

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the December 2, 2005 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on Outline and Preliminary Budget for FY 2007 Unified Planning Work Program Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Miller reviewed the information in the mailout on the preliminary budget levels and outline of the work activities for the FY 2007 UPWP, which begins July 1, 2006. He reviewed the estimated funding totals and noted that the new budget levels were based upon information provided by MDOT and on his assumptions for the DDOT and VDOT levels. The preliminary FY 2006 budget shows a 13.7 percent increase from the recently amended FY 2006 budget level. He said that the FY 2007 UPWP budget levels from the DOTs are to be finalized later in January. The outline, which contains summary descriptions for each work activity, will be the basis for the narrative in the draft of the full document.

Mr. Kirby explained that staff proposes a one time change in the funding level for each of the state technical assistance programs. It is proposed that the funding level for each state be 10 percent of the total new FTA and FHWA MPO planning funding provided by each state. Normally, the funding level is 13.5 percent. However, for this fiscal year the level is proposed at 10 percent in order to provide critical funding for the high priority work activity IV.C to conduct the regional household survey. The funding level for WMATA is 8 percent of the total new FTA funding.

Chair Canizales expressed concern about this proposal and said that it should be reviewed by the DOTs. Mr. Srikanth said that the DOTs were informed by TPB staff about this proposal and, based upon the discussion at this Committee, he will consult with VDOT staff and consider how to proceed on the technical assistance programs.

Mr. Miller reviewed the work activities and budget changes under area I in the outline. He pointed out the new activities in response to SAFETEA-LU.

Mr. Griffiths reviewed the regional household travel survey with its \$2 million budget for 10,000 surveys, and highlighted the work activities and budgets for the other projects under his direction. Mr. Mokhtari asked if the local jurisdictions could increase the survey sample sizes in their areas. Mr. Griffiths said that after the pretest it would be possible to determine the cost per additional survey, but that the survey questions could not be changed for each jurisdiction. He also explained that it will take one year to conduct the survey and another year to process it, which could cost \$500,000 to \$600,000.

Mr. Clifford reviewed the proposed work and budget changes in the Air Quality Conformity and Mobile Emission Analysis in area III.

Mr. Hogan reviewed the proposed work and budget changes in the Network Development and Models Development activities in area III.

Mr. Miller said that a complete draft of the FY 2007 UPWP will be presented at the February 3 Technical Committee meeting, released for public comment at the February 9 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting, and reviewed at the February 15 TPB meeting. He noted that the Technical Assistance Work Program activities need to be identified for the draft. A final version will be reviewed at the Technical Committee at the March 3 meeting and presented for TPB approval at the March 15 meeting.

Chair Canizales said that he was very concerned about the proposal to reduce the funding in the Virginia Technical Assistance Program and indicated that this needs to be addressed.

3. Briefing on Improving Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) Information and New Public Involvement Activities

Mr. Swanson gave a presentation on public involvement improvements related to the 2006 update to the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP). He said a number of ongoing public involvement improvements would be expanded and enhanced this year. He said that two organizations, Fitzgerald & Halliday and the Academy of Leadership Foundation, have been contracted for a total of \$100,000 to assist in these activities. The current contracts extend through June of 2006.

Mr. Swanson said that the new public involvement activities would be divided into three broad themes: education, information and input. The “education” component would be centered around the development of a Community Leadership Institute. The “information” improvements would include website enhancements.

Mr. Owolabi noted that Mr. Swanson had spoken about “branding” the CLRP. He asked if this would involve a new name for the CLRP. Several members noted that the current name is confusing. Mr. Swanson said new names might be considered.

Mr. Lake said that project selection in Fairfax County and other jurisdictions revolves around their Capital Improvement Program (CIP). He said this process provides opportunities for public involvement and it was important to let citizens know that they have these opportunities for input. He said it was also important not to give citizens the impression that they could come to the TPB and reverse previously made decisions.

Mr. Swanson agreed. He noted that one of the key goals of the activities would be to share information about where and how decisions are made, and how citizens can get involved.

Mr. Rybeck emphasized that in the case of Fairfax County, people need to know that the CIP is an important process for transportation decision making.

Mr. Mokhtari said that Mr. Swanson's presentation should indicate that local procedures and local inputs affect regional decision making.

Mr. Sanders said that despite the comments made, regionally significant projects are not provided with adequate opportunity for public input.

Ms. Erickson said that the Annual Tour in Maryland provides those opportunities.

Mr. Sanders said the Annual Tour was not adequate.

Mr. Kirby said the website improvements would include a database that would let people know when key decision-making points would be happening and where.

A participant asked whether efforts would be made to expand minority participation in the process.

Mr. Swanson said that minority participation was a key goal of the new efforts.

Mr. Kirby said it might be useful to invite Mr. Shapiro, who is leading the Academy for Leadership Foundation, to speak with the Committee.

Mr. Srikanth said that the states and jurisdictions should be contacted to comment upon the materials that would be developed for the Leadership Training Institute.

Mr. Swanson said the Citizens Guide would form the basis for the materials.

Mr. Srikanth said the Citizens Guide might be out of date.

Mr. Sanders suggested that the TPB should conduct public opinion polls.

4. Briefing on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) new State Implementation Plan (SIP) Guidance and Schedule for the 8-hour Zone Standard

Ms. Rohlfs spoke to a power point presentation and handout entitled "New Air Quality Planning Guidance", dated 12/14/05, which had she had also presented at MWAQC's December meeting. She also spoke to a one-page handout entitled "MWAQC 8-Hour Ozone Planning Schedule", revised 11/22/05. Mr. Clifford noted that the new requirements would affect TPB planning activities. In the near term, the UPWP had already been revised to include development of 2008 and 2009 networks for the SIP, and in the longer term, conformity assessments would have to adhere to emissions budgets established as part of the SIP process.

The Committee then discussed the topic including: Is the PM 2.5 implementation SIP in the handout due in 2008 or 2009? The SIP must be submitted in 2008.

5. Briefing on Federal Financial Constraint Guidance for the Long-Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program

Mr. Kirby reviewed the materials in the mailout on the federal guidance regarding financial constraint for the CLRP and TIP. He then distributed copies of his memo that was distributed at the TPB meeting on December 21, 2005 which contained responses to formal comments on the TPB's air quality conformity assessment of the 2005 CLRP and FY 2006-2011 TIP. These responses were to comments in an Earthjustice letter of December 16 to the TPB claiming that the TPB process for the plan and TIP did not meet federal fiscal planning requirements.

Mr. Kirby reviewed each comment and response and related it to the federal planning requirements and guidance. He pointed out that these December comments were essentially the same as those provided in previous Earthjustice letters on the plan and TIP in January and March 2005. He noted that FHWA and FTA found in June 2005, as part of the conformity determination for the 2004 CLRP and FY 2005-2010 TIP, that the fiscal constraint requirements have been met.

Mr. Kirby explained the important distinctions regarding funding for the CLRP being "reasonably expected to be available" and for the first years of the TIP funding being "available and committed." He said that it is very important to fully document all of the financial assumptions and commitments as we update the CLRP and TIP. Mr. Miller commented that the project submissions for the 2006 CLRP and new TIP are due February 3.

6. Briefing on Changes in Peak-Period Congestion on the Washington Region Freeway System

Mr. Sivasailam presented a slide show on the changes to the freeway system over time. He identified the total lane miles that were surveyed and the number of lanes that are congested. He also identified locations where conditions have improved, where congestion has gotten worse, and provided examples with pictures. He pointed out locations where congestion has worsened by spreading through time as well as locations where the density of traffic has increased and speeds have dropped.

Mr. Sivasailam showed before and after pictures of the Capital Beltway near the vicinity of the Dulles Toll Road where the construction of a two lane off-ramp has dramatically improved traffic flow. In response to a question, he said the goal is to present the findings to the TPB most likely at the March meeting and therefore staff would come back to the Technical Committee at the February and March meetings with a refined presentation.

The Committee wanted staff to further analyze the lane miles congested to indicate the amount of miles that are congested during the AM peak hour, and PM peak hour. They further recommended that the changes to the system be broken down by AM and PM peak period as well as by improved flow and worsened flow.

7. Briefing on Evaluation Results for Commuter Connections Transportation Emissions Reduction Measures (TERMS)

Mr. Ramfos briefed the Committee on the purpose of collecting data on TERMS operated by Commuter Connections and stated that program measurements include number of users, placements, and reductions in VT, VMT, and emissions. Next, he covered the evaluation time periods which began in COG's FY2003. There have been three evaluation periods that commenced with the implementation of the regional TERMS and at the end of each three year time period a TERM Analysis report is produced. The draft FY 2003- 2005 TERM Analysis report was mailed to the Committee and Mr. Ramfos stated that Ms. Diggins with LDA Consulting would review the data from this report. Results from this report are put into the regional TERM tracking sheet.

Ms. Diggins covered the original transportation and emission impact goals against the collective impacts of the Commuter Connections TERMS. She then covered results for each of the TERMS, including: Telework Resource Center, Expanded Telecommuting, Guaranteed Ride Home, Integrated Rideshare (both software and kiosk projects), Employer Outreach (both sales representative and Metrochek results), Employer Outreach for Bicycling, Mass Marketing, and the Commuter Operations Center.

Ms. Diggins concluded the report with some observations including that participation increased from 2002 in nearly all of the TERMS and most TERMS met participation goals. She also stated that the TERMS did not meet collective goals, but Kiosks, Software Upgrades to the regional ridematching software, Employer Outreach, and Employer Outreach for Bicycling, and the Commuter Operations Center met individual program goals. Reductions in vehicle trips (34%) and VMT (41%) were significantly above the 1999 and 2002 evaluation reporting periods. However, Ms. Diggins also stated that the emission reductions were about 20% lower than in 1999 and 2002 due to changes in emission factors.

Recommendations from the report included reviewing and revising participation goals, VT, VMT, and emission goals.

8. Review of the Draft Arterial Highway System Performance in the Metropolitan Washington Region Report

Deferred to February.

9. Other Business

None.

10. Adjourn

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Rick Rybeck

MARYLAND

Frederick Co. -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. David Moss
Prince George's Co. Aaron Overman
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. Eric Graye
 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari
MDOT
 Lyn Erickson
 Glen Smith
 BJ Berhanu

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Maria White
Arlington Co. Jeff Price
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax Co. Mike Lake
 Robert Owolabi
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Arthur Smith
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
NVTC -----
PRTC Betsy Massie
VRE Shannon Yadsko
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT Christopher Arabia
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Lora Byala

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC Takuni Yamamoto
FHWA-VA -----

FTA Deborah Burns

NCPC -----

NPS -----

MWAQC -----

COG Staff and Others

Ronald Kirby, COG/DTP
Mike Clifford, COG/DTP
Gerald Miller, COG/DTP
Mark Pfoutz, COG/DTP
Michael Farrell, COG/DTP
John Swanson, COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, COG/DTP
Jim Hogan, COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths, COG/DTP
Greg Goodwin, COG/HSPPS
Greg Jordan, Skycomp
Jeff King, COG/DEP
Sunil Kumar, COG/DEP