

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the November 3 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Update on Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2007 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY2008-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Ms. Klancher briefed the Committee on the final draft call for projects document and schedule for the air quality conformity assessment for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP. Mr. Art Smith said that Loudoun County and the Virginia jurisdictions may have trouble meeting the schedule.

Mr. Srikanth said that the new transportation projects for the BRAC relocation of 20,000 workers to Fort Belvoir and Quantico were under discussion, and that VDOT would try to have the project inputs for the CLRP by the January 26 project submission deadline. He said that for the I-95/395 HOT lane project, VDOT was working with the private firms to meet the deadline for the CLRP submission. He mentioned that there is a transit advisory committee looking at transit services for the HOT lane project.

Mr. Kirby commented that only the northern segment of the I-95/395 HOT lane project would be advanced for the CLRP in 2007 and that the segment south of Dumfries would come later. Mr. Srikanth said that FAMPO will include the southern segment in its long range plan for air quality conformity analysis.

Mr. Austin described the training for the new web-based E-TIP. He said that the web site will have password protection and there will be editors who can change the data base and reviewers who can view the database but not change it. He said that Mr. Barr of VDOT is the editor for the Virginia portion of the TIP.

Mr. Srikanth said that Mr. Barr sent out the new CLRP/TIP database for review by Virginia jurisdiction staff. He explained that the NVTA Technical Committee would review the data before it is submitted to TPB.

Chair Canizales said that cost inflation will affect some projects. He commented that last year the Virginia jurisdictions were able to allocate funding for secondary roads in December, but that now this will be done in March.

Mr. Shrestha commented that last year SHA removed some major projects from the CLRP and that this year there is uncertainty about MD 201 extended and MD 4 and other projects due to cost estimates increasing.

Mr. Kirby commented that it is better to wait until all cost and schedule estimates for major CLRP projects are firm, and that the CLRP and TIP schedule are under the control of the TPB. He explained that the timing of major new projects such as those related to the BRAC must be consistent with land use forecasts.

Mr. DesJardin of COG's planning department explained that, based upon information in the EIS currently under development by the US Army, the land use forecast of the new workers in 2011 at the Engineering Proving Ground at Fort Belvoir has been established. He said that it is unclear at this time what funding is available for the associated transportation facilities and when they would be built.

Mr. Kirby said that while there are issues about the schedule, he recommends the call for projects document go to the TPB for release at its December 20 meeting.

The Committee agreed that the draft call for projects document and schedule be recommended for approval by the TPB at the December 20 meeting, while recognizing the uncertainty regarding the timing and decisions for the submission of some new projects in Northern Virginia.

3. Briefing on Development of the TLC Program Brochure

Mr. Darren Smith handed out draft copies of a brochure for the Transportation/Land Use Connections (TLC) Pilot Program and briefly described its contents, noting that it contained a few typos of which staff were already aware. He reviewed the program development process up to that point, including approval by the TPB at its November meeting of the pilot program to include a regional information clearinghouse as well as limited provision of technical assistance services.

Mr. Kirby noted that the timeline for the pilot program is extremely compressed, and that staff hoped to get approval of the brochure by the TPB at the December 20 meeting. He encouraged Technical Committee members to provide any comments on the draft by the end of the following week.

Mr. Mokhtari and Chair Canizales asked a few questions seeking clarification on the process of selecting projects and providing technical assistance through the TLC program. Mr. Kirby emphasized that the technical assistance activities would be performed by consultants solicited by the TPB with a quick turn-around in mind. He also noted that the amount of money available through the program is limited.

Mr. Srikanth asked if applicants could seek funds through the program to allow for an additional task, such as a project visualization, to be performed by a consultant already working for the applicant on a particular project. Mr. Kirby responded that while the program is intended to complement existing local efforts, such a request would not fit the character of the program, which is not intended simply to supplement budgets for planned projects.

Ms. Ashby inquired about the process for evaluating the program and reporting to the TPB about its degree of success. Mr. Kirby responded that TPB staff would be evaluating the program and trying to capture the lessons learned, and reporting that information to the TPB following the conclusion of the pilot cycle in June 2007. Ms. Ashby suggested that technical assistance recipients be asked to fill out an evaluation form relating their experience with the program.

Chair Canizales determined that there were no objections to the general content of the draft brochure and indicated that the Committee supported presentation of it to the TPB for approval at the December 20 meeting.

4. Update on a Proposed Bus Subcommittee of the Technical Committee

Mr. Kirby summarized the history and rationale for the proposed subcommittee as initially proposed by Mr. Hamre (WMATA), and what would be able to be done with those initial proposals. Mr. Kirby spoke of the Bus Summit he attended the day before put on by WMATA and noted the enthusiasm and general agreement for the need of the subcommittee. Participants at the summit discussed interface issues and the need to refine the WMATA bus study for committee use. Mr. Kirby said an amendment to the FY 2007 Unified Planning Work Program would be needed to find at least \$50,000 needed to administer the subcommittee for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. Kirby then spoke to a draft Mission Statement for the bus subcommittee, specifically addressing the ten goals of the subcommittee. He said the TPB would be briefed at their December 20 meeting and the Tech Committee would get a proposed draft amendment to the UPWP at the January meeting with the hope of getting TPB approval later that month.

Mr. Weissberg stated that the subcommittee should include not only planners from Park and Planning, but also the various transit operators in the region. Mr. Kirby said that the committee would concentrate on getting planners into the committee but would also include representatives from the transit operators. He also stated that specific operators would be invited to present to the committee any relevant local experiences that may apply regionally.

Mr. Shrestha commented that regional planning needed to coordinate with the state highway administrations to try and include transit planning. Mr. Kirby replied that that would be a primary objective of the committee.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if private developers would be included in the Committee, citing their role in developing three or four metro stations in Prince George's County. Mr. Kirby replied that most likely private developers would not be active members of the Committee.

Mr. Maslanka cited the increasing difficulty of finding time for more committee meetings, especially for smaller jurisdictions like Alexandria where he is the representative on most of the committees at COG. He also wondered whether much of the work was already being done elsewhere, or if it could be done elsewhere. Mr. Hamre echoed the difficulty of finding time but that it was in WMATA and the jurisdictions best interest to make sure everyone is involved. Mr. Hamre also said that the committee work would be narrowly focused so as not to duplicate what other committees are doing.

Mr. Srikanth said he liked the committee goals better with the strong MPO focus, and said that goal number 4 should be more general to include TPB studies rather than just the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. Mr. Kirby agreed and said the final mission statement would reflect that change.

5. Briefing on Proposed Categories of Transportation Measures for Inclusion in State Implementation Plans (SIP)s and Air Quality Conformity Assessments

Mr. Clifford distributed and discussed a memo to the Technical Committee on transportation measure categories relating to emissions benefits in the SIP and conformity. The memo, dated December 1, 2006, provided an update to a November 3, 2006 memo on the same topic.

Mr. Clifford reviewed four categories of transportation measures. He then discussed events that occurred subsequent to November 3. Subsequent events included the adoption, by the COG Board, of a resolution encouraging member governments to adopt measures reducing pollution.

The resolution, included as Attachment B of the memo, contains a table of suggested measures. Mr. Clifford noted that some of the measures in the list are already accounted for in the conformity analysis, such as the reflection of smart-growth strategies in the land-use assumptions. He emphasized the need for the TPB to be involved in the input and review of these measures, so that no double accounting of emissions benefits occurs. He also reminded the group that, as in the past, measures in the SIP have not been available for use in conformity.

Mr. Clifford then reviewed Attachment C, which is a recommended draft letter from the TPB to MWAQC, that will be discussed at the TPB's December 20 meeting. The letter serves two purposes. The first is to identify differences in the way emissions benefits of transportation measures may be credited, and critical implications for transportation and air quality planning. The second is to offer the TPB's review and comment assistance on possible measures submitted as a result of the COG resolution. Mr. Clifford pointed out that the letter mentions that TCMs are legally enforceable and required by law to have the highest priority of all transportation projects. The letter also notes that TCMs are rigid, unlike TERMS which are flexible, and projects should only be added to the SIP as TCMs if it is absolutely certain that the project will happen. Mr. Clifford said that the recommended TPB letter includes a cc to the COG Board.

Mr. Srikanth proposed an additional sentence in the draft letter to MWAQC at the end of the "Programming Implications" section to summarize the concern experienced therein, similar to the structure employed in the following paragraph on "Review Function".

Mr. Kirby suggested that staff brief elected officials about the implications of submitting projects as TCMs.

6. Briefing on Priority Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Mr. Farrell briefed the Committee on the updated list of priority regional bicycle and pedestrian projects recommended for consideration in the FY 2008-2013 TIP by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee. There were no questions.

7. Briefing on the Transportation Research Board (TRB) Fifth International Visualization in Transportation Symposium and Workshop Activities

Mr. Darren Smith and Mr. McAuslan gave a brief overview of the history of the TRB visualization symposiums, mentioning that this was the first time a planning track had been added. They said that they gave a presentation at the symposium on the TPB's Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study, and were looking for tools and techniques that could be used to address SAFETEA-LU requirements that the planning process be visualized.

Mr. Smith and Mr. McAuslan then spoke to the PowerPoint presentation and handout. They said they were planning on acquiring some relatively inexpensive visualization software, specifically Community Viz and SketchUp, and hoping to put together a demonstration in the next year of some of the scenario work done for the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study.

Mr. Meese mentioned visualization demonstrations that were done for the MOITS group, with the purpose of demonstrating the link with operations, citing the K St. Busway Study visualizations. He said that this was probably more project specific and not necessarily appropriate to regional planning exercises.

8. Briefing on Evaluation of TPB Public Involvement Activities

Mr. Lee of CirclePoint briefed the Committee on the work tasks and schedule for his firm's on-going evaluation of TPB public involvement activities. He said that the consultants would be conducting desktop research on what other large MPOs are doing and that he would be interviewing in person and by phone TPB member elected officials, agency representatives, and members of interest groups. His questions would explore what types of public involvement activities were taking place and their effectiveness, how they relate to each other, and how they tie into regional level planning activities at TPB. He said that he would brief the Committee in February on the evaluation.

Mr. Mokhtari inquired if citizens were going to be asked what works. Mr. Lee said that he would seek input from the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee and the TPB Access for All Committee and other citizen groups, but that it is difficult to obtain useful information from the general public who are probably not even aware of the MPO process.

Mr. Owolabi commented that Mr. Lee is going to be talking to participants who are already involved in public outreach for transportation. He suggested that a broader survey of civic associations would be useful.

9. Briefing on Live Near Your Work Project

Mr. Hersey presented information on the Live Near Your Work public education outreach effort of Commuter Connections to the Committee. He prefaced his remarks by stating that where one lives and where one works cannot be unrelated to commuting and transportation issues. The presentation outlined the work program information as well as some of the local programs available.

Mr. Hersey said that the programs promoted would be those local to the employers in a particular jurisdiction. Upcoming events are to be held in the District of Columbia, Frederick County, and Prince William County.

10. Briefing on the Household Travel Survey Pilot Pre-Test

Mr. Griffiths gave a power point presentation that highlighted the key elements and findings of the pre-test conducted for the Regional Household Travel Survey. Mr. Griffiths stated that the Survey pre-test evaluated several methodological enhancements that were designed to (1) ensure coverage of all regional households, (2) capture accurate location data, (3) reduce non-response bias, and (4) measure possible under-reporting of auto travel in travel day survey diaries.

Mr. Griffiths reported that the address-list sampling frame, the selective monetary incentive, the non-respondent follow-up survey and the recruitment of GPS households were methodological enhancements that worked very well in the survey pre-test. He noted that these enhancements help to reach many types of households that are missed or do not typically participate in regional household travel surveys. He noted that these enhancements would be further refined based on additional analysis of the pre-test results and included in the main survey.

Chair Canizales mentioned that his household was one of the households randomly selected for the survey pre-test and that he participated in the survey without any problems.

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

Funds

Mr. Kirby updated the Committee on activities to date to develop potential TPB responses and recommendations for the FAMPO policies with respect to the allocation and sharing of FTA formula funds for the Washington urbanized area. He reported, as requested by the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA), that he would try to set up a meeting in December with the region's designated recipients of FTA formula funds to review the FAMPO policies.

12. Other Business

None.

13. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - December 1, 2006**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Rick Rybeck
 Mark Rawlings

FEDERAL/OTHER

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

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick Co. -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. David Moss
Prince George's Co. Vic Weissberg
Rockville Katherine Kelly

FTA -----

NCPC Michael Weil

NPS -----

MWAQC Deirdre Elvis-Peterson

M-NCPPC

Montgomery Co. -----
Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT Ian Beam
 Shiva Shrestha
 Glen Saffran

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
Don McAuslan, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
Jinchul Park, DTP
Darren Smith, DTP
Paul DesJardin, HSPPS
Sunil Kumar, DEP
Deb Kerson Biuk, OPA
W. Steve Lee, Circlepoint

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Jim Maslanka
Arlington Co. Tamera Ashby
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax Co. Robert Owolabi
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Art Smith
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
NVTC -----
PRTC Anthony Foster
VRE -----
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT Sharmilla Samarasinghe
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA -----