

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the September 5, 2008 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Update on Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2009 Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Austin spoke to the Call for Projects document and said it was scheduled to be approved by the TPB at their meeting on October 15. He said there were no significant changes to the document since the last time it came before the Technical Committee. He noted that all updates for projects that have conformity impacts had to be submitted using the iTIP database by December 5, 2008.

Mr. Austin reported that the Travel Management Subcommittee had been reviewing the segments of the CLRP Project Form that pertained to the documentation of the Congestion Management Process. He asked Mr. Meese to comment on those changes. Mr. Meese said that the Travel Management Subcommittee had suggested some revisions to the CLRP form and the accompanying instructions in the Call for Projects document to make the questions more clear and easy to answer. He referenced a memo that explained the revisions to the instructions and form. Mr. Meese reported that the Travel Management Subcommittee had recommended that the revisions be forwarded to the Technical Committee for their approval prior to implementation.

Mr. Srikanth stated that the Travel Management Subcommittee was comfortable with the suggested revisions. He noted that the Committee should review the suggested changes and submit any comments to staff. Mr. Srikanth offered several minor changes to the wording of several phrases in the Call for Projects instructions. He suggested that the instructions under question 26 should include an explanation of what facility types 1, 2 and 5 were. He also suggested that question 26 b should make it clearer that the bulleted list below comprise the set of exemption criteria. Finally, he suggested that the third to last exemption criteria be re-worded as; "The project, such as a transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facility, will not allow private single-occupant motor vehicles." The suggestions were accepted by TPB staff.

3. Briefing on Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2008 CLRP and FY 2009-2014 TIP

The summary conformity report was made available at the meeting. Mr. Clifford presented the conformity results. He reminded the group that an analysis had been completed in July, but that the removal of the NVTA funding led to a re-analysis. He noted that the "background" section of the report discusses the rerun. He pointed out the three attachments. Attachment A contains the TPB April action item outlining the

contingency plan that led to the adoption of a conformity-neutral TIP in July and the subsequent rerun of the conformity analysis. Attachment B contains the updated conformity analysis schedule. Attachment C contains the conformity project listing, and shows changes in project inputs relative to the 2007 CLRP.

Mr. Clifford stated that, in addition to network changes, the conformity rerun contained some minor updates to technical methods relating to the HOT/HOV analysis. He noted that the results are very similar to those in the initial analysis, with a slight drop in levels for both ozone season and PM2.5 pollutants.

Mr. Srikanth asked why there was an out year budget established for ozone season NOx (page 12). Mr. Clifford replied that staff would verify (2010 and beyond is for contingency purposes). Mr. Clifford noted that there was no problem adhering to any of the budgets, and reminded the group that EPA had not yet found the budgets adequate.

Mr. Srikanth asked about CAIR. Ms. Rohlfs replied that EPA has appealed the CAIR vacature court action and expects that any decision on next steps by MWAQC will be delayed pending results of EPA's appeal of the decision.

Mr. Biesiadny asked if the rerun results should be shown in comparison to the results of the initial analysis. Mr. Clifford pointed out that there were no results to accompany the TPB's July action because the adopted TIP was conformity neutral.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that the number of transit trips resulting from the travel demand shown in the report is extremely low. Mr. Kirby responded that the travel demand modeling produces linked trip values and not the individual trip segment values that Mr. Erenrich cited.

4. Briefing on the Draft 2008 CLRP and Amendments to the FY 2009 – 2014 TIP

Mr. Austin spoke to the draft brochure for the 2008 Update to the CLRP. He introduced Mr. Hodgson, a new member of TPB's staff who had worked on the brochure. Mr. Austin stated that the brochure highlighted the significant projects that were proposed to be added to or changed in the plan. The only change to this from previous versions of the list was that a project that widened two segments of US 50 between Eaton Place and Jermantown Road in the City of Fairfax had been demoted to a study, so it was removed from the list. Mr. Austin asked that any urgent corrections or edits be submitted by the close of business on the following Monday. He added that the Committee would have until November 3rd to make any additional comments on the brochure prior to its final printing.

Mr. Austin then distributed a list of eight projects that were proposed as amendments to the FY 2009-2014 TIP. The projects on this list had previously been identified as new projects with conformity impacts that could not be included in the conformity-neutral TIP approved by the TPB on July 16. Both the CLRP and this list of amendments were to be released for public comment on Thursday, October 9. Mr. Austin requested that any changes to the list of projects be submitted by the end of Tuesday, October 7.

Mr. Srikanth stated that VDOT and its local member jurisdictions were reviewing the list and would have any comments submitted by the October 7 deadline.

Mr. Kirby noted that both the District Department of Transportation and the Virginia Department of Transportation showed "Vacant" under the listing of TPB members and suggested that those agencies should send a formal letter appointing a new representative.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the CLRP listing reflected the recent budget and project cuts in Maryland. Ms. Erickson responded that this CLRP was based on Maryland's most recently approved Consolidated Transportation Program and that those cuts would be reflected in the next annual update.

5. Briefing on Proposed Changes for the FY 2009 Project Application and Selection Process for the Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program

Mr. D. Smith gave a brief PowerPoint presentation that summarized the status of the TLC Program, including an overview of the technical assistance projects completed to date and results of program evaluations. He reviewed changes made to the TLC program element in the FY 2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) as a result of recommendations by the TPB Scenario Study Task Force, and briefed the Committee on proposed changes to the technical assistance project application and selection process, in accordance with the UPWP changes. He noted that the TPB would be asked to approve the new procedures, including the formation of an independent panel for project selection, at its October 15 meeting.

Mr. Foster asked if the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) would still be able to contribute the \$80,000 in their Technical Assistance funding given their budget situation. Ms. Erickson responded that the money has already been committed and was part of the TPB's UPWP, therefore, unaffected by the budget situation.

Mr. Erenrich asked who would be on the selection panel. Mr. D. Smith responded that invitations have not been extended; however, TPB staff will contact staff from the list of organizations outlined in the memorandum.

Chairman Rawlings asked how the FY 2009 selection process is different from the FY 2008 selection process. Mr. D. Smith said that in FY 2008, staff used the evaluation tool in Appendix D to evaluate the projects with the TLC lead-consultant, Reconnecting America. Recommendations were then sent to the TPB Officers. He said that in FY 2009, staff proposes forming a selection panel of national industry experts to review and recommend applications for funding.

Mr. Biesiadny questioned the scalability requirement on the evaluation form, and noted that applications should be evaluated based on how well they meet the TLC Program goals for linking transportation and land-use. Mr. Srikanth also suggested more closely tying the weighting of the evaluation form to the principles of TLC and implementation of the recommendations that will result from the proposed projects. Staff said they would re-evaluate the inclusion of scalability on the evaluation form and more closely tie the evaluation under local planning to TLC Strategies.

Mr. Biesiadny said that the proposed due date of November 21, 2008, is unreasonable. He added that because of the additional application requirements due to the increased funding amount, applications will take longer to prepare. He suggested no less than 60 days. Other jurisdictional representatives agreed. Staff suggested a deadline of December 19, 2008, noting that the evaluation of the applications would be delayed, resulting in a proposed date of February 18, 2009, for TPB approval of FY 2009 projects.

Mr. Srikanth suggested for that for FY 2010, the call for projects be issued shortly after the FY 2010 UPWP is approved by the TPB in March. He said this would allow for projects to be conducted and evaluated over the entire course of the fiscal year.

Mr. Owolabi suggested that the selection panel include the American of Public Transportation Association (APTA). Mr. D. Smith said APTA was considered as a potential organization from which to solicit input on the panel, but was determined to be too much of an advocacy organization as opposed to the other entities listed.

Chairman Rawlings asked if it would be wise for the TPB to see all of this information for the first time and be expected to act upon it. Mr. Kirby said the selection panel is the new piece of information. He suggested that the TPB could review and approve the call for projects and evaluation criteria, which have not changed significantly since FY 2008. He said that while they would be asked to approve the panel, it could be listed as a separate action, allowing for the opportunity to approve the panel in October, or wait until November.

6. Briefing on Preliminary Household Travel Survey Results

Mr. Griffiths gave a Power Point presentation that summarized some of the initial results of the Household Travel Survey, the GPS add-on component of this survey and the non-respondent follow-up survey.

Mr. Owolabi noted that the number of records in the trip file divided by the number of records in the household file implied a household trip rate of about 11 trips per household, but the slide in Mr. Griffiths' presentation stated that the household trip rate was only 9.2 trips per household. He added that the higher 11 trip per household figure was closer to the household trip rates reported in ITE trip generation studies.

Mr. Griffiths explained that the records in the survey trip file included activity records as well as trip records and that the Household Travel Survey had been designed as an activity-based survey to include daily activities such as telecommuting as well as trips. He further commented that ITE trip rates are calculated differently from trip rates in household travel surveys and that the 9.2 trips per household was actually consistent with the home-based trip component of ITE household trip rates. He also noted that the 9.2 trips per household trip rate observed in the 2007/2008 Household Travel Survey was higher than that observed in 1994 Household Travel Survey.

Mr. Srikanth asked for the reason for the higher household trip rate in 2007/2008 and if this implied an increasing daily vehicle miles of travel per household in the region.

Mr. Griffiths respond that the geography for the 2007/2008 Household was different than in 1994 and that the survey methodology implemented in the 2007/2008 survey resulted in better coverage and follow-up than in 1994. He further added the unweighted 9.2 per

household trip rate was for daily person trips not daily vehicle trips. He added that he believed the survey methodology employed in the 2007/2008 survey did a better job in capturing daily non-motorized walk and bike trips than in 1994 and that this could be part of the reason for the higher household trip rate in the 2007/2008 survey.

Mr. Biesiadny noted that the slide on the Household Travel Survey GPS add-on component identified a 15% under-reporting of daily vehicle trips and asked if the survey results would be adjusted to account for this under-reporting.

Mr. Griffiths responded that an adjustment would be made in the expansion and analysis of the survey data to take into account this under-reporting of daily vehicle trips.

Mr. Kellogg commented that other GPS add-on studies had shown that this under-reporting was not uniform, but rather varied by the type of survey respondent.

Mr. Griffiths agreed with Mr. Kellogg's comment and said that this adjustment would have to be selectively applied in expanding and analyzing the survey data.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the GPS data could also be used to calculate speeds on segments of the regional highway network.

Mr. Griffiths responded that this was an excellent point and that he would be working with Mr. Sivasailam to use this data in the analysis of speeds on regional freeways and arterial roadways.

Mr. Sivasailam noted that because the household travel survey data occurred over a 14-month period between February, 2007 and March 2008., the survey data could be analyzed to look at the effect of the increase of gas prices on daily vehicle travel for the two months that overlapped.

Mr. Griffiths agreed that it was good to have this overlap and that this analysis could be done.

7. Briefing on Priority Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects for Consideration in the FY 2010-2015 TIP

Mr. Farrell spoke to a handout and mail-out on the list of Top Priority Unfunded Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects, and described the projects.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the list was limited to ten projects. Mr. Farrell replied that it was not, but that the project must be unfunded or partially funded, a top priority for the jurisdiction or agency, and contribute to regional goals such as pedestrian safety, improving access to transit, or improving connectivity of the regional bicycle network.

Mr. Erenrich asked if additional projects could be selected for this list. Mr. Farrell replied that this list had already been approved by the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee, so no more projects would be added. Another list will be selected next year.

8. Briefing on the Regional “Street Smart” Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign

Mr. Farrell spoke to a handout on the Street Smart Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Campaign.

Mr. Erenrich asked whether any private funding had been pursued. Mr. Farrell replied that it had not been, due to conflicts with other COG fund-raising efforts. However, there is still time to solicit private contributions for the Spring campaign wave.

Mr. Biesiadny noted that the presentation did not show the change in the number of fatalities over the years. Mr. Farrell replied that he was still waiting for 2007 pedestrian fatality and injury numbers from Maryland. Fatalities can vary significantly from year to year. And many factors other than fatalities can contribute to pedestrian fatalities, such as changes in population, demographics, even gas prices.

9. Briefing on California measure SB375 Linking Greenhouse Gas Emissions to Metropolitan Transportation Planning

Before discussing measure SB375, Mr. Kirby distributed a handout that contained TPB actions on items reviewed by the Committee at its September 5 meeting. He reviewed the final version of the TPB letter with comments on the review draft of the COG Climate Change Report that was sent to the COG Board of Directors. He then briefed the Committee on the final version of the policy principles for the 2009 authorization of federal surface transportation programs as approved by the TPB on September 17. He also distributed a copy of HR 2095, the WMATA rehabilitation needs authorization bill that had just been passed by Congress.

Mr. Kirby then briefed the Committee on California measure SB375. He distributed a press release from the governor that announced that the measure had become law on September 30, 2008 and a fact sheet that described the main features of the measure which will require that transportation plans developed by the metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) in California include strategies designed to achieve certain targets for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks. He then went through the 20 pages of the bill and highlighted the significant definitions and elements of the new planning process requirements. He commented on the main points in the bill including:

- The bill reaffirms the existing federal transportation and air quality planning requirements for MPOs to follow to produce a long range regional transportation plan, but now requires the MPOs to adopt a sustainable communities strategy designed to achieve certain targets for reductions of greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks.
- To the extent that the sustainable communities strategy is unable to meet the reduction targets, the bill requires the MPO to prepare an alternative planning strategy showing how the targets would be achieved.
- The sustainable communities strategy and the alternative planning strategy must be reviewed by the State Air Resources Board and the MPO must obtain board

acceptance that the alternative planning strategy, if implemented, would achieve the targets.

- The bill states that the adopted strategies do not regulate land use and are not subject to state approval, and that nothing in sustainable communities strategy shall be interpreted as superseding the exercise of land use authority of cities or counties within the region.
- The bill exempts a transit priority project that is identified by a local jurisdiction to be a sustainable communities project from the preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR) as required by the California Environmental Quality Act.

There was a lively discussion among Committee members about the main features and comments and speculation on what effect its main features would have if applied in the Washington region.

10. Update on the Development of the “CLRP Aspirations” and “What Would it Take” Scenarios

Ms. Bansal provided a brief update on the CLRP Aspirations and What Would it Take scenarios. This included an overview of questions posed to the Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee regarding refinement of the land use component of the CLRP Aspirations scenario and comments received to date. This also included a similar overview of questions posed to the Regional Bus Subcommittee regarding the transportation component and comments received from that committee. Committee members asked whether these two committees had been given deadlines on their comments. Ms. Bansal responded that they have been given loose deadlines; however, our collaboration with them will have to be ongoing.

11. Other Business

None.

12. Adjourn