

TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ITEM #1



National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

Technical Committee Minutes

For the meeting of
SEPTEMBER 8, 2017

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the July 7, 2017 Technical Committee Meeting.

Participants introduced themselves. The July minutes were approved unanimously.

2. Approval of Projects Recommended for Funding Under the FY 2018 Transportation Alternatives Set Aside Program for Maryland TPB Jurisdictions

Mr. Swanson described the Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program and the process for selecting projects for Maryland. He presented a list of six projects that a selection panel was recommending for TPB approval. He said the TPB would be asked to approve the projects at its meeting on September 20.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the scores for individual projects could be provided.

Mr. Swanson said that staff could provide the combined scores for individual projects. The project selection process, however, was not simply a reflection of the average scores, but rather were based upon the selection panel's discussions about each project, the set of project recommendations as a whole, as well as cost considerations.

3. Briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the VDOT and MDOT Off-Cycle Amendment to the 2016 CLRP

Ms. Posey reviewed the conformity results for the off-cycle conformity analysis. She noted that the draft report is available online. Using slides, she reviewed the amendments to the 2016 CLRP, the travel demand results, and the emissions results. She noted that VOC and NO_x levels were below the mobile budgets as is necessary to meet conformity requirements. She stated that the conformity results would be released for public comment on September 14, and that the TPB would be briefed in September and asked to approve the conformity analysis and the amendments to the 2016 CLRP.

4. Visualize 2045 Public Outreach: Summary of Phase 1 Activities

Ms. Zenner explained the outreach activities staff executed this summer for the Visualize 2045 public input survey. TPB staff conducted the first phase of public outreach related to Visualize 2045 as a public input survey between June 17-August 31. She explained the activities that staff conducted to generate input for the survey including live-surveying events, digital outreach using social media, and utilizing stakeholders as ambassadors for the survey. These activities were highly successful generating over 6 thousand responses.

5. Visualize 2045 Constrained Element: Solicitation of Inputs and Air Quality Conformity Analysis

Mr. Austin spoke to the Technical Inputs Solicitation document. He noted that the document was restructured and redesigned in order to simplify the document formerly referred to as the "Call for Projects." Mr. Austin stated that a companion brochure would be produced to provide a more public-friendly overview of the technical process. He provided the timeline and deadlines for project submissions, noting that inputs for the Air Quality Conformity Analysis

was Wednesday, November 15. Mr. Austin also asked committee members to review all records in the database.

Ms. Posey reviewed a memo requesting detailed transit coding assumptions for inputs to the Visualize 2045 Plan. She reminded the group that the Plan will now go out to 2045, instead of 2040 as it had in the past. She told the group that the document includes network coding details for all projects in the plan. She asked the group to review the assumptions and provide any updates and to provide the same sort of details for any new projects that might be added to the Plan. Ms. Posey specifically mentioned the need to update Metrorail input assumptions and the need to make sure all projects are still viable, including the Beltway HOT lanes bus service shown on page B-1. She reviewed the Purple Line inputs on page 4 as a sample for the types of data needed.

Ms. Davis asked about what type of inputs are needed. Ms. Posey replied that needed information includes street-by-street routes and peak and off-peak headways.

Mr. Milone suggested that Paul Desjardin could mention about the proposed updates to land use. Mr. Desjardin indicated that several jurisdictions are interested in making updates to Round 9.0. He stated that they would be working within the tighter deadline to get inputs in by early January.

Mr. Brown asked about future Loudon transit service that had been input to the 2016 CLRP. Ms. Posey indicated that she had removed that from the list of future transit service assumptions, as all that service was now open, and would go into the base service assumptions. Mr. Brown asked if we need current service information. Ms. Posey replied no, only future service.

Mr. Whittaker asked if information is needed about temporary bus service while I-66 is under construction. Ms. Posey replied no.

6. Visualize 2045 Financial Element: Initial Analysis

Mr. Randall provided an update on the progress of the financial element of the Visualize 2045 long range plan. He spoke to a memorandum distributed to the committee. The first part of the memo reviewed the relationship of the financial element analysis to the overall “umbrella” of the Visualize 2045 plan development. The next section reviewed the federal requirements for the financial plan including funding the projects and programs to maintain highways and public transportation systems in a state of good repair, funding the operations and maintenance of the existing transportation system, and with any remaining funds, provide more capacity to meet the growing population and employment forecast for the region.

Mr. Randall then spoke to a paragraph that reviewed the new way of doing the financial analysis that staff is undertaking for Visualize 2045. Instead of the financial analysis taking place in parallel with the call for projects, this interim analysis is being prepared in advance of the technical projects solicitation to provide a baseline for implementing agencies as they prepare to submit projects and plans in response to the solicitation. The financial plan will be part of the overall Visualize 2045 plan for approval in October 2018. He then reviewed the needed information that stakeholders have been working on since January and the current status. Some revenue forecasts and project updates are still pending for the interim analysis, which will go to the board in October as part of the technical inputs solicitation. Also included in the memo are revenue and expenditure tables from 2014 for informative purposes, as well

as a snapshot of some of the information that has been submitted already for the new analysis. He quickly reviewed the tables for the meeting attendees.

Mr. Randall closed by reporting that a new TIGER grant opportunity had been announced by USDOT, with submissions due in mid-October.

Mr. Brown asked if the tables for Virginia will be expanded to also include local jurisdiction information. The response was no; information is only provided at the sub-regional level: the District, Suburban Maryland, Northern Virginia, and WMATA.

Mr. Roseboom then summarized that updated financial information is due from the implementing agencies by mid-September and an update will be provided at the October Committee meeting.

7. Long-Range Plan Task Force Status Report

Mr. Roseboom opened the item by reminding the committee of the TPB action in July where they accepted ten initiatives for analysis. Mr. Srikanth introduced the newly released memos pertaining to the item, regarding the assumptions and methods for analysis, as well as the memo sent to the task force in August which laid out the schedule for the fall. Mr. Grant explained the general analysis approach and emphasized the sketch-level and regional nature of the analysis. He began to briefly summarize the assumptions for Initiative 1.

Mr. Erenrich inquired as to whether members could submit feedback on the assumptions, saying that the information for I-270 was incorrect. Mr. Grant replied that they could submit comment. Mr. Srikanth stated that this analysis includes assumptions above and beyond what is in the CLRP and what may be in local plans. Mr. Erenrich said he was interested in examining the networks to make sure they are correct. Mr. Srikanth responded that the networks come from existing conformity analysis, and that QA/QC is routine. Mr. Erenrich said he wanted there to be a Technical Committee work session on the details for each of the initiatives, and that he had asked to see the details at the July TPB meeting. Mr. Bunch emphasized that the analysis is being done at a high-level, the sketch planning level, at which significant changes on the regional level will not occur due to minor changes and minor details about specific segments – and that this analysis is different from the types of analysis usually undertaken by TPB staff, which usually requires much more detailed inputs. Mr. Grant stated that since the analysis is being done at a regional level, small changes will not make an impact, and that the analysis must move forward due to the tight timeframe – but that they could still receive feedback if members wish to share anything. Mr. Srikanth added that results will be brought before the Technical Committee for review.

Mr. Grant continued to provide summaries of the assumptions and methods for the ten initiatives for the analysis which was currently underway.

Mr. Brown asked for clarification in Initiative 1, if Rt 28 was assumed to have an express toll lane, and Mr. Grant replied yes. Mr. Brown then said that for Initiative 2, he has information he can share about Leesburg plans for congestion hotspot relief. Mr. Srikanth said he could send the information, and said that anyone who has comments or feedback should follow-up with an e-mail. Mr. Brown added that for Initiative 3, he was concerned that the line on the map could draw attention so to make it less controversial he recommended changing the dotted line to something that generally showed the corridor without a specific alignment. Mr. Grant suggested creating an oval instead.

Mr. Weissberg asked if land use changes and congestion relief, and their impact on one another, will be studied as part of the analysis. Mr. Grant said that it would be, since land use will impact trips on the network. Mr. Weissberg asked if the analysis will be able to show that addressing the east-west imbalance through land use changes could be a helpful tool to reducing congestion, just as expanding capacity may. Mr. Grant replied that yes that was the case.

Ms. Soneji asked if the Gainesville-Haymarket extension is shown because it is currently that way in the CLRP even though VRE is no longer considering it, or if its being studied as an addition. Mr. Srikanth said staff is aware of the VRE action and that for the next plan update, he hopes that it will reflect the most recent plans VRE has for its expansion. Mr. Grant added that since the extension is in the CLRP that it shows up here in the assumptions, but as part of the baseline and not a new service to be studied in the analysis. Ms. Soneji asked about the overlap between the initiatives – when the results are shown, will the overlap be able to be provided if not quantitatively then qualitatively? Mr. Grant said each initiative will be studied independently but that there could be synergy between initiatives, and that in the future there may be the possibility to do more analysis to examine how initiatives could interact.

Mr. Grant then described the memo with the proposed performance measures – how the measures were chosen, and how they relate to the regional challenges the task force set out to address.

Ms. Snyder asked if the technical team was planning on adding weights to the measures. Mr. Grant replied that they were not and that the task force can choose to weight or prioritize the challenges if they wish.

Mr. Srikanth stated that staff and consultants are open to feedback on the performance measures and reminded the committee that the timeline is very short. He added that the results of the analysis will give a sense of the order of magnitude of implementing initiatives. Mr. Orleans asked about the reasoning for using sketch analysis as opposed to more robust methods. Mr. Srikanth replied that he could speak with him after the meeting.

8. Project Prioritization in the Washington Region: Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

Mr. Nampoothiri of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) briefed the Technical Committee on the Authority's process for updating the long-range plan (TransAction 2040) and the Six Year Program (SYP). Mr. Nampoothiri provided a background summary of the founding of the Authority 15 years ago, including its three major functions (planning, programming, and funding) and the revenue through which it operates (HB 2313-based taxes, CMAQ and RSTP funds).

The majority of Mr. Nampoothiri's presentation focused on the TransAction process, which is a data-driven, fiscally unconstrained long-range transportation plan that is updated every five years. The key inputs to TransAction were: the COG Round 9.0 forecasts, a needs assessment, public engagement findings, 358 multimodal candidate projects, \$44 billion planning level project cost estimates, 15 weighted performance measures, and four 'alternate futures' for scenario (sensitivity) analysis. The key outputs to TransAction were: project evaluations and rankings at the corridor segment level, planning level benefit cost analysis rankings at the corridor segment level, and the scenario (sensitivity) analysis. Performance measures for TransAction were anchored around three overarching goals: enhance quality of life and economic strength for Northern Virginia through transportation; enable optimal use of the

transportation network and leverage the existing network; and reduce negative impacts of transportation on communities and the environment. Mr. Nampoothiri emphasized that TransAction did not include any work related to operations and maintenance since funding for such activities falls outside of NVTA's mission. A high-level overview of TransAction's key findings was provided by Mr. Nampoothiri. Population increase and employment increase were set at 24% and 37%, respectively. The measures were compared between Current Conditions (2016), "No Build" (2040), and the Draft Plan (2040). While Auto Trips (0.1%) did not experience much change, there were significant increases in Transit Trips (9.0%), Transit Share (8.2%), and Transit Boardings (14.1%). A small decrease was seen in Miles of Travel (-0.4%), while significant decreases were found for Hours of Travel (-23.5%), Hours of Delay (-43.8%), and Transit Crowding (-64.4%). Segment performance was determined through a series of scenarios, or sensitivity tests. Four Alternative Futures were tested, each of which covered the following scenario: (A) Technology makes driving easier; (B) Changes in travel behavior; (C) Dispersed land use growth; and (D) Concentrated land use growth. The overarching conclusion from the scenario analysis was that the draft plan will likely provide benefits to Northern Virginia residents regardless of potential future changes, but further analysis is needed to draw more detailed conclusions.

Mr. Nampoothiri indicated NVTA's move to the Six Year Program (SYP) and provided an outline for the project selection process and schedule. He indicated that all projects must be included in TransAction in order to be considered and that in addition to factoring in the TransAction evaluations, prior to Authority adoption, consideration would be given to: calculating congestion reduction relative to cost ratios, documenting relevant qualitative considerations (geographical/modal balance, cost sharing, etc.), as well as input from NVTA's committees, public comments, and the public hearing. TransAction is scheduled to be adopted during the next Authority meeting on October 12, 2017, which is also when the call for regional projects will open. The deadline for applications will be December 15, 2017. The SYP will be adopted in May or June of 2018.

A question was asked about the line between capital projects and operations/maintenance. The questioner asked how ITS or Integrated Corridor Management fits into the process.

Mr. Nampoothiri said that their call for projects asks the jurisdictions and agencies to provide a plan for operating the capacity improvements that will be provided.

Mr. Brown asked about if all the various plans of the TPB's members would be reflected in Visualize 2045.

Mr. Srikanth said that the TPB data clearinghouse and process documentation refers to the region's various plans. He said that the updated web portal for Visualize 2045 will provide links to local and state planning documents. He noted that this presentation was the last in a series of presentations to the Technical Committee on the project prioritization processes of the TPB's members. He noted that the processes are all different and the purpose of these presentations was make the committee members aware of what those different processes are.

9. Performance -Based Planning and Programming: District Department of Transportation (DDOT) Highway Safety Update

Mr. Schermann welcomed Leon Anderson, the Transportation Safety Manager at DDOT, to describe the District's process for developing transportation safety performance measures under the FAST Act's Performance-Based Planning and Programming (PBPP) requirements.

This presentation would also provide background for Mr. Schermann's subsequent presentation on setting regional targets.

Mr. Anderson presented the District's work under the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), a federal program under the FAST Act to reduce fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. States and the District are required to produce an annual report to track HSIP implementation and effectiveness consistent with State/District Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) goals and performance targets. National, regional, and local data sources were used, including from DC's Metropolitan Police Department (MPD). MPD changed its crash data application and schema in 2015 to be more in line with national Model Minimum Uniform Crash Criteria (MMUCC) requirements, with more detailed information on the nature of injuries. Mr. Anderson reviewed graphs with the District's fatality and injury numbers, rates, and five-year rolling averages; the rolling averages were used to set targets. The summary of targets for 2018 was as follows: number of fatalities, 26; number of serious injuries, 384; fatality rate per hundred million vehicle miles traveled (HMVMT), 0.70; serious injury rate per HMVMT, 10.24; number of non-motorized fatalities, 11; number of non-motorized serious injuries, 134. These targets were based on data trends, and were not aspirational. As a background to the targets being higher than data for recent years, he noted that the District's population had increased (up 13.2% since the 2010 Census), and the workforce has been increasing by 1.2% per year. Commuters who live outside of the District account for 70% of all DC jobs, and this is also projected to increase. In 2015, the District welcomed a total of 21.3 million visitors, a 5% increase from 2014, with further increases projected. Bikeshare trips increased by over 10% per day from 2015 to 2016, over 2 million per year.

In response to a comment from Mr. Srikanth, Mr. Anderson agreed these were not aspirational targets associated with the District's Vision Zero, but were working targets that will be revisited each year. Mr. Roseboom thanked Mr. Anderson for his presentation.

10. Performance-Based Planning and Programming: MPO Areas Draft Regional Highway Safety Targets

Mr. Schermann provided an overview of the MAP-21/FAST Act requirements for regional highway safety performance targets and presented a draft target for highway fatalities in the National Capital Region that is consistent with the target setting approaches of Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

The MAP-21/FAST Act regulations require states and MPOs to set targets for five highway safety performance measures:

- 5-year rolling average of total fatalities during a calendar year – using FARS data;
- 5-year rolling average of the fatality rate per 100 million VMT;
- 5-year rolling average of the total number of serious injuries during a calendar year using state supplied data;
- 5-year rolling average of the serious injury rate per 100 million VMT; and
- 5-year rolling average of the number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries.

States reported their initial targets on August 31, 2017 and MPOs have until February 27, 2018 to set and report their targets to their respective state DOTs. The District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia have each used different methods to set their safety targets. Staff proposed to apply each state's methodology to the safety data for their portion of the National Capital Region and add them together to determine the overall regional targets. For the total highway fatalities performance measure, this method would result in a 2014-2018 rolling

average target of 245.5. Staff will apply the same methodology to the other four measures and bring them to the committee for their review at a future date.

Mr. Schermann responded to a question about our member state's feedback on the draft targets by noting that the general approach to the setting of regional targets has been discussed previously with state highway safety officials and that the specific draft numerical targets will be shared with them soon.

In response to a question about potential corrective actions by the FHWA, Mr. Schermann noted that the regulations do not provide for any sanctions to MPOs for not meeting their targets, but that the FHWA will review MPOs PBPP processes during certification reviews and may identify corrective actions as part of the certification review process. Mr. Srikanth added that states would apply resources to address any safety related corrective actions they have and that these resources would flow into the TIP and therefore also address corrective actions at the regional level. In response to other questions about reporting targets, Mr. Schermann noted that the region will report an overall target at the regional level (not individual sub-targets for each state), but that we will track the sub-targets for each state internally. Mr. Srikanth added that if one of our member states targets are not met, it will be reported and addressed at the state level.

11. Proposed New Conformity Mobile Budgets for Ozone

Ms. Posey informed the group that she would cover two related topics, the first not going to the TPB, the second likely going to the TPB. She reminded the group that she had presented information to them about the region's 2008 NAAQS Ozone Maintenance Plan in April. She showed, in slide 3, the drop in actual monitored ozone emissions over time. She reminded the group that MWAQC has been working on the Maintenance Plan, and that the Maintenance Plan contains VOC and NO_x mobile budgets that the TPB will have to use when doing conformity analyses. Ms. Posey showed the mobile inventories (slides 9 & 10) that TPB staff had developed for the Maintenance Plan, and reminded the group that the TPB had transmitted the mobile inventories along with recommended mobile budgets to MWAQC in April. She showed the two tiers of mobile budgets, one set at the inventory level, and one set at 20% above the inventory level, and explained that the one set at inventory level would be the default budget, and the one set with the 20% buffer would be used, if necessary, because of changes to inputs or planning assumptions in future conformity analyses. She told the group that the new budgets would have to be used immediately when EPA found them adequate for use in conformity or when EPA approved the Maintenance Plan, even if that happened a week before TPB approves Visualize 2045. She reviewed the schedule (slide 11), and noted that the States will put the Maintenance Plan out for public comment, and then MWAQC is scheduled to approve the Plan in December, after which it will be submitted to EPA for review and approval. She explained that it will be necessary to develop two sets of mobile inventories for Visualize 2045, one with meteorology data consistent with the current ozone SIP, and one with meteorology consistent with the proposed Maintenance Plan. She noted that staff is concerned that changes to land activity (Round 9.1) and an updated vehicle fleet mix might increase emissions, and push the regional mobile emission levels above the new budgets in the Maintenance Plan.

Ms. Posey told the group that in 2012 EPA set GHG and CAFE standards for 2017-2025 light duty vehicles. As part of that ruling, it was agreed that there would be a mid-term review of those standards. In January 2017 EPA completed the mid-term review and determined that it would retain the standards. Now EPA has indicated that they may reconsider the review, and are asking for comment. Ms. Posey stated that staff recommends that the TPB comment, and

reviewed a proposed draft comment letter. She noted the three points that are made in the TPB comment letter: 1) the TPB relies heavily on Federal standards to improve air quality, 2) with the increase in zero emission and alternative fueled vehicles the standards are achievable, and 3) the region is relying on these standards for achieving GHG goals. She pointed out that the comment deadline is October 5. She stated that MWAQC and CEEPC plan to comment, and suggested that a joint TPB/MWAQC/CEEPC letter would be more effective than separate letters. She noted that MWAQC TAC and CEEPC members were asked to comment on a draft letter by 9/8, and that staff would provide an updated draft letter by COB Monday 9/11, and that Tech, TAC, and CEEPC had until COB Tuesday 9/12 to voice any concerns. The letter would go to TPB at its September 20th meeting and to MWAQC and CEEPC at their September 27th meetings.

Mr. Srikanth stated that the letter would be discussed at Steering Committee to address adding an item to the TPB agenda. He pointed out the importance of the standards for assisting with decreasing criteria pollutants and especially GHGs. He noted, while there are no federal requirements for reducing GHGs, that the TPB has been supportive of the region's aspirational goals for GHG reductions.

Mr. Walz stated that he supported a joint letter, and felt that was feasible.

12. National Capital Trail and Station Access Project Updates

Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint. He discussed the background of the National Capital Trail, a circumferential bicycle route around the core of the Washington region. The National Park Service designated a conceptual route as part of its Paved Trails Study, and the Subcommittee has approved a route map, with associated projects that would fill missing segments, upgrade existing segments, or provide short connections to nearby destinations.

Mr. Farrell then demonstrated the GIS version of the map, which allows you to click on the route segments and pull up information on the associated project. This route is mostly complete. Finishing the National Capital Trail is very achievable.

Mr. Srikanth added that the idea of a circumferential bicycle route originated with a board member. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee and then the National Park Service developed the idea further.

Mr. Srikanth also noted that the Long Range Plan Task Force initially identified 500 bicycle and pedestrian projects as part of the All Build analysis. That was a too large a number to model, but the task force wished to identify a more limited number of projects that would have a regional impact and included as aspirational projects in Visualize 2045. One idea was to work with WMATA to identify bicycle and pedestrian projects needed to enhance access to Metrorail and Commuter Rail stations and increase transit ridership. The second idea was to identify and include the projects needed to complete the National Capital Trail or Bicycle Beltway.

The Metrorail Access projects are still being developed. All this will be presented to the task force at a future meeting, possibly in December.

13. Other Business

Ms. Erickson said that the "Critical Urban Freight Corridors" item will be on the September TPB agenda after it got bumped off the agenda of a previous meeting.

Mr. Srikanth said that former Secretary LaHood's report on WMATA is expected towards the end of last month and that the Secretary will be addressing NVTA next month as well. He said that the report will cover governance, management and funding and that staff will bring the report, when completed, to the Technical Committee and to the TPB.

Mr. Roisman said that the 2017 Regional Air Passenger Survey (conducted every two years) will begin fieldwork on October 4. He said the survey is conducted at gates at all three airports simultaneously, and that the initial survey period is two weeks followed by a two-week follow-up period. He said that the oversight for this survey is under the Aviation Technical Subcommittee. Mr. Roisman also spoke about the 2017-2018 Household Travel Survey (conducted every ten years), which has been rebranded as the Regional Travel Survey. He said it is a mail-based survey, with the first mailing going out on October 3, for a one-year survey period. He asked Technical Committee members to spread the word about the surveys to local agencies so they can be aware and prepared to respond to resident questions if they are selected for the survey. Mr. Roisman added that there will be briefings given to the Technical Committee as well as the functional subcommittees at milestones of completion for both surveys.

Ms. Erickson said that the 2016 State of the Commute Survey Report has been finalized and is available and has been distributed to the Commuter Connections Subcommittee.

14. Adjourn