

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the January 9, 2009 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Update on Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP

Mr. Austin distributed copies of the draft 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP Air Quality Conformity Inputs. Changes that had been received since the beginning of the public comment period were highlighted in pink, while the original proposed changes were highlighted in yellow. He said the public comment period was still open until February 14 and asked that any further technical corrections (to dates, limits, etc.) be submitted to Ms. Posey by then. He added that two comments had been received to date; one in support of the K Street Transitway and one in opposition to improvements on I-66.

Mr. Kirby inquired about the addition of the southern portion of the I-95/395 HOV/Bus/HOT Lanes project. Ms. Posey explained that this project will extend 2 HOT lanes down to Route 17 in Spotsylvania, south of Fredericksburg, with various access points as described in the conformity table. Mr. Kirby commented on the immense scope of the project. Mr. Srikanth acknowledged this and noted that it took VDOT over four years to conclude preliminary engineering. He said the northern segment was added to the TPB's CLRP a few years ago and that most of this new extension was in the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) planning area. FAMPO has approved the project for air quality analysis. The results of that analysis have been released for public comment and FAMPO was scheduled to approve the project as a part of their long-range plan on February 13.

Mr. Kirby sought clarification that this was FAMPO's project to approve and was being submitted to the TPB for modeling purposes. Mr. Srikanth concurred, noting that the TPB model extends into the FAMPO area and that there is a small overlap between the two planning areas. He added that FAMPO had to act to approve a portion of the northern segment when the TPB added it a few years ago. Mr. Srikanth said the northern segment would be complete in 2012 while the southern segment would be complete in 2014. Mr. Kirby noted that the TPB model wouldn't pick up either segment until the 2020 threshold.

Mr. Kirby asked if there were any further changes to the transit inputs associated with the southern segment. Ms. Posey said there were no new changes beyond those approved last November. Mr. Srikanth added that the Transit Advisory Committee (TAC) had developed the transit plan for the I-95/395 HOV/Bus/HOT Lanes project and that they were still active and may recommend more enhancements in the future.

Mr. Kirby asked if all other planning requirements, including financial constraint were FAMPO's responsibility. Mr. Srikanth said that VDOT would be submitting full documentation including cost information for the TPB's benefit.

3. Update on Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP

Ms. Posey reviewed two items distributed at the meeting. The first was the conformity Scope of Work. The second was a letter from VDOT commenting on HOV assumptions in the regional travel demand model.

Ms. Posey reminded the group that she had asked for a review of transit coding assumptions in the CLRP. She noted that she had received updates from Fairfax County staff on Dulles Rail, MDOT staff on the CCT and the Purple Line, and DDOT staff on the K Street Busway.

Ms. Posey reported that VDOT's comment letter directed staff to modify the current HOV assumptions in the conformity analysis. In the travel demand model, I-66 and the Dulles Toll Rd should remain as HOV2+ facilities until 2020, at which time they should be converted to HOV3+. Ms. Posey asked if WMATA and MDOT were going to provide letters commenting on the transit constraint and HOV assumptions in Maryland. Mr. Ashby stated that WMATA would send a letter soon recommending pushing the transit constraint to 2020. Ms. Erickson said that MDOT had drafted a letter and would be sending it soon. Their model recommendations are that Maryland roads should remain as HOV2+ facilities until 2020, at which time they should be converted to HOV3+.

Chairman Erenrich asked if there was still time to make updates. Ms. Posey replied that transit assumption updates could be made through February, and that "technical corrections" to the conformity table should be made before the February TPB meeting. Mr. Erenrich asked if there had been any public comments on the Scope of Work. Ms. Posey replied that there had not.

4. Review of Draft FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Miller distributed a draft of the UPWP for FY 2010 (July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010). He reviewed the overall budget estimates and said that as he explained in January there is considerable uncertainty. He said that it is assumed that the FY 2010 funding allocation to be provided by MDOT will be the same as the current FY 2009 level. For MDOT, the current FY 2009 FHWA funding level reflects a federal rescission of FHWA funds as required under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007. For DDOT and VDOT, he said that he assumed the FY 2010 FHWA funding level will be reduced 11 percent from the FY 2009 level to reflect the federal rescission. In addition, he said that the budget estimate assumes that about \$1,600,000 of unobligated funds from FY 2008 will be available. With these assumptions, the total preliminary budget estimate for FY 2010 is about \$64,000 more than the current FY 2009 budget level.

Mr. Rawlings said that he would check if DDOT would be reducing the TPB allocation due to the federal rescission.

Mr. Miller commented that if the final federal and state allocations of new FY 2010 funding from the DOTs are received after March, any funds that are different than the assumed totals in the current budget can be allocated to specific projects and approved by a formal amendment. He said that the first draft of the full document will be released for public comment at the CAC meeting on February 12 and presented to the TPB at its February 18 meeting. He noted that the technical assistance programs for the DDOT, MDOT and WMATA are not fully specified in this version. He said that the TPB will be asked to adopt the program on March 18 and then it will be submitted to FHWA and FTA for their approval by July 1. He highlighted the work tasks with proposed funding changes from FY 2009 levels as summarized in a table at the front of the document.

Mr. Rawlings and Ms. Erickson commented that they were working with TPB staff to specify their technical assistance programs.

Mr. Kirby described another issue that is uncertain in the assumed budget levels to be provided by the DOTs. In addition to the possibility of reductions due to the federal rescission he noted that the FY 2009 US DOT budget which should have been passed by Congress in October is under a continuing resolution until early March. Thus, the full amounts of FY 2009 federal transportation funding for the states must be finalized and this will determine the FY 2010 funding available for the UPWP.

5. Briefing on Draft FY 2010 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

Mr. Ramfos stated that the Fiscal Year 2010 draft Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP) was in the agenda packet for today's meeting. A presentation was then distributed which covered background information on Commuter Connections, the benefits of Commuter Connections, and overview of what is new with the program and budget, and next steps for the CCWP.

Mr. Ramfos explained that federal planning regulations require the TPB to approve a congestion management process which includes Transportation Demand Management as part of the metropolitan transportation plan. Commuter Connections is the major demand management component of the region's congestion management process. Commuter Connections also provides transportation emission reduction measure benefits for inclusion in the air quality conformity determination approved by the TPB. This is part of the annual update of the region's CLRP and TIP. In the future, benefits from the program may be needed to address regional or national green house gas emission targets set for transportation.

He said that Commuter Connections has been shown through many evaluation studies to be a highly cost-effective way to reduce vehicle trips (VT), vehicle

miles of travel (VMT), and vehicle emissions associated with commuting in the Washington metropolitan region.

Mr. Ramfos presented a comparison of the FY 2009 budget to the proposed FY 2010 budget and stated that there are some slight variations for some of the program areas. He stated that there is an increase in the budget from FY 2009. The budget breakdown includes about 26% of the costs going to COG/TPB Staff & Overhead, 48% of the cost for private sector services, 18% of the costs are passed through to local jurisdiction TDM programs, and 8% of the costs for direct costs. Over 65% of the CCWP dollars go to the private sector, local jurisdictions, or direct costs.

The FY 2010 CCWP also has some new ideas and programs, including a new Carpool Incentive Demonstration study based on a feasibility report that was conducted this fiscal year, continuation of a regional Car Free Day campaign, and some potential changes to the Employer Recognition Awards. The Monitoring and Evaluation program area will include updating the TERM Analysis Framework Methodology which is the blueprint on data collection activities for the regional Commuter Connections TERMS, and data collection activities for the 2010 State of the Commute survey and GRH Applicant survey.

Mr. Ramfos summarized the review and approval steps for the document. He stated that the Virginia Department of Transportation had written two letters asking that funding be removed from the FY 2010 CCWP in Telework and Employer Outreach. Mr. Kirby summarized the issue by stating that the CCWP was re-structured in 2006 and allowed for both regional and jurisdictional program components. Programs such as kiosks and teleworking are jurisdictional and the state funding agencies can choose to participate or not participate in these projects. Other programs such as Commuter Operations, Marketing, Guaranteed Ride Home, and Employer Outreach are regional programs and in some cases overlap each other.

Mr. Kirby stated that staff supported the removal of the \$81,000 in Telework funds which VDOT will use to market their Telework Virginia program. However, staff does not agree with VDOT's request to remove the \$430,000 in pass-through dollars to the local jurisdictions and COG/TPB administrative funds for the Employer Outreach TERM. VDOT has requested to contract directly with the local jurisdictions and to use the \$43,000 in COG/TPB administrative costs as additional pass-thru to the local jurisdictions. Its letter requesting this change notes a decrease in funding to the local jurisdictions for ridesharing activities as well as a need to address the Megaprojects in Tysons Corner.

Ms. Erikson asked what the implications of these changes would mean for MDOT and that perhaps those impacts need to be outlined in the letter. Mr. Kirby stated that it was not clear yet as to what the implications would be.

Mr. Srikanth said that the Employer Outreach components would be in tact as outlined in VDOT's letter and that other program areas such as Marketing, Live Near Your Work, Employer Outreach for Bicycling would not be affected by this change. The program will still be regional and that VDOT will have oversight of the pass-thru dollars to the local jurisdictions. Chairman Erenrich stated that

there seems to be a loss on regional cooperation for this program. Mr. Srikanth responded that VDOT is still one of the largest contributor's to Commuter Connections.

Mr. Ramfos stated that the pull-out will affect COG's ability to effectively implement the Employer Outreach TERM. Mr. Owolabi said that there doesn't seem to be a negative impact with this request. Mr. Kirby commented that there is no explicit indication from VDOT that the program would continue and the tone of the request suggests that the money for the Employer Outreach would be shifted to the Megaprojects and there is no commitment to the linkage to the Commuter Connections regional efforts. The issue is not the \$43K in administrative costs because that amount can be absorbed; the issue is whether or not VDOT will maintain its commitment.

Ms. Erikson stated that additional assurances from VDOT would be needed. Mr. Smith said that the rideshare staff in Loudoun support VDOT's request. Ms. Blackmon said that Prince William County is also in support of VDOT's request.

Mr. Kirby said that in the final paragraph of the COG/TPB staff response letter there would need to be an examination of improving efficiencies of the program particularly with program oversight. Mr. Srikanth said that VDOT would be sending a clarification letter to its original letter requesting the change and would specify VDOT's commitment to the program. Mr. Rawlings commented that DDOT looked forward to the clarification response from VDOT.

6. Briefing on Proposed Recipients Under the FY 2009 Transportation/Land Use Connection (TLC) Program

Ms. Crawford gave a PowerPoint presentation that provided an overview of the TLC Program, including the technical assistance projects completed to date and status of the TLC Toolkits. She reviewed the FY 2009 project solicitation, and said that as of the application deadline of December 19, 2008, the TPB had received 15 applications for TLC technical assistance from 12 jurisdictions. She said the selection panel, approved by the TPB in October 2008, met on January 27 to review the applications for technical assistance. She said the selection panel chose to recommend eight applications for funding under the FY 2009 technical assistance program, for a total of \$270,000; \$190,000 in TPB funding and \$80,000 in MDOT technical assistance funds.

Ms. Crawford reviewed the FY 2009 project completion schedule and noted that the funding and completion of several of the larger projects would carryover to FY 2010. She introduced a draft schedule for the FY 2010 TLC technical assistance program, noting that conducting the project solicitation in FY 2009 would allow for more time to complete the FY 2010 projects in FY 2010, an idea previously recommended by the Technical Committee. She said the call for projects would occur in April and conclude in June, the selection panel would convene in June, and the tentative date for approval of the FY 2010 TLC technical assistance projects would be at the July 15, 2009, TPB meeting.

Ms. Crawford explained that on February 18, the TPB would be asked to approve the recommended FY 2009 technical assistance projects for funding, and the schedule for the FY 2010 TLC technical assistance program.

Mr. Phillips asked if the funding level for TLC technical assistance would remain the same for FY 2010.

Ms. Crawford responded that the TPB portion of funding for technical assistance would likely increase to \$220,000 and that MDOT is expected to commit \$100,000 of its technical assistance funds for TLC projects. She added that the TPB's FY 2009 budget for technical assistance had originally been \$180,000, but that an additional \$10,000 had been shifted towards funding technical assistance projects in FY 2009 because of excess funding reserved for the TLC toolkits.

Mr. Phillips questioned the democracy of the selection process and asked if the score sheets used by the panel would be provided for review.

Ms. Crawford said that, due to various levels of preparation by the panelists, scoring was not used. She said that instead, the panelists divided the projects in terms of high, medium and low priority and then discussed the projects based on their individual and regional merit.

Mr. Phillips asked if staff could provide him with information on how the application submitted by Loudoun County fell short of the cut.

Ms. Crawford said she would be happy to speak with him about the particulars of his application and the panelist's discussion. She added that Ms. Koster, chair of the selection panel, would also be happy to speak with him.

Chairman Erenrich asked if the TPB would be conducting a meeting in advance of the FY 2010 project solicitation so that potential applicants could ask questions about the applications process and get feedback on previously submitted applications.

Mr. Kirby and Ms. Crawford said a workshop would be a good idea and TPB staff will plan to conduct such a meeting.

Mr. Owalabi noted that the Committee has discussed the TLC project selection process over the past several years and said that it agrees that selection of TLC projects cannot rely on ranking alone and that it is a quantitative and qualitative exercise. One of the goals of TLC is to spread funding around the region to ensure a diversity of projects and issues.

7. Status Report on the Federal Transportation Stimulus Package and Review of Potential Amendments to the FY 2009-2014 TIP to include Stimulus Funded Transportation Projects.

Mr. Kirby reviewed his memorandum for the January 28 TPB meeting. He summarized what the TPB representatives from the FTA, the State Departments of Transportations, and WMATA said at the meeting on the status of the federal transportation stimulus package. He reviewed from his memorandum the proposed criteria for prioritizing federal stimulus -related transportation projects in the Washington region, as well as the best structure and process for TPB to influence stimulus - related transportation funding. He highlighted the major transportation funding elements in the stimulus package just recently passed by the US House and currently under consideration by the Senate.

Mr. Phillips inquired how much transportation stimulus funding would go to the Washington region. Mr. Kirby said that based upon the House version, that perhaps \$120 million to the District, about \$800 million to Virginia and about \$600 million to Maryland. Then about 25 percent of the STP funds would be for the region. This could change in the Senate Bill. He said that it will come down to project selection at the state level, and that the projects need to be ready to go and focus on maintenance and rehabilitation efforts.

Ms. Erickson described the types of maintenance and ready to go projects under consideration for possible stimulus funding in Maryland. She said that the time frame for spending the funds is very important.

Chairman Erenrich asked if the TIP should be amended for projects before the bill is signed. Mr. Kirby said that it depends on the type of projects. If the projects are included in the TIP as groupings for example under bridge maintenance the projects could be included as administrative modifications. However, including some major projects could require public comment. He said that if the stimulus package has become law by February 18, the TPB will be asked to amend the FY 2009-2014 TIP to include all allowable federal stimulus funded projects identified by the implementing agencies.

8. After-Action Briefing on Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program Activities for the Presidential Inauguration

Mr. Meese introduced the topic, noting that this presentation was being prepared in response to a request from the TPB at its November meeting. Mr. Meese introduced Buddy Ey, a contractor to COG working as the full-time MATOC Facilitator. Mr. Ey referred to a PowerPoint presentation slated to be given to the TPB at its February 18 meeting.

The goals for MATOC for the Inauguration were to maintain regional situational awareness of transportation incidents, to ensure that traffic management actions were coordinated, and to communicate incident information in a timely,

consistent, and reliable manner among transportation agencies. Mr. Ey, as MATOC Facilitator, was involved in preparatory meetings with key agencies in the weeks prior to the Inauguration. He was on duty on the Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday of the Inaugural weekend, physically located in the District of Columbia Emergency Operations Center. He monitored information sources, communicated incident information, and provided situational awareness to key agency contacts. Mr. Ey cited an example of his activities, gathering information on how quickly Metrorail parking lots were filling up on Inauguration morning and relaying it to MDOT and VDOT, so appropriate information could be posted on highway variable message signs.

As a follow-up to the Inauguration activities, Mr. Ey was in the process of obtaining feedback from MATOC operations stakeholders. Initial perceptions were that the program was well-received, utilized, relevant, and provided value added. Areas identified for improvement were to be addressed during the remainder of the trial phase, notably on training, equipment and fine-tuning standard operating procedures.

Chairman Erenrich suggested that Mr. Ey focus on examples for the TPB presentation, especially of specific situations that came up during the Inauguration, the actions taken by MATOC, and how they were different from what would have happened without MATOC.

Ms. Hoeffner suggested avoiding the use of the many acronyms in the presentation. Mr. Kirby agreed, suggesting that the presentation be kept at a more general level, and that examples be shown.

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

Mr. Griffiths gave a Power Point presentation highlighting some additional results from the 2007/2008 Household Travel Survey. He noted that the greatest increase in the share of daily commuters commuting by transit between 1994 and 2007/2008 occurred in the region's outer suburbs. He stated that he would be briefing the TPB on these findings at their February 18th meeting.

Mr. Smith commented that that Loudoun County Transit had been adding 2 to 3 new buses each year for the last several years.

Mr. Srikanth added that the Fairfax Connector had also greatly increased service during this period.

Chairman Erenrich asked if the sample size of the Household Travel Survey was large enough to permit analysis at smaller levels of geography.

Mr. Griffiths responded that while the sample size was not large enough to permit analysis for individual Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZs), the sampling plan was designed to permit analysis of travel behavior for aggregations of TAZs that comprise the region's major regional activity centers.

TPB Chairman Jenkins asked when the survey results would be available for individual jurisdictions, like Frederick County, MD.

Mr. Griffiths responded that he planned to present survey results for individual jurisdictions at the March TPB meeting.

Ms. Norfleet asked when the survey data files would be available for use by local jurisdictions.

Mr. Griffiths responded that because of confidentiality restrictions the raw survey data files could not be released to local jurisdictions or others, but a public release version of survey data that stripped away the confidential information would be available after technical review by the Travel Forecasting Subcommittee in a May/June timeframe.

10. Briefing on 2008 Vehicle Registration Data

Mr. Sivasailam presented the draft summaries of the 2008 decoded vehicle registration data, which will be used to develop vehicle age distribution and percentage of diesel vehicles used as an input to the Mobile 6.2 model during conformity assessment of the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP. He highlighted the increase in light duty trucks (SUVs) compared to light duty vehicles (passenger cars). Even though the total number of vehicles has increased he pointed to the age distribution for light duty vehicles which indicate the vehicles are older and the average age of the fleet is higher as compared to the 2005 registration data.

Mr. Srikanth pointed out that the NOx and VOC budgets were set with 2005 registration data and with the fleet getting older we could have higher emissions as older vehicles tend to emit higher levels of NOx and VOC. Mr. Sivasailam agreed with the observation but said that the VOC emissions will be slightly lower since the growth in fleet size in 2008 is lower compared to our previous projections. Mr. Sivasailam said he will get back to the Committee with updates at the next meeting.

11. Review on Draft Performance Information on the 2008 CLRP

Mr. Hodgson explained that the handout included draft charts and maps detailing performance of the 2008 CLRP, which would be included in the final 2008 CLRP brochure and website. He noted that the results of the performance analysis for the 2008 plan were very similar to the results for the 2007 plan, which Committee members should be familiar with.

Mr. Owolabi asked if there had been a change in the VMT per capita performance measure between the 2007 CLRP and 2008 CLRP, and Ms. Bansal confirmed that there had not been a change and that the measure remained the same (-2% change between the plan base year and 2030). Mr. Hodgson asked that Committee members review the materials in the handout and forward

any other comments or questions to him by Friday, February 13, 2009, after which the 2008 CLRP brochure will be finalized and the website will be updated to include the performance information.

12. Other Business

None.

13. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - February 6, 2009**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Rick Rybeck
 Mark Rawlings
 Ronald Mitchell

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick Co. John Thomas
 Charles Jenkins
City of Frederick Tim Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich
Prince George's Co. -----
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. -----
 Prince George's Co. -----
MDOT Lyn Erickson
 Shiva Shrestha
 Keith Bounds
 Eric Beckett

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Maria White
 Donna Norfleet
Arlington Co. -----
City of Fairfax Alexis Vrezosa
Fairfax Co. Robert Owolabi

Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Art Smith
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Monica Backmon
NVTC Greg McFarland
PRTC Anthony Foster
 Ryan Jones
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT Chris Arabia
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Clayton Ashby

FEDERAL/OTHER

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

COG Staff

Ronald Kirby, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Mike Clifford, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Jim Hogan, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Wenjing Pu, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
Sarah Crawford, DTP
Bob Griffiths, DTP
G. Toni Giardini, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Hailemariam Abia, DTP
Eulale Lucas, DTP
Tim Canan, DTP
Yu Gao, DTP
Michael Farrell DTP
Nick Ramfos, DTP
Rex Hodgson, DTP

Other Participants

Randy Carroll, MDE
Joseph Madison, MTA
Beth Potter, Tri-County Council
Bob kuhns, Clark Nexsen
Buddy Ey, MATOC