

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
ITEM #1**

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
February 7, 2014

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Meeting

Technical Committee Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from January 3 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved and written.

2. Update on Project Submissions and Status of the Financial Analysis for the 2014 CLRP

Mr. Austin spoke to a memorandum that described a preliminary set of major projects for inclusion in the 2014 Update to the CLRP. He noted that the list was preliminary, pending the outcome of discussion on the financial analysis. In addition to the projects described in the District, Maryland and Virginia, Mr. Austin stated that WMATA had submitted seven projects as components of its Metro 2025 plan. Which of these components would actually move forward for consideration in the Update to the CLRP would depend on the outcome of the financial analysis discussions.

Ms. Posey discussed the Draft Inputs for the Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP. She noted that there were some project submissions that needed clarification. She asked for corrections to be submitted to her in order to generate the table for the next meeting of the Technical Committee.

Chair Srikanth stated that the major projects list was a subset of the larger list of projects included in the Air Quality Inputs table. He also noted that for the first time this year, the major projects list also included some items that are not typically included in the Air Quality Inputs, such as the MARC Growth and Investment Plan and some components of Metro 2025.

Mr. Malouff asked for clarification on the Metro 2025 components and their status on moving forward into the CLRP. Chair Srikanth stated that these components are what WMATA wants to advance into the CLRP this year. He added that a group had been working together with WMATA staff to get cost estimates for each of the seven components and federal and other expected revenues in order to determine how much would be requested from DOTs. Once that amount was understood, the DOTs would determine how much they could contribute to WMATA, and which elements might be able to move forward with a commitment to funding. Ms. Wesolek added that it was WMATA's intent to include all components of Metro 2025 if possible.

Mr. Emerine inquired why only three projects were listed in the Air Quality Inputs. Chair Srikanth explained that those were the only ones that would potentially be modeled in

the Air Quality Analysis, but noted that some other elements may need to be funded as well in order to include those coded elements. Chair Srikanth also stated that the figures shown only described capital costs, and that the request would also require a commitment to fund operations and maintenance, including a minimum commitment to demonstrate a “state of good repair” for operations and maintenance beyond 2020.

Ms. Erickson noted that the MARC Growth and Investment Plan has been included in the CLRP in the past, but has never been highlighted in the Major Projects list. Chair Srikanth summarized that since the 2014 CLRP would include an update to the financial analysis, the major project list was looking beyond the basic technical details that would be included in the Air Quality Analysis to other larger financial commitments.

3. Update on the schedule for the 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP Air Quality Conformity Assessment

Ms. Constantine told updated the Committee members that an additional delay in releasing the Draft Scope of Work for the 2014 CLRP Air Quality Conformity determination was necessary to allow time for the details of the financial plan to be worked out. Such details could have a potential impact on the projects considered in this cycle of conformity. Ms. Constantine also pointed out that the delay brings the end of this year’s conformity cycle closer to the deadline for approval by the TPB and eventually approval by the federal government without TPB entering a conformity lapse period.

Chair Srikanth pointed to the fact that the list of state projects -- including WMATA -- and the scope of work are scheduled for public comment review by March 13th. Subsequently, the TPB will approve them in April and staff will initiate the analyses thereafter. The 2014 CLRP & FY2015-20 TIP Air Quality Conformity determination is anticipated to be approved by the TPB in October, and based on previous years’ federal approval records, to be approved by February 2015.

Mr. Brown requested a clarification on what is expected of the Committee members for the next meeting (March 7th TPB Technical Committee meeting). Ms. Constantine explained that the draft project list for the 2014 CLRP & FY2015-20 TIP Air Quality Conformity that was handed out at the meeting required a thorough review by the participating agencies and any edits to be provided to the TPB staff so that at the next meeting all the pertinent information should have been finalized. Chair Srikanth added that edits, corrections, comments and any supporting documentation pertaining to the financial plan of the submitted projects are expected.

Mr. Brown requested a clarification on whether the draft project list that was handed out at the meeting includes all projects for the 2014 CLRP & FY2015-20 TIP. Ms. Posey

responded by clarifying that the list includes only the projects deemed regionally significant, thus affecting air quality conformity.

4. Briefing on “Place + Opportunity: Strategies for Creating Great Communities and a Stronger Region”

Ms. Mintier provided a briefing on the recently-approved report *Place + Opportunity: Strategies for Creating Great Communities and a Stronger Region*. The report presents goal, strategies, and tools to assist local governments and other stakeholders with their efforts to create thriving, high-opportunity places.

Chair Srikanth asked what form the rollout of report would take. Ms. Mintier explained that COG would be doing outreach about the report to committees and external partners, and that COG and DTP staff were working together to develop a joint message about the relationship between Place + Opportunity and the Priorities Plan and how they can be aligned with COG & DTP work plans.

Chair Srikanth recommended a combined effort for outreach and asked about whether the report includes a list of how all Activity Centers were classified in terms of place and opportunity type. Ms. Mintier explained that the report includes a couple of examples of Centers within each type, but does not currently include the classifications for the full list of Activity Centers that were studied. Chair Srikanth asked about criteria used to identify each place and opportunity type. Mr. DesJardin, Director of Community Planning and Services, explained that staff wants the Board to be comfortable and familiar with the report before sharing the full list of how each Center was classified, but that they may provide summary statistics for each type in the meantime.

Ms. Erickson asked Ms. Mintier to explain who staff worked with in developing the report. Ms. Mintier explained that staff had worked closely with the Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee throughout the process of developing the report, and had gotten sign-off from each representative on how their respective Centers were classified.

Mr. Weissberg asked if the report contains discussion of using infrastructure, e.g. fixed-guideway transit or premium transit, to connect Activity Centers to create synergy, especially different types of Centers. Ms. Mintier explained that it wasn't specifically covered, but focused on existing connections or planned between Centers, but that staff would like to focus more specifically on that as a next step.

Mr. Brown said that the report should have examined undeveloped or emerging Centers, as in Loudoun County. Ms. Mintier explained that because the team could not study all 141 Activity Centers, they asked the planning department contacts to identify

the Centers that they wanted included in the report, and that due to methodology that mainly focuses on current conditions, greenfield or undeveloped Centers were not prioritized. Ms. Mintier stated that the team worked with Director of Planning Ms. Pastor to identify the Loudoun Centers that would be included in the report.

Mr. Emerine suggested that it would be helpful to tee up connections between Place + Opportunity and the Priorities Plan in the TPB Board briefing. He recommended revising the presentation to address the specific ways that Place + Opportunity and the RTPP can reinforce each other and identifying components of P+O that help meet Priorities Plan objectives.

Mr. Griffiths said that at the January TPB Board meeting the topic of affordable housing in Activity Centers came up, and that the two reports reinforce each other.

Chair Srikanth recommended looking at this report as a work in progress, since not all Centers were studied and since staff is still determining how to integrate Place + Opportunity with the Priorities Plan, and making it clear to the TPB Board that there is still more work anticipated related to the report.

Mr. DesJardin reminded the group that Place + Opportunity comes out of the TPB Vision and Region Forward goals.

Mr. Swanson said that in developing the outreach strategy for the RTPP, staff would use a lens of land use and Activity Center in thinking about implementation.

Mr. Weissberg recommended a follow-up study to analyze the emerging Centers. Mr. Roseboom mentioned a recent study by VA DRPT looks at multi-modal types statewide and recommends appropriate transit for different types of places. The study produced MultiModal Design Center Guidelines.

Mr. Mokhtari asked about differences in transportation factors between different types of Activity Centers. Ms. Mintier explained that the methodology didn't include a comprehensive analysis of all the transportation modes in each Activity Center, but that there's an opportunity to integrate more transportation network information on the Centers going forward.

Chair Srikanth recommended another presentation in the future that addresses the details of each Activity Center type and transportation network information.

5. Review of Draft FY 2015 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

The Fiscal Year 2015 draft Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP) was included in the meeting agenda packet. A PowerPoint presentation given by Mr. Ramfos that

included an overview of Commuter Connections including program benefits and highlights of what is new with the program and budget and next steps for the CCWP.

Mr. Ramfos explained that Commuter Connections is a network of public and private transportation organizations, local organizations, state funding agencies, and COG/TPB staff that work together to help reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality in the region. Commuter Connections' programs provide benefits to local jurisdictions by helping to manage and reduce congestion and improve air quality by reducing emissions which will benefit commuters, businesses with goods movement and tourist travel. The program also assists jurisdictions with attracting and retaining employers. Employers benefit through recruitment and retention of employees at their worksite. Commuter Connections also provides workers with an array of work commuting options that can lead to an improved quality of life through the reduced daily commuting costs, stress, and the time commuting to and from work.

Mr. Ramfos then discussed a map that outlined the program service area of Commuter Connections. He explained that the central service area outlined in a heavy black line is the Washington Region's 8-hour non-attainment area. The map shows that the Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) service area is much larger than the 8-hour non-attainment area for workers eligible for the GRH program, and even larger for workers who use Commuter Connections' ridematching services.

Mr. Ramfos then showed a chart with recent American Community Survey Census rankings for carpools and transit use for MSA areas showing that the Washington DC region ranks 3rd in the nation in total percentage of carpoolers and transit users.

Next, Mr. Ramfos reviewed the total daily impacts of the Commuter Connections program for VT, VMT, NO_x, and VOC based on results from the FY 2009-2011 Commuter Connections TERM Analysis report. He also explained that federal planning regulations require the TPB to approve a congestion management process (CMP) which includes Transportation Demand Management as part of the metropolitan transportation plan and that Commuter Connections is the major demand management component of the region's CMP. Commuter Connections also provides transportation emission reduction measure benefits for inclusion in the air quality conformity determination approved by the TPB. This is part of the annual update of the region's CLRP and TIP. Impacts from the program may be needed to address future regional or national transportation green house gas emission targets. Results from Commuter Connections program impacts may also be used in new federal MAP-21 legislation performance measure requirements.

Commuter Connections has been shown to be a highly cost-effective way to reduce vehicle trips (VT), vehicle miles of travel (VMT), and vehicle emissions associated with commuting in the region. The overall program's cost-effectiveness is based on the results of the Commuter Connections TERM Analysis for VT, VMT, NO_x, and VOC.

A comparison of the FY 2014 CCWP budget to the proposed FY 2015 CCWP budget was shown and there are some slight changes for each of the program areas. Mr. Ramfos stated that there is a three and a half percent increase in the budget from FY 2014 due to general increases in each of the program areas and additional data collection activities which will be required during FY 2015. Mr. Ramfos explained the budget breakdown which includes about 30% of the costs going to COG/TPB staff & overhead, 52.5% of the costs for private sector services, 8.5% of the costs are passed through to local jurisdiction TDM programs, and 9% of the costs are attributed to direct costs.

The FY 2015 CCWP also has some new features and projects, including the updating of the funding agreement between COG and the state funding agencies, the 40th year anniversary celebration of Commuter Connections, the printing and distribution of the 2013 State of the Commute general public report, the completion of the 2012 – 2014 TERM Analysis Report, and the completion of the FY 2015 Placement Rate Survey.

Mr. Ramfos then discussed the next review and approval steps for the document.

A question was asked about how many commuters used the regional Guaranteed Ride Home program. Mr. Ramfos stated that there were about 2,500 users this past fiscal year and there is a survey conducted of program registrants every three years to determine the program's transportation and emission impacts.

6. Review of Draft FY 2015 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Miller reviewed a draft of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY 2015 (July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015). He said the final draft of the FY 2015 UPWP will be presented to the Committee for review at its March 7 meeting and to the TPB for approval at its March 19 meeting. He reviewed the overall budget estimates and said that at this point as in past years there is uncertainty regarding the final USDOT FY 2014 budget and appropriations for MPO planning funding from MAP-21 which needs to be extended beyond September 30, 2014. He explained that we have assumed that the FY 2015 funding allocations to be provided by DOTs will be the same as the current FY 2014 levels. In addition, the budget estimate assumes the level of unobligated funds from FY 2013 will be the same as the unspent funds from FY 2012. As in past years, the TPB will be asked to amend the budget in the fall once the final FY 2015 funding allocations are determined.

Mr. Miller briefly highlighted the work activities that include text to describe how we will respond to the new MPO planning requirements and new programs in MAP-21. He mentioned that the proposed MAP-21 Statewide and MPO Planning Rule is due to be released by February 28 and this may provide additional guidance on establishing and

using a performance-based approach to transportation decision making and development of transportation plans for some of the work activities.

He pointed to the other work activities in the document that describe how they will contribute to developing the new performance measures and targets. These activities (beginning on page 41) include: Congesting Management Process; Management, Operations and ITS Planning; Transportation Safety Planning; Freight Planning; and Regional Bus Planning. He said that the TPB role in the MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Program is described in the Transportation/Land Use Connection Program activity (page 38), and its role in the Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program is described in the Human Service Transportation Coordination activity (page 48).

Mr. Swanson distributed a revised description for activity 3.C Regional Studies, which will replace the description on pages 56-57 in the February 7th Draft posted for the Committee. The description for the Regional Priorities Plan (RTPP), which the TPB approved on January 15th, was revised. He explained the revisions which added a comparative assessment of the RTPP and CLRP, outreach activities on the RTPP, and enhancing the linkages to the COG Place plus Opportunities Plan, which was also approved in January.

Mr. Miller said that the first draft of the full document will be presented to the TPB at its February 19 meeting, and noted that the technical assistance programs for the DOTs and WMATA remain to be specified. He explained that some portions of the current work activities will be identified in March for carryover into FY 2015. The TPB will be asked to adopt the program on March 19 and then it will be submitted to FHWA and FTA for approval by July 1.

7. Briefing on WMATA's Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Streetcar Interoperability Study

Mr. Dahlberg briefed the Committee on WMATA's Light Rail Transit (LRT) and Streetcar Interoperability study, which is facilitating coordination among the several light rail and streetcar project sponsors and stakeholders across the region to maximize the potential compatibility of these projects. The goal of the ongoing study is to promote customer convenience and to coordinate system design in order to identify potential cost savings, operating efficiencies, and network connections. The study addresses opportunities for interoperability and coordination among: fare collection systems, vehicle types and specifications, operations and maintenance facilities, power supply, guideway design, and passenger information and user interface. Planning for interoperability now will enable future connections to be improved for consumers and operators. Stakeholder

discussion has been focusing on the low-hanging fruit first, with guideway and communications interoperability in particular leading to very detailed discussions.

Mr. Holloman asked when the study would be completed and when standard guidelines might be issued. Mr. Dahlberg responded that the study is scheduled to wrap up at the end of this fiscal year, but the expectation is that the discussion will continue regionally. Regarding a product, this study has been going for two years and doesn't have an end product deliverable, though interim technical memoranda are available on the website. It is all about ongoing facilitation of regional discussions and the issuance of technical RFPs by the various project owners. Mr. Malouff added that DDOT and Arlington have been active participants.

Mr. Milone asked about fare policy and transfer charges, as well as coordinated scheduling. Mr. Dahlberg responded that these items are in the future, and will be determined by the project owners. The study is facilitating the development of common infrastructure and technology so that there are options for these types of interoperability. This is the topic of the next work session of the study group.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if there was discussion of common branding of rail systems for passengers, such as logos and colors, as well common design for stations and markings grade-crossings. Mr. Dahlberg responded that roadway and station design exceeded the scope of the study, while each brand is being designed by its project owner to appeal to its service area and customers.

Mr. Del Giudice from Arlington added that County staff would be happy to brief the Technical Committee on the progress of the Columbia Pike Streetcar system. He noted that this service will replace some of the current bus service on this corridor, and is being planned to charge bus fares. The service will be integrated with Metro for both fares and schedules, just as is done now. However, there are still questions to resolve such as off-board fare payment, level boarding, multi-door boarding, and other inter-related fare and operations options.

Ms. Wesolek noted that the next part of the study will focus on building consensus and quantifying the benefits of increased interoperability. Mr. Dahlberg responded that the aim is to produce a list of the savings for potential interoperability options, and then perhaps draft Memorandums of Understandings (MOUs) which agencies could use to facilitate interoperability during design and procurement.

Mr. Emerine inquired as to back-office fare collection and customer information interoperability. Mr. Dahlberg responded that the intention is for the new Metro fare system, NEPP, to replicate the arrangements of the SmarTrip system which is used regionally. As to customer information, WMATA does as much as it can, but other agencies play an important role, such as the Arlington Mobility lab.

Mr. Ramfos noted that there are multiple data formats out there for customer information, as well as GIS and planning applications, and asked if WMATA would be trying to expanding the types of data it made available. Mr. Dahlberg responded that there are multiple promising technologies out there, mostly being developed by the private sector, and that WMATA keeps working to make its data available in a user-friendly way to these technology developers.

8. Briefing on the MARC Growth and Investment Plan

Ms. Ratcliff, Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) and Mr. Quinn, STV Inc., gave a presentation on the draft update of the MARC system's Growth and Investment plan. The draft update identifies improvements over the next 40 years on the three commuter rail lines of the MARC system and is an update to the original 2007 plan. Ridership continues to grow several percent every year, and so some \$2 billion of capital and operating investments are planned to take place over the next fifteen years to match growing demand across the region for commuter rail travel.

Ms. Wesolek asked if there were any plans for through service continuing on from L'Enfant Plaza across the river to Crystal City. Ms. Ratcliff responded that it is a topic that has been discussed, but there are too many uncertainties, including the cost and options for re-building the Long Bridge, that make any further study too early at this time.

Mr. Burns asked if there was any plan to electrify the Camden line to match the Penn Line? Ms. Ratcliff responded that MARC has chosen to focus on clean diesels as more viable for the Camden and Brunswick lines.

Mr. Holloman asked if MARC would ever accept the SmarTrip cards instead of the TLC pass used by riders of both MARC and the local transit systems. Ms. Ratcliff responded that there have been studies over the years, but the current trains don't have room for the fare equipment, and fare enforcement would have to be done in a whole new way. Maybe in the future this option can be re-examined.

Mr. Emerine noted that the plan spoke of assessing the opportunities for transit-oriented development around each station. He asked if this was done, and if there was any projection of the likely ridership impacts. Ms. Ratcliff responded that this study was to be performed in coming years, and that there is an expectation that such growth will bring ridership increases. However, parking is maxed-out at many stations, and this also is an issue for access to the service that needs to be addressed.

Mr. Weissberg asked if there was a potential for a new station in between Riverdale and Union Station. Ms. Ratcliff responded that the track layout is not favorable for such an addition.

9. Status Report on the Development of MAP-21 Performance Measures

Mr. Randall gave a presentation on the newly updated schedule distributed by USDOT or release of the MAP-21 performance provisions. The anticipated date of release for the draft rulemaking for Statewide and Metropolitan Planning is February 28, to be followed over the ensuing months by safety, bridge and pavement, and Congestion Management / Air Quality rules. Overall, it appears that the effective date for these MAP-21 performance provisions rules to become effective is slipping into mid-2015. Other forthcoming rules include Transit Agency Representation on MPO Boards guidance and the FTA Core Capacity program which will enable transit agencies to apply for New Starts funds that can be applied to current transit alignments.

Mr. Randall then reported on highlights from the VDOT – MPO/PDC Winter Meeting held on February 5 in Richmond. There has been a slight decrease in projected 5-year transportation revenues for Virginia due to reduced gas prices, which is likely affecting DC and Maryland as well, since all have moved to wholesale fuel taxation (i.e., a certain percentage of price) rather than cents per gallon. He also gave an update on current state bills in the General Assembly, including House Bill 2, which will likely require statewide prioritization of projects. He also went over new changes in the DRPT transit programs.

Mr. Ramfos asked for clarification on the CMAQ rule: is this the CMAQ program amendments or the congestion reduction program of the MAP-21 rules? Mr. Randall responded that the federal agencies seem to be conflating the two, and that maybe there would be more clarity in the next few months.

10. Other Business

Mr. Bean, the Executive Director of COG updated the Committee on the steps being taken to recruit a new director for the Department of Transportation. He highlighted the desirable qualities of the director and reviewed the make-up of the selection panel and schedule for the selection.

Ms. Erickson told the Committee about the press release of Maryland's upcoming BIG Projects workshop.

11. Adjourn