

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

Technical Committee Minutes  
*For meeting of*  
March 2, 2012

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - March 2, 2012**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT Mark Rawlings  
DCOP Art Rodgers

**MARYLAND**

Charles County Jason Groth  
Frederick Co. -----  
City of Frederick Tim Davis  
Gaithersburg -----  
Montgomery Co. Anne Root  
Prince George's Co. Abul Hassan  
Rockville -----  
M-NCPPC  
Montgomery Co. -----  
Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari  
MDOT Lyn Erickson  
Renna Mathews  
MTA Rick Kiegel  
Takoma Park -----

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria Pierre Holloman  
Arlington Co. Dan Malouff  
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa  
Fairfax Co. Mike Lake  
Falls Church -----  
Loudoun Co. -----  
Manassas -----  
Prince William Co. Monica Backmon  
NVTC Claire Gron  
PRTC Nick Alexandrow  
VRE Christine Hoeffner  
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth  
VDRPT Anthony Foster  
NVPDC -----  
VDOA -----

**WMATA**

WMATA Mark Kellogg

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

FHWA-DC -----  
FHWA-VA -----  
FTA -----  
NCPC -----  
NPS -----  
MWAQC -----

**COG Staff**

Ronald Kirby, DTP  
Gerald Miller, DTP  
Mark Pfoutz, DTP  
Nick Ramfos, DTP  
Robert Griffiths, DTP  
Rich Roisman, DTP  
Andy Meese, DTP  
Michael Farrell, DTP  
Jane Posey, DTP  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Joan Rohlf, DEP  
Paul DesJardin, DCPS

**Other Attendees**

Randy Carroll, MDE  
Bill Orleans, HACK

# TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

March 2, 2012

## Technical Committee Minutes

---

### 1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from February 3 TPB Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### 2. **Review of Final Draft FY 2013 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)**

Mr. Ramfos referred to the handout that was in the agenda packet and reviewed the information that was released at the TPB on the draft FY 2013 CCWP at the February 15, 2012 meeting.

He stated that there were some minor changes made to the document that included the update of the transportation and emission reduction impacts for the program as well as cost-effectiveness data which were based on the recently completed Commuter Connections TERM Analysis Report. He said that the final draft document would be presented to the TPB for approval on March 21<sup>st</sup>.

### 3. **Review of Final Draft FY 2013 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Miller distributed the draft of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY 2013 (July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2013) which was released for public comment at the February 15 TPB meeting. He said this draft was essentially complete except for the District of Columbia and Virginia Technical Assistance project descriptions. The final version would be presented to the TPB for approval at its March 21 meeting and then it will be submitted to FHWA and FTA for approval by July 1.

He pointed to the overall budget estimate and said that there is still considerable uncertainty due to the lack of Congressional action regarding the USDOT FY 2012 budget and the re-authorization of SAFETEA-LU. He explained that we have assumed that the FY 2013 funding allocations to be provided by DOTs will be the same as the current FY 2012 levels. In addition, the budget estimate assumes \$950,000 of unobligated funds from FY 2011 will be available, which is the same as the unspent funds from FY 2010.

He explained that certain projects and funding in the current FY 2012 Technical Assistance Programs of Maryland and Virginia that would not be completed by June 30 will be identified for carryover to FY 2013. He said the carryover projects and budgets would be incorporated into the final version of the FY 2013 document after TPB approval at the March meeting.

Mr. Kirby provided an update on activities in the development of performance measures for the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. He explained that staff had conducted several listening sessions with various stakeholder groups and found that most people

do not understand or relate to region-wide averages and technical measures. He said that staff will try to identify more meaningful and disaggregate measures that can be communicated to the public and present as many as possible on maps with colors. He said that focus groups will be conducted in April and May to receive feedback on regional challenges, potential measures, and possible strategies from members of the general public.

Mr. Mokhtari inquired if the Maryland performance measure program could provide relevant information.

Mr. Kirby said that this effort is more disaggregated and project specific. The priorities plan is looking at the regional level. He explained that as an example, we can show trends of regional lane miles of congestion and see it worsening. If we map the trends of lane miles of congestion at activity centers or specific corridors then people can better understand the problems and potential solutions.

Chairman Rawlings asked where resources are to respond to future competitive federal grant opportunities. Mr. Kirby replied that they are included in the Regional Studies activity.

Mr. Meese highlighted the activities under his direction in the Coordination and Programs section of the UPWP and said that no major changes are proposed.

Mr. Milone summarized the activities under his direction in the Networks and Models section of the UPWP. He said that the big move to the version 2.3 Demand Model has occurred this year and now it a matter of tuning-up and improving computer run times.

Mr. Kirby explained that we continue to closely follow MPO experience and on-going studies regarding activity-based models. He said that it could cost around \$3 million and take 3 or more years to implement them for the Washington region. He said that at this time it is not clear what benefits are achieved for such a major investment.

Mr. Srikanth expressed caution and questioned if these new models provide any more meaningful forecasts than the current ones.

Mr. Griffiths summarized the activities under his direction in the Forecasting Applications and Travel Monitoring sections of the UPWP. He highlighted that on page 66 under the Household Travel Survey work item there was a proposed list of six focused geographic subareas to be surveyed in FY 2013.

Ms. Erickson summarized the work activities in the Maryland Technical Assistance Program.

Mr. Srikanth said that the project and budget details for the Virginia Technical Assistance Program were being finalized and would not be different from this year's.

Mr. Verzosa inquired about the goecoding of 2012 rail passenger survey in the WMATA Technical Assistance Program and when was the last survey.

Mr. Griffiths replied that the survey was done in 2007 and said that he would send the results to Mr. Verzosa. He pointed out that they were coded to zip code and not city.

Mr. Roisman summarized the activities under his direction in the Continuous Airport System Planning Program of the UPWP.

#### **4. Briefing on Key Considerations Associated with the Establishment of Mobil Mobile Emissions Budgets for Fine Particle Pollution (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) for the 2012 Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan**

Ms. Constantine reviewed the PowerPoint presentation: Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets for PM<sub>2.5</sub> and Their Implications for Transportation Conformity. She noted that the group had seen the presentation before, but that there were some changes which she would highlight. She gave a brief overview of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> redesignation request. She listed the milestone years for the Maintenance Plan. She reviewed the NO<sub>x</sub> and Primary PM inventories. She showed the emission decreases over time for each source type, and noted that motor vehicle emissions decline faster than any other source. Ms. Constantine explained that uncertainties in inputs, such as future vehicle fleet mixes and updates to the emissions estimating models, should be key considerations when setting the motor vehicle budgets. She noted that the motor vehicle budgets set in this maintenance plan will have to be used for many years in the future. She pointed out the limited potential of TERMS to reduce emissions. She also showed the group the a recommendation for a 20% and 30% safety margin for 2017 and 2025 respectively, and explained that these safety margins will accommodate small changes, such as vehicle fleet changes, but not significant changes, such as complete updates to the mobile model. She informed the committee that the TPB will prepare a letter of recommendation to MWAQC, articulating the need for safety margins, and urging the update of SIPs when there are significant changes to the mobile inventories.

Ms Hoeffner asked who sets mobile budgets. Ms. Constantine replied that the first level of discussion is at MWAQC. If MWAQC can't reach agreement, then there is a higher level of appeal available.

Ms. Backmon asked where Maryland stands. Mr. Kirby stated that there is support from the DOTs for safety margins, but that MDE is opposed, so the case for safety margins needs to be made very carefully. That is why a TPB letter is needed. The presentation and the letter will be given to the TPB together. Mr. Kirby stressed the need for everyone to brief TPB members on the issue. He confirmed that there is a committee above MWAQC that can take action if they wish.

Mr. Rodgers asked if we are obliged to stay under 2017 levels, or maintenance levels? Mr. Kirby replied maintenance for all sources, but future year mobile budgets will be set that will have to be met for conformity - 2040 will have to be at or below 2025 mobile budget.

Mr. Foster suggested that the main message might be too technical for the TPB. Mr. Kirby replied that it would be covered quickly, and that the TPB had a technical briefing last month on subject.

Mr. Srikanth noted that VDOT is working with VDEQ and offered support for the TPB letter. He stated that it is the responsibility of each state to submit its SIP. He suggested that the effect of leaving no safety margin in the mobile budget is akin to asking agencies to set fiscal budgets for 1 year, and then having to stick to them for 12 years with no changes allowed. He pointed out that these uncertainties are not hypothetical - changes have happened in the recent past. He asserted VDOTs continued commitment to TERMS, but reminded the group that the emissions reductions benefit from them is low.

Mr. Kirby noted that it is new to have out year budgets for maintenance. He stated that it is very important to have safety margins. He explained that the recommended margins are for small changes, not something as big as change from Mobile to MOVES. If a big change such as that occurs, the SIP should be re-opened.

Ms. Erickson said that MDOT supports the TPB letter. She asked that if there was no safety margin will we meet conformity next year? Mr. Kirby replied no. Ms. Erickson noted that so much money has already been spent on TERMS for not much emissions benefit. She suggested that everyone should make it clear to TPB & MWAQC members that we won't pass conformity next year with no safety margin.

Ms. Constantine noted that both highway and transit projects would be stopped in the event of a conformity lapse.

Ms. Erickson noted that money for new TERMS would be taken from other highway and transit projects.

Mr. Rodgers suggested that the bar charts should include 2040. Mr. Kirby said that it would be added back in to the presentation.

Mr. Malouff asked which TERMS would need to be used in the event of a lapse. Ms. Erickson answered that there is a TERM tracking sheet, but noted that there is not much emissions benefit return for investment. Mr. Malouff asked where is the list. Ms. Posey replied that it is in the conformity report, but that those measures are already adopted. She informed the group that there is another list of potential projects that have been analyzed for cost/benefit, but those have not been pulled out for 5 or 6 years. Mr. Kirby noted that the best projects from the list have already been adopted. Mr. Malouff asked if others around the country have the same problems. Mr. Kirby said they did, but many have safety margins. He noted that AAMPO is recommending requirements to open SIPs when changes are made.

Mr. Kiegal asked why transit projects could not move forward in the event of a conformity lapse, since it seems like those would be beneficial projects. Mr. Kirby stated that whether projects improve or don't improve the air quality does not matter, all projects have to pass conformity. He noted that exempt projects can move forward.

## 5. Briefing on a Draft Regional Complete Streets Guidance and Policy Template

Mr. Farrell distributed a revised draft Complete Streets document, superseding the version that had been sent in the e-mail out prior to the meeting. Mr. Kirby noted that the revised version showed strikes and adds suggested by participants at the State Technical Working Group meeting earlier in the week, changes that streamlined the earlier version. The Complete Streets document was being proposed to move forward to the TPB for the March 21 meeting as an information item, and for action at the April meeting. A TPB Work Session on Complete Streets was also scheduled for immediately prior to the March 21 TPB meeting, for TPB members and other interested parties to review the topic, to hear about related activities by state and local agencies, and to review the draft document in detail.

Mr. Farrell reviewed significant changes in the new draft document. In Section II, a more detailed and separated discussion and definition of a "complete streets principle" had been added. In Section III, examples of potential next steps within an ideal policy had been added. In the introduction to Section IV, the language had been broadened to cover all transportation projects, not just publicly-funded transportation projects.

The most extensive changes were to the several bullets in the "Inclusions" portion of Section IV, streamlining the section by removing duplicative language among its sub-bullets. Mention of rail crossings was added to point 1, enabling a separate later bullet to be deleted. Point 2 language was streamlined, though specific mention of bicycles and pedestrians being able to cross facilities as well as travel along them was retained. Language on not precluding future bicycle and pedestrian use, if major demand was not currently present but might be present in the future, was also retained.

The document used the term "transportation facilities" instead of "roads"; the reason was that the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) defined the term "road" as the cartway, not including shoulders, sidewalks, or sidepaths, which were important considerations for the Complete Streets policy.

Under Section V on documentation and reporting, it was stated that there would be documentation in the Transportation Improvement Program, details to be developed by staff and reviewed by the TPB Technical Committee.

Mr. Farrell noted the scheduled TPB work session, which would provide an overview of Complete Streets concepts and national and state activities, and provide a chance for participants to see how this policy related to activities that agencies and jurisdictions are already undertaking.

In response to questions from Chairman Rawlings, Mr. Farrell stated that the intended audience of the work session was TPB members, as well as members of the Citizens Advisory Committee and other interested stakeholders, who were also welcome to participate. Jurisdictional presentations were expected to be especially effective at conveying how Complete Streets are being implemented in the region.

Mr. Malouff noted the recent availability of an open source "Model Street Design Manual", the availability of which could be raised in the work session. Mr. Farrell offered that reference to this manual could be included on a list of design resources.

Ms. Erickson requested that the revised draft Complete Streets document be posted on the website right away so others involved might access it.

## **6. Briefing on the TPB Application for Funding Under the FY 2012 Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Competitive Grant Program**

Mr. Randall reviewed the status of the TPB's application for an FY 2012 Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Discretionary Grant from USDOT. The map of projects was presented, and he then reviewed the remaining steps to complete the application, including revising the narrative, updating the benefit-cost analysis, and collecting letters of support from supporting organizations. Project participants were requested to provide letters of support by March 9, with the goal of submitting the TPB's application by March 15.

Mr. Randall also reviewed the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) discretionary grants opportunities: Bus Livability, Bus State of Good Repair, and Clean Fuels. TPB staff is supporting WMATA's intention to re-submit an update of the 2010 application for a Bus Livability grant to improve the accessibility of bus stops throughout the region. Mr. Kellogg then reviewed WMATA's planned grant applications besides the Livability application, including State of Good Repair for bus stations at King Street and Takoma-Langley Park and grey-water systems at Montgomery and Four Mile garages, and Clean Fuels for a CNG fuel system at Bladensburg garage.

Ms. Erickson noted that MTA will be submitting several FTA grant applications, largely in the Baltimore region, but including an application on behalf of Charles County.

Mr. Malouff asked for clarification on eligible applicants for these grants. Mr. Randall responded that states can apply, as well as any local government that receives Federal funding for transit projects. He clarified that while by regional agreement all formula-distributed Federal transit funds go to WMATA, both Montgomery County and Prince George's County are eligible applicants as their transit systems are in part funded by Federal funds.

## **7. Update on Reauthorization of Federal Surface Transportation Legislation**

Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee. Both the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives were in the process of developing transportation bills. The Senate bill was thought more likely to emerge first, and would provide reauthorization for a two-year period, keeping funding at or a bit above SAFETEA-LU levels. The House bill was currently farther from probable completion, but any House bill passed could move to House/Senate conference to develop a final bill. The final conference bill could end up similar to the current Senate bill in structure and features.

The bill would likely include some program consolidation, and provisions for performance-based planning, but no earmarks (it was anticipated that neither a Senate nor a House bill will include earmarks). It was now no longer thought likely that the bill would extend for a full five years instead of two, and it apparently was no longer being considered to remove transit funding from the overall transportation bill.

The current extension of SAFETEA-LU was set to expire on March 31. If a bill has not been approved by the President by that time, an additional extension to SAFETEA-LU would be needed. The length of the extension was uncertain; it could be through Memorial Day, or could extend into 2013, beyond the November elections.

National commentary was hopeful for a new transportation bill because of wide-ranging support nationally and because of its importance to the economy. The process of drafting bills in both houses of Congress was well along, and the bills were relatively similar; there was still hope of a bill by March 31 or shortly thereafter.

## **8. Briefing on the Continuous Airport Systems Planning (CASP) Program**

Mr. Roisman presented information on the Continuous Airport System Planning (CASP) Program.

The TPB has conducted metropolitan airport systems planning for 30 years through the CASP Program. The purpose of the program is to provide a regional process that supports planning, development and operation of airport and airport-serving facilities in a systematic framework for the Washington-Baltimore region. The TPB's Aviation Technical Subcommittee develops, implements and monitors CASP Program activities, and is responsible for the integration of airport system planning with the regional transportation planning process. CASP partner agencies include the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA), Virginia Department of Aviation (DOAV), District Department of Transportation (DDOT), and the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA). In addition, representatives from the Frederick and Manassas airports and the Washington Airports Task Force attend Aviation Technical Subcommittee meetings. The CASP work program follows a cycle that starts with the regional air passenger survey, conducted every two years. The survey forms the basis for developing ground access forecasts to the airport, and then an analysis of demand and supply leads into the ground access element, a listing of projects to improve ground access to the airports that are then folded into the regional surface transportation planning process.

Mr. Roisman reviewed recent data on local air passenger originations, mode split for airport passenger access, and air cargo at the three regional commercial service airports: National, Dulles, and BWI. Growth in both passengers (at all three airports) and air cargo (at Dulles and BWI) is expected to continue over the next couple of decades. Access to the airports remains mostly via car, although there is some bus access at all three airports, and Metrorail access to National. Mr. Roisman then reviewed 2011 ground access travel times to the airports from selected regional activity centers and compared them to 2003 data. For most of those activity centers, travel times to BWI are increasing for both the AM and PM peak periods. AM peak period travel times to National have changed little between 2003 and 2011, except from Frederick and Woodbridge. PM peak period travel times to National have increased for all activity

centers between 2003 and 2011. Both AM and PM peak period travel times to Dulles have increased for most activity centers between 2003 and 2011.

Mr. Roisman highlighted travel times between the Rockville activity center and BWI, where the opening of MD 200 reduced travel times by one-third, on average.

The congested highway segments slowing airport access are consistent with those previously identified in the regional congestion monitoring process. For transit access, buses are also impeded by congested highway segments. For some activity centers, transit travel times to National and BWI are faster than automobile travel times, particularly those locations that are close to Metrorail and MARC service. The completion of the Metrorail Silver Line will improve transit access to Dulles, and all three regional airports will have rail service.

The annual regional economic impact of the three commercial airports is more than \$30 Billion and 250,000 jobs. Airport ground access problems impact both passengers and air cargo, and therefore airport access must continue to be addressed as part of the TPB work program. Airport access is addressed in the TPB Vision, and airport-related measures have been included in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). CASP work program activities work directly to support these goals and objectives through the regional transportation planning program.

A Committee member asked when the next update of the Ground Access Element would be completed. Mr. Roisman responded that it would be completed by the end of the calendar year.

Mr. Davis asked about the impact of FAA funding changes on CASP program funding. Mr. Roisman responded that the Air Passenger Survey was funded 100% by the airports (2/3 by MWAA, 1/3 by MAA). The rest of the CASP program is funded through an FAA grant that historically has been 95% Federal share and a 5% local match; however, under the new FAA reauthorization passed by Congress earlier this year, the grant program (Airport Improvement Program or AIP) is now a 90% Federal share with a 10% local match. The COG Board will need to authorize the additional local match. In addition, the initial funding level received from FAA is lower than in past years, so the work program has been adjusted accordingly; however, it is hoped that the final funding level from FAA, for which staff will receive notification in a couple of weeks, will be back at previous levels.

Mr. Davis asked for an explanation for the decreased AM peak period travel time between Frederick and National when comparing 2003 and 2011. Mr. Roisman and Mr. Sivasailam noted that there had been improvements to that route. Mr. Griffiths noted that the 2003 data may be the problem.

Mr. Mokhtari asked for elaboration on the highway improvements noted in the presentation at MD 193 and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. Mr. Roisman responded that he would check the project in the CLRP and get back to him.

Mr. Kiegel noted that in addition to the reported highway travel time savings to BWI from the opening of MD 200, the completion of the road has also allowed improved transit

service to BWI. Mr. Roisman asked if ridership levels on the new service were yet known and Mr. Kiegel responded they were not.

Mr. Rodgers asked if the change in mode split to the airports was known. Mr. Roisman responded that mode split was captured as part of the Air Passenger Survey and when he returned to the committee later in the year to report the results of the 2011 survey it would include that information.

There was a discussion of the challenges associated with accessing Dulles from the west and the role of airport access in the decision of firms to locate, and where to locate, in the Washington region. There was also discussion of how the forecast airport growth was reflected in the regional Cooperative Forecasts of employment and population.

Mr. Mokhtari asked why the travel time routes to BWI from the south used MD 32 and MD 295 rather than I-95 and I-195. Mr. Roisman responded that the routing was kept for comparison with historic data but that the next study would use I-95 and I-195. When the first ground access travel time study was performed, I-195 had not yet been completed.

**9. Other Business**

None.

**10. Adjourn**