

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
October 2, 2015

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – October 2, 2015**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick County David Whitaker
City of Frederick -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County John Thomas
Prince George's County Victor Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery County -----
Prince George's County -----
MDOT Lyn Erickson
Kari Snyder
Samantha Biddle (SHA)
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County Malcom Watson
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
NVTA Sree Nampoothiri
NVTC David Koch
Prince William County James Davenport
PRTC Betsy Massie
VRE Sonali Soneji
VDOT Norman Whitaker
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

Allison Davis

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Bill Bacon, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Bryan Hayes, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Eulalie Lucas, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Erin Morrow, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Wenjing Pu, 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
Steve Walz, DEP
Amanda Campbell, DEP
Jeff King, DEP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS
Greg Goodwin, DCPS
John Kent, DCPS

OTHER

Alex Brun
Bill Orleans
Rick Rybeck, Just Economics LLC

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Meeting

Technical Committee Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the September 4 Technical Committee Meeting

The minutes were approved as written.

2. Update on the Draft 2016 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) Amendment and Draft Conformity Determination

Mr. Austin stated that the projects in the 2015 CLRP Amendment had been released for public comment on September 10. He noted that one comment had been received to date pertaining to the I-66 Inside the Beltway project. The TPB had been briefed at their September meeting and the comment period would close on October 10. Mr. Austin said that additional information provided by VDOT on the I-66 Outside the Beltway project had been posted on the CLRP website, including a letter from VDOT indicating their selection of an alternative to include in the approved CLRP and a video that explains the preferred alternative.

Ms. Posey distributed an MWAQC comment letter on the conformity analysis, an updated summary conformity report, and a revised slide from the CLRP performance analysis. She reviewed the MWAQC letter and noted that, as in past years, the letter would be included in the conformity report. She indicated that the summary conformity report was updated to include a "comments" section, and that it included a summary of the MWAQC letter and a recommended response that would be shared with TPB at the October meeting.

Mr. Vuksan spoke to a revised slide from the CLRP Performance Analysis that described Mode Choice and the Metrorail Constraint. He noted that the title of the slide had been changed from "Transit Constraint" to "Metrorail Constraint" to more accurately reflect the modeling process. He also noted that a sentence that referenced out-of-date numbers had been deleted.

Ms. Davis suggested incorporating a bullet to indicate the reason for the constraint; the lack of funding for 100% 8-car trains. Ms. Erickson cautioned that including the funding amount on this slide could present a false equivalency of a high cost for a marginal benefit.

3. Overview of Briefing on Metro Fundamentals

Ms. Davis, WMATA, provided an overview of plans for a series of three monthly presentations to the TPB regarding WMATA. These are in response to a request from the June meeting, at which TPB board members discussed a desire to gain an

understanding of what WMATA's needs are now and for the future, what are the current issues, where does the region stand in meeting those needs, and how the TPB can play a constructive role in supporting WMATA.

The first presentation, for October, will be on the fundamentals of Metro, to establish a baseline understanding for TPB board members of basic facts about Metro. The presentation is currently undergoing review within Metro, so the final contents may change. Currently, it would cover Metro's modes, ridership, economic benefits, and governance, including the many new board members. It will also cover ongoing safety reviews by FTA and the GAO, as well as NTSB recommendations. Next will be the FY 2016 budget and longer-term capital funding plan, and where those funds come from, including for safety and state of good repair. Finally, some of the operating costs and revenues information. The planned presenter is Mr. Anosike, CFO. Presentation two in November will be on Metro's Capital Program and Momentum. This will focus much more on the capital program and the 5-year plan, the majority of which is geared towards safety and state of good repair, not expansion. It would identify how projects are selected and programmed for funding. The presentation would then talk about the proposed Momentum capital expansion plan. Presenters would be Mr. Kannan and Mr. Webster.

The final presentation in December would look at the roles that TPB can play to support Metro and the presenter would be either a board member or possibly a new General Manager. The results of multiple studies would be mentioned, along with key recommendations from these task forces and working groups and how those can move forward. The presentation would then examine Metro as a regional system, for the TPB to consider as the regional planning body. How does Metro get funded among state and local priorities and plans? What can local jurisdictions do, such as bike/pedestrian access improvements and transit-oriented land use around rail stations? These issues would be proposed for the board to consider.

Mr. Srikanth then spoke to the basis for this series of presentations, which is the Board interest in the many issues facing Metro and what constructive role the TPB could play. The TPB does not fund WMATA or have a role in its governance, but recognizes the regional importance of Metro and the involvement of many TPB board members in jurisdictions that fund Metro. The series of three presentations is designed to provide more time than a single meeting and also provide a progression in information so that the board can engage in a productive discussion. The intention is to focus on funding in the second presentation, as this is important in the CLRP financial analysis and for many members, and to emphasize how funding is important for the safety and system reliability issues that Metro is facing.

Mr. Holloman suggested mentioning highlighting the lack of a dedicated funding source for Metro and also emphasizing how Metro is a critical component of the region's transportation system, as there may be a lack of understanding on the importance of Metro and its economic role.

Mr. Rawlings asked if Councilman Mendelson, the TPB Chair, has been briefed on this presentations proposal, to which Mr. Srikanth replied in the affirmative for the three officers of the board.

A member of the public suggested that WMATA's funding needs should be emphasized and that the role of the JCC with its local agency representatives should

be mentioned in the presentation. Ms. Davis responded that the presentations are intended to go beyond a simple funding request and instead provide a vision for the importance of Metro in the region. For example, many of the local transit projects now being planned will connect into Metro, but Metro as the backbone of the region's transit system will need to be able to handle these travelers.

4. Update on Preparations for the October 21 TPB Work Session on Policy Aspects to include in the Regional Freight Plan

Mr. Schermann briefed the Committee on the status of preparations for the October 21 TPB Work Session on policy aspects to include in the regional freight plan.

He noted that the Board expressed interest in the freight plan during their July 22nd meeting and that Chairman Mendelson requested a review of the draft freight plan at an *early* non-finalized stage so that board members could provide policy input – especially on the issues of hazardous materials transport and the shared use of rail facilities by passenger and freight trains. This pre-meeting work session will allow Board members additional time to discuss these issues.

A summary of the work session will be presented to the full Board during their afternoon meeting. Staff will then compile the input that the Board members provided during the work session as well as the TPB meeting to craft a draft policy chapter for the freight plan.

The work session will run from 10:30 AM until 11:45 AM, and will be chaired by Chairman Mendelson. TPB staff will provide a brief overview of strategic freight issues and industry trends and will also review the contents of the draft regional freight plan. Staff will then provide a summary of the written information received from stakeholders in the weeks prior to the meeting. The remaining 45 minutes of the work session will be devoted to Board discussion. Stakeholders have been invited to attend the work session and may be called upon for further information or clarification.

The freight subcommittee meeting on September 17 was devoted entirely to the preparations for the October TPB work session. The primary recommendation of the freight subcommittee was for staff to solicit input from stakeholders ahead of the TPB work session. Based on this recommendation, staff has solicited written input from state departments of transportation, commuter and passenger rail agencies, freight railroads, a variety of associations, and some private businesses.

Mr. Weissberg asked whether the expected outcome of this effort is the establishment of a policy on the movement of hazardous materials through the region or is it merely to collect views on this issue. Mr. Schermann responded that staff expects that the Board wants to include policy statements in the regional freight plan and acknowledged that jurisdictions will need ample time to analyze and respond to any such proposed policy statements.

Mr. Srikanth added that the purpose of the work session was to identify the freight related policy topics that our stakeholders and Board members want to include in the regional freight plan. Staff's expected take away from this work session is a list of freight related policy priorities. Staff will then work through the freight subcommittee

and the technical committee to develop text around those priority statements which will, after approval by the TPB, become part of the updated plan. Everybody will have ample opportunity to comment on them before they are finalized.

Mr. Whitaker added that the policy topic areas should address the broad issues confronting freight and not be too narrowly focused on just one topic area.

In response to several comments about additional stakeholders that should be invited to participate in the work session, Mr. Schermann noted that he would reach out to the Federal Railroad Administration, the Federal Motor Carrier Administration and the Association of American Railroads.

Mr. Srikanth added that the end result would be policy objectives rather than prescriptions.

Mr. Rawlings noted that we have a number of freight-related policies already in the vision and that those could be a basis for this effort as well.

Mr. Schermann responded affirmatively to comments that commuter rail run through service (e.g., MARC trains running through DC to Virginia) could be an element of discussion during the work session.

Responding to suggestions that the policy topic areas should be structured to support overarching freight goals, Mr. Meese clarified that the Board requested policy input at an *early* stage of development and therefore does not likely want to be overfed information by staff about what the region's freight policy topic areas or goals should be.

5. **Update on the Regional "Stress Smart" Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign**

Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint. He said the Street Smart campaign runs two waves of advertising, Fall and Spring, aimed at promoting safer behavior by motorists, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Radio, transit, pumptopper ads, and internet advertising was used. The Spring campaign had a new element, a 15 second video.

Press events were held in the fall and the spring. Both were both successful, but the Fall event got more coverage. It is important to be aware of other traffic safety events that are going on, and avoid programming events too close together. Direct outreach "street teams" targeted high-incident locations with human-carried billboards.

The evaluation survey, which is held in the Spring, shows good before and after, and year over year improvements in recognition of the campaign ads. There is a gap in awareness between pedestrians and drivers, but the gap has been reduced over time, as we have deployed more ads aimed at drivers.

Awareness jumped in Virginia and DC, but not in Maryland. Maryland awareness is at a high level. Mr. Farrell speculated that we may be approaching saturation with the current ads in Maryland, due to the high level of pro bono placement on Maryland transit properties. Mr. Weissberg noted that Prince George's Counties has provided free transit shelter placement.

The survey also asks people to report observed behaviors. He said it appears that the increase in reported behaviors reflects increased awareness of the problem from the campaign, not actual behavior change, which is hard to measure.

Budget for FY 2016 is slightly greater than for FY 2015. Fall 2015 campaign will be similar to Spring. There will be a press event on October 27th on Market Square in Old Town Alexandria.

He said that staff is also asking partner agencies to carry out law enforcement, which we do not fund. We have suggested enforcement dates on the calendar. The press event and the radio spots emphasize enforcement, so it is important to make sure that there is actual enforcement occurring.

Publicity about enforcement enhances its effectiveness. A pedestrian enforcement workshop was held on September 28th.

Transit agencies are being asked to donate ad space, especially bus cards.

There will be an Annual Report and a two minute video with the highlights for the TPB. The PowerPoint would not be presented at the TPB.

A member commented that we should reach out to the young, rather than adults. Mr. Farrell replied that we have thought about that, and decided not to do it through this program. There are other methods of reaching young people, through the schools. Our member agencies have such programs. It's harder to reach young people once they leave school. At the regional level we have economies of scale in buying advertising, so it makes sense for this program to focus on non-school age people.

Another member asked whether our materials are approaching saturation levels. Mr. Farrell replied that in most of the region's markets have not yet reached saturation, and organizers want to avoid the expense of doing a completely new campaign. He said the short answer is it will eventually happen, but not yet.

Mr. Malouff asked that when new materials are developed, this committee should be briefed in advance. Mr. Farrell replied that we could do that, but that we encourage and invite TPB member jurisdictions send a representative to the advisory group. Input is encouraged at the advisory group, where it can be heard by everyone at the same time, and we can reach a consensus. When comments come from diverse sources and at different times, there is a risk of giving contradictory directions to the consultant. Mr. Malouff replied that this seemed reasonable, and asked that the Committee receive notice when new materials are going to be developed.

6. Update on the TPB Working Group on Unfunded Capital Needs

Mr. Swanson briefed the committee on activities related to the development of an inventory of unfunded capital needs. He said that a new TPB Working Group on Unfunded Capital Needs held its kickoff meeting on September 16. This group was formed to develop a work scope for future analysis and other regional planning activities to utilize the inventory of unfunded capital needs.

Based upon discussions during the September 16 Working Group meeting and comments received thus far, staff had identified elements to potentially include in a

scope of work. He passed out a draft memo describing these elements, which he said would be the main subject of discussion at the Working Group meeting on October 21. He said that following the October meeting, a work scope will be designed to achieve two overall outcomes: 1) address a series of policy questions using the inventory, and 2) identify a limited set of unfunded multi-modal priority projects that the region can get behind.

Mr. Holloman asked how often the inventory would be revised.

Mr. Swanson said that the inventory will essentially be in a perpetual draft state because the jurisdictions are always updating their plans. However, he did note that at some point in the future, the inventory would be used for analysis, and before that happens, he said the jurisdictions would be given the chance to make changes.

Mr. Weissberg suggested the final work product should be reframed: Instead of developing a list of “projects the region can get behind,” it should develop a list of “regionally significant projects.”

Mr. Swanson said he hoped the final product would identify projects that could be broadly supported across the region.

Mr. Emerine asked what tools might be used to identify pedestrian and bicycle projects, if the regional travel demand model was not an appropriate tool.

Mr. Srikanth said the TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee would be asked to work on this question. He said the regional Bike/Ped Plan will provide a good starting point for this work. He said this work could focus on two things: 1) identify important trail projects to improve regional connectivity, and 2) identify ways to improve circulation in Activity Centers.

Mr. Swanson noted the work of WMATA that has focused on improving pedestrian access to transit. He said this work was consistent with the TPB’s recent research conducted under a federal Transportation, Community and Systems Preservation (TCSP) grant. This type of research could provide models for pedestrian and bicycle priorities.

7. Briefing on Activities of the COG Multi-Sector Working Group (MSWG) on Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Mr. Griffiths presented the interim findings of the Multi-Sector Greenhouse Gas Working Group (MSWG) to the Committee. He explained the viable and stretch assumptions as they relate to Transportation Land use (TLU#2) strategy and went into the details of assumptions, methodology, and results including reduction in VMT and CO_{2e}. He also discussed the other transportation strategies, including those based on fuels and technology, and those affecting travel mode such as TDM, transit related, and pricing strategies. Mr. Griffiths also mentioned that he is trying to estimate potential transit demand from TLU#2.

In response to questions regarding premium transit and modifying the definition and redoing the analysis, staff responded the strategy analysis were performed using sketch planning approach, and changing the assumptions would not make a substantial difference in the results as this is a high level analysis.

It was also pointed out that housing stock outside Activity Centers are likely to be single family units whereas those inside are likely to be smaller and multi-family units and is an issue we have to keep in mind.

The policy board presentations and feedback from elected representatives indicated that that some elements of the MSWG strategies analyzed went beyond what was considered realistically implementable from a regional/local policy perspective. In particular, these elected representatives suggested that they did not consider the transportation pricing strategies and the land use strategy that would shift jobs and housing among jurisdictions to be feasible.

Mr. Sivasailam provided a handout of measures which staff developed by performing additional analysis of the results including increase in transit demand from the TDM measures including charts of the VMT decrease, GHG benefits, and transit demand increase.

8. Discussion Regarding the Potential Schedule for the 2016 CLRP Amendment

Mr. Srikanth stated that the traditional schedule for the Call for Projects for updating or amending the CLRP would present a draft of the document to the TPB in October with an approval in November and a December deadline for project submissions. He then presented an alternative schedule that would delay the approval of the Call for Projects by two months. Mr. Srikanth noted that this could present certain benefits for some agencies when developing their inputs for the FY 2017-2022 TIP.

Mr. Rawlings noted that since this would impact the eventual federal approval as well, that there may be concerns on the part of DDOT regarding some projects.

Ms. Erickson said she did not expect serious impacts in Maryland. She asked when a decision was necessary. Mr. Srikanth stated that if the delay was going to be rejected, the draft document would need to be presented to the TPB this month, so he requested input on the decision by the following Wednesday.

Mr. Srikanth suggested a proposal to move the regular amendments and updates of the CLRP to a two-year basis, beginning with the 2016 amendment, and then skipping any formal scheduled amendment in 2017. He noted that this did not preclude an amendment of the CLRP to include projects if necessary via an off-cycle amendment. Mr. Rawlings asked if funding for such an off-cycle amendment would be required to come from the requesting agency's technical assistance. Mr. Srikanth stated that this issue would need to be discussed further.

Mr. Srikanth pointed to the benefits of omitting the labor-intensive air quality conformity process every other year, including allowing time for work to be done on environmental justice and the unfunded capital needs. Mr. Srikanth indicated that the decision on skipping 2017 did not need to be made in conjunction with the decision to delay the 2016 amendment.

Mr. Malouff asked if there would be any conflict with delaying the 2016 amendment and going ahead with a 2017 cycle if desired. Ms. Erickson noted that the 2017 cycle would likely need to be somewhat condensed due to the financial planning work

required ahead of the quadrennial 2018 CLRP update. Mr. Austin noted that skipping the 2017 amendment would allow for a very early start to the 2018 update and an earlier approval of it as well.

Mr. Srikanth distributed a presentation pertaining to new ozone standards released by EPA. The presentation focused on transportation conformity analysis, and EPA's action. He said that October 1, 2015 was the date of the new ozone standards and that one year from that date, the states would be required to recommend the classification of areas that are in attainment or non-attainment of the new standards. By October of 2017 the EPA would have to finalize if an area is in attainment. If an area is not in attainment, a state implementation plan would need to be implemented, which may include motor emissions budgets. He added that no actions would be required by the TPB or member agencies for the 2016 or 2017 updates.

9. Preview of the 2015 Regional Air Passenger Survey

Mr. Roisman informed the committee that the biannual Regional Air Passenger Survey at BWI, Reagan National, and Dulles would begin on October 9 and end on October 22. He asked the Committee members to publicize the survey in their jurisdictions in order to maximize survey response (flights are randomly selected at each airport during the survey period). He also noted that the survey questionnaire has been updated for 2015 and transportation network companies (Uber, Lyft, etc.) are now a response option for the means of transportation to the airport question.

10. Other Business

None.

12. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – October 2, 2015**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick County David Whitaker
City of Frederick -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County John Thomas
Prince George's County Victor Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery County -----
Prince George's County -----
MDOT Lyn Erickson
Kari Snyder
Samantha Biddle (SHA)
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County Malcom Watson
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
NVTA Sree Nampoothiri
NVTC David Koch
Prince William County James Davenport
PRTC Betsy Massie
VRE Sonali Soneji
VDOT Norman Whitaker
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

Allison Davis

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Bill Bacon, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Bryan Hayes, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Eulalie Lucas, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Erin Morrow, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Wenjing Pu, 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
Steve Walz, DEP
Amanda Campbell, DEP
Jeff King, DEP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS
Greg Goodwin, DCPS
John Kent, DCPS

OTHER

Alex Brun
Bill Orleans
Rick Rybeck, Just Economics LLC