

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes
For meeting of
September 7, 2012

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - September 7, 2012**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT	Mark Rawlings
	Anthony Foster
	Jameshia Peterson
DCOP	Dan Emerine

FEDERAL/OTHER

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

MARYLAND

Charles County	-----
Frederick Co.	Ron Burns
	Carrie Anderson-Watters
City of Frederick	Tim Davis
Gaithersburg	-----
Montgomery Co.	-----
Prince George's Co.	Daniel Dornan
Rockville	-----
M-NCPPC	
Montgomery Co.	Gary Erenrich
Prince George's Co.	Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT	Lyn Erickson
MTA	Rick Kiegel
Takoma Park	-----

COG Staff

Ronald Kirby, DTP
 Gerald Miller, DTP
 Mark Pfoutz, DTP
 Nicholas Ramfos, 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
 Feng Xie, DTP
 Karin Foster, DTP
 Yu Gao, DTP
 William Bacon, DTP
 Johnathan Rogers, DTP
 Jinchul Park, DTP
 Wenjing Pu, DTP
 Dusan Vuksan, DTP
 Joan Rohlf, DEP
 Sunil Kumar, DEP
 Paul DesJardin, DCPS
 Sophie Mintier, DCPS

VIRGINIA

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

Other Attendees

Randy Carroll, MDE
 Rick Rybeck, Just Economics LLC
 Bill Orleans, HACK

WMATA

WMATA	Mark Kellogg
	Jonathan Parker

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

September 7, 2012

Technical Committee Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the July 6 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on the Process for Revising the Designation of the COG Regional Activity Centers

Ms. Mintier briefed the Technical Committee on the update to Activity Centers. The updated Activity Centers were identified using a menu of attributes that included local planning policy, population and employment density, intersection density, transit capacity, land use mix, and housing and transportation affordability. The main changes and outcomes resulting from the 2012 update are:

- 1) Activity Centers are better aligned with local planning;
- 2) Centers are now identified in every COG jurisdiction;
- 3) There are more Activity Centers and they are smaller (now 136 centers, compared with 59 centers previously identified); and
- 4) Centers are more aligned with the region's current and planned transit network (approximately 70% of centers currently have transit, or will be served by transit by 2040).

The proposed Activity Centers were approved by the Planning Directors in July. During September and October, COG staff will continue working with technical staff from each jurisdiction to develop technical boundaries for the Activity Centers (according to TAZs, Census tracts, and Census block groups), and will present the Activity Centers to working session of the boards/councils of each COG jurisdiction. COG staff will present the Activity Centers to the COG Board for final approval at their November meetings.

Mr. Milone asked for clarification on whether the technical boundaries would align with the present TAZs. Mr. DesJardin responded that technical boundaries would be developed for the 3722 zones, as well as for Census tracts and Census block groups.

Mr. Erenrich asked why aren't all of the proposed Purple Line stations included as centers, and how formal the update process for the Activity Centers is expected to be. Ms. Mintier responded that centers that don't currently qualify as centers according to the established criteria but that may be close to qualifying will be put on a watch list, and accepted on a rolling or yearly basis as they qualify. Mr. DesJardin explained that new centers could be added as policy changes occur.

Mr. Srikanth asked about the status of the Activity Center technical boundaries and whether these would need to be approved by the TPB. Ms. Mintier responded that COG staff is working with technical staff from each COG jurisdiction to develop the technical boundaries, and they would not be submitted to the COG Board or TPB for approval. She reported that COG staff has developed technical boundaries for most of the jurisdictions so far.

Mr. Parker asked how the selection attribute of 55 intersections per square mile was developed. Ms. Mintier explained that the attribute came from a LEED-ND (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Neighborhood Development) prerequisite, but was adjusted to from 90 to 55 intersections per square mile to capture highly urban centers and traditional towns. The attribute is used in this process as a proxy for walkability. Mr. Parker noted that 55 intersections per square mile is a low bar.

Mr. Erenrich said that significant Metro stations in Montgomery County, such as Grosvenor, were not included as Activity Centers, and that COG staff didn't include local transportation staff in the process of identifying centers. Ms. Mintier responded that that because the process is grounded in local plans, places that are not identified locally as priority growth areas or centers were not included as Activity Centers, but could be identified as such based on changes to the local comprehensive plan. (*Correction: Grosvenor is one of the Activity Centers.*)

Chairman Rawlings asked who the local contact person was for the District. Ms. Mintier responded that Ms. Hughey from DC Office of Planning was the main contact person for the process.

Ms. Backmann asked whether there was a one-to-one relationship between locally-identified centers and Activity Centers, and asked when COG staff would be meeting with the Prince William Board of County Supervisors. Ms. Mintier explained that identification as a priority growth area or center in a locally-adopted plan was one prerequisite of the Activity Centers process, but that not all locally-identified places qualified as Activity Centers. Mr. DesJardin said that the meeting schedule for local board and councils would be shared with the Committee.

Mr. Kirby summarized the key changes between past and current Activity Centers: they started large and are now smaller; they are more connected to the regional transportation network; they are intended to be walkable; and they've gotten more buy-in from local jurisdictions. He noted that investment in Activity Centers is a main focus of Economy Forward, the regional economic development report that staff will be presenting to the COG Board and then the TPB at their September meeting.

Mr. Dornan said that Activity Centers should be looked at in terms of long-term growth, regional competition, and prioritization of resources. He said that less-developed, emerging centers should not be disadvantaged, and that sometimes private development needs to catch up with the public interest. Mr. Kirby noted the difference between the descriptive role of Activity Centers in the past and the more prescriptive role now.

Mr. Mokhtari said there was a need to identify critical elements of Activity Centers. Ms. Mintier said that Activity Centers are not intended to be the same, but that all places regardless of current conditions can make certain investments to strengthen and improve the quality of the place.

3. Briefing on an Additional Air Quality Conformity Analysis to Respond to the EPA Redesignation of the Washington Region under the 2008 Ozone national Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)

Ms. Constantine started the briefing by stating that the metropolitan Washington region has been designated as a marginal non-attainment area by EPA effective on July 20, 2012 in the aftermath of the recent 2008 Ozone NAAQS final ruling. This designation sets 2015 as an attainment year, which requires the inclusion of year 2015 among the milestone years of the Air Quality Conformity Determination of the 2012 CLRP/FY2013-18 TIP. This work would need to be completed within 12 months of the effective date of the designation (i.e., by July 20, 2013). In order to alleviate any possibility of an air quality conformity lapse, this supplemental work will start immediately. Ms. Constantine continued by giving an overview of the key parameters that were included in the Air Quality Conformity Determination of the 2012 CLRP/FY2013-18 TIP while emphasizing that all technical assumptions remain the same as in the original air quality determination.

Mr. Erenrich asked whether the MOVES model is used for the analysis. Ms. Constantine replied that the emission model will still use MOBILE6 and the other input assumptions will remain unchanged. Using the published scope and schedule as a reference, Ms. Constantine introduced the schedule for this supplemental work.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the big difference of this analysis is the 2015 network development, which is time consuming. Ms. Constantine affirmed that staff has started work on coding the 2015 networks and subsequently the travel demand model and emission model runs will be executed in order to generate emissions inventories for the same criteria pollutants as the original analyses.

Mr. Erenrich asked whether additional project information is needed from local government agencies for 2015 network development. Ms. Constantine replied since this analysis is part of original 2012 CLRP/FY2013-18 TIP Air Quality Conformity Determination, which was approved by the TPB in July 2012, all modeling assumptions remain the same for consistency and no additional information is needed.

Ms. Constantine's concluded the presentation with the final comment that the additional work was necessitated by the EPA final ruling effective July 20, 2012, just two days after the Air Quality Determination of the 2012CLRP/FY2013-18 TIP was approved by the TPB. Mr. Kirby reiterated that the 2015 attainment year is new because of the designation of marginal attainment area.

4. Briefing on the Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2013 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP

Mr. Austin summarized the changes to the Call for Projects document since last year's version including updated references to MAP-21, the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, and air quality conformity requirements. He noted that since the TIP had moved to a two-year cycle, that this was an "off" year, so any changes would be made as amendments to the existing FY 2013-2018 TIP. Mr. Austin covered the schedule for the CLRP approval, noting the deadline date for project inputs for conformity analysis was December 14, 2012, and that the TPB was schedule to approve the final CLRP, any TIP amendments and the Conformity Assessment at their meeting on July 17, 2013.

A revised TIP project description form was distributed. Mr. Austin noted that the revised form asked for data points on the Complete Streets policy that the TPB had approved earlier in the year. He noted that while a new TIP document was not going to be produced, it would be advantageous to begin collecting data on any new projects now.

Mr. Austin also discussed the Future Year Transit Assumptions for the CLRP document that had been prepared by Ms. Posey. He asked committee members to review the information on routes, transit stops and headways, and to contact Ms. Posey with any updates or information on new projects.

Mr. Austin concluded by offering to set up accounts for and train any new personnel from member agencies on the CLRP and TIP database.

Mr. Erenrich asked if all TIP projects needed to be updated with Complete Streets information during this cycle. Mr. Austin replied that it was not necessary since there wouldn't be any documentation on that until the production of the FY 2015-2020 TIP, but also noted that agencies may want to take advantage of the extra time to get started this year.

5. Briefing on Establishing a TPB Bus on Shoulder Task Force

Mr. Kirby spoke to a memorandum for a proposed task force and work plan for an assessment of the Bus On Shoulder (BOS) feasibility in the region. The memo reviewed the July TPB request to establish a task force, proposed the chairs and agency membership of the task force, reviewed local and national experience with BOS, and the laid out a work plan and schedule for the assessment. He emphasized that participation by the bus operators is requested, as well as the highway agencies and jurisdictions.

Mr. Erenrich asked if participation by elected representatives is anticipated, or by technical staff. Mr. Kirby responded that both should participate. Elected officials need good data on which to base their decisions.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if BOS was for public transportation only, or if tour buses and school buses could use BOS. Mr. Kirby responded that only public transportation buses could use the shoulders.

Mr. Srikanth then spoke to VDOT's ongoing assessment of the feasibility of BOS on I-66. Preparatory work has been done through TPB staff and consultants, and VDOT is now seeking to involve the local jurisdictions in a working group. VDOT plans to conduct a quantitative benefit-cost analysis to evaluate options and the potential benefits for bus reliability and bus riders. He also noted the effort of conducting such an analysis, while the TPB assessment will necessarily be at a conceptual level. However, the I-66 work could be used as a model for the region. Mr. Kirby added that the recent Transit Cooperative Research Project report on Bus On Shoulders, report 151, noted that there was no definitive benefit-cost analysis for the effectiveness of BOS. The I-66 analysis should provide a local example of such, which can further inform the task force's work.

Mr. Srikanth in turn added that any BOS proposal has to be approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), for a design exception to the national codes. He suggested that the TPB assessment should consider federal requirements and enabling state legislation, as well as local regulations.

Mr. Dornan noted that Prince George's County would be interested in assessing the potential for BOS during along US-50 to the Beltway (I-495), during the morning peak. However, safety is a paramount issue, as well as enforcement to ensure only buses use any dedicated shoulders.

Mr. Kiegel noted that MTA commuter buses into the city are occasionally two seat rides, with some riders alighting at the outer Metro stations, such as Shady Grove and Greenbelt, while other customers want to board for the ultimate downtown destinations. A BOS assessment should consider ridership patterns like this, especially Frederick to DC. Mr. Kirby responded that the task force will have three meetings and

that the products will necessarily be fairly high-level. Mr. Kiegel agreed, but suggested that development of a pilot program for BOS implementation might be a good objective to consider. He also asked if having a separate technical group would be useful? Mr. Kirby responded that the elected officials need to hear about the technical issues of implementing BOS and that such issues will determine the feasibility of BOS.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the BOS assessment would be tied to regional challenges, such as access into activity centers. Chairman Rawlings added that the outcomes of the task force need to be discussed and agreed upon; will the outcomes be high-level analysis or specific recommendations for locations? Mr. Kirby responded that the Board directed the task force be formed, and they will have to decide what the outcomes will be. Mr. Lake followed up by asking if there would be formal invitations to agencies to be a member of the task force; Mr. Kirby said such would follow the discussion at the TPB meeting. Mr. Kirby concluded discussion by suggesting that agencies should be prepared to bring both highway and transit staff to the task force meetings, in order to provide comprehensive input.

6. Briefing on the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) Report: “Economy Forward-COG’s Call to Action for a More Competitive Metropolitan Washington”

Mr. Robertson, Executive Director of COG introduced the report and provided background on why the COG Board of Directors called for its development. He pointed out the report identifies five priorities for growth, including transportation investment, that the region needs to focus on to help drive local economic growth and competitiveness. He said that TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan is cited in the call for action section of the report, and that Mr. Turner as Chair of the TPB would describe the development of the priorities plan to the COG Board meeting at its September 12th meeting. He said that COG Board Chair, Mr. Principi, would then present the report to the TPB at its September 19th meeting.

Ms. Hange, COG staff, briefed the Committee on the report with a Power Point presentation that highlighted the region’s competitive advantages, priorities for growth and proposed action plan.

7. Briefing on Updated Safety Margins for Mobile Emissions Budgets for the 2012 PM2.5 Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan

Mr. Kirby started his presentation by providing a contextual background on the status of the on-going discussions among state transportation and air agencies with respect to safety margins for MOBILE emissions budgets. He referred to the March 21, 2012 meeting when the TPB approved a letter to MWAQC recommending the inclusion of safety margins of 20 percent for the milestone year 2017 and 30 percent for the

milestone year 2025. He justified the need for inclusion of safety margins on inherent uncertainties in modeling of emissions inventories that are attributed to the age of future year regional vehicle fleet and emissions estimating models.

Mr. Kirby then provided an update on the current status of discussions among the members of the Mobile Emissions Task Force. Upon further in-house sensitivity tests – subsequent to March 21, 2012 – it was concluded that 20 percent safety margins for both 2017 and 2025 would be acceptable and such revised margins were proposed on a June 1, 2012 letter. The proposal was accepted by the Task Force.

Mr. Kirby pointed out that according to a recent Consumer Reports article titled “Make your car last 200,000 miles”, the recently observed aging of the regional vehicle fleet may continue as it is not the result of the current economic recession. It is also due to the fact that newer vehicles are more durable and last longer. In these conditions, the proposed safety margins will ensure that Air Quality Conformity can be met despite the continuing ageing of the regional vehicle fleet. Mr. Kirby also noted that EPA and FHWA officials recently acknowledged in discussions that he had with them during the 2012 NTAQS Conference that the use of safety margins is common practice elsewhere in the nation in Maintenance Plans.

Mr. Kirby provided a briefing on the provisions of new transportation bill -- MAP-21 -- which becomes effective October 1, 2012. There are seven areas of emphasis in the new bill, which will require additional work at the MPO level as performance measures will be established by USDOT and MPOs will be called to set relevant performance targets. In the sphere of Air Quality conformity, additional planning activities may be initiated to demonstrate regional efforts to mitigate mobile emissions and congestion. The MPOs will be called to develop performance plan(s) and to update them biennially.

Mr. Emerine asked for a clarification on the performance targets described in section 150(d). Mr. Kirby replied that MAP-21 introduced a performance based approach to supporting seven national goals: safety, infrastructure condition, congestion reduction, system reliability, freight movement, environmental sustainability, and reduced project delivery delays. The secretary of transportation is tasked with establishing measures for each of those goals. And the states and MPOs have to establish targets for those measures.

Chairman Rawlings asked whether the secretary will set performance measures with the existing data. Mr. Kirby replied that secretary has to consult with state and MPOs in developing these measures. He also noted from the MPO perspective establishing performance measures that are quantifiable using readily available data would be highly desirable.

8. Briefing on the COG Report: “ Charged Up: Making Metropolitan Washington Electric Vehicle Ready”

Ms. Rohlfs started her briefing by reviewing the current status of electric vehicles in Washington. She said that in early 2011 electric vehicles were delivered to Washington area dealerships. Starting in 2009 federal stimulus funds were invested in creating charging networks on the west coast, Baltimore and Richmond. COG hosted an Electric Vehicle Forum in April 2011 to learn about electric vehicles and successful local and regional readiness strategies. As Mr. Snyder, who moderated the forum, stated to CEEPC at the time, the attendees agreed that a coordinated regional approach is needed to facilitate deployment of electric vehicles.

Ms. Rohlfs said that in June the COG Board of Directors adopted a resolution to support establishment of a Washington Regional Electric Vehicle Coalition. In September the EV Workgroups organized and began meeting, with the support of the Greater Washington Regional Clean Cities Coalition. Mr. Kolawole, DDOE, and Mr. Agazi, Fairfax County, chaired two groups, EV Infrastructure Planning and EV Policy and Processes. The groups included local member jurisdictions, utilities, fleet owners, electric vehicle manufacturers and equipment suppliers. The members of the Task Force are listed in the report. Task Force subgroups addressed local government policies, electric utility policy, vehicle fleets, and outreach and education.

The Task Force concluded its work in June. The report reviews the environmental, economic and energy security benefits of electric vehicle adoption. The Task Force addressed challenges to adopting electric vehicles in the Washington region and made 5 priority recommendations to facilitate deployment of electric vehicles in the region.

Several concerns were voiced by Committee members, including, what benefit was there to electric vehicles overall, the vehicles have such a short driving range, and there are not enough places to recharge them.

9. Briefing on Baseline Transportation Conditions for a Regional BRAC and Federal Consolidation Impact Analysis

Postponed to October.

10. Briefing on the Draft 2012 Congestion Management Process (CMP) Technical Report

Postponed to October.

11. Briefing on Results from the 2011 Washington-Baltimore Regional Air Passenger Survey

Postponed to October.

12. Update on TPB's FY 2012 Transportation, Community, and Systems Preservation (TCSP) Grant: High Impact Complete Streets Access Improvements for Rail Station Areas in the Washington Region

Mr. Swanson told the Committee that in August, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) announced that the TPB had received an FY2012 TCSP grant. The project will be funded for a total of \$200,000, with a federal share of \$160,000 and a COG match of \$40,000. The grant will be used to develop an inventory of small-scale, multimodal transportation projects, such as pedestrian/bicycle and other "complete streets" improvements, around rail stations with underutilized transit capacity. Mr. Swanson said that a contract between COG and FHWA will be developed this fall. He said that before the project was launched, staff would meet with key stakeholders to determine how the project's scope should be focused, particularly in light of planning activities that have occurred since the proposal was first developed.

Mr. Mokhtari asked that Purple Line stations be included in the project. Mr. Swanson said this suggestion would be considered, although he did note that the application did specifically state that the project would be looking only at existing rail stations and he further noted that the scope for the project was already very ambitious and the budget was limited.

13. Other Business

There were two additional items covered. First, Mr. Mokhtari informed the Committee that long time Committee member Mr. H. Foster recently died from complications from a recent operation.

Second, Mr. Ramfos briefed the Committee on a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) which was issued by the Federal Transit Administration on August 28, 2012 for the FY 2012 Discretionary Funding Opportunity under the Paul S. Sarbanes Transit in Parks Program. He stated that the Commuter Connections program was planning on submitting a grant application that would allow for a web site and smart phone application to be built to provide access to transit, ridesharing, bicycling, and pedestrian information to those visiting National Parks in the region.

Mr. Ramfos explained that this round of funding availability would be the last since the program was not extended under MAP-21. Additionally, there is no local match requirement. Program maintenance for capital and operating costs would be handled through the Commuter Connections Work Program. All three of the state funding agencies have been briefed on the grant submittal and subsequent support of the program through the CCWP. Proposals are due on September 28th.

14. Adjourn