

TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ITEM #1



National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

Technical Committee Minutes

For the meeting of
FEBRUARY 2, 2017

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the January 5, 2018 Technical Committee Meeting

Attendees at the meeting introduced themselves. A motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

2. Visualize 2045: Review of Comments Received and Approval of the Additional Montgomery County Project Submission into the Constrained Element for the Air Quality Conformity Analysis for Visualize 2045 and the FY2019-2024 Transportation Improvement Program

Ms. Erickson stated that following the public comment period on the project submissions for the air quality analysis of the constrained element of Visualize 2045, Montgomery County requested that an additional project, the New Hampshire Avenue BRT project, be included in the conformity analysis. She said the TPB began a second comment period on the additional project after approving the initial inputs and being briefed on the BRT project.

Mr. Erenrich briefly described the project. He said the project is in Montgomery County's master plan. He said it was initially submitted as a study due to concerns about interjurisdictional issues, but following the comment period and at the request of the County Council, the project was submitted for implementation by 2045.

Ms. Erickson said that the TPB would be briefed on the comments received before being asked to approve the project for inclusion in the air quality analysis.

Mr. Brown asked if the comments and responses briefing would be limited to just the new project or cover all comments received. Ms. Erickson responded that all comments would be provided to the TPB, regardless of whether action was to be taken on the subjects. Mr. Brown asked if there was a way to better explain that this is just one step in the project development process that includes future TPB actions, further project study and development, etc. Ms. Erickson noted that language explaining this is included in the materials, but that it is a common problem and that staff is open to any suggestions on how to improve communication on this issue. Mr. Srikanth suggested that the Technical Inputs Solicitation could be improved to better explain this. He also noted that there is an opportunity to explain this in the responses to comments.

Mr. Austin stated that two comments had been received in support of the New Hampshire Ave. BRT project, and a third comment on a pedestrian/bicycle Potomac River crossing.

3. Visualize 2014: General Update and Schedule

Ms. Zeller explained the general outline for the Visualize 2045 plan document with chapter titles and descriptions, as well as the general schedule, both of which were shared with the Technical Committee in the mailout. The committee will see a first draft of the plan at its July meeting. The committee and TPB will see an updated draft in September and the TPB will be asked to accept the plan as final at its October meeting.

Mr. Srikanth added that the Visualize 2045 plan is different from past documents in that all the elements will be summarized in the plan, and the plan will include a financially unconstrained chapter.

Mr. Weissberg asked how Equity Emphasis Areas would be included in Visualize 2045. Mr. Srikanth replied that they will be incorporated into the plan. Mr. Weissberg requested that this be mentioned at a TPB meeting.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the plan will show how it responds to the input received from various public outreach activities. Ms. Zeller explained that more outreach activities are planned for the spring, and that all the activities will be summarized in chapter 8. She said that chapter will summarize the outreach, describe what we learned, and describe how what we learned helped shape the plan. Throughout the plan, key issues from identified in the public outreach will be identified.

Mr. Brown asked if there would be time for the jurisdictions to give feedback on the input that staff receives on projects, noting that some projects may get a lot of attention and jurisdictions may want to help answer questions about their projects. He asked if there will be time to check with the jurisdictions. Ms. Erickson explained that staff is building in time to allow jurisdictions to respond to questions and concerns. She also noted that there is the opportunity after the plan is accepted by the TPB to shift from producing the plan to helping guide implementation of the plan, where the TPB and jurisdictions can continue to work together.

Ms. Snyder asked when the detailed results from the MetroQuest survey from last year would be released. Ms. Erickson said that report is being worked on and that in March more public outreach information would be shared with the Technical Committee.

Mr. Brown asked if the Technical Committee would be seeing those results in advance of the TPB seeing them. Ms. Erickson responded that the plan is for the Technical Committee to see the results first. Mr. Brown explained how helpful it is for the Technical Committee to see things in advance so that the TPB members can be briefed in advance of their meetings.

Mr. Lake asked if there would be an appendix which would include a list of all the existing projects within the constrained element of the plan. Ms. Erickson said the main body of the document will include a list and map containing the "major projects," and Mr. Austin added that list and map does not include every project within the constrained element. Ms. Erickson said the online database will be available as always. Mr. Lake said he is often asked by colleagues for help finding the listing of projects in the database and that it would be more helpful to jurisdictional staff and the public if the project list were more prominently made available. Mr. Srikanth said that the main body of the document will provide reference to the full list of projects to make it clear for anyone looking for the full list of projects. Mr. Austin added that the full list can be included as an appendix to Visualize 2045. Ms. Posey added that the full list of projects is included in the Air Quality Conformity report as well. Ms. Zeller added that staff can make the table more visible on the Visualize 2045 website so that anyone looking for specific projects can find the list quickly and easily. Ms. Erickson added that once the website has been updated with all these new documents for Visualize 2045, staff could provide a training for Technical Committee members showing where to find everything.

4. Briefing on the Draft FY2019 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Ms. Erickson briefed the committee on the draft FY 2019 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP, July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019). The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is the annual budget for TPB staff to carry out the metropolitan transportation planning process. Ms. Erickson provided an overview of the UPWP, its function and the responsibilities of the MPO. While the revenue and expenditure amounts were not yet final, each program director described the proposed activities for

each task identified in the UPWP. Ms. Erickson asked for comments and Mr. Erenrich suggested that the TPB presentation include discussion of how the program is different from previous years, how staff is responding to major changes and trends in transportation, and upcoming TPB actions. The board will be asked to approve the FY 2019 UPWP at its March 21, 2018 meeting.

5. Briefing on the Draft FY2019 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

Mr. Ramfos used a PowerPoint presentation to brief the Committee on The Fiscal Year 2019 draft Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP). He gave an overview of Commuter Connections' mission statement from the Commuter Connections endorsed Strategic Plan. Program benefits, the program's 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 FY 2019 CCWP budget, and highlights of what is new with the program and budget, and next steps were then covered.

Mr. Ramfos stated that the Commuter Connections Strategic Plan contains a definition of the regional TDM program. Benefits to local jurisdictions, employers and workers are all provided through the program. Benefits include reduced congestion for commuters, goods movement and tourist travel, and reductions in emissions, as well as assistance in the recruiting and retention of employees at employer sites. The program also provides a great deal of commute option information to workers in the region, which in turn help with stress and commuting cost reductions as well as the time it takes to travel to and from work each day.

Mr. Ramfos then described the service area for both the Ridesharing and Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) programs based on the regional non-attainment map. The Commuter Connections service area is much larger than the non-attainment area for commuters using the GRH program, and even larger for commuters using ridematching services. A US Census rankings chart for carpools and transit use for similar MSA areas shows that the Washington DC region ranks as one of the top urban areas in total percentage of carpools and transit users.

Total daily transportation and emission impacts of the Commuter Connections program were then reviewed. Mr. Ramfos explained that TDM is included in the federally-required congestion management process (CMP) and Commuter Connections is a major TDM component. Commuter Connections also supports regional air quality goals and is part of the update of the region's Long-Range Plan and TIP. Results from Commuter Connections program impacts may also contribute to new performance measures and goals set by the region under FAST Act requirements.

Next, Mr. Ramfos discussed the cost-effectiveness of the program with regards to vehicle trips (VT), vehicle miles of travel (VMT), and vehicle emissions associated with commuting in the region. He also explained that the costs shown would more than likely be adjusted a bit based on program evaluation results published in FY2017.

The FY 2019 proposed CCWP budget was compared to the FY 2018 CCWP budget along with a review of the associated changes for each of the programs. Mr. Ramfos stated that there is a 6.8 percent increase in the budget from FY 2018 primarily due to increased data collection efforts associated with the 2019 State of the Commute survey and GRH Applicant Survey, and modest cost of living adjustments in each of the program areas. The FY2019 CCWP budget breakdown includes 32% of the costs for COG/TPB staff & overhead, 49% of the costs for private sector services, 8% of the costs are passed through to local jurisdiction TDM programs, and 11% of the costs are attributed to direct costs.

New items in the FY 2019 CCWP include the expansion of the Flextime Incentive and CarpoolNow Driver Incentive programs, updating the FY2018 – FY 2020 TDM Evaluation Framework methodology document which is the blueprint for how data is collected and analyzed for the program, the collection of data for the 2019 State of the Commute survey and production of a draft Technical Report, as well as the collection of data for GRH applicant surveys in both the Washington DC and Baltimore region's along with the production of draft reports for each.

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

Mr. Erenrich stated that there needs to be an emphasis that the local jurisdictions help with the program's delivery and perhaps the organizational chart needs to show the local jurisdiction's role in the program committee groups.

6. Performance Based Planning and Programming: System Performance

Mr. Randall, TPB Transportation Engineer, spoke to a presentation and memorandum on federal performance-based planning and programming (PBPP). He spoke quickly to the memo, which listed the upcoming briefings planned for the board, including five of the next six board meetings. The board needs to approve many new PBPP targets so that they can be included in the Visualize 2045 long range plan and its October approval. The back of the memo also listed the 26 PBPP performance measures. Eric also spoke to the next steps for the draft PBPP responsibility Letters of Agreement previously briefed in January. Lyn Erickson added that the LOA is part of the 3C metropolitan planning agreement, which the board will take up in April for approval.

The focus for the day's PBPP presentation was on TPB staff work on the measures for the System Performance (Congestion, Freight, and CMAQ Program) area. Three travel time reliability performance measures must have targets set by May by State DOTs; the board should approve MPO targets in July for incorporation in Visualize 2045. At some later date, a greenhouse gas performance measure must also be developed, if not first repealed. Then, the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program has three performance measures, two for traffic congestion and one for emissions. Targets for these should be approved in May for coordination with the State DOTs. Of note, the CMAQ measures and targets are not for the TPB's planning area, but rather for the Washington DC urbanized area and the ozone non-attainment area respectively. Because the Baltimore and Fredericksburg MPOs also overlap the Washington DC urbanized area, those MPOs also will have to approve the urbanized area performance targets. He then spoke to two general methodologies for forecasting future performance and setting targets. One method would be to extrapolate with a straight or best-fit line current performance. The other forecasting method would be to use a relevant indicator from the TPB's travel demand model, which incorporates changes in population, employment and transportation project completion. This latter methodology is TPB's staff proposed preferred methodology.

Mr. Gaskin, TPB Transportation Planner, spoke to the CMAQ traffic congestion performance measure for non-SOV mode share. This measure applies to large urbanized areas and targets need to be set in May along with the DOTs. The rule provides three options for setting targets: using American Community Survey data, localized surveys, or volumetric counts. Mr. Gaskin then showed the data using ACS and also State of Commute data, and the results of the two methodologies for forecasting.

Mr. Li, TPB Transportation Engineer, continued the presentation with an overview of the National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS). This data set includes the actual traffic performance data to date and is provided to all agencies under an FHWA contract by the U-Md CATT

Lab. In addition, the CATT lab offers for sale a set of widgets that can be used to quickly produce data for the traffic performance measures: Interstate travel time reliability, NHS travel time reliability, truck travel time reliability, and peak hour excessive delay (PHED). TPB staff used these widgets when they were free to get data and maps for the four traffic measures.

Mr. Li first reviewed the region's performance for the PHED measure, which collects data for the AM peak and the PM Peak; the latter can be defined for either 3-7 pm or 4-8 pm. A map and the two forecasting methodologies were also shown. He then moved on to the three travel time reliability measures, and reviewed the definitions and characteristics of the Interstate and NHS (non-Interstate) travel time reliability measures, along with performance, maps, and forecasting methodologies. The truck travel time reliability measure is actually an index, and so has a somewhat different definition. Graphically, performance and a map are very similar.

Mr. Randall closed out the presentation with a note that TPB staff are continuing frequent coordination with State DOT staff as the latter move to adopt targets by May for these performance measures.

Mr. Weissberg asked for more detail on what the jurisdictions need to do for the 3C planning agreement. Ms. Erickson added that the 3C agreement signatories are the federal planning funds agencies, which is the DOTs and Virginia DRPT. Other agencies and jurisdictions will need to sign the PBPP LOA. This will be briefed in more detail next month.

Mr. Lake asked if CMAQ project applications would require more information. Mr. Randall responded that this would be up to the CMAQ project selection agencies, but that implementation of PBPP is likely to require more information from agencies over time.

Mr. Srikanth added that there will be an emphasis on more quantitative CMAQ data in future. Given the recent discussions over the board setting highway safety targets, all technical staff should be prepared to develop and provide more data to explain performance, in particular when there is a difference between current performance and aspirational goals. There will be a challenge from a policy perspective if safety or congestion performance are getting worse. Monitoring and reporting will be required.

Mr. Brown asked if current CMAQ projects would be affected. Mr. Randall responded that the data reported in the system now is what will be used, but States have already update any information and the deadline is passed. He added that this will be a subject for next month's meeting. Norman Whitaker added that VDOT already started asking for more information for CMAQ applications a few years ago. However, this data is calculated; there is no monitoring of actual emissions from funded projects, this is not feasible.

Mr. Erenrich noted that all the target-setting is advisory for the MPO. There is reporting and the certification review, but no direct impact on funding. How then does the PBPP process start affecting the project selection process, planning and development? Does the work program include how to implement PBPP.

7. Cooperative Forecast 9.1

Mr. DesJardin, Director of COG's Department of Community Planning and Services, briefed the Committee on the Round 9.1 Cooperative Forecasts. Mr. DesJardin reviewed the Cooperative Forecasting process that has been used at COG for more than 40 years to prepare forecasts of population, households, and employment for the region, its jurisdictions, and small-area Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ). TPB staff use these small area forecasts to conduct air quality conformity

analysis of the region's long-range transportation plan and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The latest update of the Cooperative Forecasts was Round 9.0. This latest update, Round 9.1, is a technical update to the Round 9.0 forecasts and accounts for newly-approved development projects or changes in adopted local plans and/or zoning that warranted a technical revision by jurisdiction that opted to provide forecast updates for Round 9.1. As part of this presentation, Mr. Srikanth explained that, in addition to being used in the forthcoming air quality conformity analysis, the Cooperative Forecasts will be used to help inform the TPB and its stakeholders of the progress toward the aspirations articulated in the optimized regional land use balance scenario of the Long Range Planning Task Force.

8. National Capital Region Freight Forum Review

This item was deferred to a future meeting.

9. Transportation and Land Use Connections (TLC) Program Solicitation Announcement

This item was deferred to the end of the meeting.

10. A Recent Profile of the Motor Vehicle Characteristics in the Washington D.C. Regional: Analysis of December 2016 Vehicle Registration Data

Mr. Vuksan (TPB staff) provided an overview of the motor vehicle characteristics in the Washington region based on the December 2016 Vehicle Registration Data (VIN Data). He stated that the vehicle registration data were being updated to ensure that the mobile emissions model (MOVES) inputs were current for the Visualize 2045 Air Quality Conformity Analysis (and for future greenhouse gas analyses). He added that the recently obtained 2016 VIN data would be used for development of two key vehicle-related MOVES model inputs:

- The number of vehicles by 13 vehicle classes, and
- The age distribution by vehicle class

Mr. Vuksan also noted that the VIN decoding exercise was a substantial effort that took months to complete. He described the history of TPB staff's vehicle registration data analysis and noted that TPB staff would have preferred to work with the July data (as opposed to the December 2016 data), but that some of the air agencies had adopted a year-end data collection cycle instead.

Mr. Vuksan proceeded to describe the findings of the 2016 VIN data analysis relative to the 2014 VIN data (used in the 2016 CLRP), which included:

- Increase in number of vehicles (especially light duty trucks),
- Increase in share of light duty trucks and decrease in share of light duty cars,
- Slight decrease in average vehicle age,
- Slight decrease in number of hybrid vehicles for recent model years, and
- Steady growth in the number of electric vehicles by model year (while representing a small segment of the vehicle fleet).

He stated that the observed trends in the Washington region are similar to those noted in EPA's Fuel Economy Trends Report and a recent study by University of Michigan. Mr. Vuksan added that decreases in prices of gasoline, and recent trends in economy (wages and jobs) and fuel economy all have an impact on vehicle purchasing decisions.

Upon conclusion of the presentation, Ms. Snyder (MDOT) asked whether MWAQC needed to take any action on the VIN data. Mr. Vuksan noted that no action on MWAQC's part was needed.

Mr. Srikanth (TPB staff) noted that the slight decrease in average vehicle age could help the region with respect to the emissions, but that the increase in the share of SUVs would likely have a negative impact – the two could offset one another, but this remains to be seen. He also noted that the staff would be conducting two sets of emissions analyses, and that once EPA approves the new 2008 Ozone Maintenance Plan budgets, meeting the new budgets could be challenging - small variations could make a difference in the region's ability to adhere to the budgets.

Ms. Ways (MDE staff) asked for further explanation of the reasoning behind using the December 2016 instead of December 2017 data. Mr. Vuksan and Mr. Srikanth noted that the schedule for the Visualize 2045 Air Quality Conformity Analysis was tight, and that the decision had been made to have the registration data ready for the analysis in time to accommodate the overall schedule.

Ms. Ways asked what specific set of registration data would be used next, and Mr. Srikanth replied that they were typically being collected on a three-year cycle. Ms. Ways noted that this might not be consistent with the State of Maryland schedule, and that this conversation should continue off-line.

11. Northern Virginia Long Distance Commuter Bus Study

Mr. Roisman introduced the subject study that was funded under the FY17 and FY18 Virginia Technical Assistance Programs and noted that the study focused on Northern Virginia rather than the entire region largely because Maryland already has a robust commuter bus network that covers long distances; in fact, MTA's contracting model proved a useful reference for the Virginia study. He also reminded the group that the study considered the feasibility of long-distance commuter bus for origins outside the TPB planning area and destinations in the regional core areas of Northern Virginia and the District of Columbia. Mr. Roisman introduced Mr. Harrington and Mr. Fravel from the study team to provide a briefing on the study findings.

Mr. Harrington described the study steering committee that provided additional oversight and guidance to the project, which included representatives from NVTC, PRTC, FAMPO, and the WinFred MPO. The study focused on demand and strategies for operating publicly-supported commuter bus services. The focus was on longer distances (50-100 miles one-way). The study began with major total jurisdictional commuter flows from the ACS CTPP (2006-2010). For existing service the I-95 corridor is well served by existing commuter bus and the Virginia Railway Express. Culpeper and Charlottesville have much more limited service (1-2 round-trips per day), and the northern Shenandoah Valley and the Northern Neck have no commuter bus service. The entire study area is served by rideshare programs. The existing commuter flows were forecast into the future (2025 and 2040) using growth rates from the Virginia Statewide Travel Demand Model and then seven potential bus transit markets were identified. Based on these markets, future year commuters were estimated, ranging between 50 and 150 daily peak commuters for the year 2025, with 50 commuters generally serving as a threshold for one bus round trip.

Feasibility for each of the seven routes was tested based on the ratio of bus travel time to auto travel time between the proposed origin and destination and the resulting estimated transit subsidy (cost) per transit boarding and corresponding farebox recovery ratio, based on a \$9.00 fare (from existing Loudoun County Transit service). Six of the initial seven routes were deemed feasible based on review and feedback from the study steering committee. Several different mixes of public and private

sector participation for bus capital and operating strategies were considered, as well as not investing in bus and increasing rideshare options or constructing more park and ride lots without necessarily adding buses; the detailed pros and cons of each approach are documented in the full study report.

Next steps include further study of potential markets and operating strategies, but also considering alternative funding sources, such as toll revenue in the I-66 and I-95 corridors specifically allocated for new transit service.

A committee member reminded the group that several years ago, a private bus carrier wanted a section of area's FTA 5307 funds based on their operations and that the public agencies successfully pushed against it; perhaps we don't want to go down that road again.

A staff member noted that the study shows that there can be competing policy objectives in context of LRPTF initiatives, and asked if the need was greater for operating or capital assistance, given the limitations of certain funding sources. Mr. Fravel noted that operating assistance appears to be more critical at this time.

A committee member noted that the Fredericksburg MPO recently conducted a similar study that should be reviewed as a reference; it found favorable increased bus service as a feeder to VRE.

12. Other Business

Mr. Swanson announced the solicitation is open to receive applications for the FY 2019 round of technical assistance projects under the Transportation Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program.

Mr. Meese briefed the committee on the COG Traffic Incident Management Enhancement Initiative (TIME). On January 10 the COG board asked staff to undertake the initiative to form a task force of practitioners regarding this issue. DTP staff are working with COG's Department of Homeland Security and Public Safety and presented ideas to the board. Staff is aiming for a task force meeting in February with work expected to be completed in October or November.

Ms. Snyder announced that MDOT is seeking input on the Draft Goals and Objectives for the 2040 Maryland Transportation Plan statewide update from jurisdictions before February 12.

Ms. Erickson announced that the November TPB meeting will take place on Friday, November 16 from 12:00-2:00 P.M. This meeting was rescheduled from previous time to prevent conflicting with the Thanksgiving holiday.

Ms. Erickson announced that DTP has a new intern, Jack Narron, working on the TLC program.

13. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 P.M.

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – February 2, 2018**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP -----

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick County Charles Freeman
City of Frederick Timothy Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County Gary Erenrich
Prince George's County Victor Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery County -----
 Prince George's County -----
MDOT Kari Snyder
 Matt Baker
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria -----
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax Chloe Ritter
Fairfax County Mike Lake
 Malcolm Watson
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas Chloe Delhomme
NVRTA Sree Nampoothiri
NVTC Patricia Happ
Prince William County Paolo Belita
PRTC Betsy Massie
VRE Sonali Soneji
VDOT Norman Whitaker
 Regina Moore
VDRPT Clinton Edwards
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----
WMATA Allison Davis

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP
Lyn Erickson, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Tim Canan, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Nicolas Ramfos, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Bill Bacon, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Matthew Gaskin, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Ken Joh, DTP
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Arianna Koudounas, DTP
James Li, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Erin Morrow, DTP
Jinchul Park, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Sergio Ritacco, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Jon Schermann, DTP
Daniel Son, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Lori Zeller, DTP
Abigail Zenner, DTP
Sunil Kumar, DEP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS
Greg Goodwin, DCPS
Nicole McCall, DCPS

OTHER

Meredith Hill, MDOT SHA
Alex Brun, MDE
Marcia Ways, MDE
Bill Orleans

OTHER

James Davenport
Tony DeLorenzo