
**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY**

December 3, 2021

1. WELCOME, VIRTUAL PARTICIPATION PROCEDURES, AND MEMBER ROLL CALL PROTOCOL

Staff described the procedures and protocols for the virtual meeting and conducted a roll call. Meeting participants are documented in the attached attendance list.

2. APPROVAL OF THE NOVEMBER 5, 2021 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

There were no questions or comments regarding the November Technical Committee meeting. The summary was approved.

ITEMS FOR THE BOARD AGENDA**3. REGIONAL ROADWAY SAFETY PROGRAM PROJECT APPROVALS**

Mr. Schermann briefed the committee on the projects selected by the Regional Roadway Safety Program (RRSP)'s Technical Selection Committee to receive technical assistance in fiscal year 2022. The RRSP was established and funded by the TPB in July 2020. The program promotes TPB roadway safety priorities and is funded at \$250,000 per fiscal year. Six jurisdictions submitted applications requesting a total of \$395,000 in funds. A selection panel consisting of staff and safety officials from the TPB, DDOT, MDOT, and VDOT, convened to recommend that the TPB approve the following projects at its December 15 meeting:

- Arlington and Prince George's County's *Planting Seeds for Regional Roadway Safety, One Traffic Garden at a Time* project (\$35,000)
- The City of Alexandria's *Improving the Capabilities and Availability of a "Pedestrian and Cyclist Safety Analytics Application"* project (\$45,000)
- The City of Falls Church's *South Washington Street Planning Opportunity Area Pedestrian Network* study (\$50,000)
- Prince William County's *Graham Park Road Safety Improvements Road Diet and Roundabout* project (\$60,000)
- Fairfax County's *Harrison Lane Corridor Pedestrian Improvements* project (\$60,000)

The consultant selection process for these projects is expected to begin in January 2022. The FY 2023 application period will open in January 2022.

Mr. Erenrich asked about the projects that were not selected for funding.

Mr. Schermann reported that a Montgomery County project on MD-650 was not selected in this round because it was for follow-on engineering work coming out of planning work awarded in the previous round. The selection panel decided to wait for the planning task to be completed before considering the preliminary engineering project.

Mr. Erenrich stated that the decision was understandable and suggested that the presentation to the TPB include a slide that summarizes this rationale.

Mr. Brown asked if the FY 2023 round that launches in January will be similar in scope and funding levels.

Mr. Schermann confirmed that it will have the same funding level and objectives.

4. DRAFT RESULTS FROM THE TPB CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION STUDY

Mr. Srikanth provided opening remarks for this item. He noted that staff and the consultant team had less than 11 months to develop and complete this study, which was not in the work plan and budget. He made four points to provide context for the presentation.

First, the context for this study is a recognition that mitigating the effects of climate change is a national and regional priority, which was identified as a focus area in 2020 for both COG and TPB. Last year, the COG Board adopted an interim 2030 greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goal of 50% below 2005 levels by 2030, which the TPB affirmed. Mr. Srikanth noted that regional GHG reduction goals are a combined goal for all the sectors, including energy, buildings, and transportation, and there are not sector-specific goals. Before adopting the 2030 GHG reduction goal, COG completed an analysis to determine the technical ability to achieve the goal and documented it on the 2030 Climate and Energy Action Plan (CEAP).

Second, while acknowledging that there is not a specific GHG reduction goal for transportation, the TPB asked staff to look at the actions necessary to reduce on-road transportation GHG emissions to meet the regional goals of 50% below 2005 levels by 2030 and 80% below 2005 levels by 2050. He noted that the Climate Change Mitigation Study (CCMS) is limited to the on-road, transportation sector and, if one or more scenarios could achieve the 50% reduction goal, that does not mean that further actions would not be necessary from other sectors to achieve the regional goal. Similarly, if none of the CCMS scenarios can achieve the 50% reduction goal, that does not mean that the region cannot meet its goal, since a combined effort across multiple sectors, could still attain the goal, as per the CEAP.

Third, given the quick turnaround for this study, the CCMS used a scenario planning approach and sketch planning tools for the analysis which means that the results are aggregate and high-level. The results represent an order of magnitude estimate.

Last, ten scenarios made up of combinations of strategies were analyzed. Mr. Srikanth noted that the levels of implementation of the strategies were extremely aggressive and perhaps unprecedented. The focus of the study was achieving the GHG reduction goal, without considering the feasibility, community acceptance, or cost of the strategies.

Mr. Moran went over the first five slides of the presentation before turning the presentation over to Mr. Grant to present the results of the study. Mr. Grant reviewed the two “top-down” scenarios that the committee saw in September and an additional top-down scenario that the committee requested. Mr. Grant then shared the results of the ten “bottom-up” scenarios. The analysis showed that none of the scenarios achieved the 50% reduction in on-road GHG emissions by 2030; however, several scenarios provide on-road GHG emissions reductions at levels assumed in the CEAP analysis. An 80% reduction by 2050 is met only with the most aggressive scenario under the reference-case electric grid but can be achieved under other scenarios with vehicle technology/fuels strategies and a cleaner electric grid.

Mr. Brown asked for more information on the clean grid case.

Mr. Grant responded that the clean grid assumed a carbon-neutral grid by 2035. Mr. Brown noted that the study focuses on 2030 and 2050, but on some of the later slides, there are references to 2040 that were unexpected.

Mr. Brown commented that slide 15 should compare to the 2030 and 2050 goals, not the CEAP.

Mr. Grant responded that the information on slide 15 could be presented in different ways and referred to Mr. Srikanth’s earlier comment that the 50% goal in 2030 is not sector-specific; therefore, ICF thought it was useful to compare to the CEAP.

Mr. Brown recommended that the committee members get this information in front of their TPB members to give them a head start.

Mr. Erenrich asked how the results vary by geography: core, inner and outer counties. He also noted

that it is important to note additional factors, particularly those relating to density, land use, and availability of high-capacity transit because the information from this study will be used to determine projects for the next long-range transportation plan. He also noted that any element of travel varies across jurisdictions and even within jurisdictions.

Mr. Srikanth responded that the sketch planning analysis conducted for this study was not able to determine changes by geographic subareas. He also agreed that the CCMS and the update to Visualize 2045 will have to acknowledge the ability to achieve the outcomes of some of the strategies in the CCMS at a local level will vary.

Mr. Srikanth remarked that the results of the CCMS analysis disabused him of the idea that we could do all of these things in the next year or even in the next few years yet shows the importance of working together with a great sense of urgency. He encouraged committee members to read all of the assumptions for the scenarios on slide 15 and think about how they could be done.

Mr. Grant added in response to Mr. Erenrich's question about geography that there was some analysis at smaller geographies because they looked at strategies like cordon pricing into parts of the District and parking pricing in Activity Centers, but assumptions about telework, for instance, were applied regionally. He did not feel that any of the analysis could be presented by geographic subcomponents.

Mr. Phillips noted that he felt that slide 15 was good for the Technical Committee presentation but recommended only using the bar charts on slide 16 for the TPB.

Mr. Nampoothiri asked if the current electric grid has the capacity to support the most aggressive scenario or if the assumption includes necessary upgrades.

Mr. Grant responded that they did not specifically look at the elements needed in the power sector for this study.

Mr. King noted that COG staff are reaching out to our utilities and the PJM (a regional transmission organization, RTO, that coordinates the movement of wholesale electricity in all or parts of 13 states and the District of Columbia) to get a better handle on what their load forecasts are and how they plan to meet the load.

Mr. King asked how possible use of renewable natural gas in vehicles, such as transit buses, factor into the study.

Mr. Grant responded that they assumed electric vehicles and did not look at renewable natural gas specifically.

Mr. King asked how connected and automated vehicles (CAV) reduce GHG emissions. Mr. Grant responded that CAVs is one place in the study with a higher level of uncertainty. ICF applied assumptions about broad-scale eco-driving.

Mr. King suggested that for the top bar in slide 5 (carbon pricing), perhaps consider in the commentary (or on the slide) that it could also be done through federal regulatory initiatives, such as Corporate Average Fuel Economy (CAFE) standards, power plant controls, etc. He noted that COG staff are actively engaged with ICF to initiate some new electric vehicle planning work in the region, across a few jurisdictions, starting in Maryland. He said that staff is happy to expand the scope to include more local governments if there is interest. He stated that he believes that states are going to be required to develop electric vehicle (EV) plans under the new federal infrastructure program.

Mr. Erenrich asked how much offsets would have to be purchased to meet GHG goals.

Mr. Srikanth responded that the CEAP shows that the region can achieve the 2030 goal, and if all the sectors did achieve the outcomes assumed, we may not need to purchase offsets. However, if every sector does an analysis similar to the CCMS and finds that the 50% goal cannot be achieved, that will be the answer on how much offsets would need to be purchased.

Mr. Phillips recommended focusing on total VMT and not VMT per capita on slide 7.

Mr. Srikanth noted that there is a regional goal to reduce VMT per capita in the Region Forward document.

Mr. Phillips suggested adding a slide with a call to action suggesting how the results of this study could be used.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the presentation for the TPB is just the start of the discussion, describing what the starting point is.

Mr. Groth suggested that jurisdictions should talk internally about actions they can take across the board (such as improve the electric grid, reduce VMT, increase telework) because it is important that we walk away from this study and do something about it, which is a point he plans to make in his remarks at the TPB meeting.

Mr. Srikanth announced that there would be a work session on the CCMS on December 13 at 3 pm (<https://www.mwcog.org/events/2021/12/13/tpb-climate-change-mitigation-study-work-session/>). He noted that any comments or corrections to the slide deck need to be received by COB Monday, December 6.

5. PBPP – DRAFT 2018-2022 HIGHWAY SAFETY TARGETS

Mr. Schermann and Ms. Nham presented TPB Staff recommendations for the 2018-2022 regional highway safety targets and briefed the Committee on the National Capital Region’s safety outcomes and progress towards the 2016-2020 highway safety targets.

Ms. Nham reported that 2020 roadway fatalities in the region increased by 4.9 percent, despite a 19 percent decrease in VMT. The increase in the number of traffic fatalities translated into a 30.2 percent increase in the fatality rate. The number of serious injuries and the serious injury rate decreased by 22.3 percent and 3.6 percent respectively since 2019. The number of non-motorist fatalities and serious injuries also decreased by 26.1 percent in 2020. She noted that the region met its 2016-2020 serious injury and serious injury rate targets, but fell short of the fatalities, fatality rate, and the non-motorist fatalities and serious injuries targets.

Mr. Schermann presented the staff recommended 2018-2022 safety targets as well as the methodology used to develop them. The proposed targets are:

Performance Measure (5-year rolling average)	Proposed 2018-2022 Target
# of Fatalities	253.0
Fatality Rate (per 100 MVMT)	0.588
# of Serious Injuries	1,889.7
Serious Injury Rate (per 100 MVMT)	3.867
# Non-motorist Fatalities & Serious Injuries	508.6

Mr. Groth asked if it is possible that the reduced number of cars on roadways during the pandemic resulted in more speeding and led to more serious injury crashes to become fatal crashes.

Mr. Schermann shared the consensus among many state DOTs and safety researchers that having fewer cars on the roadways during the pandemic is linked with increased speeding and more traffic fatalities. With regards to whether the decrease in serious injuries is associated with the increase in the number of fatalities, he shared that it was a reasonable hypothesis but noted that the decline in serious injuries in the region is a continuation of previous trends.

INFORMATION ITEMS

6. VISUALIZE 2045 – PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS MEASURES

This item was postponed for a future meeting.

7. MOVE DC UPDATE

Ms. Hairfield (DDOT) briefed the Technical committee about DDOT's long-range transportation plan, moveDC. She noted that the plan was a collaborative effort that aligned with other plans in DC and the region. The report is currently being updated and being reviewed by the Mayor's office. She then outlined the goals, policies, and strategies of the plan. Ms. Hairfield also covered some of the mapping efforts that went into the plan as well as their implementation strategies.

Mr. Malouff (Arlington) asked about the planning characteristics of the freight priority network. Ms. Hairfield noted that the plan uses the existing freight priority network plus additional streets that are considered crucial to the network. It was also noted that those streets could see wider lane widths and more pick-up and drop-off zones. For freight priority streets that are redesigned, DDOT is careful to not diminish its characteristics and if it does the appropriate signing and wayfinding are in place to notify truck drivers.

Ms. Youngbluth (VPRA) asked how moveDC considers heavy rail and if the freight map considers the network or if it uses the DC State Rail plan. Ms. Hairfield noted that moveDC plan does consider heavy rail, but the freight network does not include rail. There is a strategy in the plan that looks at the State Rail plan and DDOT will be following its update.

Mr. Phillips (WMATA) asked about the transit network priority map and the investments and strategies that will be pursued in moveDC for transit prioritization in its corridors.

Ms. Hairfield noted that it will include things like building bus priority lanes, making signal changes, and shifting traffic patterns for buses.

Ms. Rupert (DDOT) also added that they have been closely coordinating with Ms. Kanagy who works closely with Metro to ensure communication between relevant groups.

8. 11TH STREET BRIDGE PARK

Mr. Kratz said that the 11th Street Bridge Park will be DC's first elevated park. He said the park will cross the Anacostia river. He said that this project is part of a larger effort to ensure that investment is coming to under invested neighborhoods while ensuring that local residents can stay and thrive. His presentation covered the project's background and how the park connects to local transit systems. He also shared renderings and talked about the equitable investments the project has made to date.

Mr. Ganvir said that this is a very innovative public private partnership between.

Mr. Groth said that this is a powerful display of how nonprofits and government can work together to accomplish a something that might have been otherwise unimaginable.

Mr. Phillips said he was impressed by the workforce development and business generation development and support programs. He said he also liked the graphics.

Mr. Srikanth thanked Mr. Kratz for his presentation. He said that the main reason the TPB highlights efforts like the 11th Street Bridge is that it provides examples that of projects that meet the TPBs goals.

It is an example of projects that advance regional priorities even though it isn't included in the long-range plan. He encouraged member jurisdictions and agencies to share similar projects with the Technical Committee. He said this committee is a forum for information exchange and sharing best practices.

OTHER ITEMS

9. OTHER BUSINESS

COG hybrid/in person meeting status report

Staff updated the Technical committee that hybrid meetings are being planned in January for the Technical Committee and TPB meetings. Staff will update the website with latest information as needed. In terms of maximum occupants, the TPB will be following DC's health rules and regulations and will use an RSVP system on the website for tracking.

Reciprocity Letter status

Staff informed the Technical committee about the status of reciprocity letter from the TPB to the governors and mayor to collaboratively work together to have a reciprocity agreement regarding the enforcement of automated traffic citations. The TPB did not approve the letter to give extra time for additional edits to address concerns of the members. The letter will be brought back to the TPB at the December meeting.

The TPB members also asked if TPB staff could compile an inventory of each jurisdictions' automated traffic devices. This was able to be compiled and will be shared with the members. Staff did ask the technical committee members to look over the research and provide any updates or comments, as needed.

Ms. Sinner (VDOT) asked how potential edits will be considered for the reciprocity letter. Director Srikanth (TPB) noted that the staff plan for the letter will be reported at the steering committee meeting. The staff will follow advice of the chairman and vice chairman. Currently staff will propose to take the received comments from Virginia and Maryland and revise the letter to reflect those comments.

CAV Principles Update

Staff updated the Technical committee on the CAV principles where the draft form was presented at the November TPB meeting. The final version approval is estimated to be in January 2022.

Resiliency Study Update

Staff informed the Technical committee that the Resiliency memo and whitepaper will be posted on the Visualize 2045 website and on the COG website. Planning for next steps in resiliency will begin soon.

Project InfoTrak – Project Description Form reports and FY 2023 – 2026 TIP Update

Staff informed the Technical committee that collection of TIP data is beginning in January. Draft tables will be produced for the agencies next month. This data will be presented to the technical committee in February and March for review and be released for public review in March.

TLC – FY 2023

Staff informed the Technical committee that TLC Solicitation is opening mid-December. The application process is beginning earlier to allow more time for application review. TPB Approval is expected to be in April.

Certificate of Appreciation

Chair Groth recognized and presented a Certificate of Appreciation to Norman Whitaker (VDOT) for his time serving on TPB and COG committees.

10. ADJOURN

No other business was brought before the committee.

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT	
Mark Rawlings – DDOT Lezlie Rupert – DDOT Sama Brooks – DDOT Madeline Hairfield –DDOT Ravi Ganvir – DDOT Kristin Calkins – DCOP Jason Groth – Charles County Mark Mishler – Frederick County David Edmondson – City of Frederick Eric Graye – MNCPPC Steve Aldrich – MNCPPC Kari Snyder - MDOT Gary Erenrich – Montgomery County Victor Weissberg – Prince George’s County Jennifer Slesinger - Alexandria Dan Malouff – Arlington County	Malcolm Watson – Fairfax County Robert Brown – Loudoun County Chloe Delhomme – City of Manassas Sree Nampoothiri – NVTA Sophie Spiliotopoulos - NVTC Meagan Landis – Prince William County Norman Whitaker - VDOT Regina Moore – VDOT Amir Shahpar - VDOT Ciara Williams – VDRPT Christine Hoeffner – VRE Mark Phillips – WMATA
OTHERS / MWCOG STAFF PRESENT	
Anant Choudhary Andrew Austin Andrew Meese Bill Bacon Bryan Hayes Charlene Howard Dusan Vuksan Eric Randall Jane Posey Janie Nham John Swanson Jon Schermann	Kanti Srikanth Leo Pineda Lyn Erickson Mark Moran Nazneen Ferdous Nicole McCall Sarah Bond Sarah Bond Sergio Ritacco Stacy Cook Tim Canan Scott Kratz – Building Bridges Across the River