

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

Technical Committee Minutes  
*for meeting of*

**June 1, 2012**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - June 1, 2012**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                    Mark Rawlings  
DCOP                    Dan Emerine

**MARYLAND**

Charles County        Jason Groth  
Frederick Co.         Ron Burns  
City of Frederick     Tim Davis  
Gaithersburg         -----  
Montgomery Co.      Gary Erenrich  
Prince George's Co.  Vic Weissberg  
Rockville             -----  
M-NCPPC  
  Montgomery Co.    -----  
  Prince George's Co. -----  
MDOT                 Lyn Erickson  
                              Renna Mathews  
MTA                    -----  
Takoma Park         -----

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria            Jim Maslanka  
Arlington Co.        Dan Malouff  
City of Fairfax       Alexis Verzosa  
Fairfax Co.          Mike Lake  
Falls Church         -----  
Loudoun Co.         Robert Brown  
Manassas             -----  
Prince William Co.  -----  
NVTC                 -----  
PRTC                  Nick Alexandrow  
VRE                    Christine Hoeffner  
VDOT                 Kanathur Srikanth  
VDRPT                Amy Inman  
NVPDC                -----  
VDOA                 -----

**WMATA**

WMATA                Danielle Wesolek

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

FHWA-DC             -----  
FHWA-VA             -----  
FTA                    -----  
NCPC                  -----  
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  
Beth Newman, DTP  
Andrew Austin DTP  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Yu Gao, DTP  
Jinchul Park, DTP  
Dusan Vuksan, DTP  
William Bacon, DTP  
Daniel Son, DTP  
Anant Choudhary, DTP  
Jim Yin, DTP  
Stuart Freudberg, DEP

**Other Attendees**

Randy Carroll, MDE  
Bill Orleans, HACK

# TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

June 1, 2012

## Technical Committee Minutes

---

### 1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the May 4 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes approved as written.

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

Ms. Posey distributed two documents. The first was the summary report for the air quality conformity analysis of the 2012 CLRP and FY2013-2018 TIP. The second was a comparison of travel and emissions data for the 2011 CLRP vs. the 2012 CLRP. Ms. Posey reviewed the summary report, briefly describing each exhibit. For exhibits 6 and 7, she noted that it is necessary for the ozone season (VOC and NO<sub>x</sub>) pollutant levels to be below the EPA approved Mobile Emissions Budgets in the SIP. The exhibits show that forecast year emissions (the bars) are below the budget (the horizontal line). For exhibits 8 and 9, Ms. Posey noted that no mobile budgets are shown because the region has reached attainment of the PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard, and with MWAQC working on a Maintenance SIP, the states withdrew their previously submitted Mobile budgets for PM. The withdrawal letters are included as Attachment A.

Ms. Posey then discussed the comparison of travel and emissions data for the 2011 CLRP vs. the 2012 CLRP. She noted that households and employment are down, transit trips are up, and vehicle trips and VMT are down, relative to the 2011 CLRP. She stated that in spite of a decrease in vehicle trips and VMT, that emissions increased. She explained that staff conducted a sensitivity test to investigate the results. The sensitivity test, using 2008 VIN data instead of 2011 VIN data, resulted in a decrease in emissions, showing that the impact of the older vehicle fleet overwhelmed the impact of a decrease in vehicle trips and VMT. Ms. Posey said that the public comment period would start on June 14<sup>th</sup>, and that the TPB would be briefed in June and asked to approve the conformity analysis in July.

Mr. Srikanth pointed out an error in the significant change project listing in the appendix of the report. Mr. Austin said he would correct it.

Mr. Erenrich asked about transit trips and about average network speeds affecting emissions. Ms. Posey said that transit trips were up, and that fine particles pollutants are not affected by speeds in the Mobile model. Mr. Erenrich suggested showing that transit trips are increased. Ms. Posey said she would add it to the comparison table.

Mr. Kirby stated that if we had to use MOVES and adhere to budgets set with old data, we could have a problem—this is what we are trying to convey to MWAQC.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the analysis also shows the impact of demographic data—something that the DOTs have no control over. He pointed out there would be an increase in emissions with an increase in the demographic data [when the economy turns around].

Mr. Kirby said that the important issue is that the emissions are below the maintenance level, but MWAQC wants to lower the budgets. If the region has a more rapid growth, there could be a problem. This sensitivity test shows a need for safety margins.

### **3. Briefing on The Draft 212 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP**

Mr. Austin distributed copies of the Significant Additions and Changes to the 2012 CLRP and the Draft 2013-2018 TIP documents. He noted that the correction to the CLRP project title would be made, per Mr. Srikanth's comments in the last item. Mr. Austin asked members of the Committee to review the drafts, including the introductions and financial analysis tables for accuracy. He asked for any edits to be submitted by Friday, June 8. Ms. Matthews noted that MDOT would likely be requesting an amendment to the FY 2011-2016 TIP in July and asked how that should be incorporated into this draft. Mr. Austin said that those funds should be programmed in the draft FY 2013-2018 TIP as they are planned to be in the amendment.

### **4. Status Report on the CY 2012 Solicitation for Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom Projects**

Ms. Newman presented a Status Report on the TPB's 2012 Solicitation for Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom projects. The briefing included a recap of the past five solicitations and highlighted a project from each jurisdiction, including WMATA's bus stop improvement project funded in 2011. She described the solicitation details, including funding amounts, outreach and priorities that were encouraged by the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force. She also recapped the 2011 JARC and New Freedom Assessment and described the recommendations that were incorporated into the solicitation, including a move to biennial solicitations. Also included were the selection committee process and a basic schedule for the 2014 solicitation. The project recommendations will be presented to the TPB at its June 20 meeting for final approval.

Mr. Griffiths asked if the solicitation is now good for 2 years, and Ms. Newman explained that the solicitation will skip a year. Ms. Backmon asked about grantee findings from the Assessment. Ms. Newman responded that projects are taking longer to implement than anticipated, and that agencies are having trouble achieving the estimates of number of individuals served in their original applications. She stated that

findings also noted that benefits are significant but hard to quantify because of a) the qualitative nature of some of them and b) the multiplier effect that is hard to measure. Ms. Newman added that the full Assessment report is available at [www.tpbcoordination.org](http://www.tpbcoordination.org).

Ms. Erickson asked if, since the projects come from the Coordinated Plan, what the schedule is for the plan update. Ms. Newman responded that the last update was done in 2009, and the next update will likely be done in the next year or so, and that the Task Force will address that question when it convenes its fall meetings. It will be in the UPWP. Mr. Kirby asked about the structure of the programs around the country. Ms. Newman responded that TPB is the only DR among the 9 peers reviewed that conducts an annual solicitation. TPB is also one of the few agencies to convene an independent selection panel rather than have staff review and select applications for funding. Mr. Kirby asked about the difficulty of sustaining the projects without continued funding, and Ms. Newman responded that it may be considered in the plan update. Ms. Newman also talked about the federal United We Ride effort to promote coordination on human service transportation and of the opportunity to get different agencies to participate, e.g., Medicaid.

Mr. Griffiths asked if there would be more funding since the solicitations will be every other year and if that will mean more applicants. Ms. Newman responded that it will be more funding, but potentially larger, regional projects, adding that 50 grants is a lot to manage. Ms. Erickson asked about issues with the selection and members not being happy with outcomes. Ms. Newman responded that applicants will certainly be disappointed if their projects are not selected, but that the Selection Committee gave feedback on the applications that can be related to the applicants to improve future submissions. Ms. Newman added that agencies can request a debrief of their scores. Mr. Griffiths suggested that should be included in the TPB presentation.

#### **5. Briefing on Proposed Additional TPB Staff Comments Regarding Incorporating Safety Margins into Out-year Mobile Emissions Budgets for Fine Particle Pollution (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) for the 2012 Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan.**

Mr. Kirby provided an introduction on the topic and a contextual basis for incorporating safety margins in the PM<sub>2.5</sub> redesignation request and maintenance plans. He reiterated the need for inclusion of safety margins in order to address uncertainties associated with future VIN data changes, travel demand model updates and new versions of the MOVES model. He also informed the Committee that AMPO has issued a policy recommendation proposing that whenever significant input data changes occur -- VIN data or MOVES model changes -- the SIP should be updated. Such a requirement does not exist today.

Ms. Constantine presented the results of sensitivity tests, which measured the incremental changes in NOx and PM2.5 emissions inventories for the milestone years 2017 and 2025 of the maintenance plan when the 2005 and 2011 VIN databases were used. The PowerPoint presentation was centered on the regional vehicle fleet composition and average age differences between the 2005 and 2011 VINs and how changes in such attributes of the vehicle fleet yielded substantial changes in the projected 2017 and 2015 NOx and PM2.5 emissions inventories. The sensitivity tests concluded that the estimated emissions increases are mostly attributable to the ageing of the regional vehicle fleet, which is most pronounced in larger vehicle classes. The analyses also concluded that commercial vehicles (i.e., light commercial trucks, buses and heavy duty trucks) play a substantial role in estimated emissions increases. Such vehicles are not amendable to travel demand reduction strategies as they operate on independent schedules. The emissions increases due to the ageing of the vehicle fleet are more significant in year 2017 and less during the later years of the maintenance plan.

Mr. Erenrich asked whether there would be significant emissions decreases from newer vehicles as they enter the regional fleet. Ms. Constantine replied that differences are not measurable at the individual vehicle level since new models on the road today are already very clean thanks to new technologies. It is rather the cumulative effect of the entire vehicle fleet that becomes cleaner over time as new the new technologies become fully integrated into the mix and older vehicles are retired. Mr. Kirby commended that as older, heavy duty the vehicles are being replaced more emissions reductions will be realized over time. Mr. Srikanth added that another way to address the issue is to look at the vehicle regulatory process. The vehicles manufactured according to TIER2 regulations and the vehicles manufactured according to TIER1 regulations have different emission standards. Then he pointed out brake wear and tire wear also have big impacts on PM2.5 emissions.

## **6. Update on Reauthorization of Federal Surface Transportation Legislation**

Mr. Kirby explained that the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) has been extended nine times since it expired on September 30, 2009, most recently through June 30, 2012. He said that on March 15, 2012 the Senate approved MAP-21, a two-year reauthorization proposal, and on April 18 the House approved HR 4348, a reauthorization proposal with an extension of SAFETEA-LU through September 30, 2012 along with other provisions.

Mr. Kirby reported that the staff of the conference committee has been working through the two bills to identify areas of agreement. There seems to be agreement on a major provision to increase funding for the TIFIA loan program from \$120 million to \$1 billion.

The funding levels for the other programs appear to be flat, and identifying new funding to augment the Highway Trust Fund continues to be a major obstacle.

Mr. Kirby explained that a significant provision in MAP-21 calls for state DOTs and MPOs to use performance measures for performance-based planning and programming. The funding levels for the other programs did not change much. He pointed out that the House bill does not contain any policy changes but does include requiring the President to approve the Keystone pipeline, which could be a major problem.

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

Mr. Kirby spoke to a PowerPoint on the RTPP. The RTPP aims to identify 10 to 15 near-term and long-term 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, with particular focus on the upcoming June 2 RTPP Citizen Forum. An independent firm, *America Speaks*, is organizing and facilitating the Forum. *America Speaks* also recruited the participants, a representative sample of the general public. The Forum includes table discussions, dynamic participation, and keypad polling. The Forum objectives are to determine: (1) How clear are the TPB materials on the goals, challenges, and strategies? (2) How can the TPB communicate these topics more effectively to the general public? and, (3) Are there additional challenges and/or strategies that should be included? Mr. Kirby concluded with a discussion on next steps. A TPB Work Session on the RTPP is scheduled for June 20<sup>th</sup>. Interim Report 2 will be presented to the TPB in July. The TPB will seek broader feedback from the general public in the fall. Benefit-cost analysis will take place in the winter 2012 to spring 2013 time period resulting in finalized strategies.

### *Questions and Answers*

Ms. Mathews asked if the challenges are specific to the goals. Mr. Kirby confirmed the challenges are specific to the goals, and added that strategies may address multiple goals.

Mr. Weissberg recommended adding the words “balanced economy” to Goal 2. Mr. Kirby noted that the Goals come from six of the eight Vision goals, a document that took three years to find consensus on goal language. Mr. Kirby added that the goals are broad and the RTPP focus is on refining the challenges and strategies.

Ms. Mathews asked if the strategies are priority strategies and what is considered a strategy. Mr. Kirby replied that a strategy can be a program or project that supports the region and ideally addresses multiple goals. The strategies given in the Discussion Guide

are examples strategies. The culmination of the RTPP will be a list a 10 to 15 priority strategies, which will be determined after a benefit-cost analysis of several strategies.

Mr. Emerine asked how TPB will conduct its benefit-cost analyses of strategies. Mr. Kirby noted that TPB staff will examine all benefits and all costs, similar to what we have done in our federal grant applications. Ultimately, much of the process is qualitative.

## **8. Other Business**

Mr. Erenrich asked the status of the TIGER 4 submission. Mr. Randall answered that there was no news yet.

## **9. Adjourn**