

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
ITEM #1**

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

---

## **Technical Committee Minutes**

For meeting of  
**January 3, 2014**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - January 3, 2014**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                    Mark Rawlings  
                             Anthony Foster  
DCOP                    -----

**MARYLAND**

Charles County        -----  
Frederick Co.         Ron Burns  
City of Frederick     Tim Davis  
Gaithersburg         -----  
Montgomery Co.      Gary Erenrich  
Prince George's Co.   -----  
Rockville             -----  
M-NCPPC  
  Montgomery Co.     -----  
  Prince George's Co. Famararz 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.   -----  
NVTC                  Claire Gron  
PRTC                  Nick Alexandrow  
VRE                    Christine Hoeffner  
VDOT                  Kanathur Srikanth  
                             Norman Whitaker  
VDRPT                Tim Roseboom  
NVPDC                -----  
VDOA                  -----

**WMATA**

WMATA                Michael Eichler

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

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

**COG Staff**

Gerald Miller, DTP  
Robert Griffiths, DTP  
Michael Farrell, DTP  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Jane Posey, DTP  
Andrew Meese, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Rich Roisman, DTP  
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP  
Dusan Vuksan, DTP  
Dan Sonenklar, DTP  
Paul DesJardin, DCPS

**Other Attendees**

Bill Orleans  
Norman Gross, DDOT  
Jameshia Peterson, DDOT

---

## **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

### Technical Committee Meeting

---

#### Technical Committee Minutes

**1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from December 6, 2014 Technical Committee Meeting**

The minutes were approved as written with a minor correction to the attendance list.

**2. Update on the TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)**

Mr. Sonenklar gave a presentation on the status of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP), and gave an overview of activities that were carried out since the December 18, 2013 Board meeting. He reviewed elements of the December 12, 2013 draft Plan, highlighted a number of changes that were made from previous drafts, and presented on the time frame for public comment and approval. Mr. Sonenklar implied that staff were not expecting many changes to be made prior to the January 15, 2014 TPB meeting where the board was expected to approve the plan, and that no comments were submitted to date.

Chair Srikanth followed up saying that the current draft will be presented to the TPB with an accompanying memo outlining comments received and response to those comments. He clarified to the group that a fully updated version of the document will not be available on January 15<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Srikanth also mentioned that he was aware that both MWACQ and CEEPC were planning on submitting comments. Mr. Sonenklar confirmed that staff knew about those comments, but that substantive changes were not expected.

Mr. Srikanth asked if it would be possible for the Tech Committee to get a preview of the comments memo before the TPB meeting, to which Mr. Sonenklar responded that the timeframe unfortunately will not allow for that to happen.

Mr. Brown inquired about where the RTPP will go from here once it is approved. Mr. Sonenklar responded that the RTPP is a consensus policy document that aims to influence local decision making and that there are no mechanisms in place for project screening and selection. Mr. Brown expressed concern that some jurisdictions need to finish building infrastructure, not just maintain what is built. Chair Srikanth responded that the RTPP doesn't rule out new infrastructure, it simple starts with meeting existing maintenance needs and allows for steps beyond that.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that the resolution for adoption that will accompany this action item is very important and that close attention needs to be paid to how it is worded when it comes to how the plan should be used.

Mr. Lake commented that his jurisdiction has their own prioritization method underway, and that informational presentations to the boards of local jurisdictions could help in the process of identifying priority projects. Chair Srikanth responded that it should be left up to the individual jurisdictions if they want to take an official action on the plan or just accept it as informational.

Mr. Miller stated that the resolution for approval will be posted on Thursday before the TPB meeting and will make clear that this is not a prescriptive document.

**3. Update on Project Submissions and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment, and Status of the Financial Analysis for the 2014 CLRP**

Chair Srikanth recounted developments at the December meeting of the Technical Committee, wherein the decision was made to postpone the release of the draft project inputs in order to make further progress on the financial analysis component of the CLRP update.

Mr. Austin thanked Committee members for their work on getting project information submitted in a timely manner. He reported that he and Ms. Posey had been reviewing the inputs and had not seen many projects that would qualify as “regionally significant.” He said a revised Conformity Table would be compiled and that further discussions on the financial plan would have implications for inputs from WMATA.

Ms. Posey noted that there were some completion dates in VDOT’s project submissions that still showed completion dates of 2012 and 2013, that should be noted if they are complete. Chair Srikanth stated that their submissions had not been finalized yet and that those would be reviewed.

Mr. Brown asked if the inputs were available for review online. Mr. Austin replied that he would provide view-only access to any Virginia locality staff that wanted to review the project submission data.

Chair Srikanth reported that he hoped to have VDOT’s submissions ready by the 3<sup>rd</sup> week of January. He noted that a comparison of projects costs and available revenues was ongoing and a large factor in that discussion is the amount that needs to be committed to WMATA. Depending on the outcome of that commitment, there may or may not be additions to the conformity table inputs.

Mr. Miller stated that another aspect of the financial analysis pertains to the scope of work for the Air Quality Conformity Analysis and removing the transit constraint which is dependent upon a commitment to funding a State of Good Repair.

Mr. Brown inquired about VDOT's coordination with Loudoun County regarding new projects entered into the CLRP. Chair Srikanth replied that VDOT was in touch with NVTA staff on that issue. This new revenue stream and its distribution is an NVTA decision, and the discussion also will have to involve contributions to WMATA.

Ms. Erickson stated that the MARC Growth and Investment projects would be added into the CLRP database and that a presentation on it was available on the MTA web site.

#### **4. Update on the Schedule for the 2014 CLRP & FY 2015-2020 TIP Air Quality Conformity Assessment**

Ms. Constantine provided an update of 2014 CLRP air quality conformity assessment schedule. She explained that there will be a one-month delay in releasing the scope of work for public comment in order to allow sufficient time for state agencies to finalize this year's CLRP financial plan. The financial decision to be made will affect what projects will eventually be included in the CLRP and the funding of WMATA, which will be reflected in the TPB transportation modeling process by a removal of the year 2020 transit constraint. This technical detail will be featured in the scope of work.

Chair Srikanth emphasized that the funding decisions to be made between now and February 13<sup>th</sup> not only affect the projects inputs for this year's air quality conformity determination but they also affect the assumptions of the scope of work. If more time is needed for such decisions to be made, there is a possibility that further delays in releasing the scope of work may occur. Further postponements in the release of the scope of work, however, are limited as the current schedule calls for this year's conformity to be approved by the TPB on September 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014.

Mr. Erenrich asked about the schedule for resolving WMATA concerns to meet conformity assessment deadline. Chair Srikanth answered that a meeting among three states, WMATA and COG has been scheduled in the third week of January. Mr. Erenrich then asked about the funding allocation by Maryland counties. Ms. Erickson answered that it has to wait after the regional agreement is made and there is no action for counties for now.

Ms. Hoeffner asked when the VRE needs to provide information for long-range projections for expected revenues. Chair Srikanth replied that there will be a 2010 template sent out in the next few days.

**5. Briefing on Priority Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects Recommended for the FY 2015-2020 TIP**

Mr. Farrell spoke to a hand-out.

Every year the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee selects this short list of projects. It came out of the regional bike plan, which has over 500 projects, which are not prioritized. A short list of unfunded projects made sense. Projects are nominated by the TPB member jurisdictions, but should respond to a number of selection factors. There are four new projects on the list since last year.

Three projects from last year's list were funded, including the regional bike share project, now known as Capital Bikeshare. This was originally a regional federal TIGER grant application, which was not funded but which has since been largely funded from other sources.

Mr. Weissberg said that there had been a successful TIGER grant application for the Anacostia River Trail. Mr. Farrell replied that regional bike sharing was a different TIGER grant.

Mr. Farrell said that there is still some information to be filled in with respect to budget numbers, but the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee has seen and approved this list. Mr. Weissberg asked whether the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee could discuss the difficulties of putting bike sharing at Metrorail stations? One of the concerns has been terrorism insurance relating to the repositioning trucks. Mr. Farrell replied that it had not been, but it certainly could be. There is a WMATA representative on the Subcommittee. There are numerous bikeshare stations near Metro in the city, but they are not on WMATA property.

Mr. Austin suggested that a summary of the projects submitted and those funded could be included in a brochure for the FY 2015-2020 TIP. Mr. Farrell said that this list will be brought to the TPB at some point as an information item.

Mr. Malouff said that bicycle planning in many places had moved to cycle tracks, and this list seemed to be mostly trails. Mr. Farrell replied that cycle tracks are a new thing. DDOT is building them, but DDOT chose the Metropolitan Branch Trail as their priority. For some of the projects, such as the McArthur Boulevard bikeway, if you drill down to the design details, you may find some things that look like cycle tracks, as well as on-street bike lanes and separated side paths on various segments. Northern Virginia is mostly using separated side paths, due to a number of factors including higher speeds on many of the roads, and a desire to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists on the same facility.

Mr. Emerine agreed. DC's cycle tracks are largely funded, but as the Vision plan is wrapped up they may identify corridors for cycle tracks that are not yet funded, and which could end up on this list.

**6. Briefing on the Proposed Comments on the Draft Initial Designation of the Highway Primary Freight Network (PFN)**

Mr. Meese presented. As had been presented at last month's meeting, the MAP-21 legislation called for national designation of a highway "Primary Freight Network" (PFN), a draft of which was published in the November 19, 2013 *Federal Register*. Comments were due to FHWA from stakeholders by January 17, 2014. A draft letter was now distributed to the Committee.

Staff had reached out on coordination of comments, and had received draft comments from DDOT, MSHA, and VDOT, though these were not yet released to share with the Committee. The primary concern of the three states and staff was the 27,000-mile national limit on the PFN, which inevitably meant that a number of critical facilities will be left off. The draft TPB letter specifically pointed out the lack of designation for access roads to Dulles and National Airports, as well as an almost complete lack of designated roadways within the District of Columbia. The draft letter noted that the constraint was concerning as to how the PFN designation might be used later for federal strategic planning, performance measurement, or funding decision making.

Mr. Meese noted that staff had considered but was recommending against either providing no TPB comments, or providing detailed, facility-specific comments, but rather was recommending sending a letter that raised issues at the policy level. He noted that the states may get into more facility specificity in their comments. He also noted, in correction of a typo, that the total designated PFN regionally was less than 200 miles. This compared to approximately 775 miles regionally of National Highway System-designated roadways (those not prohibiting trucks).

Mr. Meese invited comments from the Committee, noting that the letter, including any changes, was anticipated to be placed into the "Letters Sent/Received" package being mailed out to the TPB on January 9 for its January 15 meeting.

In response to a question from Chair Srikanth, Mr. Meese confirmed that this was proposed as a technical-level letter, reviewed by the Committee, and sent by staff based upon Committee comments, not slated for formal Board approval.

In response to a question from Mr. Mokhtari, Mr. Meese noted that the general sense of the law and draft PFN was that designation was for the purposes of national-level strategic planning and performance measurement, and was not anticipated to affect local decision making; however, the law and draft PFN were not detailed in their explanation of this. In response to a further question, Mr. Meese stated that he did not

anticipate that this would prevent localities from putting restrictions on roads, since it was at a national, strategic level.

Mr. Thomas stated that the draft TPB letter appeared consistent with anticipated MDOT/SHA comments. MDOT/SHA was not anticipating suggesting any additions to the PFN, due to the need to delete in balance to any additions. MDOT/SHA was also considering comments on the related Rural Freight Network designation, including facility-specific comments, but those will not impact urban areas. He anticipated being able to share a further draft of the MDOT/SHA comments the following week.

Mr. Rawlings stated that he had no concerns on the draft TPB letter on behalf of DDOT. Chair Srikanth reported that VDOT was anticipating submitting comments, along the same theme of the insufficiency of the 27,000-mile limit. VDOT was also considering commenting on the potential implications of PFN designation regarding such MAP-21 requirements as performance measurement, performance standards, and funding. VDOT also may express concerns about the designation of tunnels in the Hampton Roads area. He stated that overall, VDOT will have state-specific comments, but at an MPO level, this was generally consistent.

## **7. Briefing on a Draft Regional Green Streets Policy for the Washington Region**

Mr. Farrell spoke to a hand-out. He told the Committee that this is to be an information item for the TPB this January. It will likely be an action item for the TPB in February. Chair Srikanth suggested that any jurisdiction that has comments should send them to Mr. Farrell.

This regional policy is the result of a request that came to the TPB over a year ago, a workshop was held, and this and other committees have been briefed a number of times. There have been significant changes since the last time the TPB Technical Committee saw this policy. VDOT's comments have been incorporated in the new draft, and an "Attachment B: Green Streets Resources" document has been created.

Mr. Farrell reviewed the "Summary of Comments and Responses" from stakeholders. The Citizens Advisory Committee members generally suggested that the policy be more detailed and prescriptive, while the TPB member agencies have indicated that they want less specificity and more flexibility in the regional policy. Attachment provides links to design manuals and other resources. Implementation issues will be examined in greater detail at the implementation workshop.

The inventory of Green Streets policies shows policies relating to Green Streets in the National Capital Region.



We had a fairly long comment period, but that was probably beneficial in that these documents had time to filter out to many stakeholders, including the environmental staffers.

Chair Srikanth asked if the CAC has seen this version. Mr. Farrell replied that they had not, but that they would be briefed at their next meeting.

## **8. Assessment of the Transportation Impacts of Forecast Growth in Regional Activity Centers**

Mr. Griffiths gave a PowerPoint presentation on impacts of the growth forecast for the new COG Activity Centers in Round 8.2 Cooperative Forecasts on future travel demands. This presentation showed that the new Activity Centers were better aligned with local jurisdiction comprehensive plans and the region's long term investments in rail transit. He noted that about 60% of the forecast regional growth in households and 75% of the forecast growth in jobs was projected to occur in these Activity Centers. He stated that because of the concentration of more of the region's future growth in these centers, the greatest increases in regional travel by transit, walking and biking between 2015 and 2040 are expected to occur in travel to, from and within the new Activity Centers.

Mr. Thomas and Mr. Eichler stated that some of the Activity Centers not directly served by rail transit were served by the Metro Bus Priority Corridor Network (PCN) and other high quality bus service and that this fact should also be noted in the presentation.

Mr. Griffiths agreed to include this suggestion in the presentation given to the TPB.

Chair Srikanth, Mr. Miller and Mr. Milone commented that it was difficult to gauge the overall impact of the growth in Activity Centers on the regional transportation system from the presentation because only percentage figures were shown.

Mr. Griffiths responded that he would include the absolute increases in travel by mode inside and outside of Activity Centers in the presentation given to the TPB.

## **9. Review of Outline and Preliminary Budget for FY 2015 Unified Planning work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Miller distributed a memorandum with a preliminary budget, work activity funding changes from FY 2014, and an outline for the UPWP for FY 2015 (July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015). He reviewed the overall budget estimates and said that at this point there is considerable uncertainty regarding the USDOT FY 2014 budget with MPO planning funding from MAP-21. He explained that we have assumed that the FY 2015 funding allocations to be provided by DOTs will be the same as the current FY 2014 levels. In addition, the budget estimate assumes the level of unobligated funds from

FY 2013 will be the same as the unspent funds from FY 2012. As in past years, the TPB will be asked to amend the budget in the fall once the final FY 2015 funding allocations are determined.

He explained that the basic work program budget is \$10,917,000 without carryover funds, which is the same as the corresponding current FY 2014 budget level as amended November 20, 2013. He said that Table 2 indicates that at this time no significant changes in the work activity budgets are proposed. However, if the final budget level increases, additional funding will be allocated to specific work activities to support new efforts required under MAP-21. He pointed out that the technical assistance program budget is unchanged from the current FY 2014 budget level because these program budgets are based upon percentages of the FY 2015 funding allocations which are unchanged from FY 2014.

Mr. Miller reviewed the work activities that would include new efforts to respond to the MPO planning requirements and new programs in MAP-21. The major modification to the metropolitan planning process call for MPOs to establish and use a performance-based approach to transportation decision making and development of transportation plans. He referred to the CLRP and TIP work activities in the outline which highlight how MAP-21 calls for performance measures and targets to be established by the USDOT, the states, transit providers and MPOs, and the two-year time line to set the metropolitan targets. He referred to page 23 on Regional Studies which includes an update of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP) in next fiscal year. He explained the proposed activities to start evaluating how the RTPP is being utilized and to develop a scope for the update.

Mr. Meese reviewed the work activities under the section 2. Coordination and Programs and highlighted new efforts. He said that once the MAP-21 regulations are final, Congestion Management, Operational issues, and Transportation Safety will have prominent roles in performance-oriented planning. He said that his team continues to explore utilizing new data sources and examine existing sources in more detail.

Ms. Constantine reviewed her work activities and said that for air quality conformity, the new MOVES model (2014) will capture CAFÉ standards and Tier 3 standards and provide more reliable emissions inventories including greenhouse gases. She said that in Mobile emissions they are watching the evolution of the CMAQ program, following MWAQC Ozone 2008 developments, and streamlining the TERMS analysis. She said that the vehicle identification number (VIN) inventory which is collected from states every 3 years will be in July 2014.

Mr. Milone highlighted his Network Development and Models Development activities. Mr. Griffiths reviewed his work activities. He said that it was time to wrap up the geographically-focused travel surveys and that we need to begin planning the next

regional large-scale household survey for 2016-2017. It will be costly and as in the past we will coordinate it with the Baltimore Metropolitan Council.

Mr. Miller said that the first draft of the full document will be presented to the TPB at its February 19 meeting, and noted that the technical assistance programs for the DOTs and WMATA remain to be specified. He explained that some portions of the current work activities will be identified in March for carryover into FY 2015. The TPB will be asked to adopt the program on March 19 and then it will be submitted to FHWA and FTA for approval by July 1.

**10. Briefing on the Marc Growth and Investment Plan**

This item was delayed until the February meeting.

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

Mr. Randall put up the schedule distributed by USDOT for release of the MAP-21 performance provisions. He noted that these are only a part of the MAP-21 rules coming out, including the Congestion Management / Air Quality rule and Primary Freight Network rules already mentioned by TPB staff and the Transit Agency Representation on MPO Boards guidance discussed at previous meetings.

In regard to the performance provisions, comments were due on the Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) on Transit Safety and State of Good Repair performance provisions on January 2. Comments were submitted by the TPB and by WMATA. The Metropolitan and Statewide Planning draft rule was supposed to be released in October. Current rumor is that it may come out February 4, in which case it will be discussed at the next Technical Committee meeting. Chair Srikanth added that Virginia is looking forward to these notices of rulemaking as well.

**12. Other Business**

Chair Srikanth thanked Ms. Erickson for her past years work and reviewed with the Committee his expectations for the coming year.

**13. Adjourn**