
**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
MEETING RECAP**

April 2, 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 MARCH 5, 2021 TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING RECAP

There were no questions or comments regarding the March Technical Committee meeting. The meeting recap were approved.

ITEMS FOR THE BOARD AGENDA

3. REGIONAL BIKE TO WORK DAY 2021 PROCLAMATION

Mr. Ramfos briefed the Committee about the status of the region's 2021 Bike To Work Day event. The event will be held on Friday, May 21st and is organized jointly between Commuter Connections and the Washington Area Bicyclist Association (WABA). There is also a Steering Committee with local volunteers from jurisdictions, employers, and bike enthusiasts that help support the implementation of the event. This year marks the 20th year of the event which began in 2001 with just 5 pit stops.

Due to the Coronavirus pandemic, this year's event will be a bit different than events in the past. Each pit stop will need to adhere to a strict COVID policy along with participants that register for the event. There will be no entertainment, speakers, or live raffles as the main objective is to get commuters on their bikes to the pit stops to pick up their T-shirts. There will be no food or beverages that would be consumed at the pit stops. However, some pit stops will be offering packaged goods in "grab-n-go" bags that can be taken along with giveaway items. Each pit stop will be required to have hand sanitizer stations and signage directing the participants in and out of the pit stop area as no lingering will be permitted. This year, COG/TPB staff worked with WABA and COG's legal team to develop a "Hold Harmless" clause that each registrant needs to read and agree to during the event registration process.

Mr. Ramfos also explained that COG/TPB staff had worked closely with WABA on best safety practices given that WABA has held many large successful biking events during the pandemic and also consulted with the three state funding agencies and the Bike To Work Day Steering Committee. There will be over 90 pit stops in the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia this year. Every jurisdiction in the region is represented.

Registration for the event opened in early March and to date there are over 1500 registrants. The messaging for this year's event will focus on workers getting needed exercise to assist with mental well-being in the wake of lockdowns due to the pandemic.

Mr. Ramfos reported that there are over two dozen sponsors of the event and nearly \$50,000 was raised to help with the event's costs. There will also be event T-shirts. A regional Proclamation will be presented during today's TPB Steering Committee. There will also be a recommendation at both the Steering Committee and the TPB for local jurisdictions to adopt a similar proclamation to help support the event.

4. CRRSAA APPLICATIONS RECEIVED AND TIMELINE FOR SELECTION AND TPB APPROVAL

Ms. Winchell-Mendy provided the committee with a brief overview of CRRSAA funding, eligibility criteria, selection criteria and the selection process. She then shared the types of applications received and from which jurisdictions, and the timeline for TPB and FTA approval of projects recommended for funding. Questions included concerns about the timing of FTA approval in light of the progress of vaccination and staff shared how FTA will allow for qualifying expenses to be retroactive to January 20, 2021.

5. FY 2022 TLC TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS

Referring to the posted material, Mr. Swanson said the selection panel for the Transportation Land Use Connections (TLC) Program met on March 29 and identified 11 projects that it recommended for funding. He said the program received 27 applications requesting a total of \$1,645,000. This was the most applications ever received for one round of funding. He said that \$600,000 was available this year, so there was considerable competition for funding. He described the selection process and briefly described each of the recommended projects.

Mr. Weissberg expressed disappointment that the application submitted by Prince George's Department of Transportation and Public Works was not selected. He said this project addressed most of the program's policy priorities.

Mr. Swanson reiterated that there was a lot of competition for funding this year. He said that staff would be available for debriefs regarding unsuccessful applications after the TPB had voted on the new projects at its meeting on April 21.

Mr. Brown asked if federal funding restrictions applied to TLC projects.

Mr. Srikanth noted that TLC projects are not grants, but rather the TPB is spending its regional planning funds to provide technical assistance to the projects. So federal grant restrictions do not apply.

6. VISUALIZE 2045 – BRIEFING ON PROJECT INPUTS AND DRAFT SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS FOR THE 2022 UPDATE TO VISUALIZE 2045 AND THE FY 2023-2026 TIP

TPB Transportation Planner, Ms. Cook previewed a draft presentation that will be presented to the board at its April meeting. She noted that there are two parts to Visualize 2045, TPB's long-range transportation plan, 1) the constrained element, which is subject to many constraints related to funding, timing, and requirements associated with the federally required air quality conformity analysis; 2) the 'rest' of the plan, which includes goals, discusses challenges, communicates public opinion (which we call Voices of the Region) and reports regional strategies developed through studies to help the TPB and its member agencies address its many policy priorities.

She provided an overview of the project development process for projects that are submitted for inclusion in the update to the constrained element and noted the significant challenges of developing transportation projects in the face of the many constraints (our current land use, transportation demand, funding and funding silos, competing needs), while working together to address critical concerns such as climate change and equity. Stacy reviewed past studies and which of the strategies recommended by those studies for implementation could be included in the constrained element. She highlighted recent and forecasted progress toward regional goals.

Mr. Austin noted that there are about twenty new projects, four of which he highlighted as "major change" projects. He shared details, including costs and scheduled completion dates, about the four major projects, which are: 1) additional bus lanes on H and I Streets NW in the District; 2) construction of a new 4-lane road in Loudoun County parallel to US 50; 3) modification to the proposed I-495 "Traffic Relief Plan" managed lanes from electronic toll lanes (ETSS) to high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes; and

4) modification to the proposed I-270 “Traffic Relief Plan” managed lanes from electronic toll lanes (ETSs) to high occupancy toll (HOT) lanes; He noted that the comment materials packet contains description sheets which include detailed information about all of the new projects.

Ms. Posey noted that the TPB will be asked to approve the air quality conformity scope of work along with the project inputs. She noted that the scope of work is included in the materials packet posted for comment. She reviewed the policy and technical assumptions that will be used in the conformity analysis. These assumptions are listed in a table in the scope and include new vehicle fleet data current to 2020, new network inputs, and new land activity reflecting Round 9.2 Cooperative Forecasts. Ms. Posey also showed a sample page of the air quality conformity inputs table and noted that the table, which lists all projects included in the highway and transit networks for the air quality conformity analysis, is included in the comment materials packet. She noted that highlighted cells in the table show changes since the 2020 Amendment to Visualize 2045.

Mr. Brown (Loudoun County) made some suggestions for clarifying the materials before the TPB meeting. He stated that it should be clear that the projects listed are only those that are going into the conformity analysis and not all projects in the plan. He expressed concern about the use of the word “prioritized” (slide 6), which suggested to him that submitted projects were prioritized in some way. He suggested that on slide 12 Step 2 it was not clear what “new inputs” the TPB was being asked to approve. He wanted it to be clear that the “major new project” (US 50 parallel) listed for Loudoun County is a Loudoun County proposed project, not a VDOT proposed project. Mr. Brown pointed out that the major projects map on page 7 of the comment materials packet has the Dulles Greenway erroneously shown as being an HOV facility [subsequent review of the map showed that the key colors were reversed—this has been fixed].

Ms. Cook added some responses in the chat: Bob, and all, responses to your questions, in brief, here, but I'm happy to follow up. 1. You are correct that the air quality conformity analysis is a subset of LRTP projects, for example illustrative studies are not shown in conformity tables 2) Slide 6, for prioritization, the word can be applied specifically - such as referring to the SMART SCALE program, or more generally as to how locals choose to select their projects, Prioritization and project selection does not happen at the TPB. Question 3 (slide 12) thank you for noting the reference to 'new' inputs in step 2. I will change that to 'all inputs' for the presentation to the board. Question 4, slide 23: We will update this slide to include Loudoun County, thank you for this comment. Question 5, we will revisit the map. We can make minor corrections to the packet and can post an errata sheet.

Ms. Sinner (VDOT) noted that with the transition to the new project database (Project InfoTrak – PIT) some historic projects had been erroneously pulled forward and listed as current projects, and while they had reviewed the project list, she suggested that there should be a disclaimer noting that there could be some small errors in the project listing. Mr. Austin responded that he hoped that most of those errors had been caught.

Ms. Slesinger (Alexandria) asked if there was an opportunity for the public to review and respond to the policy question information that is not yet available for the existing projects in the Plan. Mr. Srikanth noted that agencies have until April 30th to complete the policy question information for existing projects in the Plan. He indicated that the policy question information is completed and available for review for the new projects and the major changes in the Plan. He reminded the group that there are hundreds of projects that are already in the Plan and that there are three new questions for agencies to answer for those projects. He noted that the TPB will not approve the inputs until June, so that there is time for people to look at the project information.

Mr. Phillips (WMATA) thanked staff for all the work involved in putting the comment materials together. He asked when does the TPB have an informed ability to remove or add specific projects from the Plan. He noted that in June, when the TPB will be asked to approve the project list, there will be no VMT targets, no GHG analysis, and no conformity analysis results. Mr. Srikanth noted that the TPB members (or their staff or others from their jurisdictions) have already decided what projects from their

jurisdictions will be submitted to the LRTP, so that no projects should be a surprise. He reminded the group that the TPB members have been working since 2010 on climate change, and on mobility and accessibility, increasing transit, reducing single occupant vehicles—all of the various TPB policy priorities. He stated that the Board members are very well aware of what the TPB’s collective regional consensus priorities are. He also said that many studies that TPB has done since 2009 show what kind of actions are needed to “move the needle” on those priorities. For example, to increase ridesharing the TPB needs to promote vanpooling and carpooling. To reduce single occupant trips the TPB needs to promote transit ridership by perhaps adding BRT corridors, bring jobs and housing closer together, and promote teleworking. He noted that pricing strategies, including the introduction of many new miles of tolled lanes, have been added in the region. He emphasized that the TPB members have prioritized their projects and selected which to fund and include in the LRTP. Mr. Srikanth also noted that the TPB looks at the region as a whole, not at projects on an individual basis or a corridor basis. TPB staff hopes that TPB members over the years have considered these priorities as they develop their project priorities and asks that jurisdictions include information about projects in their project development documentation. Lastly, Mr. Srikanth suggested that no one project will hit all policy priorities.

Mr. Phillips asked a question in the chat: AQCA: How is the model treating telework? What assumptions are you making for the analysis years? Mark Moran responded: To Mark Phillips: Regarding how telework is treated in the TPB travel demand forecasting model: In the current model (Gen2/Ver. 2.3), we do not have an easy way to represent telecommuting. That is a typical shortcoming of aggregate, trip-based travel models, like the Gen2 Model. Presumably, nonetheless, telecommuting is represented in a low-level way in the data that was used to calibrate the model (the 2007/2008 COG Household Travel Survey). For the next-generation travel model, the Gen3 Model, it is planned to have telework model. However, the Gen3 Model is not scheduled to be completed until FY 23.

Mr. Erenrich (Montgomery County) asked in the chat: Please outline the technical review analysis process and whether a technical review panel will be used? Mr. Srikanth responded: Regarding the question of limited manner of representing Telecommuting in the region’s air quality model, this impact is that vehicular trips, VMT and related emissions may be slightly over estimated since those telecommuting trips are assumed to be on our roadways and transit. For the purpose of the air quality conformity analysis perspective, it is better to over-estimate emissions rather than underestimating the same.

Ms. Calkins (DC Office of Planning), asked how the process would work if there was a project that, as a regional body, the whole Board agreed was not working towards the TPB’s goals of reducing VMT or GHGs. Mr. Srikanth said that when a decision is made at the jurisdiction level, the local agency evaluates and decides to fund a project. At the Board each jurisdiction gets to hear about projects from other jurisdictions and how the projects meet priorities. The Board can decide if a project meets regional priorities and can decide to remove a project from the Plan. This (June) is the time for the TPB do that.

7. CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE TPB

Mr. Srikanth reflected on the TPB’s recent climate change discussions. Due to time constraints from a previous item, he noted that the March 17 board meeting’s *TPB Climate Change Mitigation Study* item was deferred to the April board meeting. The Technical Committee had received the presentation and report at their March meeting. This presentation went over the four large studies the TPB/COG has done examining the types of strategies, in transportation, that have been found to have the potential to reduce greenhouse gasses (GHGs).

The Climate Change Mitigation Study will build on the past work of these studies. It will be a detailed analysis sharing what outcome levels will need to be attained in order to reduce GHG emissions that reflect the region’s goals for 2030 and 2050. Mr. Srikanth noted that there are three broad categories of actions that will be used to reach these goals:

-
- Reducing VMT
 - Converting the fleet from fossil fuel to clean fuel
 - Improving traffic operations

An important use of the analysis will be identifying the levels of implementation for these categories at the regional and local level in their project planning and programming decisions. The Climate Change Mitigation Study will provide data driven, analysis-based information that can be used by the decision makers at all levels.

It is also noted that the TPB's Visualize 2045 Long-Range Plan reflects only those projects/programs/policies that, for federal purposes, must be reflected in the Plan document and in the TPB's air quality conformity model. A number of actions that local jurisdictions and state agencies could and are taking which contribute to GHG reductions is not explicitly reflected in the Plan including the development of Climate Action Plans. Lastly, Mr. Srikanth noted his hopes that the strategies of the past studies and results of the upcoming analysis will add specific levels of outcomes Climate Action Plans can include.

INFORMATION ITEMS

8. CLIMATE CHANGE MITIGATION STUDY OF 2021 – WORK PLAN

This item was presented by Mr. Grant, ICF, who spoke from a set of presentation slides, which had previously been uploaded to the Technical Committee webpage. His presentation covered the following topics:

- Introduction to ICF and the ICF staff who would be conducting the scenario study, a.k.a., Phase 2 of the TPB Climate Change Mitigation Study (CCMS) of 2021;
- Objectives of the CCMS;
- Planned technical approach and possible tools to use;
- Timeline; and
- Potential scenarios to be studied.

Mr. Erenrich (Montgomery County) asked whether a technical review panel will be used for this study. Mr. Erenrich said that he was interested in a thorough technical review, noting that, if this is going to be a successful study, we will need to have buy in. He volunteered to be on a technical review panel for the study. Mr. Phillips (WMATA) also volunteered to be on such a panel.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the consultant will be making regular briefings to the Technical Committee and the TPB over the nine months of the study. At various points during the project, the consultant will produce draft memos and/or reports for review and comment by the Technical Committee and the TPB. He also noted that there was no plan to create a subset of the Technical Committee or the TPB. Thus, anyone on these two committees would be able to provide review and comment.

Lastly, Mr. Phillips noted that he hopes the study will include a scenario whose goal is carbon neutrality by 2050 (not simply an 80% reduction in greenhouse gases by 2050, compared to 2005 levels, which is one of the goals in the Metropolitan Washington 2030 Climate and Energy Action Plan).

Mr. Grant said that, although the final list of scenarios has not yet been determined, a carbon-neutral scenario for 2050 is currently under consideration.

9. ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATE TO THE 2004 TPB/FAMPO AGREEMENT

Ms. Erickson reminded the committee that the TPB and the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) are two adjacent MPOs which have a special relationship as defined in the "2004

Agreement for Cooperatively Conducting the Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Programming Process in the Portion of the Metropolitan Washington Urbanized Area within the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's Boundaries" (2004 TPB/FAMPO MOU). Simply put, FAMPO and the TPB share the federally prescribed responsibilities for conducting the metropolitan transportation planning process for the Washington D.C. Urbanized area, with FAMPO responsible for the urbanized area portion of Stafford County.

The TPB's metropolitan transportation planning process was reviewed and certified by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in Spring of 2019. The FHWA and FTA have strongly recommended that the 2004 TPB/FAMPO MOU be updated by June 2020. Since 2019, FAMPO and TPB staff have been coordinating a draft update to the MOU. FAMPO approved a final draft on March 15, 2021. The TPB is being asked to review and approve the updated MOU that was approved by FAMPO at the TPB meeting on May 19. The agreement is administrative in nature and provides clearer and updated documentation for current practices and procedures that are already in place. Ms. Erickson then walked the committee through the changes/updates to the agreement found on page 3 of the memo.

10. 2019 AIR PASSENGER SURVEY: GEOGRAPHIC FINDINGS

This item was deferred.

11. MID-ATLANTIC ELECTRIFICATION PARTNERSHIP

This item was presented by Mr. Dorfman, Greater Washington Region Clean Cities Coalition Executive Director. His presentation covered the Mid-Atlantic Electrification Partnership, which is a U.S. Department of Energy funded project that will foster an electric vehicle (EV) ecosystem across Virginia, DC, Maryland and West Virginia. He noted that the project is being led by the Virginia Clean Cities Coalition and the Greater Washington Region Clean Cities Coalition. The three-year project will support inter- and intra-city trips for commercial and government entities, consumers fleets, airports and other passenger destinations, schools, trucks serving large distribution centers (ports), as well as workplace charging. The project will hold more than 25 educational events that will address planning and equity issues within frontline communities, deploy over 175 light-, medium- and heavy-duty EVs, and install over 375 charging stations across the designated area.

The Committee was asked to begin developing potential EV charging station locations that might meet the siting criteria. Ideas can be submitted to COG Staff or the Clean Cities Coalitions representatives.

OTHER ITEMS

12. OTHER BUSINESS

Street Smart

Staff briefed the technical committee on the spring Street Smart ad campaign. Testimonial walls will be returning at shopping malls and will allow for socially distant participation. Ads will be run from April 19 – May 16 to raise awareness of pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Vision Zero Workshop

Staff briefed the technical committee on Vision Zero Arterial Design workshop. Representatives will be present from NACTO that will talk about design guidelines for major arterial safety for pedestrians and bicyclists. Representatives from DC, VA, and MD as well as local representatives will also speak about their efforts in pedestrian and bicyclist safety at major arterials. The event will be held April 23 and no registration is required.

Regional Roadway Safety Program

Staff briefed the technical committee on the Regional Roadway Safety Program (RSP). Application period closed on March 22. Eleven applications were received totaling at \$700,000. It is possible that a third of these applications could be funded with the \$250,000 RSP funding. Projects recommendations are planned for late April. There will be a meeting in the future that will discuss the selection process.

TAP application opportunities

Staff briefed the technical committee on the TAP application opportunities. A reminder was given about the application periods. The DC application period began on March 31 and will be open until May 12. The Maryland application period is from April 1 to May 17. The Virginia pre-application process begins May 17 and closes July 1. The Virginia applications are due on October 1.

Transit within Reach

Staff briefed the technical committee on the Transit within Reach program. The proposal is being refined and the website is being updated. The scope of the program is being increased to include high capacity transit stations. Abstracts will be available May 2.

Visualize 2045 – (*new) inputs for ALL projects due April 30

Staff briefed the technical committee on the completion of the Visualize 2045 project inputs. A reminder e-mail will be sent. Also noted was a reminder to the committee that project submissions for the Tracking Progress effort is still taking place. An e-mail will also be sent with details about an April workshop.

Resiliency Study Update

Staff briefed the technical committee on the Resiliency Study progress. Interviews with all the DOTs have been scheduled and interviews with other members will be scheduled.

CAV webinar

Staff informed the technical committee that the scheduled March 25th CAV webinar and white paper release were postponed due to circumstances beyond TPB's control. The new date will be planned for some time in May and notices will be sent out when more information is available.

13. ADJOURN

No other business was brought before the committee.

ATTENDANCE

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT	
Mark Rawlings – DC DOT Kristin Calkins – DCOP Rogelio Flores – DCOP Jason Groth – Charles County Mark Mishler – Frederick County Gary Erenrich – Montgomery County Victor Weissberg – Prince George’s County Kari Snyder – MDOT Jen Slesinger – Alexandria Dan Malouff – Arlington County Malcolm Watson – Fairfax County Robert Brown – Loudoun County Chloe Delhomme – City of Manassas	Sree Nampoothiri – NVTA Dan Goldfarb – NVTC Meagan Landis – Prince William County Betsy Massie – PRTC Norman Whitaker – VDOT Maria Sinner – VDOT Regina Moore – VDOT Ciara Williams – VDRPT Laurel Hammig – NPS Christine Hoeffner – VRE Mark Phillips – WMATA
OTHERS / MWCOG STAFF PRESENT	
Kanti Srikanth Lyn Erickson Tim Canan Andrew Meese Mark Moran John Swanson Stacy Cook Karen Armendariz Sergio Ritacco Leo Pineda Anant Choudary Sarah Bond Andrew Austin Nazneen Ferdous	Nicole McCall Nicolas Ramfos Mike Farrell Lynn Winchell- Mendy Jessica Mirr Charlene Howard Arianna Koudounas Eric Randall Jane Posey Jon Schermann Jinchul Park Leah Boggs Ira Dorfman Michael Grant Jim Kuiper