

---

## **TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY**

February 2, 2024

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

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

### **2. APPROVAL OF MEETING RECAP FROM THE January 5 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING**

There were no questions or comments regarding the January Technical Committee meeting. The summary was accepted as final.

## **ITEMS FOR THE BOARD AGENDA**

### **3. NATIONAL CAPITAL TRAIL NETWORK UPDATE**

Andrew Meese presented, referring to a memorandum in the mailout materials. The draft National Capital Trail Network update, reviewed by this committee at its January meeting, was presented to the TPB at its January 17 meeting, with a comment period open through February 9, and anticipated approval of the network update as final at the TPB's February 21 meeting. The memorandum gave a link to the draft National Capital Trail Network update webpage. There had been no changes made to the network since the January briefings.

At the January 17 TPB meeting, board members had questions about two specific trails, one in Loudoun County, and the other in the City of Fairfax. Staff was able to exchange information with a board member and with jurisdictional staffs, which ensured that the draft network had the correct information in these two cases.

In the Loudoun County case, there had been a rerouting of the trail in question by the County, correctly reflected in the network map. In the City of Fairfax case, city staff verified the City's intent that, at this time, the trail in question (George Snyder Trail) should remain as it is currently in TPB's documents, included as part of the TPB's Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region comprehensive network, but not as part of the National Capital Trail Network portion of the plan. The next National Capital Trail Network update round was to start soon, to be completed in about a year's time.

There were no questions from the committee.

### **4. BRIEFING ON SELECTED 2024 WORK ACTIVITIES**

Ms. Lyn Erickson briefed the committee on several Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) projects that are currently underway for FY 2024. Focus topics include equity and access, safety, climate change, data collection and analysis, and public information tools. Ms. Erickson highlighted several studies that TPB staff are working on, including an Analysis of Transportation Inequities in Disadvantaged Communities, a 2024 Regional Safety Study, Implementation Considerations for On-Road Transportation Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategies, Regional Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Implementation (REVII) Strategy, Transportation Resilience Study – Phase II,

---

Coordinated Transit On-Board Data Collection, a new Regional Travel Survey, an Intercity Bus and Passenger Travel Study, Travel Monitoring and Trends Analysis, a Regional Activity Centers Update, and a People's Guide to Transportation Decision-Making in the National Capital Region. Ms. Erickson concluded that all these efforts are underway while staff also develop Visualize 2050. Ms. Erickson also mentioned that tuning into sub-committee meetings is the most effective way for folks to give feedback and stay informed on the UPWP projects.

The following questions were asked following Ms. Erickson's presentation:

Mr. David Edmondson inquired when local jurisdictions would know, approximately, the costs to be able to get local over samples.

Mr. Timothy Canan responded that TPB staff are currently in the process of developing the scope of work that would occur in early 2025. Mr. Canan stated that if everything goes according to plan, staff could initiate the data collection in late FY 2025, so there is ample time to coordinate with jurisdictions. Staff will likely reach out to members in early FY 2025 to see if and how any add-ons are desired.

Mr. Victor Weissberg inquired what the best way to give feedback on methodologies on the projects would be.

Mr. Kanti Srikanth responded that going through the respective subcommittees is the best way to give feedback. Mr. Srikanth also added that most of these studies have already begun and so there are no opportunities to go back and re-scope the projects. However, tuning into the subcommittee meetings provides opportunities to identify follow-up studies. Mr. Srikanth also stated that members can email him their comments or ideas at any time for consideration on future efforts. Mr. Srikanth continued to say that this presentation was an opportunity to refresh everyone's memory on what is happening in the current plan.

Ms. Erickson responded that TPB staff tried to highlight the new and upcoming activities. Ms. Erickson stated that one can pay more attention to the projects in the subject matter expert areas (subcommittees) and that many of the products do not get much attention until they reach the Board level at completion. Ms. Erickson noted that all of the subcommittee meetings are hybrid and one can find their schedules at the end of the Tech Committee agenda and on the COG web page under events.

Mr. Mark Phillips inquired about more detail on the Climate Change Report, such as whether it will track the region's progress in meeting the seven strategies and how staff will treat the remaining seven strategies that were marked for further study.

Mr. Srikanth responded that the tracking of how the region is doing in terms of reducing greenhouse gases in each sector, is a separate ongoing activity. Mr. Srikanth stated that there were fourteen strategies that the previous technical study identified and the TPB adopted seven of those, while setting aside the other seven for further study. The current Climate Change Report is assessing the remaining seven strategies and identifying considerations to implement the strategies.

Mr. Phillips responded that this may be an opportunity to find a way to track how well the region is doing on the seven strategies that the board adopted.

## **5. BRIEFING ON THE DRAFT FY 2025 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM**

Ms. Lyn Erickson briefed the committee on the draft UPWP for FY 2025 (July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025), which the Board will be asked to approve in March 2024. Mrs. Erickson noted that tables 1, 2, and 3 (Pages 41-43) are very important for review to understand revenue and expenditures. Ms. Erickson explained how MPOs are allocated funding and the three buckets of money (new funds for the fiscal year, old funds unexpended from previous years, and carryover funds from current year UPWP). Together, these funds total about \$26 million for FY 2025.

---

Ms. Erickson then summarized the new FY 2025 new and enhanced activities. These include new Transportation Resilience Planning Activities, updated Travel Forecasting, and new Mobile Emissions and Climate Change Planning. Ms. Erickson also touched on new studies and surveys, including further study of GHG reduction strategies, implementation of Regional Travel Survey format, regional coordination of future transit on-board surveys, regional bike/active transportation count program, and enhanced transportation safety data deep-dive. Ms. Erickson then highlighted additional, ongoing work efforts and multimodal board initiatives for FY 2025. Ms. Erickson concluded with the next steps to work towards finalizing the document for March 21 Board approval.

Mr. Nick Ruiz inquired about the process and goals of coordinating transit onboard surveys.

Mr. Tim Canan responded that this effort is intended to reach out to all of the public transportation providers in the region to support them in their survey efforts. Rather than conducting one region-wide, central survey, this effort seeks to partner with each of the agencies to review their current survey resources and include questions that would help provide TPB with modeling efforts.

Mr. Canan stated that for those smaller agencies that do not have survey resources, TPB staff and consultants will be able to help provide surveys.

Mr. Ruiz followed up to ask when staff will be requesting that agencies coordinate with them to integrate TPB's questions into their surveys.

Mr. Canan mentioned Mr. Mark Moran is an expert point of contact for technical data questions, but that staff are expecting to begin coordination this year, before FY 2025.

Mr. Srikanth responded that TPB staff are ready and eager to work with VRE and other agencies on survey efforts.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **6. BRIEFING ON THE DRAFT FY 2025 COMMUTER CONNECTIONS WORK PROGRAM**

Dan Sheehan, COG/TPB staff, briefed the committee on the draft FY2025 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP). The CCWP serves as an annual guide for work products and services performed as part of the Commuter Connections Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program. and sets an annual budget. The budget for FY2025, as recommended by the State Transportation Demand Management Work Group, is set at \$7.7 million. DDOT, MDOT, MTA, and VDOT fund the program using formula based on census data and other factors. Notable projects included in the FY2025 CCWP include implementation of the federal Enhancing Mobility Innovations grant, celebrating the program's 50th Anniversary, and conducting many survey/program evaluation tasks, including updating the TDM Evaluation Framework Methodology and development of the 2025 State of the Commute Survey, among other items. Work items for FY2025 will seek to build upon program successes since coming out of the pandemic. The most recent evaluation of the program, completed in fall 2023, has shown that the program has a sizable net benefit on reducing congestion and air pollution. Notable metrics include the reduction of daily vehicle trips (119,500), reducing daily vehicle miles of travel (2.1 million), reducing daily Nitrogen Oxides tailpipe emissions (0.4 tons), and reducing daily Volatile Organic Compounds tailpipe emissions (0.3 tons).

Mr. Sheehan concluded the presentation by noting the next steps for review and approval of the document. Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, asked how TPB can optimize data collection and survey analysis for member consumption. Kanti Srikanth, COG/TPB staff, acknowledged that TPB produces many data-oriented resources and will examine how to best summarize the various resources available for local jurisdictions. Amir Shahpar, VDOT, asked if the 11% increase in CCWP funding is a typical increase. Mr. Srikanth responded that the current year-over-year increase is

---

unusual and is due to a concerted effort to conduct program evaluation activities and produce the triennial State of the Commute report. The CCWP budget typically rises 3-4% annually to account for contractor and labor cost increases.

## **7. VISUALIZE 2050: UPDATE ON LOGO, PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT, PROJECT INPUTS, NEXT STEPS**

Cristina Finch provided an update on public engagement and project inputs. The summary of the first Visualize 2050 comment period covering most of 2023 was shared with the TPB in December and staff will be following up with states on general responses. The staff is currently reviewing hundreds of records submitted for consideration in the plan and coordinating with agencies on clarifications in preparation for the March comment period. In their review, staff noted several submissions do not include adequate funding information.

Ms. Finch explained the use of Primary Project Type Study/Planning/Research and the differences when used for a T or CE record as follows: T record – Study/Planning/Research are funded and programmed for planning or preliminary engineering as they evaluate how to address issue(s) and multiple possible options. These records are in the financial plan but not the conformity analysis. CE record – Study/Planning/Research is not programmed, and future funding ability is not reasonably anticipated. A preferred alternative and engineering may be underway but a total cost estimate and how the full project will be funded is unknown. These records are not in the financial plan or conformity analysis.

Ms. Finch stated all CE projects that are not studies must have general funding sources (federal, state local, bonds, private) assigned that add to the total cost estimate. To summarize, Ms. Finch explained for projects to be in the V2050 air quality analysis, financial and conformity information must be provided, and studies or projects with only planning and engineering money will not be in the air quality analysis or the March comment period. Future cycles of the plan or out-of-cycle amendments is an option for projects that will not have financial information ready. There were no questions from members.

## **8. TRANSITIONING TO MOVES4**

Dusan Vuksan and Jinchul Park of TPB staff briefed the committee on staff's plans to use EPA's MOVES4 model, released on August 30, 2023, for estimating criteria pollutant emissions (Nitrogen Oxides and Volatile Organic Compounds) in the upcoming Visualize 2050 Air Quality Conformity Analysis. Staff also noted that the new model will be used in the Visualize 2050 greenhouse gas (GHG) analysis to evaluate the region's progress toward meeting the GHG reduction goals. Mr. Vuksan discussed the main differences between the recently released MOVES4 model and its predecessor, MOVES3 model. Finally, staff briefed the committee on the findings of preliminary sensitivity analysis conducted using the two models to assess the potential impacts of MOVES4 on the region's emissions estimates.

## **9. INTERCITY TRAVEL STUDY**

Eric Randall briefed the committee on a planned intercity bus and rail travel study. The purpose of the study will be to collect regional information on intercity bus and rail travel to meet federal requirements for metropolitan transportation planning and to improve regional knowledge. This study will build on the staff research conducted in May 2023 and the TPB work session conducted in October 2023. This study is part of the FY 2024 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and will continue into FY 2025. The study will employ a consultant to expand on previous work to also include intercity passenger rail and commuter rail. The consultant will collect intercity travel data including by

---

means of a field survey to collect information such as ridership, intercity trips by time of day and day of week, station and stop locations, traveler demographics, traveler origins and destinations (inc. jurisdiction/zip code of residence), etc. The deliverables will include a draft and final report as well as a webmap with geographic data. TPB members will be contacted in upcoming months to get their input and coordination on the study. Nick Ruiz asked for more information about how the study would involve commuter rail systems. Eric Randall responded that the focus of the study is on intercity travel primarily for non-work or special business purposes rather than regular commuters. However, intercity travelers from Baltimore have a choice between MARC and Amtrak, or travelers from Richmond may drive to Fredericksburg and then get on VRE. Once the consultants are onboard, there will be outreach and discussion to refine the scope of traveler information collection. David Edmondson asked if intercity bus routes would be mapped rather than just bus stops. Eric Randall said that perhaps the webmap could include illustrative intercity bus routes. Intercity buses can of course modify their route between stops based on traffic conditions; for instance, going up to New York City they might take the Baltimore Washington Parkway or might take I-95. He will bring this up with the consultant team once the study begins.

## **10. OTHER BUSINESS**

Janie Nham reminded the committee applications are currently being accepting for the regional roadway safety program and the TLC program. The application process will be open until March 8th. The program provides short-term consultant services to jurisdictions in our region for planning or preliminary engineering projects. Currently, the projects can receive up to \$100,000, which is up from \$80,000 last year. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Janie Nham or John Swanson.

As was presented in January, Lyn Erickson reminded the committee that the Fauquier County urban area is no longer considered “contiguous” with the TPB’s urban area and is no longer required to participate in the TPB’s planning process. On behalf of Fauquier County, VDOT has requested that the TPB officially change the boundary and membership to reflect this, and the TPB will be asked to approve this action on February 21. No comments have been received at this time.

Jane Posey mentions that she will email the Detailed Transit Assumptions for Visualize 2050 to the Committee.

The next Community Leadership Institute session is going to be at the end of April. They will be held in three evening meetings from 5:30 P.M. to 9:00 P.M. Jay Fiset and Kathy Porter will be facilitating the sessions. We are reaching out to the AFA and CAC advisory committees first for applicants, then we will open it up to the general population and we may ask for your help in getting the word out.

There were no additional staff updates.

---

**ATTENDANCE – Virtual**

<b>MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT</b>	
Mark Rawlings – DDOT Rebecca Schwartzman - DC Office of Planning Gary Erenrich – Montgomery County David Edmondson – City of Frederick Brian Fields – City of Gaithersburg Victor Weissberg – Prince George’s County Kari Snyder – MDOT Silas Sullivan - Alexandria Dan Malouff - Arlington County Malcolm Watson – Fairfax County Bob Brown – Loudoun County Megan Landis – Prince William County Evandro Santos – Prince William County	Brian Leckie– City of Manassas Amir Shahpar - VDOT Regina Moore – VDOT Amy Garbarini - VDRPT Sophie Spiliotopoulos -NVTA Hannah Pajewski – NVTA Nick Ruiz – VRE Mark Phillips – WMATA Mark Mishler Frederick County
<b>OTHERS / MWCOG STAFF PRESENT</b>	
Kanti Srikanth Lyn Erickson Kim Sutton Sergio Ritacco Eric Randall Andrew Austin Andrew Meese Cristina Finch (Virtual) Jinchul Park	Janie Nham Leo Pineda Tim Canan Mark Moran Rachel Beyerle Dusan Vuksan Jamie Bufkin Charlene Howard Erin Morrow