

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
ITEM #1**

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
11/1/2013

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - November 1, 2013**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
 Anthony Foster
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick Co. Ron Burns
City of Frederick -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. -----
Prince George's Co. Vic Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich
 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT Lyn Erickson
 Vaughn Lewis
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 -----
VDOT Norman Whitaker
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Danielle Wesolek

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
FHWA-VA -----
FTA Melissa Barlow
NCPC -----
NPS -----
MWAQC -----
MWAA Michael Hewitt

COG Staff

Ron Kirby, DTP
Gerald Miller, 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
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Dan Sonenklar, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
Lyn Winchell-Mendy, DTP
Joan Rohlfs, DEP

Other Attendees

Bill Orleans

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

December 6, 2013

Technical Committee Meeting

Technical Committee Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from November 1, 2013 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Update 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 two revisions in the Call for Projects document. He noted that the dates in January 2014 had been moved up by one week with a review by the Technical Committee on January 3rd and release for public comment on the 9th. He also stated that a portion of the Policy Framework section that referenced Region Forward and the COG Climate Change report had been reinstated at the request of Board member Ms. Tregonning.

Mr. Austin added that the deadline for project inputs was December 13 and that with holidays in between this was a very short time to assemble the information for public comment. He asked for agencies to meet the project input deadline to the best of their ability.

Mr. Erenrich asked what would happen if it turns out later that there were not sufficient funding to cover projects that had been submitted, particularly given the uncertainty of Metro's financial needs. Chair Erickson replied that WMATA representatives had provided preliminary budget numbers and that all agencies were working on looking at their own cost estimates. Mr. Kirby added that this was why the financial piece comes first and that the Board wouldn't proceed with approving the projects for modeling if they weren't certain of the financial constraint. Chair Erickson said that once Metro's numbers had been settled, then the states and locals can look at what projects they can put forth. She added that Metro was unable to distribute the financial figures at the time, as they had not been made public.

Mr. Kirby said that there are some projects being discussed in Northern Virginia, but the time-frame for agreement on those projects may preclude them from being included in this year's cycle. He recommended that rather than delay the cycle for a month or two to accommodate them, that they could wait for the following year, or be pulled in as part of an off-cycle analysis if there was an urgent need to include them in the CLRP.

Mr. Austin added that he would be distributing a complete listing of all records in the CLRP database, with their accompanying Conformity and TIP records, as well as some records that needed to be reviewed for clean-up purposes.

3. Briefing on a Performance Analysis of the 2013 CLRP

Mr. Sonenklar gave a presentation on the performance analysis of the 2013 CLRP and used a power point presentation to highlight the data in graphics and maps. He explained that the latest analysis has incorporated the 8.2a Population and Employment Forecasts, and an updated to the version 2.3 travel model. The updates to the model included an increase in non-motorized trip in densely populated areas based on results of the geographically focused household travel surveys completed in 2011 & 2012. In addition time penalties were added to bridge crossings to better match estimated trip counts to observed trip counts, and roadway functional classifications in the network were adjusted based on substantial network review. One final change from previous years that was noted was the fact that the MOVES 2010 emissions model was used for the first time for the air quality conformity estimates.

Mr. Erenrich asked why the decision was made to increase non-motorized counts by 30% in the more densely populated areas. Mr. Sonenklar responded that this was due to results from the geographically focused household travel surveys which indicated higher levels of walking and biking than previously observed. Mr. Milone added that it was a 30% increase in the share of non-motorized trips in the model.

Mr. Brown asked for clarification on the definition of lane miles of congestion. Mr. Milone answered that roads are considered to be congested when they experience level of service E or worse. Mr. Brown then asked how this analysis fits into the bigger picture of the MAP-21 performance measures. Mr. Kirby responded that the performance measures being developed under MAP-21 will hopefully be reasonable and will include some of the measures that we already analyze.

Mr. Erenrich complimented the analysis, and offered the suggestion that we not only analyze peak hour congestion but peak period congestion. He asked if it was possible to calculate lane miles of congestion throughout the day. Mr. Kirby answered that we can calculate this for any time of day.

Mr. Emerine suggested that a chart showing daily mode share for all trips by sub-geographical areas, not just work trips, would be helpful to see.

Mr. Erenrich commented that the ability to use non-motorized modes varies greatly throughout the region and that it would be helpful to see an analysis of the number of jobs that are available within a 30 minute bike or walk from various places throughout the region. Mr. Kirby responded that non-motorized levels are higher in the core

jurisdictions where short trips can be taken by non-motorized modes. Mr. Milone added that bike and walk trips are only modeled at the regional level, so the number of jobs accessible would only be able to be analyzed at the zone level of geography and would not take into account smaller scale characteristics such as typography and presence of bike lanes.

Mr. Malouff pointed out that the drop in VMT per capita goes against the results of the performance analyses performed on the CLRP over the past 10 years, which shows a large shift in projected travel behavior. Mr. Kirby responded that throughout the 1990's we consistently projected that VMT per capita would increase over time, but for the past 7 to 8 years this measure has flattened out. During this 7-8 year period we have projected that VMT per capita would not change substantially between the base year and the out year of our analysis. Some years we have predicted a 1% increase in VMT per capita in the out year, other years a -1% change. Mr. Kirby went on to say that we are not certain if this shift in VMT per capita is a short term pattern, or a long term change in travel behavior. Since World War II VMT per capita has consistently gone up overall, but there have been points over this time period in which VMT per capita stayed constant. Since we are still not sure exactly what we are seeing, Mr. Kirby said that we don't want to be too optimistic but rather try to provide the best estimate that we can.

Mr. Mokhtari suggested that a measure indicating the change in transit supply over time, similar to the change in roadway supply, should also be shown. Mr. Erenrich suggested that this might be a figure that shows the change in fixed-guideway miles. Mr. Milone responded that this was possible and that staff will look into the possibility of calculating such a measure.

4. Update on the TPB Website "Transportation Planning Information Hub for the National Capital Region"

Mr. Swanson gave a briefing and a demonstration of the new Hub website. Mr. Erenrich said the site was good. He asked if there were plans to develop a regional calendar with public hearings.

Mr. Swanson said that the maintenance of such a calendar was currently beyond staff capacity. He said it might be something to consider for the next phase.

Chair Erickson noted, in response to Mr. Erenrich, that the site includes a green arrow that provides links to public involvement information (calendars, meeting announcements) on other sites.

Ms. Backmon asked how the high-profile projects were chosen. Mr. Swanson said he had asked staff in the states and jurisdictions to provide suggestions. He said the projects identified generally were higher cost and/or were projects that were prominently featured in public discussions.

Mr. Mokhtari suggested the site might have a page for citizens that might be labeled "How to Use This Website."

Mr. Emerine asked how the site deals with multi-state regional projects, such as the Long Bridge.

Mr. Swanson said the Long Bridge was listed under D.C., because it is a study sponsored by DDOT. He said it was worth thinking about how such projects should be treated.

Ms. Wesolek asked if WMATA staff had reviewed the site.

Mr. Swanson said he had received substantive feedback from WMATA staff.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the site has links to bus schedules, and other immediate operations questions that citizens might have.

Mr. Swanson said the site is limited to transportation planning. He said that it might be useful to clarify that point.

5. Briefing on the Comments Received on the Revised TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)

Mr. Kirby spoke about the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). He said a new version would be released at the next CAC meeting on November 14. He said it would be graphically designed and would include revisions mainly in Chapters 1 and 5.

Mr. Holloman asked when comments should be submitted.

Mr. Kirby said that comments did not need to be submitted again if they were already submitted. He said that those who had not submitted comments should get them in within the next few days.

Mr. Malouf asked if it was safe to assume there would be another comment period.

Mr. Kirby said yes.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the plan would include recommendations broken down by mode as well by time period (i.e., short-term and long-term).

Mr. Kirby said the recommendations would not be broken down by mode because the plan was focused on promoting a multi-modal regional approach. He also noted that the recommendations would not be project-level.

Mr. Emerine said that he was glad that the introductory chapter will expand references to Region Forward. He said the latest version already represented an improvement. He noted that Region Forward had specific targets. He said it would be useful if the RTPP

could use those targets although he acknowledged that it may not be possible for it actually to be used for evaluation.

Mr. Kirby said the Region Forward transportation targets might be included. Mr. Orleans suggested that TPB staff might coordinate efforts with COG housing staff. Mr. Kirby said the two departments were working together.

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

Mr. Farrell spoke to four hand-outs. He told the Committee that there are no changes since last time to the documents. Since the TPB agenda is over-full, the comment period has been extended to November 22nd. A revised draft based on these comments will be presented in December.

Mr. Farrell said not all the comments received will necessarily be integrated in that draft. There will be a table of all the comments received and a response to it. Some of the comments have called for far more detailed design standards than anything staff was thinking of putting into this kind of a document, and recommendations for using low-power lighting and native plants. Mr. Farrell mentioned another issue was whether multi-use paths should have a categorical exclusion based on runoff patterns and quality compared to roads and parking lots.

Mr. Farrell said comments should be submitted in writing if possible. The new deadline is November 22nd, which will allow sufficient time to integrate these comments.

Mr. Kirby said that it would be good to get this to the TPB in December, which will be the one-year anniversary of the request. He asked Mr. Farrell if there were any issues. Mr. Farrell replied that some of the comments from the CAC suggested that the policy should do more, adding issues such as use of native plants and low-power lightings. Adding these issues could complicate the definition of Green Streets, which is currently defined as a green approach to storm water runoff.

Mr. Mokhtari suggested that the concepts of Green Streets and Complete Streets could be integrated better. Perhaps a section could be added that talks about how a Green Street can also be a Complete Street.

Mr. Kirby said that the terms were both very broad, but the actual specifics are narrower than the terms might suggest. There is an advantage to having something specific. You can have a green street that isn't complete, and vice versa. Green Streets means the use of landscaping, trees, and other environmental site design to manage storm water runoff.

Mr. Emerine suggested that we may be able to keep the core definition, but add a section that acknowledges related concerns such as use native species. Perhaps an appendix on Best Practices to address issues of environmental performance can be added.

Mr. Kirby said that that was a good suggestion.

Mr. Weissberg said that in Prince George's they had merged the concepts of Complete and Green Streets.

Mr. Mokhtari said that some Green Streets projects posed an opportunity for a Complete Street.

Ms. Backmon asked if a check box would be added to the CLRP form. Mr. Farrell replied that it would not be, but that the policy incorporated other follow-up actions such tracking who has policies through surveys, and best practices workshops to exchange information. At the stakeholders workshop there were many projects discussed that were both Complete and Green. Complete and Green Streets, they are sometimes complementary, but can also be conflicting priorities, especially in areas where pedestrians and bicyclists have not been accommodated before. It's fair to say that DC is generally not trying to expand motor vehicle capacity in corridors where they are doing these projects.

Mr. Mokhtari said that DDOT was trying to increase capacity by increasing the number of high capacity vehicles such as buses and light rail, rather than by increasing the capacity to move more vehicles.

Mr. Kirby said that these issues should be addressed for the TPB, perhaps as part of the presentation. We can address explicitly the relation between Complete and Green Streets.

Mr. Erenrich said that on the Purple Line there was a lot of conflict between green and complete streets concerns.

Mr. Mokhtari replied that we should talk about the issues and compromise.

7. Briefing on an Amendment to the FY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Revise the Budget and Work Elements

Mr. Miller referred the Committee to his October 25th memorandum on the proposed amendment. He explained that since the FY 2014 UPWP was approved in March, the funding allocations provided by DDOT, MDOT and VDOT have been revised to reflect changes in "new FY 2014 funding" that come from the federal FY 2013 budget, and adjustments in the "unobligated FY 2012 funding" that are unexpended funds from the

completed FY 2012 UPWP. He said that the new funding total needs to be increased by \$966,365 and the unobligated FY 2012 total needs to be decreased by \$352,461. The net result is an increase of \$613,904 for the total FY 2014 UPWP budget.

Mr. Miller explained that the technical assistance funding level for each state is an agreed percentage of the total new FY 2014 funding provided through the respective state, and the technical assistance funding level for WMATA is an agreed percentage of the new FTA 2014 funding. He pointed out that the budgets for the technical assistance programs in the District, Maryland and Virginia will increase by \$57,900, \$48,000 and \$24,600 respectively, while the WMATA program will increase by \$15,550. He then explained that because the total for all of the technical assistance programs increases by \$146,050, the net total funding for the core work program increases by \$467,850.

Mr. Miller said that a 3 percent across the board increase is proposed for the work activity budgets in the core work program for increases in salaries and other costs during the fiscal year, and that the last across the board increase of 2 percent for these budgets occurred in 2007. The 3 percent will account for \$330,000 of the \$467,850 total increase. He then described how the remaining \$137,900 is proposed to be allocated to six work activities in the core work program as shown in Table A in the memorandum and summarized in Table B.

Mr. Miller then said that the day before the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) had informed him that it had received a slight increase in FY 2014 Section 5303 funding from the Federal Transit Administration, which resulted in an increase in 5303 funding that is available for the TPB work program. He explained that this increase was \$76,871 more than included in the proposed increase in "new FY 2014" funding shown in Table 1 in his memorandum of October 25, 2013. He distributed a November 1 memorandum that described how this increase is proposed to be included. Since this is new FY 2014 FTA funding, the technical assistance funding level for Virginia will increase by \$10,400 and the level for WMATA will increase by \$6,100. Because the total for the technical assistance programs will increase by \$16,500, the net total funding for the core work program will increase by \$60,371. He said that because the \$60,371 increase is in FTA funding, it will be utilized primarily for transit related activities in the core program. For work activity 2.F Regional Bus planning, it is proposed to add \$31,371 more than indicated in the October 25th memorandum. It is also proposed to add \$29,000 to work activity 1.D Financial Plan to enhance the development and documentation of the transit financial components of the financial plan for the 2014 CLRP. The memorandum included a revised Table B to indicating these changes. He concluded by saying that Table 1 and Table A in his October 25th memorandum will be revised to include these budget increases for the amendment to be sent to the TPB for approval at the November 20 meeting.

Mr. Erenrich asked how many focused geographic subareas will be travel surveyed this year and how much each costs. Mr. Griffiths said that 14 subareas are planned and that these are about all we can handle. Each costs about \$80,000.

Mr. Mokhtari inquired if the additional funding for the Transportation/Land Use Connection Program would be available for more technical assistance projects. Mr. Miller said that the additional funding was for staff support of the new MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Program not project support.

Mr. Erenrich asked whether there could be more work on bus on shoulder planning. Mr. Miller replied that any additional work would be under the regional bus planning activity which is receiving additional funding.

8. Proposed Guidance for Transit Agency Representation on MPO Boards

Mr. Kirby spoke to the 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 discussed at the October 16 TPB meeting. An approved comment letter was then submitted to the FHWA/FTA on October 22. The letter endorses the flexibility of the proposed guidance and requests no further changes in the final rule.

Mr. Kirby noted that in his discussions with other MPOs the two key issues appear to be 1) whether other public transportation providers should or should not be included, instead of only the FTA Section 5307 direct recipients who are operators of public transportation proposed in the guidance; and 2) whether the proposed requirement to amend or adopt new by-laws was above and beyond the requirement of the MAP-21 language. He noted that few appear to pay attention to the preamble in the proposed guidance, which emphasizes that this requirement is being proposed to ensure that the performance provisions of MAP-21 can be successfully carried out by the MPO boards. Mr. Kirby emphasized that the transit representation will have to be in place by October 1, 2014, and expressed the hope that the final ruling would come out quickly so that there is time to amend the by-laws if necessary.

Mr. Randall then spoke to a memo that provided an overview of the many comments that were submitted by the due date of October 30, by metropolitan planning organizations, transit agencies, environmental groups, and private citizens. Aside from the two issues noted by Mr. Kirby, Mr. Randall also noted that MPOs operate under a wide range of complex representation agreements, sometimes specified in state law or in interstate compacts, amendment of which would be very challenging. For instance, he noted that some MPOs consist of directly elected officials, for which the inclusion of an agency representative would be a substantial change. On the other hand, the Los

Angeles metro area has nearly 30 transit operators, and it would be complex to include them in any meaningful way on the MPO board. In addition, many commenters felt the inclusion of transit agencies on the board could unbalance the respective balance between city and county representation and state representation.

Ms. Wesolek then spoke to the comment letter submitted by WMATA. WMATA noted three issues, including 1) why are transit agencies the only specifically designated modal representatives, 2) make the designated 5307 recipient the transit representative on the board (NB. this would be WMATA in the Washington region), and 3) that transit and highway agencies should have equal representation with other membership categories on the board. However, WMATA also feels that all transit agencies should be represented on the board. Ms. Webster added that WMATA staff had intense discussions in developing this comment letter, looking at the legislative language and the intent of the law. WMATA staff view the MAP-21 requirement as a fresh opportunity to discuss how to best represent the various transportation interests in the Washington region in the planning process.

Mr. Mokhtar noted that MDOT already represents Maryland Transit Administration interests on the board. Mr. Erenrich noted that WMATA is similarly represented by the jurisdictions and states that provide the funding for the agency.

Ms. Erenrich stated that the vested interests of the funding agencies should be the key determinant in establishing representation in the planning process. Equality of representation needs to flow from the investments or contributions made to transit or to other modal projects and programs.

Mr. Kirby responded that many MPOs have been around 20, 30, or even 50 years, and were set-up through complex historical arrangements. If the FHWA/FTA come out with a final rule that is prescriptive, there will be many challenges in implementation, not just amendment of by-laws, but relative representation issues. However, this discussion really needs to take place once the final rule is published.

9. Status Report on the Development of MAP-21 Performance Measures

Mr. Randall put up a slide of the USDOT schedule for MAP-21 Performance Provisions, which has nine rulemakings. He emphasized that these are Federal rules, still under development, which will require certain performance measures to be reported. Transit agencies, highway agencies, and MPOs will have to set targets for each measure, and then explain how they are going to meet those targets. He noted that one rule for safety was published last year, and that a draft notice of performance measures for the transit safety and transit state of good repair rules has been published by FTA. However, the Metropolitan and Statewide Planning rule, though expected to be

published in October, has been delayed, likely due to the Federal government shutdown. He noted that besides performance measures and targets, the planning process will likely be changed as to how projects are entered into the CLRP and TIP, as these projects will have to show how they help the agency and/or MPO achieve the targets for the measures relevant to a project. He also noted that for some measures the MPO will want the flexibility to have one target for the region, and for other measures may want to have a different target for each agency.

10. Other Business

None.

11. Adjourn