

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the June 3, 2005 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on Revisions to the Draft Round 7.0 Cooperative Land Use Forecasts

Mr. DesJardin reported that in response to the concerns raised by the District of Columbia Office of Planning staff about the jobs and housing imbalance implied by the Round 7.0 forecasts, the Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee (PDTAC) had held several special meetings to discuss this issue. He further reported that the PDTAC had considered several ways that forecast jobs and housing might be brought into closer alignment, but had not yet reached a consensus on how to resolve this issue. He continued that the PDTAC was meeting again at 10:00 am to try to come to an agreement and reach closure on the matter.

Mr. Griffiths reported that the crux of the matter was that strong economic growth was foreseen throughout the 2000 to 2030 forecasting period, but that practically all jurisdictions in the region would reach build out of their residential zoning under current local plans by 2020. With commercial development continuing apace and residential development virtually stopping after 2020, there was a significant gap between the number of new jobs foreseen and the limited amount of new housing expected to be built in the 2020 to 2030 period.

Mr. Griffiths further reported that even after accounting for projected increases in commuting from areas outside the Washington region, there was still a sizeable gap between the number of forecast jobs and the number of new households that would be needed to provide enough workers to fulfill the job forecast.

Mr. Griffiths noted that planners were looking at an option that would balance the number of forecast jobs and households by increasing forecast households in the region by 46,000 households and by increasing forecast households in the jurisdictions just outside the Washington area, but within the TPB model area by 46,000 households and shifting 46,000 forecast jobs from the Washington to these jurisdictions as well.

Mr. Verzosa commented that just assuming more housing would not necessarily mean it would be affordable for the needed workers.

Mr. Griffiths responded that, all other things being equal, expanding the supply of new housing would bring the relative cost of this new housing down a little bit.

Mr. Rybeck commented that just balancing the forecast number of jobs and households for the transportation model would not eliminate the problem, local jurisdictions needed to make the changes in their land use plans --- that is what the imbalance in the forecasts was telling us.

Mr. Biesiadny responded that the problem was not until 2020 and beyond and that we have the time to make the needed changes in our land use plans.

Mr. Rybeck conceded that this was a good point, but we needed to begin making these changes starting now.

Mr. Srikanth commented that as development and redevelopment in the inner areas becomes maxed out, development moves farther out and that is one of the reasons why suburban vehicle miles of travel continues to grow so rapidly.

Mr. Clifford asked how long it would be before a Round 7.0 TAZ-level land use data file would be available for this year's CLRP/TIP Update and Air Quality Conformity Analysis.

Mr. DesJardin responded that the PDTAC was aware of the schedule for this year's CLRP/TIP Update and Air Quality Conformity Analysis and the need for Round 7.0 TAZ-level forecasts before this work could begin. He stated that assuming the PDTAC reached agreement on the revisions to the draft Round 7.0 forecasts today, he expected that a Round 7.0 TAZ data file could be ready by the end of the month.

3. Briefing on Transportation and Air Quality Impacts of the Base realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission's Proposal to Move DOD Jobs Within Washington Region

Mr. DesJardin stated that during the June 8 meeting, the COG Board of Directors had approved Resolution R19-5 authorizing COG staff to undertake an assessment of the impacts of the Department of Defense Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) recommendations for the Washington region.

Mr. DesJardin summarized the land use and economic findings from the report, stating that the analysis was focused on two time periods – 2010 and 2020. He stated that for 2010, total projected employment for the Washington metropolitan region would be reduced due to the proposed BRAC changes by approximately -15,000 jobs compared to the Round 6.4A Forecasts. Mr. DesJardin said that several jurisdictions would see a reduction in projected employment, including Arlington County (-19,321 fewer jobs), the City of Alexandria (-7,539 jobs), and the District of Columbia (-6,508 jobs). He said that several jurisdictions would see an increase in projected employment, including Fairfax County (+14,506 additional jobs), Anne Arundel County (+4,450 jobs), Prince William County (+2,500 jobs) and Prince George's County (+1,496 jobs). Mr. DesJardin said that while total 2010 employment in COG's Regional Activity Center Clusters would be about 1.2 percent lower than foreseen in Round 6.4A due to BRAC, the "I-95/Springfield Area" and "Bethesda/Friendship Heights" would see more jobs than were previously anticipated. Mr. DesJardin said that no changes in the projected number of households in the region are anticipated.

For 2020, Mr. DesJardin said that total projected employment for the Washington metropolitan region would increase by approximately 13,700 jobs due to BRAC. Mr. DesJardin stated that projected employment in Fairfax County would increase by approximately 21,400 jobs, followed by Anne Arundel County (+5,361 jobs), Prince

William County (+3,013 jobs), and Prince George's County (+1,557 jobs). He also said that 2020 projected employment in Arlington County would total approximately -6,600 fewer jobs due to BRAC, followed by the District of Columbia (-4,511 jobs) and the City of Alexandria (-2,400 jobs).

Mr. DesJardin said that approximately 8,500 additional households would be added to the region as a result of BRAC, with increases anticipated in Prince William (+3,000 households), Fairfax (+2,000 households) Stafford (+1,500 households) and Montgomery (+1,000) counties, and the District of Columbia (+1,000).

Mr. Clifford described the transportation and air quality impacts shown in the report, stating that for 2010, total regional transit trips would decrease by -18,528, total vehicle trips would increase by 26,790, and regional vehicle miles traveled would increase by 73,829. He said that VOC emissions would increase by 0.03 tons per day compared to Round 6.4A, while NO_x would increase 0.02 tons per day. For 2020, Mr. Clifford stated that transit trips would decrease by -6,097, vehicle trips would increase by 84,932, and vehicle miles traveled would increase by 133,435. VOC emissions would increase by 0.08 tons per day while NO_x would increase 0.03 tons per day.

Mr. Hogan inquired about the impacts of BRAC on the draft Round 7.0 Cooperative Forecasts. Mr. DesJardin stated that the BRAC Commission would not act until September 8, so any changes would be included in Round 7.1. Mr. Rybeck noted that at the regional scale, the transportation and air quality impacts are very minor, but at the local scale some impacts are significant. Mr. Kirby noted that a 2 percent reduction in regional transit trips was a significant change.

Mr. Robertson gave a brief history of COG's role in the BRAC study. He mentioned that Mr. Fisette, of the COG Board, asked COG staff to look at land-use and transportation impacts of the most likely scenarios. Mr. McLain, from George Mason University, provided land-use assumptions for the study. Mr. Robertson stated that staff completed the study but did not make any conclusions or evaluations based on the findings. He expects that the COG Board will 1) adopt a findings report, 2) weigh in on DOD vs. GSA building anti-terrorism standards, and 3) perhaps discuss lease-hold issues.

Mr. DesJardin distributed the body of the draft report "*COG/TPB Regional Analysis: Impacts of the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Recommendations For the Metropolitan Washington Region*", and mentioned that the report, along with the appendices, is available on COG's website. He noted that Mr. McLain's methodology for providing inputs is included in the appendices.

Mr. DesJardin discussed the study's 2010 and 2020 analysis years. He first reviewed 2010 findings that show a loss of 15,000 jobs, relative to the adopted Round 6.4A Cooperative Forecasts, for the Washington metropolitan region. Anne Arundel County is expected to gain jobs, so a net loss of 10,800 jobs is expected for the entire modeled area. Arlington County, the City of Alexandria, and the District of Columbia would see a loss of 19,000, 7,500, and 6,500 jobs respectively. Fairfax County, Anne Arundel County, Prince William County, and Prince George's County would see a gain of 14,500, 4,400, 2,500, and 1,500 jobs respectively. A net reduction of 28,000 jobs is expected in

regional activity center clusters. However, some clusters would see an increase in jobs. Jobs at Ft. Belvoir, a special generator, would increase by 15,000. Mr. DesJardin stated that the transportation impacts seemed reasonable at a regional scale.

Mr. Biesiadny suggested that the value in the second bullet item under BRAC impacts on regional activity centers, reduction in jobs to Silver Spring/Takoma Park/Wheaton, should be negative. Mr. DesJardin concurred.

Mr. DesJardin reviewed 2020 findings which show a net increase of 13,700 jobs, relative to the adopted Round 6.4A Cooperative Forecasts, for the Washington metropolitan region. Most of the new jobs would be in Fairfax County. Arlington County would see job infill by 2020, but not to the levels projected in the Round 6.4A forecasts. Households would shift, including a net increase in number, with the shift in jobs. Regional activity center clusters would see a modest increase in households and a small reduction in jobs.

Mr. Simpson noted that Bethesda/Friendship heights values were listed twice. Mr. DesJardin noted the error and said that he would remove the second reference.

Mr. DesJardin pointed out the materials in each of the remaining sections of the report, and noted that the report would be on the July agenda for the TPB.

Mr. Hogan asked if the BRAC land use assumptions would affect Round 7 Cooperative Forecasts. Mr. DesJardin indicated that the BRAC assumptions would be reflected in a Round 7.1 forecast. Mr. Hekimian inquired as to why the numbers would not be reflected in Round 7. Mr. DesJardin replied that the small area numbers would not be available in time to meet the Round 7 deadline.

Mr. Srikanth summarized that there would be a short term (2010) decrease in jobs and a long term (2020) slight increase in households. He noted that regionally there would not be much impact.

Mr. Kirby noted that the scope of work indicates that staff will identify areas with the greatest changes so that others could assess local impacts.

Mr. Kubley asked if the job changes included contractors as well as federal employees. Mr. DesJardin indicated that they did. Mr. Kubley asked if staff looked at impacts from one area of a county to another. Mr. DesJardin replied that staff generally reviewed regional changes.

Mr. Rybeck noted that while the regional impacts are minimal, local impacts might be extreme, and asked if the local impacts could be pointed out. Mr. Kirby noted that pages 27 and 29 of the report contain maps that show trip changes by zones.

Mr. Clifford reviewed pages 25 and 28 and noted that there was not as much impact in 2020 as in 2010 relative to the baseline. He pointed out that the two percent regional decrease in transit trips is significant. He also pointed out the tables showing a comparison of VOC and NOx emissions for CLRP vs. BRAC. He noted that while there was a net increase in emissions, the change was not dramatic.

Mr. Clifford noted that it would not be possible for staff to quickly provide local impact studies, but he offered to provide trip tables, loaded link files, etc., for anyone in local or state agencies who is interested in doing their own analysis.

Mr. Kirby asked if there was any interest in having a local impact analysis. He mentioned that there was time until September to provide information. He noted that some groups, such as the Board of Trade, who wants to come up with a case to get federal funding to offset impacts, were looking at local effects.

Mr. Hekimian noted the importance of the local impacts, especially to Metro and Virginia. Mr. Kubley noted that Metro's loss would be greater than just ridership loss due to the increased cost of the additional buses serving longer trips to the locations of the new jobs. Mr. Biesiadny pointed out that there is a Fairfax Connector bus garage near Ft. Belvoir, and that Connector buses serve that area.

Mr. Rybeck asked if an increase in traffic in some local areas would cause a disproportionately greater increase in congestion in those areas. He suggested a need to highlight that issue. Mr. Kirby responded that local level studies would show an increase in congestion. Mr. Maslanka indicated that regional maps do not show local detailed impacts, and that staff should perhaps provide focus area maps. Mr. Kirby asked if there was state and local staff interested in working on this. Mr. Biesiadny responded yes.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if staff could provide bar charts, similar to those shown for the region, that show local area impacts. There was general agreement that this was a good idea. Mr. Srikanth suggested giving locals two weeks to indicate to staff what they need. Mr. Kirby said that any work should be underway by the July 20th TPB meeting. Mr. Mokhtari said that the local area bar charts should be prepared for the TPB. Mr. Kirby said that staff would report to the COG Board in one week, and at the TPB meeting, staff would report mostly on transportation impacts. Mr. Srikanth suggested that staff should report the local impacts to the TPB. Ms. Samarasinghe asked about the timeline, and TPB's impact related to the timing of the Congressional hearings. Mr. Kirby pointed out the timeline on page 3, and said that any work must be done before September 8th. Ms. Samarasinghe asked if staff planned to show local impacts to the TPB. Mr. Kirby indicated that staff would prepare local impact slides similar to the regional slides shown in the report. Mr. Hekimian mentioned articles discussing extension of Metro to Ft. Meade and asked if COG has been asked to study that. Mr. Kirby indicated no.

4. Status Report on the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2005 Financially Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Clifford discussed the status of the current conformity assessment. He stated that staff does not yet have the Round 7 land-use, but hopes to get it this month. He said that the networks are all coded, and that some work on emissions factors is still on-going. He indicated that if the land-use is completed this month that staff hopes to meet the current September completion date.

Mr. Kubley asked when staff expected to get the electronic land-use files. Mr. Clifford indicated that he was not sure, but that Mr. DesJardin had earlier estimated that it would take a week or two to complete the files after the numbers were approved. Mr. Rybeck asked, assuming that the land-use was approved this month, if the results would go to the TPB in September. Mr. Clifford answered yes, and indicated that results would be shared with the Tech Committee in September.

5. Review of the Draft Scope of Work for Conducting the PM_{2.5} Conformity Analysis of the 2005 CLRP and FY 2006-2011 TIP

Mr. Clifford said that the PM_{2.5} scope is on COG's website, and that it has not changed since last month. He noted that EPA is working on additional guidance, but that the conformity clock is ticking so that staff must proceed with the analysis. He indicated that the document went to the MWAQC TAC conformity subcommittee, and that staff expects that MWAQC will send a letter to TPB.

Ms. Samarasinghe asked about the schedule for the conformity analysis as it relates to the April 5, 2006 lapse date. Mr. Clifford said that federal approval is needed by the April deadline. Mr. Biesiadny mentioned the MWAQC TAC conformity subcommittee's discussion, and asked if staff agreed with the discussion. Mr. Clifford indicated that staff is comfortable with the planned approach. Mr. Srikanth noted that VDOT and MDOT do not agree with the conformity subcommittee's discussion of doing both Option 1 and Option 2.

6. Review of the Air Quality Conformity Determination Made by FHWA and FTA for the 2004 CLRP and FY 2005-2010 TIP

Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee on the recent June 14, 2005 air quality conformity determination made by FHWA and FTA for the 2004 CLRP and FY 2005-2010 TIP. He pointed out that this determination also indicated that the fiscal constraint requirement in the MPO transportation planning regulations had been met. He then referred to the mailout materials that contained a letter of April 25, 2005 from FHWA and FTA to Earth Justice responding to two enclosed letters of January 18 and March 9 from Earth Justice committing on the pending conformity determination. Finally, he briefed the Committee on a letter from Mr. Kirby of June 13 to Earth Justice responding to its comments on the conformity determination and fiscal constraint planning requirements.

Mr. Kirby noted that the main comment was that plan did not demonstrate that the funding for WMATA was adequate to maintain the existing transit system and relies on new revenues from the Metro Matters funding agreement and recommendations from the Metro funding panel calling for dedicated funding sources for Metro. He said that the response in the letter clarified that this assertion in the comments was not correct and that no new revenues were assumed and that the transit ridership constraint addressed this issue. He summarized the comments on several other issues and the responses in his letter. He commented that at the national level there is more concern about demonstrating whether the highway or transit system is adequately being maintained because if it is not clearly demonstrated investments in any future system expansions could be severely limited.

Mr. Kirby said that he believed that for the next CLRP update we will have to provide better documentation on the financial plan and how it addresses all of the financial planning requirements, particularly demonstrating adequate system maintenance and rehabilitation. He noted that FHWA and FTA would be issuing new guidance on the CLRP financial constraint planning requirements and that we need review them carefully for the new plan update. He also referred to a recent letter from FTA to DVRTP regarding the CLRP financial plan and the EIS for the Dulles Rail Project. He explained that this letter raised the issue of funding for adequate future maintenance and rehabilitation of the Metrorail system and commented on the need for consistency between the EIS demand analysis and the transit capacity constraint in the CLRP. He said the TPB staff will work more closely on this EIS and all major project EISs to address the financial planning requirements.

7. Briefing on Background and Status of Establishing the Regional Transportation Coordination Program (CAPCOM)

Copies of a presentation on the conceptualization and status of the “CapCom” program were distributed. The handout had been prepared for and used at a July 6 special work session of the COG Chief Administrative Officers (CAO) Committee and the states’ Senior Policy Group (SPG) for Homeland Security. The July 6 work session addressed both CapCom and the Capital Wireless Integrated Network (CapWIN) Project. Similar information would be presented at the TPB’s special work session on CapCom scheduled immediately prior to the July 20 TPB meeting.

The July 6 work session grew out of concerns resulting from FY2005 Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) funding applications. Both the CAOs and SPG had previously reviewed the application for UASI funding for CapCom; the CAOs recommended against funding at this time, but the SPG acted to provide a \$1 million subgrant for the CapCom program. Differing views on the advisability of the CapCom program were discussed at length by a number of CAO, SPG, public safety, and transportation representatives on July 6. These differing views were not totally resolved, and discussions are likely to continue. CAO concerns may have grown from the proposal to co-house CapCom at the University of Maryland with the CapWIN Project. There perhaps had been a lack of understanding among some CAOs of the distinction between CapCom, a regional program for sharing information on the status of transportation systems, and the CapWIN project, which focused on developing communications technologies for use by field responders at the scenes of incidents, to date mostly used by public safety agencies.

CapWIN previously had fallen under scrutiny by the CAOs regarding costs and effectiveness.

In November 2004, the TPB had endorsed moving forward with initiating the CapCom regional transportation coordination program, co-housed with CapWIN. DDOT, MDOT, and VDOT also had endorsed this action. For continuing the discussion, Mr. Kirby asked the Committee to help urge their Board members to attend the July 20 session. Additionally, now that the \$1 million UASI grant can be used for startup activities, the stakeholders will need to discuss plans for that as well as future ongoing support funding from transportation sources.

In response to a question from Mr. Mokhtari, Mr. Kirby noted that the original UASI grant application was for about \$5 million for an almost two-year effort, but the award by the SPG was scaled back to \$1 million, which would provide for a more modest startup effort.

Mr. Srikanth urged that good background materials on the issue be provided to the Board, and that Board be briefed on the issues the CAOs raised on July 6. Mr. Kirby noted that though CapWIN had gotten much of the attention at the July 6 session, it was not intended to get deeply into the topic of CapWIN on July 20.

In response to a question from Ms. Samarasinghe, Mr. Kirby noted that CapCom was modeled on the similar TRANSCOM organization in metropolitan New York. TRANSCOM uses a combination of federal earmarks, other federal funding, and member agencies' contributions; those member agencies are required to contribute local funding to TRANSCOM to be on its Board of Directors. For CapCom, UASI funding and a potential federal earmark pending in the federal transportation reauthorization legislation were considered to be just startup funding. Mr. Kirby estimated that future sustaining funding on the order of \$5 million from transportation sources will have to be determined. Ms. Samarasinghe noted that it would take at least a year's advance notice for states to get such funding requests into their processes. Mr. Meese noted that the program and the \$5 million annual estimate were scalable to some extent.

Mr. Kirby noted two main schools of thought among stakeholders on proceeding with a CapCom program. One was that the region should study all aspects carefully before proceeding, because of a number of potential technical and cost issues. The other view was a feeling of urgency to begin right away, at least with a limited program, so benefits could start as soon as possible, and for the region to learn from the experience as a prototype.

8. Review of Proposed Improvements for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) Process and COC Documents

Mr. Miller briefed the Committee on a memorandum from VDOT and the Northern Virginia jurisdictions which identified a comprehensive set of concerns and suggestions for improving the TIP and CLRP process and documents. He reviewed each of the twelve proposed suggestions for improvement and presented the TPB staff responses to them. He reported that more than half of the suggestions had already been implemented or would go into effect in the next solicitation cycle. The Committee discussed the possibility of re_labeling the "Carry Over" column in the TIP document to more closely match the jurisdictions' STIP documents and to provide the reader with a better history of project funding. This discussion highlighted the issue that many jurisdictions show slightly different data in their STIP documents.

The Committee also discussed the possibility of adopting an expanded set of TIP phase codes to describe projects that do not fit the traditional "Planning and Engineering," "Right-of-Way Acquisition" and "Construction" definitions. Mr. Rybeck suggested that a working group meet to discuss the more technical points that still needed resolution. This

working group would meet in July and the results would be reported back to the Committee at its September meeting.

Mr. Kirby said that in the next solicitation cycle staff would prepare a second table that could accompany the standard Air Quality Conformity Input table. The purpose of this second table is to provide a list of all projects that are not coded in the travel networks for demand model analysis but are included in the region's CLRP. The two tables, together would be a comprehensive list of projects in the CLRP.

Mr. Austin informed the Committee that the project database application would be presented in an online, web based format starting with the 2006 CLRP. He announced that following a series of workshops to improve the flow of information from agencies to the TPB, staff would offer training to all agency personnel on the new system and would continue to be available for training on an as needed basis.

9. Review of Draft FY2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Pfoutz distributed the draft FY 2006-2011 TIP and told the Committee that the TIP is scheduled to be released for public comment at the September 15 TPB Citizen's Advisory Committee.

10. Other Business

None.

11. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - July 8, 2005**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Rick Rybeck

MARYLAND

Frederick Co. -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. Bob Simpson
Prince George's Co. -----
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. Alexander Hekimian
 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari

MDOT Shiva Shrestha
 BJ Berhanu

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Jim Maslanka
Arlington Co. Nicole Lewis
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Arthur Smith
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
NVTC -----
PRTC Karen Waterman
VRE -----
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT Sharmilla Samarasinghe
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Scott Kubly

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
FHWA-VA -----

FTA Kim Goins

NCPC Michael Weil

NPS -----

MWAQC -----

COG Staff and Others

Ronald Kirby, COG/DTP
David Robertson, COG/EO
Mike Clifford, COG/DTP
Gerald Miller, COG/DTP
Robert Griffiths, COG/DTP
Mark Pfoutz, COG/DTP
Jim Hogan, COG/DTP
Andrew Meese, COG/DTP
Jane Posey, COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, COG/DTP
Jim Yin, COG/DTP
G Toni Giardini, COG/DTP
Bill Bacon, COG/DTP
Jinchul Park, COG/DTP
Anant Choudhary
Joan Rohlf, COG/DEP
Jeff King, COG/DEP
Paul DesJardin, COG/HSPPS
Greg Goodwin, COG/HSPPS
Neil Comedux, Clark/Nexsen
Kyle Walton, Coalition for Smarter Growth
Christopher Arabia, VDRPT