

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

## **TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

### **1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the September 8, 2006 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### **2. Update on Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2006 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY2007-2012 TIP**

Staff distributed the draft summary report for the air quality conformity analysis of the 2006 CLRP and the FY2007-2012 TIP. Mr. Clifford said that while a summary had been given at the last Technical Committee meeting, the PM<sub>2.5</sub> analysis had not been completed at that time. He noted that the full conformity report is on the COG website.

Mr. Clifford briefly went through the summary report. He pointed out exhibits 7, 8, and 11 as showing the “bottom line” for VOC, NO<sub>x</sub>, and the PM<sub>2.5</sub> pollutants, respectively. He reported that the analysis results provided a basis for conformity of the CLRP and the TIP. He mentioned that the public comment period ends on October 14<sup>th</sup> and that the TPB is scheduled to approve the conformity analysis at their October 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Mr. Rybeck mentioned the reported harmful effects of diesel pollution and asked if there was any monitoring of those pollutants. Mr. Clifford responded yes, that PM<sub>2.5</sub> monitors record these pollutants which are directly related to diesel vehicles and other diesel engines.

Mr. Canizales asked when we are getting new emissions budgets. Mr. Clifford responded that the new 8-hour ozone budgets are scheduled to be submitted to EPA in the Spring, and that they will be used in the next conformity analysis. Mr. Canizales asked if the new budgets would cause a problem in meeting the conformity requirements. Mr. Clifford said that it was difficult to determine, since the budget levels would be set at this year’s inventory estimates and next year’s conformity estimates would reflect updated land activity and other forecasts. He noted that if the budget levels were exceeded next year, that there are a number of TERMS already implemented that would help meet budget requirements. Mr. Kirby asked about the emission reduction totals in the TERM tracking sheet. Mr. Sivasailam responded that in 2010 there are approximately 5.5 tons of NO<sub>x</sub> and 2.3 tons of VOC benefits shown in the TERM tracking sheet. Mr. Clifford noted that 2008 and 2009 inventories would have to be completed and compared against their respective budgets.

Mr. Kirby asked if TPB staff had the MWACQ letter approving the conformity analysis. Mr. Clifford indicated no, that it was still being reviewed by MWAQC committees.

### **3. Review of Draft 2006 CLRP and FY 2007-2012 TIP**

Mr. Austin reported that the Draft 2006 CLRP had been released on September 14 at [www.RegionalTransportationPlan.org](http://www.RegionalTransportationPlan.org). No comments of substance had been received on the plan. Some agencies had provided feedback on financial information in the Draft FY 2007-2012 TIP. Mr. Austin provided a brief summary of the technical corrections made and distributed a list of changes that affected programming between FY 07 and FY 12 in the Virginia portion of the TIP. Any further changes or edits were requested by the close of business, today, Friday, October 6.

Mr. Kirby noted that the Virginia portion of the TIP contained financial data from the recently approved FY 2006 STIP for Virginia. Mr. Srikanth confirmed that VDOT expected to have revised figures for FY 2007 available in January, and that they would reconcile the TIP at that time. Mr. Kirby added that TPB staff had agreed to meet with the Virginia Division Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and VDOT Northern Virginia and central office staff in Richmond to review and discuss how to improve the TIP development, amendment and adjustment process.

Mr. Shrestha noted that some comments had been made by SHA staff that the TIP should show only one column for FY 2007-2012. Mr. Kirby stated that federal law specifies that the TIP must show funding that is available for the first two years of the program. He noted that Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia each report to a separate division of FHWA and that WMATA reports to another person at FTA and that the instructions coming from each of these offices may not be consistent. Mr. Srikanth suggested that the Richmond meeting might be moved to COG and involve Maryland and the District as well. Mr. Kirby and Mr. Miller replied that the Richmond meeting should remain, but that additional meetings with other agencies were likely necessary.

Mr. Canizales asked who from VDOT reviewed the project data. He inquired about two projects that were slated for deletion from the TIP, the first of which was still under construction. Mr. Miller stated that as long as the funds were obligated and spent, it was no longer necessary to show the project in the TIP. His second inquiry was regarding another phase of a project that was currently in the ROW acquisition stage for additional intersection improvements. Mr. Austin noted that many VDOT projects are broken out into very specific phases and that the intersection in question might be included on a separate line item. Additionally, as long as the project was accounted for in the CLRP and Conformity analysis, the project could be added into the TIP at any time as an amendment.

### **4. Briefing on Performance of the 2006 Long Range Plan**

Mr. Eichler presented the first round of analysis of the performance of the 2006 update to the CLRP. He was asked whether all of the analysis presented was also included in the current CLRP brochure. He replied that some of the latest analyses are not represented in the current brochure, but will be in the next iteration of the brochure.

Some discussion addressed the concern of presenting "lane miles of congestion" in either absolute growth (2002 to 2030) or percent growth (2002 to 2030). Some Committee members said that this representation might misstate the growth in congestion levels. It was suggested that showing the percentage of congestion lane miles, both in 2002 and 2030, would present a better picture of the situation.

For both the lane miles of congestion and metropolitan growth (jobs and population) slides, it was noted that while the outer suburbs had the greatest percent change between 2002 and 2030, the inner suburbs had the greatest absolute growth.

One attendee asked what definition of "congested" was used. The presenter replied, "roadway links with a volume-to-capacity ratio over 1 (one)."

When presented with a slide showing downtown Metrorail congestion, the definition of Metrorail congestion was questioned. Mr. Kirby replied that the data were delivered by WMATA and it was most likely relating to a passenger-volume versus train-capacity ratio. It was suggested that the definition of the Metrorail congestion appear on the slide.

When presented with the activity clusters map, Chair Canizales questioned why VRE stations were not shown. They will most likely be included on subsequent versions of this map. Many of the VRE stations he was asking about are currently outside of existing activity clusters, and when the activity cluster shapes are updated, they will most-likely contain the stations in question.

Mr. Rybeck stressed that clusters are not small enough for analysis and much of the land area in the clusters is still too far away from transit to be considered transit-oriented or transit-accessible and therefore private cars will still be used.

Mr. Srikanth suggested that the changes in metropolitan growth (jobs and employment) could be broken down into the activity clusters: in core clusters, in suburban clusters or not in clusters. This level of analysis will better match the transit work share data presented. This was addressed by the statement that further activity center/cluster analysis will be conducted, including the requested analysis.

Mr. Sivasailam suggested that the air quality discussion in the brochure, which was passed out at the beginning of the item, also include new Particulate Matter (PM 2.5) levels.

## **5. Briefing on Documentation of Phase I of the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Scenario Study**

Mr. McAuslan distributed a draft of the technical report on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. He stated that the purpose of this report was to document the technical analysis and evaluation of the five alternative land use and transportation scenarios examined in the first phase of the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study.

Mr. McAuslan reviewed the structure and content of the draft technical report with the Committee and stated that it was still being updated and revised based on comments received from the Joint Technical Working Group (JTWG). He stated that a revised draft of this report would be presented to the JTWG on October 13, 2006 and a final draft was scheduled to be distributed to the TPB on October 18, 2006.

Mr. Mokhtari commented that the Executive Summary of the draft technical report suggested that the "More Households Region" scenario was the best scenario and did not highlight the fact that the "Region Undivided" was also found to be one of the best scenarios.

Mr. Kirby and Mr. Griffiths responded that it just was not those two scenarios that improved the future performance of the regional transportation network, rather it was all scenarios that put more of the region's housing and jobs in closer proximity and focused more mixed use development around an expanded transit system that improved system performance.

Mr. Griffiths agreed to look at revising the wording for the Executive Summary to make it clear that it was all scenarios that put future jobs and housing closer together that had a positive impact on future travel conditions.

#### **6. Briefing on Implementing Proposed New Regional Initiative for Strengthening the Linkages Between Transportation and Land Use Planning**

Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee on the power point presentation on the topic that was presented to the TPB on September 20. He then distributed a memorandum to the Committee that detailed a staff proposal for a pilot program to promote coordination between land use and transportation planning. This new initiative will provide a regional clearinghouse to document local and state experience, and offer technical assistance to localities. Each technical assistance project would be for up to \$20,000 on a task order basis with a consultant team. He explained that the TPB would be asked to reprogram \$250,000 in funding from the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Scenario Study work activity in the FY 2007 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to implement the pilot program for an initial six-month period from January 1 through June 30, 2007.

Mr. Mokhtari commented that many of these local studies cost a lot more than \$20,000 and asked what could be accomplished with this assistance. Mr. Kirby said that these efforts would not be for big studies but could provide timely information and expert advice and be a catalyst for a larger study. He said that the program would raise the profile of what is going on now across the region. In response to Mr. Verzosa, Mr. Kirby said that the \$250,000 was identified as excess funding to begin the program, and other funds would be needed if the program would be continued. Ms. Samarasinghe asked about the role of the Committee in selecting the projects. Mr. Kirby said that based upon the experience with a similar program in Los Angeles, the assistance would be limited to \$20,000 and offered on a first come first served basis. The total assistance budget is \$100,000 over the six-month period. The Committee would establish the

criteria to help ensure that good requests for assistance are prepared by the local jurisdictions.

Chair Canizales commented on the \$150,000 budget for TPB staff and asked if it would decrease if the program expands. Mr. Kirby said that the clearinghouse would need staff and the administrative and coordination staff time would probably not go down if the program expands. Ms. Samarasinghe asked if there would be concerns about some localities receiving more funding than others. Mr. Kirby said that with the limited assistance he believed that this would not be a problem.

The Committee recommended that the pilot program be advanced for approval by the TPB.

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

Mr. Kirby explained that the March 2006 Transportation Planning Certification prepared by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) recommended that the TPB and Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) work cooperatively to reach a resolution on the allocation and sharing of FTA formula funds for the Washington urbanized area. He briefed the Committee on the mailout item which included five recent FAMPO resolutions that present its policies with respect to the allocation and sharing of these formula funds. He distributed a draft letter to FAMPO outlining potential TPB responses and recommendations on each of the MPO policies. He reviewed the draft letter and explained that it is based upon the guidance provided by FHWA and FTA in an August 9, 2004 letter to FAMPO on this topic. He then reviewed the specific guidance related to the TPB and FTA designated recipient's role in allocating regional transit funds. He explained that the draft letter will not be presented to the TPB in October and will be subject to further review by the Committee at its November 3 meeting.

Mr. Rybeck said that it was a good letter but suggested that the first sentence be deleted because the letter was now responding to the FAMPO resolutions. Ms. Ashby commented about the statement in the draft letter that recommends that FAMPO participate in the TPB planning and programming process with regard to projects and programs serving the needs of northern Stafford County. She said that WMATA as the designated recipient of these funds needs to be consulted and involved with this recommendation. Mr. Kirby explained that he had discussed this recommended position with high-level WMATA staff.

Chair Canizales commented that the planning and programming process includes WMATA and that WMATA staff may need to inform the WMATA Board about the draft letter. He noted that WMATA was not represented at the meeting and said that WMATA staff need to be informed of the letter. Mr. Srikanth suggested that the sentence in the last paragraph of the draft add "the WMATA process" to the TPB planning and programming process. Mr. A. Foster said that FAMPO staff should be

consulted regarding the resolutions. Mr. Kirby said that he has had many discussions with FAMPO staff and will continue the dialogue. Chair Canizales asked the Committee members to take the draft letter to their organizations and agencies to review.

**7. Briefing on Initial Results of an Analysis of a Regional System of Variably Priced Lanes (VPLs) in the Washington Region**

Delayed to the November meeting.

**8. Additional Business**

None.

**9. Adjourn**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - October 6, 2006**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                      Rick Rybeck  
                                 Mark Rawlings

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

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

**MARYLAND**

Charles County        Tony Chinyere  
Frederick Co.         Denis Superczynski  
Gaithersburg         -----  
Montgomery Co.      David Moss  
Prince George's Co.   Aaron Overman  
Rockville             Katherine Kelly  
M-NCPPC  
Montgomery Co.      Eric Graye  
Prince George's Co.   Harold Foster  
                                 Faramarz Mokhtari

FTA                      Deborah Burns  
  
NCPC                     -----  
  
NPS                      -----  
  
MWAQC                 Deidre Elvis-Peterson

**COG Staff and Others**

MDOT                    Ian Beam  
                                 Shiva Shrestha

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  
Jim Yin, DTP  
Don McAuslan, DTP  
Andrew Meese  
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP  
Dusan Vuksan, DTP  
Jinchul Park, DTP  
Michael Eichler  
Brian Cassidy, DTP  
Keisha Ransome, DTP  
Erin Morrow, DTP  
William Bacon, DTP  
Bettina Irps, Michael Baker

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria             Maria White  
Arlington Co.         Tamera Ashby  
City of Fairfax         Alexis Verzosa  
Fairfax Co.             Mike Lake  
Falls Church         -----  
Loudoun Co.            -----  
Manassas               -----  
Prince William Co.    Rick Canizales  
NVTC                    Elizabeth Rodgers  
PRTC                    Anthony Foster  
VRE                      -----  
VDOT                    Kanathur Srikanth  
VDRPT                  Sharmilla Samarasinghe  
NVPDC                 -----  
VDOA                    -----

**WMATA**

WMATA                 -----