

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the October 2, 2009 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Update on Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2010 Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Austin reviewed the Call for Projects document and described two proposed changes. The first was the addition of a question on the CLRP Project Description form to obtain information on freight mobility. He distributed a handout to explain the second change proposed in response to comments made at the TPB by Ms. Tregoning and Ms. Hudgins. The new section titled "Evolving Policy Context and Direction for the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP" was intended to be inserted on page 7 following material on the overview of Policy Framework and Federal Requirements. Mr. Austin noted that the goals identified in the new section were taken from language used in the Greater Washington 2050 and Climate Change reports and that they also reflect anticipated language in upcoming federal transportation legislation.

Mr. Srikanth supported the addition of new language to the document. He suggested that the new text be moved to page 14, following the section on TPB Vision and Vision goals. He also suggested that the new text acknowledge that many of these goals already exist in the Vision in some manner.

Mr. Biesiadny suggested a revision to the final sentence to read "it would be worthwhile to consider this evolving policy context and direction..."

Mr. Kirby said these were good suggestions and that this section would be presented to the TPB at their meeting on November 18. Mr. Kirby said that there was some concern about the currently proposed schedule and suggested that the committee may want to recommend a delay. Mr. Srikanth

said that VDOT would not be able to meet the January 8, 2010 deadline because the Commonwealth had yet to finalize its long-range forecasts. He said that VDOT might not be ready until March.

Mr. Biesiadny added that the Commonwealth Transportation Board was still making adjustments to FY 2010 because of declining funds and had not even looked at 2011 yet. Representatives from the District and Maryland supported the delay to March.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the new context language should say anything about congestion management. Mr. Kirby replied that there was no discussion of new or evolving language on this matter in the upcoming legislation.

Mr. Erenrich asked what the implications of the delay were on the four-year expiration of the plan. Mr. Kirby said the last major Plan update was approved by the federal DOT partners in April 2007, which gives the TPB until April 2011 to receive federal approval for the 2010 update.

3. Briefing on COG Draft Greater Washington 2050

Mr. Robertson provided an overview of the Greater Washington 2050 Report, which he stated is currently released for public comment until November 30, 2009. He provided a presentation describing the 2050 Coalition's work on setting regional goals and targets across several sectors of housing, education, transportation, environment, public safety, among others. He also provided an overview of the compact created by the Greater Washington 2050 Coalition and stressed that signing on to the compact and adhering to it was strictly voluntary.

Mr. Kirby said that the effort was a significant undertaking and provided an overview of a draft letter from the TPB commenting on the report. He said that the draft letter addressed nine questions posed to TPB in a letter from Mr. Robertson to Chairman Jenkins.

Comments from committee members included a concern about the specific transportation targets and what existing data they are based on. Mr. Erenrich said that more input would be needed on the targets to ensure that they could actually be achievable. Mr. Robertson explained that targets

were a difficult issue, where some coalition members wanted harder targets, others wanted softer targets. However, he said that input was desired and jurisdictions should comment before November 30. Mr. Mohktari expressed a concern on the connection between CLRP development out to 2040 and the 2050 targets matching up.

Committee members also expressed specific concerns about some of the goals, stating that while it was good to acknowledge that transportation and other sectors are interrelated, they do not have control on land use issues. Members specifically said that meeting the specific housing affordability target in the report would be difficult.

Mr. Besiadny said that baseline analysis would be helpful in assessing the appropriateness of targets. Concerns on the make-up of the coalition were also raised because the DOTs were not involved. Ms. Foster commented that freight should be addressed in the report.

4. Briefing on Proposed Response to the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee's (CAC) Recommendation to Develop a Long-Range Regional Transportation Priority Plan

Referring to the handout memo, Mr. Kirby described the draft staff response to the CAC recommendations titled "Moving Forward with the Development of a Regional Long- Range Transportation Plan." The memo proposed that the TPB should 1) develop a consolidated list of unfunded transportation projects and priorities that have been identified at the regional, state and local levels, 2) host a regional forum in early Spring 2010 to discuss regional transportation priorities, and 3) develop an enhanced work plan for long-range plan activities.

Mr. Mokhtari said that the jurisdictions had to scramble to put together the recent TIGER grant application. He said this experience illustrated the need for a regional plan with identified priorities that would be "on the shelf."

Mr. Kirby said that, to the contrary, the TIGER grant application showed that flexibility is necessary to respond to opportunities such as the TIGER grant. He said the concept of high-quality transit was already established through work

on the Aspirations Scenario, and he further noted that participants had plenty of time to pull the proposal together.

Mr. Biesiadny also disagreed with Mr. Mokhtari. He said that there were plenty of projects ready and identified for inclusion in the TIGER proposal. He said the issue is not a lack of projects, but rather a lack of funding. He also said it was time to commit to some hard deadlines for the completion of the scenario study.

Chairman Erenrich said it was important to note that every county was doing master planning that involved identification of transportation priorities. He said this information needs to be brought to the surface.

Mr. Kirby noted that Chairman Erenrich's point was reflected in his memo, which called for the development of a consolidated list of unfunded transportation projects and priorities that have been identified at the regional, state and local levels.

Mr. Kirby noted that having the federal government as a partner does not make planning decision making more predictable. He noted that with the recent BRAC shifts, there was no opportunity to negotiate with the federal government.

Chairman Erenrich said that at the regional level, there is a need for coordination on BRAC challenges.

Ms. Haldeman said there is a need for continuous outreach and education on regional transportation challenges.

Mr. Kirby agreed that there is a need for more education. As an example, he cited a recent survey which found that 70 percent of recipients think that the gasoline tax is indexed to inflation.

5. Briefing on I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor

Mr. Anderson of the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) and Mr. Kiegel of the Maryland Mass Transit Administration (MTA) presented a

comprehensive 23 slide presentation on the I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study, which includes the Corridor Cities Transitway. The study area includes 30 miles of limited access highway on I-270 and US 15 in Montgomery and Frederick Counties and 14 miles of transitway within Montgomery County. The Committee was briefed on the study background, its purpose and need, measures of effectiveness, the alternatives studied, a summary of public and agency comments received to date, and next steps.

Chairman Erenrich suggested that the presentation needs to be much more focused for the TPB and only present relevant background and key information on the alternatives currently under consideration.

Ms. Haldeman asked if MTA had received WMATA's comments on the Corridor City Transitway and if a bike path was included. Mr. Kiegel replied that the comments were received. He said that the footprint includes a bike path, but the path is not assumed to be constructed in this study.

Mr. Kirby said that there will be a lot of interest at the TPB on the study and suggested that the presentation be tailored to give a more regional view.

6. Briefing on the Washington metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program

Mr. Ey, the MATOC Facilitator, reported and introduced his new colleague Ms. Jordan who has joined him at MATOC, monitoring and making regional transportation incident notifications. Since the last report to the TPB in September, MATOC had moved to its more permanent operations home, co-located with the Capital Wireless Information Net (CapWIN) offices in Greenbelt. This co-location takes advantage of cost savings by sharing CapWIN's already existing computer and communications infrastructure.

Mr. Ey noted MATOC's continuing coordination activities during a number of incidents that occurred in September through November. He described regional coordination of two Capital Beltway incidents that illustrate MATOC's impacts, which were to be cited in his upcoming November 18 presentation to the TPB. MATOC also helped maintain regional situational awareness during the November 4 – 5 Montgomery County-wide traffic signals computer

outage. Additionally, as was the case at the time of the September report, the MATOC Steering Committee continues to actively work to address the MATOC long-term funding issue.

7. Briefing on an Amendment to the FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Revise the Budget and Certain Work Tasks

Mr. Miller distributed a PowerPoint presentation on an amendment to the FY 2010 UPWP to revise the budget to reflect funding increases and modify certain work tasks for the last half of the fiscal year. He said that the TPB will be briefed on this amendment at its November 18 meeting and asked to approve it on December 16. He provided the background on the conservative assumptions in the budget that the TPB approved in March. He explained that since then the final FTA and FHWA funding allocations provided by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) have changed and there is an additional \$868,000 for the budget. He then quickly reviewed five work activities and three technical assistance programs that are proposed to receive additional funding.

Mr. Meese also reviewed a proposed new work activity to provide planning support to the MATOC Program with a budget of \$120,000. Mr. Thomas asked if this activity would help solve MATOC's funding needs. Mr. Kirby said that this activity would provide planning support to the program, but MATOC will need \$400,000 per year from the three states for operations.

Mr. Mokhtari expressed support for more funding for implementing projects under the TLC program rather than for more studies. Mr. Kirby said that changes to the TLC program should be addressed in next year's program.

Chairman Erenrich asked what the likely hood is that this increase would continue next year. Mr. Kirby said he did not know. Congress still needs to act to reauthorize the federal surface transportation program, identify new revenues, and approve the USDOT FY 2010 budget.

8. Briefing on the COG Climate, Energy & Environment Policy Committee and Draft 2009-2012 Regional Climate Action Work Plan

Mr. Clifford discussed an item that was distributed at the meeting. The item contained a November 6th draft memorandum from Mr. Kirby to Mr. Freudberg commenting on the Climate, Energy & Environment Policy Committee's (CEEPC) Draft 2009-2012 Regional Climate Action Workplan. The item also contained four attachments with related materials; the first three attachments had been previously posted on the web site, and the fourth attachment was newly issued, as described below.

Mr. Clifford noted that the new COG committee (CEEPC) was formed after the publication of the November 2008 climate change report. In September CEEPC released for review and comment a draft workplan to obtain emissions reductions from all emissions sources to achieve the 2012 goal, a 10% reduction below 'business as usual' greenhouse gas emissions levels.

Mr. Clifford briefly discussed the four attachments. Attachment 1 contains an October 22nd version of the CEEPC workplan showing recommendations and performance measures. Attachment 2 is an October 15th email from Mr. Clifford to Mr. Freudberg offering comments on the transportation section of the Climate Action Workplan presented to CEEPC at its September 23rd meeting. Attachment 3 is an October 20th email from VDOT to Mr. Freudberg containing VDOT's comments on the workplan. Attachment 4 incorporates the recommended changes into the recommendations and performance measures list included in Attachment 1. Mr. Clifford noted on Attachment 4 that items hi-lighted in blue are new, and items hi-lighted in peach are relocated. He indicated that four TPB work program activities are folded in and timelines are shown. He pointed out that the line items listing VMT reduction (item 10), transportation operations coordination program (line 26), freight (line 30), and regional planning (line 39) are relocated to the TPB work program section of the document.

Mr. Clifford noted that there would be a conference call on Monday discussing the workplan and comments, and that staff would like the Committee's endorsement on the proposed comments.

Chairman Erenrich asked if the dates were calendar or fiscal year. Mr. Clifford replied calendar.

Mr. Srikanth indicated that he was part of the CEEPC, and that he supported the updates in Attachment 4. He suggested using the same row ID numbers as in Attachment 1. Mr. Clifford responded that staff decided to develop a separate document, as the original table had already been updated with new line numbers. Mr. King suggested that the updated list should be transmitted as a memo, and that he would make updates with consecutive row numbering. Mr. Thomas asked what happened to the bike/pedestrian measures that were included in the original document. Mr. Clifford replied that those and other measures had been listed as examples, but that they had been deleted by DEP staff to be consistent with the other sections of the document. Mr. Kirby noted that there are too many examples to list them all.

Mr. Kirby said that TPB is asking to report on current technical work efforts before specific projects are “hard-wired”.

Mr. Srikanth noted that some projects are listed as being the responsibility of local governments, and suggested that those jurisdictions should comment.

The Committee endorsed advancing the memo.

9. Briefing on the Norfolk Southern Crescent Corridor Intermodal Freight Project

Norfolk Southern’s Mr. Smith spoke to a Power Point presentation. He introduced the Crescent Corridor initiative and spoke about the benefits this would have for the region. The Commonwealth of Virginia has invested \$43 million since 2007 and has pledged an additional \$60 million for the initiative. Norfolk Southern is in discussions with Maryland for support. At full build-out, the Crescent Corridor would be a 2,500 mile network to link the supply chain from the South to the Northeast. This provides potential for over one million fewer truckloads as containers and trailers can travel by rail for the North-South domestic long hauls. Mr. Smith estimated 884,000 annual truck diversions from Maryland and 878,000 annual truck diversions from Virginia. At build-out the Crescent Corridor would deliver logistics savings, safety savings, emissions eliminated, highway maintenance savings, congestion savings, and fuel savings. He concluded with a request of the Transportation Planning Board for support of the Crescent Corridor Initiative.

Chairman Erenrich asked if Norfolk Southern had applied for TIGER funding. Mr. Smith replied yes, Norfolk Southern applied via a multi-state grant where Pennsylvania was the lead state applicant.

In response to Mr. Farrell's question about who benefits from the project, Mr. Smith discussed how the Crescent Corridor would benefit thirteen states primarily. He noted that 80 percent of freight shipping is domestic.

Currently most the north-south moves or the south to Chicago moves are made by truck. Mr. Smith noted that 4.1 million trucks drive north-south for distances of 500 miles or greater. Market share is available for a mode shift to rail.

Mr. Kirby noted that TPB staff would prepare a Draft letter that would be on the December Committee agenda for discussion. Norfolk Southern would then present it at the December 16 Transportation Planning Board meeting.

10. Briefing on the Establishment of the Virginia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (VAMPO)

Mr. Austin spoke to the material distributed for the item. He explained the purpose and mission of the organization and noted that VAMPO was requesting that each member MPO pass a resolution supporting their establishment.

Mr. Erenrich asked if this type of organization should be replicated in Maryland. Ms. Erickson noted that there are fewer MPOs in Maryland and that a great deal of communication already exists between them.

Mr. Biesiadny said that a role should be defined for the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority.

Mr. Srikanth expressed concerns about the MPOs having a role in project selection and the role of Maryland and the District in the TPB's membership in VAMPO.

Mr. Austin noted that only one initial meeting had been held so far and that the organizational structure and bylaws had not been determined yet.

11. Review of Draft Brochure on the 2009 CLRP and FY 2011-2015 TIP

Mr. Hodgson explained that the handout included draft charts and maps detailing performance of the 2009 CLRP, including the recently approved amendments. He asked that Committee members review the materials in the handout and forward any comments or questions to him and that staff would present the full draft brochure for Committee review at the December 4 meeting.

12. Other Business

None.

13. Adjourn