

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the October 6, 2006 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Review of Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2007 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and FY 2008-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Ms. Klancher reviewed the draft call for projects document and schedule for the air quality conformity assessment for the 2007 Plan and FY 2008-2013 TIP. The TPB will be asked to approve the final document at the December 20 meeting. The 2007 Plan has to be SAFETEA-LU compliant since this Plan will be adopted after July 1, 2007. She stated that to make the Plan title more descriptive and user-friendly, the name will be changed to "Regional Transportation Plan", as discussed last spring. Mr. Biesiadny asked that if the name is changed, a paragraph be added to the document near the front that stresses that the plan is financially constrained. Mr. Rybeck stated that he felt that leaving out the word "constrained" will confuse people and asked if a formal action was taken to approve the name change. Ms. Klancher replied that no formal action had been taken. Mr. Mokhtari stated that more discussion is needed on the change of the plan name. Mr. Rybeck made a motion to keep the Plan name "Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan". Mr. Biesiadny seconded the motion. The motion passed the committee. Mr. Rybeck stated that the new logo goes with CLRP, not RTP and that the name CLRP is good to use with the public, since the question of what the "C" stands for surfaces. Mr. Mokhtari stated that CLRP also includes "long-range" which is important. Mr. Kirby stated that he understands the concerns and that there is a strong sense from the Committee to keep the name CLRP.

Mr. Austin spoke to the Committee about the project information submission process. Agency staff would use a new online project submission application. Specific instructions on how to access the web-based application would be made available at next month's meeting. He explained that most of the basic information requested in the forms would remain the same. He discussed some significant changes that addressed a new SAFETEA-LU requirement for a Congestion Management Process. A new question asks if traffic congestion conditions necessitate the proposed project or program, and if so to identify those conditions. Ms. Ashby remarked that a vast majority of projects were being proposed to address congestion. Mr. Austin noted that all such projects should answer "yes" to that question then. He added that this did not trigger any further documentation requirements; only projects that increase capacity for SOVs required Congestion Management Documentation.

Mr. Biesiadny said the addition of checkboxes to identify the eight federal planning factors were a good idea, but wondered how staff would address the TPB's priority areas regarding the Vision. Mr. Austin stated that the TPB Vision goals were very closely

associated with the planning factors. The only one that didn't correspond directly was the new, independent "security" factor, which the Vision combines as safety and security. Mr. Mokhtari noted that the new question on Environmental Mitigation may not have a simple "yes" or "no" answer. Mr. Austin said that staff would consider a third option, possibly "To Be Determined."

3. Report on the Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign

Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint presentation on the results of the 2006 Street Smart Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Campaign.

Mr. Biesiadny noted that in some jurisdictions one third of households spoke a language other than English at home, and asked if languages other than English were being used in the campaign.

Mr. Farrell replied that during one year of the campaign, at the request of Montgomery County, safety brochures in Chinese, Vietnamese, and Korean had been prepared, as well as in English or Spanish. However, Spanish speakers are disproportionately represented among pedestrian fatalities and injuries, being eight times as likely to be hospitalized for a pedestrian injury as Asians. For that reason, it has not been considered cost-effective to do materials or advertisements in languages other than English and Spanish. Spanish language radio, print, transit shelter ads, and brochures will continue to be used.

Mr. Mokhtari asked, in relation to slide #6, how the program could be considered effective when fatalities had increased in 2005. He also asked if there was more information available on the type and location of crashes.

Mr. Farrell replied that it was disappointing that fatalities had increased to 87 in 2005, from 71 in 2004. However, pedestrian fatality numbers have a lot of variability, and the long-term trend is down. The average in recent years is lower than the long-term average.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if we were focusing on particular areas. Mr. Farrell replied that transit ads were being placed on corridors with high crash rates.

Chair Canizales suggested that a slide showing jurisdictional breakdowns be put in the presentation for the TPB.

Mr. Kirby said that the process for requesting local funds was not working well. Issues included proper timing for the budget cycle, and that as a small item it has tended to be overlooked. He asked for suggestions to improve the process.

Mr. Versoza suggested that the requests be sent directly to the CAO's, TPB Board Members, and TPB Tech representatives.

Ms. White asked if it could be made part of the COG dues. Mr. Kirby replied that not all jurisdictions support the program. Loudoun County passed a board resolution specifically refusing to fund it. To make it mandatory through the COG dues would probably not work.

Ms. Kelly said that Rockville cannot place ads on its transit shelters, though it can put them on buses.

Mr. Kirby noted that there had been a lot of support from the police chiefs throughout the region.

Mr. Biesiadny suggested that private sector sponsorship could include nonprofits such as the Insurance Institute.

Mr. Mokhtari asked why the District of Columbia was not contributing as a local jurisdiction. Mr. Kirby replied that for the purpose of this program they were considered a State.

4. Briefing on Implementing the New Transportation/Land Use Connection (TLC) Pilot Program

Mr. Kirby summarized a PowerPoint presentation that was given at the October 18, 2006 TPB meeting and included in the mailout for the November TPB Technical Committee meeting. He briefly reviewed discussion of the item at previous TPB meetings, and explained the Resolution (R11-2007) passed by the Board to amend the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to facilitate creation of a pilot program called the Transportation/Land Use Connection (TLC) Program. He said that these committees were generally supportive, and that at its October meeting the Steering Committee recommended that a proposal to begin a pilot program be brought before the Board as an action item at the October meeting of the TPB.

Mr. Kirby outlined the program proposal, including the implementation of a regional clearinghouse to document local and state experiences with land use and transportation coordination and the offer of short-term technical assistance to local jurisdictions through consultant contracts to support their coordination activities. He detailed a start-up budget and proposed implementation timeline for the pilot program, and said that the funds would be shifted from composite scenario planning activities in the budget for the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study (RMAS).

Mr. Mokhtari and Mr. Biesiadny raised concerns about how the requests for technical assistance through the program would be prioritized and balanced between the two states and the District of Columbia. Mr. Biesiadny recommended that a deadline for submissions be set so that they could be evaluated against each other and selected with equal geographic representation in mind. Mr. Kirby said that the program was designed

to be first-come, first-served so that it could be started up quickly and the money could be spent before the end of FY 2007, but that setting a deadline for submissions would be useful.

Mr. Mokhtari and Ms. Samarasinghe asked questions concerning the use of consultants to keep costs down for both the administration of the technical assistance contracts and the management of the clearinghouse, and if more money could thus be made available for the technical assistance itself. Mr. Kirby responded that TPB staff were looking at options and had met with staff members from the non-profit organization Reconnecting America. He said that they may be able to help with the clearinghouse as well as program administration but it was too early to know how much they could really be of assistance, especially since they are focused specifically on Transit-Oriented Development (TOD). He said that the amounts budgeted for the elements of the pilot program are rough estimates and more money may end up being available for the technical assistance component.

Ms. Samarasinghe asked if it was realistic to fund project scoping activities with such small amounts of money, and suggested that the focus be on assistance with visualization activities. Mr. Kirby said that Mr. Bottigheimer of WMATA had suggested that it would be useful for the program to fund scoping activities based on his experience with the West Hyattsville TOD project.

Ms. Samarasinghe also suggested that the process of applying for assistance be designed to minimize parochialism among the jurisdictions. Mr. Kirby pointed out that the proposals will be subject to review by the TPB, which should hopefully help in that regard.

5. Update on TPB Human Service Transportation Coordination and Related Efforts

Ms. Klancher briefed the Committee on recent activities related to Human Service Transportation Coordination: 1) a WMATA proposal for TPB and COG to develop and administer a new web-based regional clearinghouse on specialized transportation services for human service agencies and their clients; 2) the status of TPB and Access For All Advisory Committee recommendations to improve MetroAccess service; and 3) the first meeting of the TPB Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force. WMATA has implemented some of the AFA/TPB recommendations, is considering others, such as door-to-door service, and others are pending, such as the increase in staffing levels and involving users in changes to the eligibility process.

Ms. Samarasinghe asked about the source of funds for the regional clearinghouse and asked if that is what the JCC had some concerns about. Staff replied that the \$375,000 would come from old unspent WMATA JARC money and that the \$150,000 needed to maintain the clearinghouse would come from the FY2008 WMATA budget. Ms. Hughey from WMATA stated that the JCC asked Mr. Yaffe at WMATA to get back to them with more

details about the proposal related to door-to-door service and human service coordination initiatives, with a cost and benefit analysis.

Mr. Mokhtari asked what information would be included in the clearinghouse and stressed that some people without internet access will need to get the information a different way, such as over the phone. Ms. Hughey said that WMATA will look at how to fund getting more phone support. Mr. Biesiadny suggested that the title of the slide "Recommendations Planned to Be Implemented" should be changed since some of the recommendations have not yet been agreed to, such as the door-to-door service. Mr. Verzosa stated that door-to-door service would go above and beyond what is required by the Americans with Disabilities Act and that human service agencies should fund and contribute more to the MetroAccess program. Ms. Hughey commented that WMATA is looking at working with more human service agencies and other transportation providers on the MetroAccess program.

Mr. Weisberg stated that he attended the first TPB Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force meeting and is concerned that existing fixed route services need to be considered for the new JARC funding since the services have been funded in the past with JARC. Ms. Ashby stated that existing regional bus and rail services have accessibility issues that need to be considered (such as the lack of accessible pedestrian infrastructure). Ms. Klancher was asked if the MetroAccess program had considered a call back system to alert passengers that their vehicle is on the way and she replied that those calls are currently being done.

6. Briefing on Initial Results of an Analysis of a Regional System of variably Priced Lanes (VPLs) in the Washington Region

Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee, summarizing the results-to-date of the analysis of a regional system of variably priced lanes.

Mr. Biesiadny inquired about the difference between the toll calculation technique used by the TPB analysis and the technique used by other analyses.

Mr. Kirby replied that other analyses use diversion curves that attempt to estimate the percentage of traffic that will take an alternate, parallel route for the entirety of a long journey. In the system being analyzed, there are options to enter and exit the toll lanes at multiple points throughout the system. Additionally, the toll lanes being analyzed can have tolls varying by segment, which is another departure from traditional tolling approaches. As such, the diversion curve analysis used for traditional toll roads is not appropriate.

Mr. Mokhtari asked about the reversible HOV lanes along the I-95/395 corridor in Virginia, stating that there are only on-ramps northbound and off-ramps southbound.

Mr. Kirby reminded Mr. Mokhtari that the discussion was about the proposed projects in the CLRP, which include adding many off-ramps along the HOT lane route.

Mr. Mokhtari then asked about the roadways that were being proposed for HOT lanes, noting that the proposed roads in his jurisdiction (Prince George's County) are nearly all on state roads, while in other areas of the region the proposed HOT lanes are all on interstates.

Mr. Kirby replied that this is an initial proposal, and that more details will be available next month.

7. Briefing on On-Going 8-Hour Ozone and PM 2.5 State Implementation Plan (SIP) Activities

Ms. Rohlfis distributed and discussed two handouts showing the 8-Hour Ozone SIP schedule and dates for deliverables. She said that the 8-Hour Ozone SIP base year is 2002 and the attainment date is 2009. She explained that there is discussion of including a "voluntary bundle" of measures in the SIP which would not be used for credit, but would be available if needed. She noted that the draft SIP is scheduled to go to MWAQC TAC this month, and to MWAQC in January, 2007. Public hearings are scheduled for February and March. The final SIP is scheduled to go to MWAQC in April and then on to EPA.

Ms. Rohlfis described the two tasks not yet completed. The first is the attainment modeling results which she indicated would likely not be a problem with the use of additional weight of evidence. The second is the development of a contingency plan, which is necessary to be in place if evidence shows that reasonable further progress is not met by 2008 or attainment is not met by 2009. She noted that for the contingency plan, MWAQC is discussing the development of mobile emissions budgets for 2010 (reasonable further progress) and 2011 (attainment). She stated that the contingency plan would be discussed at the November 17th MWAQC TAC meeting.

Mr. Kirby stated that any discussion of a new mobile budget is a new initiative, and that developing mobile budgets is a very big deal requiring a lot of work. He noted that there is nothing in the conformity rule that suggests that mobile budgets can be used as contingency measures.

Ms. Rohlfis replied that mobile sources are expected to have significant reductions starting in 2007 and that the air agencies feel that credit could be taken for those reductions. She noted that this is just a proposal being discussed.

Mr. Kirby said that the transportation representatives should be consulted so that everyone understands the huge increase in work that setting new mobile budgets would entail. Mr. Rybeck asked for a cost estimate of the work. Mr. Kirby noted that in addition to setting the budgets, that staff would have to perform conformity analysis for the new budgeted years. He mentioned that funding would have to be taken out of other programs.

Mr. Clifford distributed two items. The first was his memo discussing the use of transportation measures in the SIP and in conformity. He briefly reviewed each of the attachments, which categorized existing measures: (1) to distinguish TCMs from other SIP measures, (2) to demonstrate their use in developing mobile budgets, and (3) to distinguish SIP measures from conformity measures.

The second item was a memo discussing a recent court decision related to EPA's conformity rule, and a possible future court case related to the new hotspot conformity requirement. The court decision, in which Environmental Defense challenged EPA's transitional conformity rules vacates a provision of the rule, however, it does not affect the TPB's conformity determination of the 2006 CLRP and the FY2007-2012 TIP.

The possible case provides a 60 day notice that Environmental Defense and Sierra Club plan to commence civil action against US DOT and the TPB on grounds of failure to conduct a quantitative PM2.5 hot-spot assessment for the ICC in Maryland. Mr. Clifford noted the requirement for both regional and hot-spot analyses for projects, but pointed out that a quantitative hot-spot analysis is not required. He referred to the memo's Attachment B Federal Register excerpt showing that a qualitative hot-spot analysis is appropriate. He mentioned that a qualitative hot-spot analysis was performed on the ICC.

Mr. Kirby noted that the intent notice shows the importance of following federal regulations. He pointed out that the letter of intent came out just after the TPB approved the TIP. The timing reflects the fact that suits must challenge actions.

Mr. Srikanth asked if staff had contacted Federal Highway, and noted we have 60 days to assess the situation. Mr. Kirby replied that the information had been forwarded to Federal Highway and MDOT.

8. Briefing on a Proposed Bus Subcommittee of the Technical Committee

Mr. Kirby summarized the history and rationale for the proposed subcommittee as presented in his memo to the Committee in the mailout item. The memo also included a draft proposal for a regional bus committee prepared by Jim Hamre of WMATA, which was discussed at a recent meeting of WMATA, DDOT and TPB staff. Mr. Kirby said that creating a new subcommittee is a good idea, but the scope and activities of the subcommittee needs to be clearly defined and the resources identified to support it. He pointed out that staff support in the current UPWP for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee is budgeted at \$75,000 per year and that a new bus Subcommittee might need \$100,000 in staff support depending on the expected work activities. The proposed subcommittee will be discussed at the 2006 Bus Conference sponsored by WMATA November 30. He said that after the Committee reviews and discusses the WMATA draft proposal today, TPB staff will prepare a revised proposal reflecting the comments for review and approval by the Committee at its December 1 meeting. It will then be scheduled for consideration of the TPB at its December 20 meeting.

Mr. Hamre briefed the Committee on the background of his proposal and reviewed the suggested work activities of the subcommittee. Mr. Weissberg asked whether the subcommittee would address operational issues or long range planning. Mr. Hamre replied that the subcommittee will provide an opportunity for the bus operators to discuss their service strategies and issues.

Mr. Verzosa inquired how the subcommittee would relate to the existing bus transit operators group that is involved with emergency operations coordination. Mr. Hamre said that it would replace this group.

Mr. Srikanth commented that all of the proposed work areas were good, but that the subcommittee should focus on planning as related to MPO activities.

Mr. Hamre said that the subcommittee should not try to do everything initially and it would provide an opportunity to interact with private providers and other operators outside the WMATA compact.

Mr. Kirby said that bus operators are involved in the COG emergency coordination and planning activities and the TPB MOITS task forces. He said that if the new subcommittee would focus on planning bus service for 2010 and beyond that it will be forced to address a lot of operating issues.

Ms. Samarasinghe said that the subcommittee could either become a coordinating or planning body. If it does planning, it will have to be careful because future funding for transit is limited.

Mr. Kirby commented that future bus services must meet the fiscal constraint requirements for the long range plan and that this would be important for the subcommittee to address. Mr. Meese explained that COG's operational role in emergency coordination has been curtailed.

Mr. Kirby asked the Committee to provide comments on the draft proposal. Staff would prepare a draft scope and budget for the new subcommittee. The scope will present the subcommittee activities focusing on planning needs.

Mr. Smith asked what the new subcommittee would do that the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC) does not. Mr. Kirby said that the subcommittee would be regional and have a long-range focus. Mr. Smith said that he would support this new subcommittee.

Mr. Hamre invited the Committee members to attend the 2006 Bus Conference sponsored by WMATA on November 30.

9. Status Report on Coordination with the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) on Allocating and Sharing of Regional Transit Funds

Mr. Kirby referred to a letter of October 17 to the TPB in the mailout from the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) regarding the TPB and FAMPO working cooperatively to reach a resolution on the allocation and sharing of FTA formula funds for the Washington urbanized area. He also pointed out in the mailout the draft letter to FAMPO that the Committee reviewed on October 6 outlining potential TPB responses and recommendations on each of the five resolutions on the FAMPO policies with respect to the allocation and sharing of these formula funds.

As requested in the NVTA letter, Mr. Kirby said that he will convene a meeting of the region's designated recipients of formula transit assistance to review FAMPO's request for an allocation of federal transit funds. The meeting participants will include high level representatives from the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission, the Virginia Railway Express, the Maryland Department of Transportation, the District of Columbia Department of Transportation, and the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation. He said he hopes to set up a conference call rather than a meeting and will report back to the Committee at its December 1 meeting.

10. Briefing on the Transportation Research Board (TRB) Fifth International Visualization in Transportation Symposium

Delayed to December.

11. Other Business

None.

12. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - November 3, 2006**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Rick Rybeck
 Mark Rawlings

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick Co. Denis Superczynski
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. David Moss
Prince George's Co. Vic Weissberg
Rockville Katherine Kelly
M-NCPPC
Montgomery Co. Eric Graye
Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT Ian Beam
 Shiva Shrestha
 Amber Rhodes
 Gail Moran

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Maria White
Arlington Co. Tamera Ashby
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Art Smith
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
NVTC -----
PRTC Anthony Foster
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT Sharmilla Samarasinghe
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Tomika Hughey

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC Takumi Yamamoto
FHWA-VA -----

FTA Deborah Burns

NCPC -----

NPS -----

MWAQC Deirdre Elvis-Peterson

COG Staff and Others

Ronald Kirby, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Michael Clifford, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Jim Hogan, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Bob Griffiths, DTP
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Don McAuslan, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
Beth Newman, DTP
Jinchul Park, DTP
Michael Eichler, DTP
darren Smith, DTP
Anant Choudhary, DTP
Erin Morrow, DTP
William Bacon, DTP
Hailemariam Abai, DTP
G Toni Giardini, DTP
Paul DesJardin, HSPPS
Jeff King, DEP
Joan Rohlf, DEP
Randy Carroll, MDE
Jaak Pedak, Fairfax County DOT
Jim Chandler, Town of Leesburg