

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the May 1 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program

Mr. Kirby referred to a presentation handout that had recently been used to brief transportation agency executives on the MATOC Program. The presentation recapped the development history of MATOC up to its current trial phase leading to full implementation. DDOT Director Mr. Klein, MSHA Administrator Mr. Pedersen, and WMATA General Manager Mr. Catoe were the executives that had recently been briefed by the MATOC Steering Committee. The focuses of these presentations were to update the executives of the status of program development, which can sustain operations based on the original SAFETEA-LU earmark through June 30, 2010, as well as making the executives aware of the upcoming request for sustaining funding from DDOT, MDOT, and VDOT to support MATOC in FY2011 and beyond.

Resources needed were estimated to be \$1.2 million per year, or \$400,000 per funding partner. This funding would provide the basis for a core MATOC Program. Additional funds were being sought that could provide for enhancements to the program, including the recent submission (in partnership with the University of Maryland) of a High-Priority Project (HPP) request for the new federal transportation authorization through U.S. Representatives Moran and Ruppertsberger for MATOC enhancements. However, to be able to apply for such enhancement monies, it will be important to demonstrate that a core basic MATOC program has been committed to and funded.

The executives indicated supportiveness for the MATOC program and recognition of its benefits, but there was caution concerning the difficulty of finding even limited funding for a new program in the current budget situations.

In response to a question from Mr. Srikanth, Mr. Kirby noted that the MATOC Steering Committee had discussed the possibilities of MATOC funding sources other than state DOT-contributed funds, but that the Committee had noted the need for a committed, reliable base of funding provided by funds such as state funds.

Mr. Ey, the MATOC Facilitator, spoke next about his specific recent activities under the MATOC Program. He has met and worked extensively with the operations personnel of the major transportation agencies, including transit, helping encourage and improve their interagency coordination, and helping build personal relationships that are essential to effective coordination. He has also

worked on technical issues with the MATOC Information Systems Subcommittee as well as the developers of the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS) at the University of Maryland on improving the technical systems that can share data.

MATOC operations have focused on freeways as have the MDOT and VDOT operations centers, but he was also aware of and interested in the need to focus on the arterials around the region, particularly those that are major bus routes or evacuation routes. MATOC and RITIS are looking into obtaining more information on incidents on arterials from public safety agencies in automated ways. Mr. Ey now monitors police and fire radio scanners to try to get some of this information.

In response to a question from Chairman Erenrich, Mr. Ey agreed that there was interest by Mr. Pack at the University of Maryland to integrate transit bus operations data into RITIS, pending availability of this data from the source agencies as well as enhancement funding to accomplish this integration.

Mr. Ey cited two recent examples of incidents with MATOC involvement. First was an incident on I-66 on the Friday of Memorial Day weekend, where he had early awareness of a major incident, and notified key operations personnel. I-66 westbound was closed for over three hours, but the early notification and early action by operators to close the exit from the Beltway help avoid the major backups that might have otherwise occurred.

A second example Mr. Ey cited was current Beltway construction projects on either side of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. This area has barrier-separated express and local lanes. There is a Maryland construction project in the local lanes, while there is a Virginia construction project affecting the express lanes. Signage on the Maryland side of the river, which was worded to encourage traffic to avoid the Maryland construction project in the local lanes, was tending to encourage traffic to pile into the already-congested construction zone in the express lanes on the Virginia side. Mr. Ey reviewed the situation and encouraged that the signage to be changed to encourage drivers to use the local lanes. Even though there was a construction project causing backups in the local lanes, it was still much less than the backups in the express lanes, and the overall backups were significantly reduced. This was cited as an example of analyzing the situation from a MATOC regional strategic perspective rather than the tactical perspective that a single transportation agency has.

In response to a question from Mr. Foster, Mr. Ey noted that MATOC operations are to be self-reliant, ramping up between now and this summer or fall, at a shared facility with the regional Capital Wireless Information Net (CapWIN) Program.

In response to a question from Chairman Erenrich, Mr. Ey noted that he does keep a log of the incidents that he monitors, and that this will be a good continuing practice.

Mr. Kirby noted the need for the briefing to be shorter at the actual TPB meeting. He and Mr. Ey also noted the need to be able to quantify impacts such as the value of the travel time savings and safety impacts to make the case for MATOC.

3. Update on Proposed Amendments to the FY 2009-2014 TIP to Include Additional American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funded Projects

Mr. Kirby stated that with the TPB actions to amend or modify the FY 2009 TIP to include ARRA funded projects in May, that all of the region's ARRA funding has been committed for the District of Columbia, Maryland, and WMATA . He asked the VDOT representative to report on any forthcoming TIP amendment or modification requests for the June 17 TPB meeting.

Mr. Srikanth reviewed recent actions on the state ARRA projects in the region and in May. He explained that the Northern Virginia region was allocated \$52 million and the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) has approve a list of regional projects in May and that the CTB will be asked to approve them in June. He said that these projects would be submitted to the TPB for TIP action probably by August. He also said that there would be a TIP amendment for the June 17 meeting. He said that Northern Virginia has received about \$108 million of the approximately \$400 million statewide ARRA funds allocated to date.

4. Briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP

Ms. Posey distributed the draft summary air quality conformity report. She reminded the group that the analysis methodology was very similar to that of last year's, including the use of the Version 2.2 travel demand model and EPA's Mobile6.2 emissions factor model. She noted that assessment criteria include adherence to 1-hour budgets for ozone season pollutants and wintertime CO, and that PM_{2.5} pollutant levels must be below those of the 2002 base. She pointed out that 8-hour budgets for ozone season pollutants are shown, even though the EPA has not yet found those budgets adequate. She listed updates since last year including Round 7.2 Cooperative Forecasts, summarized in Attachment B, and new 2008 vehicle registration data. She noted that a listing of significant project input changes is included as Attachment A.

Ms. Posey went through the exhibits, pointing out the trips and VMT summaries in exhibit 2, the emission factors tables in exhibits 3-5, and the emission levels for each analysis year, along with relevant budgets, in exhibits 6-10. She noted that while VMT and trips decreased relative to last year, that emissions increased. She pointed out that the 2010 emission levels are now very close to the 8-hour ozone and PM budgets. She noted that the report would be available at the beginning of the public comment period on June 11th, and that staff would present the analysis results to the TPB at their June meeting. She reminded the committee that the TPB is expected to approve the conformity analysis, and adopt the CLRP and TIP at the July Board meeting.

Chairman Erenrich suggested that a note should be added to the exhibits showing the 8-hour budgets, indicating that adherence to these budgets is not a requirement as EPA has not yet deemed them adequate. Ms. Posey said she would do that.

Mr. Srikanth noted that it is important to point out that the increase in emissions relative to last year is mostly due to the older vehicle fleet. Mr. Kirby stated that the current numbers are the relevant ones, but that a table could be developed showing the differences from last year.

Mr. Verzosa asked if the analysis reflected vehicle emission inspection requirements. Mr. Clifford responded that I/M programs are included in the emission budgets. Mr. Kirby noted that older vehicles are not as efficient as newer vehicles, and programs like cash for clunkers might help. Mr. Mokhtari asked why this year's decrease in VMT did not result in a drop in emissions. Mr. Kirby responded that the change in the age distribution and fleet mix indicated in the 2008 registration data increased the emission factors. Mr. Clifford pointed out the decreasing emission factors through time as shown on exhibit 4.

Mr. Kirby suggested that the TERM tracking sheet should be included in the report. Ms. Posey said she would add it. Mr. Ramfos asked if the TERM benefits were reflected in the emission totals. Ms. Posey indicated that they were not.

5. Briefing on the Draft 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP

Mr. Austin spoke to the Draft FY 2010-2015 TIP document that was made available at the meeting. He noted that the Virginia portion was omitted, but that a supplementary section for VDOT would be available by the end of the meeting. He asked Committee members to review the document and said that any final changes were needed by the end of the day on Monday, June 8. The TIP was scheduled to be released for a 30-day public comment period at the TIP Forum on Thursday, June 11. Mr. Austin briefly explained the format of the TIP forum and noted that he would deliver the agenda to the DOT and WMATA representatives that were scheduled to attend.

Chairman Erenrich asked what types of changes were acceptable to the draft TIP. Mr. Austin said that funding changes and minor description changes were allowable, but any changes to data that have conformity impacts (completion dates, project limits, number of lanes, etc.) were not. Mr. Srikanth noted that project information for VDRPT was not yet complete, but would be submitted by the June 8 deadline.

Later in the meeting, Mr. Austin distributed the Virginia portion of the TIP to Committee members. He noted that a couple projects were still missing from that version, but would be added in. Mr. Miller also noted that entries had been created and/or modified for DDOT, MDOT and VDOT to show consistent project descriptions and funding for Commuter Connections and MATOC programs.

6. Update on Draft Scope of Work and Budget for An Air Quality Conformity Assessment for An Amendment to the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP to Include the Purple Line Light Rail Project and the Transportation Components Associated with the “Return to L’Enfant” Development Over I-395

Ms. Posey distributed three items. The first was the scope of work for an off-cycle conformity analysis of MDOT and DDOT amendments to the 2009 CLRP and FY2010-2015 TIP. The second was a description of MDOT’s amendment to include the Purple Line Light Rail project. The third was a description of DDOT’s amendment to include the transportation components associated with the “Return to L’Enfant” Development over I-395. All three documents were presented as a notice item to the TPB in May. Ms. Posey noted that the procedures for the conformity analysis would be the same as for the one just completed for the 2009 CLRP. She reviewed the schedule, noting the beginning of the public comment period for inputs in May, expected approval for the go-ahead in June, draft report in September, and final approval of the conformity analysis and adoption of the amendments in October.

Ms. Posey asked Ms. Erickson to describe the MDOT amendment. Ms. Erickson described the Purple Line Light Rail project, recognizing the conflicts along a portion of the alignment on the Capital Crescent trail. She noted that MDOT would be providing a short summary addressing the issues in that area. Mr. Madden stated that coordination for the project had been on-going for years, and that the trail had been originally purchased for the transit use. Chairman Erenrich commented that it should be made clear that the counties support the light rail project. Mr. Kirby suggested that there will be more public comment on the project at the TPB meeting, and that MDOT should be ready with succinct responses. He also noted that TPB staff would need help with responses to the comments. Ms. Erickson noted that there was only one comment on the website. Chairman Erenrich asked if all comments to the TPB are included in the meeting minutes. Mr. Kirby replied that they are.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the modeling would only include the light rail. Mr. Madden noted that feeder bus changes were included in the submission.

Mr. Smith asked if the amendments would be likely to cause a conformity problem, especially if the 8-hour budgets were to be approved by October. Mr. Kirby said that the amendments were not likely to have a big impact, especially in 2010 where the region is closest to the budgets.

Ms. Posey described the DDOT project, noting the transportation segments that would be included in the conformity analysis. Mr. Clifford noted that there were no land-use changes in 2010 for this analysis.

Chairman Erenrich asked for better descriptions/ maps of the DDOT project for the TPB.

Mr. Srikanth noted that VDOT and MDOT had asked DDOT to provide details of the traffic impact study done for the project. DDOT provided a report, and VDOT had distributed it to local jurisdictions, but had gotten no feedback. Mr. Shrestha

said that SHA had also received the report and has concerns about the count methodology. Mr. Kirby asked that a letter be provided to TPB with comments from the impact study in time for the mailout.

Mr. Clifford added that he felt he should note that EPA was not ignoring the submitted emission budgets awaiting adequacy findings, but that EPA was dealing with larger issues such as the CARE rule.

Chairman Erenrich asked about the status of earlier discussions relating to including Montgomery and Prince George's Counties in the Baltimore Region's non-attainment area. Mr. King said that Baltimore had shown clean data, so it was a non-issue.

7. Update on the Development of a Regional Priority Bus Project for Submission for a Competitive Grant under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

Mr. Eichler and Ms. Bansal provided a status update on the development of a regional package of priority bus corridors for funding under the ARRA TIGER grant program. They informed the group of the first round of submissions, and that another round would be pending with an updated submission form that would be easier to use and requested more specific information from the agencies.

Mr. Srikath thanked the staff for their hard work on this effort, but informed the whole committee that projects that will require any work by a state DOT will need to be reviewed by many departments within the department. Each DOT has different groups that manage different parts of the highway system (pavement, right-of-way, signals, etc.) and each will need to be consulted to ensure that a project can be completed by 2012. He recommended that this consultation occur before July 1, 2009. He also noted that some corridors in Virginia have been "federalized" and any work on these would require timely federal approval. Mr. Owolabi recommended the submission form be updated to include questions pertaining to consulting with state DOTs.

Mr. Eichler stated that a new submission form would be sent out by the end of the day, and submissions would be due 7 days afterwards. He stated that all projects previously submitted in the old form would need to be resubmitted with the new form to ensure that the appropriate data for each project is attached.

8. Briefing on Integrating Freight into the 2010 Update of the CLRP

Ms. Foster gave a PowerPoint presentation to the Committee that summarized the draft report: "Integrating Freight into the 2010 Update of the CLRP" and the Next Steps for the Freight Program. She reviewed freight trends and noted that the majority of total freight trips made by all modes in the region, when measured by total tonnage or by total value, are "through" trips.

She reviewed current Freight Program outreach activities and noted that the Freight Subcommittee meets bi-monthly. She explained that a Freight Stakeholder Outreach Survey has been conducted to gain input from shippers,

receivers, and wholesalers. Congestion on I-495, I-95, and I-66 were raised repeatedly as the most significant challenges to doing business in the region.

The following recommendations to Integrate Freight into the 2010 CLRP presented were:

1. Enhance the freight section of the CLRP during the next major CLRP update.
2. Work towards a detailed National Capital Region Freight Plan.
3. Maintain the current Freight Subcommittee, Focus on Freight e-newsletter, and outreach.
4. Continue to compile and analyze freight data to better understand the regional freight system.

The materials included a map showing the top ten congested locations as identified in the recent Skycomp aerial survey, with percentages of truck traffic noted at a few freeway locations. In response to a question from Mr. Thomas, Mr. Kirby noted that the percentages were spot percentages at specific locations, not an average along a whole route such as I-70.

Chairman Erenrich suggested adding the MARC Plan project to add a third rail on the MARC Brunswick and Camden Lines to the Regional Freight Project Database. This would be implemented over 20 years, however, but would improve freight and passenger rail. He also suggested identifying highway height and weight restriction locations in the region.

Ms. Hoeffner suggested including the Virginia State Rail Plan as a source document to identify projects for the Regional Freight Project Database.

Mr. Kirby commented that the pending Authorization Bill will likely have a new Freight Program.

In response to a question from Mr. Srikanth, Mr. Kirby and Ms. Foster affirmed that the current actions are for the 2010 CLRP update, as well as for a future National Capital Region Freight Plan.

Ms. Rayman applauded these freight planning efforts, and recommended coordination with the Maryland state freight plan and program. Ms. Rayman also recommended that the metropolitan Washington plan include the project to increase the height within the Howard Street Tunnel in Baltimore, even though it is not within the Washington region, as an important project for Washington as well as for the whole East Coast.

9. Status Report on the TPB 2009 Solicitation for Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom Projects

Ms. Klancher gave an overview of the TPB process for selecting JARC and New Freedom projects. The TPB's Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan lays out the process including the selection criteria. This was the third solicitation and ran from February 4 to April 29. Three JARC priorities were established by the task force and include:

- Transportation vouchers for low-income workers, including taxi vouchers or gas cards.
- Expanded transit in underserved neighborhoods,
- Shuttles or vanpools to suburban employment sites.

One New Freedom priority was established: travel training for people with disabilities on how to use fixed route transit systems.

Ms. Klancher stated that TPB member Mr. Lovain chaired this year's selection committee; other members included experts in human services (low-income, persons with disabilities) public transit and private providers. The funding recommendations go to officers for concurrence with the funding recommendations from the selection committee and then the TPB votes on the recommendations. The recommendations will be included in the TPB mail-out.

At the June 17 TPB meeting, Mr. Lovain and Ms. Newman will present the selection committee's funding recommendations to the TPB.

Chairman Erenrich asked if many project proposals were received this year and Ms. Klancher replied that there were quite a few applications received and that staff was pleased with the response, especially given the economic downturn and the requirement that the federal JARC and New Freedom funds be matched.

10. Update on EPA's Draft Motor Vehicle Simulation Model (MOVES)

Ms. Lucas and Mr. Kumar reported on updates on the transition from EPA's MOBILE6.3 model to MOVES. They presented information on selected features of the model and informed the Committee about the need to form a task force to oversee the transition process. Ms. Lucas reported that a work plan with tentative dates has been proposed. She also mentioned that MWCOCG will be hosting a MOVES training class on June 29th and 30th. Chairman Erenrich asked when will TPB be briefed on MOVES and Ms. Lucas said that it would be best to have both SIP and AQC guidance documents from EPA before the board is briefed.

11. Briefing on the Maryland Department of Transportation's (MDOT) Policy and Program Recommendations and High Priority Projects for the 2009 Authorization of Federal Surface Transportation Programs

Ms. Erickson introduced Ms. Rayman, Assistant Secretary, MDOT Transportation Policy to the Committee. Ms Rayman distributed a 5-page paper entitled

“Maryland’s Federal Surface Transportation Authorization Platform,” and briefed the Committee on MDOT's policy and program recommendations in the paper for the 2009 authorization of federal surface transportation programs.

Ms Rayman distributed a 10-page list of the "High Priority Project" requests submitted to the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for the authorization legislation and commented upon several projects, including the intermodal rail terminal in the Baltimore/ Washington corridor and the National Gateway Railroad Clearances in Multiple States project. She also presented MDOT’s approach to identifying state and local projects for submission under the TIGER competitive grant program of ARRA. She said that MDOT will solicit project inputs for a state application and make decisions on what will be in it by July 30.

Mr. Weissberg, Chair of the TPB Freight Subcommittee invited Ms. Rayman to attend its next meeting.

Mr. Kirby asked what is being considered for the Washington region under the new high speed rail program.

Ms. Rayman said that several projects are being discussed, including a new AMTRAC station at BWI, wedge yards at Union Station for MARC trains, and passenger improvements at Union Station.

12. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions Analyses

Mr. Sivasailam briefed the committee on Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions analysis. He spoke about the staff analysis of the new administration proposal to achieve 35.5 miles per gallon fuel efficiency (CAFÉ) standards by 2016 and their impact on CO₂ emissions reduction. He compared the new proposal with the older proposal to achieve the same CAFÉ target by 2020 and the additional benefits from the new proposal amounts to only about 0.5% reduction in CO₂. He told the Committee that staff has completed analysis on a number of additional control measures and they are being reviewed by the Travel management Subcommittee. Once all the control measures analysis is completed he said he will report back to the Technical Committee.

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

Delayed until July.

14. Other Business

None.

15. Adjourn