

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
ITEM #1#**

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD#

Technical Committee Minutes

**For meeting of
10/4/2013**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - October 4, 2013**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick Co. Ron Burns
City of Frederick Tim Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. -----
Prince George's Co. Abul Hassan
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. -----
 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT Lyn Erickson
 John Thomas
MTA -----
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax Co. Mike Lake
 Malcolm Watson
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Robert Brown
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Monica Backmon
NVTC Claire Gron
PRTC Nick Alexandrow
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Norman Whitaker
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Danielle Wesolek

FEDERAL/OTHER

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

COG Staff

Ron Kirby, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Marco Trigueros, DTP
Sarah Crawford, DTP
Clara Reschovsky, DTP
William Bacon, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Dan Sonenklar, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS
Sunil Kumar, DEP

Other Attendees

Elizabeth Bezilla, DCOP
Bill Orleans

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

November 1, 2013

Technical Committee Meeting

Technical Committee Minutes

Before the meeting began, Mr. Kirby and Mr. Meese informed the Committee that Ms. Foster of TPB staff had passed away earlier in the week. The Committee observed a moment of silence in her honor.

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

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on the Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP

Mr. Austin spoke to the draft Call for Projects document and went through the proposed schedule. He noted the onset of the process was being delayed by a month in order to more closely align with the approval of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). Mr. Austin also said that the Call for Projects document specifically references the RTPP and asks agencies to consider the strategies contained therein when developing their project inputs.

The 2014 CLRP will also be a major 4-year update, which will include an update to the financial plan. Mr. Austin noted that more information would follow on that topic. He also said that he would distribute materials the following week detailing all CLRP projects in the database and asked agencies to review the cost and completion date fields.

Mr. Austin said that users of the CLRP/TIP/Conformity database would notice some changes this year, which were reflected in the instructions in Section 3 of the Call for Projects document. Most notably, he said, was the introduction of two separate input forms for TIP and Conformity data, where they had previously been merged together.

Mr. Brown asked if agencies needed to have access to the database to input their projects. Mr. Austin clarified that all local and transit agencies in Virginia needed to coordinate their inputs with VDOT who would submit all Virginia projects together. Mr. Austin said that he would make sure to include localities in Virginia on the distribution of the CLRP database project listings. He also noted that the database was accessible online in the CLRP website at www.mwcog.org/CLRP.

Ms. Backmon asked if previous updates to the CLRP were available. Mr. Austin said the CLRP website contained an archive of previous updates both in the Resources section and under the major project listings.

Mr. Brown commented that in previous years he had received a shape file displaying all of the projects in the CLRP, which he said was very helpful. Mr. Malouff asked if the CLRP was still available in a Google Earth format. Mr. Austin replied that the Google Earth application had not been updated to include the latest CLRP, but he noted that improvements were under way to include GIS enhancements directly tied to the database of projects, which would replace the Google application.

Ms. Posey discussed the future transit assumptions for the CLRP and TIP. She asked agencies to review the assumptions and make sure they were up-to-date. She asked for any changes to be submitted in writing by February 7, 2014. She noted that the base transit network should be accurate as of December 2013.

3. Update on the Final Report of the TPB Bus On Shoulders (BOS) Task Force

Mr. Randall gave a presentation reviewing the work of the TPB bus on shoulder task force and summarizing the final report. He reviewed the founding of the task force, the interest in bus on shoulders in the region, and the four meetings of the task force. He then spoke to the final report, which looked at challenges and lessons for implementing bus on shoulders, evaluated three highway corridors in the region for the feasibility of bus on shoulders, and then the findings of the report, that shoulder conditions are the biggest unknown and possible obstacle to implementation, which should therefore be focused on short segments.

Mr. Holloman asked if only buses in revenue service could use the shoulders, or if buses in non-revenue service could as well. Mr. Randall responded that this would be determined on a project specific basis by the roadway agency and bus operator. However, in most regional highway corridors, traffic in the reverse commute direction is usually not too terrible, and buses in non-revenue service operating in that direction would be unlikely to use the shoulders much in any case.

4. Update on a Revised Draft TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)

Mr. Kirby reviewed a revised memo that described seven major themes that will be addressed in the next update of the RTPP draft. He said a revised version of the plan will be released for public comment at the CAC meeting on October 10.

Mr. Brown suggested that the Technical Committee should have an interactive session similar to the Economy Forward event conducted on September 27.

Mr. Holloman noted that not all the public comments received have been posted on the RTPP website.

Ms. Wesolek said that Mr. Kirby's memo suggested that Momentum 2040 and WMATA's Regional Transit System Plan (RTSP) are synonymous, which is not quite accurate.

Mr. Kirby said that he wrote the text in question based upon the Momentum document. He said the RTPP draft needs to be faithful to that document.

Ms. Backmon noted that one theme that emerged from the September 27th event was a call for a regional transportation authority. She noted that Northern Virginia already has an authority, which has a specific role. She said she did not understand what the role of an additional regional authority would be.

Mr. Kirby said that he is not particularly supportive of the call for a regional authority because it is not politically feasible. He said it is more important to determine how to be effective within existing political circumstances.

Chair Erickson said that at her table on September 27th, many of the participants who did not have a background in transportation were supportive of a regional authority. She said that these people need to be educated on why such an authority is not likely to be established.

Mr. Emerine said that more detail is needed in the RTPP regarding long-term scenarios. For example, he noted that Scenario B calls for more transit, but it does not provide adequate details as to what that would mean.

Mr. Kirby said the details in Momentum inevitably will be more detailed than the RTPP.

Mr. Malouff said that the RTPP needs to clarify how land use is tied into the long-range scenarios.

Mr. Orleans noted that the RTPP calls for greater transparency, but he said the RTPP itself was not developed in a transparent manner. He expressed concerns about the fact that the September 27th event was not open to the public. He also said the region should develop a new transportation compact similar to the WMATA compact.

Chair Erickson, responding to Mr. Orleans, said that the September 27th event relied upon a level of expertise that was provided by the regional stakeholders who were the participants. She said it was not intended to be a public event. Regarding Mr. Orleans' suggestion for a new regional transportation compact, she said there is no political will to explore that.

Mr. Kirby said that many people in the region want more cooperation, so they look to the idea of a new “authority.” But he said that is not realistic.

Mr. Emerine said it would be helpful for the public and other users of the RTPP to understand the estimated cost effectiveness of different strategies.

Mr. Malouff said that the RTPP needs to explain the land use effects of tolling scenarios that include tolls on new capacity compared to tolls on existing capacity. He also said that MAP-21 is a two-year bill and therefore its limitations on tolling existing capacity may not be long-lasting.

Mr. Kirby said that TPB analysis shows that tolling existing capacity will be a “hard sell.” He said the goal of the RTPP is to get changes in the CLRP in the short-term. Regarding land use, he said the CLRP Aspirations Scenario, including the latest version that does not toll existing capacity, was designed to support land-use concentrations in Regional Activity Centers.

Ms. Wesolek challenged some of the wording in the RTPP, which suggests that Momentum 2040 is not designed to address crowding.

Mr. Kirby said Ms. Wesolek was reading the draft incorrectly.

5. Update on the Regional “Street Smart” Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign.

Mr. Farrell distributed a PowerPoint, and played a video summary of the FY 2013 Street Smart Annual Report. He said the campaign was able to get a total of \$2.5 million of campaign value on a half million dollar media budget. He noted that awareness of the campaign messages was about twice as high among pedestrians as among motorists. The next campaign will focus more on motorists. The likely press event date for the Fall campaign is October 22nd.

Mr. Kirby suggested playing the video to the TPB, without any PowerPoint.

Mr. Malouff asked what the intended audience was for the video. Mr. Farrell replied that the target audience is the board members. It is not intended as direct outreach material for the public; it is a companion piece to the printed annual report.

Mr. Milone asked if more detail on the campaign survey results could be provided. Mr. Farrell replied that some statistics were provided in the annual report. A long PowerPoint with more detail on the survey results is also available on request. Mr. Milone asked when survey results for next year will be available. Mr. Farrell replied only one survey will be done, in the Spring. He said only one survey is done for budgetary reasons, and also because there are usually new ads and a bigger budget for the Spring campaign. This year the creative may not be redone; the current ads won a

major award, and it is believed they have “legs”. There have been a lot of positive responses to this creative; the partner agencies like it. The money not spent on campaign development can be put into more media buys.

6. Briefing on a Draft Regional Green Streets Policy for the Washington Region

Mr. Farrell told the Committee that there have been no significant changes to the Green Streets documents since the Committee was briefed in September. He announced that because of the TPB’s schedule the comment period has been extended to October 24th. A number of committees were briefed in September, including the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, the Anacostia Watershed Management Committee, and the Climate, Energy, and Environment Policy Committee. The CAC will also be briefed. So far there have not been a lot of comments; just one technical correction of a footnote. Comments will be integrated into the next draft documents. Comments should be emailed to Mr. Farrell.

Mr. Kirby said that the Green Streets policy will likely go to the TPB in November.

7. Update on the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program

Mr. Meese presented, referring to a memorandum prepared by Mr. Hutchinson, the MATOC Facilitator. At the September 18, 2013 meeting, Councilmember Snyder requested that the TPB receive a status report on the MATOC Program, either by presentation or by memorandum, specifically to include information on MATOC's coordination activities during the unfolding of the September 16 Navy Yard shooter incident. Since it was anticipated that there would not be sufficient time for a presentation at the October 16 TPB meeting, a draft memorandum had been prepared, shared at today's meeting for review and comment. The final memorandum would be included in the Letters Sent/Received packet in the mailout materials prior to the October 16 meeting, and Mr. Kirby was to mention it in his remarks during the October 16 meeting.

Mr. Meese provided an overview of the draft memorandum. First was a background section on MATOC, with links to further information on the MATOC website for readers not familiar with MATOC. Next in the memorandum was a review of MATOC's overall regular/daily core activities. Following was a section on new or recent MATOC Program activities, including coordination during recent events such as the August 28 March on Washington anniversary. Also noted was that circumstances at MATOC's previous leased offices in Greenbelt necessitated a move of the MATOC offices to the University of Maryland's Technology Ventures Building in College Park. The new space was being configured to MATOC's needs, with construction expected to be completed by the end of October, and operations run from suitable remote locations in the meantime.

The memorandum then turned to a description, with maps and chronology, of MATOC's activities during the Navy Yard incident. The context was that there were several other traffic incidents being coordinated by MATOC at that same time around the region; coordination among numerous simultaneous incidents is a key role for MATOC. MATOC encouraged a number of messages on highway message signs that day.

The memorandum concluded with an outlook section, noting MATOC's numerous active users, outreach activities to key stakeholders and agencies, and its regional construction coordination study now underway.

There were no questions or comments from the Committee.

8. Update on the Connection between Goods Movement and the Economy at the County Level in the Washington Region

Cancelled.

9. Briefing on the new Activity Centers and their Share of Round 8.2 Forecast Regional Growth

Ms. Reschovsky briefed the Committee on the New Activity Centers recently developed by the Planning Directors in COG member jurisdictions. The Original Activity Centers were developed after a call from the TPB Board in 1998. The newly developed Activity Centers more accurately reflect the local Comprehensive Plans that are maintained by the jurisdictions and better align with the Region's planned long term investments in transit. Activity Centers prioritize development in existing urban centers and priority growth centers, often around transit hubs. They also allow monitoring of the growth in regional forecasts. Activity Centers are meant to be dense with a mixture of employment and residential uses. She said the number of 2040 transit stations in Activity Centers has grown from 89 to 166. It is expected that 58% of household growth by 2040 will occur in Activity Centers. Similarly, 76% of employment growth is expected to be in Activity Centers by 2040.

Mr. Malouff asked if the entire City of Frederick was in Activity Centers? Ms. Reschovsky answered yes.

Mr. Brown was concerned about some of the centers in Loudoun. Ms. Reschovsky responded that some had their names changed in the final stages of development at request of the planners in Loudoun County, specifically One Loudoun became Ashburn. Mr. Griffiths mentioned that some of the original Activity Centers were heavily employment based, but now most of them are mixed use.

Mr. Malouff asked about the types of Activity Centers. Ms. Reschovsky responded that they are not all the same, which is appropriate. Some have a lot going on, and others

are planned to in the future. Size and densities also vary depending on which part of the region they are in.

Mr. Lake asked about the borders of the original Activity Centers. Ms. Reschovsky responded that they are TAZ boundaries that are not always reflective of the actual area where growth was or was expected. Mr. DesJardin added that the growth areas have changed.

Mr. Emerine posited that some of the growth areas are smaller than the Activity Center boundaries. Ms. Reschovsky indicated there are cases where that is possible, such as the Activity Center including the Monumental Core will not see growth in housing or jobs on the actual Mall. Mr. Griffiths mentioned that planners had the opportunity to divide a TAZ if necessary, but would have had to submit forecasts for both parts. No TAZs were divided.

Mr. Roseboom inquired about the Activity Centers in Fairfax and Prince William Counties. The list was provided after the meeting.

Mr. Davis indicated that the Activity Centers highlighted on the slide for Frederick are not all contained within the City of Frederick boundaries.

Ms. Wesolek asked when the shapefiles of the new Activity Centers will be made available. Ms. Reschovsky indicated that once the internal review is complete they will be released. Mr. DesJardin added that he expected they would be available by the end of the calendar year. Mr. Kirby also added that while the COG Board did approve the new Activity Centers, they have not yet seen the data, which must happen before the data is released.

10. Other Business

After Item 4 Mr. Randall discussed MAP-21 Federal Register Notices

Mr. Randall gave a presentation on a recent Federal Register notice regarding proposed FHWA/FTA guidance on transit representation on MPO boards, as required under MAP-21. The TPB will have to include representation by MTA, PRTC, and WMATA, through one of several options for representation included in the guidance. A draft letter with proposed TPB comments on the proposed guidance was distributed, which will be presented to the TPB at its October 16 meeting. The proposed letter endorses the flexibility of the proposed guidance and requests no further changes in the final rule.

Another Federal Register MAP-21 notice was also published; the FTA's advanced notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) for performance measures for transit safety and state

of good repair. Mr. Randall noted that most requirements are for the three major transit agencies, but that all FTA recipients and sub-recipients will have some requirements for measuring and reporting. He noted that there are specific questions for MPOs that the TPB will have to consider in the notice.

In regard to the first item, Chair Erickson noted that the Maryland State Highway Administration is represented on the Baltimore MPO Board, and that an MTA representative will have to be added once this guidance becomes effective in a year. Mr. Kirby emphasized that the transit representation will have to be in place by October 1, 2014, so the TPB needs to start formulating how this will be done now.

Chair Erickson requested further elaboration on what would have to be done to amend the TPB by-laws to include transit representation. Mr. Kirby responded that somehow the three FTA Section 5307 recipients, MTA, PRTC, and WMATA, would have to have representation. While WMATA is already on the board and votes on routine matters, it does not have a weighted vote, which all three transit agencies would somehow have to have.

Mr. Brown noted that a member of the PRTC Board, the representative from Prince William County, already sits on the TPB. Mr. Kirby responded that the rulemaking would appear to require direct transit agency representation, with a vote, and not just two votes for a jurisdictional representative who has a transit agency. He noted that Ms. Erickson as the MDOT representative has also represented the interests of the MTA at the TPB, but that this might not be acceptable to the FTA. The question is how to have transit agency representation through the specifically designated representative. He emphasized that the Federal Register notice is only proposed at this point, not final, so the determination might have to wait until the final rulemaking. He also noted that the TPB already has transit agency representation on its committees and subcommittees, another requirement in the proposed guidance.

Chair Erickson asked about next steps and how the transit representation might be designed to meet the intent of the law in the TPB's by-laws. Mr. Kirby noted that there are several proposed options in the guidance for transit representation. He suggested that once the final rule is published, a by-laws task force would be started. He noted that giving WMATA a weighted vote will change the current voting balance for the TPB, which will be a major issue. Mr. Randall added that he would expect the final rule to come out around February 2014.

Ms. Wesolek stated that WMATA will be reviewing the Federal Register notice and the proposed letter, and wanted to be sure that there is time for revision of the letter. Mr. Kirby noted that comments are due back by October 30, so they have to be approved this month by the TPB, which means by the October 16 meeting. WMATA can provide comments up to then, though a draft of the letter will be sent out to the TPB on October 10. Mr. Alexandrow noted that PRTC will also review and provide any comments.

At the end of the meeting Chair Erickson informed the Committee that the Maryland Transportation Plan was released for public comment.

Chair Erickson also asked about the financial plan update for the CLRP. Mr. Kirby answered that a consultant had been hired and was starting to work with the member jurisdictions and agencies to update the plan from four years ago.

11. Adjourn