

TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ITEM #1



National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

Technical Committee Minutes

**For the meeting of
April 7, 2017**

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the April 7, 2017 Technical Committee Meeting

Chairman Davis called the meeting to order. Participants introduced themselves.

2. Approval of Regional Bike to Work Day 2017 Proclamation

A briefing of upcoming activities for the region's 2017 Bike To Work Day event was given by Mr. Ramfos. Bike to Work Day will be held on Friday, May 19th through a regional partnership between Commuter Connections and the Washington Area Bicyclist Association (WABA). The event was expanded in 2001 by Commuter Connections and is geared towards encouraging commuters in the region to use bicycling as a clean, fun and healthy way to get to work. A participation goal has also been set by the Bike to Work Day Steering Committee. Mr. Ramfos stated that the COG/TPB staff coordinates the event; however, there are scores of other individuals that are involved in putting on the event each year.

Bicycling is supported in several different ways including cycling classes offered by WABA, Commuter Connections bike to work guides and 86 "pit stops" for this year's event. Commuter Connections also promotes its Guaranteed Ride Home program to cyclists. "Commuter convoys" will also be sponsored through WABA volunteers at several of the pit stops. The convoys are helpful for first-time or novice bicyclists.

There are many event "freebies" including food and prizes, bike maps and literature, bike raffles, bicycle tune-ups at some of the pit stops and free t-shirts for those registering by the deadline.

A graph tracking the growth of the Bike to Work Day event by event registrants and number of pit stops was then shown. There has been somewhat of a leveling off in terms of participants and number of pit stops.

Mr. Ramfos stated that Bike to Work Day coincides with National Bike to Work week. In 2016 there were approximately 17,500 registrants and the goal for 2017 is to reach 18,600 registrants which represents a 6% increase. There was also a record setting \$54,550 received in corporate sponsorships for the 2017 event. The TPB will be asked to adopt a Bike to Work Day Proclamation during its April meeting.

Employer involvement with bicycling includes support from employers for the event through the Commuter Connections Employer Outreach program. It also includes educating employers about bicycling benefits including reduced parking and employee health and fitness improvements. Many employers in the region host Bike to Work Day pit stops. Mr. Ramfos also reported that Commuter Connections also promotes an Employer Challenge and that the top five employers with the most registered employees for the event are selected and then one is randomly chosen as the winner. The winning employer's employees that registered for the event receive a luncheon and the site is presented with an appreciation plaque. Many employers in the region support bicycling to work through the installation of bicycle racks, lockers and cages, and shower facilities. The federal bicycle subsidy and Capital Bikeshare memberships for employees are also promoted to employers.

A regional survey is conducted of event participants every three years as part of the Commuter Connections Mass Marketing TERM analysis. The purpose of the survey is to measure impacts of event participation and to assess use of bicycles for commute travel before and after event. The last survey was administered in 2013 via e-mail and there was a 29% response rate. The results are used in the Commuter Connections TERM Analysis Report. Mr. Ramfos reported that a survey was conducted last November for 2016 event participants and the results are currently being reviewed.

Mr. Ramfos then reviewed some of the results from the survey including age breakdown, the home and work states of participants, and the type of employer they worked for. 34% of participants worked for the federal government and the same held true for the private sector. 21% worked for non-profit organizations, and 9% work for state or local governments. About 2% of the participants are self-employed. 17% of the survey respondents stated that they had never commuted by bicycle before Bike to Work Day and 10% of the respondents stated that they started bicycling to work about a day and a half each week after Bike to Work Day.

Next, Mr. Ramfos stated that Bike to Work Day is a rain or shine regional event. Each of the pit stops is encouraged to have a contingency plan to determine whether to cancel their local pit stop event based on inclement weather. A regional rain date is not set mainly because there is no clear definition on what is enough rain and whether it may be raining in one part of the region and not another. There are no guarantees that it wouldn't rain on the rain date. Setting a rain date may send the wrong message that commuters can't bicycle to work in the rain.

WABA plans to send VIP invitations out to formally invite elected officials to participate in the event. All the TPB members will be on the list and will be asked to RSVP to the pit stop of their choice.

The event's web site address is www.biketoworkmetrodc.org, and includes a section that allows registrants to choose the pit stop closest to them. The maps associated with the pit stops were produced in collaboration with COG/TPB GIS staff. Facebook and Twitter social media pages for the event are also available. Mr. Ramfos stated that Instagram and Snapchat social media outlets will be used and "geofilters" will also be made available to those posting photos from the event. Posters and "rack cards" have also been produced for employers, bicycle shops and others to use to promote the event. There will also be t-shirts available for those that register by the deadline.

Mr. Ramfos also stated that corporate sponsorship dollars will be used to produce pit stop banners that can also serve as a way to advertise the event in the community surrounding the pit stops.

Dan Emerine asked whether there was income or zip code data available from the Bike to Work Day survey conducted. Mr. Ramfos stated that there was income data but would have to check on the zip codes being available. Mr. Emerine stated that this type of information would be useful for a TDM plan that DDOT is in the process of developing to help determine whether these types of programs are reaching underserved populations. Mr. Ramfos stated that he would take a closer look at the data collected from the 2016 survey to determine whether zip code information would be available. Gary Erenrich stated the presentation to the TPB should emphasize the amount of local staff working on the event. Tim Davis asked whether the BTWD Proclamation was available in draft format. Mr. Ramfos stated that it would be posted as part of the TPB agenda and made available to everyone at that time. Mr.

Ramfos also stated that TPB members would be encouraged to go back to their jurisdictions and pass similar Proclamations.

3. Recap of Items out for Public Comment and Summary of Public Comments to date Regarding the Proposed “Out-of-Cycle” Amendment to the 2016 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the Amendment to the 2016 CLRP and 2017-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Austin stated that the public comment period began on March 9 and would close on Saturday, April 8. He noted that approximately 20 comments had been received at the time of the meeting and gave a brief characterization of the comments. Following the close of the comment period, Mr. Austin stated that he would work with staff from the pertinent member agencies to develop responses to the comments. Ms. Erickson noted that the Board would be asked to review and approve the projects and that the comments would be incorporated into the documentation of the amendment to the CLRP.

Ms. Posey reminded that the scope of work was out for public comment along with the project inputs, and that there were no updates to the scope since it was presented at the last month’s meeting.

4. Long-Range Plan Task Force Status Report

Mr. Davis stated that the membership of the Long-Range Plan Task Force was announced two days prior to the Technical Committee meeting and the first meeting was scheduled for the upcoming Monday. He stated that anyone who cannot be present at the meeting is welcome to listen in through the phone.

Mr. Srikanth explained that the resolution establishing the Long-Range Plan Task Force passed at the board meeting on March 29 was in the mailout materials. He stated that the only significant change to that version was a membership structure proposed by the board chairs and passed, with some amendments, along with the resolution. He explained the process by which TPB members nominated themselves followed by the chairs making a decision on the final membership group, the list of which is available on the website of the Long-Range Plan Task Force.

Mr. Srikanth explained that Technical Committee members, as well as TPB members and alternates who are not members of the task force, are welcome to attend and observe the meetings. He stated that the website will be regularly updated and that updates of the task force will be a regular agenda item for both the Technical Committee and TPB going forward. Mr. Srikanth explained the approach for the first meeting of the task force on April 10 agreed upon by the board chairs and reflected in the agenda and meeting materials. He also described the vision for the task force’s work over the next few months, which is detailed in the work plan document.

Mr. Erenrich asked how the task force meetings would be run and if there was going to be a facilitator. Mr. Srikanth responded that the chair of the task force, Jay Fiset, will facilitate the meetings. Mr. Erenrich followed up by asking if the technical consultant had been hired yet. Mr. Srikanth responded that the RFQ was in development and that staff is trying to secure the consultant as soon as possible.

Ms. Davis asked if assumptions would be made regarding what's in the CLRP, noting that two of the challenges listed in the mailout materials for the task force include state-of-good-repair.

She said that if there is going to be a limited list of 6-10 projects, programs and policies identified by the task force, she wondered how state-of-good-repair could fit into that in the context of "game-changers." Mr. Srikanth replied by saying the challenges are up for discussion by the task force so they will determine their final list, and suggested different options for how the task force may handle the state-of-good-repair issue.

A committee member asked what the plan would be for taking action on the initiatives studied by the task force, such as would localities adopt new projects into their comprehensive plans. Mr. Srikanth responded by saying that the task force and board will end up with a list of projects, programs and policies they will champion to the region, and that some localities may choose to adjust their current plans in line with the support of their members.

Mr. Brown stated his concern that the term "game-changing" sounds too much like an initiative that would have an immediate and large impact. He said he believes expectations need to be managed because the positive and significant changes coming to the region from creative initiatives will take years or decades to show a large impact.

Ms. Erickson stated that at the next TPB meeting there would be an update on the Long-Range Plan Task Force, and there will continue to be updates for the foreseeable future.

5. Approval of Projects Recommended for Funding Under the FY 2018 Transportation Alternatives Set Aside Program for Northern Virginia TPB Jurisdictions

Mr. Cobb presented on the approved projects for the Transportation Alternatives Set Aside in Northern Virginia. The 2015 FAST authorized the TPB to make funding selections for projects through the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program. The TPB works with the Virginia Department of Transportation to review and select projects. TPB staff organized a selection panel made up of staff of DDOT and Prince's George's Department of Streets and Public Works. The selection panel reviewed the projects and selected them using a point and ranking system that considers several regional goals and priorities. The panel selected seven projects to receive \$2.7 million in funding.

6. 2018 Quadrennial Update of The Long-Range Plan

Ms. Erickson spoke to current work efforts on the long-range plan update. She stated that this agenda item will be on every Technical Committee agenda going forward to ensure jurisdictional staff are kept up to date.

Mr. Randall then spoke to the required financial analysis for the 2018 LRP. Staff are working with the three DOTs and WMATA to develop revenue and expenditure projections. There have been several round of meetings and teleconference. In addition, a conference call was held with local jurisdictions and agencies to discuss revenue and expenditure data as well, though in many cases they will need to know state estimates first. The next part of the analysis is review of major projects and costs. He noted that the database of these has some evident errors, which will need to be corrected. There are also some projects that have been on the books for twenty-five years, and stakeholders should review these projects. TPB staff anticipate competing their review and sending out the list in the coming weeks.

Mr. Swanson spoke to the public participation activities planned in support of the 2018 LRTP.

He explained that staff is planning to conduct a public opinion survey this spring/summer. Workshops will be conducted in the fall/winter.

Mr. Hampton added that other MPO public participation plans have been reviewed to learn lessons.

Ms. Erickson closed by noting that the purpose of conducting the public survey now is so that it can be wrapped into and inform the Call for Projects and the CLRP process that will kick-off at the end of the year. She solicited input from jurisdictional staff by e-mail, with possible conference calls or other sessions to come.

Mr. Brown noted that Loudoun County has done extensive public outreach in support of the county's plan, and suggested that the county's work and findings be reviewed to see if any information can be integrated into the TPB's efforts.

Ms. Erickson noted that the board will be asked to adopt not only the projects of the CLRP but also the projects identified through the long-range planning task force. Board members will not only advance their own projects, but also those of the region. And through the PBPP process, board members will also have to approve projects outside of their region. This segues to the next agenda items, in which MDOT and VDOT will speak about their statewide prioritization process. Next month, there will be presentations by DDOT and WMATA, and then subsequently NVTA and any other agencies. These presentations on prioritization processes need to be communicated to board members to educate them on the different selection processes in the region.

7. Project Prioritization in the Washington Region: A Series of Presentations on How Funding Agencies Prioritize Projects for Funding in the CLRP and TIP – Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT)

Ms. Erickson introduced former long-term colleague Ms. Michelle Martin.

Ms. Martin gave the first in a series of presentations on how funding agencies prioritize projects for funding. She explained the MDOT structure, including the development of the State Report on Transportation. She described transportation planning at the state, regional, and local levels. She also described transportation funding processes, including the development of the Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP), the identification of program priorities, and project/program selection criteria.

Ms. Erickson asked for more explanation of the "Priority Letter" process, including how data is provided by local jurisdictions and how it is used by MDOT.

Ms. Martin explained that state law requires submitting agencies to provide data justifying projects submitted for funding. The state uses this as an essential part of their project selection process. She said that some of this information is qualitative and some is quantitative.

Mr. Lake asked whether the presentation should more explicitly identify "at the governor's discretion" as a factor for project selection.

Ms. Martin agreed that state policy and politics plays a role in project selection.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the governor's decision to cancel the Red Line in Baltimore was well known, but much less well known was that state did fund a package of improvements for Baltimore.

Ms. Martin agreed, noting that MDOT had funded a number of important and efficient bus improvements for Baltimore. She said these projects represent a major overhaul for the area's bus system.

Ms. Erickson added said that this work included important transit signal priority (TSP) initiatives that never would have been funded if the Red Line had been funded.

Mr. Malouff said it was useful to note that in comparison to Virginia, Maryland's project selection process is more centralized.

Ms. Martin agreed, noting that this fact was sometimes for the good and sometimes not.

8. Project Prioritization in the Washington Region: A Series of Presentations on How Funding Agencies Prioritize Projects for Funding in the CLRP and TIP – Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)

Mr. Whitaker described Virginia's Smart Scale performance-based prioritization process. He said that Smart Scale allocates most new State capital funds through a performance-based competition. He said that NVTA regional project funds are also allocated through performance evaluation. Both funding programs are guided by long range, multi-modal plans. He described the solicitation process for Smart Scale and criteria and methodology for project selection. He described how the

Ms. Erickson asked is Smart Scale is federal or state funding.

Mr. Whitaker said that Smart Scale is state funding. He said there is about \$1 billion for the current round.

Mr. Brown said the funds that ultimately come to projects can include a mixture of federal, state and other funds.

9. Performance-Based Planning and Programming – Draft Regional Targets for Transit Asset Management

Mr. Davis introduced the agenda item, noting that presentations have been given by MTA, DRPT, and WMATA at recent meetings. This agenda item is the culmination of those presentations as well as information from other transit agencies.

Mr. Randall then spoke to the agenda item, referring to the memo and presentation included in the mail-out. He noted that this is an item on the April TPB agenda, with approval of the region's targets to take place at the May TPB meeting. He then reviewed the federal requirements for transit asset management, to which local jurisdictions have been responding. He noted that there are two levels of requirements, with larger agencies reporting directly to FTA, of which there are seven in the region. Smaller systems are reporting through the statewide agencies, MTA and DRPT respectively. Overall, there are nine reporting entities in the region providing targets to TPB as the MPO. He then reviewed the differences in asset

classes and that agencies can set their own standards and targets for each asset class. Given the variation among asset classes, standards, and targets among the region's agencies, the staff recommendation is to propose the matrix of the nine entities and their four top-level targets as the set of targets to be formally approved by the TPB as the MPO.

Mr. Holloman asked how these requirements would apply if jurisdictions or transit agencies are contracting out first-mile/last-mile connecting services to TNCs. Mr. Randall responded that the jurisdiction or agency have no direct responsibility for their capital assets, and therefore these services would not come under this rule.

Ms. Erickson emphasized that this is a board item and a staff proposal, so committee attendees are encouraged to brief their board members on this proposal and action. Mr. Srikanth added that the targets of the transit providers have already been adopted at a local or agency level, and that the recommendation is based on your adopted targets. However, in other places MPO boards have adopted more aspirational targets, to encourage improved performance. Another option would be to average the region's targets and set MPO targets based on averages, but that would make half the agencies already better than the region's targets, potentially removing further incentive to improve performance. As targets will be set annually, starting with a pragmatic set of targets and then seeing how this develops over the next year is the preferred course of action.

10. Performance-Based Planning and Programming–Pavement and Bridge Condition Performance

Mr. Davis introduced this item by noting that the website for this item is really valuable. Mr. Randall thanked Ms. McCall and Ms. Howard for their labor that went into producing this resource. He then spoke to a memo in the mail-out and then opened the website page. He noted that the committee was previously briefed in December on the region's 2015 data. Now the 2016 bridge data is available, and staff have also developed summary sheets and produced website information for each jurisdiction. The summary sheets show performance as well as important background information such as the percentage ownership of non-Interstate NHS in each jurisdiction.

Using the website, Mr. Randall explained various options on the website. He noted that some data is known to be incorrect, with some bridges having obviously incorrect lat-long data. Staff decided to faithfully recreate what is the federal databases rather than try to make corrections; ideally this data will be improved and corrected going forward as DOTs react to the new HPMS manual requirements and the PBPP data collection requirements. On the map, he pointed out condition around Union Station and in the District as examples of the data available. Ms. Howard noted the legend available on the screen.

Mr. Brown noted that this will be a useful item for Loudoun County to see if VDOT is doing a good job on maintaining bridges in the county. It was noted the county does not own any NHS roads; instead either VDOT or the towns own the non-Interstate NHS roads in the county. Mr. Srikanth asked for an update on the due dates for targets in this rulemaking. Mr. Randall responded that the final rule for pavement and bridge condition came out on January 18, 2017, and the effective date is currently suspended by the new administration. While the rule is final, there could be changes in the actual effective date. Currently DOTs would set their first targets by February of 2018 and MPOs within six months following, or by August 2018. Ms. Howard noted that besides the information available on the webpage, TPB staff will also be updating the Regional Data Clearinghouse to include layers of this data.

Mr. Davis asked about submitting corrections. Ms. McCall noted that some data is known to be incorrect, but it is up to the State DOTs to submit correct data to FHWA. TPB staff have taken the data straight from the HPMS and NBI databases. Specifically, VA 267 out of Dale City is one example where surface type data is apparently incorrect, which is why it is shown in purple.

Mr. Srikanth added that targets will be set at the state level and at the MPO level. Targets are not set by local jurisdictions, but staff felt it important to make data available at the jurisdictional level for informative purposes.

11. Ozone Maintenance Plan

Ms. Posey noted that this item is going to the TPB and that there were two documents included in the mailout. The first was a letter from TPB to MWAQC, and the second was the slide presentation. Ms. Posey reminded the group that VOC and NOx are precursors for ozone. She noted that ozone levels have been decreasing steadily, and that the region is in compliance with the 2008 ozone standard. She indicated that MWAQC is developing a re-designation request and maintenance plan for the standard. She reviewed the reasons for developing a maintenance plan. She listed the components of the maintenance plan, including the development of mobile inventories for 2014, 2025, and 2030. She explained that the mobile inventories will be used to develop new mobile budgets, and the new mobile budgets will be used in future air quality conformity analyses. She explained that mobile emissions inventories are developed using current assumptions, such as current federal vehicle and fuel standards and current vehicle fleet and cooperative forecast data. She then noted that these assumptions can change in the future, and that the new assumptions would be used to develop mobile inventories for future conformity analyses. The new mobile inventories would be compared against the mobile budgets which were developed using the old assumptions, and thus could cause the region's conformity analysis to fail. Ms. Posey explained that in order to address these uncertainties related to assumptions used in developing the mobile inventories, staff drafted a letter from TPB to MWAQC recommending that 1) the mobile emissions budgets for 2025 and 2030 be set with a safety margin of 20% above the mobile inventories, and that 2) the maintenance plan include explicit language indicating that the mobile budgets will be updated to accommodate changes to federal control programs and/or emissions models. She noted that the TPB would be asked to approve the letter at the board April meeting. Ms. Posey presented graphs showing the mobile inventories and recommended mobile budgets using the 20% safety margins. She noted that the 2025 mobile budget would be used for any conformity analysis year between 2025 and 2029, and that the 2030 mobile budget would be used for any conformity analysis year from

2030 to the out year of the CLRP, which will be to 2045 for the 2018 CLRP. She reviewed the maintenance plan schedule, which includes development of mobile budgets in the April to June timeframe, public hearings in the September to November timeframe, and submission of the re-designation request and maintenance plan to EPA in early 2018. She noted that as soon as the budgets are approved or found adequate by EPA that they must be used in any subsequent conformity analysis, including one that is currently underway.

There were no questions.

12. Intercity Bus and Tourism

Ms. Koudounas briefed the committee on the tasks that TPB staff have undertaken to meet the new federal requirements finalized in May 2016 regarding Intercity Bus travel. She

highlighted key findings regarding intercity bus counts, including numbers and locations of boardings and alightings, as well as origins and destinations. Ms. Koudounas recommended some future study possibilities, which included conducting a passenger survey, and counting all seven days of intercity bus travel. She indicated that these findings and additional study could inform TDM and other TPB planning efforts.

A committee member asked why the study did not include station travel during holidays or other peak travel times. Ms. Koudounas responded by indicating that at the time of the study, TPB was aiming for a representation of average/typical travel behavior, given the limitations of the period during which data was collected.

A citizen asked if any data had been retrieved on ridership prior to deregulation. Mr. Zilliacus indicated that the data does not exist.

13. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – April 7, 2017**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County Ben Yeckley
Frederick County -----
City of Frederick Timothy Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County Gary Erenrich
Prince George's County Anthony Foster
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery County -----
Prince George's County -----
MDOT Matt Baker
Kari Snyder
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County Mike Lake
Malcolm Watson
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
NVTA Sree Nampoothiri
NVTC Patricia Happ
Prince William County James Davenport
PRTC Betsy Massie
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Norman Whitaker
Regina Moore
VDRPT Clinton Edwards
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

Allison Davis

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

FHWA-DC -----
FHWA-VA -----
FTA -----
NCPC -----
NPS Laurel Hammig
MWAQC -----
MWAA -----

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP
Lyn Erickson, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Bill Bacon, DTP
Lamont Cobb, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Ken Joh, DTP
Arianna Koudounas, DTP
Jessica Mirr, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Dzung Ngo, DTP
Jinchul Park, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Sergio Ritacco, DTP
Jon Schermann, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Feng Xei, DTP
Lori Zeller, DTP
Abigail Zenner, DTP
Patrick Zilliacus, DTP
Sunil Kumar, DEP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS
Nicole McCall, DCPS

OTHER

Alex Brun, MDE
Victor Henry, BMC
Michelle Martin, MDOT
Bill Orleans