

## **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

### **1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the April 6 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### **2. Review of Virginia Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2007 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2008-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Srikanth briefed the Committee on information provided by VDOT in response to questions raised at the April 18 TPB meeting on the major Virginia project submissions for inclusion in the air quality conformity assessment for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008\_2013 TIP. He reviewed in detail the 14 comments and the draft VDOT clarifying responses and proposed changes the project description forms for the I-95/I-395 HOT Lanes Project and the I-66 Spot Improvements Project.

Committee members asked numerous questions about several of the proposed 11 responses for the I-95/I-395 HOT Lanes Project. Srikanth responded to each of the questions, and indicated that the suggested changes would be incorporated into a revised set of materials.

For the response to comment two, Mr. Biesiadny requested that it should clarify that FAMPO's approval of the transit plans applies only for the area under its purview. For the response to comment 11, Mr. Maslanka said that Alexandria is very concerned about the proposed bus only ramp from the HOT lanes to Seminary Road and requests the city have a role in evaluating the benefits of adding the ramp.

For the response to comment 9, Ms. Ashby said that Arlington County wants to see an analysis of extending the HOT lanes across the 14<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge sooner than will be done on the on-going 14<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge EIS being conducted by FHWA. Mr. Srikanth said that VDOT was on the EIS Steering Committee and that it, DDOT and Arlington County all support the EIS examining the HOT lanes across the bridge as one of the alternatives.

Mr. Weissberg commented that he hoped that the HOT lane project would not affect the study of rail on the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. Mr. Kirby said that the project was located quite a distance from the Wilson Bridge and would not have a significant impact.

Mr. Biesiadny encouraged VDOT to work closely with DDOT and others on the 14<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge EIS alternative and other proposed clarifications. Mr. Rawlings said that he would follow-up with the appropriate DDOT staff. Mr. Kirby said that all of the revisions and additions to the project description forms will be in the TPB mailout on May 9 so that TPB members will have time to review them.

For the response to comment 12 on the I-66 Spot Improvements Project, Ms. Ashby requested that the response indicate that the design drawings be shared with local jurisdictions. Chairman Harrington suggested that the response say the project will not preclude Metrorail to Tysons and a third Metrorail track.

Mr. Srikanth thanked the Committee members for their comments and indicated that the suggested changes would be incorporated into a revised set of materials for the TPB mailout.

**3. Review of Draft Scope of Work for Conducting the Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2007 CLRP and FY2008-2013 TIP**

Mr. Clifford mentioned that the draft scope of work, which had been included in the mailout, was the same as last month except for a schedule change. He noted that the version sent to the TPB in April contained a transmittal letter and an MWAQC comment letter.

Mr. Clifford discussed two items that were distributed. The first was TPB's Item 13 from the April 18<sup>th</sup> meeting, which is a scope of work for an off-cycle conformity analysis for a new interchange on US 340 in Frederick County, Maryland. He noted that MDOT wants to advance the regionally significant project immediately, and therefore does not want to wait until the regular conformity cycle. He said that the analysis will be just like last year's, and will include horizon years of 2010, 2020, and 2030. The schedule includes final action by the TPB in July.

Mr. Beam noted that the developer is paying for the conformity analysis, as well as the construction costs of the interchange.

The second item distributed was the April, 2007 edition of Federal Highway Administration's Transportation Conformity newsletter. Mr. Clifford noted that the first five paragraphs in the newsletter are relevant to conformity in the Washington region. The first paragraph discusses EPA's proposed rule to implement transportation conformity provisions in SAFETEA-LU. These proposed requirements should not have much impact in the Washington area. For example, one element addresses a change in frequency requirements for conformity, but as this region assesses conformity on an annual basis that will not likely have any effect. The second and fourth paragraphs discuss EPA's new PM<sub>2.5</sub> requirements for SIPs. Mr. Clifford noted that while SO<sub>2</sub> will be required to be inventoried in the SIP, it is not going to affect the current conformity analysis. The third paragraph addresses implementation of the new 24-hour PM<sub>2.5</sub> standard and applies mostly to MWAQC tasks. The fifth paragraph, which discusses a US Supreme Court ruling on greenhouse gas, indicates that the EPA does have the statutory authority to regulate emissions of greenhouse gases from new motor vehicles. Mr. Clifford mentioned that there is a new committee on greenhouse gases being established at COG. He noted that mobile source CO<sub>2</sub> emissions rates are increasing with time, as they are tied to fuel economy.

Mr. Kirby mentioned a recent Washington Post article about CO<sub>2</sub>. The reporter got VMT numbers from COG, but then used DC, Maryland, and Virginia HPMS data instead. The

reporter only used 2001 and 2005 HPMS data, and then developed a trend for each jurisdiction with just the two data points. Mr. Kirby explained that HPMS data are notoriously varied over time, with large increases and decreases from year-to-year. The reporter erroneously concluded from just the two data points that CO<sub>2</sub> is increasing over time except in the District, where it is decreasing, and based his article on that.

Mr. Kirby noted that COG will be doing CO<sub>2</sub> inventories for the region.

**4. Briefing on TPB Access for All (AFA) Advisory Committee Recommendations To Improve Language Access to Transit**

Ms. Newman presented an update of the Access for All Committee's draft language access recommendations. The AFA reconvened the transit information subcommittee in late 2006. The subcommittee prepared an updated report that will be presented to the TPB on May 16. The new report provides recommendations for three hot spot areas and system wide recommendations which are broken down into short-term, medium-term and long-term time frames.

Ms. Newman asked for feedback on the presentation, which will be presented to the TPB. Mr. A. Foster and Mr. Biesiadny both suggested that the presentation should highlight the accomplishments since 2003. Mr. Biesiadny added that the presentation should clarify when the barriers were identified and when the hot spots were identified. Mr. Harrington suggested that a table of accomplishments could be provided with the mail out. Mr. Biesiadny noted that the new Metrorail route maps that have been installed in bus shelters are excellent maps. Mr. Foster added that the FTA recently updated its Title VI regulations regarding language access plans, and that it might be helpful to review the regulations. Finally, Mr. Harrington added that there are funding issues associated with the long-term recommendations.

**5. Status Report on Coordination with the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) on Allocation 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 a draft letter to FAMPO outlining potential TPB responses and recommendations on each of the FAMPO policies. He said after today's review, he would work with the staffs of the designated recipient of formula transit assistance to finalize a draft for review by the Technical Committee and TPB in June.

Mr. Kirby said that FAMPO has urged the TPB to advocate for the Fredericksburg Area to be designated a separate urbanized area with a Stafford County border line as a result of the 2010 Census. He said that the proposed TPB response will be not to take any position on this designation at this time.

Regarding the FAMPO request that it receive a portion of the FTA Section 5307 funds based upon population and population density factors, Mr. Kirby said that the proposed TPB response will be not to sub-allocate the funds. This would be consistent with FTA guidance provided in an August 2004 letter to FAMPO. FAMPO would be invited to participate in the TPB planning and programming process with regard to projects serving the needs of northern Stafford County, and could propose projects that are eligible for Section 5307 funds for inclusion in the CLRP and TIP.

Mr. Kirby said that FAMPO has requested that it receive a portion of the FTA Section 5307 funds based upon its bus service-miles as PRTC does currently. He reviewed a WMATA Board Resolution of January 27, 2000 regarding regional allocation of federal transit funds that prohibits any such sub-allocations. He said that he would work with WMATA legal and planning staff to explore how this position could be changed.

Mr. Biesiadny inquired if the region's designated recipients had signed-off on the responses in the draft letter. Mr. Kirby replied that they had not and that the WMATA resolution poses a problem.

Mr. Biesiadny said there may be concerns about the proposed TPB position on the 2010 Census, and that NVTC approves supporting the designation of a separate urbanized area with a Stafford County borderline based upon the 2010 Census. He also commented that there was no objection to PRTC and VRE getting the federal funding for each of their system's miles included in the federal formula.

Mr. Kirby said that he recommends that the TPB decision on the separate urbanized area be delayed until the 2010 Census data is available. He also said that giving FAMPO a share of federal funds based upon its bus-miles would set a precedent that the entire region may not want to set.

Mr. Canizales said that the TPB position could agree with the FAMPO position on the separate urbanized area, and that Stafford County is not really part of Northern Virginia now.

Mr. Biesiadny reported that NVTC and PRTC have approved supporting the designation of a separate urbanized area with a Stafford County borderline based upon the 2010 Census.

Ms. Ashby commented that the proposed position not to sub-allocate funds based upon bus-miles and to accept project proposals from FAMPO would be a lot more complicated.

Mr. Srikanth said that the existence of the WMATA resolution would appear to prohibit any funding sub-allocations based either upon bus-service miles or for funding a project.

Mr. Kirby agreed and said that without a new WMATA resolution, a TPB position is difficult to determine.

Chairman Harrington said that the WMATA general counsel will be asked to look into the effect of the resolution, and commented that Section 5307 funds cannot be used for all types of projects.

Ms. Ashby commented that Northern Virginia now is subsidizing the Stafford County commuters that use Metrorail.

Mr. Canizales asked if the proposed position would be legal. Mr. Kirby said that TPB can program projects on a case-by-case basis and commented that the current WMATA resolution might be challenged.

Mr. Biesiadny stated that the Northern Virginia jurisdictions supported FAMPO having the same service-mile allocation procedure as VRE and PRTC do now.

Mr. Kirby said that the TPB must also consider the implications of such a sub-allocation precedent for the Maryland jurisdictions.

**6. Status Report on the Transportation/Land Use Connection (TLC) Pilot Program**

Mr. Smith updated the Committee on the status of the pilot TLC technical assistance projects, saying that consultants have been selected to perform the projects and the contracts are being finalized. He said that project kick-off meetings would be taking place in the next couple of weeks and staff was confident that the work could be completed by June 30, 2007, as planned. He also showed on-screen a draft version of the TLC Clearinghouse Web site, navigating through various sections and describing the content included in each. He asked the Committee to provide any comments on the Web site by the following Friday, May 11, and said he would send an email with the site address to committee members mid-week as a reminder.

Mr. Maslanka asked about the status of the TPB's application for funding through the Virginia 2007 Multimodal Planning Grants Program to complete the remaining Virginia TLC projects that did not receive TPB funding in the pilot round. Mr. Smith responded that although recipients were to have been announced on May 1, TPB staff had not been notified of whether or not it received a grant through the program.

Mr. Mokhtari noted that MTA and FHWA were undertaking studies pertaining to the Langley Park area, which is the focus of one of the TLC projects, and encouraged TPB staff to coordinate with those agencies. Mr. Smith and Mr. Swanson said that representatives from state agencies would be a part of the kick-off meeting for that project and would be involved going forward. Mr. Smith noted that TPB staffs are somewhat dependent on the local TLC applicants to be aware of any concurrent studies and include the appropriate parties.

**7. Status Report on Regional Travel Trends Report**

Mr. Griffiths gave a brief status report on the Regional Travel Trends Report. He stated that he had presented a detailed report outline to the Technical Committee at their April

meeting and he was proceeding to prepare the report along the lines described in this outline. Mr. Griffiths stated that he expected hope to have a draft presentation on this report at the June TPB Technical Committee meeting.

## **8. Update on the Congestion Management Process (CMP)**

Mr. Meese referred to a handout containing a proposed outline for a CMP report, along with a cover memorandum and CMP-related excerpts from the February 14, 2007 final federal rule for metropolitan planning. SAFETEA-LU requires that metropolitan transportation planning processes include a CMP, an updated version of the previous requirements for a Congestion Management System (CMS). The CLR to be developed by this fall must be SAFETEA-LU-compliant, including integration of a CMP. Additionally, the March 2006 federal certification of the TPB metropolitan planning process recommended that the region's CMS be enhanced. The excerpts from the February 14 final rule showed the emphasis that has been placed on CMP requirements in the new law and regulations.

The FY2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), beginning July 1, 2007, will have a separately funded task for the CMP. This will enable COG/TPB to hire a new staff person dedicated to the CMP, and will facilitate a concentrated CMP development effort at that time.

Mr. Meese reviewed the proposed draft outline for a CMP report as a guide to the work to be done over the coming months. The outline was based upon review of the SAFETEA-LU legislation and regulations, as well as the outlines of the TPB's Congestion Management System Annual Reports produced in the mid-1990s.

The proposed CMP report outline was divided into two major sections. Chapters 1 through 6, comprising the first major section, will provide an overview of the CMP, focusing on where congestion occurs or will occur in the region. This section will also look at strategies for congestion management; both previously implemented strategies as well as proposed strategies. These chapters will also substantially comprise the CMP chapter included in the next CLR.

Chapter 7 comprised the second major section of the CMP report, focusing on data and methodologies. The data tables, maps, and graphics in Chapter 7 will communicate the many necessary details of CMP analysis. This will be the technical core of the CMP report, but likely would not be included in such detail in the CLR.

Mr. Meese requested comments on the draft outline by May 15.

## **9. Status Report on the Enhanced Arterial Highway Congestion Monitoring Program**

Mr. Sivasailam handed out a memorandum to the TPB Technical Committee requesting volunteers to collect speed/travel time information on arterial highways and a power point presentation on the enhanced arterial highway congestion monitoring pilot program.

Due to lack of time, he agreed to come back the following month and make a formal presentation.

**10. Briefing on the Draft Outline of the TPB Public Participation Plan and on the Evaluation of the TPB Public Involvement Activities**

Mr. Swanson gave a PowerPoint presentation explaining the conceptual and regulatory context for the development of the TPB Participation Plan. He noted that the consultant-conducted evaluation was being finalized, and summarized a few of the major observations in the evaluation and how staff planned to incorporate those points into the Participation Plan. Ms. Crawford circulated a handout with a draft outline and timeline for development of the Participation Plan and described the sections proposed for the plan in greater detail. She highlighted the constituencies the Plan will focus on: those *involved* in the TPB transportation planning process, those *informed* about transportation issues, but not involved in the TPB process, and those *interested* in transportation, but who have little prior knowledge. She then reviewed the timeline for the completion of the Plan, noting the goal of having the Final Plan adopted by the TPB in September 2007.

Mr. Anthony Foster and Mr. Canizales raised the issue of outreach to communities with limited English proficiency and asked how staff planned to involve those communities in the development of the plan and address those communities in the plan itself. Mr. Canizales also urged staff in its public involvement efforts to strive for a balance between inner and outer jurisdictions, including providing easier ways for residents in outer jurisdictions to comment on projects before the TPB and be involved in the planning process. Ms. Crawford responded that staff had met with the Access for All Advisory Committee, whose focus includes these populations, and received good feedback for activities to include in participation efforts. She said that staff hoped to conduct further outreach to limited-English communities, as well as citizens in outer jurisdictions.

Ms. Ashby noted that localities have their own public involvement processes around transportation issues and suggested that staff consider collaborating with local agencies on outreach efforts and reflect such a strategy in the Participation Plan. Mr. Swanson noted that the plan was called simply a "Participation Plan" and that federal regulatory intent seemed to be for MPO staff to involve local agency staff as part of broader involvement efforts.

Mr. Shrestha said that his experience with public involvement has indicated that citizens are largely unaware of TPB process and the TPB's role. He suggested that public outreach focus on educating the public on how transportation decisions get made at various levels, because it is something they find difficult to understand. Chairman Harrington pointed out that it is challenging to communicate to the public the regional story and the role of the TPB as a forum for regional policy rather than a body that addresses neighborhood-level transportation issues. Mr. Swanson responded that the TPB's Community Leadership Institute (CLI) series was designed to provide a comprehensive education about the transportation decision making process and the TPB's

regional role and has been somewhat successful. He mentioned that the next CLI in June would be focused on leaders of immigrant communities.

Mr. Mokhtari said that he liked the goals stated in the Participation Plan outline, but suggested that the plan document should also be clear about why citizen involvement in the transportation planning process is important.

#### **11. Briefing on Consultant Study for Enhancing Consideration of Freight in Regional Transportation Planning**

Mr. Meese referred to a slide presentation, and to copies of the full draft report available at the meeting.

The consultant study began in fall 2006. The draft final report was posted on the COG/TPB Web site on May 1 for Technical Committee review and comment. The requested deadline for comments on the draft report was May 15.

The study objectives were to identify issues and opportunities for enhanced freight planning consideration, to lay the groundwork for specific TPB UPWP activities in future fiscal years, ensure coordination with freight planning activities of member agencies, and to develop initial freight information for use in current regional discussions and CLRP development.

There were six major chapters in the report. Chapter 1, "Context of State and Local Freight Planning Activities", described a number of relevant studies the states and DC are undertaking or have undertaken that were important for the region to consider. There were also important Baltimore Region and I-95 Corridor Coalition activities.

Chapter 2, the "Washington Region Freight Profile", described the role of freight in the Washington region, commodity flows, the regional freight transportation system, and freight generators, and contained a number of maps.

Chapter 3, "Recommendations on Future Activities and Committee Approach to Freight Planning", provided case studies of other MPOs, critical success factors, and recommendations.

Chapter 4, "Recommendations on Stakeholder Outreach Activities", laid out options for involving stakeholders in the process as well as survey ideas.

Chapter 5, "Data Sets and Analytical Tools", identified a number of public and private sector data sets available for analysis and how they can be used.

Chapter 6, "Conclusion", contained a brief summary and outlook.

The report described a number of key findings. While this region is not a large freight generator, its large population and vibrant economy demand a responsive freight system. The region lies at the crossroads of several important national freight corridors. Movement of goods is adversely affected by mounting highway and rail congestion.

Truck stops and parking facilities are in short supply. Both local freight movement (on the order of 41% by weight) and through movement (on the order of 59%) are significant. Air cargo is the fastest growing segment – airports and airport ground access will remain critical.

Regarding what is being moved; approximately 222 million tons of goods worth over \$200 billion are transportation to, from, or within the region annually. Construction materials (e.g., gravel), waste/scrap, and coal products are the top commodities by weight. Machinery and textiles are top commodities by value. Significant growth is projected. It is also estimated that an additional 314 million tons of goods pass through the region annually (through traffic).

Regarding modes of freight transportation, approximately  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the freight traveling to, from, or within the region is by truck. Other modes are also used, but final delivery usually still has to be by truck. Rail movements are significant for high weight, non-time sensitive cargoes. Air cargo, focusing on the highest value, time-sensitive goods, is the fastest growing segment. Pipelines move much of the petroleum products into the region. A marginal amount moves by water transport.

It was noted that there were distinctions between transportation planning for freight and general transportation planning practices for passenger movement. Whereas most passenger infrastructure is publicly owned and controlled, private industry (ports, railroads, terminals, pipelines), owns and controls significant parts of the freight movement system. Passenger trip generation is well understood and documented, whereas freight movements are sensitive to market forces, and thus difficult to forecast. Freight movement has fewer sources of data, especially at the local level. Whereas passenger planning can typically be coordinated on a regional or local basis (small percent of intercity trips), freight planning requires multi-jurisdictional, interregional cooperation (higher percentage of long-distance trips). Freight uses the system differently, and carrier perspectives differ regarding problems (e.g., chokepoints) and solutions.

Key recommendations for the TPB planning process were to continue to engage in the state freight activities of the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. It was recommended to form a Freight Subcommittee under the TPB Technical Committee with both public and private sector representatives. Also needed was to designate a COG/TPB staff person for freight planning. In addition to committee activities, it was recommended to undertake freight stakeholder outreach activities – events, surveys, personal contacts, newsletters, and a freight portion of the TPB Web site.

Mr. Meese reviewed a number of data charts, graphics, and illustrations in the report showing an overview of freight movement in the region.

The study was to be completed by May 31. Action was to continue on follow-up to the recommendations, including determination of committee structure, increased outreach to stakeholders, and integration of freight information into the CLRP. Information was invited regarding local jurisdiction freight planning activities. Overall, even though the

Washington metropolitan area is not an industrial area, it still has important freight movement issues.

In response to a question from Mr. Smith on what local jurisdictions should do to better incorporate freight planning, Mr. Meese noted several key aspects of the report, including review of data, outreach to stakeholders, and inventorying of freight facilities in the individual jurisdiction, and agreed to add information to the report on potential local government activities.

In response to a question from Mr. Biesiadny, Mr. Meese noted that the study had been coordinated with the ongoing Virginia Statewide Freight Study, and that key staff for the Virginia and Maryland statewide freight planning efforts were members of the ad hoc study committee.

In response to a question from Mr. Griffiths on the varying sizes of the mapped freight clusters, Mr. Meese noted that the size and geographic layout of the freight clusters were determined by professional judgment, and future efforts could utilize more specific criteria and data.

In response to a question from Mr. Moss, Mr. Meese explained that the corporate logos on the slides of example freight facilities were of companies that had major freight operations at those facilities.

**12. Briefing on How the TPB Planning Process is Addressing the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Regulations issued on February 14, 2007.**

Delayed until June meeting.

**13. Other Business**

**14. Adjourn**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - May 4, 2007**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                      Mark Rawlings

**MARYLAND**

Charles County        -----

Frederick Co.         -----

Gaithersburg         -----

Montgomery Co.      -----

Prince George's Co. -----

Rockville             -----

M-NCPPC

Montgomery Co.      -----

Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari

MDOT                   Shiva Shrestha

Ian Beam

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria            Jim Maslanka

Arlington Co.        Tamera Ashby

City of Fairfax       -----

Fairfax Co.           Tom Biesiadny

Falls Church         -----

Loudoun Co.         Art Smith

Manassas             -----

Prince William Co. Rick Canizales

NVTC                  -----

PRTC                   Anthony Foster

VRE                    Christine Hoeffner

VDOT                  Kanathur Srikanth

VDRPT                Sharmila Samarasinghe

NVPDC                -----

VDOA                  -----

**WMATA**

WMATA                Tom Harrington

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

FHWA-DC              -----

FHWA-VA              -----

FTA                    Deborah Burns

NCPC                  -----

NPS                    -----

MWAQC                -----

**COG Staff**

Ronald Kirby, DTP

Gerald Miller, DTP

Michael Clifford, DTP

Mark Pfoutz, DTP

Jane Posey, DTP

Jim Hogan, DTP

Bob Griffiths, DTP

Andrew Austin, DTP

Andrew Meese, DTP

Darren Smith, DTP

William Bacon, DTP

John Swanson, DTP

Beth Newman, DTP

Michael Eichler, DTP

Sarah Crawford, DTP

Jeff King, DEP

**Other Participants**

Jaak Pedak, Fairfax County DOT

Monica Backman, Prince William County DOT

Chris Arabia, Virginia DRPT