

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes
For meeting of
January 11, 2013

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - January 11, 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. -----
 Prince George's Co. -----
MDOT Lyn Erickson
 Vaughn Lewis
MTA -----
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax Co. Mike Lake
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Robert Brown
Manassas Patrick Moore
Prince William Co. Monica Backmon
NVTC Claire Gron
PRTC Nick Alexandrow
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT Amy Inman
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Mark Kellogg

FEDERAL/OTHER

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

COG Staff

Ron Kirby, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Dan Sonenklar, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Jonathan Rogers, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP

Other Attendees

Kenna Williams, Sherry Matthews, Inc.
Dana Minerva, DEP Consultant
Randy Carroll, MDE
Bill Orleans, HACK

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

January 11, 2013

Technical Committee Minutes

1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from December 7 TPB Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

2. **Briefing on Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2013 CLRP**

Mr. Austin distributed a draft handout that detailed the significant changes proposed for the 2013 update to the Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and went through the contents with the Committee. He noted that the handout did not include description sheets for projects in the District, but that those would be compiled based on data submitted by DDOT in time for release for public comment the following Thursday. Following that, Mr. Austin asked Ms. Posey to speak to the Air Quality Conformity project input tables which were also distributed. Ms. Posey noted that the tables did not yet include projects from FAMPO or BMC, but said those would be added by the following Thursday. She asked Committee members to review the tables and submit any edits by the close of business the next Tuesday, so there would be time to incorporate those prior to release for public comment.

Mr. Kirby said that there was a need for some more information and discussion to resolve some issues. He also asked Committee members to make sure that all TPB members were aware of these projects and that they were fully vetted.

Chairman Erickson asked if there were any implications to missing the proposed approval date in July that may be caused by using the new MOVES model. Mr. Kirby noted that using the MOVES model shouldn't impact our ability to meet the deadline.

Chairman Erickson noted that there was a significant amount of new expenditures laid out in the proposed projects and asked representatives from DDOT and VDOT to comment. Mr. Rawlings stated that all projects were accounted for in the District's Capital Improvement Program. Mr. Srikanth stated that financial information was included in the CLRP description forms and added that all projects put forth are included in local and state transportation plans. He noted that the two projects put forth as alternatives for improving access to the western side of Dulles Airport need to be studied for the NEPA process. Mr. Srikanth also stated that the Manassas Bypass being submitted as a study was a segment that was previously being considered as an alignment of the Tri-County Parkway and is still in the City of Manassas's comprehensive plan. Mr. Moore added that the project has political traction within the city and is needed to alleviate traffic through Manassas.

Ms. Backmon stated that NVTA requires a letter for CMAQ and RSTP projects to move forward, but she could not confirm that all other projects had been vetted locally.

Mr. Malouff asked about the timing of the alternative selection for the Dulles Airport access improvement projects. Mr. Kirby replied that Virginia's environmental process should be complete in June, in time for VDOT to select an alternative to move ahead into the CLRP when it is approved in July.

Chairman Erickson reminded Committee members that this information would be released for public comment on January 17th and that the TPB would be asked to approve the inputs on February 20th.

3. Briefing on Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2013 CLRP and the FY 2013-2018 TIP

Ms. Posey distributed the draft scope of work for the air quality conformity analysis of the 2013 CLRP and FY2013-2018 TIP. She noted technical inputs: Version 2.3 travel model and 2011 VIN are the same as last year, Round 8.2 land activity and MOVES emissions model are new this year. She listed the analysis years: 2015, 2017, 2020, 2025, 2030, and 2040. She mentioned that VDOT has 2 alternatives for one project, so that the 2025, 2030, and 2040 analysis years will be run a second time to include the 2nd alternative. She reviewed the project schedule, noting that the public comment period for inputs starts on January 17th, and that the TPB will be asked to adopt the inputs and the Scope of Work in February. The draft report should be available at the June Tech Committee meeting, and the TPB will be asked to approve the analysis & the 2013 CLRP in July.

Mr. Kirby asked Ms. Posey to explain the purpose of each analysis year. Ms. Posey stated that 2015 is required for the new ozone standard, 2017 and 2025 are required if the Fine Particles Maintenance Plan including new mobile budgets is adopted by EPA before July, 2020 is required to develop transit constraint levels, 2040 is required as the out year of the plan, and 2030 is required as there must not be greater than a 10 year gap between analysis years. Ms. Posey noted that if EPA does not adopt the PM2.5 Maintenance Plan and mobile budgets before July, that the test showing that forecast year emissions are no greater than 2002 base emissions will be used. Mr. Kirby noted that the required test for the ozone season pollutants is a comparison of current forecast year emissions developed using the MOVES emissions model against mobile budgets set in 2007 using the Mobile emissions model.

4. Briefing on the Draft Report: "Talking About Congestion Pricing: Probing Public Attitudes Through Deliberative Forums"

Referring to a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Swanson briefed the committee on the forthcoming study on the public acceptability of congestion pricing. He described the methodology used for the study. He said the report for the study would be released in the TPB mailout.

Mr. Srikanth said that it seems to have been a good idea for the TPB members and stakeholders, including the state DOTs, not to have been directly involved in the study so that the members would not have a vested interest in the study's outcome and there are fewer questions about its objectivity. He asked for an explanation for the fact that the study found an increase in support for gas tax increases.

Mr. Swanson explained that the interest in raising gas taxes was partly explained by the fact that is a familiar mechanism.

Mr. Kellogg asked if there were any lessons in the study for transit.

Mr. Kirby said the public's general doubts about the elasticity of demand apply to transit as well as highways.

Mr. Emerine asked what lessons should be drawn from the support for gas tax increases.

Mr. Kirby said one clear lesson is that public education is needed regarding current sources of funding for transportation, including gas taxes.

Ms. Inman asked what the study's implications might be for expanded transit. She suggested there could be an additional study to look at attitudes about potential variable pricing mechanisms on transit.

Mr. Swanson said that all the scenarios featured expanded transit and this was a selling point for all three. He emphasized that participants in all forums, including people from outer jurisdictions expressed an interest in increased transit.

Mr. Srikanth made the case for better public education on transportation funding. He also spoke about the capacity of transit to absorb travel demand, noting that even as congestion grows, many people do not find transit to be a viable option.

Mr. Weissberg asked if the study found different results among people from different parts of the region.

Mr. Swanson said that attitudes at the forum in the District of Columbia were somewhat different from the others. For example, participants at that forum were more likely to have strong feelings about Scenario 3, which would create a priced zone in Washington's central business district.

5. Breifing on the Request for Development of a Regional "Green Streets" Policy

Mr. Farrell discussed a letter which had been sent from the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Partnership to the TPB, requesting that the TPB consider adopting a regional Green Streets policy, similar to the regional Complete Streets policy. The letter cited Prince George's recently adopted "Complete and Green Streets Policy" as an example. A "Green Street" policy deals with runoff. The TPB directed staff to come up with a proposal.

Ms. Minerva of the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Partnership then spoke to a PowerPoint on Green Streets, and their potential benefits to the Washington region. Mr. Burns asked if public works or a homeowner's association would maintain these features. Mr. Weissberg said that that would vary, depending on the subdivision. Ms. Minerva said that citizens will often take care of the plantings in front of their houses. Ms. Backmon asked if VDOT would do the maintenance on its roads.

Mr. Srikanth said that VDOT is already dealing with stormwater issues, and is complying with those regulations as part of its designs. Such a policy would have implications in multiple areas that need to be examined. The State and local DOT's should be approached, and some sort of inventory of policies should be done.

Chairman Erikson said that the Maryland State Legislature passed a stormwater act in 2007, and enabling regulations were put in place in 2010. Local jurisdictions in Maryland are required to enact identical legislation. Ms. Erikson is not convinced that a regional policy would help in Maryland, since they are already required to implement Green Streets by law. The Prince George's policy is drawn directly from the Maryland law. Ms. Minerva said that the Maryland stormwater law mostly dealt with actions by private developers. Local policies could avoid placing the entire burden of compliance with stormwater runoff requirements on the environmental departments.

Mr. Weissberg asked if what was being sought was something similar to the Prince George's model.

Mr. Kirby said that we may need a couple of months deliberation at the Technical Committee before we go back to the TPB. Mr. Srikanth suggested that the next effort might be to have a group of appropriate staff from the state and local level examine the issue. We should identify what is already there, what is needed, and what can be done. Mr. Srikanth offered to send names of some appropriate people.

Mr. Farrell said that in the case of the Complete Streets policy we had started with a lot of detail, and eventually pulled back to a level general enough that everyone could agree to. Much of the value of the exercise was in raising awareness of the issues. The likely outcome is a statement that Green Streets are a good thing, plus a model policy. Mr. Meese announced that a Complete Streets implementation workshop was scheduled for January 29th.

6. Review of Outline and Preliminary Budget for FY2014 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Miller distributed a memorandum with a preliminary budget, work activity funding changes from FY 2013, and an outline for the UPWP for FY 2014 (July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014). He reviewed the overall budget estimates and said that at this point there is considerable uncertainty due to the lack of Congressional action regarding the USDOT FY 2013 budget with MPO planning funding from MAP-21. He explained that we have assumed that the FY 2014 funding allocations to be provided by DOTs will be the same as the current FY 2013 levels. In addition, the budget estimate assumes the level of unobligated funds from FY 2012 will be the same as the unspent funds from FY 2011. As in past years, the TPB will be asked to amend the budget in the fall once the final FY 2014 funding allocations are determined.

He explained that the basic work program budget is \$10,388,000 without carryover funds, which is the same as the corresponding current FY 2013 budget level as amended November 28, 2012. He said that Table 2 indicates that at this time no 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 2013 budget level because these program budgets are based upon percentages of the FY 2014 funding allocations which are unchanged from FY 2013.

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 said that under these activities, TPB staff will coordinate with the three state DOTs on their measures and targets to ensure consistent measures that are relevant for the TPB planning area. TPB staff will then coordinate with DOT staffs, WMATA and other transit providers to set targets. The new TIP and 2014 CLRP will include a description of the measures and targets under development or to be used in assessing the performance of the transportation system.

He pointed to the other work activities in the outline that describe how they will contribute to developing the new performance measures and targets. These activities include Congesting Management Process; Management, Operations and ITS Planning; Transportation Safety Planning; Freight Planning; and Regional Bus Planning. He said that the proposed TPB role in the new MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Program is described in the Transportation/Land Use Connection Program activity, and its proposed role in the new Enhanced Mobility Program is described in the Human Service Transportation Coordination activity.

Mr. Kirby reported that he and some TPB staff had recently participated with staff from MPOs, state DOTs and transit agencies from across the county in a USDOT webinar on on-going federal efforts to establish national performance measures and to discuss how targets could be set. He said everyone agrees that the measures have to be useful and realistic. He said that the MPO requirements and role in performance management will be on the February agenda so more time can be devoted to this important topic.

Mr. Meese reviewed the work activities under the Section 2. Coordination and Programs and highlighted new efforts for the following: Congesting Management Process; Management, Operations and ITS Planning; Emergency Preparedness Planning; Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning; Transportation Safety Planning; and Freight Planning. He said that the next three-year cycle of the aerial survey of the region's freeway system will be conducted under activity 5.B Congestion Monitoring and Analysis.

Mr. Griffiths reported that on page 33 under the Household Travel Survey work activity there was a proposed list of six focused geographic subareas to be surveyed in FY 2014. He said that he tried to identify areas in Activity Centers that will not have been surveyed by then and asked members for comments on the list.

Mr. Miller said that the first draft of the full document will be presented to the TPB at its February 20 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 2014. The TPB will be asked to adopt the program on March 20 and then it will be submitted to FHWA and FTA for approval by July 1.

7. Briefing on Additional Information on the Performance of the 2012 Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP)

Mr. Kirby gave an overview of additions to the 2012 CLRP Performance Analysis presentation, presented at the December 19th meeting of the TPB. The additions were incorporated into the presentation in order to respond to concerns voiced by TPB members at the November meeting. Mr. Kirby presented a chart comparing household, population, and employment forecasts from 1990 to observed levels in 2010, noting that our predictions in 1990 were fairly accurate to observed data in 2010. He explained

that the observed number of households in 2010 was 4% lower than predicted in 1990, the population in 2010 was 8% higher than predicted, and the number of jobs in 2010 was 11% lower than predicted. Mr. Kirby also noted the accuracy of the predictions varied from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Mr. Kirby presented a slide illustrating that there were many projects in the 1991 CLRP that were completed by 2010, and that there were a number of projects built that were not designated as projects in the 1991 plan.

Mr. Kirby presented a number of new graphics indicating current and forecast use of different travel modes including single occupancy vehicles, HOV/Carpool, transit, and non-motorized modes. These graphs showed that despite little change in the mode share for all trips and work trips, the total number of trips taken by each mode will rise substantially over the next 30 years. He then described how trips by mode and mode share are very different in the regional core, inner suburbs, and outer suburbs of the region. Mr. Kirby called attention to the fact that transit shares are much higher in the regional core than anywhere else, that single occupancy vehicle shares are higher in the inner and outer suburbs, and that the majority of trips today and in 2040 will be made in the inner suburbs. He used observed mode shares from the 2010/2011 Geographically Focused Household Surveys to illustrate the point that travel behavior varies throughout the region.

Mr. Kirby finished his presentation speaking about CLRP funding. He noted that the term 'capital' was used as an expense category where the expenditures charts said 'expansions' in the past. This is because the capital category includes expansions to the highway and transit systems in addition to capital costs that are intended to upgrade existed parts of the system (i.e. new buses and rail tracks).

Mr. Kellogg said that the number of unconstrained transit trips in the presentation seems low given Metro's expected increases in ridership between now and 2040. He suggested that the unconstrained value should be analyzed and sharpened. Mr. Kirby explained that the transit constraint is a relatively crude measure, and agreed that it may need to be sharpened moving into the future.

8. Update on the Regional "Street Smart" Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign

Mr. Meese announced that this update reflects a commitment made last year to brief the Committee early in the process. We have had a couple of major changes, including that the program is now funded through the COG dues, and our advisory committee membership reflects that change. We also have a new contractor, Sherry Matthews, Inc. Mr. Meese introduced Ms. Williams, who spoke to a

powerpoint on the Street Smart campaign, which covered the Fall 2012 campaign activities and the draft materials for Spring 2013.

Mr. Kirby asked about the composition of the focus groups. Ms. Williams replied that there will be two English, and one Spanish language focus group. The focus groups will reflect our target audience demographically and geographically.

Mr. Alexandrow said that vehicle fatalities have been decreasing, while pedestrian fatalities have not. This campaign looks like a good way to get that vulnerability across. He liked the focus on the Hispanic community. Overall very good.

9. **Briefing on Regional Transportation Data Clearinghouse**

Ms. Howard discussed the new Regional Transportation Data Clearinghouse (RTDC) application available to Committee members. Mr. Malouff asked whether the application was available to the general public, and Ms. Howard replied not at this time. Mr. Griffiths said that it is not the data that necessarily need to be protected by user name and password. However, the application currently resides on an internal DTP server, so at this time it is necessary to restrict access to the application until it is passed off to the IT department to host on an externally secure machine.

Chairman Erickson asked how one could gain access to the RTDC—Ms. Howard replied that the user name and password would be provided to Committee members. Mr. Brown asked where the traffic count data came from, and Mr. Griffiths replied from all over, wherever staff can get traffic counts. Mr. Orleans asked when the application would be available to the general public. Mr. Griffiths replied that we will be working with our IT department to host the application on a server that is not an internal working server, and he anticipated that this would occur within this year.

Mr. Kellogg asked whether it was possible to query the application to see how counts varied day-to-day. Ms. Howard replied that the RTDC has limited tools to do that sort of analysis, but the data can be exported and brought into one's own GIS or other software.

Mr. Kirby asked whether TPB staff has received any feedback about the RTDC. Mr. Griffiths replied that we have not received any. However, Ms. Kile responded that that the Travel Forecasting Subcommittee has provided some feedback thus far. Due to time limitation, Ms. Howard provided an abbreviated demonstration of the functionality of the RTDC.

Mr. Kirby said that we would bring the item back at a later date so the application can more fully be demonstrated.

10. **Update on the Activities of the TPB Bus on Shoulder Task Force**

Mr. Randall quickly reviewed the schedule for the Bus On Shoulder (BOS) task force, with the first meeting held in October and the second meeting planned for January 23, prior to the TPB meeting that day. He reported that a technical memorandum on local and national experience with BOS was distributed for comment on November 26, and that a second memo was in development. As part of the work plan, TPB staff is working with VDOT and with SHA to collect and analyze information for corridors being evaluated for BOS feasibility. He then reviewed the planned agenda for the second task force meeting, which will review the latest work and also feature a discussion on safety and incident response issues, if speakers can be confirmed.

In the interests of time, a supporting presentation with some of the initial analysis was not shown. Mr. Srikanth requested that the presentation be posted on the Technical Committee website.

11. **Status Report on a Summary Guide for the FY 2013-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Austin distributed additional copies of the draft Summary Guide to the FY 2013-2018 TIP. He noted that there had been no substantive changes since the Committee had last seen the document in December 2012. He briefly described the contents of the brochure.

Mr. Brown asked if the sub-projects that were grouped together in VDOT's portion of the TIP were included in the summary guide or if they would be made searchable on the web site. Mr. Austin answered that they were not included in this document as it was meant to give a brief summary of projects and then to guide users to the web site. He added that currently, the grouped projects had not been provided by VDOT in a data format, but suggested that this was something that could be considered for future improvements.

Mr. Kirby asked how grouped projects are selected to move forward for construction or implementation. Chairman Erickson answered that it is largely a technical/procedural issue that depends on which projects are ready to go and when funding is available. Mr. Srikanth echoed that comment and noted that some projects are also locally administered. Mr. Srikanth suggested improvements to the brochure content in order to better define project groupings and criteria.

12. **Other Business**

None.

13. **Adjourn**