

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the October 5, 2007 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved with a correction to change "NVTC" to "NVTA" in Item #2.

2. Update on Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2008 Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Kirby spoke to the Draft Call for Projects document and noted that there had only been one minor change on the date of the deadline for project submissions. Ms. Ashby noted that a question may be raised at the TPB meeting regarding the project submission deadline. Mr. Srikanth said that a meeting was being held on January 10 to determine which projects would be submitted by VDOT and NVTA. He said slipping the deadline or the release date to the 16th may be beneficial. Mr. Kirby reminded the Committee that only projects that have conformity implications need to be submitted at that time. Mr. Biesiadny said that NVTA would be submitting a set of new significant projects. Ms. Posey said that she also needed changes to existing projects. Mr. Srikanth noted that VDOT and NVTA would be submitting both new projects and updates to existing projects with new completion dates.

3. Briefing on I-95 Corridor Coalition Activities in the Washington Region Including the Mid-Atlantic Rail Operations (MAROps) Study

Mr. Schoener, Executive Director of the I-95 Corridor Coalition, spoke and introduced Ms. Parker of Coalition staff, and consultant Mr. Grenzeback. Mr. Schoener referred to a presentation and handout describing the membership, governance, and activities of the Coalition. Mr. Grenzeback provided a summary of MAROps study background and results, as well as critical freight movement and rail issues. The Coalition was in the beginning stages of a follow-up "MAROps II" study.

Mr. Srikanth suggested shortening the presentation for when it went to the Board on October 17, as well as considering the level of detail presented. He also suggested showing projected cost levels on the slide that summaries projected benefits.

Mr. Meese suggested that the level of detailed background information be reduced in favor of more specific information on possible next steps, such as suggesting that the TPB be involved in the MAROps II study, and Mr. Schoener agreed. Mr. Kirby noted it was important to emphasize that the Washington region's rail issues were part of the much larger East Coast rail situation.

In response to a follow-up question, Mr. Schoener noted that the time frame of the MAROps II study was six months to one year. Mr. Kirby suggested that the Coalition might want to come back to the TPB in the spring with a follow-up presentation.

Staff agreed to work with Mr. Schoener on refining the October 17 TPB presentation, and agreed to post today's presentation on the TPB Web site. The MAROps (I) study

and executive summary materials were available on the Coalition's Web site at www.i95coalition.org.

4. Briefing on a Proposed Amendment to the FY 2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Implement the Second Year of the Transportation/Land Use Connections (TLC) Program

Mr. Kirby said staff has completed the evaluation of the pilot phase of the TLC Program. He said that based on the results of the evaluation, staff has developed recommendations for conducting the TLC Program in FY 2008. He added that staff has developed new language to amend the placeholder narrative in the FY 2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for the TLC Program. He asked Ms. Crawford of DTP staff to describe the results of the evaluation and report the staff recommendations for changes to the TLC Program in FY 2008.

Ms. Crawford spoke to a PowerPoint presentation that summarized the memorandum on the evaluation results and a proposed amendment to the FY 2008 UPWP. She outlined the main items that participants of the TLC Program highlighted in their comments. She related the participant feedback to the staff recommendations for the FY 2008 TLC Program, and described the amendment to the FY 2008 UPWP required to implement those recommendations.

Mr. Srikanth asked staff to clarify what had been described as the extended timeframe for project completion for the FY 2008 projects. Ms. Crawford said that projects in FY 2008 will be completed over a span of 10 weeks, versus the tight 6-week timetable used for the pilot phase. Mr. D. Smith noted that this extension responds to the requests heard in the evaluation for more time, but also keeps the projects on a focused schedule, which many interviewees said was important for project success.

Mr. Biesiadny noted that the budget for FY 2008 contains \$255,000 for the program and asked staff why they were only including one more project in FY 2008 than was included in the pilot phase. Ms. Crawford noted that the TPB would fund at least six projects and said that it became apparent during the pilot round that significant staff time was necessary in administering the projects and useful in refining the scope to make the projects as beneficial as possible given the modest funding level.

Mr. Kirby added that staff time will be spread not only across the FY 2008 projects, but will also be used for the five VDOT Multimodal Grant Program projects the TPB will administer.

Ms. Ashby suggested that staff note this additional responsibility and expand upon how the budget will be distributed to various TLC activities when presenting this information to the TPB. She also mentioned that Arlington County Board member Mr. Fisette, also a member of the COG Board, has recently expressed interest in this program. She suggested that it might be appropriate for the COG Board to hear about the TLC Program.

Regarding the budget for the TLC Program, Mr. Srikanth added that it would be prudent to note that the funding for staff time to administer the VDOT-funded projects leverages more funding for technical assistance.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the TPB would monitor the completed projects to see if recommendations from these projects are implemented in the future. Ms. Crawford said

TPB staff plans to check in with participant jurisdictions in a year to see how they have used the products delivered through the TLC Program.

Mr. Mokhtari also suggested that TPB staff develop broad project categories for the application that focus on the challenges addressed in the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Scenario Study. Mr. Kirby responded that there are trade-offs to giving more specific directions in the application and noted that the first round had produced some creative applications that still were focused on regional goals.

Mr. Foster asked if staff would provide sample applications from the FY 2007 pilot round for references to potential applicants for FY 2008 funding. Mr. D. Smith said that the applications from the pilot round had previously been posted on the TLC Program website, and could be made available again as a reference to applicants in this round.

5. Briefing on Proposed TPB Responses to the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's (FAMPO) Policies on Allocating and Sharing of Regional Transit Funds

Mr. Kirby updated the Committee on the development of TPB responses to the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) resolutions presented to the TPB on September 20, 2006, which delineate FAMPO's policies with respect to the allocation and sharing of FTA formula funds for the Washington urbanized area. He briefly reviewed the 8/31/07 draft version of the TPB response letter that was presented at the September 7 Technical Committee meeting. He then distributed some suggested language changes to the draft TPB response to FAMPO that were received by e-mail the day before from the Northern Virginia jurisdictions. He said that the suggested changes to the second paragraph regarding a TPB position on designation of urbanized areas as a result of the 2010 Census could be addressed with some wording changes. He commented that he did not fully understand the suggested changes to the fourth paragraph and that he needed time to review them.

Mr. Biesiadny apologized for the lateness of the suggested changes. He said that the proposed changes to the fourth paragraph can be clarified and improved.

Mr. Kirby suggested that he work with Northern Virginia staff and WMATA staff to develop final language for the draft letter. He said given the timing of the suggested language changes that this item would be removed from the proposed agenda for the Oct 17 TPB meeting.

6. Review of Draft Agreement Between TPB, State DOTs and Public Transit Operators on Metropolitan Transportation Planning Responsibilities in the Washington Region

Mr. Miller explained to the Committee that the final federal transportation planning regulations require that the metropolitan planning organization (MPO), the states and the public transportation operators have a written agreement that identifies their responsibilities for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process. He distributed a draft MOU, which was also in the mail-out, and provided an overview of its contents. He said that the MOU essentially describes the current roles and responsibilities of TPB, the DOTs, WMATA and the jurisdictions' public transportation operators for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process and does not create new ones. He said that the transit operators have been briefed on the MOU at the recent Regional Bus Planning Subcommittee meeting. He commented that some of

the transit operators indicated that they will need to have their lawyers review the MOU and some are unsure who will sign the document.

Mr. Biesiadny inquired why the MOU was going to the TPB in October if it is undergoing legal reviews.

Mr. Miller said that the TPB, the DOTs and WMATA also need to sign it and the TPB representatives may have concerns that should be identified as soon as possible. The Board needs to be briefed on it so it can be executed by all of the parties in line with all of the other Board actions to comply with the final SAFETEA-LU planning requirements for the CLRP and TIP.

Ms. Harvey commented that MDOT may sign for MTA which is a public transportation operator.

Mr. Verzosa, Mr. Mokhtari, Ms. Ashby and Mr. A. Smith commented on who should sign for the transit operators in their jurisdictions.

Mr. Kirby said that who should sign is up to each jurisdiction and may vary from operator to operator. He said that the regulations are pretty clear that a written agreement is necessary.

Mr. Hamre commented that a review of agreements from other MPOs and transit operators could be useful.

Ms. Burns suggested that staff contact Mr. Goodman at the FTA Office of Planning in Washington to obtain other agreements and to clarify what signatures are needed.

7. Review of Texas Transportation Institute's (TTI) 2007 Urban Mobility Report

Mr. Kirby presented a review of the Texas Transportation Institute's, "Urban Mobility Report". He mentioned that he will be making a similar presentation to the Transportation Planning Board at the October 17th meeting. He said that the ranking change in congestion for the urban areas in the report is mostly due to methodology changes and may not be very meaningful. He summarized the conclusion: congestion is getting worse in all major urban areas across the country and a major reason is due to the fact that transportation funding has not been adequate to meet the growth in travel demand.

A number of members commented that the report does not address local conditions adequately, but recommended that the presentation to TPB be less technical in nature. Mr. Kirby agreed and said that he intends to include information on a two national commissions formed to address adequate funding for the "Transportation Trust Fund" in the next reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU. Mr. Shrestha commented that MDOT studies congestion problems and funds a number of projects to manage and reduce congestion.

8. Review of Draft FY 2008-2013 TIP

Mr. Pfoutz gave a brief status report on the development of the Draft FY 2008-2013 TIP. Mr. Austin stated that this would be the last draft that included projects with no funding between FY 2008 and 2013 and that showing only previous funding would not be sufficient to remain in the TIP. He noted that he would continue to work with VDOT staff to complete the funding information for local and transit projects in Virginia.

Mr. Austin stated that a new SAFETEA-LU regulation requires that any project anticipated to be complete by the final year of the TIP has to show the full funding necessary to complete that project. Mr. Shrestha noted that the funding schedule for some projects wasn't exactly settled for some projects. Mr. Kirby said that a "best estimate" would be sufficient.

Mr. Austin then gave a brief status report of each agency's inputs. He said the next draft would be produced for the first Public Forum on the TIP to be held October 11, and asked for any changes for that draft to be submitted by October 9. He said the Forum would take place immediately following the TPB's Citizens Advisory Committee meeting. Staff would give an overview of the TIP's purpose and relationship to the CLRP in the planning process. Staff from each DOT and WMATA would be given five minutes to discuss the process by which they select, prioritize and fund projects. Each agency would also be asked to describe opportunities for public involvement in their processes and to highlight significant new projects or changes in their TIP submissions. Mr. Austin emphasized that the Forum was intended to be process-oriented, and would not focus on the individual project level.

Mr. Kirby suggested that the Technical Committee hold a special meeting on October 26 to review the new requirements under SAFETEA-LU and how TPB staff was addressing those regulations.

Mr. Srikanth inquired if projects that were privately funded needed to be shown. Mr. Austin responded that the federal planning regulations require that all funding be shown for any regionally significant project, regardless of the source of funds.

9. Update on Air Quality Planning Activities

Mr. Clifford mentioned a recent Travel Demand Model modification that required the re-run of several conformity analysis years. With each year's analysis taking about 27 hours to run, the timeframe for completion is tight, but draft results are still expected at the next Tech Committee meeting.

Mr. Clifford mentioned that, while we expected to be required to show adherence to the 8-hour Ozone mobile budgets i.e., VOC and NO_x for this conformity assessment, that the Feds are behind schedule and have not yet begun an adequacy review of the 8-hour Ozone SIP. He noted that this is not really a problem, as we will be prepared to show adherence to the current 1-hour budget.

Mr. Clifford stated that the 2002 and 2009 PM2.5 SIP inventories are complete, but still undergoing staff review.

10. Briefing on a Proposed Amendment to the FY 2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Conduct a Region-wide On-board Bus Survey

Mr. Griffiths presented a proposal that had been developed in response to the Regional Bus Subcommittee's request that the Committee identify potential funding for a supplemental on-board survey of bus riders on local jurisdiction transit systems that would complement WMATA's planned 2008 Metrobus On-Board Survey. The proposal presented by Mr. Griffiths recommended that the TPB reprogram \$375,000 in funding from its FY 2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for a Supplemental Local Bus On-Board Survey and that WMATA provide to TPB, the \$750,000 in funding that WMATA had budgeted to conduct the 2008 Metrobus On-Board Survey. TPB staff would then design the 2008 Metrobus and Supplemental Local Bus on-board surveys as

a coordinated and complementary regional effort that would engage a single survey contractor for the conduct of both of these surveys.

Mr. Griffiths also noted that the proposed region-wide on-board by survey would include a pre-test of two alternative questionnaires. The first alternative questionnaire would be relatively short, designed to obtain just the data needed for WMATA's Metrobus subsidy allocation formula and a few essential planning data items needed for bus route planning and/or regional travel demand model validation. The second alternative questionnaire would be a slightly longer and would include all of the questions on the first alternative questionnaire plus additional questions designed to obtain data that would be useful in analyses of the social and economic characteristics of bus riders and the development of more refined transit patronage forecasting models.

Ms. Harvey asked if MTA and local jurisdiction transit agencies were also going to be asked to provide funding for the Supplemental Local Bus on-board survey.

Mr. Griffiths replied that MTA and local jurisdiction transit agencies would not be asked to provide funding for the Supplemental Local Bus on-board survey. He stated that the proposed supplemental on-board survey would be designed to be completed within the \$375,000 identified within the TPB's FY 2008 UPWP.

Mr. Griffiths did note that some local jurisdiction transit agencies conducted their own on-board bus surveys on a regular basis and that staff planned to work with each local agency and their contractors to avoid duplication of effort and thereby reduce overall survey costs.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if each local system would be able to develop its own questionnaire.

Mr. Griffiths responded that, ideally, all local transit agencies would use the same region-wide questionnaire, but that each local transit agency could use a slightly different questionnaire customized for their system as long as it included the same set of core questions asked in the region-wide questionnaire.

Mr. Hamre commented that WMATA staff and the members of the Regional Bus Planning Subcommittee supported the proposal presented by Mr. Griffiths.

11. Update on Transportation Safety Planning

Due to the shortness of time at this meeting, this item was substantially deferred to the October 26 special meeting. Mr. Meese noted that draft materials would be sent out prior to the October 26 meeting for review. He also noted that, as called for in the FY2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), the Transportation Safety Subcommittee was being formed under the TPB Technical Committee. Some potential members had been identified through the June 6, 2007 Regional Transportation Safety Forum, as well as a follow-up meeting on July 31. Mr. Meese asked Committee members to contact him or Mr. Farrell if they wanted to participate or identify additional persons to participate on the new subcommittee from their agencies or jurisdictions. To assist in this, staff agreed to email to Committee members the list of names identified so far for the Subcommittee from the June 6 and July 31 meetings.

12. Briefing on Draft Congestion Management Process Elements for the 2007 CLRP

Due to the shortness of time at this meeting, this item was substantially deferred to the October 26 special meeting. Mr. Meese noted that draft materials would be sent out to the Committee in advance of the October 26 meeting for review. He also noted that there had been a good discussion on this topic at the September 25 Travel Management Subcommittee, and it was anticipated to again be discussed at the Subcommittee's next meeting on October 23.

13. Review of Draft TPB Procedures for Processing Revisions to the CLRP and TIP

Mr. Miller explained to the Committee that the final planning regulations require that TPB procedures for an administrative modification or an amendment to the CLRP and TIP between scheduled periodic updates be consistent with DDOT, MDOT and VDOT procedures and be documented. He distributed a draft of the procedures and briefly reviewed them with the Committee. He pointed out that the main distinction in the procedures is in the definition of the funding limitations that qualify for an administrative modification as adopted by DDOT, MDOT and VDOT for their respective state transportation improvement programs (STIPs).

14. Other Business

None.

15. Adjourn