



Technical Committee Minutes

For the meeting of
December 7, 2018

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the November 3, 2018 Technical Committee Meeting

2. Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan

Lyn Erickson, DTP Plan Development and Coordination Program Director, noted that in the previous month both the TPB and Technical committee received briefings on the Coordinated Human Service Plan which has been open for public comment for the past 30 days. She reiterated that the plan document is updated every four years and it helps define which projects are eligible for selection for the Enhanced Mobility program that is administered by COG and the TPB. No substantial comments were received, and the TPB will be asked to approval the plan in December. There were no questions from the committee.

3. Initiatives Discussion

Kanti Srikanth, TPB Director drew the committee's attention to the handout associated with the agenda item and began by referencing the special work session that was held for TPB members where subcommittee representatives addressed recommendations that support the realization of the 7 endorsed aspirational initiatives. The board received a summary of these recommendations and also had a discussion regarding their content. Chair Allen, at the previous meeting of the TPB, requested that board members reflect on the recommendations and consider both feasibility and plausibility in regard to implementation, with the goal of gathering consensus on items that the board can support. At the December board meeting, members are expected to return to the set of recommendations with suggestions as to what action can be taken by the TPB.

Mr. Srikanth noted that in respect to subsequent processes of implementation, he views this as a top-down process where the policy makers of the TPB can determine next steps. He shared that he will be hosting a conference call with the officers of the TPB soon to get a sense of the board's thoughts and intended direction. In respect to his reflections of the board members' discussions, he noted that whereas there was no voting or metrics around consensus, however he drew from the comments that were made and consolidated the series of suggestions presented in the accompanying memo.

He then asked the technical committee members to review the revised items and provide feedback by the following Tuesday that can be addressed during his upcoming discussion with TPB officers. Mr. Srikanth then briefly reviewed the suggestions he gathered from the board discussions with the technical committee members and entertained comments and discussion.

4. Visualize 2045: Environmental Justice Analysis Results

Sergio Ritacco, TPB staff, briefed the committee on the federally required Environmental Justice analysis examining the constrained element of Visualize 2045 for impacts on low-income populations and/or minority populations. Using the TPB-approved Equity Emphasis Areas, Mr. Ritacco presented the results of this analysis demonstrating that Visualize 2045 does not have a disproportionately high or adverse impact on these populations.

Kari Snyder, MDOT asked if staff had presented the results to the TPB Access for All Advisory Committee (AFA). Mr. Ritacco responded that the report was recently finalized and will be presented at the next TPB AFA meeting in January 2019.

Bob Brown, Loudoun County inquired as to why the results were presented with the 2045 No-Build after the Plan Build scenario, suggesting it as counterintuitive. Mr. Ritacco clarified that the main determination of the analysis was between the 2019 and 2045 Plan Build results, with the intent of keeping those figures as the predominate information to share. The No-Build results were presented after to provide interested readers with that context.

Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County inquired on possible next steps of this work after presenting the determination to the TPB, in particular a deeper analysis on the measures and data to hone down on the outcomes of the analysis. Mr. Ritacco responded that, for this analysis, the materials presented were intentionally narrowed to answer the federally-required test, elaborating that future work may be at the instruction or direction of the TPB. Mr. Srikanth clarified on the objective of this analysis, pointing out that the decision-making process for transportation investments is outside the TPB's purview, and the land-use decisions occur at the local level. It is the staff's hope that this analysis, which was a significant enhancement over previous iterations, helps local decisionmakers to dig deeper on what this analysis is saying and equity issues in transportation and land-use decisions. Mr. Srikanth added that the main takeaways are important to recall: 1) that Visualize 2045 conforms with the EJ determination test, 2) EEAs and the Rest of the Region experience many benefits from the plan, and 3) there are opportunities for the region to improve the outcomes of certain measures.

Mark Philips, WMATA asked how to frame those policy elements to the TPB. Mr. Srikanth clarified that we are trying to achieve two objectives with this work: Present findings tied to a federal required analysis and draw additional policy-level detail as future considerations for policymakers. Staff are intending to draw those elements at the end of the presentation to help frame that discussion.

Kristin Calkins, DCOP, noted possible challenges where transportation improvements within EEAs may accelerate market forces affecting housing prices and displacement, recommending that staff be prepared to engage in this topic and inform housing policymakers. Mr. Srikanth noted this as an inherent challenge of gentrification.

Mr. Brown inquired if equity is considered at that local-level in comprehensive planning. Ms. Calkins noted that there is no federal requirement or mandate as comprehensive planning requirements are mostly set at the state-and local-level and that many do include a housing component. Mr. Brown clarified that it could be a future aspirational element to look more deeply into equity issues and what guidance is provided by state-level officials. Norman Whitaker, VDOT added that is agency has not specific guidelines unless the project become federalized.

Mr. Weissberg stressed articulating the next steps and encouraged staff to continue exploring this topic.

5. Performance-Based Planning and Programming: Draft Highway Safety Targets

Jon Schermann, TPB staff, briefed the committee on the federal requirements pertaining to setting annual highway safety targets for the NCR and presented a draft set of 2019 highway safety targets. He noted that the committee received this information last month and that today's presentation was primarily a dry run for the December TPB meeting. He then reviewed the five safety performance measures and discussed the federal regulations related to MPOs' requirements to set regional safety targets.

Mr. Schermann then showed two slides indicating that, because of the 2017 increases in fatalities, it is very likely that the region will not meet the 2014-2018 fatality and fatality rate targets set last year. He said that, based on the Technical Committee's input during their November meeting, the methodology used to establish the draft 2019 safety targets was based on "Option B". This methodology, which is nearly identical to what was done last year, consists of developing sub targets for each state's portion of the region using respective state methodologies, combining the resulting sub targets into a single set of regional targets, comparing each of them to last year's adopted target, and then selecting the lower value for each one of the five targets. The next steps consist of presenting draft targets to the TPB in December and requesting approval of targets at the January TPB meeting.

In response to a question from Mr. Brown, Mr. Schermann noted that there are no consequences for an MPO that does not meet their targets. Ms. Erickson stated that with respect to the board being uncomfortable with setting "high" safety targets that we could include draft resolution language that acknowledges the discomfort with any targets greater than zero, but also states the TPB's firm support of Vision Zero and other efforts to make greater progress. Mr. Srikanth added that the presentation to the TPB should emphasize that our proposed fatality target is a reduction from the experience of the last several years. He also noted, in response to other comments, that any effort to push the needle starts with understanding what is causing the increase in fatalities. Mr. Schermann added that staff is developing a request for proposal (RFP) for a study, funded through the UPWP, to perform a more thorough analysis into the safety data to understand what is driving the numbers and what actions the TPB can take to reduce the numbers.

6. Visualize Story Map

Charlene Howard, TPB staff drew the committee members' attention to the visually displayed webpage for the Visualize 2045 Story Map and thanked members for their contributions to the production of the long-range plan. She noted that the goal of the story map is to capture the content of the plan document in a more visually comprehensive and appealing fashion. She then briefly led members through the layers of the

Including dynamic maps that were designed to enhance the data content included in the plan document. She demonstrated how users including the public can interact with the software and find geographically precise demographic and statistical data including info on major projects. She encouraged members to access and share the Visualize 2045 long range plan story map which can be located here: <http://bit.ly/Viz2045>

7. Performance-Based Planning and Programming: Transit Asset Management

Eric Randall, TPB staff, gave a presentation on the federal requirements for transit asset management target-setting. This is the second time the board will be approving these types of targets for the region. He noted that the region spends hundreds of millions of dollars annually on keeping WMATA as well as the other transit providers in a state of good repair, for instance by buying buses. He reviewed the requirements, timeline, and process for providers to annually set targets, with larger agencies reporting directly to FTA and smaller systems having the option of reporting directly or participating in group reporting through the statewide agencies, MTA and DRPT. He reviewed the performance measures and then showed the matrix of targets formally approved by the TPB in June 2017, followed by the latest data for targets adopted by each of the region's providers. However, the FTA suggestion is for MPOs to adopt a single target for the region for each asset class. This requires additional data from the local providers of public transportation, both the targets and the figures for asset numbers or another indicator. TPB staff are reaching out to collect this information. The draft targets that are calculated with this data will be presented to the committee

next month. The draft targets will also be an informational item on the January TPB agenda, with approval of the region's targets anticipated to take place at the February TPB meeting.

Kanti Srikanth clarified that the FTA's suggestion on how to determine regional transit asset targets was not directed specifically to the TPB, but instead promulgated to all MPOs.

8. Status Report on Improving the TPB Travel Demand Forecasting Model

This item was presented by Mark Moran, COG/TPB staff, who spoke from a set of presentation slides, which were distributed to the committee. Mr. Moran noted that TPB staff maintains at least two regional travel demand models: an adopted, production-use model and one or more developmental models.

The production-use model, known as the Generation-2/Ver. 2.3 model, is the model used by TPB staff to assess the performance of the long-range transportation plan (LRTP) and to perform the air quality conformity analysis of the LRTP. The Ver. 2.3 model was calibrated to year-2007 conditions, using the most recent household travel survey.¹ The model was validated to year-2010 conditions. The most recent release of the Ver. 2.3 model family, Ver. 2.3.75, became the adopted model on Oct. 17, 2017 by action of the TPB. Mr. Moran noted that TPB staff is currently finalizing the Ver. 2.3.75 model user's guide and transmittal package, both of which should be ready by early December.

Next, Mr. Moran described the TPB's strategic plan for model improvement, which was developed in 2015 with consultant assistance and has been subsequently updated to reflect schedule changes. This plan provides the framework for the TPB's developmental models. The strategic plan has three phases over nine years (slide 5):

1. Updates to the existing production-use, trip-based, travel demand model. From FY 2016 to FY 2019.
2. Development of a next-generation (Gen3) model with existing household travel survey and transit on-board data. From FY 2019 to FY 2022.
3. Development of a Gen4 model with new data, including the 2017-2018 Regional Travel Survey. From FY 2023 to FY 2024.

In Phase 1, consultant assistance was used to add several enhancements to the Ver. 2.3 model. The result was the Ver. 2.5 model, which, over the last year has been undergoing testing and revalidation by TPB staff. Phase 1 is to conclude in FY 2019. Regarding the Gen2/Ver. 2.5 model, Mr. Moran discussed

- The model timeline (slide 7).
- The four enhancements that had been sought from Ver. 2.5 and which of those enhancements were achieved (slide 8). To date, only one of the four enhancements has been definitively achieved. The other three have been only partially achieved.
- A summary of the recent model validation effort by TPB staff (slide 9).
- Current issues, concerns, and status (slides 10-11).

Regarding the Gen3 model, Mr. Moran discussed the planned approach for getting consultant assistance: a request for information (RFI) followed by an upcoming request for proposals (RFP). He also presented some aggregate findings from the RFI. The schedule for the RFP will be dependent on staffing levels that are available for this effort, but Mr. Moran noted that, under the current plan, the RFP advertisement period is likely to begin in late January.

Regarding the TPB's current, production-use travel demand model (slide 4), Mr. Brown asked why the model was calibrated to year-2007 conditions, noting that 2007 was over ten years ago, which seems a bit dated. Mr. Moran said that the Ver. 2.3 model is calibrated to observed data, including the 2007-2008 COG/TPB Household Travel Survey. Such surveys are very expensive to conduct and are typically conducted every ten years or so. TPB staff is currently collecting a similar survey (the 2017-2018 Regional Travel Survey). It will take about one to two years to factor and clean the data, which means that the survey data will not be ready for model calibration until 2020.

Ms. Erickson noted that, next month, there will be a briefing to the Technical Committee on the 2017-2018 Regional Travel Survey. Mr. Brown asked how frequently the TPB staff gets requests from consultants and state/local government for the travel model outputs from the model. Mr. Moran said that TPB staff responds to about 50 to 60 data requests per year. Lastly, Mr. Brown suggested that, when TPB staff responds to a data request from a consultant working on a project in a particular jurisdiction, he would prefer TPB staff to inform the jurisdictional staff about the data request. Mr. Moran noted that all data requests are recorded in a log and a subset of these are listed in the monthly progress reports. Mr. Srikanth suggested that we could investigate this matter after the meeting. Regarding the travel model user's guide mentioned earlier, Ms. Snyder asked whether this is just useful for people who want to run the model or whether it contains information about how the model works, including how one should use the model output. Mr. Moran noted that the user's guide contains both types of information.

9. Northeast Megaregion Travel Demand and Investment Model

This item was presented by Mr. Moran, who spoke from a set of presentation slides, which were distributed to the subcommittee. Mr. Moran's presentation summarized what he had learned about the Northeast Megaregion Travel Demand and Investment Model from a one-day workshop that he attended on November 9 in Philadelphia. The Northeast Megaregion extends from southern Maine to central Virginia, an area covering 12 states (and the District of Columbia), 50 million residents, and 38 MPOs. The study is being conducted by John Landis, a professor at the University of Pennsylvania, under the aegis of the University Transportation Center for Cooperative Mobility for Competitive Megaregions (CM2). The model is to have three main components (slide 7):

- One inter-metropolitan, multi-modal travel demand model covering passenger trips greater than 50 miles for the following modes: auto, rail, air travel, and possibly bus.
- Four intra-metropolitan travel demand models covering four areas: 1) Boston-Providence-Worcester; 2) Greater New York City; 3) Greater Philadelphia; 4) Baltimore-Washington-Richmond. These models would cover person travel greater than 5 miles, considering automobile, bus, subway and light rail, and commuter rail modes.
- One national-scale freight travel demand model for modeling truck, rail, and air freight flows in and out of major metropolitan areas in the Northeast Megaregion.

Slide 11 showed the status of each of these three main components. Mr. Moran concluded with some TPB staff observations and questions (slide 13), including the following:

- Project is very ambitious, given its scope and limited funding
- Modeled area is large, but the proposed number of transportation analysis zones (TAZs) is models (ca. 900)
- Possible benefits from this model for our model
 - External and through travel
 - External transit travel
 - Airport passenger trips

Mr. Moran noted that TPB staff will continue to monitor the progress of the Northeast Megaregion Model. There were no questions or comments following Mr. Moran's presentation.

10. Dockless Bike and Scooter Share Workshop Highlights

Michael Farrell, TPB staff, presented materials on the October 31 Dockless Bike and Scooter Share Workshop. This workshop was part of a series of professional development workshops sponsored by the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee. This workshop was a follow-up to a workshop on the same topic on May 31, 2018 where roughly 50 people attended.

He noted that this is a rapidly-evolving field and that just in the last six months there have been a lot of changes. Conventional dockless bicycles seem to be on their way out nationally, with electric scooters and electric-assisted bikes taking their place partly because there is more customer willingness to pay for electric scooters and electric-assist bikes than for conventional bicycles. User fees are higher, and revenues are more robust.

Safety of electric scooters is a concern, with a lot of press coverage. However, hard data is lacking. For example, there are issues with coding and with reporting of crashes, especially single-vehicle crashes. Possible factors could include vehicle stability on rough pavement, user recklessness, and user learning curve.

Speed limits and sidewalk bans were another hot topic. For example, Arlington will have a geo-fenced speed limit of 10 mph and a ban on sidewalk riding. The scooter firms contend that 10 mph is too fast for sidewalks but too slow for mixed traffic in the streets. Those who utilize the scooters are encouraged to use bike lanes, but many streets have no bike lanes. Virginia also bans scooters on streets with speed limits higher than 25 mph even if there is a bike lane.

Some agencies permit scooters and electric-assist bikes, while others ban them. Park agencies tend to prohibit scooters. Enforcement on trails is inconsistent, so scooters and electric-assist bikes are likely to show up on the trails regardless.

Parking is another concern, companies may be required to move improperly parked scooters. However, scooters do have smaller footprint than bikes, and they usually remain upright in windy conditions. Parking areas can be designated at low cost, with paint; no fixed installations needed. The scooters get touched every day for re-charging, so they get fixed quickly.

Geo-fencing may be able to deal with inconsistencies in speed limits between jurisdictions. Baltimore has gotten a lot of scooter ridership, and they found that the user base was more racially diverse than the user base for conventional bike share. Baltimore is getting about 40,000 trips per week.

We may have another follow-up workshop in six months, depending on demand.

A member asked whether scooters were displacing conventional bike share. Mr. Farrell replied that Capital Bikeshare has not yet noticed a strong effect. It's more the dockless bikes that have been displaced, some of the companies have chosen to replace them with scooters. The only dockless bikeshare company still standing in the District is Jump, which is all electric-assist. Capital Bikeshare has recently introduced electric-assist bikes, which could be interpreted as an attempt to compete. There is no plan to eliminate Capital Bikeshare.

However, it is an open question whether Baltimore will replace their docked bike share system, which was shut down by theft and vandalism. Capital Bikeshare has a stronger locking mechanism than the bike share firm that was operating in Baltimore.

Baltimore has two scooter companies in operation, operating up to 1000 scooters each. Actual deployed on any given day ranges from 500-950 scooters each. Damage rates are high, but the scooters are getting fixed.

11. Other Business

- Abigail Zenner, TPB staff, reminded members that the CAC recruitment process has begun and will be closing. She explained what the Citizens Advisory Committee is and encouraged members to nominate individuals within their local communities who may be interested in serving the board. TPBCAC
- Lyn Erickson, TPB staff, informed members that at the upcoming TPB meeting the new officers will be voted on for the 2019 calendar committee. A nominating committee will be composed to select the next officers and that it is now the turn Virginia to chair the planning board. She also recognized and thanked the Technical committee chair Bob Brown, Loudoun County and that his term will be ending in the new year. Mr. Brown shared his thanks and gratitude with the fellow members and staff. Ms. Erickson then announced that Mark Rawlings, MDOT will be the incoming committee chair for calendar year 2019.

Concluding she encouraged members to engage the committee and staff to share information through the committee on regional projects and developments and to feel comfortable suggesting topics of interest that members may be interested in exploring.

12. Adjournment