

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

---

## **Technical Committee Minutes**

For meeting of  
**October 3, 2014**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE – October 3, 2014**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings  
Jameshia Peterson

DCOP -----

MARYLAND

Charles County -----  
Frederick County Ron Burns  
City of Frederick -----  
Gaithersburg -----  
Montgomery County Gary Erenrich  
Prince George's County Vic Weissberg  
Rockville -----  
M-NCPPC  
Montgomery County Eric Graye  
Prince George's County Famararz Mokhtari  
MDOT Lyn Erickson  
Matt Baker  
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman  
Arlington County Dan Malouff  
City of Fairfax -----  
Fairfax County Mike Lake  
Malcolm Watson  
Falls Church -----  
Fauquier County Marie Scheetz  
Loudoun County Robert Brown  
Manassas -----  
NVTA Denise Harris  
NVTC Claire Gron  
David Koch  
Prince William County Ricardo Canizales  
James Davenport  
PRTC Betsy Massie  
VRE Christine Hoeffner  
VDOT Norman Whitaker  
Dan Painter  
VDRPT Tim Roseboom  
NVPDC -----  
VDOA

WMATA

Danielle Wesolek

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Kanti, Srikanth, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Robert Griffiths, DTP  
Andrew Meese, DTP  
Gerald Miller, DTP  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Bill Bacon, DTP  
Lamont Cobb, DTP  
Michael Farrell, DTP  
Ben Hampton, DTP  
Charlene Howard, DTP  
Jessica Mirr, DTP  
Jane Posey, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Rich Roisman, DTP  
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP  
Daniel Son, DTP  
Dan Sonenklar, DTP  
John Swanson, DTP  
Marco Trigueros, DTP  
Dusan Vuksan, DTP  
Feng Xie, DTP

OTHER

Bill Orleans

## **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

### **Technical Committee Meeting**

---

#### TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

Minutes were approved as written.

**2. Update on the Draft 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP**

Mr. Austin stated that the draft 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP had been released for public comment on September 11<sup>th</sup>. He reported that a few comments had been received on the I-270 widening project, in addition to a comment letter from MWAQC. He added that the TPB would be asked to approve the CLRP at their October 15 meeting.

Mr. Sonenklar distributed a memo that outlined two changes that had been made to the Performance Analysis of the CLRP. The first change was the inclusion of highway congestion maps, and the second was a technical correction to the VMT and VMT per capita numbers.

Mr. Erenrich asked if there was any reason for the change in VMT numbers beyond quality assurance/control reviews. Mr. Griffiths responded that it was a spreadsheet calculation error.

Mr. Srikanth spoke to a request that had been made at the September Technical Committee meeting for a comprehensive list of all projects in the CLRP. Mr. Austin said the list was under development and would be shared with the Committee in the next month or two.

**3. Update on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP**

Ms. Posey stated that she would not review the summary conformity report, as she had done that last month, and there was no change. She indicated that the report was presented to a number of committees throughout the public comment period, including AQCPAC, MWAQC's citizen advisory group. This was the first time that the conformity results had been presented to AQCPAC. She indicated that MWAQC submitted a comment letter on the conformity analysis, and summarized the letter.

Mr. Srikanth mentioned that the Access For All Committee commented directly to the TPB about specific projects in the CLRP. The TPB directed staff to draft letters to the agencies responsible for each project commented on by the AFA Committee. He also noted that WMATA commented positively on the funding for the State of Good Repair, but also indicated that there is need to work towards funding other enhancements such as 8 car trains.

#### **4. Briefing on the Draft Call for projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2015 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP**

Mr. Srikanth stated that members of the TPB, the CAC and some federal partners had expressed a need for a simplified version of the larger Call for Projects document. The request was also made to formally incorporate the policy objectives of the Regional Transportation Priorities plan into the Call for Projects. He stated that the TPB would be asked to approve the Call for Projects document at their November meeting.

Mr. Austin distributed three items: a companion brochure to the Call for Projects document, a sample CLRP project description form and the schedule for the approval of the 2015 CLRP and its Air Quality Conformity Analysis.

Mr. Austin stated that the larger document – the official Call for Projects document would remain largely the same, with the addition of language recognizing the approved Priorities Plan as a part of the policy context. This document would be made available as a resource online. The distributed brochure would become the “public face” of the Call for Projects document. Mr. Austin highlighted the contents of the brochure, including a section that highlighted six of the region’s “greatest needs.”

Next, Mr. Austin discussed the CLRP form and instructions for project submissions. He stated that project submission would be done online using the CLRP/Conformity/TIP database that had been used in the past. He highlighted the new “Policy Framework Questions” that had been added to the form to address the Vision and Priorities Plan and additional policy context described in the Call for Projects document. Mr. Austin described a proposed two-stage process that would have staff review project description forms and ask agencies to respond to follow-up questions based on their submissions. The provided responses could then be used as a basis for a letter or other documentation on how the projects in the CLRP address the region’s greatest needs – as is asked for in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.

Ms. Massie asked if there would be an FY 2016-2021 TIP. Mr. Austin stated that the TIP had been moved to a two-year cycle so the new FY 2015-2020 TIP would remain the TIP of record for this CLRP update.

Mr. Brown asked about the relationship between projects in the CLRP and in VDOT's larger state transportation plan, VTrans. Mr. Whitaker stated that VTrans was being updated this year and would likely include more projects and detail. Mr. Srikanth noted that VTrans is made up of two components; a policy document and a surface transportation plan that detailed highway and transit projects. He noted this list was not financially constrained and generally was at a very high level, compared to the CLRP which contains much more detail and smaller level projects.

Mr. Malouff expressed concern that the list of six "greatest needs" seemed to lack context of origin. Mr. Srikanth noted that the needs had been compiled from the goals and strategies identified in the Vision and the Priorities Plan, as well as other COG policy resources such as the Climate Change Report and Region Forward. The list was also informed and shaped by the measures used in the most recent Performance Analysis and the Priorities Plan Assessment of the CLRP. Mr. Malouff suggested it would be helpful to somehow show that relationship.

Ms. Wesolek stated that the discrepancy between having 8 Vision goals and only 6 needs listed may generate some confusion. She also inquired about the process for the follow-up questions that would be asked of agencies. Mr. Austin stated that the intent was to have each agency assist staff to describe how the new and existing projects in the CLRP address the policy goals outlined in the Call for Projects. Mr. Srikanth added that the responses to these questions will be helpful during the development of the Priorities Plan Assessment. Mr. Austin noted that the intention was to keep the CLRP form more simple, rather than asking for a multitude of potential data points, and then to follow up with more focused questions based on the actual projects submitted.

Mr. Brown asked if the follow-up question approach would be applied to projects already in the CLRP. Mr. Austin responded that the intent was only to look at new projects as they were submitted in the context of projects already in the Plan, but not to retroactively inquire about projects.

Mr. Weissberg suggested including the "greatest needs" identified on the CLRP form. Mr. Austin said that each was addressed in one way or another on the form with the new Policy Context questions.

Mr. Mokhtari suggested including a comment field with each of the Policy Context questions that would allow agencies to describe how the project addressed that issue.

Ms. Wesolek stated that the information on how a project addresses the Priorities or needs was valuable information that should be included in the process as early as the first public comment period. Ms. Erikson noted that the follow-up questions would be used to develop the Priorities Plan Assessment, which wouldn't be released until September, so it wouldn't be necessary to have up front. Mr. Austin added that the agency's responses on the CLRP form would be available during that initial comment

period, but that he doubted there would be sufficient time to process the follow-up questions with each agency before January 15<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Wesolek suggested asking agencies to submit their own documentation on how their projects address the Priorities Plan along with their projects, without waiting for the questions.

Ms. Erikson asked committee members to submit comments to Mr. Austin by the close of business on Monday. Mr. Srikanth added that the document was still in draft form and that the TPB may suggest changes as well prior to approving it in November.

## **5. Briefing on the 2013 Regional Air Passenger Survey**

Mr. Roisman began his presentation by acknowledging other TPB staff involved in the survey: Mr. Mohammed (survey manager), Ms. Reschovsky and Ms. McCall (field supervision), and the survey contractor WBA Market Research.

The regional air passenger survey is performed every two years (most recently in October 2013) and the results reported to the Committee and the TPB. This year the COG Board of Directors also has an interest in the survey results and airports in general as part of their year-long focus on regional infrastructure. As part of that initiative a Regional Airports Forum was held on COG on September 26<sup>th</sup> that was attended by approximately 25 people, including several members of the Committee. The air systems planning region used for analysis is larger than the TPB planning area. There is a three-airport regional system that serves distinct markets, serves both air passengers and air cargo, and is accessed using a multimodal surface transportation network. The bi-annual air passenger survey provides the data foundation for the rest of the air systems planning program, that includes preparation of ground access forecasts, monitoring ground access travel times, and preparing a ground access element and air cargo element to the regional air systems plan. The Aviation Technical Subcommittee (of the TPB Technical Committee) has oversight of the air systems planning program.

The region is fortunate to have three commercial service airports, all three of which are in the top 25 within the U.S. in terms of annual enplanements (boardings); only New York shares this distinction. Historically, the airports have served three distinct markets: BWI Marshall is the destination for low-cost air carriers due to the presence of Southwest Airlines (71% market share). Washington National is the most accessible airport to the core areas of the region on both the highway network and via Metrorail (15% mode share, among the highest in the country). National is the region's short-haul, origin-destination airport, and American Airlines (following its merger with US Airways) has 56% of the market share at National – that share has been shrinking as the merged airline divests the slot (takeoff and landing) pairs that were required as a Federal condition of the merger. Those slots have been picked up by low-cost carriers. Dulles is the region's international air gateway (50 international destinations) and location for long-haul domestic flights to the West and is served by the Airbus A380, the world's largest passenger aircraft.

Mr. Roisman noted that the three airport regional system should be balanced and discussed the various regulations in place at National (and their history) to help keep the system in balance, mitigate aircraft noise, and ensure safe and efficient operation of the airport. He also noted that COG/TPB policy has been to seek and maintain balance in the system, and that Congress designated National as the short haul airport and Dulles as the long-haul and growth airport when MWAA was created in the 1980s and took over operation of the airports from the Federal government. Finally, he noted that a combination of economic factors, regulatory changes, and changes within the airline industry have been contributing to an imbalance within the system.

Recent data trends show that regional enplanements have been flat since 2005, which has matched similar trends in regional employment and vehicle-miles of travel; however, looking airport by airport there has been redistribution of regional airport passengers between the three airports, with significant increases at National and BWI Marshall and decreases at Dulles. Recent forecasts from the FAA show significant growth in air passengers out to the year 2040, with most of the growth going to BWI Marshall and Dulles. Mr. Roisman noted that in addition to the regulatory limits in National, the airport is also approaching its physical capacity, whereas there is room for growth at the other two airports.

The 2013 survey ran from October 9<sup>th</sup> to October 22<sup>nd</sup>: the Federal government was shut down from October 1<sup>st</sup> to October 16<sup>th</sup>, although the impacts in survey results were felt more from the cumulative effects of the Federal sequester than the shutdown itself. Mr. Roisman reviewed results on locally originating air passengers vs. connecting air passengers, trip origin, mode of access, airport choice factors, and trip purpose. With regard to trip purpose, the decrease in business travel related to the Federal sequester was emphasized. With regard to airport choice, most passengers chose to travel from the closest airport to them. Mr. Roisman also noted the shift in airport service areas (where a majority of passengers in that area are choosing a certain airport), particularly the shift in western Montgomery County from Dulles to BWI due to the improved accessibility to BWI using the Inter County Connector (MD 200), and the shift in southeastern Prince William County (but west of I-95) from Dulles to National. Finally, Mr. Roisman noted the significant economic impact of the airports (nearly \$50 Billion and 500,000 jobs) on the region.

Ms. Erickson asked what the percentage of international flights was at Dulles and could it be contributing to the regional system imbalance. Mr. Roisman responded that he did not know the exact percentage could check and respond back; however, he noted that international travel at Dulles has been consistently growing (whereas domestic travel has been consistently shrinking) so international travel at Dulles is not responsible for the system imbalance. In his view, the imbalance is being caused by the erosion of the regulations in place at National and subsequent addition of flights from that airport. Mr. Griffiths noted a specific example where a perimeter exempt flight was added from

National to Salt Lake City where service already existed between Dulles and Salt Lake City; after one year the Dulles service was eliminated.

Mr. Malouff asked what would happen if Congress added more slots to National given the physical limitations of the airport. Mr. Roisman indicated that MWWA has a responsibility to safely accommodate the flights in and out of National, but doing so if further slots were added would require some creative solutions – at some point the airport cannot physically accommodate any more aircraft, particularly overnight parked aircraft. In terms of ground access, automobile parking would need to be expanded. Mr. Roisman also deferred the question to Mr. Hewitt of MWWA. Mr. Hewitt noted that the airfield will never be expanded and that will become the limiting factor at National; once the available takeoff and landing times are filled up, that is the end – delays will then occur for airlines and the airport will become less attractive to airlines.

Mr. Erenrich asked for clarification on the meaning of “out of balance” and why it is an issue for the group when the airports compete against each other. Mr. Roisman responded that Dulles and BWI have long been designated the region’s growth airports and that the airport operators have invested heavily in infrastructure to accommodate that growth; with the system out of balance those investments are being wasted. Mr. Erenrich asked why the investment issue was a COG/TPB issue. Mr. Roisman noted that the COG Board is emphasizing infrastructure investment this year; it is a TPB issue because the TPB is looking at efficient investment throughout the entire regional transportation network. Furthermore, if National reaches capacity limits and service is curtailed, it hurts the economic competitiveness of the region. Finally, travelers must be able to access the airports using the ground transportation system that is included in the TPB’s plans (e.g., the CLRP and TIP); those plans approved by the TPB are aligned to maintain and improve that access, but many of the major regional bottlenecks on the highway network are in locations crucial to airport ground access. Mr. Griffiths added that in terms of interest at the COG Board, airport noise and public safety are also issues historically associated with the system imbalance.

Mr. Mokhtari asked how the regional activity centers could assist with improving the airport system balance. Mr. Roisman responded that the airports themselves are activity centers and land use decisions are being made based on their locations. Ms. Massie asked if there was a companion piece looking at air freight. Mr. Roisman noted that the regional air cargo plan was in the process of being updated and would be presented to the committee when completed. Mr. Painter asked if another survey would be conducted soon. Mr. Roisman responded that the survey is conducted every two years, so the next one will be in fall 2015. Mr. Malouff asked at what point would air passengers begin considering Richmond International Airport as a travel alternative. Mr. Roisman indicated that such information could not be determined directly from the survey; however, it was known that BWI in particular served many passengers from outside the air systems region (PA, DE). His understanding regarding Richmond was that its airfares were not necessarily competitive with our region’s airports. Mr. Griffiths



added that for international travel people are coming from as far as North Carolina to access Dulles (based on previous surveys) so it is market dependent. Ms. Wesolek asked if airport choice factors varied based on trip purpose. Mr. Roisman indicated that price sensitivity was higher among non-business travelers but closest airport was still highest for both business and non-business travel.

## **6. Update on the Regional “Street Smart” Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign**

Mr. Farrell played a video on the FY 2014 Street Smart program.

In the interests of time Mr. Farrell skipped to page 12 of the PowerPoint, on partnerships. Mr. Farrell said he has been working with the Bus Subcommittee to obtain free PSA placement of Street Smart ads, particularly bus cards and shelters. He said he is also working through the advisory group and the police chiefs committee to get pedestrian and bicycle safety related enforcement carried out during the campaign, which will take place in November.

Ms. Erickson praised the video, which was created by the project consultant.

## **7. Update on the Washington Region Transportation Planning Process Certification Review on October 28 & 29**

Mr. Srikanth briefed the committee on the upcoming federal certification review of the transportation planning process for the Washington region, which will take place on October 28 and 29. A draft agenda was distributed and reviewed with the committee, focusing on the specific topics that will be covered. For each session, the lead federal reviewer opens discussion and TPB staff will respond with the latest accomplishments and developments; at that time other organizations may be asked or have the opportunity to comment. Representation from the Fredericksburg-area metropolitan planning organization (FAMPO) will attend as well, due to the overlap of a small portion of Stafford County with the TPB planning area.

Ms. Erickson emphasized that the certification process is the essence of what the metropolitan planning process is, and recommended attendance as an intense and valuable learning opportunity. Mr. Srikanth added that the certification review is an opportunity to learn from the federal representatives about what other MPOs do. In response to questions about the location and the meeting time each day, Mr. Miller responded with the logistical details. As background, a federal questionnaire from 2010 is being updated with fresh responses by TPB staff and will be distributed to the committee in the next several days.

**8. Briefing on the Draft Update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region**

Mr. Farrell announced that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee had decided that the bicycle and pedestrian project database needed further review.

He and Ms. Mirr demonstrated a draft on-line map of bicycle and pedestrian project from the draft regional bicycle and pedestrian plan. The map, which was created by the GIS department, will allow members of the public to click on a project on the on-line map, which will pull up a summary of the information on that project from the database. Projects are color-coded by status on the draft map. We are working with the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee to improve both the map and the database.

**9. Briefing on the October 2 Joint Meeting of the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) and the Climate, Energy and Environment Policy Committee (CEEPC)**

Mr. Srikanth informed the committee members that on October 2nd a joint meeting of the MWAQC and CEEPC committees had taken place and that he had briefed the committee members on the process of regional transportation planning. He referred to a copy of the presentation that was distributed and noted its content including what the TPB was, the federal mandates for the TPB, key elements of its federally-mandated planning activities, activities undertaken beyond conformity such as CLRP performance analysis, RTPP assessment and scenario analyses such as the 2010 What Would IT Take.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the presentation also explained how the TPB works with local jurisdictions and the states and MWATA in a Bottom Up-Tops Down manner to develop the CLRP. He the purpose of the meeting was to identify how MWAQC and CEEPC could work with the TPB to engage the Transportation sector is advancing the region's environmental goals.

Mr. Srikanth referred to the last slide of his presentation noting that he had suggested a working group of professionals be established to first identify viable/implementable strategies from all four sectors which could then be quantified (emissions reduction), cost estimated and an implementation schedule developed; this would be submitted in the form of an action plan/blue-print for the three Boards. He informed the Committee that MWAQC and CEEPC staff Director, Mr. Walz prepared a presentation on the region's work on criteria pollutants and greenhouse gases and the role of transportation sector in the same.

Mr. Srikanth then informed the Committee about the discussion among the committees' members that had followed the two presentations culminating in a joint

resolution that went beyond the proposal he and Mr. Walz has made. He referred to a copy of the meeting notes provided by MWAQC/CEEPC staff that described the gist of the resolution; he described the two points of the resolution: first was asking the TPB to consider an action affirming the COG's multi-sector GHG reduction goals and secondly asking COG to jointly convene a multi-sector, multi-disciplinary professional working group to explore establishing targets for consideration when the regional transportation plan is developed.

Mr. Erenrich asked whether the role and function of transportation in meeting the 80% greenhouse gas reduction goal by 2050 was discussed. Ms. Erickson answered that it was not discussed and she suggested that each participant of the TPB technical committee reaches out to their members in different boards and explains to them the issues.

Mr. Srikanth added that a point was made during the presentation that the local initiatives in transportation sector can contribute to regional emission reductions but it should be acknowledged that there are limitations to how much reductions could be achieved through such local initiatives just within the transportation sector. Instead, all sectors working collaboratively could achieve more reductions and in a cost efficient manner.

Mr. Walz said this is one of the steps of ongoing education process to let people in transportation and environmental communities understand each other. There wasn't a chance in the joint MWAQC/CEEPC meeting to get into further details along these lines.

Mr. Griffiths added that the objective is to be realistic and to identify strategies that are cost effective and implementable. Mr. Walz affirmed that this effort is beyond the CLRP conformity process. It is part of an educational process.

Mr. Srikanth noted that he expects the Board to visit this matter in the coming months upon receiving the formal communique from MWAQC-CEEPC and from COG Board.

#### **10. Briefing on the Southeast High Speed Rail from Richmond, Virginia to Washington, DC Study**

Mr. Roseboom and Mr. Craig from the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) briefed the committee on the commencement of the Tier II Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Southeast High Speed Rail (SEHSR) corridor from Richmond, VA to Washington, D.C. Mr. Craig distributed a one-page handout, summarizing the Tier I study completed in 2002, the study corridor, the objectives of the study, and upcoming public scoping meetings. The study will include: examination of the feasibility of adding a third track, and even a fourth track in

Alexandria; other infrastructure improvements to permit adding four trains per day between Washington and Charlotte; and getting trains up to 90 mph speed. The study will also coordinate with the Long Bridge study being conducted by District DOT and the Union Station master terminal plan.

Ms. Massie asked for clarification on the amount and source of funds for the project. The response was from a Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) grant, with local matching funds provided by the state and other sources. It was also clarified that this is a NEPA-plus planning study, so while no construction is currently funded; it may provide a springboard for design-build contracting by the state.

Ms. Hoeffner added VRE's perspective on the study, including the number of trains they run, their current development plans, and their hope that further projects in the corridor will be funded by DRPT and the local jurisdictions. She asked if a financial plan would be developed from the study, which Mr. Craig recorded as a question for future response.

Mr. Malouff asked if there was any planning for electrification. Mr. Craig responded that at this time there is no examination of electrification planned, though locomotives that can use both diesel and electricity are being looked at.

Ms. Wesolek asked if an intercity travel analysis was being conducted as per the stated comparison with air and auto traffic. Mr. Craig recorded this as a question for future response.

Participation was requested in the technical advisory process. Questions were asked about the role and responsibilities of participating, which Mr. Roseboom described as a strategic advisory and technical comment opportunity.

## **11. Other Business**

None.

## **12. Adjourn**