

TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ITEM #1



National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
December 2, 2016

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the December 2, 2016 Technical Committee Meeting

The Minutes were approved as written.

2. Long-Range Plan Task Force Phase 1 Report

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Swanson briefed the committee on the Phase I task force report. He provided background on the origin of the task force and the work that informed the report. He described inputs and analysis in the report. He said the TPB would be asked to accept the report at its meeting on December 21. He said that December 9 was the deadline for comments on the draft report.

Mr. Srikanth reminded the committee that they should find the inputs familiar since they were derived from existing local, state, and subregional plans.

Mr. Erenrich suggested it would be helpful if staff could augment the analysis to better account for changes in pedestrian and bicycle trips. He asked if, for example, it would be possible to estimate the benefits that might result from improved access to transit stations. Mr. Srikanth said the model assumes that improvements in the All-Build inventory will provide access to stations via all modes.

Mr. Milone said it is challenging to combine regional and local scales. He said it might be possible to use sketch planning to estimate changes in travel. He agreed that if investments are being contemplated, it is important to identify benefits.

Mr. Erenrich said he thought that WMATA had conducted an analysis for its station access study that might be similar to the approach he was suggesting.

Mr. Brown said the work of the Long-Range Plan Task Force was important, but he cautioned that the TPB does not control major funding sources. He said it was important to think about how the TPB's long-range planning activities might be practically and effectively used to influence the bodies that actually control funding.

Mr. Srikanth said it will be a challenge in Phase II of the task force's work to determine how to identify a limited list of priority projects.

Mr. Whittaker said it is the function of an MPO to identify priority projects at the regional level for the long term. He said this is what the public should expect an MPO to do, but he also noted that this task is very difficult.

3. Coordination Efforts with the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board (BRTB), the MPO for the Baltimore Region

The Baltimore Regional Transportation Board (BRTB), which is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Baltimore Urbanized Area, is conducting its annual "Retreat" at the MWCOG facilities on December 21, 2016. In the spirit of coordination and the continuing,

cooperative and comprehensive (3-C) planning process, TPB staff has invited the BRTB to participate in the TPB Board meeting on December 21, 2016. Ms. Erickson provided some background information on the BRTB, which has the same federal planning responsibilities as the TPB. The BRTB planning area has a population of 2,684,787 people and has 1,516,318 jobs. The BRTB's FY 2017 UPWP budget has \$6.5 million programmed to carry out the federal planning responsibilities. The TPB staff coordinates with the BRTB staff in virtually every aspect of transportation planning.

4. Briefing on "Communities of Concern" for the Proposed Enhancements to the Title VI/Environmental Justice Analysis of the CLRP

Ms. Klancher briefed the committee on the December TPB presentation identifying "communities of concern" in Phase 1 of the proposed enhancements to the Title VI and Environmental Justice (EJ) analysis of the CLRP. In December, the TPB will be briefed on the "communities of concern" methodology and map.

The key enhancement is the identification of "communities of concern," which are small geographic areas that have significant concentrations of low-income or minority populations using an index based on tract-level demographic data from the U.S. Census 2010-2014 American Community Survey. These regionally agreed-upon areas will also be used in other TPB work activities including the sampling strategy for the regional Household Travel Survey, encouraging applications for the Transportation and Land-Use Connections grant program for studies involving these areas, and other long-range planning work. "Communities of concern" could also be used by local jurisdictions to assist with their community planning initiatives in areas such as housing, health care, education and parks or green space.

Mr. Ritacco demonstrated the online interactive map with options to click on and off demographic layers, the "communities of concern," the transportation improvements in the 2016 CLRP and COG's Activity Centers.

After the TPB approval of the "communities of concern" map anticipated in January, TPB staff will conduct Phase 2 of the Title VI and Environmental Justice (EJ) analysis which is the examination of the 2016 CLRP for disproportionate and adverse impacts on low-income and minority population," measured by accessibility to jobs, hospital and educational institutions. The measures will be analyzed for the "communities of concern" compared to the rest of the region. The analysis by TPB staff will occur between February and April 2017, with briefings to the Technical Committee expected between May and June 2017.

Mr. Holloman inquired if there is an official definition or designation for the term "communities of Concern" and noted possible sensitivity towards the phrase. Ms. Klancher noted previous discussions of the name "communities of concern" with local Planning directors, that MPOs across the nation have used various other terms for the areas, including potentially vulnerable populations and Environmental Justice areas, and that staff understand potential sensitivities related to the name "communities of concern."

Mr. Byrne commented on the challenge of meaningful involvement from low-income or minority communities in the transportation planning process, citing Baltimore's "Vulnerable Populations Index" work. Ms. Klancher elaborated on the efforts to involve traditionally disadvantaged population groups through the Access for All Advisory Committee and other TPB public participation initiatives. Mr. Byrne recommended that the local jurisdictions help reach out to these communities to involve them in the regional process.

Mr. Holloman asked what public comments were received to date and Ms. Klancher clarified that an official public comment period was not held, but comments were requested from the Technical Committee and the Planning Directors Committee. Ms. Klancher said WMATA submitted comments supporting the work. Ms Klancher also noted that the staff briefed the Citizens Advisory Committee at its November meeting and CAC members had some of the toughest questions but applauded the work and wanted the map used widely in planning, programming, and policy across the region.

5. 2015 Washington-Baltimore Regional Air Passenger Survey Geographic Findings

Mr. Roisman delivered his presentation on the results of the 2015 Washington-Baltimore Regional Air Passenger Survey, including an overview of the three regional commercial service airports and the survey process. He noted during discussion of historical trends in regional air passenger enplanements going back to the year 2000 that the region's enplanements actually increased between 2014 and 2015, from 32 million annual enplanements (where the region had stayed flat since 2005) to 34.1 million annual enplanements. On an individual airports basis, BWI has the highest number of enplanements, followed closely by DCA, and then by IAD. Market share is split almost one-third equally, with slightly more of the pie to BWI and DCA and less to IAD. Most of the passengers at all three airports are considered local originations (instead of connecting passengers), meaning they access the airport using the regional surface transportation network, and those local originations are the subject of the rest of the analysis that was presented. The share of local originations at all three airports grew between 2013 and 2015. Looking at trip purpose, business travel has increased since 2013, where both the effects of Federal sequestration and a Federal government shutdown depressed business travel, but the 2015 levels are not yet back to pre-sequestration levels reported in the 2011 survey. Passenger preference remains to go to the closest airport, as defined by survey respondents. The 2015 is the first air passenger survey to ask about the use of Uber, Lyft, and similar services to travel to the airport and regionally it was found that 9% of passengers were using those services to travel to the airport. At DCA, the share of passengers using Metrorail to travel to the airport has decreased from 15% to 12% between 2013 and 2015. Mr. Roisman also showed a map of the geographic service areas for each airport based on the survey results. Mr. Roisman noted that the FAA forecasts for the region's airport indicate that IAD will experience the greatest level of passenger growth out to the year 2040. Mr. Roisman noted that there was a typo on Slide 13, that the survey briefing would be going to the TPB on December 21, not December 14. Staff is receiving reports on the draft survey report and expects to finalize it by the end of the year, after which preparations will begin for the 2017 Washington-Baltimore Regional Air Passenger Survey.

A committee member asked if the reported transit share for BWI included MTA Light Rail; Mr. Roisman responded that it did include MTA Light Rail, as well as MARC Commuter Rail and Amtrak intercity rail.

A committee member noted that the chart colors for each airport were not consistent across the presentation and that the information should be made consistent prior to presenting to the TPB; Mr. Roisman agreed and noted that he would make the requested changes to the presentation.

A committee member asked if there has always been a single dominant carrier at each of the three airports; Mr. Roisman responded that yes, this has historically been the case for as long as he has been reviewing the survey results.

A committee member asked if Uber was shown in the mode of access chart on Slide 10; Mr. Roisman clarified that TNCs (Transportation Network Companies) shown in the chart is the umbrella term used for services such as Uber and Lyft, and reminded the group that 2015 is the first survey that offered TNCs as a possible response; the option was not available in the 2013 survey.

A committee member asked if the FAA forecasts shown were used as inputs to the regional surface travel demand model; Mr. Roisman responded that yes, they were used as model inputs.

6. TPB Bylaws Amendment

Currently, there is no provision in the TPB Bylaws to allow for remote participation in the Board meetings by members or their alternates via telephone or the internet. In response to a request from TPB members, Mr. Srikanth announced a proposal to amend the TPB Bylaws so as to allow participation of the Board members or their alternates remotely via the internet and or the telephone. Ms. Erickson also asked that technical committee members look at their own bylaws and if there is a similar provision, would they please share it with us. It will be on the December TPB agenda as a Notice Item and then TPB will act on it in January. Loudoun County and Frederick City staff mentioned that they have policies and will provide the details.

7. Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC) I-66 Inside the Beltway Multimodal Program

Mr. Goldfarb and Ms. Happ presented information on the I-66 Inside the Beltway Multimodal Program developed and administered by NVTC, with consultant support from Kimley-Horn and Associates through VDOT.

Mr. Goldfarb provided background on NVTC and its role in planning transit in Northern Virginia, as well as its role in the Transform 66 Inside the Beltway project. NVTC will receive a portion of the toll revenue for the roadway for transit and TDM projects, based on an agreement with the Commonwealth of Virginia. All NVTC jurisdictions or transit operating agencies in Northern Virginia (except for VRE) are eligible to submit projects to use the funds, and non-motorized transportation project are eligible. NVTC received 19 applications totaling \$42.7 million in funds for available funds of \$10 million. The project required that all components submitted were expected to be ready by toll day one and selected components will receive funding, following a screening process, technical evaluation, and ranking of components. The selection process looked at congestion relief (particularly person-throughput), diversion mitigation, and cost-effectiveness, using methods that were scaled for the available program budget but could be escalated if future program budgets significantly increased.

Ms. Happ reviewed the ten components selected at a total cost of \$9.8 million. She said that more detail on each component is available on the NVTC website. The collective benefits of the components include moving more people through the I-66 ITB corridor, connecting Activity Centers, providing new bus routes and enhanced service, and more efficient corridor operation. The benefits will be tracked using performance measures on an annual basis and reported to NVTC and to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB); the jurisdictional agreements with NVTC for funding the components require the jurisdictions to report performance data to NVTC. The initial package of components was approved by NVTC and the

CTB and will be ready on toll day one in summer 2017. There will be another call for projects during 2017.

A committee member asked if there was an opportunity to hold excess toll revenues in reserve to save for a large project or component. Ms. Happ said that this issue has not been previously raised or discussed. Mr. Goldfarb noted that the initial program needs to get up and running and repay some of the Commonwealth's initial outlay before a reserve policy is considered, and that a two-year program rather than a one-year program is being considered. He also noted that the possibility of bonding against the toll revenues was examined and found to be infeasible. Ms. Happ added that debt service is being considered for the next call for projects.

A committee member asked how the selection process considered origin-destination patterns and component benefits that may accrue to District and Maryland residents. Mr. Goldfarb responded that the decision to toll only the peak-travel direction likely dampened the benefits that might accrue to non-Virginians, but that the TDM programs to be funded benefit users from all areas, and that as the program matures there may be non-peak direction services and components that are funded in the future that benefit the larger region.

A committee member asked how future operating costs would be paid from the new bus service being introduced by the program components. Mr. Goldfarb responded that the jurisdictional agreements cap NVTC's funding of operating service at 100% for the first five years and a step-down over the following three years, so that at the end of eight years of service the jurisdiction would need to fund 100% of the transit operating expenses. He also noted that the jurisdictional agreements specify ridership threshold as included in the component application, and if a component fails to meet ridership targets, NVTC can terminate funding.

Chair Roseboom noted that there has already been one groundbreaking for one of the project components, and Ms. Happ noted that new PRTC service funded under this program would begin operating on December 12.

8. Briefing on Federal Planning Regulations

Mr. Randall spoke to a presentation to update the committee on developments in federal rulemaking, including performance-based planning and programming. He referred to a memorandum included in the mail-out.

Mr. Randall started with an update on the latest schedule for publication of the final rulemakings for the five categories of performance rules. Final rulemakings are still pending for Highway and Bridge Condition, System Performance, and Transit Safety, and sources report that the federal agencies are trying to get these all issued by the end of the Administration, within the next few weeks. He noted that the FAST Act was the authorizing legislation for the PBPP rulemaking, and lasts through federal fiscal year 2020, or close to another four years.

He then displayed a slide with a calendar for 2017 and 2018, with the months that DOTs and Transit Agencies would set targets in each of their respective PBPP areas, followed within 180 days by the MPO. The only targets that have to be set by the TPB in 2017 are the transit asset targets, but then early 2018 will require setting targets in other PBPP areas. The transit asset targets are due to be set by the end of this year, and TPB staff will be reaching out to collect the targets and underlying data from the transit agencies or jurisdictions. The TPB also needs to coordinate with all stakeholders in the PBPP process, including DOTs, NHS roadway

owners, and transit providers, to document roles and responsibilities in the PBPP process, as required under the new Planning Rule.

Mr. Randall then moved on to an update on Highway and Bridge Condition Performance for the region. Nicole McCall has completed an updated analysis with the 2015 pavement data, which became available in October. These highway and bridge pavement condition measures are still proposed under a draft rulemaking almost two years old; the final rule is anticipated in the next few weeks. There are six performance measures, four for pavement condition and two for bridge conditions. The process for calculation is complex, and TPB staff plan to develop a recorded webinar for informational purposes that explains the steps in data collection, analysis, and measured performance.

He reviewed the extent of the data that needs be collected for pavement condition, showed maps for the data elements, and noted the flowchart that is used to calculate overall performance. Overall, this region is doing well for pavement condition performance, well below the statewide standard proposed by the draft rule. He emphasized there is no standard for MPOs though. A graph was shown that demonstrates what travelers actually experience, in terms of pavement condition, with 60% of VMT on good pavement, another 32% on fair pavement, and then 8% of travel on poor pavement.

Mr. Randall then moved on to bridge condition, reviewing the extent of bridge data, showing the flowchart used to calculate bridge performance, and then a graph of the bridges and culverts – culverts being a subset of bridges – in the region over time. He showed a graph of performance and a map of the bridges in the region. He noted that the region has several new or replaced bridges which is improving performance. In addition, the definition of the National Highway System in the region has been changing, which also changes the number of bridges in the region that are measured. The entire highway and bridge condition field is in a state of transition, and it will be a few years until the scope of the NHS and data settle down. The region is in good shape though, and a graph of the performance over time in the region shows the increase in the Good measure over the past few years. He concluded by showing graphs of the measures of structurally deficient bridges, and noted the region is well below the proposed statewide standard for this measure as well.

Mr. Srikanth then reviewed several sections of the presentation for the committee. He emphasized that while the State DOTs will be collecting the data and make most of the programming decisions for pavement condition projects, the residents of the jurisdictions are the users of the road and that jurisdictional staff should be observing the projects being funded. He reviewed the pavement types and data elements, and that the flowchart produces the output measure. He noted that some data is unavailable for some sections, including: pavement type, both directions for Interstate, and section length. New data will be collected if these requirements are incorporated in the final rule. He also noted the data needed for bridges and flowchart used for those measures. He reiterated that the region's bridges are in good shape and meet minimum standards, but DOTs and MPOs can set more stringent targets.

Mr. Erenrich asked for confirmation that these rules apply just to the NHS, not local roads. Mr. Randall stated this was correct, with the NHS including Interstates and principal arteries, some of which may come under local jurisdictions. TPB staff will also complete a jurisdictional-level set of information on pavement and bridge performance.

9. Analysis of Transportation Impacts of WMATA's Safetrack Program

Mr. Randall reviewed TPB staff's plans to conduct a more extensive review of the transportation impacts of WMATA's SafeTrack program. This will build on previous staff analysis of automobile traffic for the first surges. The new analysis will look at surges one through ten, also incorporate local transit information, highway traffic counts, any non-motorized data, and any other information on travel patterns during the surges. He announced that e-mails had been sent to local transit contacts, and many members of the committee, the previous day, asking for any available data by next Friday, December 9. The plan is to complete the analysis and have results for presentation at the January 6 committee meeting.

Mr. Roseboom emphasized the deadline of the request for data. Mr. Srikanth noted the memorandum in the mail-out had more information as well.

10. Status Report on the 2017-18 COG/TPB Household Travel Survey

Due to time overruns from previous agenda items, Mr. Roseboom deferred Item 10 until January 2017.

11. 2016 CLRP Amendment Brochure and Report

Referring to a handout, Mr. Swanson said the draft report for the 2016 CLRP Amendment was being distributed. He said that Technical Committee members had a deadline of December 14 to provide comments on the draft. He said a final version of the report would be handed out at the TPB meeting on December 21.

Mr. Hampton said a summary brochure of the 2016 CLRP Amendment would be handed out at the TPB meeting on December 21.

Mr. Swanson announced an upcoming TLC Peer Exchange event on December 8 at the Martin Luther King Library.

12. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – December 2, 2016**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP -----

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick County -----
City of Frederick Timothy Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County Gary Erenrich
Prince George's County -----
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery County -----
 Prince George's County -----
MDOT Tyson Byrne
 Matt Baker
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County Mike Lake
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
NVRTA Sree Nampoothiri
NVTC Patricia Happ
Prince William County James Davenport
PRTC -----
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Norman Whitaker
 Regina Moore
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
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
Andrew Meese, DTP
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Lamont Cobb, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Ken Joh, DTP
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Arianna Koudounas, DTP
Jessica Mirr, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Sergio Ritacco, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Jon Schermann, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Lori Zeller, DTP
Abigail Zenner, DTP
Patrick Zilliacus, DTP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS
Steve Walz, DEP
Sunil Kumar, DEP

OTHER

Alex Brun, MMDE
Dan Goldfard, NVTC