

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

## **1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the March 7, 2008 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

## **2. Update on the 14<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge Corridor Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)**

Mr. Van Dop, of the Eastern Federal Land Highway Division, FHWA and project manager, presented a PowerPoint on the 14th Street Bridge Corridor EIS project which began in 2006. He reviewed the history and schedule for the draft EIS which is to be completed in the fall of 2008. He briefed the Committee on the status of the project and the 43 improvement options currently under consideration. He said that he would brief the TPB on the project at its May 21 meeting. He said that he had recently met with bicycle and pedestrian planners and would be meeting with the transit planners and private operators that have bus service on the bridge soon.

Mr. Foster inquired how the project interfaces with the VDOT I-395 HOT Lanes project. Mr. Van Dop replied that the project is discussing the option that the lanes could be extended into the District.

Mr. Srikanth commented that there is no direct linkage with HOT lanes between the projects currently, and that the VDOT HOT lanes end at Eads Street for the TPB air quality conformity assessment of the current CLRP.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the transit enhancement options would include park-and-ride lots on either side of the bridges. Mr. Van Dop said that he wanted the local jurisdictions to provide input on this.

Mr. Weissberg expressed support for more transit options and the need to identify park-and-ride lots and other transit supportive improvements.

Mr. Srikanth said that the Steering Committee for the 14th Street Bridge Corridor project which affects many jurisdictions wanted to broaden its outreach and brief the Technical Committee and TPB so that other jurisdictions and agencies could provide input on the EIS. He suggested that Mr. Van Dop could brief the NVTB and other interested boards of jurisdictions on the project.

Mr. Van Dop asked Committee members to identify options that should be considered and to provide input for the study. He commented that no funding has been identified for any of the options, but good ideas and options can be presented to Congress for its consideration.

Mr. Biesiadny suggested that Mr. Van Dop also meet with the local jurisdictional highway planners as well as the bus planners.

Chairman Rawlings said that DDOT appreciates the FHWA's work on the EIS. He asked about the District's request that the study look at extending the project limits to Massachusetts Avenue.

Mr. Van Dop said that this request needed to wait until the study received the new TPB travel model with the HOT lanes project in it. The model has been received but he said that he is concerned about options that just move congestion from one location to another.

He thanked the Committee and said that he would be pleased to return to discuss the project at any time.

**3. Briefing on Replacement of the Northern Virginia Portion of the FY 2008-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) with an Amended FY 2007-2012 TIP**

Mr. Srikanth spoke to a handout for the item. He said that in January 2008 the TPB had approved the 2007 CLRP, FY 2008-2013 TIP and the corresponding conformity analysis. Subsequently, it was discovered that the Virginia Department of Transportation is not planning to develop a State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), meaning that there will be no document that the FY 2008-2013 TIP projects can be forwarded into. Therefore the FY 2008-2013 TIP is being corrected by replacing the Virginia portion with an amended version of the FY 2007-2012 TIP. Mr. Srikanth said that nine projects need to be amended into the FY 2007-2012 TIP to include funding for the new projects that had conformity impacts in the 2008 CLRP analysis. He said that this amendment had been released for public comment and that the TPB was scheduled to approve the amendment in April.

Ms. Erickson noted that this has delayed Maryland's STIP process and urged anyone with questions or concerns to bring them up as soon as possible so that they could be resolved prior to the amendment approval. She said that the Maryland portion of the TIP

is not affected by this amendment, but that if it is not approved by the end of May, they may need to submit an amendment for some projects.

Mr. Kirby said he was hopeful that FHWA staff would be ready to expedite the approval process and approval could possibly take place within 4-6 weeks.

**4. Briefing on an Alternative Set of Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2008 CLRP and FY 2009-2014 TIP**

Mr. Kirby explained that on February 29, the Virginia Supreme Court declared that the taxing ability of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) was unconstitutional. Unless the Virginia General Assembly acts by June to provide NVTA funding, certain projects approved by the TPB on February 20 for inclusion in the conformity assessment for the 2008 CLRP and FY 2009-2014 TIP must be removed. He distributed a memorandum to the Committee on a contingency course of action for the 2008 CLRP and FY 2009-2014 TIP conformity assessment. He explained the two components of the contingency action and said that the TPB will be asked to approve it at the April 16 meeting.

Mr. Mokhtari inquired if this action was going to be released for public comment and then acted upon. Mr. Kirby said that the only requirement for public comment on project submissions is for final action. He explained that it is good to have public comment for the air quality conformity inputs but this is just a contingency removal.

Ms. Erickson agreed with Mr. Kirby's explanation.

Mr. Von Dop asked what would happen to the BRAC projects serving Ft. Belvoir that were submitted for the new TIP. Mr. Kirby said that if the contingency action was necessary, these projects would be included in the air quality conformity assessment and new TIP adopted by the TPB in October. Mr. Von Dop requested to be informed if something changes by August that could affect these projects moving forward.

Mr. Del Giudice inquired about the effect of delaying projects on the air quality conformity analysis. Mr. Kirby explained that the analysis uses networks for 2009, 2010, 2020 and 2030. If the completion date for a project that increases capacity moves from 2009 or 2010 then it affects the conformity analysis.

Mr. Kirby also explained that if the project is shown to be completed within the years in the TIP out to 2014 then full funding must be included in the TIP. He said that FHWA is looking at this more closely and that if the completion date is within the TIP period the total funding needs to be shown. If the project completion is beyond the TIP period, the project has to meet the fiscal constraint requirements for the CLRP.

Mr. Srikanth distributed a draft list of projects that would be removed from the 2008 CLRP and new TIP under the contingency action. He reviewed each project and said that the NVTA would approve the list on April 10. He said that VDOT is also reviewing the projects submitted on February 20.

Mr. Biesiadny commented that many of the NVTA projects were in the previous TIP and that the NVTA funding was added to accelerate their completion. He said that some projects only have partial NVTA funding. He explained that the NVTA only programmed two and a half years of funding and that there are a lot of new projects that were not funded at this stage.

Ms. Backmon commented that for Prince William County the Route 1 widening is an important project that could be delayed.

Mr. Srikanth pointed out that many of the projects on the list that would be removed or delayed were in Prince William County.

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

Ms. Bansal presented a draft of the final 2007 CLRP brochure for review by the Technical committee and provided a PowerPoint presentation on the recently completed performance of the 2007 CLRP. She highlighted major findings from the analysis regarding travel demand and metropolitan growth, congestion, air quality, accessibility to jobs, and growth in activity clusters. These findings included more rapid growth in employment, population and congestion in the outer suburbs; a general rise in VMT, but a slight decline in VMT per capita; and the same rate of growth for activity clusters and non-cluster areas in the region. Ms. Bansal also provided a general overview of the final

brochure, which includes the performance analysis and asked the Committee for comments and changes by 12pm on Monday April 7.

Some members stated that the review period was too short, but they could have comments later in the week. Ms. Bansal responded that printing in time for the TPB Board meeting was the reason for the short timeframe. There were also questions on the use of activity clusters versus centers. The analysis used clusters; however, zones will be finer grained in 2010 to address current problems with large zone sizes. Other issues discussed included the lack of a frame of reference by which to judge the percentage changes in the performance statistics, such as the change in percent households in activity clusters, and problems with the use of a 45 minute threshold versus an average commute time for the accessibility analysis.

## **6. Review of the Development of the “CLRP Aspirations” and “What Would it Take” Scenarios**

Mr. Kirby presented a status report on the activities of the Scenario Study Task Force, which includes the development of the “CLRP Aspirations” and “What Would it Take?” scenarios. He provided the Committee with an outline of proposed considerations for each scenario, including goals, measures of effectiveness, schedule, strategies and possible products. The scenarios will be developed by June 2008, analyzed until February 2009 and then will go through a period of public outreach until June 2009. In 2010 there will be a full CLRP update, which provides an opportunity to incorporate scenario results into the plan.

Members provided some input for what should be incorporated into the scenario study, such as locally adopted plans for transit inputs. It was also stressed to focus on transit projects over highway investment. It was suggested to invite the Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee to the Scenario Study Task Force meetings. The idea of value capture as a funding mechanism for transit was also briefly discussed as a topic issue for the task force.

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

This item was not presented.

## **8. Briefing on Draft Report on Regional Travel Trends**

Mr. Griffiths reported that he was still responding to comments on the Draft Travel Trends report and did not have an updated document to present yet because of the priority given to getting the field data collection for the Regional Bus Survey underway in early April. The data collection for the WMATA bus routes in this survey needs to be completed by Memorial Day to meet WMATA's schedule for this work.

Mr. Griffiths then gave a brief progress report on the Regional Bus Survey. He stated that the pre-test had been completed and that the short-form questionnaire with the addition of two questions would be used in the main survey. The two additional questions were on household income and on race/ethnicity. He said that the main survey would begin the week of April 15<sup>th</sup>.

**9. Update on the Status of the FY 2009-2014 TIP inputs and 2008 CLRP Forms**

Mr. Austin stated that the deadline for updating CLRP and TIP project information, along with the Congestion Management Process documentation was April 25. A draft of the TIP would be prepared for a Public Forum on May 15 and then the TIP would be released for public comment along with the findings of the conformity analysis of the 2008 CLRP on June 12. Mr. Shrestha inquired about edits and updates that needed to be made after the April 25 deadline. Ms. Erickson noted that minimal changes could be made after the deadline but the bulk of the information should be finalized by that time. Mr. Shrestha noted that some of the new SAFETEA-LU fields on the CLRP forms may need review by project managers. Mr. Austin replied that the priority should be on completing TIP funding information and CMP documentation and then on reviewing the new SAFETEA-LU fields on the CLRP forms.

Mr. Austin said that the Citizens Advisory Committee would be involved in discussions on the details of the TIP Forum, and that it would likely follow a similar format as last year. Mr. Miller suggested that it may not be feasible to have a substantive draft TIP available for this meeting.

Mr. Meese reminded the group of the CMP documentation requirements and spoke to the handout materials. He said that the Travel Management Subcommittee would meet on April 15 to discuss the CMP documentation.

**10. Other Business**

None.

**11. Adjourn**