

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

Technical Committee Minutes  
*for meeting of*  
November 4, 2011

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - November 4, 2011**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                    Mark Rawlings  
DCOP                    Art Rodgers  
                              Will Handsfield

**MARYLAND**

Charles County        Jason Groth  
Frederick Co.         Ronald Burns  
City of Frederick     Tim Davis  
Gaithersburg         -----  
Montgomery Co.      Gary Erenrich  
Prince George's Co.  Lou Farber  
Rockville             -----  
M-NCPPC  
  Montgomery Co.    -----  
  Prince George's Co. -----  
MDOT                  Lyn Erickson  
                              Alyssa Seibert  
                              Vaughn Lewis  
MTA                    -----  
Takoma Park         -----

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria            Pierre Holloman  
Arlington Co.        Jennifer Fioetti  
City of Fairfax        Alexis Verzosa  
Fairfax Co.            Mike Lake  
Falls Church         -----  
Loudoun Co.          -----  
Manassas             -----  
Prince William Co.  Monica Backmon  
NVTC                  Clair Gron  
PRTC                  Nick Alexandrow  
VRE                    -----  
VDOT                  Kanathur Srikanth  
VDRPT                Anthony Foster  
NVPDC                -----  
VDOA                  -----

**WMATA**

WMATA                Mark Kellogg

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

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

**COG Staff**

Ronald Kirby, DTP  
Gerald Miller, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Robert Griffiths, DTP  
Michael Farrell, DTP  
Andy Meese, DTP  
Jane Posey, DTP  
Yu Gao, DTP  
Gareth James, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Daivamani Sivisailam, DTP  
Joan Rohlofs, DEP

**Other Attendees**

Randy Carroll, MDE  
Carey Roessel, Marquise Management  
Bill Orleans, HACK

# TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

November 4, 2011

## Technical Committee Minutes

---

### 1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from October 7 TPB Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### 2. **Update on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2011 CLRP**

Ms. Posey said that the conformity results were released for public comment on Oct. 13. She noted that staff presented the results to MWAQC TAC and to TPB in October. She explained that staff had discovered an error in the travel demand model relating to HOV trip development, and that all analysis years were being rerun, and the new results would be included in the final conformity report. She noted that the technical correction would not affect the bottom line conformity finding. Ms. Posey mentioned that no comments had been received to date, but that staff was expecting a MWAQC comment letter.

Mr. Kirby noted that this represents the official release of the V2.3 travel demand model. Ms. Backmon asked which version of the model was used. Ms. Posey said she was not sure, but thought it was v2.3.34 or 35. Ms. Backmon asked if the change to the model since the draft version was released was significant. Mr. Kirby replied that it was a small change at the regional level, but would be significant for study corridors. Mr. Griffiths suggested that Prince William County should definitely get the updated version of the model.

### 3. **Update on the Draft 2011 CLRP**

Mr. Austin noted that the mail-out item included the summary of proposed additions and changes to the TPB that had been released for public comment on October 13, 2011. For the sake of consistency with the initial release last spring, the summary list included three projects that had been approved as amendments to the 2010 CLRP in July. Mr. Austin stated that the comment period would end on November 12 and that no comments had been received to date. The TPB would be asked to approve the proposed additions and changes to the CLRP at their meeting on November 16.

### 4. **Briefing on COG's Regional Incident Management and Response (IMR) Action Plan**

Mr. Meese reported. At its March 9 meeting, the COG Board had formed a Major Incident Management and Response (IMR) Steering Committee in response to the

January 26 snowstorm, chaired by Councilmember Andrews of Montgomery County.

The IMR Committee met six times over eight months, with its final meeting on October 26. The IMR Committee oversaw development of a findings and recommendations report, which was to be presented to the COG Board on November 9 and to the TPB on November 16. Councilmember Andrews was to make the presentation to the TPB on November 16. The latest version of the report was posted on the Technical Committee website; a slightly updated version with changes only to appendices was to be available by the time of the November 9 COG Board meeting.

It was anticipated that he would report that the IMR Committee was composed of 19 representatives from key sectors including Emergency Management, the Chief Administrative Officers, the COG Attorneys Committee, Public Information Officers, the Federal Office of Personnel Management, the Business Community, Utilities and Transportation. Transportation representatives included DDOT, MDOT, VDOT, WMATA, and MATOC.

The 70-page report itself included an Executive Summary; a review of the day's events; a review the of focus areas assigned to it by the COG Board; and an accounting of issues, findings, recommendations, and status. The effort looked at communications, coordination, and authority, including an examination of what is done elsewhere (e.g., New York's TRANSCOM). It made recommendations addressing advanced preparations, actions just before an incident, and actions during an incident. Also included were a number of appendices with technical background material.

The initial charge to the Steering Committee included 4 focus areas:

- Real-time information or situational awareness among local, state, and federal government agencies with operational authority or responsibilities
- Real-time information to the media and the public
- Regional coordination
- Decision-making.

The Committee was briefed on and examined these focus areas and developed related findings and recommendations.

The major recommendation of the report was the creation of a Regional Incident Coordination (RIC) Program. Under the RIC Program, knowledgeable staff would be responsible for regional monitoring and redistribution of relevant information, and have a proactive role to initiate COG's previously established Regional Incident Coordination and Communication System (RICCS) coordination calls. Included would be exercises and tests of communications means and protocols. RIC would coordinate with MATOC and

with the proposed regional Public Information Officers' (PIOs') Virtual Joint Information Center (V-JIC). A RIC oversight group that would be a continuation of the IMR Committee would be established. The RIC Program will be initially housed and staffed at the DC Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency (HSEMA), funded by regional U.S. Department of Homeland Security funding.

Other recommendations in the report included strengthening use of communications tools, improvements to regional snow conference calls, media outreach to the public on preparedness and vehicle abandonment, updating employee release policies and taking into account transportation conditions and capacity before releasing employees, and utility preparedness.

The Committee examined national/international incident management models to determine if there were a better framework for decision-making. Models from places located within one state or with one dominant jurisdiction were seen not to be appropriate for the multi-jurisdictional NCR. There would be legal barriers to creating a central authority; it was not clear that a central authority would achieve better results than a robust, well-coordinated multi-jurisdictional approach.

The report also gave examples of how regional coordination would work under the IMR Committee recommendations. It described what happened during the January storm and two other recent events (the August 23 earthquake and the October 11 person struck by a Metro train) as well as describing what would have happened differently if the RIC Program had been in place.

Two of the report's recommendations specifically addressed transportation. It recommended that MATOC operations be expanded from the current 16 hours a day, 5 days a week to 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The report also called for an assessment of and expeditious installation of back-up power for major traffic signals.

Mr. Kirby noted that the IMR Report would be presented first to the COG Board on November 9 for acceptance, and then to the TPB on November 16 for information. He anticipated that the two presentations would have different emphases. At the COG Board, attention may be given to the new federal Office of Personnel Management (OPM) employee release policy, which has already received coverage in the press. The recommendation for traffic signal backup power was of particular interest to Chairman Andrews, and may be emphasized at the TPB. Mr. Kirby recommended that this issue be referred to the MOITS Technical Subcommittee and its Traffic Signal Subcommittee.

Mr. Erenrich noted that available signal battery backup systems would only sustain operations for three hours or so, not long enough for many emergencies. Mr. Kirby noted that the report's recommendations were at a relatively high level, and that any response could get into the details of the issue.

Mr. Kirby added that several MATOC participants were also on the IMR Committee, and their suggestions helped shape the proposal for the RIC Program. Whereas MATOC focuses on the transportation sector, RIC goes beyond to multi-sector issues. MATOC may have transportation conference calls prior to any RIC calls, to help shape transportation input to the subsequent RIC calls.

Mr. Handsfield asked whether the effort looked at non-motorized transportation options, in light of the significant use of Capital Bikeshare after the August 23 earthquake. Mr. Meese replied that the current IMR effort did not look at non-motorized transportation specifically, but that other emergency preparedness planning activities in recent years had done so. Mr. Kirby added that he hoped that as a result of the IMR report, more tabletop exercises would be held regionally that could, for example, look at details such as non-motorized travel.

Mr. Srikanth asked regarding the bullet on page 31 of the report that stated, "RIC staff would share information with appropriate officials", who exactly were those officials? Mr. Kirby replied that such details had not been worked out yet. He noted that MATOC messages started out going only to public sector agencies, but now the MATOC Steering Committee has decided that they are ready to start sharing information with the public directly soon, and that RIC will follow a similar path to start with stakeholder agencies, and then later to the public. Agencies now involved in COG snow calls would likely be the first involved, such as schools, Board of Trade, and OPM. Mr. Meese added that now we only have a "snow" call, but later the knowledgeable RIC staff could advise which participants would need to be in whatever coordination call was needed; e.g., schools or transportation may or may not need to be involved in a particular situation.

Mr. Srikanth noted that a number of VDOT's signals already have battery backup. Mr. Kirby noted that our assessment will provide that information back to discussants.

Mr. Srikanth asked that if RIC will be 24/7, will MATOC also need to be 24/7 as recommended in the report? Mr. Kirby replied that this would be a good question to examine in our follow-up transportation response to emergencies. Mr. Kirby replied that it will be important to be aware of what those responders are doing, and also that it will be helpful to have representation from those responders at tabletop exercises. He further emphasized that advance planning for incidents is part of the report recommendations.

In response to a question from Ms. Erickson, Mr. Kirby noted that the COG Board was slated to "accept" the IMR Report. The report as it stands is a report of the IMR Committee. The TPB will not have authority to act on the report, but does have the ability to respond as it thinks appropriate to the report's recommendations. The traffic signals recommendation, for example, would go through the MOITS Subcommittee, then the Technical Committee, and then back to the TPB. In response to a follow-up

question from Mr. Erenrich, Mr. Kirby replied that the only action he would anticipate from the TPB is a request to examine recommendations in our committee structure for a response.

Mr. Erenrich noted that these issues, as well as issues such as snow plowing, also impact bus transit operations, and recommended that this report be taken to the Regional Bus Subcommittee. Mr. Meese recommended also addressing them through the MATOC structure, particularly the MATOC Operations Subcommittee Transit Task Force (formerly the Regional Transit Operators Group – RTOG), chaired by Mr. Marx of PRTC. MATOC itself has been undertaking a post-January 26 snow coordination effort including transit and snow plowing issues and an upcoming tabletop exercise, which would be a good venue for addressing shorter-term operational issues. Mr. Kirby added that through MATOC, transportation has discussed that it needs to be more proactive in encouraging demand management.

Ms. Erickson asked what time frame was anticipated for responding to the recommendations. Mr. Kirby noted that this was an issue to be considered. The Committee discussed what information might be brought back to the TPB, how it could be collected, and what time frame would be needed. It was anticipated there would be pressure to bring back answers quickly. Initial information could be brought back quickly, perhaps as soon as the December 21 TPB meeting, with continuing work ongoing, particularly regarding anything that would concern the potential commitment of additional funding for implementation. A traffic signal survey through MOITS and the Technical Committee was recommended. Mr. Meese asked for assistance from Technical Committee members in getting quick jurisdictional responses to a survey that staff could send out soon.

Mr. Erenrich noted that control and communications systems among signals are important along with power backup of the lights themselves, so signals still could have timing problems even if they are still lit.

Mr. Kirby suggested that staff create a checklist of ongoing or upcoming activities that address the transportation recommendations.

## **5. Update on the Regional “Street Smart” Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign**

Mr. Meese reported since Mr. Farrell was not able to attend. At the October 19 TPB meeting, an update on the Street Smart campaign was given. Part of the discussion was the idea first raised last year by Mayor Euille of Alexandria to fold the Street Smart local contributions into the COG membership dues structure as opposed to undertaking a separate solicitation of voluntary contributions from the jurisdictions. A specific proposal was to be discussed by COG Budget and Finance Committee for their November 9 meeting for the FY2013 COG budget. At the TPB, it was discussed whether

the TPB would authorize Chair Bowser to send a letter of support to the Budget and Finance Committee on Street Smart. After some discussion, the TPB decided to table the issue until the November 16 TPB meeting.

Mr. Kirby added that the action that the TPB would consider depends on the action of the Budget and Finance Committee. If the Budget and Finance Committee endorses the proposal on November 9, then the TPB would consider sending a letter supporting that decision to the COG Board. If the Budget and Finance Committee does not endorse the proposal, then the TPB would consider what if any action it would take.

Mr. Meese added that the fall campaign, in conjunction with the change from Daylight Savings Time, was to begin after the November 8 election. The kickoff press event was scheduled for Monday, November 14 on Piney Branch Road in Silver Spring, at a location where there are new pedestrian safety treatments that have been installed by the State Highway Administration. The Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration and the County were involved in setting up the event.

Ms. Backmon asked if Street Smart were included in the COG dues structure, would the campaign reach all jurisdictions? Mr. Kirby replied that because the current campaign is regional, it does reach all jurisdictions, but not every jurisdiction has been able to participate in shaping the campaign messages. That would change. Also, the rotation of where the events are hosted will be expanded. Ms. Backmon noted that there has been a perception of differing benefits of the campaign to outer jurisdictions versus inner jurisdictions. Mr. Kirby agreed, and noted that Loudoun County this year had voted to contribute for the first time, but noted that the message also needed to be tailored to rural roads.

## **6. Briefing on a Draft Regional Policy on Complete Streets**

Mr. Meese reported since Mr. Farrell was not able to attend. The draft Complete Streets policy has been posted on the website for a month or two, and been reviewed by three committees: the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, the Regional Bus Subcommittee, and the Access for All Committee. We have also received comments on the website. It had become clear in the numerous comments that there was not yet a consensus on the direction of the policy. Therefore, staff recommended removing this item from the draft TPB November 16 agenda, putting together a new draft, and taking the time necessary to build consensus among stakeholders before moving forward to the TPB. Numerous Technical Committee representatives expressed agreement.

Mr. Kellogg noted that the TPB Chair Bowser and Citizens Advisory Committee Chair Dobelbower may be disappointed in the delay, but it should be taken as an indication we are taking this seriously.



## **7. Briefing on the Composition of the Vehicle Fleet in the Washington Region in 2011**

Ms. Constantine spoke to a PowerPoint presentation on the key characteristics of the 2011 Vehicle Identification Number (VIN) databases, which were received from the DC, MD and VA state agencies and which are used as inputs in Air Quality applications. The main findings were: First, the regional vehicle fleet is getting older as the average age increased 0.34 years during the 2005-2008 periods. It was 0.87 years older for the 2008-2011 period. Second, the share of light duty vehicles in the overall vehicle fleet continues to increase despite a disruption in the trend lines due possibly to the recession and the 2009 Cash-for-Clunkers program. Third, the popularity of hybrid vehicles continues despite a disruption in the upward trend in 2009 possibly due to the recession. Fourth, the changing composition of the vehicle fleet increases emissions rates of criteria pollutants. However, various pollutants are affected differently: VOC is less sensitive to changes in the vehicle fleet composition as gasoline standards have had a long time to yield beneficial results. NOx and PM2.5 pollutants are more sensitive to changes in the composition of the vehicle fleet as the rules have had a short time to be integrated into the regional fleet.

Mr. Erenrich asked, given the sample size, if it make sense to draw conclusions. Ms. Constantine responded that the data represented a full sample of the vehicles registered in the region and that DTP staff examined the observed patterns and tried to rationalize them with other available data such as gasoline price fluctuations, the effects of the economic recession and the Cash-for-Clunkers program although the focus has been the observed trends rather than a full interpretation of the results.

Mr. Rodgers suggested that it might be useful to put into number of vehicles per capital or per household on slide1 to see if there is any correlation with the total vehicle population increase. He then asked if the data is available for any smaller geography other than DC, MD,VA. Ms. Constantine replied that for suburban MD the data is available at the zip code level while for northern VA the data is available at the jurisdiction level. Since the intended purpose of the VIN databases is to serve as inputs in Air Quality applications (i.e., Air Quality Conformity and State Implementation Plans), Mr. Kirby commented that its uncertain whether additional analyses and reporting on the VIN databases were justified although the suggestion about the number of vehicles per capita could be interesting.

Mr. Erenrich pointed out VMT per vehicle also have an impact on emission. Ms. Constantine agreed with Mr. Erenrich and elaborated that the reason VMT was not part of the presentation was that the intended purpose of the presentation was to highlight key attributes of the changing vehicle fleet and their relationships with emissions rates of criteria pollutants without undue complexities when the VMT was part of the

conversation. It was mainly about observed trends and their relationships with emissions rates. Mr. Kirby confirmed that.

Mr. Erenrich continued by saying that transit agencies are rushing to replace old vehicles with newer, cleaner ones and perhaps such data could be used in support of grant applications.

Mr. Kirby explained that on the LDV and LDT ratios slide, the one-time Cash-for-Clunkers Program could be the reason for the 2009 disruption of the trend lines. Mr. Handsfield commented that the narrative should include tax incentives.

Mr. Erenrich asked when is the next heavy-duty diesel standard. Ms. Rolfs responded by saying that the last was year 2007 for heavy duty vehicles and year 2008 for light duty vehicles. Mr. Erenrich then commented that probably a backlog of replacements could catch up on heavy duty vehicles.

Mr. Foster asked for a clarification on whether the states of VA and MD were included in their entity in the analyses or just the neighboring jurisdictions. Ms. Constantine clarified that they included suburban jurisdictions in MD and the northern Virginia jurisdictions that are part of the TPB Air Quality analyses area. Subsequent revisions of the presentation material reflected the above clarification.

Mr. Holloman asked whether staff looked at vehicle production and auto makers that went out of business. Ms. Constantine replied that staff did not examine that. Mr. Kirby added that staff could pull out specific vehicles.

## **8. Briefing on the Implementation of the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program**

Mr. Randall gave a presentation on the status of implementation of the TIGER Bus Priority project. He emphasized that the presentation will not go to Board, only a memo based on that distributed to committee members in the mail-out. The status update is in response to a request by TPB Chair Ms. Bowser, who asked the question based on the TPB's recent work in preparing a TIGER FY 2011 application.

Mr. Randall spoke quickly to the history of the TIGER grant and that activity to date on the project has been on completing the specification and procurement process prior to signing contracts. He summarized recent accomplishments by each project owner and showed a graph of rejected expenditures by each over the project lifetime. The status of the required performance monitoring reports on the 16 sub-projects was also reviewed; these results of these studies will inform future regional projects for bus

priority. He then proposed that the next briefing would take place in the spring of 2012 once more work was in progress. There were no questions from the Committee.

## **9. Briefing on the Development of Performance Measures for the TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)**

Mr. Kirby gave a PowerPoint presentation on a review of performance-based planning and programming, and its potential application to the TPB Priorities Plan. He first summarized the background to the TPB Regional Priorities Plan Process and the federal Government's focus on performance measurement, noting a clear synergy between the Priorities Plan Process and the greater reliance on performance measurement that is anticipated with the next federal transportation bill. Next, he outlined the major recommendations made by a 2009 'International Scan', conducted by the U.S. DOT, that researched how countries abroad (the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and Sweden) link transportation performance and accountability. He briefly talked about the National Capital Region's selection as a pilot site for an NCHRP study on the integration of performance measures into a performance-based planning and programming process, although he noted that the nature of the TPB's involvement was yet to be determined. Finally, he reiterated the regional goals that had been agreed upon in the work scope, and provided some illustrative examples of potential performance measures and actions.

Mr. Erenrich said a bike and pedestrian performance measure should be included on the list.

Mr. Hansfield agreed, adding that the availability of options is paramount.

Mr. Kirby responded that the provision of a comprehensive range of transportation options has been a long-standing policy goal of the TPB, both on and off the roadway system, and that this would continue to inform the Priorities Plan Process.

Ms. Backmon asked if the TPB's performance measures would be linked to those of Virginia's General Assembly.

Mr. Kirby replied that staff would look into it.

Chair Kellogg said that it would be important to keep the Region Forward goals in mind.

Mr. Kirby replied that all the agreed goals originated from Region Forward and the TPB Vision.

Mr. Srikanth asked what would be the main takeaway for the TPB.

Mr. Kirby replied that a 'straw man' would be developed for members to react to, but that the immediate task would be to determine the right measures for each of the goals.

He noted that this process was further along in certain areas, such as emissions, where the TPB already had well-established work activities.

Mr. Rodgers asked whether the International Scan had proposed specific performance measures.

Mr. Kirby replied that this had not been the focus of the research conducted for the International Scan, but he said that staff would be considering specific measures from other places for inclusion in the straw man.

Chair Kellogg asked whether the Board of Trade's regional priorities effort could somehow be linked to that of the TPB.

Mr. Kirby replied that the Board of Trade was currently in the process of educating itself for the transportation element of its priority-setting. He said that he had attended a Board of Trade meeting relating to this effort and that staff would continue to monitor its progress.

## **10. Briefing on Climate Change Activities**

Mr. Kirby discussed DTP staff involvement on climate change activities and spoke from the PowerPoint handout on the subject. In addition to mitigation the region would be paying attention to adaptation which involves measures to reduce or avoid climate change impacts. Staff would re-estimate the inventories and strategy impacts using the Version 2.3 Travel Demand Model and MOVES emissions model. Staff will estimate the impacts of the new CAFÉ standards for light duty and heavy duty vehicles. COG is involved with ECO driving by joining the efforts of the I-95 Corridor Coalition. Staff is participating in a number of FHWA, AASHTO and AMPO activities associated with climate change. There were no questions from the Committee members.

## **11. Other Business**

Mr. Erenrich suggested that TPB write to the region's congressional delegation expressing concerns about the reduction in tax exemption for employer provided transit subsidy from \$230 to \$120.

Mr. Kirby said that he would provide the TPB a copy of the WMATA Board letter on this subject.

## **12. Adjourn**