

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
ITEM #1**

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

---

## **Technical Committee Minutes**

For meeting of  
**February 6, 2015**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE – February 6, 2015**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT	Mark Rawlings
	Jameshia Peterson
DCOP	Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County	-----
Frederick County	Ron Burns
City of Frederick	-----
Gaithersburg	-----
Montgomery County	Gary Erenrich
Prince George's County	Victor Weissberg
Rockville	-----
M-NCPPC	
Montgomery County	-----
Prince George's County	Famararz Mokhtari
MDOT	Matt Baker
	Samantha Biddle
	Mike Nixon
Takoma Park	-----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria	Pierre Holloman
Arlington County	Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax	-----
Fairfax County	Malcolm Watson
Falls Church	-----
Fauquier County	Marie Scheetz
Loudoun County	Robert Brown
Manassas	-----
NVTA	-----
NVTC	Claire Randall
	David Moch
Prince William County	James Davenport
PRTC	Betsy Massie
VRE	Christine Hoeffner
	Sonali Soneji
VDOT	Norman Whitaker
	Andrew Beacher
	Dan Painter
VDRPT	Tim Roseboom
NVPDC	-----
VDOA	-----

WMATA

Jonathan Parker

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP  
Gerald Miller, DTP  
Robert Griffiths, DTP  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Andrew Meese, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Anant Choudhary, DTP  
Ben Hampton, DTP  
Charlene Howard, DTP  
Eulalie Lucas, DTP  
Nicole McCall, DTP  
Jessica Mirr, DTP  
Mark Moran, DTP  
Dzung Ngo, DTP  
Jinchul Park, DTP  
Jane Posey, DTP  
Wenjing Pu, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Clara Reschovsky, DTP  
Sergio Ritacco, DTP  
Rich Roisman, DTP  
Jon Schermann, DTP  
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP  
Dusan Vuksan, DTP  
Fen Xie, DTP  
Jeff King, DEP  
Sunil Kumar, DEP  
Amanda Campbell, DEP  
Paul DesJardin, DCPS  
Sophie Mintier, DCPS

OTHER

Bill Orleans

---

## TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

### Technical Committee Meeting

---

### Technical Committee Minutes

#### 1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from January 9 Technical Committee Meeting**

Chairman Rawlings asked Mr. Miller to chair his last meeting before retirement in honor of his 25 years of service to the Technical Committee. Minutes were approved as written.

#### 2. **Update on Project Submissions for the 2015 CLRP**

Mr. Austin stated that the project submissions had been released for public comment on January 15<sup>th</sup> and that the TPB was briefed at their meeting on January 21<sup>st</sup>. He noted that based on some comments already received, TPB staff had been working with VDOT to provide more information on the transit and bicycle/pedestrian elements of the two express lanes projects on I-66. Mr. Austin stated that TPB staff would work with the implementing agencies to develop responses to any comments received. These comments and responses would be presented to the TPB at their meeting on February 18<sup>th</sup> and would become part of the record of the 2015 update to the CLRP.

Ms. Posey distributed and spoke to a list of technical corrections to the Air Quality Conformity Inputs table that would be included prior to approval by the TPB.

Mr. Miller stated that he was impressed with the amount of coverage the projects and the comment period were receiving in the press and added that he hoped it would give the public a better understanding of the TPB's process. Mr. Whitaker noted that VDOT had held four public meetings on the I-66 outside the Beltway project and that all of them were well-attended.

Mr. Srikanth asked Mr. Whitaker to expand on VDOT's work to answer questions raised by the TPB and during the public comment period about bus services on the I-66 inside the Beltway project. Mr. Whitaker stated that a menu of options had been developed in the I-66 multimodal study and that improvements identified in that study would be prioritized in coordination with local jurisdictions. He added that a list of placeholder inputs for transit service would be provided to TPB staff by the end of February.

Mr. Miller asked if DDOT had held any public hearings on the bike lane projects. Mr. Rawlings stated that two public forums had been hosted, and most comments received were supportive.

#### 3. **Update on the Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2015 CLRP and the FY 2015-2020 TIP**

Ms. Posey indicated that the scope of work had not changed since she reviewed it at the last Technical Committee meeting. She noted that she had presented the document to the TPB at

its January meeting, and that the document was out for public comment, along with the project inputs, until February 14<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the proposed WMATA fare increases and service cuts would be included in the conformity analysis. Mr. Srikanth asked if those are planned to be temporary. Mr. Parker indicated that they were. Mr. Erenrich suggested that it is important to understand the air quality impacts of the changes. Mr. Srikanth stated that the WMATA changes will not be included in the conformity analysis because they are still proposed (not ready at time of “pencils down”), and because, with their temporary nature, they would not impact any of the out-year forecast networks. Mr. Srikanth also indicated that TPB staff would continue to communicate with WMATA about their changes. Mr. Mokhtari agreed that the air quality impacts should be determined. Mr. Parker stated that WMATA is doing estimates of trip and revenue impacts. Mr. Erenrich asked if WMATA would estimate air quality impacts. Mr. Parker responded that they would not.

#### **4. Briefing on the Implementation of the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program**

Mr. Randall briefed the Committee on the progress of the TPB’s TIGER Grant, awarded in 2010 and ongoing for the past four years. The TPB Chair, Mr. Mendelson, requested a briefing on the grant at the February TPB meeting. Mr. Randall spoke to a presentation on the grant. Only a year and a half remains in the period of performance, with time also needed to complete invoicing and get reimbursement from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) before the grant funds expire on September 30, 2016. He ended by noting the recent FTA approval of the revision request submitted in October 2014.

Ms. Massie added an update on PRTC’s progress on their CAD/AVL system installation. Mr. Erenrich stated that the Pentagon bus station is the second-busiest in the region after Silver Spring, not the busiest.

Mr. Malouff asked which agency to contact regarding the real-time passenger information signs. Mr. Randall responded it would depend on the question, as there are multiple parties involved. Mr. Malouff clarified that he was interest in the information displayed. Mr. Randall emphasized the system is in test, so the display has yet to be fine-tuned. However, personnel from each jurisdiction have been trained on the system and should be able to make adjustments. WMATA is still collecting public input on the project.

Mr. Erenrich asked if there was any discussion on moving some project elements to New Hampshire Avenue. Mr. Randall responded that this option was off the table, and that the funds were re-directed to the Takoma Langley Transit Center, per the recently approved revision request. He noted that Ms. Stacy Colletta from the County was participating in the project. Mr. Mokhtari asked if the Maryland projects would be completed on time. Mr. Randall stated that all implementing agencies are very conscious of the expiration of the grant.

Mr. Emerine requested confirmation the queue jumps on 16<sup>th</sup> Street would be installed this year, and that the project is independent of the discussions on bus lanes and other improvements for 16<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Randall responded that this was correct.

Mr. Erenrich asked if any agencies were preparing to submit an application for TIGER Seven, or if TPB would submit a regional application? Mr. Miller responded that TIGER One was 100%

Federal money. Now submitters have to provide matching funds, and experience has been that most of these projects are not actually ready for construction funding through TIGER.

Mr. Miller suggested that the presentation note that TPB will be involved with the TIGER Grant for performance monitoring for several years after the grant funding ends.

## **5. Briefing on the COG Cooperative Forecasting Process**

Mr. DesJardin briefed the Committee on the new draft Round 8.4 Cooperative Forecasting process, speaking from a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. DesJardin noted that the process was established in 1975 and the first series of Forecasts was approved by the COG Board of Directors in 1976. Mr. DesJardin noted that the process is a “top-down / bottom-up” methodology, using an econometric model to establish benchmark regional projections in 5-year increments. Mr. DesJardin noted that the strength of the Forecasts is the “bottom-up” land use element, based on short-term permitting and development activity and guided long-term by zoning and local comprehensive plans. Mr. DesJardin stated that Round 8.4 is a minor, incremental update to the Forecasts, with revisions from only 4 COG jurisdictions – Arlington County, the City of Alexandria, Prince William County, and Fairfax County – as well as updated projections for the Maryland counties of the Baltimore Metropolitan Council.

## **6. Review of Draft FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Srikanth presented the Draft FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program which represents the TPB’s budget document. He noted that all of the activities that the TPB plans to undertake in FY 2016 between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016, with the corresponding budgets amounts is outlined in the Draft document distributed to the Committee. He said that the Draft document has been released for public comment now during February and that the Board is scheduled to approve the document in March.

Noting the process he said that upon adoption by the Board, in March, the UPWP would be submitted to the FHWA and FTA for approval. Mr Srikanth noted that any request for any activity to be undertaken that is a deviation from this adopted work program it will have to be amended and federally approved.

Mr. Srikanth reviewed the funding for the UPWP – noting that 80% of the money comes from the Feds – FHWA and the FTA combined - and 20% comes in matching funds; 10% is provided by the three state DOT’s and an additional 10% provided by the local jurisdictions from their membership dues paid to the Council of Governments. He said that the Draft currently assumes same funding amounts as in the current fiscal year given that federal funding for FY 2015 has not been fully obligated and that current federal funds runs through May 2015 only. He noted that as in years past when we have firmer information from the Feds and from the DOT’s we will have to come back and amend the UPWP.

Reviewing the proposed work items and budget he referred to Table 2 for a listing of various work activities grouped under six major program areas. He said that the first five of these groups are what we typically refer to as the core program activities and the sixth group is Technical Assistance, an ancillary element to the core program. Explaining the Technical

Assistance program he noted that the Board sets aside a certain amount of money for the three DOT's and WMATA so if they have any planning projects they would like TPB staff to do on their behalf. Mr. Srikanth noted that Technical Assistance projects would be those that in some way shape or form has the potential to impact and benefit the entire region.

Mr. Srikanth mentioned one substantive change in the budget structure which was a reduction in the amount of Technical Assistance funds. He said that staff had worked with the three DOTs and WMATA to move some of the money that was previously used to be set aside for the Technical Assistance into the main core program area – for FY 2016 this would be about \$450,000. He noted that with federal planning funds not having been substantively increased in a long time, but cost of services going up and with new regional planning activities being undertaken the TPB is facing a tight budget situation for the next fiscal year and potentially beyond that as well. The increased funding into the core program in FY 2016 derived from the reduction in Technical assistance will allow the core program, to undertake enhancements to the regional travel demand model (about \$100,000) and set aside another about \$400,000 for the decennial regional Household Travel Survey – a \$3M effort – to be undertaken in 2017.

Mr. Srikanth reviewed some of the new activities for FY2016 which includes Performance Based Planning for MAP 21, travel demand models development, the Emissions Estimation Model, the MOVES Model. Reviewing the Regional Studies work item he noted that it is one of the work program elements that typically the Board initiates within its prerogative to undertake some regional level studies and described the three activities anticipated for next fiscal year: (1) the Multi-Sector Greenhouse Gas Initiative; (2) the unfunded projects listing combined with exploring new funding for a set of these regionally significant, and (3) reconciling the RTPP that the Board adopted earlier in 2014 with the federal priorities identified in MAP 21.

## **7. Review of Draft FY 2016 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)**

The Fiscal Year 2016 draft Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP) was included in the meeting agenda packet. A PowerPoint presentation given by Mr. Ramfos that included an overview of Commuter Connections including program benefits, program coverage area, MSA rankings for carpool and transit use, daily program impacts, the program's role in the regional planning process, the program's cost effectiveness, the proposed budget, and highlights of what is new with the program and budget, and next steps.

Mr. Ramfos explained that Commuter Connections is a network of public and private transportation organizations, local organizations, state funding agencies, and COG/TPB staff that work together to help reduce regional traffic congestion and improve air quality. Commuter Connections' programs provide benefits to local jurisdictions, employers and workers by helping to manage and reduce congestion and improve air quality by reducing emissions. Commuter Connections also provides a variety of work commuting options that can lead to an improved quality of life through the reduced daily commuting costs, stress, and the time commuting to

and from work. This also helps with worker recruitment and retention efforts and with goods movement and tourist travel in the region.

Mr. Ramfos then showed a map that outlined the program's coverage area. The area outlined in a heavy black line is the Washington Region's 8-hour non-attainment area. The map shows that the Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) service area is much larger than the 8-hour non-attainment area for workers eligible for the GRH program, and even larger for workers who use Commuter Connections' ridematching services. Mr. Ramfos then showed charts with recent American Community Survey Census rankings for carpools and transit use for MSA areas showing that the Washington DC region ranks 3rd in the nation in total percentage of carpools and transit users.

Next, Mr. Ramfos reviewed the total daily impacts of the Commuter Connections program for VT, VMT, NOx, and VOC based on recent results from the FY 2012-2014 Commuter Connections TERM Analysis report. He also explained that federal planning regulations require the TPB to approve a congestion management process (CMP) which includes Commuter Connections as the major Transportation Demand Management component. Commuter Connections also provides transportation emission reduction measure benefits for inclusion in the air quality conformity determination approved by the TPB. This is part of the annual update of the region's CLRP and TIP. Impacts from the program may be needed to address future regional or national transportation greenhouse gas emission targets. Results from Commuter Connections program impacts may also be used in new federal MAP-21 legislation performance measure requirements.

Commuter Connections has been shown to be a highly cost-effective way to reduce vehicle trips (VT), vehicle miles of travel (VMT), and vehicle emissions associated with commuting in the region. The overall program's cost-effectiveness is based on the results of the Commuter Connections TERM Analysis for VT, VMT, NOx, and VOC.

A comparison of the FY 2015 CCWP budget to the proposed FY 2016 CCWP budget was shown and changes for each of the program areas. Mr. Ramfos stated that there is an eleven and a half percent increase in the budget from FY 2015 due to general increases in each of the program areas and intense data collection activities which will be required during FY 2016. Mr. Ramfos explained the budget breakdown which includes about 28% of the costs going to COG/TPB staff & overhead, 57% of the costs for private sector services, 8% of the costs are passed through to local jurisdiction TDM programs, and 7% of the costs are attributed to direct costs.

The FY 2016 CCWP also has some new features and projects, including an adjustment to the 'Pool Rewards budget to bring budgeted totals for the carpool and vanpool incentive closer to the participation rate in the program, the updating of the TDM Evaluation Framework Methodology document for the FY 2015 – 2017 data collection cycle, data collection for the 2016 State of the Commute Survey which will also include the production of a draft technical report, in-depth Guaranteed Ride Home applicant surveys for both the Washington DC and Baltimore metropolitan regions, and applicant retention rate surveys for both rideshare and Washington, DC Guaranteed Ride Home applicants.

Mr. Ramfos then discussed the next review and approval steps for the document.

A question was asked about the effect of HOT lanes and the formation of carpools and will this be addressed in any of the research conducted through Commuter Connections? Mr. Ramfos stated that the Placement Rate and Applicant Retention Rate Surveys would more than likely have survey questions to address this issue.

## **8. Briefing on the First Meeting of the COG Multi-sector Working Group to Examine Greenhouse Gas Reductions**

Mr. Srikanth thanked the representatives who participated in the January 30 kickoff meeting of COG's Multi-sector Working Group and noted that it was well attended with representatives from the environmental sector, land use planning sector as well as the transportation sector. He said that the COG website now has this activity listed and all of the meeting materials and presentations may be found at this on-line site.

Mr. Srikanth then reviewed the agenda topics and provided the gist of the presentations made. Agenda topics reviewed included (1) a presentation on setting the stage for Multi-sector Working Group which essentially looked at how did we get here, what is the purpose and plan of work for this Multisector group; (2) review of the 2008 Climate Change Report that serves as the basis for the currently adopted regional goal for reducing carbon dioxide emissions in this region; (3) presentation about the land use planning directors about activities within their domain; (4) presentation about the activities within the Energy and Built Environment sector and finally (5) a review of the activities and work to date on in the transportation sector by Mr. Griffiths.

Mr. Srikanth then reviewed the contents of Bob's presentation including results of the TPB's work from 2010 with the "What Would It Take" scenario study – which had looked at what kinds of strategies would be needed within the transportation sector to try and reduce CO2 emissions.

Speaking about next steps Mr. Srikanth noted that since the Multisector group is a large group in order to help facilitate a more focused brainstorming with more time the Multi-sector Working Group on January 30<sup>th</sup> identified and talked having three smaller groups. The sub-groups would be of the Transportation, Land Use and Energy-Built Environment sectors. Each of these groups will brainstorm to identify strategies at a very high level that in each sector feels should be analyzed because they believe there is a potential of meaningful CO2 reductions coming if those strategies are implemented. And those strategies should be such that they can be realistically implemented and the word that has been used is viable strategies in all of these sectors.

Speaking about the type and level of tragedies to think about he suggested a couple of examples; by increasing transit services you can help reduce single occupant vehicles by bringing them into transit which reduces VMT and that helps reduce CO2; another example he noted was if the daily transit mode share currently is at 7 or 8% increasing that by 5 percentage points or doubling it.

Mr. Srikanth said that there will be an e-mail coming out to all of the other sectors about these meetings so if the transportation sector representative is interested in participating in the



Planning Directors land use discussions they could do so. He recalled that the Planning Directors would be meeting on February 20<sup>th</sup> and the transportation sector subgroup meeting is scheduled for February 27<sup>th</sup> with the Energy and Environmental subgroup also meeting on February 27<sup>th</sup>.

Speaking about the follow up to the February meeting Mr. Srikanth said that by March the Council of Governments hopes to have a consultant on board and the consultant will attend all of the subgroup meetings to review these strategies that the subgroups would have developed in February and any additional strategies we may develop in March. The consultant would then help facilitate a discussion to identify which of these are viable, which of these are short term, which of these are long term. In May the larger Multisector group would reconvene take a look at all of the strategies together and that will be their opportunity to review and comment and question on strategies from all sectors. The purpose of this would be to examine the strategies proposed, see if any is left out, what was the thinking behind leaving something out and is their opportunities to add some more or to combine something else.

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

Mr. Randall updated the Committee on the latest developments regarding US DOT regulations on performance measures under MAP-21, speaking to a presentation. He reviewed the five categories of performance rules, emphasizing that no rules are yet final. He also spoke to some common elements of the requirements for data collection and the MPOs role for setting targets and reporting on performance. He concluded with a review of next steps for action by the TPB and the transportation agencies in the region.

Mr. Meese noted that the highway safety rules for fatality reporting apply to all roads, not just federally designated roads.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the use of the acronym CMAQ refers to performance in this category, not the Federal highway funding program.

Mr. Srikanth emphasized that the TPB as the MPO looks forward to starting the discussions with State DOTs, who have the most responsibilities for performance data collection and reporting. State DOTs have been working very closely with the federal agencies on this topic, given the scale of the proposed data collection effort. MPOs cannot collect this data, only the State DOTs and WMATA, and therefore TPB will have to coordinate with these agencies on all the performance measures making. He requested copies of any formal letters or other submissions to the federal agencies. However, the MPO is still responsible for including performance data in the TIP and CLRP, and without this information theoretically federal approval could be withheld. He stated that future coordination and cooperation will be critical.

Mr. Srikanth stated that TPB staff have begun this coordination discussion via the State Technical Working Group, and will continue to establish relationships with the appropriate staff in each jurisdiction.

Mr. Parker asked for information on how USDOT will use this performance information. Mr. Srikanth responded that targets will have to be set, and agencies will have to report on

performance against these targets. Some of the MAP-21 regulations require funds be used to assist in meeting any targets in danger of being missed. Mr. Miller added that the performance provisions are an iterative process that will take many years to be implemented and to lead to changes in the transportation project planning and programming process.

Mr. Emerine asked when the conversation on targets will be set and the discussion on trade-offs among funding different targets. Mr. Srikanth responded that the rules first need to be finalized. Data collection will then be the big effort. Target-setting will be a comparatively modest part of the process, as opposed to collecting data and understanding the trends and factors involved. Target setting should be actionable and achievable, rather than aspirational.

This is the basis for interest in a future workshop with federal agency staff on the MAP-21 performance provisions. In the meantime, coordination with the State DOTs will proceed.

#### **10. Briefing on the Court Decision on Change to Region's Ozone Attainment**

A memo included in the February Tech Committee mailout was developed by COG's DEP staff for discussion at the January MWAQC TAC meeting. Ms. Posey summarized the memo, briefing the committee on a court decision changing the region's ozone attainment date. The summary included that: EPA designated the Washington region as a "marginal" non-attainment area on July 20, 2012, with an attainment date of December 31, 2015. NRDC successfully contested the attainment date, which was changed to July 20, 2015. Because the whole ozone season (May-Sept.) must be considered, the attainment date is effectively moved back one summer. Originally the region would consider data from the 2013-2015 ozone seasons, but with the revised attainment date the region must consider data from the 2012-2014 ozone seasons. Using 2012-2014 data, the region does not attain the standard. Two options for addressing this are being considered: 1) the states can ask for a 1-year extension, or 2) the region can be "bumped up" to the next "level" of non-attainment, and automatically be given a longer extension to attain. The first option is likely to be selected, as it is more straightforward and involves fewer requirements. Ms. Posey also noted that EPA is expected to finalize a new ozone standard by October of this year, and that will remove the requirements to attain the current standard.

Mr. Lake asked if everyone starts over when a new standard is set. Ms. Posey replied yes, and noted that some areas that were previously in attainment would change to non-attainment.

Mr. Miller pointed out that there is time after a new standard is set before the region has to take any action. Ms. Posey concurred, but noted that EPA hopes to establish designations shortly after the standard is set.

Mr. Ramfos asked who measures the pollutant levels. Ms. Posey replied that there are monitors set around the region, and there are specific requirements for how monitors are set for each pollutant.

Mr. Miller noted that it is frustrating that much of the region's bad air is from other areas. Ms. Posey agreed, and stated that "transport" is also being studied and addressed, and pointed out that this region's pollution is transported to other areas.

**11. Other Business**

**12. Adjourn**