

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
January 9, 2015

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – January 9, 2015**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick County Ron Burns
City of Frederick -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County John Thomas
Prince George's County -----
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery County -----
Prince George's County Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT Lyn Erickson
Matt Baker
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County -----
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
NVTA Petty Teal
NVTC Claire Randall
Prince William County James Davenport
PRTC -----
VRE Sonali Soneji
VDOT Norman Whitaker
Andrew Beacher
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

Jonathan Parker

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Yu Gao, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Jeff King, DEP
Eulalie Lucas, DTP
Jessica Mirr, DTP
Jinchul Park, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Wenjing Pu, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
Patrick Zilliacus, DTP

OTHER

Bill Orleans

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Meeting

MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from December 5 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Status Report on the CY 2014 Solicitation for Projects Funded by the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program

Ms. Klancher provided an overview of the solicitation and selection process for the first round grants for the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program. The TPB is the designated recipient of the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility for Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program for the Washington DC-VA-MD Urbanized Area.

She said that to prepare for the implementation of the Enhanced Mobility program, the TPB adopted an Update to the Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan in November. The Coordinated Plan includes the competitive selection process for Enhanced Mobility grants. In July, the TPB approved key elements of the Coordinated Plan which included priority projects for the solicitation. Ms. Klancher noted that the grant applications submitted did respond to strategies and priority projects, such as the emphasis on local jurisdictions and organizations working together on human service transportation coordination. A grant solicitation was conducted from August 28 to October 24, 2014. Approximately 1,200 organizations were notified about the grant opportunity. TPB staff conducted four pre-application conferences; one in Silver Spring, one in Tysons Corner and two at COG. A selection committee, chaired by Mr. Lovain, reviewed and scored the grant applications based on the evaluation criteria in the Coordinated Plan and recommended projects for funding.

The next steps include concurrence with the Selection Committee's recommendations by the TPB officers, and then presentation for approval by the TPB on January 19. The TPB would hold another solicitation for Enhanced Mobility funding between August and October 2015.

Chair Rawlings asked if the TPB would be briefed in January and then be asked to adopt the recommendations in February. Ms. Klancher responded that the Board will be

briefed and asked to approve the funding recommendations at the same time at the January meeting.

Mr. Thomas asked if all of the applications received would spend all the Federal funding available for the solicitation. Ms. Klancher stated that the funding requested by all of the applications was less than the amount of Federal funding available in this solicitation.

Mr. Mokhtari noted that the Enhanced Mobility program provides about \$2.8 million annually and asked why \$5.07 million was available in the solicitation. Ms. Klancher responded that FY13 and FY14 funds were combined for the solicitation.

3. Update on the Draft Update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region

Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint and reviewed the slides that he proposed to take to the TPB, including the changes that have been made since the TPB was briefed on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan on December 17th. Comments have been received and changes have been made in response to those comments. Details will be summarized. An on-line map and visualization were also created. The TPB will be asked to approve the plan.

Follow-on actions will include maintaining and improving the on-line mapping and visualization. The project database will be updated every two years, and the full plan will be updated every four years.

Mr. Farrell reviewed some screen captures from the visualization. The maps are interactive and have embedded features from other programs, including the Census explorer and the Capital Bikeshare website. He expressed hope that the visualization would reach more people than the paper plan.

Ongoing bicycle planning activities include the bicycle beltway work group's efforts to identify a circumferential bicycle route or routes, the National Park Service regional trails plan, a new top priority unfunded bicycle and pedestrian projects list, and two or more professional development workshops.

A member asked how the public had been made aware of the plan. Mr. Farrell replied that it had been publicized through the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee list, and through the CAC. Mr. Mokhtari suggested that some slides showing the visualization should be presented to the TPB. Mr. Srikanth agreed, but noted that the visualization itself was not yet ready to be presented. Mr. Meese asked if there would be slides presented to the TPB. Mr. Srikanth responded that there would be slides.

The information in the bicycle and pedestrian project database was provided by the agency and jurisdiction representatives on the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee. There is no request that the TPB Technical Committee review it further.

4. Briefing on Project Submissions for the 2015 CLRP

Mr. Austin spoke to the handout of major project submissions for the 2015 update to the CLRP and described the projects that had been received. Mr. Srikanth noted that the removal of the Columbia Pike Streetcar should be included in the presentation of major changes and a note that no major changes were submitted from agencies in Maryland or from WMATA. Ms. Posey spoke to the Air Quality Conformity Inputs table and noted that there were some questions on the transit inputs. She indicated that transit service assumptions would be needed by Friday, February 6th. She asked for any changes to the Conformity Inputs by the close of business on Tuesday, January 10th.

Mr. Parker inquired what the term “not coded” meant under the completion date. Ms. Posey responded that this provides for listing studies that are not funded for construction.

Ms. Hamilton spoke to the presentations on the I-66 projects. Mr. Holloman asked about federal regulations pertaining to converting lanes to toll lanes and if there was any requirement to add general purpose lanes. Ms. Hamilton noted that the existing facility was all HOV during the periods that would be converted to express lanes, and that the conversion of HOV to HOT lanes was allowed for under federal law. She said she was not aware of any requirement to add more general purpose lanes and that no one was being restricted from using the lanes.

Mr. Emerine asked how the scope of commuter bus enhancements would be defined. The response was that a 2009 precursor study had been conducted and was in the process of being updated with current demand levels. Mr. Emerine suggested that it would be beneficial if that study update was conducted in coordination with the TPB study to be discussed later on the agenda.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the I-66 outside the Beltway project would preclude the expansion of Metro. Ms. Hamilton responded that it was not precluded and noted one option did preserve right-of-way. She added that in discussions with Metro, there was no intent to move ahead with expansion at this time. Mr. Mokhtari asked if Metro expansion would be able to eliminate the need for the project entirely. Ms. Hamilton explained that the study results indicated that no single option presented itself as a comprehensive solution.

Mr. Srikanth suggested limiting the presentation to the Board to just a few highlighted slides to save time. Ms. Erickson suggested omitting the details on the alternatives, but

stressed that discussion of the P3 process and coordination with local jurisdictions was important.

Ms. Erickson also suggested that the phrase “provide a funding source” in the purpose statement be clarified. Ms. Hamilton responded that VDOT will manage the tolling on the project inside the beltway and that once construction, operations and maintenance costs were covered, the tolls would provide a new funding source for multi-modal solutions.

Mr. Parker asked how this project might impact WMATA’s need for 100% 8 car trains. Ms. Hamilton responded that the multi-modal study did address 8-car trains and that VDOT will work with the local jurisdictions and WMATA to continue to look at that issue.

5. Briefing on Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2015 CLRP and the FY 2015-2020 TIP

Ms. Posey reviewed the draft scope of work. She noted that the tasks were similar to last year’s. She pointed out that new inputs, in addition to the highway and transit projects, include: updated VIN data and updated Cooperative Forecasts (Round 8.4). She listed the analysis years (2015, 2017, 2020, 2025, 2030, and 2040) and noted that 2020 is being run to develop transit constraint values, and will not include emissions estimates. Ms. Posey reviewed the schedule, and indicated that the October approval allows time for a CLRP performance analysis. There were no questions.

6. Review of Outline and Preliminary Budget for the FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Miller distributed a memorandum on the UPWP for FY 2016 (July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016) including a preliminary budget, work activity funding changes from FY 2014, and a 35-page outline of the work activities. He reviewed the overall budget estimates and said that at this point there is uncertainty regarding the USDOT FY 2015 budget with MPO planning funding from MAP-21. He explained that the assumption is that the FY 2016 funding allocations to be provided by DOTs will be the same as the current FY 2015 levels. In addition, the budget estimate assumes the level of unobligated funds from FY 2014 will be the same as the unspent funds from FY 2013. As in past years, the TPB will be asked to amend the budget in the fall once the final FY 2016 funding allocations are determined.

He explained that in light of the new performance-based planning requirements and in anticipation of the major funding needed for a large-sample regional household travel survey to be conducted in 2016-17, the three DOTs and WMATA have agreed to reduce their budget levels for their technical assistance programs in order to provide additional funding for core program work activities.

He said that the proposed technical assistance program budget is \$1,317,807, which is a decrease of \$458,385 from the current FY 2015 budget level. He explained that the technical assistance program budgets are based upon agreed percentages of the estimated FY 2016 funding allocations. This year, the agreed percentage of the total new FTA and FHWA planning funding passed through each state is reduced from 13.5 percent to 10 percent. The funding level for WMATA technical assistance is reduced from 8 percent to 6 percent of the new FTA funding.

Mr. Miller said that the core program budget is \$11,563,778 without carryover funds, which is an increase of \$458,385 more than the corresponding current FY 2015 budget level. He then reviewed Table 2 which shows the proposed changes in the core work activity budgets. He noted that the current activity 1.E Private Enterprise Participation with a \$19,000 budget will be incorporated into 2.F Public Transportation Planning. A new activity entitled: 1.F Performance-Based Planning for the CLRP and TIP is proposed with a budget of \$100,000 to coordinate the efforts to produce the new performance measures and targets required under MAP-21. He said that \$300,000 is added to activity 5.C in anticipation of the new major household travel survey. He also pointed out that \$100,000 is added to 4.C Models Development.

Mr. Srikanth elaborated on the new work activity on page 7 in the outline that would coordinate 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 highlighted the activities in 3.C Regional Studies on page 27, which include support for the transportation sector in the COG multi-sector greenhouse gas work group, follow-on activities for the TPB's regional list of unfunded transportation projects and review of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP) to determine how it could be updated in 2017 to inform the 2018 CLRP.

Mr. Meese highlighted the new work activities under Section 2. Coordination and Programs. He commented that congestion management, operational issues, safety, and freight will have prominent roles in performance-oriented planning.

Ms. Constantine reviewed her work activities and commented that for air quality conformity the MOVES model (2014) will capture CAFE standards and Tier 3 standards and provide more reliable emissions inventories including greenhouse gases. She said that in Mobile emissions they are following MWAQC developments regarding an update of a PM2.5 Maintenance Plan, and streamlining the TERMS analysis.

Mr. Milone highlighted his Network Development and Models Development activities. Mr. Griffiths reviewed his work activities. He said that staff will be wrapping up the

geographically-focused travel surveys and will begin planning the next regional large-scale household survey for 2016-2017 which will be costly.

Mr. Miller said that the first draft of the full document will be presented to the Technical Committee on February 6 and to the TPB at its February 18 meeting. He 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 2016. The TPB will be asked to adopt the program on March 18 and then it will be submitted to FHWA and FTA for approval by July 1.

7. Briefing on Actions to Establish the COG Multi-Sector Working Group to Examine Greenhouse Gas Reductions

Mr. Srikanth briefed the Committee on the most recent actions by COG with regard to the multi-sector working group convened by COG to work on greenhouse gas reduction strategies and specifically that there is now a proposed date for this group to meet and that is Friday, January 30th at 10:00 am in the Training Center. He informed them that a letter of invite was sent on December 30th asking the Directors of various agencies or Administrators of jurisdictions to nominate a senior level professional staff from the Transportation, Land Use and Energy/Environmental agencies. He distributed a table listing all of the jurisdictions within the Transportation sector who should have received a letter of invite from COG. With regard to those that COG was yet to hear back from given the limited time between now and the group's meeting he mentioned that COG staff will send out a reminder email again on Monday asking for nominations. Mr. Srikanth requested that the Committee members work within their agency or jurisdictions to send a response nomination as soon as possible. This will help the COG staff send out the meeting materials to the appropriate staffs. In response to a question he noted that the invite was e-mailed on Dec. 30th and an original signed copy was also sent by regular mail.

8. Briefing on the Regional Bus Staging, Layover, and Parking Location Study

Mr. Roisman presented a brief overview of the study (based on his PowerPoint slides) and then introduced Mr. Harrington of Cambridge Systematics, who led the technical work for the study. Mr. Roisman noted that thousands of buses enter the regional core each day and that for commuter buses, traffic congestion forces them to arrive well ahead of their scheduled departure times to reach their boarding locations, or to circle the block or park in unauthorized locations. The lack of staging, parking, and layover locations and the core traffic congestion also negatively impacts other bus services. The study considers need for staging, layover and parking locations for the five distinct services identified in the DDOT 2011 Motorcoach Action Plan (Commuter, Tour Bus, Shuttle, Sightseeing, Intercity). The study seeks to establish both short-term solutions as well as a long-term regional vision for motorcoach operations.

The study was initially funded under the FY14 UPWP Technical Assistance Program (DC, MD, and VA) and has been active since summer 2013, with the consulting team of Cambridge Systematics and Sabra, Wang Associates beginning work in March 2014. The study work concludes with the final report before the committee today. The study included a steering committee for oversight that met on a monthly basis, with representatives from regional bus operators as well as NVTC, DDOT and DCOP. Additional oversight came from the Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee. Mr. Roisman requested that the Committee provide comments on the draft final report within 30 days. He also noted the coordination between this study and the planned VDOT improvements along I-66 as pertaining to accommodating the proposed bus service along the corridor that would terminate in Arlington and/or the District.

Mr. Harrington reviewed the study findings and lists of recommended sites for on-street staging and off-street parking (based on his PowerPoint slides). He noted that a review of existing conditions showed 1,100 buses entering the core on a typical weekday and requiring parking, with a supply of around 600 off-street spaces. The review also showed a need of about 45 on-street staging locations, highlighted in the area around the State Department and Gallery Place, as well as southwest Washington and in Arlington. He reviewed the site evaluation criteria and weights.

Mr. Holloman asked if the location of restroom facilities and other amenities were considered in the site evaluation criteria. Mr. Harrington responded that such amenities were included in the cost assumptions for the off-street sites but were not considered for the on-street sites and the issue was not raised by the bus operators, but could be included. Mr. Mokhtari asked why staging areas to accommodate up to ten buses were considered when the staged buses might be serving fairly dispersed locations relative to the staging area. Mr. Harrington responded that this issue was raised by the study steering committee during their review of the initial criteria and the weight for the location size was reduced as a result. Mr. Mokhtari then asked about the source for the cost estimate for structured parking as it was higher than he had seen elsewhere.

Mr. Harrington responded that the estimate came from a national review of bus parking costs but there could be variability. Mr. Mokhtari also suggested looking at loading zones for shared on-street use for staging, similar to mobile vending zones. Mr. Roseboom asked about the lack of recommended locations in Arlington. Mr. Harrington responded that for on-street sites, the travel time reliability from Arlington to stop locations in the District was not competitive with other sites; for off-street location site availability in Arlington was a challenge.

9. Briefing on Changes in Regional Travel and Commuting Trends 2010-2013

Mr. Griffiths gave a PowerPoint presentation on changes in population, employment, vehicle miles of travel, transit ridership and commuting mode shares in the region between 2007 and 2013. He noted that while population in the region had increased by 11% from 2007 to 2013, employment growth, daily vehicle miles of travel (VMT), and total transit ridership had remained relatively flat. Nonetheless, he noted that the commute mode shares for single driver and carpool trips had decreased slightly and increased slightly for transit and bike commuting. The percent of workers teleworking or otherwise working from home had also increased during this period.

Mr. Griffiths stated he was still analyzing some of the factors that could explain why daily vehicle travel and transit ridership in the region was not growing while population growth was steadily increasing.

Mr. Brown suggested that changing demographics in the region may be part of the explanation and suggested that Mr. Griffiths examine daily VMT per person for person 16 and older. He agreed that was a good suggestion and he would look into that issue.

Mr. Rawlings thanked Mr. Griffiths for his presentation and stated that he looked forward to seeing the results of his more in-depth analysis at a future Technical Committee meeting.

10. Briefing on the Composition of the Vehicle Fleet in the Washington Region in 2014

Ms. Constantine provided an overview of key trends observed in the 2014 Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) database, which will be used for the 2015 CLRP air quality conformity analysis. The database is routinely updated on a triennial basis using raw vehicle registration data from the MD, DC and VA departments of motor vehicles through coordination with the state air agencies and the MWCOG department of Environmental Programs. Upon decoding and analyzing the data in-house, it was concluded that the regional vehicle fleet: (1) grew approximately 3% in the last three years; (2) comprises of 54% of light duty cars and 40-41% of light duty trucks in the MD and VA jurisdictions, while the corresponding percentages in the District of Columbia are 64% and 32% respectively; (3) heavy duty trucks comprise 4-6% of the regional total; (4) the popularity of light duty cars – as opposed to SUVs and light duty trucks - varies over time and it is heavily influenced by the price of fuel; (5) hybrid and electric vehicles are increasing in the region, as they now comprise 2.74% and 0.04% of the regional total of light duty cars/trucks; (6) the average age of vehicles – all vehicle type categories – continues to increase because vehicles are built better and their

owners keep them longer. The silver lining – for air quality impacts – is that while the average age of vehicles continues to increase, the marginal increase during the most recent triennial (2011-2014) was approximately half of what it was during the previous triennial (2008-2011).

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

Mr. Randall updated the Committee on the latest developments regarding US DOT regulations on performance measures under MAP-21, speaking to a presentation. He announced that the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) for Pavement and Bridge Condition for the National Highway Performance Program was published on January 5. Mr. Randall reviewed the status of all scheduled rulemakings and then spoke to details of the Pavement and Bridges Rule, including the proposed performance measures, the data on which they would be based, the requirements for data collection, and the required performance reports. He then went into greater detail on the roles of the State DOTs and MPOs in setting targets, as it would appear a standard model for these has been established. He concluded with a review of next steps for action by the TPB and the transportation agencies in the region.

Mr. Srikanth emphasized the draft status of the rules, and that the State DOTs have been preparing for these rules and will be submitting comments by April 6. TPB staff will reach out to the State DOTs to coordinate on any comments, including the proposed extensive data collection required. He then said more time would be provided at the next Technical Committee for discussion of the proposed MAP-21 rules. TPB staff wants to work with other agencies on developing the necessary coordination for these performance provisions.

Mr. Srikanth also noted that that March had been proposed for a 1-1/2 day workshop with federal agency staff on the MAP-21 performance provisions. However, further discussions with FHWA and FTA have led to the likely date for this meeting being postponed to April. Once a date is confirmed, the Committee will be sent a save-the-date message. TPB and State DOT Staff are working to develop an agenda.

12. Other Business

Mr. Srikanth announced the good news that the FHWA and FTA had approved the TPB's air quality conformity analysis for the 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP. He noted the importance of this approval for project sponsors to include as part of required project documentation.

13. Adjourn