

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes
for meeting of

December 7, 2012

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - December 7, 2012**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
 Anthony Foster

DCOP -----

MARYLAND

Charles County Jason Groth
Frederick Co. Ron Burns
City of Frederick Tim Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich
Prince George's Co. Vic Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. -----
 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT Lyn Erickson
 Roy Gothie
MTA -----
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax Co. Calvin Lam
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Robert Brown
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
NVTC Claire Gron
PRTC Nick Alexandrow
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Randy Hodgson
VDRPT Tim Roseboon
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Danielk Wesolek

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
FHWA-VA -----
FTA -----
NCPC -----
NPS -----
MWAQC -----

COG Staff

Ron Kirby, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Dan Sonenklar, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Jinchul Park, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Jonathan Rogers, DTP
Karin Foster, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Yu Gao, DTP
Sunil Kumar, DEP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS

Other Attendees

Nicole Katsikides, MDOT
Jack VanDop, FHWA
Randy Carroll, MDE
Bill Orleans, HACK

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

December 7, 2012

Technical Committee Minutes

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

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Update on an Additional Air Quality Conformity Analysis to Respond to the EPA Redesignation of the Washington Region under the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)

Ms. Posey reminded the group of the off-cycle conformity analysis required by the region's designation as a marginal non-attainment region under EPA's 2008 Ozone NAAQS. She noted that she had gone over the report at the November meeting, and would not go over the results again. She mentioned that the public comment period went until December 15, and that no comments had been received so far, but that she was expecting to get a comment letter from MWAQC. She reminded the group that the deadline for inputs for the 2013 CLRP conformity analysis is December 14th. She also noted that a few months ago she had distributed a memo detailing transit assumptions for project network coding, and asked that any changes to transit project assumptions be provided by February 1.

Ms. Erickson asked to have the transit details memo sent to her.

3. Briefing on a Report on the Implementation of Complete Streets Policies in the Washington Region

Mr. Farrell spoke to two handouts on the Complete Streets survey.

Mr. Kirby said that all agencies had responded. Mr. Farrell said yes but that some responses needed clarification.

Mr. Brown said that the March 2012 report indicated that Loudoun County had a Complete Streets policy. Mr. Farrell replied that the survey results still need to be reconciled with other sources of information. Mr. Brown asked to whom the survey had been sent. Mr. Farrell promised to provide a list of contacts.

Mr. Groth said that Charles County did not yet have a Complete Streets policy; other things had taken priority.

Chair Rawlings said that the group responding to this survey was not always the same as the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee. Mr. Farrell clarified that for jurisdictions that

did not send a representative to the bicycle and pedestrian sub-committee, he had reached out to others such as city managers.

Mr. Erenrich said that he wished he had been contacted about the survey. The question of whether a jurisdiction has a policy or not is a simple one.

Mr. Kirby said that we want to get this on this month's TPB meeting, but it needs to be complete and accurate. A revised version will be sent to the Technical Committee.

Chair Rawlings asked what else would be done to promote Complete Streets. Mr. Farrell replied that the new TIP project description form included information on implementation of Complete Streets policies. A forum on implementation of Complete Streets policies will be held in January.

4. Briefing on a Draft TPB Letter to the Legislatures of the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia Expressing Support for Action on Transportation Funding

Mr. Kirby presented the Power point to the Committee that was given at the November 28th TPB meeting on the performance of the 2012 CLRP. Based upon this presentation, the TPB recognized that one of the most significant regional challenges highlighted by the 2012 CLRP is the need for additional funding for both transit and roadways to address maintenance and rehabilitation requirements and capacity improvements needed to accommodate a growing region. He said that the TPB requested for the December meeting a draft letter to the legislatures of the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia which will express TPB support for increases in transportation funding.

Mr. Weissburg suggested that the east-west differences in highway accessibility be included in the challenges section of the presentation.

Mr. Erenrich commented on the population and employment forecasts for 2040 and expressed doubts about some of the jurisdictions' growth rates.

Mr. Kirby said that similar concerns about the jurisdictional forecasts were raised at the TPB meeting. He said that he will look at how the forecasts made in 1990 for 2010 actually compared to the 2010 Census numbers by jurisdiction and present the results at the December TPB meeting. He explained that the local jurisdiction land use planners develop their own forecasts and then use a cooperative process to reach agreement on the regional totals. He said that while there is a lot of uncertainty when forecasting over a 20 year period, the forecasts are updated every year.

Mr. DesJardin of COG's Department of Community Planning and Services described the background and technical steps in COG the cooperative forecasting process. He commented that long-range forecasting cannot anticipate major national influences on

the region such as 9/11 or wars, but the process is disciplined by a model for the total regional forecasts and involves all of the local land use planners reviewing each other's projections. The process tries to capture local policy changes with annual updates.

Mr. Griffiths recounted the evolution of the regional forecasting process from the first round in the 1980s to the latest Round 8 in 2012. He commented that each round has involved more local planner review and cooperation and technical enhancements.

Mr. Erenrich expressed concern about the need for additional buses to serve the forecast increases in transit ridership and the lack of funding for more transit capacity as well as for Metrorail maintenance and rehabilitation.

Mr. Kirby agreed that transit capacity is critical for transit. He then distributed the draft letter and highlighted its main points.

Regarding the draft letter, Mr. Erenrich suggested adding something to encourage the states to address the recent reduction of allowable tax-free federal transit commuter benefits that seems to have reduced Metrorail ridership.

Mr. Kirby said that the letter focused on revenues, and referred to the section in the letter about states giving local jurisdictions more transportation revenue options. He said that local jurisdictions in both states are concerned that they receive much less back from the state than they contribute. He said that a revised draft would be posted for the TPB meeting.

5. Update on the Implementation of the New Transportation Alternatives Program under MAP-21 in the Washington Region

Referring to a memo that was presented to the TPB in November, Mr. Swanson briefed the Committee on progress in establishing a project selection process in our region for the new Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), which is a formula program established under the new federal reauthorization bill known as MAP-21. He said that the TPB in November had generally expressed support for a TPB staff proposal for implementing the program in our region. He briefly described discussions between staff and three the state DOTs regarding the established of the TAP.

Mr. Brown said he understood that on December 3 VDOT had issued a solicitation for applications for FY2014.

Mr. Swanson said that was correct. He said that for FY2014, VDOT and the TPB would issue separate solicitations for projects. He said that VDOT had already announced that for FY2013, the TAP funds would be used for projects selected under the Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program prior to the enactment of MAP-21.

Mr. Canizales asked how projects already initiated under TE would be treated under the TAP.

Mr. Swanson said that in Virginia, VDOT had announced that it intended to use all FY2013 TAP funding for projects selected under the TE Program. For FY2014 funds, VDOT will use its statewide TAP funding for already initiated projects, but the TPB would solicit new projects for FY2014 with its suballocated funds.

Mr. Brown asked if representatives from the Technical Committee would be on the selection panel for the TAP projects. Mr. Swanson replied the TPB staff proposal called for impartial experts from national organizations to comprise the panel.

Mr. Malouff asked how project selection will be coordinated between the statewide and suballocated funds. Mr. Kirby said the process will need to be closely coordinated so that it is not duplicative or inefficient.

Ms. Erickson said the Maryland process would get underway in the spring.

Mr. Kirby said that TPB staff was pleased that MDOT intends to combine funding for both FY2013 and FY2014 in one solicitation. Further, he noted that there will only be one solicitation for MDOT for both statewide and suballocated funds.

Chair Rawlings said that DDOT is awaiting guidance regarding the treatment of DDOT as a potential applicant for projects.

Mr. Kirby emphasized the importance of regional criteria.

Mr. Orleans said that it might be more effective to combine all the state suballocations into one large fund to use on a project that would cross jurisdictional lines.

Mr. Swanson said that the TAP is actually intended for use on small, local projects.

6. Update of the Implementation of the New Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program under MAP-21 in the Washington Region

Ms. Klancher spoke from a PowerPoint presentation and described how MAP-21 changed the three former FTA programs: Job Access and Reverse Commute, New Freedom, and Elderly and Disabled, and described MAP-21's new Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program. She also provided an overview of the TPB staff proposal for a joint designated recipient between the TPB, DDOT, MTA and DRPT in the Washington DC-VA-MD Urbanized Area. Staff has been hosting discussions with these agencies, WMATA and Mr. Wojahn as the Chair of the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force.

Ms. Klancher said regional projects could still be funded under this joint designated recipient arrangement, either through one of the state agencies or WMATA. An outline for a Memorandum of Understanding will be developed for review by DDOT, MTA and DRPT. Until a designated recipient for the new MAP-21 Enhanced Mobility program is on file with the FTA, none of these funds can be expended.

Mr. Weissberg asked if the JARC program was entirely removed or put under another program. Ms. Klancher replied that MAP-21 eliminated the JARC program all together, but did make Job Access Reverse Commute activities eligible operating expenses under the Section 5307 program that WMATA receives, which under SAFETEA-LU was only for capital expenses.

7. Briefing on the Draft Maryland Statewide Interim Rail Plan

Ms. Katsikides, Director of the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) Office of Freight and Multimodalism, spoke to a PowerPoint about the process of developing the Maryland Statewide Rail Plan to be compliant with the Passenger Rail Improvement and Investment Act (PRIIA). PRIIA requires the inclusion of passenger and freight projects in Statewide Rail Plans for federal funding eligibility.

The Maryland Statewide Rail Plan goals include: Quality of Service, Safety and Security, System Preservation and Performance, Environmental Stewardship, and Connectivity for Freight or Passenger Mobility. Current projects include those in Maryland that are part of the High Speed Intercity and Passenger Rail Program and the CSX National Gateway projects. Long range projects aim to improve double-stack options for containers moving from the Port of Baltimore and Amtrak 2030 projects.

Ms. Katsikides stated that the Maryland Statewide Rail Plan will be available to the public via the MDOT website in January 2013. Once posted, the Plan will be open for public comment for 30 days.

Mr. Hodgson asked about the Howard Street Tunnel project in Baltimore City. Ms. Katsikides noted that the Mount Clare rail facility in Southwest Baltimore is being developed. This would provide for double-stack train movements as a result of bypassing the Howard Street Tunnel, a \$1.6 billion dollar project. Ms. Katsikides noted that the Baltimore and Potomac Amtrak Tunnel, a large Baltimore City state-of-good repair project, is a "top priority" project.

Mr. Orleans asked about CSX air rights for transit oriented development above rail tracks. Ms. Katsikides replied that the Maryland Statewide Rail Plan does not get that specific; however, transit oriented development is discussed and MDOT staff are discussing air rights issues with the railroads on specific projects.

Mr. Erenrich mentioned that Montgomery County has given a lot to CSX and suggested the Rail Plan should note some of the county's Purple Line issues with CSX. Ms. Katsikides will follow-up with Mr. Erenrich regarding language on this topic.

Mr. Burns asked about at-grade rail crossing elimination as noted under the safety goal. Ms. Katsikides replied that the Rail Plan includes capital projects and policies to pursue, including making rail crossings safer or eliminating them.

8. Briefing on the Update of Transportation Emissions Reduction Measures (TERMs) for the Washington Region

Ms. Constantine briefed the Committee on an upcoming update of Transportation Emissions Reduction Measures (TERMs) by providing a PowerPoint that identified the reasons that an update is needed at present time and what is the general approach and timeframe for soliciting input from participating governmental entities.

Mr. Canizales inquired whether enhanced access to transit through walking would be a TERM project input whose emissions reductions could be quantified using MOVES. Ms. Constantine responded that other types of enhanced access to transit – such as a shuttle service bringing people to a transit station – have the potential to yield more defensible emissions reductions estimates than enhanced pedestrian access to transit using MOVES as the emissions estimating model.

Mr. Malouff asked whether the bike sharing program can be measured using MOVES model. Ms. Constantine answered that the bike sharing program is hard to capture in the MOVES environment if reliable bike ridership data is not available.

Mr. Kirby commented that the TERMS update will mainly focus on significant emissions reducing projects, which are above and beyond what is already reflected in the travel demand model and the various MOVES input data categories (e.g., vehicle population VIN data). Potential examples that could be considered in TERMS analyses could be diesel engine retrofits and anything related to electric vehicle fleet deployment. He reassured the meeting participants that no conformity compliance problems are expected at present time. He alerted the group that with upcoming emission model changes in 2013 and a possible approval of PM2.5 mobile emission budgets – currently set at inventory levels for Tier I – it is prudent to have a basket of TERMS available for consideration should it becomes necessary.

Mr. Erenrich asked whether the TERMS projects have to be funded. Mr. Kirby answered that they should be funded and they should be sought out among existing budgeted projects at the jurisdictional level.

Mr. Brown requested a clarification on the method of soliciting stakeholder representatives. Ms. Constantine responded by clarifying that this was just an

introduction to this work effort and that additional information and an invitation to identify representatives to a technical workgroup will be forthcoming (via email).

Mr. Malouff asked whether electric vehicles such as electric taxis in Arlington County are significant enough for emission reductions. Mr. Kirby responded affirmatively. Ms. Constantine added that cumulative effect of a regional fleet of electric taxis would even be more significant in the region.

Mr. Canizales asked whether the expanded or leased parking lots should be considered. Ms. Constantine replied that they are encouraged to be submitted as long as they are post 2007.

9. Status Report on the TPB Website “Transportation Planning Information Hub for the National Capital Region”

Mr. Swanson briefed the Committee on the draft website called the “Transportation Planning Information Hub for the National Capital Region,” which will be a clearinghouse on the region’s transportation planning activities. He reminded the Committee that the origin of the website was an event in May 2010 called “The Conversation” in which numerous stakeholders recommended that the TPB develop a new tool for explaining the regional transportation planning process to the public. He gave Committee members a brief tour of the site, including its three main sections: Planning Process; High-Profile Projects; and Documents and Resources.

Mr. Hodgson emphasized the importance of keeping the site updated.

Mr. Swanson agreed.

Mr. Brown noted that in some cases, the site itself may be up-to-date, but it may provide links to local sites that are outdated. He noted that the Loudoun site contained old information.

Ms. Erickson asked if Mr. Swanson wanted comments now from the Technical Committee members regarding content, or if staff would send out a notice when they are ready to receive such comments.

Mr. Swanson said the content was not ready for such review. He said he would send out a notice when they wanted such comments.

10. Status Report on a Summary Guide for the FY 2013-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Austin distributed copies of the Summary Guide for the FY 2013-2018

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Mr. Kirby spoke to the need for a document that made the very complex TIP a little more understandable. He noted that the Citizens Advisory Committee had a long-standing interest in seeing a document of this nature. Mr. Kirby noted that federal regulations set more stringent standards for funding in the first two years of the TIP versus the third and fourth years, and any additional years. He noted that this item would be brought back to the Technical Committee in January 2013.

Mr. Austin noted that projects had been divided into a new categorization scheme: new construction, maintenance and rehabilitation, and other projects. He asked Committee members to review and comment.

Ms. Erickson asked for clarification that this document was not meant to replace the complete TIP document that is used for inputs to the State Transportation Improvement Programs. Mr. Kirby said the Summary Guide was not a replacement but a supplement to the TIP.

Mr. Brown noted that the VDOT portion of the TIP includes a large number of grouped projects and said that it is very difficult to determine whether a project is in the TIP or not, as these grouped projects are not searchable at the moment. Mr. Austin responded that he would contact VDOT to discuss means of making this project information more accessible.

11. Other Business

None.

12. Adjourn