

## **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

### **1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the December 1 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### **2. Briefing on the Proposed Regional Bus Subcommittee of the Technical Committee, and a Draft Amendment to the FY 2007 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for a New Regional Bus Planning Work Activity**

Mr. Kirby summarized the history and rationale for the proposed subcommittee as initially proposed by Mr. Hamre (WMATA). Mr. Kirby then briefly spoke to the Bus Committee handouts.

Mr. Biesiadny, referring to Goal #1 for the Committee, commented that changes have been made since the regional bus study was completed in 2002 and the goal should reflect that it should be explicitly stated that the Committee would work to update that study. Mr. Kirby stated as part of the goal the Committee would seek to review and update where possible. Chair Harrington stated that the Committee would review, refine and update the 2002 study. Mr. Srikanth asked if the study was limited to WMATA services. He stated the next study should include all transit service operators. Mr. Miller pointed out that the Regional Bus Study was a lengthy, expensive study, and the proposed amendment only dealt with the remainder of this fiscal year's work activities.

Chair Harrington asked what the product of the Committee would be. Mr. Kirby responded that the Committee would create a list of priority projects, and would be able to take a closer look at inputs to the CLRP. He also stressed the importance of the Committee's goal to coordinate with other regional committees regarding bus transit participation in planning and training activities.

Mr. Srikanth requested that item #4 regarding technical advice given for transit assumptions for TPB planning studies should be expanded to include scenario studies, including the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the Committee should include more transit than just bus. He said that perhaps only having bus as a focus would be narrow and maybe should be more inclusive of other forms of transit. Mr. Kirby replied that it was important for this Committee to keep its focus on bus issues only, but would certainly address other transit planning issues when necessary.

Chair Harrington said that there was an opportunity with this Committee for coordination between bus operators and transit planners.

Mr. Kirby commented on the importance of having an agreement signed by all parties on the roles and responsibilities for transit planning in the region, as requested in the TPB

Transportation Planning Certification report from March 2006. This Committee would be the ideal forum in which to bring all parties together in order to accomplish this.

Mr. Moss was concerned about the perception of Committee redundancy and felt it was important to clearly make a distinction between the scope of this Committee and what other groups were already doing.

Mr. Kirby finished by adding that Mr. Hamre would serve as the interim chair of the Committee.

**3. Status Report on Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2007 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2008-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Kirby reviewed the approved schedule for the air quality conformity assessment for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP. He pointed out that at the December meeting, the Committee had acknowledged potential issues with some major projects in Virginia in meeting the January 26 project submission date.

Mr. Srikanth said that there was uncertainty regarding several projects for submission. He explained that the funding commitments for the new transportation projects for the BRAC relocation of 20,000 workers to Fort Belvoir and Quantico were under discussion. He said that there may be some design changes for the Beltway HOT lane project in the CLRP, and VDOT was working with the private firms to define the I-95/395 HOT lane project. He mentioned that there is a transit advisory committee working to define transit services for the HOT lane project. He also said that the current projects and costs in the CLRP are being reviewed and some may need to be updated.

Mr. Biesiadny commented that no funding is on the horizon for the BRAC projects.

Mr. Shrestha commented that more time to submit projects would be beneficial because there is a new administration for MDOT and that financial constraints may affect some projects. He also said that there may be BRAC transportation projects in Maryland.

Mr. Rawlings said that DDOT is currently reviewing project funding in the FY 2007-2011 TIP.

Mr. Harrington said that WMATA would have some Metro Matters items for the new TIP.

Mr. Kirby said that based upon these status reports on the expected project submissions he recommends that the schedule be revised a month and that the new project submission date be February 23.

The Committee agreed and recommended to the TPB that the submission schedule be revised by one month due to the uncertainty regarding the timing and decisions for the submission of some new projects in Northern Virginia and Suburban Maryland.

**4. Review of Briefing for the TPB on Visualization in Transportation and Land Use Planning**

Mr. D. Smith spoke to the PowerPoint presentation, stressing that he was looking for feedback from the Committee on changes that might be necessary when presenting to the TPB.

Mr. Kirby commented that the presentation was too complicated for the TPB. He suggested that it would be more useful to show examples of what types of visualization were being done around the country. He suggested that the examples should be simpler and highlight some different software packages that are being used.

Mr. Overman said that the presentation needed to stress that the purpose of any visualization needed to be determined early, otherwise it might not be useful. He suggested Mr. D. Smith tell the TPB about what specific opportunities there are where visualization could be useful.

Mr. Moss commented that the presentation was informative for the Committee but perhaps too detailed and complex for a short presentation to the TPB. He questioned how relevant much of the presentation would be to elected officials.

Mr. Kirby suggested the presentation start with SAFETEA-LU requirements regarding visualization, then move on what Mr. D. Smith and Mr. McAuslan learned at the TRB Visualization Symposium in Denver. He stressed that the TPB needs to be informed of what types of visualization choices are available.

Mr. Mokhtari commented that staff should begin to make the CLRP a more “user-friendly” experience, suggesting that slide number 5 of the PowerPoint presentation does not do enough to show CLRP context. He suggested that visualization efforts should be tailored more towards the CLRP. Mr. Kirby responded that staff is exploring different web mapping to make the CLRP more accessible, but the presentation to the TPB would be to show other techniques that we may be able to use.

Mr. Kirby said that the project level visualization that is already being done by TPB member jurisdictions can be highlighted. However, staff would focus visualization efforts on a regional basis rather than at the local project level.

A number of suggestions were made on how to make certain slides better. Mr. Biesiadny suggested that the ICC slide was a good example of using Google Earth to demonstrate a plan, but that staff should avoid mentioning that it is the ICC in order to avoid any controversy. Mr. D. Smith responded that this slide was in the presentation to show the dangers in publishing the plans in such a public way that suggested more accuracy than

was actually available. Mr. Biesiadny also suggested that slide 13 simply had too much information to see and fully comprehend.

Mr. Foster suggested highlighting the particular methods on slide 9 that staff may be able to utilize. Both Mr. Griffiths and Mr. Kirby suggested not discussing any MetroQuest slides because they were complicated to explain and would not be used by staff regardless. Mr. Kirby suggested that the presentation focus on the positives of visualization and stay away from the negatives.

Mr. Canizales commented that there were many remarks and suggestions regarding the presentation and suggested that it be revised before going to the to TPB. There was consensus among Committee members that this was the right approach.

## **5. Briefing on Outline and Preliminary Budget for FY 2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Miller distributed a handout with slides and the outline and preliminary budget for the for FY 2008 UPWP (July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008). He reviewed the overall budget estimates and then the detailed work activity table in the outline. He described the time line for developing the document and said that the first draft of the FY 2008 UPWP will be presented for review at the February 2 meeting. He described the changes to the structure of the program and that the FY 2007 Section I is split into two sections. He highlighted the new and changed work activities in Section I and II and related them to SAFETEA-LU requirements.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if all of the \$250,000 budget for the TLC program would be used for technical assistance in FY 2008. Mr. Kirby said that some of the total, perhaps not \$150,000 as this year, would be needed for the clearinghouse. However, the entire program budget is a place holder and will be revisited after the current pilot is completed in June.

Mr. Meese reviewed in more detail the new and changed work activities in Section II. He mentioned that staff is recommending that the MOITS TPB policy task force and the MOITS technical task force be restructured so that the MOITS technical task force becomes a subcommittee to the Technical Committee. This will ensure better coordination for the revamped Congestion Management Process which is a Technical Committee responsibility. Mr. Biesiadny suggested that this change be reviewed with Mr. Snyder, the current chair of the policy task force.

Mr. Clifford reviewed the new and changed work activities under his direction. He described the changes for the air quality conformity, mobile emissions analysis, and software support work activities. He also described the congestion monitoring and analysis activity, and the expansion of the new approach to monitor arterial highway congestion. Mr. Rathbone commented that there are new techniques for obtaining travel data from personal GIS devices. Mr. Clifford explained that this new approach utilizes volunteer drivers with GIS devices.

Mr. Hogan reviewed the new and changed work activities under his direction. He described the network development activity and its proposed consultant study to identify options for improving network coding and data quality and consistency. He described the main changes for the travel demand models development and cordon count activities. Mr. Rathbone commented on the VDOT HOT lane travel demand model being used for regional analysis. Mr. Hogan said that it would inform the regional model development. Mr. Shrestha inquired about the availability of the new FTA SUMMIT software package. Mr. Malone said that the current version is 3 years old, but that FTA is still working on the new one and it may be a long time before it is released.

Mr. Griffiths reviewed the new and changed work activities under his direction. He described the major changes for the scenario study, the regional household travel survey, and the cooperative forecasting and transportation planning processes work activities. He reviewed the changes for the regional data clearinghouse activity and explained the rationale for the staff recommendation that supplemental traffic counts be conducted in 2007 to complement the household travel data and the transit data collection efforts. He explained that the recommendation was for a percentage of the District, Maryland and Virginia technical assistance funding to be utilized for the supplemental traffic counts.

Mr. Srikanth said that every year VDOT has many requests for its technical assistance funding and would like more information on the count locations and data. He commented that more count data this year would be desirable.

**6. Update on Letter to the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) offering TPB Review and Comment on Transportation Measures to be Submitted by COG Member Governments to Reduce Air Pollution**

Mr. Clifford discussed a letter sent from TPB to MWAQC which offers TPB review and comment on the transportation measures to be submitted by COG member governments to reduce air pollution, in response to a November 8, 2006 COG Board resolution. Mr. Clifford noted that the issue had been discussed at last month's Technical Committee meeting. He reminded the group that the COG Board resolution generated concern that input of transportation measures in this manner might cause difficulties such as double-counting of emissions benefits, etc. He pointed out the two purposes of the letter: 1) to review the ways in which emissions benefits of transportation measures may be credited in the SIP and the air quality conformity process, and 2) to offer the TPB's review and comment assistance on possible measures submitted as a result of the COG resolution.

Mr. Clifford mentioned that the two attachments include: A) a previous letter from TPB to MWAQC transmitting mobile source emissions data and budget information for the 8-hour ozone SIP, and B) the COG Board resolution.

Mr. Clifford noted that TCMs are legal commitments that must be implemented. He pointed out that measures can be credited either in the SIP or conformity, not both. He emphasized that there must be vigilant bookkeeping so that there is no double-counting of emissions benefits.

Mr. Clifford told the group that the letter had been sent to MWAQC. He also mentioned that the deadline for submitting measures had been moved back a month.

Mr. Foster asked about a value pricing measure that Ms. Pourciau mentioned at TPB. Mr. Kirby responded that no measures had been submitted yet for the SIP. Mr. Srikanth noted that the District had mentioned the measure a year ago, and that Virginia and Maryland did not support a value pricing measure in the SIP.

Mr. Biesiadny informed the group that measures will be coming forward from the local governments with the recommendation of discussion.

Mr. A. Smith questioned that the SIP budget numbers (from Attachment A) seem to be lower than in the past. Mr. Clifford responded that previous budgets are 2005 based estimates, and that as we move through time the budgets get lower. Mr. Kirby noted that the budgets are set at the inventory level. Mr. A. Smith asked why there was no safety margin. Mr. Kirby indicated that a margin had been proposed, but that MWAQC set the budgets exactly at the inventory level, less TCMs.

Mr. Clifford informed the group that the Environmental Defense and Sierra Club suit relating to the ICC was filed. Mr. Kirby noted that the document was 105 pages and very complicated. He pointed out that it was available on the Environmental Defense web site, and that staff would get copies for anyone who was interested. He stated that the two major issues in the suit are 1) that the purpose and need did not address alternatives appropriately, and 2) the PM2.5 hot spot analysis. New regulations regarding PM2.5 hot spot (qualitative vs. quantitative) analysis were established in March, 2006. Mr. Srikanth noted that requirements for hot spot analysis are not new, only that now PM2.5 pollutants must be included. Mr. Kirby said he would keep the group updated in the matter.

**7. Briefing on a Proposal to Include Funding in the FY 2007 and FY 2008  
UPWPs for the Planning and Implementation of a Bicycle Route-finding Web Site  
for the Washington Region**

Mr. Sebastian, Vice Chair of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, presented, and referred to a memorandum included in the meeting materials. A Web-based software system similar to Mapquest would enable travelers to find bicycle-friendly routes to their destinations. Auto-oriented systems like Mapquest often route travelers on major roadways like the Beltway, not usable by bicyclists. The Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee had been examining the issue of bicycle routing software for a number of years. Earlier available products had been deemed too expensive, but now there was a promising more affordable system available, the ByCycle.org trip planner. Mr. Sebastian introduced Mr. Gilliland of the Washington Area Bicyclist Association (WABA) who demonstrated an existing on-line application of the ByCycle.org system for Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Development of this bicycle routing system was initially considered to be implemented regionally as part of an overall upgrade of the Commuter Connections software. Since this upgrade likely would not take place until FY2009, the Bicycle and Pedestrian

Subcommittee sought alternatives to implement the system sooner. Thus a proposal was developed to utilize UPWP funds for system development. This would be in a two-phase approach.

Phase I, proposed to be funded in the FY2007 UPWP, would develop an initial system in time for Bike-to-Work Day in May 2007. It would cover the District of Columbia, Alexandria, Arlington, and Fairfax County, utilizing data already available for those jurisdictions.

Phase II, proposed to be funded in the FY2008 UPWP, would complete the system for the remainder of the region. Subsequent to FY2008, funding to maintain the system would have to be sought from sources outside the UPWP, possibly the Commuter Connections program. It was intended that the system would be developed to be compatible with Commuter Connections software systems.

The cost estimate was \$33,000 from the FY2007 UPWP for Phase I, and \$32,000 from the FY2008 UPWP for Phase II. Funding would be provided from the UPWP to WABA, and WABA would contract with ByCycle.org to undertake the project.

Mr. Srikanth expressed support for the concept. In response to a question from Mr. Srikanth, Mr. Miller stated it was feasible to identify \$33,000 of unspent funds in the FY2007 UPWP to support the startup of the program, and that the request for the Phase II funding could be introduced into the ongoing FY2008 UPWP budget discussions. Phase I should be initiated only if it is reasonable certain that FY2008 Phase II funding will also be provided.

In response to a question from Mr. Mokhtari, Mr. Miller stated this project was not able to be supported by the Transportation-Land Use Connection program, which was designated for jurisdictional rather than regional projects.

In response to a question from Mr. Srikanth, Mr. Miller stated that the proposal was anticipated to be finalized and brought back for February approvals by the Technical Committee and TPB.

Mr. Canizales asked whether the Committee felt comfortable moving forward immediately. The Committee agreed that the proposal should move forward immediately for action by the TPB in January, to amend the FY2007 UPWP to include Phase I, and for Phase II funding to be included in the draft FY2008 UPWP.

## **8. Briefing on Development of a Safety element for the 2007 CLRP**

Mr. Meese presented, referring to a memorandum and a slide presentation in the meeting materials. Safety is a SAFETEA-LU federal planning factor in metropolitan planning regulations, now separated from security due to different focus areas and stakeholders. A safety element must be developed as a component of the 2007 CLRP as part of ensuring that the CLRP is SAFETEA-LU compliant. The written materials distributed summarized

a number of aspects of safety planning and their importance. The TPB process already had undertaken a number of safety activities, including the Street Smart campaign and Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee-sponsored training workshops, but there has not been a separate, dedicated safety line item in the UPWP. A separate transportation safety planning task was now proposed to be included in the FY2008 UPWP.

Development of the safety element of the 2007 CLRP was beginning now. Staff was compiling information for this element to be completed by September. Initial safety activities for the remainder of FY2007 would be supported by existing staff through the MOITS program. Starting in FY2008, there was proposed to be a separate budget and task for safety in the UPWP, to address additional activities and to actively involve stakeholders.

In response to a question from Mr. Srikanth, Mr. Meese confirmed that a regional safety summit or workshop was planned for the April or May time frame, and this workshop would review substantive information for the safety element at a mid-process juncture. The Committee would be briefed additional times as needed.

**9. Review of the Final Draft Version of the “What’s in the Plan for 2030?”**

Mr. Eichler distributed copies of the new “What’s in the Plan for 2030” brochure and briefly discussed the differences between this new brochure and the draft distributed to the TPB at the October meeting. The primary change was the addition of more analysis in the Plan Performance section, including congestion maps, accessibility analysis and activity clusters. It was brought to Mr. Eichler’s attention that at least one project in the project listings section of the brochure was dated 2006. Mr. Eichler said a full review of any projects dated 2006 would be performed and any changes or removals of completed projects would be done before the brochure is finalized.

**10. Briefing on Plans to Consult with State and Local Resource Agencies on 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP**

Ms. Klancher gave a brief overview of the proposed process to consult with resource agencies on the CLRP, as required by SAFETEA-LU. A draft letter to state-level environmentally-related agencies in D.C., MD and VA was distributed for the Committee to review along with a list of agencies and contact information. Committee members were asked to provide comments and additional contacts to Ms. Klancher by Friday, January 19.

Mr. Srikanth asked if the federal information about the SAFETEA-LU requirements could be provided along with the letter. Staff replied that the language is not that user-friendly, but could be included with the packet of information that is sent out to the resource agencies.

**11. Other Business**

Staff notified the Committee that the final TLC brochure was available and was being mailed to all member jurisdictions.

**12. Adjourn**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - January 5, 2007**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                      Rick Rybeck  
                                 Mark Rawlings

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

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

**MARYLAND**

Charles County        Tony Chinyere  
Frederick Co.         -----  
Gaithersburg         -----  
Montgomery Co.      David Moss  
Prince George's Co.   Aaron Overman  
Rockville              Katherine Kelly  
M-NCPPC  
Montgomery Co.      -----  
Prince George's Co.   Faramarz Mokhtari  
                                 Harold Foster  
MDOT                    Ian Beam  
                                 Shiva Shrestha

FTA                      Deborah Burns

NCPC                    -----

NPS                     -----

MWAQC                -----

**COG Staff and Others**

Ronald Kirby, DTP  
Gerald Miller, DTP  
Michael Clifford, DTP  
Mark Pfoutz, DTP  
Jane Posey, DTP  
Jim Hogan, DTP  
William Bacon, DTP  
Bob Griffiths, DTP  
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Don McAuslan, DTP  
Andrew Meese, DTP  
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP  
Darren Smith, DTP  
Greg Goodwin, HSPPS  
Jeff King, DEP  
Wendy Klancher, DTP  
Robert Snead, DTP  
Dusan Vuksan, DTP  
Mark Moran, DTP  
Michael Eichler, DTP

**VIRGINIA**

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

**WMATA**

WMATA                 Tom Harrington