

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the June 2, 2006 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on the Draft 2006 CLRP Financial Analysis

Mr. Reno of Cambridge Systematics Inc (CSI) briefed the Committee on a handout draft of the report: "Analysis of Resources for the Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan for the Washington Region." This version reflected the review and comments on the revenue and expenditure summaries at the July 5 meeting of the working group for the analysis. He said that the update of the financial analysis is based on information available as of April 19, 2006 when the TPB approved the project submissions for inclusion in the air quality conformity analysis of the 2006 CLRP and FY 2007-2012 TIP. He said that the transportation revenue and expenditure forecasts for the District of Columbia and Suburban Maryland were complete, and that the Northern Virginia data is almost complete except for the local transit information.

He reviewed the revenue data in Table 1 and explained the expenditure data in Table 2, which also presents the WMATA identified capital needs beyond the current Metro Matters funding and indicates a funding shortfall. He said that the analysis does not assume the revenues associated with the Davis Bill (\$3 billion) to be reasonably expected to be available. He noted that the District data indicates a short fall in the WMATA operating cost request.

Mr. Kirby said that until the specific commitments are obtained for the Davis Bill funding, the \$3 billion in transit expenditures can not be assumed in the CLRP for the air quality conformity analysis, and transit ridership into and through the core area will continue to be constrained at 2010 levels for 2020 and 2030. He said that since the analysis is essentially complete, this draft report will be presented at the July 19 TPB meeting.

Mr. Srikanth said that he is working with Northern Virginia jurisdiction staff to finalize the local transit revenue and expenditure forecasts.

In response to Mr. Biesiadny, Mr. Reno said that the District shortfall is about \$800 million total and begins in the out years.

3. Briefing on Draft Report: "An Update on the National Capitol Region's Transportation Capital Funding Needs"

Mr. Reno distributed copies of the draft report on the progress made since early 2004 in identifying resources to meet the region's unfunded transportation needs highlighted in

the TPB “Time to Act” brochure. The report is intended to inform the public and elected and appointed officials about the transportation funding accomplishments since 2004, highlight continuing funding challenges, and present potential long term funding solutions. He requested members to review the information on the project accomplishments and provide him comments.

He then gave a PowerPoint presentation based upon the report. He said that the presentation will be given to the TPB and asked for comments. Ms. Lynott commented on the slide showing dramatic increases in construction costs in recent years and said that officials need to see it.

Mr. Srikanth said that the presentation was at a good level for a policy discussion at the TPB. He asked several questions about the slide showing fuel taxes for the states. Mr. Reno answered the questions and said that the slide will be changed to be clearer.

Mr. Owolabi inquired about how collecting user fees based upon VMT at the pump worked. Mr. Reno replied that the Oregon DOT is conducting a pilot on this currently and then explained how it worked.

Mr. Mokhtari asked how a VMT fee would work in a multi-state region. Mr. Reno said that GPS technology would be required. Ms Lynott commented that VMT fees do not provide an incentive for fuel efficiency. Mr. Mokhtari asked what the advantage of moving to VMT fees would be over just increasing the taxes per gallon of gas. Mr. Reno said that in the next few years, the region will have to rely on increasing the gas taxes per gallon to adequately maintain and operate the transportation system. However, the funding source of our transportation system should be decoupled from the use of more gallons of fuel as the nation seeks to reduce its dependence on oil.

4. Update on Transportation-Land Use Incentive Programs

Mr. Kirby spoke to two PowerPoint presentations, one that was included in the mailout (“Strengthening the Linkages Between Transportation and Land Use Planning in the Washington Region”) and another that was distributed at the meeting (“How Would a Transportation – Land Use Grant Program Work in the Washington Region”). He explained that the first presentation was given to the TPB at its June meeting and presented three options for TPB initiatives, while the second was a new portion that described in greater detail the possibility of a grant program to fund capital and/or planning projects that help achieve land use and transportation goals.

Referencing the map of activity clusters included in the first PowerPoint, Mr. Mokhtari sought clarification on the difference between “core” and “suburban” activity clusters, to which Mr. Kirby responded that the distinction is only geographic. Mr. Griffiths also clarified that some of the growth in households included in the scenario study is not currently present in jurisdictional comprehensive plans, but that planners had

acknowledged that housing units would have to be added to plans to accommodate expected job growth.

Ms. Lynott asked how other MPOs are measuring the success of their grant programs and value of the investment. Mr. Kirby responded that all the programs have monitoring and evaluation activities. Mr. Smith added that the other regions are looking at the amount of housing development facilitated and additional funding leveraged, along with any detectable shifts in land use patterns, and in some cases have altered their project selection criteria based on evaluation findings.

Ms. Ashby raised concerns about how any grant program would be funded and if it would take away from existing programs or allocations, and emphasized that a new grant program should equitably distribute funds among all jurisdictions in the region.

Mr. Mokhtari and Ms. Lynott discussed the need for and ability of such a grant program to address both areas that are in need of something to catalyze new development as well as already-developed areas that need retrofitting, possibly using activity centers as a framework for analysis. Mr. Kirby responded that a new grant program would be designed with such thoughts in mind, and that the idea is to fund small projects that could potentially push activity centers over a certain threshold of development appeal and livability.

Mr. Biesiadny questioned the real need for a new initiative, to which Mr. Kirby responded that although TPB members acknowledged that much is already being done in this area, several indicated that existing efforts are not enough and that the TPB should try to provide more impetus and raise the profile of these efforts. Mr. Srikanth suggested that the TPB needs to more clearly define what the goal of such an initiative would be, especially if simply getting more publicity for existing efforts might suffice in building momentum.

Mr. Griffiths and Mr. DesJardin emphasized that a key issue on which such a program could focus would be housing affordability, and that the scope could be broadened to include activity centers beyond those defined as regionally significant.

Mr. Keys asked for clarification on the desire of the TPB to pool resources for a new initiative, to which Mr. Kirby responded that some Board members are interested in making a small pot of money available to fund target projects selected regionally.

Mr. Mokhtari questioned assumptions about household size implicit in the scenario study that would serve as the basis for action, suggesting that future households may be larger, necessitating less development of housing units. Mr. Griffiths responded that trends in household size are significantly downward, and that the assumptions used are actually optimistic in that regard.

Chairman Canizales said that his main concern about the issue is the source of funding, pointing out that pooling the amounts being discussed could result in loss of a significant

percentage of the discretionary funds available for Northern Virginia jurisdictions. He also expressed concern that distribution of funds via such a grant program would be inequitable and would slight outer jurisdictions of the region.

5. Briefing on Steps for the TPB to Become the Designated Recipient for the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom Programs and on Establishing a Task Force to Develop the Coordinated Plan for Human Service Transportation for the Region

Ms. Klancher gave a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the proposal for how this region will address SAFETEA-LU requirements for human service transportation coordination planning based on a series of stakeholder meetings held between April and June 2006. The TPB will be asked to approve the proposal at its July meeting. SAFETEA-LU provides three Federal Transit Administration (FTA) human service related transportation programs, all of which must be coordinated with a human service transportation coordination plan. The programs are: the Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities Program (Section 5310), Job Access and Reverse Commute Program (JARC, Section 5316), which has been changed from an earmarked program to formula-based distribution to urbanized areas, with projects to be selected on a competitive basis; and the New Freedom Program (Section 5317), a new program for projects that go “above and beyond” the Americans with Disabilities Act’s (ADA’s) transportation requirements. The proposed new TPB responsibilities would include:

- 1) Establishing a task force to oversee the development of the human service transportation coordinated plan. The task force will include a wide range of stakeholders such as human service agencies, public and private transportation providers, and consumers;
- 2) Serving as the designated recipient for JARC and New Freedom funds for the Washington D.C.-MD-VA Urbanized Area; and
- 3) Conducting the competitive selection process for JARC and New Freedom programs for the Washington D.C.-MD-VA Urbanized Area.

If the TPB approves these new responsibilities in July, staff will work with the DOT’s to have the TPB designated the recipient of JARC and New Freedom.

The Committee members asked follow-up questions on the amount of JARC money available and how it is distributed, and how that differs from TEA-21. Members also asked how the regional coordination plan will interact with state or county level plans and what the scope of the plan will be. Committee members also expressed concerns about the Department of Transportation Planning using the 10% of the funds available under SAFETEA-LU to administer the program and asked for a proposed budget. TPB staff anticipates needing to hire one full-time person to administer the program and ensure all of FTA requirements are met.

6. Review of Public Comments Received to Date on Final Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region

Mr. Farrell spoke to a handout which showed the changes and additions to the draft plan that had been made in response to public and Committee comments.

Ms. Lynott asked why some projects had been eliminated. Mr. Farrell explained that certain projects, in particular those in Transaction 2030, were not yet ready for inclusion.

Mr. Canizales asked how often the plan would be updated. Mr. Farrell replied that that it would be desirable to update it every year, so as to use it as a tracking tool to measure progress. Mr. Canizales noted that the plan would be going to the TPB in July.

Ms. Lynott asked what the relationship would be between this plan and the CLRP. Mr. Farrell replied that this plan was a broader "wish list" plan intended to inform the CLRP.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the plan could show projects that are included in the CLRP. Mr. Farrell replied that it does, and referred to figures 6-3 and 6-4 in the handout and table 6-3 in the handout. Mr. Mokhtari asked why water was shown in the legend. Mr. Farrell replied that he thought it was important enough to show.

7. Briefing on the TPB Access for All Advisory Committee's Report "Transportation Issues for Low-Income Populations: Findings and Recommendations"

Ms. Klancher gave a PowerPoint presentation on the recent Access for All Advisory Committee report "Transportation Issues for Low-Income Populations: Findings and Recommendations". The TPB's Access for All (AFA) Advisory Committee established a subcommittee to look more closely at transportation concerns for low-income communities, a continuing issue for the AFA.

The report is the result of the AFA subcommittee's work looking at transportation barriers faced by low-income communities, and in particular the racial and economic divide between the eastern and western sides of the region. This subcommittee was chaired by AFA member Ms. Richardson and met from March to November in 2005 and was made up of active AFA members with a variety of backgrounds. The report identifies findings and recommendations related to access to jobs and services, and transit dependency of the low-income population. Better bus stops and transit information and balanced economic development between the eastern and western sides of the region were some of the recommendations made. The TPB will be briefed on the report by Ms. Porter and Ms. Richardson in July.

Mr. Overman stated that Prince George's County will begin its bus stop inventory in the fall. Mr. Foster stressed the importance of considering lighting at bus stops in any standards that are developed.

8. Review of Proposed Metropolitan Transportation Planning Regulations

Mr. Miller distributed copies of the proposed SAFETEA-LU transportation planning regulations for MPOs which were published June 9, 2006. Speaking from copies of a PowerPoint presentation, he reviewed the eleven major planning requirement changes and described six in detail. Mr. Meese described revisions to the congestion management process and the safety and security planning factors.

Mr. Miller also reviewed the March 2006 federal planning certification recommendations. He described the steps to develop an agreement on regional transit planning and recommended that the Committee establish a working group to document the existing roles and to develop the bus system for the long-range plan. Mr. Meese described potential activities in freight planning and recommended that a consultant study be initiated to review current activities and to identify promising activities for FY 2008.

9. Update on Air Quality Planning Activities

Mr. Clifford discussed two documents for this item. The first was distributed, the second was included in the mailout. The first document was a June 30, 2006 memo from Ms. Lucas to COG DEP staff, transmitting five sets of inventories for the 8-hour ozone SIP. Mr. Clifford explained that the first set includes 2002 base data, the second two sets are hypothetical scenarios, and that the last two sets are scheduled to be discussed at the upcoming MWAQC TAC meeting for use in developing budgets for the 8-hour SIP. Mr. Clifford noted that these 8-hour SIP budgets will not be used in the on-going conformity analysis, but will be used in next year's conformity analysis.

The second document discussed was a letter from the TPB to MWAQC regarding SAFETEA-LU consultation requirements directed at air agencies. The letter officially requests coordination between TPB and MWAQC related to the update of the conformity SIP documents.

10. Review of Draft FY 2007-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Pfoutz distributed a revised FY 2007-2012 TIP. Mr. Miller told the Committee the revised draft included new text to reflect the changes in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and reminded the Committee that the TIP was scheduled to be released for public comment September 14.

Mr. Austin explained that staff was still experiencing problems with the web based database being developed for submitting projects, but that it should be ready for use in a couple of weeks.

11. Update on FAMPO Proposal for Allocating and Distributing FTA Formula Funds Available to the Washington Urbanized Area

Mr. Kirby updated the Committee on the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) proposal to TPB for allocating and distributing annual FTA formula funds for the portion of the Washington urbanized area within Stafford County.

He said that the funds currently generated by the mileage-based measures in the FTA Section 5307 formula are distributed to the specific rail or bus operator that provides the route and revenue vehicle miles through agreements between designated recipients and operating agencies. He explained that currently WMATA as the designated recipient keeps all of the funding attributable to the urbanized area population and population density in the funding formula. He said that this is the main funding issue for Stafford County, and that the same issue has been raised for Loudoun and Prince Williams Counties .

Mr. Kirby said that staff has had discussions with staff at FAMPO, the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC), WMATA and the involved jurisdictions and agencies, primarily in Virginia. He said that the formula would be run with and without the Stafford County population and density to identify the amount of funds in question. He also said that ridership survey data from WMATA and VRE will be examined to estimate how many riders on these systems are from Stafford County. Once the data is analyzed, he said that he would consult with all of the stakeholders including NVTC and WMATA to develop a TPB response to the FAMPO proposal.

Mr. Biesiadny reported that NVTC recently took a position not to accept the FAMPO proposal.

Chair Canizales said that Mr. Harf of PRTC made a presentation explaining this issue to Prince William County. He commented that some county officials indicated that if Stafford County receives its population based funding then Prince William County should also.

12. Other Business

None.

13. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - July 7, 2006**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Maurice Keys

FEDERAL/OTHER

MARYLAND

Frederick Co. -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. David Moss
Prince George's Co. Aaron Overman
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. -----
 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT Ian Beam
 Shiva Shrestha

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

FTA -----

NCPC -----

NPS -----

MWAQC John Nwoke
 Deidre Elvis-Peterson

COG Staff and Others

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Maria White
Arlington Co. Tamera Ashby
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny
 Robert Owolabi
 Mike Lake
 Dan Lathbone

Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Art Smith
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
NVTC Jana Lynott
PRTC Anthony Foster
VRE -----
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT -----
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

Ronald Kirby, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Jim Hogan, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Bob Griffiths, DTP
Darren Smith, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Paul DesJardin, COG/HSPPS
Jeff King, COG/DEP

WMATA

WMATA -----