

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

## **1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the February 1, 2008 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

## **2. Review of Final Draft FY 2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Miller distributed the final draft FY 2009 UPWP (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009). He said that the draft of the document was presented to the TPB at its February 20 meeting, and pointed out the few minor changes in this version from the February version. He said that the TPB will be asked to adopt the program on March 19 and it will be submitted to FHWA and FTA for their approval by July 1.

Mr. Miller explained the process of identifying some projects and funding in the current FY 2008 program that would not be completed by June 30 for carryover to FY 2009. He then reviewed a memo on the proposed FY 2008 project amendments and carryover of FY 2008 funding to the FY 2009 UPWP. He said they would be incorporated into the final version of the FY 2009 document.

Mr. Miller said that the MDOT technical assistance program including some carryover project funding is in the draft document. He noted that the technical assistance programs for DDOT, VDOT and WMATA, which will also include some carryover funding, are being specified.

Mr. Srikanth explained that VDRPT would have a project in the Virginia technical assistance program with a budget of \$50,000. Mr. Rawlings said that there will be a bike count project and an auto travel time study in addition to the current projects in the DDOT program. Mr. Harrington commented that the WMATA technical assistance program will support the enhanced transit network coding effort and will study the impact of congestion on bus operations.

## **3. Review of Final Draft FY 2009 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)**

Mr. Ramfos stated that the draft FY 2009 Commuter Connections Work Program was released for public comment at the February 20, 2008 TPB meeting. He also said that comments were received from the state funding agencies and that a new draft of the document was produced for the meeting today that reflected the incorporation of some of the comments received. The current draft of the FY 2009 CCWP was also approved by the Commuter Connections Subcommittee on February 19<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Ramfos reviewed the substantive changes made to the document including changing of the Commuter Connections Structure chart, the addition of language in the Commuter Operations Center program to address the implementation of the regional TDM web bases system, the addition of language to reflect that the Carpool incentive demonstration project is a study, the addition of the Car-Free day project into the Marketing project, the additional of a new project under Employer Outreach labeled

Program Administration, and revised language under the Maryland and Virginia Telework program area to clarify the roll of the on-call consultant.

The Committee recommended that the final version of the FY 2009 CCWP be presented for the Board's approval at its March 19 meeting.

#### **4. Briefing on the Final Report of the TPB Regional Value Pricing Study**

Mr. Kirby greeted the committee, and then turned the presentation over to Mr. Eichler who spoke to a PowerPoint presentation, summarizing the updates to the Regional Value Pricing Study Final Report Presentation since the previous presentation to the committee in February. After this update, Mr. Kirby then discussed the contents of the report's executive summary.

Mr. Owolabi noted that the executive summary refers to a "free flowing" volume to capacity ratio, and inquired as to what that ratio was. Mr. Eichler replied that the ratio used in the study was actually a range from 0.6 to 0.8, and that the speed range corresponding to this ratio range depends on the facility type: For freeways, the speed range is high and narrow, and very close to free-flow speed of 65 MPH. However, on expressways and arterials, the speed range is lower and wider. Mr. Kirby noted that using speed ranges resulted in many links with high speeds but low volumes, and using a volume-to-capacity ratio range ensured high speeds and high volumes.

Mr. Shrestha inquired about new Variably Priced Lanes studied along Maryland state routes 4, 5 and 210 in Prince George's County. He said that development is currently planned for much of that area that might not be compatible with the addition of new lanes. He inquired how he might reply to those who might see this study as a plan for new lanes. Mr. Kirby replied that this was indeed "just a study" and should be seen as such: some of the studied lanes may not be financially feasible, others might not be compatible with right-of-way constraints, etc.

Mr. Weisburg asked about the demographic breakdown of costs and benefits of the network of variably priced lines, wondering if economic impacts were studied. Mr. Kirby replied that the study was based on the 2000 US Census and used a measure of accessibility to determine impacts on the different population groups. He suggested that economic impacts could be assessed when studying specific corridors, and said that he could incorporate a summary about other studies of economic impacts of pricing in the executive summary.

Mr. Srikanth suggested that the study report resembled a vision document. Mr. Kirby responded that this report was a study of scenarios, answering the question "What if?" Mr. Srikanth suggested that the report seems very "realistic" and not as much like a "What If?" study as the Scenario Study.

Mr. Griffiths inquired as to whether TPB staff will be conducting local before and after studies. Mr. Kirby responded that several pricing projects are currently underway in the region, and that those projects can be closely monitored.

Mr. Mokhtari inquired whether the costs/benefits distribution chart could be presented broken down by jurisdiction, in order to get a better feeling for more localized distribution of benefits and costs. Mr. Kirby replied that the next step would be to evaluate specific projects and evaluate local impacts of those projects, but that a jurisdictional break-down of the costs and benefits would not be useful.

Mr. Mokhtari inquired about the transit enhancement, stating that the only transit that received enhancement was regional routes and that local bus routes were not enhanced to support access to the enhanced regional transit. Mr. Eichler responded that any bus route that had greater than one-third of its route miles on the variably priced network received the transit enhancement, such that the enhancement was not only localized to the areas near the freeway network. He presented the map of increases in transit availability increases based on the transit enhancement, and pointed out large increases in areas distant from the variably priced lanes network. Mr. Harrington briefly described the experience of the WMATA SmartMover route on the Beltway, stating that "getting there" was the problem, and that more study would be required.

Mr. Smith suggested that tolling lanes in Loudoun County would be problematic. Mr. Eichler replied that all the toll lanes studied in Loudoun were newly constructed lanes and not tolled existing lanes.

Mr. Kirby summarized the presentation, and suggested that if current effort to initiate congestion pricing in Manhattan is successful in the next few months, it could provide a real boost to considering pricing of existing lanes in the region. Mr. Rawlings summarized the next steps for the presentation to the board, and suggested that the presentation be scaled down in preparation for the TPB. Mr. Kirby replied that a new, less-technical presentation based on the executive summary would be presented to the TPB on March 19.

## **5. Update on Activities of the TPB Scenario Task Force**

Mr. Kirby briefed the committee on the activities of the TPB Scenario Task Force, including the development of two new transportation and land use scenarios to be analyzed in 2009. He presented the two scenarios, which will be a "CLRP Aspirations" scenario and a "What Would it Take" scenario. The former will draw from past scenario work, the value pricing study, public feedback and other committee recommendations. The latter will begin with a CO2 reduction goal and work backwards to determine the combination of interventions required to achieve those goals. The scenarios will be developed through the end of this fiscal year and analysis will continue through February 2009. Useful results from the study could be incorporated into the CLRP during the 2010 full update. Mr. Kirby stated that the TPB will be briefed on the two scenarios at their March meeting.

## **6. Status Report on the State Implementation Plans (SIPS) for Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) for the Washington Region**

Mr. King provided an update on the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for the PM<sub>2.5</sub> NAAQS. He said the public comment period has ended and response to comments and the revised SIP have been approved by the Technical Advisory Committee for recommendation to the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC). MWAQC will act on the SIP on March 7. If approved, the SIP will be sent to the states for submission to EPA Region III by the deadline of April 5, 2008. There were no comments received on the motor vehicle emissions budgets. At the TAC meeting, the City of Alexandria voted against the SIP and the response to comments. The city believes the SIP should contain more stringent requirements for controls at the Mirant Potomac River Generating Station.

## **7. Update on the Region-wide On-board Bus Survey**

Mr. Griffiths gave a status report on the Regional Bus On-Board Survey. He reported that the survey firm NuStats had been selected as the survey contractor and that a project kick-off with the contractor had been held on February 14<sup>th</sup>. He also reported that a survey pre-test of two alternative questionnaires would be conducted on 300 bus trips beginning March 17<sup>th</sup>. He further stated that, based on the results of the survey pre-test, the survey questionnaire to be used in the main survey would be finalized in early April. The main on-board bus survey would begin in Mid-April and continue into early June. Approximately, 4700 bus trips would be surveyed in the main survey and would be conducted on both Metrobus and local jurisdiction bus routes.

Mr. Weissberg asked for a list of the specific bus routes that would be surveyed in the survey pre-test.

Mr. Griffiths agreed to send to this list to Mr. Weissberg.

## **8. Briefing on TPB Travel Demand Model, Version 2.2**

Mr. Milone informed the Committee that the TPB has recently adopted a new travel forecasting model known as Version 2.2. The Version 2.2 model has been in development over the past two years with the oversight of Travel Forecasting Subcommittee and has been used to support the TPB's most recent air quality conformity determination work. He reviewed several technical features of the model that distinguish it from prior travel models used by the TPB. These include a new commercial vehicle purpose and a moderated set of external travel forecasts (i.e., travel entering or exiting the modeled area from external areas). As a result of these features, the forecasted vehicle-miles-of-travel (VMT) for 2030 is about 8% less than that produced by the prior Version 2.1D#50 model. He added that most of this decline in VMT is attributable to the revision in external travel forecasts. The Version 2.2 model documentation is now available on the COG/TPB website and staff is currently responding to numerous requests for the model by consultants and local agencies.

Mr. Srikanth asked for more clarification about the reduction in simulated VMT in 2030, and the associated reduction in external travel. Mr. Malone said previously it was assumed that traffic at each external facility would grow at a uniform annual rate of 3%. After a review of historical traffic growth data at external locations, regional land activity forecasts, and the physical network capacity at external locations, the 3.0% per annum growth rate assumption was determined to be unsustainable. The moderated growth rate is now location-specific. In Virginia, where many of the external facilities are located in undeveloped areas, the external traffic growth rate varies from 2.5% to 3.0% per annum. In Maryland, where many external facilities are located in very developed areas (e.g., near the Baltimore City area), the external growth rate varies from 1.1% to 2.7%. The overall average traffic growth rate across all externals is 1.8%. This average rate is also more consistent with the average growth rate of jobs and households reflected in the Round 7.1 Cooperative Forecasts.

## **9. Report on the 2008 CLRP Environmental Consultation Meeting**

Ms. Klancher provided an overview on the first environmental consultation meeting held on March 6, 2008. She stated that the meeting was well attended with a good mix of representatives from environmental resource agencies and state and local transportation

agencies. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss next steps the TPB could take to meet the SAFETEA-LU requirements that require TPB to consult with environmental agencies on the development of the CLRP and that the CLRP include a discussion of potential mitigation activities.

Ms. Klancher stated that the meeting participants had a good discussion about what the most appropriate and helpful regional role would be given that most environmental issues are dealt with at the local and state levels or during the EIS process. Outcomes from the meeting included a recommendation that the mapping effort done by Ms. Bansal should be updated regularly and that two areas be identified on the maps: 1) Highly sensitive areas (avoidance areas) and 2) Restoration areas where mitigation efforts may be the most beneficial. Staff plans to work on this effort and have it reviewed by the environmental resource and transportation agencies.

Ms. Skrikanth commented that he heard good feedback from the meeting and that people thought it was helpful in producing some potential next steps for the TPB.

#### **10. Review of Draft Performance Information on the 2007 CLRP**

Ms. Bansal briefed the Committee on a draft version of the performance information for the 2007 CLRP brochure and website. She presented preliminary information from travel demand forecasts and land use forecasts, such as changes in population, VMT, and work trips. Three graphs were presented showing the rise in population and employment primarily in outer jurisdictions and the rise in work trips across all modes. Two important findings from this analysis were a decrease in VMT per capita, which can be attributable to changes in the travel demand model and increased congestion, and a rise in lane miles much lower than the rise in VMT, which can signal the expectation for more congested lane miles by 2030.

Mr. Rawlings asked whether this analysis was on the CLRP website. Ms. Bansal answered that it is not as of yet but will be when the analysis is complete.

Mr. Skrikanth questioned why the analysis did not include all of the performance elements of the 2006 CLRP. It was answered that this is simply a preliminary analysis and in its final form will include all of the same analysis done in 2006. The final analysis is expected to be complete in time for the April 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### **11. Review of Draft Congestion Management Documentation Reference Materials for the 2008 Call for Projects**

Mr. Meese referred to a handout. The draft reference materials were developed to assist agencies as they fill out Congestion Management Documentation Forms (required for single-occupant-vehicle [SOV] capacity-increasing projects) pursuant to the Call for Projects for the CLRP and TIP. The documents were being distributed to the Committee as well as several subcommittees for review and comment, at the request of the Travel Management Subcommittee. The deadline for comments to Mr. Meese was March 18.

In response to a question from Mr. Shrestha, Mr. Meese noted that the "main" form in the Call for Projects contains a question where the responder indicates whether the project is an SOV capacity-increasing project; if the answer is yes, then there is a secondary Congestion Management Documentation Form to be filled out. The draft reference materials are intended to assist agencies in filling out the secondary form. Mr. Meese also urged that agencies not delay in filling out their Call for Projects forms, including any necessary congestion management information, in order to meet the

previously announced April 25 deadline for completion of all required CLRP/TIP information. Agency programming staffs were welcome to contact Mr. Meese or Ms. Wellman if they had questions.

**12. Briefing on Draft Report on Regional Travel Trends**

Delayed to April.

**13. Other Business**

Mr. Shrestha announced the "8<sup>th</sup> National Conference on Access Management" to be held in Baltimore on July 13 to 16. He encouraged staff from all local jurisdictions to attend and told the Committee to call him directly if there were any questions.

**14. Adjourn**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - March 7, 2008**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                      Mark Rawlings

**MARYLAND**

Charles County            -----  
 Frederick Co.            John Thomas  
 City of Frederick        Tim Davis  
 Gaithersburg            -----  
 Montgomery Co.        David Moss  
 Prince George's Co.    -----  
 Rockville                -----  
 M-NCPPC  
   Montgomery Co.        Yuanjun Li  
   Prince George's Co.    Famararz Mokhtari  
 MDOT  
                               Lyn Erickson  
                               Keith Bounds  
                               Del Harvey  
                               Shiva Shrestha

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria                Jim Maslanka  
 Arlington Co.            -----  
 City of Fairfax           Alex Verzosa  
 Fairfax Co.                Robert Owolabi  
 Falls Church             -----  
 Loudoun Co.              Art Smith  
 Manassas                 -----  
 Prince William Co.      Monica Backmon  
 NVTC                      Greg McFarland  
 PRTC                       Anthony Foster  
 VRE                        Christine Hoeffner  
 VDOT                       Kanathur Srikanth  
 VDRPT                    -----  
 NVPDC                    -----  
 VDOA                      -----

**WMATA**

WMATA                    Clayton Ashby  
                               Tom Harrington

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

FHWA-DC                -----  
 FHWA-VA                -----  
 FTA                        -----  
 NCPC                      -----  
 NPS                        -----  
 MWAQC                  -----  
 FEMA/DHS              -----

**COG Staff**

Ronald Kirby, DTP  
 Gerald Miller, DTP  
 Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP  
 Mark Pfoutz, DTP  
 Andrew Austin, DTP  
 Jim Hogan, DTP  
 Bob Griffiths, DTP  
 Andrew Meese, DTP  
 Darren Smith, DTP  
 William Bacon, DTP  
 Melanie Wellman, DTP  
 Michael Eichler, DTP  
 Erin Morrow, DTP  
 Tim Canan, DTP  
 Nicholas Ramfos, DTP  
 Ron Milone, DTP  
 Monica Bansal, DTP  
 Mark Moran, DTP  
 Paul Desjardin, HSPPS  
 Jeff King, DEP