

# TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes  
*for meeting of*

July 6, 2012

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - July 6, 2012**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                    Mark Rawlings  
                             Anthony Foster  
DCOP                    Dan Emerine

**MARYLAND**

Charles County        -----  
Frederick Co.         Ron Burns  
City of Frederick     Tim Davis  
Gaithersburg         -----  
Montgomery Co.      -----  
Prince George's Co. Abul Hassan  
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       Alexis Verzosa  
Fairfax Co.           Mike Lake  
Falls Church         -----  
Loudoun Co.          Robert Brown  
Manassas             -----  
Prince William Co. Monica Backmon  
NVTC                  Claire Gron  
PRTC                  Nick Alexandrow  
VRE                    -----  
VDOT                  Kanathur Srikanth  
VDRPT                -----  
NVPDC                -----  
VDOA                  -----

**WMATA**

WMATA                Mark Kellogg

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

FHWA-DC              -----  
FHWA-VA              -----  
FTA                    -----  
NCPD                   -----  
NPS                    -----  
MWAQC                -----

**COG Staff**

Ronald Kirby, DTP  
Gerald Miller, DTP  
Mark Pfoutz, DTP  
Jane Posey, DTP  
Robert Griffiths, DTP  
Rich Roisman, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
John Swanson, DTP  
Andrew Meese, DTP  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Deborah Bilek, DTP  
Karin Foster, DTP  
Dan Sonenklar, DTP  
William Bacon, DTP  
Johnathan Rogers, DTP  
Anant Choudhary, DTP  
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP  
Huijing Qiang, DTP  
Sunil Kumar, DEP  
Ryan Hand, DCPS

**Other Attendees**

Randy Carroll, MDE  
Girado Smith, Prince George's Co. DOT  
Bill Orleans, HACK

# TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

July 6, 2012

## Technical Committee Minutes

---

### 1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the June 1 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### 2. **Update on the Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP**

Ms. Posey stated that there were no changes to the summary conformity report since she presented it last month. She said that she presented the conformity results to the TPB and MWAQC in June. She noted that the public comment period started on June 14<sup>th</sup>, and that both the summary and full conformity reports were posted on the COG website. No comments have yet been received relating to the conformity analysis, but MWAQC is working on a comment letter.

Mr. Malouff asked when the public comment period ends. Mr. Austin said July 14<sup>th</sup>.

### 3. **Update on the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP**

Mr. Austin stated that the draft CLRP and TIP had been released for public comment at the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting on June 14, 2012. He added that approximately ten comments had been received to date, all supporting projects in the draft TIP. Chairman Rawlings asked when comments and technical corrections from agency staff were due. Mr. Austin said the comment period for the public and agency review would end on July 14.

### 4. **Briefing on Regional Car Free Day 2012**

Mr. Ramfos briefed the Committee on Car Free Day which will be held on Saturday, September 22<sup>nd</sup>. He gave background information on the world wide event that was initially held in 2007 in the District of Columbia. He also explained that the event began in Europe in the mid 1990's and went worldwide in 2000. Most European cities close down streets and set aside areas for pedestrians, bicyclists and public transit that is usually used by cars. This all occurs during mobility week. Car Free Day is celebrated in 1,500 cities in 40 countries.

Mr. Ramfos stated that Car Free Day was rolled out regionally in 2008 with TPB support. The event is coordinated through the Commuter Connections network and COG/TPB staff supports local jurisdictions and organizations looking to

promote the event. The purpose of the program is to invite citizens in the region to try alternative forms of transportation such as transit, bicycling and walking for any trip they make that day. The event is also geared towards a “car-lite” theme whereby event participants can pledge to use carpools, vanpools, transit or telework.

The web site developed for the event can be accessed at [www.carfreemetrodcd.org](http://www.carfreemetrodcd.org). Web site visitors will be able to pledge to go car free and Mr. Ramfos explained that the primary target market for the event are individuals who ordinarily drive alone by car for errands, leisure activities, classes, or weekend workers since the event will be held on a Saturday this year. Secondary groups include those already in car free travel modes.

Mr. Ramfos then reviewed the web site and the pledge form for Car Free Day. He also described the marketing and advertising materials that would be used for the 2012 event. He stated that staff was still working on the particulars for the creative messaging given that the event would be held on a weekend. The message would be geared towards using transit if it is available, bicycling, walking, or carpooling for non-work trip activities. He then discussed the social media strategy for the event through the use of FaceBook and Twitter. He also stated that DDOT had been working with the National Park Service to close some streets on Car Free Day in Ft. DuPont Park as part of the “Feet in the Street” celebrations. Mr. Ramfos stated that Montgomery County was also working on street closures associated with Farmer’s Market events being held in Bethesda. The hope was that perhaps some additional jurisdictions would close streets as part of the event.

A proclamation will be presented to the TPB for review and signature this month and members will be asked to pledge and provide information on their activities for the event through a COG Podcast and social media outlets.

There was a question regarding concern with the transit system adding additional capacity to accommodate those interested in using public transportation on Car Free Day. Mr. Ramfos responded that it was highly unlikely that this would happen given the added costs for service on the weekends.

There was also discussion of promoting the use of alternatives on a Saturday can translate to using the same alternative modes during the week for work trips. Mr. Ramfos stated that the messaging plans to address this issue through advertising and marketing channels. The goal for Car Free Day is to encourage individuals to try something different for any trip they make by either going car free or “car-lite.”

Mr. Kirby thought it would be good to include a message for those who could not go car free or car-lite to combine errands. Mr. Ramfos stated that the message would be added into the marketing strategy.

There was also discussion on whether or not European cities would be holding the event on a Saturday. Mr. Ramfos stated that the event is held on the same calendar date each year and this year it happens to fall on a Saturday. Most cities will be celebrating the event on Saturday the 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Chairman Rawlings asked what the pledge goal was for Car Free Day. Mr. Ramfos stated that the goal for 2012 is to obtain 10,000 pledges.

**5. Briefing on Proposed Recipients Under the FY 2013 Transportation/Land Use Connection (TLC) Program.**

Ms. Bilek, referring to a PowerPoint presentation and to a memo which was circulated, presented an overview of the TLC Program, including the Regional Peer Exchange Network, which was introduced in FY2012, and the Design Pilot Program, which is being introduced for the FY2013 cycle. She summarized the projects that the selection panel recommended for funding for FY2013.

Ms. Erickson noted that MDOT had a chance to review the Maryland projects, and agreed with the selection panel's recommendations. She added that she is looking forward to the slate of recommended projects.

**6. Update on the Development of the TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)**

Mr. Kirby spoke to a PowerPoint. The RTPP aims to identify 10 to 15 regional strategies that offer the greatest potential for addressing regional challenges. He reviewed the schedule for developing the RTPP followed by the public outreach activities already conducted and planned. Feedback from the public outreach activities have led to further refinement of materials including: 1) more concise goal language; 2) expanding the list of challenges; and 3) more comprehensive strategies. Additional near-term, ongoing, and long-term strategies were proposed. The long-term strategies will build off of existing TPB work in multi-modal and land-use scenarios. Public outreach in the fall aims to reach a 600 person sample of regional stakeholders. Participants will be asked for their feedback on the strategies. The fall event will inform a future public outreach event in spring 2013. The goal of these public outreach efforts is to identify widely understood priority strategies and garner broad-based public support.

Mr. Brown asked about how funding mechanisms will be reflected in the strawman list of challenges and strategies. Mr. Kirby replied that funding will be elaborated on when the strategies are fleshed out. Some strategies, such as the long-term scenarios or the expansion of bikeshare, already have funding mechanisms built in.

Mr. Srikanth asked if funding mechanisms will be provided for near-term and ongoing strategies? Mr. Kirby answered yes.

Ms. Bockman expressed concern about the focus on Metrorail. Mr. Kirby noted that TPB staff should broaden some strategies to include commuter rail.

Mr. Emerine asked if the Committee members could submit wording changes? Mr. Kirby replied that the comment period is open thru August 15<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Emerine was also interested if TPB staff will use any of the WMATA scenario work. Mr. Kellogg noted he was happy to speak with TPB staff on their scenario work. Mr. Kirby added that TPB staff could consider additional scenarios, however, noted that scenarios take a long-time to execute and TPB staff has a limited amount of time in advance of the fall outreach activity.

Mr. Verzosa asked how long the long-term strategies are. Mr. Kirby replied that the horizon year is 2040 to parallel the CLRP. Mr. Verzosa added that the June 2 forum results skew towards bike/ped/transit. Mr. Kirby replied that the group was representative of the region, for example, the group had trouble understanding bikesharing.

Mr. Srikanth noted that congestion differs based on local (disaggregated) representation versus regional totals. This may explain why the strategies, which are general and regional in nature, skew more towards bike/ped/transit and less toward road improvements.

Mr. Verzosa added that citizens appear to be well-educated on transportation issues. Mr. Kirby replied that TPB staff got a lot of good feedback. We hope to get similar feedback from the fall outreach event.

Mr. Malouff expressed concern that Metro core capacity doesn't have its own specific challenge. Mr. Kirby noted the point and noted the TPB staff would consider changing some of the existing challenge language. Mr. Srikanth noted that core capacity was included under the current challenges for Goal 1.

Mr. Kellogg noted that he was impressed with the outcome of the June 2 forum. The transparency and trust concerns that were expressed are important for WMATA and the DOTs to consider. Mr. Kirby noted that TPB staff was impressed by the insightful and informed participant comments. The RTPP process has a lot to gain by getting strong public support.

## **7. Briefing on the Process for Revising the Designation of the COG Regional Activity Centers**

Mr. Hand briefed the Committee on the COG update of the Activity Centers. He explained that the new Activity Centers will be better aligned with local planning and Region Forward to maximize their value. These centers will represent smaller areas than current Regional Activity Centers and they will be more focused on the region's transportation system. The update process is taking place in three steps. The first step updated how activity centers were selected based on stakeholder input. Second, the locations and analysis system for Activity Centers will be determined through collaboration with the Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee. Third, the new Activity

Centers will be implemented resulting in several products starting with a strategic investment typology.

Mr. Kirby asked for clarification on the relationship of the new Activity Centers to the current ones. Mr. Hand responded that 67 percent of new Activity Centers are located within the Current Regional Activity Centers and the majority of centers outside of the existing centers are special attractors such as Fort Belvoir. *(Correction 60 percent of new Activity Centers are located within the Current Regional Activity Centers).*

Mr. Kellogg asked about the mixed use character of the new activity centers compared to the current Regional Activity Centers. Mr. Hand responded that the vast majority of new Activity Centers are either vertical or horizontal mixed use and that the centers that are not mixed use are generally special cases such as the National Institutes of Health. Mr. Hand also noted that a direct comparison to current Regional Activity Centers was not possible because of fundamental differences in their purpose but, that approximately a dozen of the fifty nine current Regional Activity Centers were classified as mixed use.

#### **8. Briefing on Sensitivity Analysis Comparing Mobile Emissions Estimates Using the MOBILE 6.2 and MOVES Models**

Mr. Kirby explained that he 2012 CLRP Air Quality Conformity Determination package is scheduled to be presented to the TPB for approval in July, a series of sensitivity tests were recently conducted based on the 2012 CLRP. They aimed to measure the relative emissions differences for milestone years 2020 and 2040 of the 2012 CLRP when two input variables change: the regional vehicle fleet population and the emissions estimating model. With respect to the regional vehicle fleet population changes two consecutive Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) databases were tested: 2011 VIN versus 2008 VIN while all other input categories remained unchanged. With respect to emissions estimating model changes two models were tested: MOVES2010a versus MOBILE6.2 while all other input categories remained unchanged.

Ms. Constantine presented the findings of the tests, which revealed that emissions increases in the order of 11-13 percent across all pollutants were estimated for year 2020 as the result of the ageing of the regional vehicle fleet between 2008 and 2011. The corresponding increases for year 2040 -- the last year of the 2012 CLRP -- were estimated to be in the order of 5-8 percent as vehicle technologies will be fully integrated in the regional fleet by then. As the end of the MOVES grace period is fast approaching, a comparison between emissions estimates derived using Mobile6.2 and MOVES2010a was conducted in order to contextualize the issue of upcoming Air Quality Conformity Determinations to be conducted using MOVES while emissions budgets were set using Mobile6.2 and noncurrent input data. The tests revealed that emissions derived using MOVES2010a are substantially higher than what they would have been using Mobile6.2: the estimated increases for

year 2020 ranged from 16 percent to 100 percent depending on the pollutant while the corresponding values for year 2040 ranged from 14 percent to 100 percent.

Mr. Kirby emphasized the lack of a requirement in the Air Quality Conformity Rule mandating that SIPs be updated every time there are significant changes in Air Quality Conformity Determination inputs such as vehicle fleet composition and emissions estimating models. He noted that with the dramatic emissions increases that are estimated from these sensitivity tests there is an inherent risk of not meeting Air Quality Conformity in the near future. It is an issue that affects numerous MPOs nationwide in addition to TPB and as a result AMPO took a formal position on this issue by urging EPA to adopt a procedural change to address this discrepancy. He also mentioned that he will present this information to a USDOT/EPA Air Quality Conference in early August.

Ms. Backmon asked if there are other MPOs in this same predicament. Mr. Kirby replied that after speaking with a staff person at AMPO, there are about 50% of the states and MPOs that routinely update SIPs including Virginia but not Maryland.

Mr. Srikanth noted that Baltimore recently updated the vehicle registration data and observed a comparable increase in the estimated emissions (in the order of 18 to 19 percent).

Mr. Kirby commented that TPB staff would like to be proactive with this issue thus preventing a potential Air Quality Conformity lapse as SIPs undergo revisions, which may take a while.

Mr. Srikanth commented that in the Commonwealth of Virginia safety margins are commonplace as EPA has already approved safety margins in a few non attainment areas. Furthermore, safety margins are also used extensively elsewhere in the country. The Conformity Rule clearly allows safety margins although they have not been used in the Washington region. Use of safety margins would need to be agreed by Maryland, DC and Virginia.

Ms. Backmon asked what would be the conditions if EPA would write it as a requirement. Mr. Srikanth replied that it would help. Mr. Kirby added if there is such a requirement, then the TPB would be able to conduct Air Quality Conformity determinations with the emissions model and input assumptions that are reflected in the SIP that established the prevailing budgets.

Ms. Constantine's final comment pertained to the magnitude of safety margins since the issue has been a focal point of on-going discussions among the air agencies: the size of the safety margins is equally important as the inclusion of safety margins in a SIP. The sensitivity tests have shown the order of magnitude of the safety margins needed to address perpetual VIN changes and modest



emissions model changes. Insufficient safety margins would defeat the purpose of including them in a SIP. Mr. Kirby added that the safety margins that TPB proposed are adequate to accommodate VIN changes and modest changes in the MOVES model. However, for drastic emissions model changes such as from MOBILE6.2 to MOVES, the only feasible solution would be to promptly update the SIPs. MWAQC has the ability to update SIPs.

#### **9. Briefing on Regional Transportation Safety Information**

Mr. Davis, chair of the Transportation Safety Subcommittee, introduced the subcommittee and its activities to the Committee members. He noted that the transportation safety subcommittee met twice this year, on March 16 and June 27. Mr. Davis then introduced Mr. Huijing Qiang.

Mr. Qiang presented the Regional Transportation Safety Picture. He explained that the Transportation Safety Subcommittee coordinates with the three State Strategic Highway Safety Plans, advises the maintenance of the Safety Element of the Constrained Long-Range Plan, and serves as a forum to exchange information on best practices in transportation safety planning. He briefed the Committee on the safety element of the CLRP as well as the coordination between safety subcommittee and other subcommittees. The briefing also included the latest available regional transportation safety information, which includes various fatality numbers, rates, and trends for each safety emphasis area for which regional data is available.

Mr. Holloman asked, if the safety data analysis covers those crashes which are caused by cell phone-related contributing factors. Mr. Meese responded that while cell phone-related crashes are generally categorized under impaired/distracted driving crashes, there are currently no further breakdowns or analyses specific to this cause of crashes in the data collection methods used by police or other field personnel.

#### **10. Briefing on the Multimodal Coordination for Bus Priority Hot Spots Study**

Mr. Randall presented an overview of the results of this study, jointly funded by the FY 2012 UPWP Technical Assistance programs of DDOT, MDOT, VDOT and WMATA. He reviewed the key study objective of the study: to identify a set of implementable bus priority improvements across the region. The study built on previous work by the TPB and WMATA, updated and expanded to use data from bus operators across the region. To ensure regional input, the study was coordinated through the TPB's Management, Operations and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Technical Subcommittee and the TPB's Regional Bus Subcommittee (RBS). Mr. Meese added that the joint involvement of traffic engineers and transit specialists in the study, both as agency participants and within the consulting team, added considerable value to the study process and results.

Three primary tasks were conducted by the consulting team: 1) Development of the Regional Top 15 “Hot Spot” Lists, b) Field Verification of Data, and c) Hot Spot Bus Treatment Preliminary Design. Mr. Randall described the process and critical factors in each primary task. The top 10 hot spots in each major jurisdiction were displayed, and the field verification process described. For the last task of preliminary design, he displayed examples from the proposed locations on North Capitol Street, D.C. Bus priority treatment capital costs were discussed, which could be mitigated if construction was integrated with other work. In addition, the impact on other vehicles is small; however, the improvements also had relatively modest operating costs savings for bus operations. Mr. Randall then spoke to further use of the study, which provides an actionable list of hot spot locations for bus priority improvements.

Mr. Kirby asked how such projects get funded and built in each jurisdiction. Mr. Randall responded that each agency and jurisdiction has a different process and source of funds. Some projects will be implemented through the bus corridor studies being completed by, for instance, WMATA and DDOT working together. Some projects will be funded through means such as the TPB’s TIGER Grant. However, it is a multimodal challenge for agencies to agree on bus priority measures as a priority for implementation.

Ms. Erickson spoke to add emphasis to the point that these multi-modal projects are extremely complicated; otherwise, agencies would be executing them already. These types of projects are not regional and are not included in the TPB’s TIP, but MDOT and SHA do have some funds that are allocated to these types of projects. She sees the actionable list of hot spots being used by SHA and the counties to identify and propose bus priority improvements to be funded.

Mr. Verzosa questioned the twenty year basis for operating cost savings. Mr. Randall responded that these are capital projects, and that typically a long pay-off period is considered to justify the investment in infrastructure versus the operational cost savings that could be achieved over time.

Mr. Orleans inquired as to why larger projects were not considered for the study, given their likely higher benefits. Mr. Randall responded that the scope and the cost of studying large projects were not feasible within the constraints of the study. For instance, roughly one-third of the Virginia hot spots are in and around the Pentagon to Crystal City area. However, designing and analyzing a major bus priority measure, for instance a flyover ramp between I-395 and the Pentagon, was not feasible within the course of this study. Instead, the focus was on hot spot locations where relatively modest bus priority measures could be implemented in the near-term.

Mr. Lewis asked when the final report would be available. Mr. Randall answered that the final deliverable for the study was just delivered Tuesday night. However, the deliverables from earlier in the project are available at the links in the memorandum mailed out to the Committee, including the draft report for the

final task, which has almost all the information. Over the course of July, TPB staff will make any needed final edits and will also respond to agency comments. The study report as a whole should be fully available by the end of the month.

**11. Briefing on the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) Study of Activity-Based Travel Modeling Experiences**

Mr. Milone briefed the Committee on a recently completed study of MPO experiences with activity-based travel models (ABMs). ABMs have emerged from research as the next generation of travel demand models and are now being implemented by some MPOs as a replacement to their trip based models (TBMs). The study was established to provide the MPO community with greater insight on the demonstrated costs and benefits associated with the use of ABMs relative to TBMs. TPB staff is not currently developing an ABM, but is interested in understanding the experiences of early adopters of the technology. Mr. Milone presented details of the study design, described how ABMs conceptually compare with TBMs, and reviewed some of the key findings of the study.

Mr. Milone said that TPB staff believes the study has yielded valuable findings regarding ABM implementations and applications. The findings should be useful to any MPO that is interested in implementing an ABM. At the present time, TPB staff does not plan on moving forward with developing an ABM. Instead, staff feels that available resources should be allocated among data collection efforts (such as the recent geographically focused Household Travel Survey effort) and the enhancement of the existing trip based travel model (the Version 2.3 Travel Model). Staff also feels that the interest and consent of the existing stakeholders of the region will need to be secured before developing an ABM for the Washington region. TPB staff will, nonetheless, continue to monitor the experiences of other MPOs using ABMs over the next few years.

**12. Other Business**

None.

**13. Adjourn**