to the entity. The three states were asked to receive the funds and after further discussions, the states approached COG to receive the funding on their behalf as the designated recipient and to assist in reconstituting the TOC into an independent SSOA. The COG Board approved this request and an MOU was signed between COG and the states. The states have identified that the transition may take 3 to 4 years to implement. Given the January 2015 L'Enfant Plaza Metrorail incident and ensuing National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) safety investigation, one of the findings was that the TOC had not be reconstituted to have legal authority and felt that the investigation findings needed to be enforced and recommended that the FRA take over in order to implement the recommendations. USDOT's Secretary Foxx disagreed with the NTSB recommendation and instead stated that the FTA would step in to work with the TOC given that the FTA has enforcement authority and can also assist in reconstituting the TOC into an independent legal authority. Some of the TPB Board members want to understand the requirements and the transition plan and how they can assist in setting up the new entity quickly. Staff members from the state agencies involved on the project will be briefing the TPB and include DDOT, MDOT and VDRPT. A copy of the presentation for the November 18th TPB meeting is not available. Normally presentations made to the TPB are shared with the Technical Committee; however the members of the TOC are not members of the Technical Committee. As soon as the presentation is received, it will be posted to the TPB's meeting page.

Betsy Massie asked whether or not staff from the FTA been identified to work with the TOC. Mr. Srikanth stated that the point of contact to work with the FTA and TOC is Sean Thompson. Corey Walker from the FTA will also be working with Mr. Thompson. Mr. Srikanth stated that Nicholas Ramfos is the COG/TPB staff lead on this project.

Mr. Mokhtari asked about the difference between the TOC working group and the Metro Safety Commission (MSC) policy group. Mr. Srikanth stated that the groups have different staff. The TOC has ongoing responsibilities which will eventually transition to a MAP-21 compliant organization. The MSC policy group consists of different of staff that have been identified to work on the transition in order that the TOC staff members can continue their daily work and not be interrupted with the stand-up of the MSC. Mr. Srikanth also stated that the funding for the MSC is being provided to COG and to the states through COG in order to continue operations and to stand up the MSC. Lyn Erickson asked whether or not there is an organizational chart to show the relationship between the TOC, WMATA and the MSC. Mr. Srikanth stated he would pass the suggestion on to the states to consider for inclusion into the TPB presentation. Mr. Srikanth also stated that there is also a TOC web site which provides detailed background information. Mr. Mokhtari asked how the TOC members are appointed. Mr. Srikanth stated that TOC will be replaced by the MSC and the current TOC members are state employees. Once the MSC is set up and is independent, it is not clear how the structure will look like, but this is something that will be examined further for development and implementation. Mark Rawlings asked whether or not the state agencies have been asked to make the TPB presentation. Mr. Srikanth stated that this was the case.

5. Briefing on the Activities of the COG Multi-Sector Working Group (MSWG) on Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Mr. Griffiths referred to the mailout materials on the Multi-Sector Working Group (MSWG), specifically the COG board resolution on the interim findings of the MSWG. The resolution thanked members and staff of the MSWG for all the hard work, directed staff to scale back some of the strategies for inclusion in the forthcoming action plan, and called for the formation of a policy level working group to review the strategies for inclusion in the action plan and to ensure any proposed mandatory actions be achieved by statutory legal authority. Some of the COG board members were against strategies that suggest taxes, and fees as well as pushing all future development into Activity Centers. They want to ensure that these strategies are not considered for the action plan.

Mr. Griffiths also discussed the task undertaken by the consultant to close the final 1/3 gap to achieve the 80% reduction in GHG through expanded fuel efficiency in light duty, heavy duty vehicles on the transportation side, decarbonizing the power sector through, solar and nuclear, and reducing energy needs of new buildings such as net zero buildings. Most of these would require action on the part of the Federal government through Federal policies and regulations including congressional action. Transportation staff will work with planning and environmental program staff to review the strategies and develop the list as directed by the COG board resolution.

One of the questions asked was whether the solutions listed to close the final 1/3 gap are realistic or more of an academic exercise. Staff responded that the consultant work was based on a National Science Foundation study and the technology exists. In staff's opinion, for the transportation sector this lays out the road map to achieve the reductions needed in the mobile sector.

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

Mr. Randall briefed the Committee on updates to the US DOT regulations on performance measures under MAP-21, speaking to a presentation. He provided an overview of the schedule for publication of the proposed and/ or final rulemakings for the five categories of performance rules. The final rulemaking of most interest to TPB staff, that for State and Metropolitan Planning, is now scheduled to be published in March 2016, and the Highway System Performance proposed rulemaking is expected in November.

The first of the proposed transit rules was published on September 30, for Transit Asset Management. Mr. Randall briefed the key aspects of this proposed rulemaking. He emphasized the applicability of the rulemaking for all recipients or sub-recipients of Federal transit funds (e.g., Section 53XX funds) that own, operate, or manage capital assets used in the provision of public transportation.

Mr. Brown noted that Loudoun County takes no FTA funds, and would not participate in these rules. Mr. Weissberg noted that Prince George's County would be required to participate in the transit asset management rule as a sub-recipient of funds from MTA. Mr. Randall noted that DC, all the Maryland jurisdictions, and most of the Virginia jurisdictions would be subject to the rule.

Mr. Srikanth noted that Fairfax County would also be subject to these rules, even though no FTA funds go to the Connector bus service, but because the County uses FTA funds for other projects in the County. Mr. Roseboom noted that DRPT transfers on CMAQ and RTSP funds from FHWA to the jurisdictions for some transit purposes, such as for a park and ride lot. Ms. Massie noted that the funds would have to be transferred administratively to FTA for this to apply.

Mr. Randall noted that COG would also be responsible under this rule due to its funding of 5310 grants and vanpools. Agencies need to verify their own sources of funding though.

He continued his presentation by speaking to the two tiers for reporting, by agency size. Tier I providers with 101+ vehicles in revenue service or a rail system have to prepare and submit a Transit Asset Management Plan to the FTA. Tier II provider with 100 or fewer vehicles and no rail system are grouped and reported collectively by State or other recipient. Each provider has to submit two annual reports. He described the up to nine elements that will be required of a transit asset management plan. The rulemaking has four performance measures: Equipment, Rolling Stock, Rail Infrastructure, and Stations/Facilities. Finally, there is a requirement for transit agencies to prioritize their capital investments, with projects ranked by priority, based on policy and safety and fiscally constrained. MPOs and States will need to include these prioritized investment plans in their transportation plans and transportation improvement programs (TIPs).

Ms. Massie asked if TPB would be submitting comments in response to the rule and noted the complexity of collating the seventeen transit agencies in the region into one list or report. Mr. Randall responded that the process seemed sound and the responsibilities for MPOs acceptable, and that the transit agencies would bear the burden of the rule. In addition, many of the more administrative details have yet to be worked out which would actually determine the burden on every organization. At a policy level, the rulemaking seems sensible and of appropriate scale in his opinion.

Mr. Ramfos asked if COG would have to participate in the rulemaking for vanpools. Ms. Massie noted that PRTC does not plan to report for the vanpools, as they are not hired or managed by PRTC, only reimbursed with FTA funds with vouchers. PRTC will also follow up with FTA on this however. Mr. Randall noted that the rulemaking is focused on capital assets, so FTA operating funds may not require participation.

Mr. Mokhtari asked how a transit agency would prioritize one capital project over another. Mr. Randall said that an agency would have to use a decision support tool to rank and prioritize projects, which for Metro especially will be complicated. However, the MPO does not anticipate doing this for the transit agencies in the region, though may look at bus asset plans overall.

Mr. Randall closed by speaking to the interaction between the proposed transit rules and then the next steps in TPB coordination with the State DOTs on the highway safety and highway condition performance measures. Further topical discussions will be held as more of the rulemakings are published, and the technical committee will be updated as the discussions progress. He noted the transit safety rule is due out in December.

7. Report of the TPB Work Session on Policy Aspects to Include in the Regional Freight Plan

Mr. Schermann briefed the Committee on the October 21 TPB Work Session on policy aspects to include in the regional freight plan.

He noted that during the July TPB meeting Chairman Mendelson asked that the Board be given an opportunity to provide policy input to the Freight Plan at an “early stage” of development. This request resulted in the TPB Work Session held immediately prior to the October TPB meeting.

Mr. Schermann said the Work Session began with a TPB staff presentation that provided an overview of the Regional Freight System including a review of the drivers of freight demand, including population growth, the evolution of the supply chain, and an overview of transportation industry trends. This was followed by a summary of stakeholder comments received prior to the work session. The stakeholder comment summary was followed by a review of a draft list of potential freight policy topic areas culled from existing plans, stakeholder input, and discussions at freight subcommittee meetings.

Mr. Schermann said that the Work Session concluded with a 45-minute discussion that amplified the points provided by staff and raised additional ones to consider. First Vice Chairman Lovain summarized the work session discussion as centering on the following underlying principles:

- Maximizing public safety;
- Dealing with land use compatibility and coexistence;
- Prioritizing infrastructure investments that relate to activity centers and intermodal facilities;
- Supporting the region's economic development goals including those in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan; and
- Environmental protection.

A briefing on the Work Session to the Board during the regular meeting was planned but did not occur due to time constraints.

Mr. Schermann noted that based on input received during the Work Session as well as the content of current and upcoming Freight Subcommittee and TPB Technical Committee discussions, staff will craft a new policy section of the draft plan. This new policy section of the plan, as well as the overall plan, including the technical sections, will be brought to the Board for review and potential TPB action for approval in early 2016.

Mr. Schermann concurred with comments from Mr. Mokhtari and Mr. Davenport clarifying that the discussion among attendees of the Work Session moved from a focus on hazardous materials routing to a concern about routing of freight movements in general to include land use coexistence and compatibility, as well as the environmental justice issues associated with freight movements.

8. Update on the TPB Working Group on Unfunded Capital Needs

Mr. Swanson briefed the committee on the activities of the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group. He said the group has met twice, in September and October, and had provided guidance to staff for the development of a work scope that will use the inventory of unfunded projects that staff has developed over the last year. He said the scope will be released before the next working group meeting, which would be on November 18 at 2:30 after the TPB meeting. He said the scope would describe a coordinated program of activities that the TPB would conduct over the next three years to identify unfunded priority projects that the region broadly supports. These activities will be designed to be integrated into the next quadrennial update of the region's long-range transportation plan in 2018. He said that during the remainder of the current fiscal year, staff would be conducting an analysis of "No-Build" and "All-Build" (the full inventory) scenarios.

Mr. Austin said that staff needed additional information about projects in the inventory in order to analyze the All-Build scenario. He said staff would be reaching out jurisdictional staff to get that information.

Mr. Brown said that his office could provide that information. He also noted that Loudoun includes projects in the CLRP that might not necessarily be required, but they do so to be sure those projects are considered for funding in the future.

Mr. Emerine said that “funding potential” should be included as a criterion in the selection of priority unfunded projects. He said that it is important to consider the ability of different projects to attract different kinds of funding.

Mr. Swanson said that funding potential may be a consideration.

Mr. Orleans said that some projects currently in the CLRP should be considered for removal from the plan.

Mr. Swanson said this particular set of activities had not been established to reopen the CLRP, but instead would focus on unfunded needs.

Mr. Mokhtari said that multimodal considerations and “region divided” considerations should be included in the analysis.

Mr. Swanson said those two factors would be included.

Mr. Thomas said it will be useful to conduct a No-Build analysis in order to better understand the impacts of the CLRP.

9. Update on Briefings Regarding WMATA Funding

Ms. Allison Davis, WMATA, provided an overview of plans for a series of three presentations to the TPB regarding WMATA. At the November 18 TPB meeting, the board is scheduled to receive two briefings on WMATA needs and funding. The first presentation, on “Metro fundamentals,” was originally scheduled for the October meeting but was postponed due to other agenda items. The second presentation will describe Metro’s capital program and the Momentum Plan. The final presentation in December would look at the roles that TPB can play to support Metro and the presenter would be either a board member or possibly a new General Manager.

Ms. Davis outlined some options for the schedule of these presentations at upcoming meetings, but noted that this was actively under discussion. Mr. Srikanth noted that the agenda would be discussed at the Steering Committee and a determination on the schedule made in coordination with the TPB Chair.

It was noted that a new General Manager had been announced by WMATA, and it was discussed if this person should present to the TPB. However, at this time WMATA staff will give the background presentations and a WMATA board member more familiar with the issues would facilitate the December presentation.

10. Update on Activities to Commemorate the TPB’s 50th Anniversary

Mr. Hampton announced that there would be two main events later this year to commemorate the TPB’s 50th anniversary. The first event will be on Wednesday, November 18, just before the regularly scheduled meeting of the TPB. He said that all of the Committee members were invited, that there would be a special video shown at the event, and that there would be guest speakers. He said that the other main event will be the COG Annual

Meeting on December 9, which will feature the video and a special keynote speaker. He said that staff will be producing a printed brochure to accompany both events.

Mr. Srikanth said that invitations for the November event have been sent to current members of the TPB and TPB Technical Committee, as well as past TPB and Citizens Advisory Committee chairmen and past TPB staff. He said that invitations to the event in December would be sent to current TPB members. He announced that the keynote speaker at the December event will be futurist Mr. Hiemstra, who will be able to speak to some of the forthcoming transportation challenges and opportunities in the region, especially those related to advances in vehicle and other technology.

11. Adjourn