

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES
FOR JUNE 1, 2007

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the May 4 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Update on Air Quality Planning Activities

Staff distributed a memo from Mr. Clifford containing the draft results of the air quality conformity assessment of the proposed US 15/340 interchange at Jefferson Technology Park. The project is an amendment to the 2006 CLRP and FY2007-2012 TIP.

Mr. Clifford noted that the Board had approved two conformity scopes of work at the May TPB meeting. The first was for the conformity analysis of the 2007 CLRP/ FY2008-2013 TIP. The second was for the conformity analysis of the amendment to the 2006 CLRP/ FY2007-2012 TIP to include the interchange at US 15/340 at Jefferson Technology Park in Frederick, MD.

Mr. Clifford gave a status report for both conformity analyses. For the 2007 CLRP, staff has begun network coding, is getting familiar with the Version 2.2 travel demand model, and is working on completing the TAZ-level land activity forecasts. For the 2006 CLRP amendment, staff completed the travel demand and emissions estimates. Mr. Clifford discussed the handout with the 2006 CLRP amendment summary results. He reported that since the project is small, the resulting change in emissions for each pollutant is small. He indicated that the emissions adhere to their respective conformity criteria.

Mr. Clifford noted that MWAQC approved the response to comments and the final document for the 8-hour ozone SIP, and is on track to meet EPA's June 15 SIP submission deadline. He reported that guidance for the PM_{2.5} SIP has been issued by EPA and that work is in the early stages of development. A conference call is scheduled to discuss which pollutants need to be inventoried and included in the SIP. Possibilities are: sulfur dioxide, ammonia, and VOC.

Mr. Biesiadny asked for clarification on the scheduled adoption by the TPB of the 2007 CLRP / FY2008-2013 TIP. Mr. Clifford noted that the schedule had slipped to December due to extra time for project submission review.

3. Briefing on the CO₂ Mobile Source Emissions Estimates for the Washington Region

Mr. Kirby highlighted the mailout material – a May 25, 2007 memo from him to the Technical Committee entitled “Estimates of CO₂ Emissions from Mobile Sources”. The memo provided modeled inventories for 2002, 2010 and 2030, and interpolated estimates for 2000, 2005 and 2020. A summary table showed that while VOC and NO_x emissions are projected to decline significantly between 2002 and 2030 (by 61% and 87%, respectively) in the face of significant increases in households (44%), employment (41%) and VMT (37%), CO₂ emissions show a 48% increase over this period.

Mr. Kirby then distributed and discussed two excerpts from the May 11, 2007 AASHTO Journal describing: (1) a bill passed by a U.S. Senate committee which called for a new fuel economy standard of 35 mpg, and (2) a report from a May 22nd EPA panel hearing in which California sought permission from EPA to impose greenhouse gas emissions controls on new autos and light trucks. He noted that the Maryland legislature had also passed a bill opting into the California program, if California's request is granted by EPA, and that the above inventory numbers do not reflect the impacts of such a program. Mr. Kirby indicated that staff planned to advance this program to the TPB this month.

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following points: it should be emphasized in the report to TPB that, unlike other vehicle types, CO₂ rates through time for transit vehicles actually decreased (staff agreed); would the Maryland / California vehicle program impacts be estimated in time for the TPB presentation? (yes, staff was having a consultant prepare such estimates for the Washington region and that work should be completed prior to the TPB meeting); were impacts of ethanol fuels available? (staff would review the literature and could apply such impacts to VMT); the total energy production demands need to be considered when estimating ethanol impacts.

Mr. King of COG/DEP was asked to comment upon the total CO₂ inventory. He noted that, while TPB had produced the mobile source component, DEP was preparing a base year inventory to also cover point and area sources of CO₂, including the importation of electricity used in the Washington region but produced elsewhere. It was noted that Table 1 in Mr. Kirby's memo showed a higher rate of increase through time of CO₂ emissions in Virginia than in Maryland or the District (this was due to VMT increasing at a higher rate in Virginia than elsewhere).

4. 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 activities to date to develop TPB responses to the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) resolutions presented to the TPB on September 20, 2006, which present its policies with respect to the allocation and sharing of FTA formula funds for the Washington urbanized area. He reviewed the same draft letter from TPB to FAMPO that he presented at the May 4 Technical Committee meeting. This draft outlines potential TPB responses and recommendations on each of the FAMPO policies.

He explained that he has not made any changes to this letter since May 4 because he is working with WMATA staff who have requested a legal review of the implications of the January 2000 WMATA Board Resolution that appears to limit potential TPB responses. Chairman Harrington said that WMATA staff is researching the details regarding allocation of 5307 funds and MPO action in TIP approval.

Mr. Kirby pointed out that the final planning regulations issued in February 2007 address 5307 funds and indicate that they cannot be suballocated by jurisdiction. He said funding can be considered on a project by project basis. He said that it is clear that if any of the funds allocated to WMATA for the Washington urbanized area leave the area then other WMATA Compact members will have to make up these funds. He said that Mr. Rybeck of DDOT has expressed concerns about this impact. Mr. Beam said that MTA is also aware of this potential impact on Maryland funding.

Chairman Harrington commented that WMATA staff has estimated that riders from the FAMPO area using the Metrorail system receive more than \$500,000 in subsidy per year, which is much more than FAMPO could receive under its request for a portion of the 5307 funding.

Mr. Kirby explained that due to the on-going legal review at WMATA this item would not be on the June 20 TPB agenda, and said an update would be presented at the July Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Rawlings said that at the State Technical Working Group meeting on Tuesday there was a discussion about possible additional wording and caveats for the draft letter. Mr. Kirby explained that it was suggested at this meeting that the letter could point out that the financial plan for the CLRP assumes all of the funding for the region and the FAMPO Metro riders are currently receiving a substantial subsidy. It could also point out that the WMATA resolution would have to be addressed.

Mr. Canizales cautioned that such points should not be included in a letter that says no to the FAMPO request because it may cause a reaction with legal action.

Mr. Kirby said that he will wait for the WMATA legal review and not prepare a new draft letter until it is available. He commented that the best approach for FAMPO would be for it to identify a project that is good for its region and for the Washington region.

Mr. Rawlings said that DDOT is supportive of the first two points being included in a letter.

Mr. Biesiadny said that the Northern Virginia local governments also need to be involved in developing the TPB response to FAMPO.

Mr. Kirby said that once the WMATA legal review is complete that he will review it with the FTA designated recipients and prepare a new draft letter. This draft will go to the Technical Committee and then to TPB so it will have at least 2 months of time for review by everyone. He said that he is in contact with FAMPO staff to keep them informed that we are working on the reply.

5. Briefing on Visualization of the CLRP and Land Use Information

Mr. Eichler presented an update on the proposed visualization of the transportation projects and land use information in the CLRP. He described how the land use data and project types are represented in the visualization. He then gave a demonstration of the visualization using Google Earth.

Committee members asked several questions. When asked whether a user can zoom in, Mr. Eichler demonstrated the navigational features of Google Earth, including zooming in and out, panning side to side and up and down. He confirmed for Mr. Moss that the 6-year TIP is not currently part of the visualization. Mr. Mokhtari inquired about the representation of transit projects. First, is there any differentiation between types of transit projects (heavy rail versus light rail versus bus)? Currently there is no differentiation between types of transit projects, but when a transit project is clicked, generally the information window which appears describes the project and specifies its mode. Second, why are the HOT lane projects displayed along side the transit projects instead of the highway projects? Mr. Eichler explained that HOT facilities are available to HOVs and buses free of charge, and are considered facilities for moving vehicles

containing more than one occupant. These multi-occupant vehicle facilities are shown together on the "Transit and HOV" facilities maps produced by TPB staff, and they are grouped together in this visualization. However, the Intercounty Connector (ICC) is not free for HOVs and is therefore displayed on the highways map.

The Committee then briefly discussed the presentation of the visualization. Mr. Mokhtari asked how the visualization would be promoted, and suggested a brochure could be used to help announce the new CLRP visualization. Mr. Srikanth recommended some minor edits to the introduction and instructions page.

After review by the TPB at its June meeting, this visualization will be made available to the public on the TPB web site.

6. Status Report on 14th Bridge Corridor Project EIS

Mr. Kirby explained that a status report on the development of the 14th Street Bridge Corridor Project Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be presented by Mr. Van Dop of FHWA at the June 20 TPB meeting. Since Mr. Van Dop could not attend the meeting today, Mr. Kirby provided a brief report based upon the May project newsletter in the mailout. He said that the project is now in the process of developing the alternatives to be studied and reviewed the timeline which calls for a DEIS in Spring 2008. He noted that it is possible that a preferred alternative could be proposed for inclusion in the air quality conformity process for the 2008 CLRP at that time.

Mr. Kirby said that it is a good time to update the TPB because any 14th Street Bridge Corridor improvements are closely related to the I-95/395 HOT lane project, which is proposed for the 2007 CLRP. He pointed out that during the next six months TPB can have a role in developing the alternatives to be examined. He suggested that it may be worthwhile to ask FHWA staff to make an in-depth presentation on the alternatives under consideration at the July Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Mokhtari commented that if widening the bridge is not on the table then the alternatives are limited. Mr. Kirby replied that it is on the table.

Mr. Srikanth said that currently the project team is identifying a wide range of alternatives together with screening criteria that will help focus on a few alternatives. He said that the study has just produced a large report on current conditions in the corridor and identified 6 or 7 problems. He suggested that FHWA staff could present this report on the problems to the Committee in July.

Mr. Kirby announced that NCPD staff would be on the July Technical and TPB meeting agendas to respond to comments and questions on the rail relocation study, which was presented at the May TPB meeting.

7. Briefing on a Proposed TPB Regional Taxicab Regulators Task Force

Mr. Miller briefed the Committee on the proposed mission statement for a TPB task force of taxicab regulators in the region. He gave some background about how the taxicab regulators from the District and other major jurisdictions had been meeting the past year on an ad hoc basis to exchange information and to discuss items of mutual interest. In response to a request from the chairman of the District taxicab commission, Mr. Kirby invited the group to meet at COG. He said that the group has met 3 or 4 times at COG and was pleased to find a home. He explained that the group has requested to become part of TPB, and the proposed mission statement was developed so the group could be established as a task force. He reviewed the goals and objectives and said that the task

force would meet every 2 months. He commented that the new task force would complement the interest in taxicab services currently found in the TPB Private Provider Task Force and the TPB Human Services Transportation Coordination Task Force.

Ms. Samarasinghe inquired about the funding needed to support the task force. Mr. Miller said that the only expense was for hosting their lunch meetings and this could be covered in the existing budget for the Private Providers Task Force.

Mr. Biesiadny asked why this was placed on the TPB agenda for action in June without more notice. He said that in Fairfax County, taxicab regulation is under consumer affairs and not transportation and that he had not had a chance to discuss the task force with the county regulators.

Mr. Kirby said that he thought that the Board would be comfortable acting to set up the task force and suggested that the Steering Committee consider how it should be shown on the TPB agenda later today. Mr. Srikanth said that perhaps the group should be a COG committee rather than be part of the TPB. He suggested that the TPB transportation planning context needs to be explained and the its role in TPB activities clearly defined.

Mr. Kirby said that this is a transportation group and if it comes to COG it will be under the TPB. He said that a cover memo would be prepared to provide the background and the TPB context for setting up the task force. He commented that the regulators are just looking for a home and not for a new role in TPB activities. He noted there are some direct links to current TPB interests such as the need for accessible taxicabs in the District raised by the TPB Human Services Transportation Coordination Task Force.

Mr. Kellogg commented that there is growing interest in the region in requiring hybrid-fueled taxicabs to reduce vehicle emissions.

Mr. Rawlings suggested adding text to explain that this new task force mission cannot be subsumed under the existing task forces.

8. Briefing on the Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Policy and Technical Task Force Recommendations Based upon Traffic Technology International Magazine's "Most Wanted: Traffic Management's Magnificent 10"

Mr. Meese referred to a draft memorandum as a handout. The article of reference was written by Mr. Tarnoff of the University of Maryland for this international publication. It listed ten of the most successful widely used traffic management technologies, along with a sidebar of seven technologies described as having unmet potential. The article was referred to the MOITS Task Forces by the TPB on March 21 for review and for development of recommendations on the topic, both of which were addressed by the draft memorandum. TPB support for continued and enhanced resources was recommended for four items: operations programs and activities, regional coordination efforts, traveler information programs, and traffic monitoring and detection equipment. The memorandum was to be presented to the TPB at its June 20 meeting, in conjunction with a report on the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program. The MATOC Program was also to be the subject of a special TPB work session immediately prior to the June 20 meeting.

In response to a comment from Mr. Kirby, Mr. Meese agreed to add language to the draft memorandum regarding the role of the private sector in traveler information.

In response to a question from Mr. Owolabi, it was noted that the TPB Work Session on MATOC was aimed at interested Board members, and the Technical Committee and other interested persons were encouraged to attend.

In response to a question from Mr. Srikanth, Mr. Meese noted that the MATOC Steering Committee was anticipated to discuss regional traveler information development, but there was no current timetable for implementation.

Mr. Griffiths noted that the District of Columbia was receiving traffic monitoring information from a private vendor, Mobility Technologies, and that these data were helping inform Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) estimates for the District. Mr. Verzosa added that such private sector systems had been deployed in other parts of the region. Mr. Meese noted that private sector traffic monitoring agreements with highway agencies may place restrictions on public agencies' use of the data for purposes other than internal traffic management or planning (i.e., not allowing data to be given away for free on agency Web sites or roadside variable message signs).

9. Briefing on the Draft Report on Regional Travel Trends Report

Mr. Griffiths distributed a handout that provided a summary of the major findings in the Draft Travel Trends Report. He stated that regional weekday vehicle miles of travel (VMT) were growing at an average annual rate of 2.9% per year and this growth in VMT was increasing at a faster rate than population and employment growth in region, which were increasing at annual rates of 1.8% and 1.2% respectively. He also stated that weekday Metrorail ridership between 2000 and 2005 had grown at an average annual rate of 3.3% and that this rate of increase was faster than that of weekday VMT. Mr. Griffiths added that this difference in the relative growth rates suggested some shift in the modal shares of travel by auto and transit during this five-year time. He continued that some newly available data on commuting from the Census' American Communities Survey (ACS) also supported this conclusion. He said that the ACS data for the metropolitan Washington statistical area showed transit's modal share of commuting travel increasing from 10.9% in 2000 to 13.2% in 2005. In this same time, the ACS data showed the commuting share by carpool/vanpool dropping from 13.4% in 2000 to 11.7% in 2005.

Mr. Biesiadny stated that NVTC had good data on the growth in bus ridership in Northern Virginia and suggested that some of this data could be added to the Regional Travel Trends report.

Ms. Samarasinghe suggested that the correlation between the availability of transit service and household vehicle availability be examined.

Mr. Griffiths responded that this was an excellent idea, but the data currently available for the travel trends report would not permit this type of analysis. Nonetheless, he added, when the results of the 2007 Household Travel Survey were available this correlation could be examined.

Mr. Kirby asked about the geography used to define the metropolitan Washington region.

Mr. Griffiths responded that it varied based on the data that was available from different sources. He noted that the 2005 ACS data used a slightly broader definition of the metropolitan region than was used in 2000 and thus, for a strictly apples-to-apples comparison, some of the numbers for 2000 would have to be recalculated. Nonetheless, despite the small differences in geography, the major findings on changes in regional travel trends would remain about the same.

Mr. Harrington asked if there was a way to break out changes in regional commuting trends by public sector versus private sector workers.

Mr. Griffiths responded that he would look into the availability data for this type of breakdown.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if the 2000 to 2005 travel trend data could be broken out by regional activity centers.

Mr. Griffiths responded that the travel data for the Travel Trends report could not be broken out this way because the data was not available at that level of geographic detail.

Mr. Griffiths concluded his presentation by stating that he would be bringing a full draft of the Regional Travel Trends report to the Technical Committee at their next meeting.

10. Status Report on the Enhanced Arterial Highway Congestion Monitoring Program

Mr. Sivasailam updated the Committee on the status of the enhanced arterial highway congestion monitoring pilot program. He described the steps undertaken in the route selection, choosing the hardware and software, solicitation of volunteers and the data collection protocol. He handed out an instruction booklet that includes a liability waiver document and trip diary to be used by the data collection volunteers. He once again requested members to either volunteer themselves or solicit volunteers from their agencies. When asked when volunteers were going to start driving, he responded that staff is ready for volunteers to begin driving as part of the pilot program and after the conclusion of the pilot program; a plan would be developed for a long-term, multi-year effort. In response to a question about criteria for volunteer selection, he responded that preference would be given to volunteers who drive primarily on arterials, but would not exclude potential volunteers who travel a portion of their route on freeways.

Volunteers would need to have a minimum of three work trips per week and they must travel within the MSA. Mr. Sivasailam was asked whether volunteers would be collecting data continuously for a week (including off-peak periods) or whether the trip diary was only for commute trips. He responded that yes, volunteers will be asked to keep the GPS units on for all trips and there is space in the trip diary for notes on the non-commute trips. In response to a question as to how many units will be available to each jurisdiction for potential volunteers, he said staff would like to limit participation to three per jurisdiction for the pilot program.

11. Briefing on How the TPB Planning Process is Addressing the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Regulations Issued on February 14, 2007

Mr. Miller reviewed how key provisions in the final regulations are being addressed in the TPB planning process. He presented a 12-page handout, which highlighted the following six significant changes:

- Scope of planning process and Newly separated Safety and Security Planning Factors
- Participation and Consultation
- Congestion Management Process
- Development/Content of Plan and TIP
- Metropolitan Planning Agreement
- MPO Planning and NEPA process

He said that the regulations become effective July 1. The 2007 CLRP and new TIP, which are scheduled to be adopted by the TPB in December, will have to meet these regulations. He commented that TPB staff has been working on the main requirements for the past year, and that the FY 2008 UPWP was restructured and includes new resources addressing the key requirements. He noted that the evaluation of TPB public involvement activities was completed and a draft of the new participation plan will be presented to the Committee in July. He summarized the activities for the new consultation and environmental discussion requirement and the new work to document the congestion management process.

He concluded by describing the requirement for a written agreement between the DOTs, the MPO and transit operators regarding their role and responsibilities in the metropolitan planning process. He commented that discussions have begun with the staff of the DOTs and the transit operators on this agreement which will describe their current planning roles and responsibilities.

12. Review of Draft Final Report of Consultant Study for Enhancing Consideration of Freight in Regional Transportation Planning

This item was deferred to the July meeting.

13. Other Business

None.

14. Adjourn

