

## **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

### **1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the June 5 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### **2. Briefing on the CSX National Gateway Freight Rail Initiative**

Ms. Cardoza, CSX Director of Strategic Infrastructure Investments briefed the Committee on the National Gateway Initiative. This Initiative would create a double-stack rail network along key corridors to improve the flow of freight between the Mid-Atlantic and Midwest, as well as the nation. The initiative would also add six new terminals, including one to serve the Baltimore/Washington region. It is proposed to be funded in part by federal funds from the next transportation authorization. At the June 17 Transportation Planning Board meeting, CSX Transportation made public comment and asked the TPB to join the states of Maryland and Virginia, several other states, and the Cincinnati and Toledo Metropolitan Planning Organizations in writing a letter of support for the initiative. Ms. Cardoza concluded her presentation with a request for TPB support of the National Gateway Initiative.

Ms. Cardoza clarified that all projects are anticipated to be completed by 2012 with the exception of the Virginia Avenue Tunnel.

Ms. Erickson asked how many states are involved in the Initiative and how their funding contributions are split. Ms. Cardoza responded that six states are involved and their funding contributions are proportionate to the number of projects in each state.

Mr. Erenrich was interested in who would repair the City Bridge in Montgomery County. CSX has met with local and state employees to discuss some of the eldest bridges in worst repair. Some can be removed; however, CSX has not focused on funding yet.

Mr. Meese asked whether CSX can provide the Study referred to in presentation that shows benefits of National Gateway Initiative. Ms. Cardoza replied yes.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the National Gateway Initiative was consistent with the MARC 2030 Plan. Ms. Cardoza replied yes, the tunnel coincides with the MARC 2030 Plan and CSX is working with local agencies.

Mr. Kirby asked if CSX would still be sharing tracks with VRE and MARC under the Initiative. CSX responded that they are working with VRE southbound to add a third rail. There is still a problem with the Long Bridge.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the Initiative would increase the number of trains or increase the amount of freight moved. CSX responded that there will be an increase whether or not the Initiative takes hold. With more freight entering the Ports of Norfolk and Baltimore, there will be more trains and trucks.

Mr. Erenrich also spoke from a Montgomery County perspective that he would like to have a list of projects and know who CSX has spoken to in the County. He reiterated the need to involve local governments especially on bridge issues. CSX promised to make available a more specific presentation on project details and summary of contacts.

Mr. Biesiadny commented that the Virginia Governor did not sign the joint letter, but a separate letter of support. He also suggested that in fairness the Technical Committee should hear from Norfolk Southern Railroad.

Mr. Erenrich asked how the Initiative money competes with MD State DOT and TPB projects for TIGER funding. Ms. Cardoza explained that MD, VA, NC, PA, OH have committed to submitting one package for federal funding. CSX explained that state funding is the biggest cost driver. CSX is requesting 77 million in federal money, from TIGER funds, Authorization, any source they can identify.

Mr. Kirby raised three key issues: TPB needs to know more about the projects; what to say in a broad brush letter; and when a letter will be available from the District. Ms. Erickson noted that it would be difficult to get anything more than a general endorsement.

Mr. Biesiadny raised the concern again for Norfolk Southern, another major railroad. Mr. Srikanth of VDOT replied that the CSX letter of support question is not mutually exclusive to Norfolk Southern getting benefits. Ms. Karin Foster noted that Norfolk Southern has been invited to Freight Subcommittee discussions but has thus far not participated, perhaps because they are more involved with the Baltimore MPO. CSX added that Norfolk Southern and CSX do not share the same corridors and business.

Mr. Erenrich referred further discussion to the TPB Steering Committee.

### **3. Update on Proposed Amendments to the FY 2009-2014 TIP to Include Additional American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funded**

Mr. Kirby explained that all of the region's ARRA funding has been committed for the District of Columbia, Maryland, and WMATA. He said that at the June 17 meeting the TPB amended the FY 2009 TIP to include ARRA funded projects for VDOT and Charles County. He asked the VDOT representative to report on forthcoming TIP amendment or modification requests for the July 15 TPB meeting.

Mr. Srikanth stated that VDOT would not have any ARRA TIP amendment requests for the July TPB meeting. He explained that the Northern Virginia

region was allocated \$52 million and the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) has approve a list of regional projects in May and that the CTB will be asked to approve them in June. He said that these projects would be submitted to the TPB for TIP action perhaps in September.

**4. Update on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015**

Mr. Clifford presented an update on the draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2009 CLRP and 2010-2015 TIP in place of Ms. Posey who was unable to attend the meeting. He spoke to the "short report" in the mailout which had been released for public comment on June 11<sup>th</sup>. He told the committee that they had seen an earlier draft of the conformity results so he would not go into too much detail in presenting it, other than to say that the region meets all requirements and the conformity assessment will go to the TPB for approval at its July meeting. There was a technical correction made to emissions factor calculations for Maryland jurisdictions that resulted in a very small reduction in the overall emissions forecasts. Mr. Clifford also distributed and highlighted for the committee an MWAQC comment letter to TPB in reference to the conformity assessment. The letter raises concern about the delay in EPA approving new emissions budgets; acknowledges that the adherence margin is significantly tighter than last year largely due to changes in the inputs to the process; and notes that, in light of the economic downturn, future changes will need to be monitored closely.

Mr. Clifford then distributed and spoke to Item 10 from the June 17, 2009 TPB meeting regarding the Purple Line and "Return to L'Enfant" projects which will be included in a new conformity assessment. In the course of discussing those projects at the TPB meeting, the District of Columbia indicated that since plans for the K St. Busway project have been revised, they proposed to also fold these revisions into the new conformity assessment. Those changes were currently out for public comment and will be up for TPB approval in July. This addition should not affect transportation staff's schedule for the new conformity assessment.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the public could still comment on project submissions to the latest conformity assessment, to which Mr. Kirby responded no, they can only comment on the K St. Busway project changes. Mr. Biesiadny asked if the K St. Busway is in the CLRP because that project is part of a TIGER application which would not be approved until October. Mr. Kirby responded that the project must be in process but does not have to have engineering level of detail. Ms. Erickson commented that MDOT recognizes that an error was made by DDOT's omitting the project from their initial 2009 CLRP submissions, but MDOT did not appreciate only having a few days notice to review the changes to the K St. Busway project. Mr. Rawlings responded by saying that the DDOT appreciates their support.

## 5. Briefing on the Draft 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP

Mr. Austin stated that the Draft 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP had been released for public comment on June 11. Copies of the Draft TIP were made available for review. Mr. Austin asked the committee to review the TIP and submit any additional comments or edits by July 10. He added that the TPB was scheduled to adopt the CLRP and TIP on July 15.

Mr. Austin then talked about the Public Forum that was held in conjunction with the June 11 Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), wherein the CLRP and TIP were released for public comment. Following the Forum, TPB staff discussed the timing of a spring forum on the TIP and its effectiveness in terms of public involvement in the planning process. Staff decided that the CLRP and TIP will still be presented to the CAC upon its release for public comment (usually in June), but that the effort towards a “public forum” on the CLRP and TIP will be focused on one event in the fall.

Concerns were also raised at the Public Forum on the lack of funding shown for Bicycle and Pedestrian projects in the TIP. Mr. Austin explained that VDOT and MDOT do not typically program federal funds on projects that are exclusively bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities, but that DDOT and local counties in Maryland do. This situation lead to some misleading numbers and graphics in the financial analysis of the TIP. Mr. Austin noted that one additional piece of data that was available was an indication of whether a project included accommodations for bicycles and pedestrians. Future analyses could include a count of projects that include those accommodations.

Mr. Austin stated that an online search tool for the CLRP and TIP would be made available to the public in the coming months. Following a quality control check of the database, TPB staff will distribute PDF documents for every CLRP, TIP and Conformity record in the database for each agency to review. He also added that additional funding had been identified in the UPWP for improvements to the CLRP and TIP database. This will provide significant enhancements to both the data input process and the search tool for the public.

## 6. Update on the Development of a Regional Priority Bus Project for Submission for a Competitive Grant under the American Recovery and Reinvestment

Ms. Bansal, provided an update on the regional bus priority project that will be submitted for a US DOT TIGER Competitive Grant. Ms. Bansal provided a brief update on the final grant guidance issued by DOT earlier in June and spoke to two handouts regarding project specifics and next steps. Questions from Committee Members included whether the Scenario Study Task Force would propose a methodology for selecting final project components. Comments regarding this topic included demonstrating how projects meet regional goals, how they connect to each other and to existing transit infrastructure, and cost-effectiveness. There was extensive discussion on the deadline for receiving final project details. The final deadline was changed from June 29 to August 1<sup>st</sup> to

better accommodate local jurisdiction time constraints and the TPB would be presented with a menu of projects rather than a final list.

**7. Briefing on Proposed Recipients Under the FY 2010 Transportation/Land Use Connection (TLC) Program**

Mr. Rogers gave a PowerPoint presentation updating the Committee on the status of the TLC Program and the selection of TLC technical assistance projects for FY 2010. He provided background on the program including the TLC Clearinghouse and the technical assistance projects completed to date. He explained the funding available for the FY 2010 technical assistance cycle, and the timeline for FY 2010 project solicitation, selection, and delivery. He described the slate of projects recommended by the selection panel for approval by the TPB at its July 15 meeting for FY 2010 funds. He noted that the panel sought additional information from staff about projects in Virginia before making a final recommendation, but would be adding two additional Virginia projects to the slate for TPB approval in advance of the TPB mailout.

**8. Briefing on Draft Analysis Results for the “What Would it Take” Scenario**

Ms. Bansal provided a PowerPoint presentation with an update of work completed on the “What Would It Take” scenario. She provided a comprehensive briefing of the scenario since there had been a great time lapse since the committee’s last update. Process details were also discussed, such as the idea of presenting the updated data to TPB in July to keep them informed of the scenario development and also to ramp up scenario analysis. It was stated that the analysis has been slowed due to a constantly shifting baseline, requiring reanalysis of strategies several times.

**9. Update on Findings from the 2007/2008 Household Travel Survey**

Mr. Griffiths and Ms. Reschovsky gave a Power Point presentation on walking and biking from the 2007/2008 Household Travel Survey along with demographic differences of residents in Activity Centers/Clusters. Overall walk trips have increased between 1994 and 2007/2008, despite decreasing as a primary mode to work; and bicycle trips have remained constant while increasing as commute mode. Residents of Activity Centers/Clusters make fewer auto trips and two thirds of all transit trips begin or end in a Regional Activity Center/Cluster.

Mr. Erenrich asked about the change in walking and biking for Frederick County between 1994 and 2007/2008. Mr. Griffiths explained that an increase in the sample size produced more reliable estimates in the 2007/2008 survey.

Mr. Rawlings asked about the reduction in walking to work for District residents. Mr. Griffiths responded that an increase in reverse commuters accounted for the drop in walking to work.

Mr. Erenrich requested a decimal place be added to the Prince William County bicycle numbers and he was concerned that the sample may have been too small. Mr. Griffiths responded that he had checked the Prince William County

numbers and it is less than .01 percent. Mr. Meese suggested a consistent scale for walking and biking.

Mr. Srikanth expressed surprise regarding the high number of walk access to Metrorail trips. Ms. Reschovksy indicated that the numbers were consistent with findings in the On-Board Metrorail Surveys. It also accounts for riders who may drive from home to a station but then have a walk access on the work end of their return trip.

**10. Other**

None.

**11. Adjourn**