
**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MEETING RECAP**

June 4, 2021

1. WELCOME, VIRTUAL PARTICIPATION PROCEDURES, AND MEMBER ROLL CALL PROTOCOL

Staff described the procedures and protocols for the virtual meeting and conducted a roll call. Meeting participants are documented in the attached attendance list.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MAY 7, 2021 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

There were no questions or comments regarding the May Technical Committee meeting. The minutes were approved.

ITEMS FOR THE BOARD AGENDA

3. REGIONAL ROADWAY SAFETY PROGRAM APPROVAL

Mr. Schermann briefed the committee on the Regional Roadway Safety Program (RRSP) projects recommended for board approval by the Selection Panel. The program provides technical assistance “to assist TPB member jurisdictions and the region to develop and/or implement projects, programs or policies to equitably improve safety outcomes for all roadway users.” The RRSP is funded at \$250,000 for FY 2021 and for FY 2022.

Mr. Schermann further reported that 11 applications totaling \$700,000 in funding requests were received. To select the candidate projects to recommend for funding, TPB convened a five-member panel with representatives from TPB, DDOT, MDOT, VDOT, and the FHWA. The panel selected five projects to recommend for technical assistance (listed below). Mr. Schermann noted that three of the selected projects are from Maryland while two are from Virginia, three are design/preliminary engineering projects while two are planning, three involve roadway safety audits, and four projects are either entirely within or connect to Equity Emphasis Areas.

Jurisdiction Name	Project	Panel Recommendation
Montgomery County	MD 650 High Injury Network Safety Study and Design	\$60,000
Prince George’s County	Roadway Safety Audits and Design Recommendation for County Maintained High Injury Network	\$40,000
City of Laurel	Bowie Road Safety Audit	\$30,000
Arlington County	Arlington / Virginia School Zone Speed Camera Guidelines	\$60,000
Fairfax County	Herndon Parkway (Van Buren to Spring) Complete Street Safety Improvements	\$60,000

Finally, Mr. Schermann reported that he will present the selected projects to the TPB at the upcoming Board meeting on June 16, 2021. There were no questions or comments.

4. VISUALIZE 2045: FINANCIAL PLAN PRELIMINARY OVERVIEW

Mr. Randall briefed the committee on the scope of work and preliminary results for financial plan for the

2022 update of the Visualize 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan. He noted that both a memorandum and the presentation deck were available in the meeting materials. He started by recapping the federal planning regulations that a long-range transportation plan and TIP have a financial plan that demonstrates how the projects and programs in the plan and TIP can be implemented and the sources of funding reasonably expected to be made available to carry them out. The long-range plan must be fiscally constrained, with reasonably expected revenues equal to the estimated cost of operating and maintaining the region's highway and transit systems and keeping them in a state of good repair, as well as paying for the expansion projects in the plan.

Mr. Randall reviewed the sources of transportation funding and then reported on preliminary forecasts for the analysis, with graphs of the revenues for the region and for each state by source, followed by the expenditures for the region by highway or transit mode and by purpose. About 34 percent of funding is going to highways and 66 percent to transit, of which the majority will go towards WMATA. He closed with some perspective on transportation funding in the region, with about 84% going to operations and state of good repair.

Director Srikanth provided some context on why the preliminary analysis is being brought to the board. The board is expected to approve the projects for air quality conformity analysis this month. Staff wanted to show that this slate of projects meets fiscal constraint requirements before board approval.

Ms. Sinner (VDOT) asked about the time it takes to conduct the financial analysis process. Eric responded that the planning for the financial analysis scope of work was shared with the State Technical Working Group in March 2020. Overall, it's about an eighteen-month process, taking place in coordination with the project inputs and other work on the long-range plan. The financial analysis should be completed by December of this year.

Director Srikanth added that every project in the long-range plan, all 500 or so of them, needs to be reviewed for updated projects costs. This cost expenditure process needs to be reviewed, as well as high-level revenue projections for motor fuel sales, and so forth. Inflation and growth factors need to be considered, as well as the federal surface transportation reauthorization and how some funding programs may be adjusted. The same happens at the state, regional, and local level; just as during the last analysis the dedicated funding for Metro was approved.

5. APPROVAL OF PROJECT INPUTS AND AQC ANALYSIS SOW VISUALIZE 2045 UPDATE

Director Srikanth informed the technical committee about the schedule to approve the conformity project inputs and the scope of work for updating the region's long-range transportation plan (LRTP), Visualize 2045. He went into detail about the processes that occur at both the regional and federal levels.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the TPB has received a response to the Air Quality Conformity time extension request that was sent to the USDOT. The response will be included under the materials for the Transportation Planning Board meeting. The USDOT did not approve 6-month extension that was requested. They asked that work be continued for the update at the scheduled time and noted that a missed deadline will impact the flow of federal funding to the region. Mr. Srikanth went over a couple options for the committee that could be considered to stay on track to meet the deadline. He informed the technical committee about the process the Board members will follow in seeking approval of the conformity project inputs.

Mr. Whitaker (VDOT) noted that VDOT hopes that the TPB will use the same practice that has been used for previous updates. He asked about the process for the Board to remove a project from the Air Quality Conformity list noting that some projects that have been in previous plans have spent money on project

development based on the assurance that they would be in the LRTP. He also noted a concern of funding implications if there was a delay of the plan approval and a lapse of plan certification. Director Srikanth noted that the Board will be informed properly about the process through an informative memo which will include the effort and time required to meet fiscal constraint. He stated it was within the right of the Board to remove projects if they question them which was why the Project Description forms were created. Mr. Srikanth said that projects not included in the current round of analysis could be added back into the next round noting there is no federal limit of how often the TPB can update the plan.

Ms. Sinner (VDOT) shared her concern of the possibility of the plan lapsing noting the importance of the federal funding. She encouraged that the Board be informed about the details of what could occur if the LRP lapses.

Mr. Brown (Loudoun County) asked about the procedure for removing projects. Mr. Srikanth responded noting that there would be a resolution that contains a list of projects to be approved in the AQC analysis. During the discussion, Board members can make amendments to the resolution where the Board could remove projects from the plan. He also noted that there are not many proposed changes to projects from the current plan.

Mr. Rawlings (DDOT) asked if projects could be added to the plan. Mr. Srikanth noted that projects could be added if it goes through the transportation agency and they meet a number of requirements, including financial backing and the project being in the required agency plans and programs. Mr. Rawlings also asked if about the plan approval schedule if projects were added or removed. Mr. Srikanth responded noting that the deadline will be missed if an agency tries to add projects to the plan due to the process for including additional projects. He also mentioned that removing projects should not impact meeting the federal deadline.

Ms. Hoeffner (VRE) asked if transportation agencies will have a role in the discussion if projects are recommended to be removed from the plan at the Board meeting. Mr. Srikanth responded noting the agency will have an opportunity to speak about the project even if there are no direct representatives for that agency on the Board. It was also noted that state DOTs serve as a conduit for other transportation agencies and could recognize members of those agencies to speak on projects.

Ms. Snyder (MDOT) asked how long the USDOT and EPA have to review and approve the AQC determination. Mr. Srikanth responded noting there is no specific allotted time in the regulations. Ms. Jackson (FHWA) confirmed that there is no legal timeframe for approval of the AQC.

Mr. Brown suggested having Ms. Jackson and Mr. Koenig (FTA) at the Board meeting to provide assistance, if needed, to the Board members. He also asked if review can begin on the sections of the plan that do not require the AQ conformity project list. Mr. Srikanth responded confirming that they can and that the other sections of the plan are progressing.

6. PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE BUILD SCENARIO

Director Srikanth briefed the Technical committee on a resolution proposed by Board member Evan Glass for the Board's consideration. It proposed to look at an alternative conformity analyses, alongside the Visualize 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan's constrained element, with a different set of projects designed to achieve the region's GHG reduction goals.

Mr. Brown (Loudoun County) informed the committee that he submitted an e-mail to TPB staff with questions about the proposal.

Mr. Whitaker (VDOT) asked that Mr. Srikanth be clear with the Board members about the criteria for selecting new projects and if the process has changed since the last constrained long-range plan (CLRP). He noted that, in the past, projects were added by project sponsors and not staff or Board. The Board adopts a list of projects from sponsors who have committed to fund, construct, operation, and

maintain projects. He also noted that an unconstrained scenario that does not represent a list of projects developed using the past practices would be unlikely to be approved by FHWA.

Mr. Phillips (WMATA) noted that the Board needs to know exactly what the alternative build scenario needs in order to be approved. He asked if the resolution currently lists which projects would be removed or added. Mr. Srikanth let him know that there was no list of projects with the resolution that was shared with the Technical committee.

Mr. Rawlings (DDOT) asked if any changes were made to the project list if it would require a 30-day public comment period. Mr. Srikanth noted that in the past, when projects were removed after the initial public comment period, the TPB was not required to hold another public comment period but if a project was added then another comment period could be held. Ms. Jackson (FHWA) confirmed that Director Srikanth was correct.

Mr. Erenrich (Montgomery County) asked Director Srikanth if he could summarize details of the plan if it were to lapse due to the inclusion or removal of projects. Mr. Srikanth noted that the technical committee will be linked to the federal regulations that will be followed due to the complexity of the topic.

Ms. Calkins (DCOP) asked what the process would look like to run both scenarios concurrently. She asked if the TPB can accommodate that and what process would need to be followed assuming the TPB adopted it. Mr. Srikanth noted that information for regarding that will be shared in the informational memo.

Ms. Snyder (MDOT) noted her concern about concurrent conformity analysis with the amount of time available. She also commented on her experiences working together with the TPB and the improvements the region has seen over the last several years.

INFORMATION ITEMS

7. TPB CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION STUDY OF 2021: LITERATURE REVIEW

Mr. Moran, TPB's Program Director for Travel Forecasting and Emissions Analysis, delivered some introductory remarks. He noted that, at the beginning of the year, TPB staff began the TPB Climate Change Mitigation Study of 2021 (CCMS) with the goal of identifying potential pathways for the region to reduce on-road, transportation-sector greenhouse gas emissions to meet regional greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals associated with 2030 and 2050. The study is divided into two phases: Phase 1, conducted by TPB staff, was a review of past work conducted by both TPB and COG regarding climate change mitigation. Phase 1 concluded with a report, dated March 2, 2021, documenting major findings from the past TPB and COG studies.¹ The findings from that report were presented by TPB staff to the Tech. Committee in February, and to both the TPB and the Climate, Energy and Environment Policy Committee (CEEPC) in May.

Mr. Moran noted that Phase 2 of the CCMS is a technical analysis/scenario study conducted by ICF, a consulting firm with significant expertise in climate change planning and mitigation. The ICF technical analysis is to last about nine months, concluding with a final report in December. Michael Grant, of ICF,

¹ Erin Morrow, Dusan Vuksan, and Mark S. Moran, "TPB Climate Change Mitigation Study of 2021, Phase 1 Report: Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions Strategies: Findings from Past Studies" (Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board, March 2, 2021),

<https://www.mwcog.org/file.aspx?&A=MiD6Ji82bKyfKHZxf4NWsf6lDtx%2bOIVznGk7eZoe1E%3d>.

made a presentation to the Tech. Committee in April regarding the CCMS work plan.² The ICF scenario study began with a literature review. A draft copy of the literature review was provided to the TPB staff in May, and TPB staff has recently provided some comments on the draft to ICF. The draft literature review was quite comprehensive and one of the TPB staff comments was that TPB staff would like an executive summary developed for the report. Once the report and executive summary have been finished, TPB staff plan to share them with the Tech. Committee, the TPB, and other interested parties. Lastly, Mr. Moran noted that the CCMS could be beneficial in addressing some of the issues raised in a recently proposed resolution on an alternative-build scenario discussed as part of the preceding agenda item.

The presentation was given by Mr. Grant and Mr. Agalloco, from ICF, who spoke from a set of presentation slides. The presentation covered the following topics: 1) Key analysis steps in the study; 2) Purpose of the literature review; 3) GHG reduction efforts of regional agencies and utilities; 4) GHG reduction efforts in the U.S. and abroad; 5) What has been learned about using transportation-related strategies for reducing GHGs; 6) Implications and next steps.

Due to time limitations, comments and questions were submitted via the WebEx chat box. Below is a summary of those comments and questions. Comments and questions have been edited for clarity and readability.

Mr. Brown, Loudoun Co., wrote, "This presentation is so informative, I would propose that it be added to the June TPB meeting agenda, placed before the discussion and vote for the adoption of the air quality conformity inputs and the discussion of the alternative-build resolution. I did not see it on the draft agenda for TPB." Mr. Srikanth responded, "This presentation was originally planned to be taken to the TPB in June, but the proposal for an alternative-build analysis has taken up all the available time. So, the CCMS presentation had to be postponed until the next month (July)! There is something important to be said for waiting for this study to be completed, so that it can identify the types of GHG reduction strategies, and their associated levels of implementation and outcomes, that would likely be needed to attain COG's 2030 and 2050 GHG reduction goals. That is the TPB staff position, but the policy makers may have their own perspectives on this."

Mr. Phillips, WMATA, wrote, "First off, I want to thank you for the highly informative and helpful work. I'm excited to see where it goes from here. I also think it's important to highlight your finding that meeting our climate goals will require a package of strategies and tools, no silver bullet." Mr. Srikanth wrote, "I agree with you that is the most important finding I see from the past 11 years of studies in this region: Not only is there no single strategy that can get us there; the actions needed within each strategy will be hard and require the highest degree of commitment. Additionally, consensus building will be critical to achieving these ambitious GHG reduction goals since many of the low-hanging fruits have already been picked."

Mr. Phillips then wrote three questions. First, Mr. Phillips wrote, "Perhaps I missed it, but did you include congestion pricing? Is that categorized under travel demand management? I'd encourage you to include examples and findings from places that have implemented it or seriously considering it." Mr. Grant responded, "We did look at literature on congestion pricing, noting different forms (e.g., cordon pricing, freeway pricing, managed lanes). Some of the cordon pricing examples/scenarios show high potential for significant reductions in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) to an urban core (30-40% reduction), but it should be noted that cordon pricing is generally targeted to urban core trips, which are only a portion of regional VMT. Road pricing strategies like VMT-fees and pay-as-you-drive insurance apply to all travel, so these latter strategies have a more global influence."

Second, Mr. Phillips wrote, "Did you see and/or include studies that show the U.S. needs to reduce VMT in addition to aggressive adoption of zero-emissions vehicles (ZEVs) to attain 2030 and 2050 GHG

² Michael Grant, "TPB Climate Change Mitigation Study of 2021 - Work Plan," <https://www.mwcog.org/events/2021/4/2/tpb-technical-committee/>.

targets? I believe I've seen such studies from the Rocky Mountain Institute, California Air Resources Board (CARB), etc.” Mr. Grant responded, “Literature does point to the value and importance of implementing multiple strategies, including mode shift, particularly given the time to transition to electric vehicles (EVs).”

Third, Mr. Phillips wrote, “Will your analysis be able to distinguish between types of intervention and levels of investment? For example, in terms of encouraging mode shift from single-occupant vehicles (SOVs) to other greener modes, bike/pedestrian projects, local buses that come every 30-40 minutes, and high-capacity transit are different animals. Is there any way to address this in the literature review or the subsequent scenario study? I have similar questions for transportation operations/management strategies: Are there any strategies/tools that are more effective than others? How do they impact GHGs, and by how much? What's the inflection point? For example, a change in traffic speeds of X is associated with what level of reduction in GHGs?” Mr. Grant responded, “Regarding the literature review, the studies that we examined address a variety of different interventions and investments, but it is often difficult to make generalized conclusions, given the differing contexts (e.g., city, region, different regions) and timeframes. There is research on the effects of transit frequency and optimum traffic speeds, for instance, and more specific analyses, but we could not capture all of that in our literature review. Through the scenario analysis, however, we will define and explore scenarios that include different types of interventions.” Regarding Mr. Phillips’ third question, Mr. Moran and Mr. Vuksan wrote, “Some of the work that ICF conducted in this region for the Long-Range Plan Task Force (LRPTF) back in 2017 shows that even the most aggressive transit scenarios will result in only a 1-2% reduction in VMT in the region relative to a future baseline forecast. For example, in one initiative, we studied adding 62 stations to the current transit system (which is very aggressive, probably exceeding anything that can realistically happen in the near future), extending the Metrorail lines to Potomac Mills, Germantown, and Laurel, and extending the Purple Line to Tysons. In this case, VMT reductions were about 1% at the regional level (shifts in land use to the impacted corridors were also assumed). In another case, we studied implementing an entire system of bus-rapid transit (BRT) routes throughout the region, and VMT was reduced by less than 1%. It is important to keep in mind that these figures could be the ceiling regarding GHG reductions, even with the most aggressive high-capacity transit (HCT) assumptions. These transit projects would, of course, have multiple co-benefits regarding equity, economic development, and mobility, but their impact on GHGs tends to be very modest at the regional level, even in the very aggressive scenarios that were studied.”

8. ESTABLISHING A BASELINE UNDERSTANDING FOR A POST-PANDEMIC NEW NORMAL IN REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION

Mr. Canan delivered a PowerPoint presentation that established a baseline understanding on the regional economy and travel before and during the COVID-19 pandemic; provided an overview of the impact of teleworking; reviewed perceptions and expectations for the post-pandemic new normal; and offered three potential scenarios that might be considered for the post-pandemic new normal in the national capital region. As part of this presentation, Mr. Canan presented statistics on observed economic and travel impacts during the pandemic period. These included an overview of the number of Coronavirus cases and deaths, the loss of jobs and increases in unemployment, reductions in use of commercial and retail space, and changes in roadway and public transportation travel volumes. He also reviewed how employers responded to the public health threat with increased teleworking, as well as what these employers expected in terms of continuing to offer teleworking to their workers following the pandemic. He similarly reviewed how travel has changed for residents of the region and what they expect in terms of their regional travel and teleworking behavior in the post pandemic period.

Having established this baseline understanding of what has occurred and what employers and workers anticipate for the post-pandemic period, Mr. Canan presented three potential post pandemic scenarios: A) The region will return to pre-pandemic conditions; B) The region will experience shifts and land and travel patterns, but the overall long-term growth will be unaffected; and C) The region will experience

shifts and land and travel patterns, and the overall long-term growth may be affected because workers may no longer be required to live in the same region where they work. Mr. Canan concluded by conducting an online, interactive poll asking participants to vote which of these three scenarios they felt was the most realistic to expect for this region. The results of the polling were displayed real-time during the polling demonstration and indicated that Scenario B was most likely.

Mr. Srikanth noted that a similar presentation featuring these three scenarios have been given previously to both COG's Region Forward Coalition and the Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee and that both also agreed that Scenario B was most likely and that that further highlighted the importance of TPB's Aspirational Initiative, "Bring Jobs and Housing Closer Together." He noted that while we continue to think about future scenarios and land use and travel patterns in the region, we should be focused not just on 15-minute cities, but 15-minute "communities" in which we are focused on connectivity to just not jobs, but accessibility to all important uses comprising a community.

Mr. Groth noted that the development community in his own jurisdiction is advocating for land use designations that can accommodate more flexibility among uses. He also noted that prior the pandemic, his jurisdiction was considering an office expansion; however, with increased teleworking as the likely new normal, that will have to be factored into the overall calculation of space requirements.

9. LOCAL AND REGIONAL ELECTRIC VEHICLE PLANNING

This item was deferred.

10. ASPIRATION TO IMPLEMENTATION: PUBLIC OUTREACH ON EXISTING PROJECTS THAT ALIGN WITH THE ASPIRATIONAL INITIATIVES

Ms. Armendariz briefed the committee on the Aspiration to Implementation outreach. She said that the Aspiration to Implementation activity's purpose is to reaffirm the importance of the TPB's Aspirational Initiatives by highlighting examples that have been implemented and align with the initiatives. This project also seeks to supplement the analysis of these initiatives, which was conducted by the TPB prior to endorsing the initiatives, with input from the public about how these initiatives are impact the everyday lives of people. The activity is expected to officially launch at the end of June 2021.

Ms. Zenner reviewed the social media and digital promotion plans for the outreach activity. She also reviewed the ambassador program and the materials TPB staff will be developing for the social media and promotional campaign.

OTHER ITEMS

11. OTHER BUSINESS

Dashboard

Staff shared information about a basic dashboard application that will use existing data to showcase regional information. A demo of the dashboard will be presented in the near future.

TAP Application Opportunities

Staff informed the technical committee about the TAP program and went over the application review process. It was noted that the review will be presented to the Board in July. The Virginia pre-applications are due on July 1 and the applications are due on October 1. The Board is scheduled to approve the Virginia projects in February 2022.

Transit within Reach

Staff informed the technical committee about the Transit within Reach program. The application deadline for this program is July 1. Projects will be reviewed and decisions will be made in the summer. For questions or comments, please contact John Swanson or Nicole McCall.

Voices of the Region: Jurisdiction-Level Data Sharing

Staff shared information about the Voices of the Region data sharing. An e-mail will be sent to the committee early next week with a memo and form about accessing the data at the jurisdictional level. Data will be available for 10 jurisdictions and only to local staff. A public report is being prepared that compare each jurisdiction to the region which will be released soon.

Resiliency Study Update

Staff updated the technical committee on the Resiliency Study. A memorandum and draft whitepaper are being developed and are estimated to be completed later this month. The final products will be available later in the year. Drafts will be sent to technical committee members that submitted input to the study for review.

CAV webinar

Staff recapped the May 25th CAV webinar. It was the fourth webinar in the series and focused on the findings and recommendations from the CAV whitepaper. The recording of the webinar will be available on the website soon. The whitepaper was shared through the chat and can be found on the website.

BTWD recap, Map

Staff gave the committee a recap of the Bike-to-Work Day event. The event was a success with good turnout and over 9,000 registrants. The printout maps developed for the event were very popular and all copies of them were distributed. More copies will be created in the future. Members of the technical committee also shared their experiences with the event.

HCT Map Project

Staff updated the technical committee on the High Capacity Transit Map project. It is a regional transit map that will show different modes of travel. The project proposal will be shared with Director Srikanth once prepared and stakeholder engagement will begin at the Regional Public Transit Subcommittee meeting.

New Staff

Staff introduced a new hire to the technical committee, Kyona Davis.

12. ADJOURN

No other business was brought before the committee.

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT	
---------------------------------------	--

Mark Rawlings – DC DOT Kristin Calkins – DCOP Jason Groth – Charles County Mark Mishler – Frederick County MiYoung Park – City of Gaithersburg Kari Snyder – MDOT David Schlie – MDOT Gary Erenrich – Montgomery County Jennifer Slesinger - Alexandria Dan Malouff – Arlington County Chloe Ritter – City of Fairfax Malcolm Watson – Fairfax County Robert Brown – Loudoun County	Chloe Delhomme – City of Manassas Sree Nampoothiri – NVTA Dan Goldfarb – NVTC Meagan Landis – Prince William County Betsy Massie – PRTC Norman Whitaker – VDOT Maria Sinner – VDOT Regina Moore – VDOT Ciara Williams – VDRPT Katherine Youngbluth - VDRPT Christine Hoeffner – VRE Mark Phillips – WMATA Sandra Jackson – FHWA Laurel Hammig – NPS
---	--

OTHERS / MWCOG STAFF PRESENT	
-------------------------------------	--

Lyn Erickson Kanti Srikanth Tim Canan Andrew Meese Mark Moran Charlene Howard Nicole McCall Dusan Vuksan Jane Posey Jinchul Park Bill Bacon Jon Schermann Nazneen Ferdous Eric Randall	John Swanson Abigail Zenner Bryan Hayes Sergio Ritacco Leo Pineda Sarah Bond Stacy Cook Karen Armendariz Wanda Owens Janie Nham Yu Gao Kyona Davis Michael Grant Adam Agalloco
---	---