

TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ITEM #1



National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

Technical Committee Minutes

**For the meeting of
June 2, 2017**

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the June 2, 2017 Technical Committee Meeting

Participants at the meeting introduced themselves. The minutes were approved unanimously.

2. Performance-Based Planning and Programming: Regional Targets for Transit Asset Management

Mr. Randall spoke to the agenda item, referring to a report included in the mail-out. Updated since last month, the report summarizes the region's transit asset management (TAM) targets. The first change, which is not yet reflected in the report, will be to clarify that Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) and Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) are reporting on behalf of smaller, Tier 2 systems, not for their own operations (in the case of the MTA).

The second change is to incorporate recently promulgated Federal Transit Administration guidance on the rulemaking. The guidance has modified some deadlines set by the federal rulemaking, and a note to this effect was included as a footnote in the previous version of the report. At the TPB meeting in May, it was asked that the deadlines and requirements modified by the guidance be incorporated into the report, which has been done.

Mr. Randall highlighted that per the guidance the region's providers of public transportation will accordingly have to set new targets for FY 2018 by October 31, 2018, if their fiscal year is July to June, as it is for most agencies in the region.

Mr. Srikanth and Ms. Erickson then spoke to the importance of TPB Technical Committee representatives working with their board members to communicate agenda items and provide any feedback to TPB staff before the board meetings.

3. Long-Range Plan Task Force Status Report

Mr. Davis introduced the item and announced the next meeting of the Long-Range Plan Task Force. Mr. Srikanth explained the materials handed out for this item, including the memo which explained the final product and next steps of the LRPTF, including the purpose of the next few meetings, and also introduced the collection of bundles of projects, programs and policies suggested by members of the task force.

Mr. Erenrich asked by what method the task force would screen the list of bundles. Mr. Srikanth explained that task force members will come to the next meeting with their favorite and least favorite bundles, which will help guide the discussion. He also explained that once the task force has narrowed the list down, staff can do a qualitative evaluation of the remaining bundles to weigh their projected effect in address the regional challenges. Mr. Erenrich responded that the bundles will take a very long time to go through during the task force meeting, and he expressed concern about the meeting being structured in a way to accommodate the task at hand. Mr. Srikanth responded saying that hopefully all the task force members will come prepared to the meeting to help the meeting move quicker. Ms. Erickson added that Mr. Fiset will be facilitating the meeting and that past meetings have been moving along well.

Ms. Soneji noted that many of the ideas are from existing long-range plans, and that also some of the ideas are “out there” – she asked if there would be an opportunity for stakeholders, such as transit providers, to give input as to the details of the initiatives during the analysis phase and to also weigh in on their feasibility. Mr. Srikanth said that the viability question has been discussed, and that the task force has not come to a decision that the bundles studied would need to be “viable.” He added that board members may not necessarily agree on what “viable” means.

Ms. Zeller explained some navigation tips for reading through and comprehending the table of bundles. She explained the different types of notes in the document to help with that.

Mr. Brown asked if the top-5, bottom-5 feedback needed to be limited by the existing bundles or if the member feedback could include the desire to remove certain initiatives from bundles. Mr. Srikanth explained that the polling exercise is to see in general where the task force stands. Mr. Brown stated he thinks the exercise would be best if it limited members to the bundles without any changes. Mr. Srikanth responded that Mr. Brown’s idea is how task force members were instructed to prepare for the meeting. Mr. Brown asked how those instructions are distributed and to whom. Ms. Erickson replied that there is an invitation that goes to task force members only and there is a general blast sent to everyone else. Ms. Zeller added that the instructions for the top-5, bottom-5 exercise were included in the LRPTF agenda. Mr. Brown said it would be helpful if the invitation sent to task force members could also be sent to Technical Committee members so that they can have ample time to work with their board members. Ms. Zeller explained that the task force meeting would begin with an informal poll to get the conversation started, and that that is the point of coming prepared with the top-5 and bottom-5 bundles.

Mr. Davis asked how can Technical Committee members help their board members provide input if their board members are not on the task force. Mr. Srikanth answered that anyone can reach out to the task force members, no matter where they are from.

Mr. Davenport asked if the poll would take place at the June 7 meeting. Ms. Zeller replied that it will.

Mr. Emerine said that there is a challenge in ranking and prioritizing the bundles because the projects, programs and policies have varying levels of specificity. He said that some bundles may rise or fall depending upon whether some details are expressed or not. He asked if more specificity could be given to help these decisions. Mr. Srikanth said that there are varying levels of specificity throughout the bundles and that their viability also varies.

Mr. Erenrich stated that to him that land use question is the most critical, and that the assumptions about future growth are creating problems because of how pipeline projects are characterized in the existing numbers. He also stated that it is very difficult to “move the needle” on congestion or transit ridership, and that he thinks it is important to choose regional performance measures for the analysis. Mr. Srikanth replied that land use assumptions will be tested in the task force’s analysis.

4. 2018 Quadrennial Update of the Long-Range Plan: Survey Update

Mr. Swanson spoke about outreach for the 2018 long-range plan. He emphasized that the new plan will include an unconstrained element for the first time, which means the plan can be conceptualized and presented more broadly. This means there is more opportunity for public participation. He said that public outreach this summer will focus on conducting a public opinion survey. He said the survey will be conducted in two ways – with a controlled sample and as an open, public survey. He said that MetroQuest software will be used for the survey. He guided the committee through a draft version of the survey.

Mr. Holloman suggested that a question about respondents’ income should be added.

Mr. Foster asked if the survey would be provided in Spanish. He also suggested that questions could more specifically ask about different types of rail services.

Mr. Swanson said the survey would be provided in Spanish. He said that staff would consider all suggestions, but cautioned that the survey needed to be kept fairly simple.

Mr. Emerine asked how the results of the survey would be made available to the board and the DOTs. He asked if the TPB would provide formal responses to comments.

Mr. Swanson said that staff had not planned to send responses to each respondent. He said the survey results would be made available in the Call for Projects and in the final report. He also said the responses would be used to inform focus groups and forums that will happen in the fall and/or winter.

Mr. Srikanth said the survey results would be made available in the Call for Projects.

Mr. Emerine commented on the survey screen that asks respondents to provide their ideas on a map about potential projects. He said this input could be useful for the Long-Range Plan Task Force.

Chairman Davis said the survey is fun to do. He suggested a question should be added that asks participants to identify their most frequently used mode of travel. He also asked whether and how outlying areas would be included.

Mr. Swanson said that the controlled survey would be designed to include proportional input from all the TPB jurisdictions. He also noted that for the open survey, a consultant was being hired to make sure outreach occurred in all parts of the region.

Ms. Erickson said the TPB would be provided with an update on the survey at its June meeting.

Ms. Soneji asked if the survey would be mobile-friendly. She asked if it would be also conducted as a paper survey.

Mr. Swanson answered that the survey would be mobile-friendly. He said that staff was not planning to conduct it as a paper survey, although respondents could call staff and take it over the phone if they could not take it online, or did not want to.

A question was asked if there would be a limit on the number of times someone could take the survey.

Mr. Swanson said that the controlled survey was designed to limit responses. He said the open survey would not be controlled in that way.

Ms. Zeller noted that staff will be monitoring whether a large number of responses are coming from the same device at the same time.

Ms. Happ noted, however, that when one device is used to solicit responses from multiple participants, we would not want to limit that input.

Mr. Swanson moved on to the second part of the presentation, which focused on branding and name. He said that a name for the plan had largely been settled upon: "Visualize 2045." He showed the group several logo designs that a consultant had developed.

Mr. Holloman said he thought the logo should not explicitly reference one mode.

Mr. Erenrich said that more pictures, such as different types of activity centers, should be used.

Mr. Malouff said that the logo should convey the idea of multi-modalism and he suggested the current draft designs did not do that.

Ms. Massie questioned the meaning of one of the designs, which appeared to convey nodes, but would not be clear to the public, she believed.

Ms. Happ said she thought simplicity was key to logo design.

Mr. Brown said the logo should reflect all parts of the region, including areas that were more rural. He suggested that a graphic might provide a geographic representation of the region.

Mr. Swanson said it is hard to convey the geography of the region using a map in a manner that has meaning to average people.

Mr. Emerine said there are limits to what a logo can do. He said that a lot of good comments had been made, which should be woven into the plan itself, but they did not necessarily need to be reflected in the logo. He said he agreed that the logo should be kept simple.

5. Virginia Railway Express (VRE) 25th Anniversary Activities

Tom Hickey, VRE Chief Development Officer, spoke to a presentation on Virginia Railway Express celebrating its 25th Anniversary, highlighting the achievements of the first 25 years, including ridership, performance, and the growth of the system. VRE opened in 1992, after an MWCOC 1984 study identified the feasibility of commuter rail service in the region. VRE is a successor to prior service that was discontinued in the 1950s. VRE has two lines, serving about 19,500 weekday passengers, which are 11% of the peak hour trips across the 14th Street bridge complex into the District and would otherwise likely be in cars, adding to congestion. He spoke to ridership patterns: origins and destinations. He went over the 2040 system plan, which envisions VRE becoming a regional rail service in the future, with more trains, higher frequencies and bi-directional service throughout the week, similar to other US and to international systems. He then reviewed the capital funding needed and the funding arrangements for VRE projects, though many projects are carried out by other agencies, including Virginia DRPT, the District, and the private railroad CSX. He concluded by emphasizing the strategic partnerships that are important to VRE, including TPB.

Ms. Soneji added that improvements of the eight-mile corridor – the Long Bridge and the eight miles to the south through Alexandria – are critical to VRE's future growth plans.

Mr. Milone asked how often VRE trains are held up by freight trains. The answer was that this happens, but the data is not very clear or quantified. CSX and VRE work very closely together to manage operations, and also Amtrak, but delays can occur due to various reasons.

Mr. Roseboom asked for more information on the Broad Run expansion plan and the proposed Gainesville Haymarket extension. Mr. Hickey responded that after thorough analysis, the expansion at Broad Run was more effective and efficient than the proposed extension, and therefore VRE has chosen to proceed with the Board Run expansion plan.

Ms. Zenner asked about the actual anniversary of VRE. It was reported that the VRE birth date is June 22, 1992, on the Manassas Line, while the Fredericksburg Line opened on July 20, 1992.

Mr. Srikanth noted that there is less time available on the board meeting agenda for this item. He also noted that he was a contented VRE customer.

6. Critical Urban Freight Corridors

Mr. Schermann and Ms. Markley briefed the committee on FAST Act regulations on the designation of critical urban freight corridors (CUFC), the work to date on the identification of CUFCs including the identification of 25 miles of draft CUFC segments in the Maryland portion of National Capital Region, and next steps in the designation process including the request for provisional approval of the Maryland CUFCs by the Steering Committee.

CUFCs are part of the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN) which was established through the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. Projects, including planning, engineering, and construction activities, on the NHFN (which includes CUFCs) are eligible for federal funding through the National Highway Freight Program.

MPOs with populations greater than 500,000 have the authority to designate CUFCs but must demonstrate coordination with state DOTs in doing so. While TPB staff is coordinating with each of the three states in the TPB planning area to identify CUFC candidates, Maryland is the first state ready for designation of its CUFCs. The TPB will be asked to designate a full set of CUFCs for all

three states later this fall. Maryland has requested early provisional designation of its CUFCs so they can include them in their State Freight Plan update to be completed this summer. Maryland has 25 miles of CUFCs to be designated in Frederick, Montgomery, Prince George's, and Charles counties.

Mr. Schermann and Ms. Markley shared the locations of the 25 miles of Maryland CUFCs identified using a methodology that included consideration of truck volumes, freight employment density, and CTP project locations.

Next steps include the request for provisional designation of the Maryland CUFCs by the Steering Committee in June with final designation by the TPB in the fall. Coordination will continue with DDOT and VDOT to identify their CUFC candidates which will be reviewed by the Freight Subcommittee and presented to the Technical Committee and brought to the TPB for official designation later this year.

Questions about the outreach to local jurisdictions, the top 50-mile list of CUFC candidates included in the top 50-mile screen, and additional clarification on the methodology used were discussed by Committee. Mr. Schermann noted that a full discussion of the methodology, including maps of the top 50-mile candidates were reviewed in detail by the Freight Subcommittee and that the presentation to the Technical Committee did not include as much detail. Ms. Markley stated that all but one of the CUFCs are located on roadways that are part of the regional freight-significant network, which is part of the Regional Freight Plan.

Mr. Erenrich noted that certain important high-volume corridors in Montgomery County did not make the list including US 29, MD 355, and MD 97 and wanted to know why they were not among the proposed set of CUFCs. Mr. Schermann stated that portions of MD 355 were included in the top 50-mile list but were edged out by other roadways with higher scores or planned CTP activity. Mr. Erenrich indicated that roadway classification should be a factor in determining CUFC candidates and that these CUFCs were not yet ready to be presented to the Steering Committee for action. Mr. Schermann subsequently provided additional materials clarifying the methodology and scoring used to identify the CUFCs.

7. Freight Trends

Mr. Schermann provided an overview of some of the most relevant retail and delivery trends recently discussed by the Freight Subcommittee.

New technologies are reshaping the demand for freight as well as the supply of freight services. These technologies now enable consumers to be more demanding and more informed about their purchases. Consumers want the products they purchase to be delivered fast and preferably with free shipping. Businesses are responding by offering free shipping and faster delivery. If consumers want their products to come to them, they will be shipped via established players like FedEx, UPS, or the postal service; or through new players like Amazon Flex.

It is very likely that these trends will accelerate in the future. Consumers will have wider selections of products to choose from and additional options for delivery. Retailers are reinventing their supply chains to provide more product choices and delivery options. This can reduce dependence on automobiles and enable car free living in urban areas. On the other hand, it increases the number of trucks using the roadways and exacerbates the competition for curbside space - especially in dense urban areas.

Mr. Schermann noted that as population and employment continue to grow in our Region, competitive pressure on existing urban curb space will grow and newly urbanizing parts of the region will begin to experience similar pressures. This is a difficult problem to address and there is no single solution. Each jurisdiction will need to navigate the trade-offs and create solutions that are acceptable to their respective residents and businesses.

Some of the new technologies that are either here already - or on the horizon include truck platooning, robot deliveries and delivery drones. The basic idea of truck platooning is that trucks outfitted with the proper technology can "platoon" - that is, once the second truck is positioned properly behind the lead truck, the system connects them so they operate at a set distance from one another. Two or three trucks can be linked this way resulting in significant fuel savings, particularly for the non-lead trucks. This is being tested now on certain rural interstates in the US. Postmates food delivery robots are currently operating in the Georgetown neighborhood and on the 14th St. corridor in Washington, DC.

Drone delivery is very attractive to businesses because of its considerable cost savings compared to truck and driver delivery. Despite the potential cost savings, there are significant hurdles to overcome before drone deliveries become commonplace. Package delivery drones are still a long way off, especially for our Region because unmanned aircraft of any type are prohibited from operating within 15 miles of National Airport due to national security considerations. A committee member asked if there were studies looking at the impact of e-commerce on the postal service. Mr. Schermann said that while it is hard to foresee all the impacts that could result from fast-changing technology, to-date, the rise of Amazon has been beneficial to the postal service in that Amazon contracts with them to make many of their last mile deliveries, especially on Sundays.

Mr. Davis noted that it took 18 months to receive his UAV (unmanned aerial vehicle) pilot's license and that it is not an easy process. He also asked how it was that delivery robots are operating on DC sidewalks and that there are ordinances in Frederick that prohibited motorized vehicles on sidewalks.

A committee member asked which cities are currently doing a good job with managing the increasing demand for curb space. Mr. Schermann responded that while he is not aware of what is going on in most cities, the District is doing innovative work on managing loading zones and New York City has been a leader in encouraging off-hours delivery.

Mr. Srikanth added that through the FAST Act, MPOs are supposed to bring in these emerging technologies through the long-range planning process. One thing is clear; technology is not going to have a positive impact for all regional planning objectives, it will be a plus for some and a negative for others. Automated vehicle technology for example, is expected to provide safety benefits but might not be beneficial to transit ridership or land use. Also, these emerging technologies might have a negative or at least an unclear impact on employment.

8. Performance-Based Planning and Programming (PBPP)

Mr. Randall provided an update on federal PBPP rulemaking and TPB's plan for implementation. He went over the PBPP rulemaking scheduled and he mentioned the repeal of the MPO Coordination and Planning Area reform rule on May 12. He noted that one PBPP rulemaking is still pending, that for Transit Safety. Two rulemakings recently became effective though, those for Pavement and Bridge Condition and for System Performance (Highway, Freight, CMAQ Program). Both of these were paused for four months while the new Administration reviewed them, and the System Performance rule had had its section on Greenhouse Gas emissions reporting indefinitely suspended. He then reviewed the performance measures for these two rules and then the target-setting dates for all the rules over the next eighteen months. Lastly, Mr. Randall spoke to the required coordination among MPOs, NHS asset owners, and the providers of public transportation, which must jointly agree upon and document in writing the coordinated processes for collecting data, selecting targets, and reporting targets and actual performance. He referred to a draft letter included in the handouts for the day's meeting, and asked for agencies to review and comment.

9. Performance-Based Planning and Programming (PBPP) – Virginia Safety Target Setting

Mr. Read presented the MAP 21/FAST highway safety performance measures, Virginia's methodology for setting statewide targets, and efforts underway to assist Virginia's MPOs in their setting of regional highway safety targets.

The highway safety performance measures final rule requires states and MPOs to set targets for five performance measures (PM); fatalities, fatality rate per 100 million VMT, serious injuries, serious injury rate per 100 million VMT, and nonmotorized fatalities and serious injuries. NHTSA and FHWA share the first three targets and each PM and target is in terms of a 5-year rolling average. The state requirement is to set a target for each PM for the next calendar year. FHWA then determines whether the state has met – or made significant progress on – each target.

Virginia's target setting approach begins with the idea that targets should be consistent with the safety objectives laid out in the Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP). To determine reasonable targets, Virginia looked at a variety of trends including fatalities, serious injuries, licensed drivers, VMT and others. Based on analysis of these trends, VDOT determined that fatalities could be reduced by 2 percent annually through 2021. In a similar manner annual reductions in the fatality rate, serious injuries, serious injury rate, and non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries could be reduced by 3 percent, 5 percent, 7 percent, and 4 percent respectively. With this data as background, VDOT and the DMV are currently negotiating on setting the 2018 targets.

MPOs have until February 2018 to either set regional targets or agree to support the state targets. VDOT is currently developing methodologies and a set of tools to help Virginia MPOs to set and report on their targets. VDOT is working to provide VMT and safety data by MPO geography together with tools to calculate trend lines. These data and tools should be available for MPOs to use this summer.

Mr. Srikanth noted that Maryland is operating under a "Towards Zero Deaths" approach while the District of Columbia has embraced "Vision Zero". While neither of those states make zero fatalities

their official target, their target setting is informed by these aspirations. Mr. Read stated that Virginia's strategic plan is called "Arrive Alive" and is based on the goal to halve fatalities by 2030. Virginia is absolutely motivated by the aspiration to achieve zero fatalities and if trends observed in the 2000s had been maintained Virginia would be at zero in about four years. However, because recent trends have been flattening out and because it is un-clear what the next five years will bring, the state is being somewhat more conservative about setting targets.

10. Other Business

There was no other business.

11. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00.

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – June 2, 2017**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County Ben Yeckley
Frederick County -----
City of Frederick Timothy Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County Gary Erenrich
Prince George's County Anthony Foster
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery County -----
Prince George's County -----
MDOT Kari Snyder
Kandese Holford
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County Mike Lake
Malcolm Watson
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
NVRTA Sree Nampoothiri
NVTC Patricia Happ
Prince William County James Davenport
PRTC Betsy Massie
VRE Sonali Soneji
VDOT Norman Whitaker
Regina Moore
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
Todd Horsley
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----
WMATA Jonathan Parker

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP
Lyn Erickson, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Ken Joh, DTP
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Jessica Mirr, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Sergio Ritacco, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Jon Schermann, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Lori Zeller, DTP
Abigail Zenner, DTP
Steve Walz, DEP
Sunil Kumar, DEP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS

OTHER

L'Kiesha Markley, SHA
Tiana Norris, MDOT
Meredith Hill, MDOT
T.R. Hickey, VRE
Stephen Read, VDOT
Clinton Edwards, VDRPT
Alex Brun, MDE
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
David Willauer, Cambridge Systematics
Bill Orleans