

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the November 7, 2008 Technical Committee Meeting.

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on Draft Scope of Work for Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2009 Financially Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Ms. Posey distributed the draft conformity scope of work. She stated that the scope is very similar to last year's. She mentioned that ozone season pollutant emissions will be compared to both the current 1-hour and new 8-hour ozone budgets, and that PM_{2.5} pollutants will be compared to a 2002 base and also to the budgets for those pollutants. She mentioned that the analysis will be done using the Version 2.2 travel demand model. She noted that changes from the last analysis include the use of new Round 7.2 cooperative forecasts and 2008 vehicle registration data. The analysis years include 2010, 2020, and 2030. She reminded the group to review TERM commitments.

Ms. Posey asked the members to offer feedback on the use of the following current technical/policy assumptions: 1) the conversion of all HOV facilities to HOV 3+ in 2010, 2) the 2010 transit constraint, and 3) transit project specifics. She stated that no updates would be made to these assumptions unless written instruction to do so was received.

She reviewed the schedule, and pointed out that it lists the dates approved by the TPB in the October "Call For Projects" document. The schedule currently shows TPB project input approval in February, and TPB conformity approval in July. She noted that if the TPB approval of inputs slips to March, that the conformity approval will slip to September.

Mr. Biesiadny asked if staff could provide a list of current transit input assumptions to review and respond to. Ms. Posey replied that staff would email out a list shortly.

Mr. Erenrich asked for an explanation relating to EPA's potential reversal on the region's PM_{2.5} attainment status. Ms. Rohlfs noted that, while nothing is in writing yet, EPA notified MDE that the Baltimore area would be designated as being in non-attainment for the 24-hour PM_{2.5} standard, and that Montgomery and Prince Georges counties would be added to the Baltimore non-attainment area. She explained that EPA's reason for including Montgomery and Prince Georges counties in the Baltimore region is because those counties contribute to Baltimore's violation of the standard. Ms. Rohlfs noted that monitor readings in the two counties do not indicate a violation. She stated that there would be a

conference call with EPA to discuss the matter at the MWAQC TAC meeting the next Tuesday.

Mr. Erenrich asked if Montgomery and Prince George's would have to be partitioned out. Ms. Rohlf's noted that this was the first step in a movement that would start next year. Mr. Erenrich asked if this round of conformity would be affected. Mr. Clifford said that the issue opens lots of questions about the SIP and conformity, and that it is surprising that EPA is going to reverse themselves. Mr. King pointed out that EPA would have a comment period on this issue. Mr. Srikanth remarked that the upcoming conformity analysis would not be affected by this issue.

Mr. Kirby reiterated the fact that updates to technical/policy inputs, such as the conversion of all HOV facilities to HOV3+ in 2010, would have to be made in writing in order for them to be incorporated in the analysis.

Mr. Biesiadny asked if an HOV definition could be applied to a specific facility, or if an assumption would have to be region-wide. Ms. Posey answered that each facility could be defined separately.

Mr. Kirby asked about the impact of the potential stimulus package on the timing of the development of conformity project inputs. Ms. Erickson replied that most MDOT projects relate to system preservation, and will not affect conformity. She expects to input them as an amendment to the current TIP. Mr. Srikanth said that there are not likely to be any new projects in Virginia as a result of the stimulus package, and that the stimulus package money would affect the current TIP.

Mr. Kirby asked if there is a Virginia meeting scheduled in January to discuss budget effects on project inputs. Mr. Biesiadny answered that there is a meeting scheduled on January 13th related to project lists released in December. Mr. Srikanth noted that amendments to Virginia's program will be finalized on January 22, but that project specifics would not be worked out until a later date. He expected it would take 30-60 days after January 22 to provide details of how the amendments would affect conformity.

Mr. Kirby asked how that would affect the current schedule. Mr. Srikanth replied that the schedule was discussed at the TMS meeting, and that it was decided to keep the current timeline because if the amendments do not affect conformity, changing the schedule would cause an unnecessary delay in the analysis. Mr. Biesiadny commented that he was comfortable keeping the current schedule.

Mr. Kirby proposed making a recommendation that the January TPB meeting be cancelled due to the Inauguration schedule. He noted that there were no pressing items for TPB approval. He asked opinions. Mr. Erenrich asked if TPB played a role in, or had policy, regarding the sharing of potential stimulus package money received by WMATA. He wondered if that should be a TPB discussion. He emphasized the need for money for the local transit providers.

Mr. Biesiadny stated that that issue was not really relevant in Virginia, but that it was a WMATA Board matter, not TPB's. Ms. Erickson said that by January a list of projects for potential stimulus money would already be complete, and TPB discussion would be too late at that time. Mr. Rybeck suggested that it might be premature to suggest dropping the January TPB meeting. Mr. Kirby suggested that the meeting could be moved to January 28th, but still thought that cancelling was the way to go.

3. Briefing on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) Capital Improvement Needs

Mr. Harrington gave a PowerPoint presentation to the Committee on WMATA's 2011-2020 Capital Needs Inventory and said that the system is at a critical juncture with major rehabilitation needs at a time of surging ridership. He summarized the improvements needed to maintain the bus and rail system performance, expand system capacity to meet the growing demand, and improve the cost - effectiveness and quality of service. He explained that the total capital needs for FY 2011-2020 are about \$11.3 billion or \$1.1 billion per year while the current capital budget level is about \$500 million per year. He said that a new funding agreement between WMATA and its compact members needs to be completed by July 2010. He pointed out that the recently passed Davis bill for WMATA authorizes \$1.5 billion in federal funds over ten years for capital needs. When these funds are matched with local dedicated funding there will be a total of \$3 billion or \$300 million per year available.

Committee members asked clarifying questions and provided comments on the slides on pages 10 and 13. He explained that on the rail system capacity figures on page 13, the \$3 billion in new funding will not get the full congestion improvements shown in the bottom figure. Members provided suggestions on how to tailor the presentation for the December 17 TPB meeting, including providing clarification on what improvements are in the \$11.1 billion and what part of this need is met with the new \$3 billion federal bill. It was also suggested that the presentation needs to mention the CLRP financial constraint requirement and address how this new funding will affect the current core capacity constraint on Metrorail ridership.

Mr. Harrington thanked the members for their comments and said he will address the issues raised by the Committee and better link the presentation to the TPB planning process.

4. Update on the Development of the "CLRP Aspirations" and "What Would it Take" Scenarios

Ms. Bansal and Mr. Eichler provided an update on the development of the two new scenarios, the CLRP Aspirations and What Would it Take scenarios. Ms. Bansal went over a PowerPoint presentation on the land use component of the

CLRP Aspirations scenario and the “What Would it Take” scenario and Mr. Eichler presented the transportation component of the CLRP Aspirations scenario. Ms. Bansal began by going over a new land use approach based on density goals and jobs/housing balance goals for each activity center to support transit service and walkability. Mr. Eichler provided an overview of the proposed BRT network including service details and additional transit projects to be included in the scenario. Lastly, Ms. Bansal provided an overview of new research for the “What Would it Take” scenario including example combinations of strategies that meet the regional climate change goals.

Discussion included questions on the use of transit-supportive density criteria and it was suggested that new research exists that may better inform density goals in the scenario. There was also a request to provide greater explanation of the transit-supportive densities, as some transit services were stated to require higher densities than others without clear reason. Other questions included how the principles of the RMAS scenarios were included in the new approach, such as the region undivided scenario. Ms. Bansal explained that the effects of the region undivided scenario were achieved through the new land use approach because land use is shifted to many transit stations on the eastern portion of the region that are currently not in activity centers. Other questions included how specific projects would be included in the scenario. Mr. Eichler answered that some projects overlapped with the BRT network and would therefore be replaced with the BRT service.

5. Review of Regional Priority Bus Projects for Consideration in the FY 2010-2015 TIP

Mr. Yaffe spoke to a PowerPoint presentation describing the Regional Bus Subcommittee’s list of regional near-term priority bus projects. Similar to the work of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, this list highlights project that would provide great benefit to bus operators throughout the region.

Mr. Harrington inquired about the inclusion of the K St. Busway on the list, which has been included in the CLRP, stating that it should be included on the maps in the presentation.

Mr. Mokhtari inquired about the exclusion of the US-1 corridor in Prince George’s county, stating that it was also emerging. Mr. Yaffe replied that the corridor has “already emerged” and that the intersection of US-1 with Paint Branch Parkway and Campus Drive was included on the priority list as a bottleneck.

Mr. Kirby asked about the relevance of these items to the TPB. Mr. Eichler replied that these were short-range operational issues that would provide great benefit to the region’s bus operators. The operators raised these issues when being asked to participate in long-range Regional Bus Subcommittee planning

activities. Mr. Harrington suggested that the items should be considered for the short-term planning horizon, perhaps 10 years.

Mr. Mokhtari inquired about costs for the projects on the list. Mr. Eichler replied that the projects and problem areas described have been suggested by the bus operators, but that those operators do not have the jurisdiction over them. For example, PTRC representatives nominated several issues with downtown circulation for their commuter buses. Mr. Kirby summarized by saying that the bus operators have identified problem areas that may have local solutions with regional benefits.

Mr. Smith asked about the significance of being on the priority list. Mr. Meese replied that, as with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee's priority list, this process provides a regional perspective to project prioritization: projects that might have little local benefit may have large regional benefit.

6. Briefing on Alternative Approaches for Linking Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions to Metropolitan Transportation Planning

Mr. Kirby distributed a PowerPoint presentation on alternative approaches for linking greenhouse gas emissions to metropolitan transportation planning. This presentation is for the December TPB meeting in response to requests for information on options for addressing the recommendations of the COG Climate Change Report, in addition to California measure SB375 that Mr. Kirby briefed the Board on at its November 17 meeting.

He summarized the recommendation in the COG report that the TPB collaborate to evaluate how a process modeled after the current regional planning process for transportation and air quality planning could be adapted to address greenhouse emissions. He then reviewed the key provisions in SB375. He said the measure provides the best example of a regional transportation planning process that links greenhouse gas emissions. He reported that it was discussed at the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) national conference as an approach that could be proposed for the federal transportation bill authorization in 2009. He noted the importance of the two-year process that involves an inclusive committee of all stake-holders for setting the regional targets for reductions of greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light truck. He said that this process will allow time for each region in the state to examine and discuss what is feasible to achieve rather than just adopting global goals.

He concluded by reviewing the TPB's current activities to address greenhouse gas emissions in the planning process in the "What Would it Take" scenario which is analyzing vehicle, fuel, and demand management strategies using the goals set in the COG Climate Change report.

Committee members asked clarifying questions and provided comments on how to focus the presentation to better present clear options for the TPB to consider for addressing the recommendations of the COG Climate Change Report and to explain how SB375 could be adapted for the Washington region. Mr. Kirby thanked the members for their suggestions and said that he will revise the presentation for the TPB.

7. Briefing on Final Draft FY 2009-2014 TIP Brochure

Mr. Austin distributed copies of the new FY 2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) booklet explaining that there were still a couple of minor changes to be made. He asked for comments from the Committee.

8. FY-2009 Models Development Consultant Task Order Research

Deferred to January 2009 meeting.

9. Briefing on the 2007 Washington-Baltimore Regional Air Passenger Survey

Deferred to January 2009 meeting.

10. Other Business

None.

11. Adjourn