

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

## **TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

### **1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the May 5 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### **2. Update on the 2006 CLRP Financial Analysis**

Mr. Reno of Cambridge Systematics Inc. (CSI) briefed the Committee on a draft version of the report: "Analysis of Resources for the Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan for the Washington Region." This version reflected the review of the revenues and costs summaries at the May 27 meeting of the working group for the analysis. He said that the update of the financial analysis is based on information available as of April 19, 2006 when the TPB approved the project submissions for inclusion in the air quality conformity analysis of the 2006 CLRP and FY 2007 - 2012 TIP. He reviewed the summary forecasts of transportation revenues and expenditures for the District of Columbia, Suburban Maryland, Northern Virginia, and the region for the 24 year period from 2007 to 2030. He noted that the forecasts are in constant 2006 dollars. He said that all project cost estimates are being reviewed and updated by the agencies to reflect recent cost increases.

He said that CSI has produced place holder numbers for the Northern Virginia revenue and expenditure forecast data through 2030, and that VDOT and the Virginia jurisdictions are working to finalize the revenue and expenditure forecasts. He reviewed the data in Table 1 and explained that Table 2 presents the WMATA identified capital needs beyond the current Metro Matters funding and indicates a funding shortfall. He said that the analysis does not assume the revenues associated with the Davis Bill (\$3 billion) to be reasonably expected to be available.

Mr. Kirby said that until specific commitments are obtained for the Davis Bill funding, the \$3 billion in transit expenditures can not be assumed in the CLRP for the air quality conformity analysis, and transit ridership into and through the core area will continue to be constrained at 2010 levels for 2020 and 2030. He suggested to the Committee that because all of the revenue and expenditure data in the tables was not complete that this report not be presented to the TPB in June.

Mr. Srikanth said that he is working with the local jurisdiction staff at the Technical Committee of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) to review the VDOT revenue and expenditure forecasts. He explained the status of the review to date, but said that the estimates would probably not be completed and reviewed until the end of June.

Mr. Biesiadny commented that a lot of progress was made on this at the recent NVTA Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Kirby stated that without complete Virginia information the draft report should not go to the TPB. Mr. Srikanth suggested that the Board could be briefed on the implications of not funding all of the WMATA request because the Davis Bill is still uncertain. He noted that the VDOT six-year program was scheduled to be released in June and it would probably not affect projects in the air quality conformity analysis. Mr. Kirby said that the Board was aware the funding for the 2006 CLRP is consistent with the projects it approved in April for the air quality conformity analysis and that the funding from the Davis Bill is unresolved. Mr. Biesiadny said that the Northern Virginia members have been informed of this situation.

Mr. Rybeck said that he appreciated the hard work producing the forecasts by the Virginia agency staffs.

Mr. Kirby concluded by saying that there would only be a status report on the financial analysis at the June TPB meeting and the draft report would be presented at the July TPB meeting. He said that CSI would continue to be involved in the new fiscal year to finalize the report.

**3. Briefing on Draft Report: “An Update on the National Capitol Region’s Transportation Capital Funding Needs”**

Mr. Reno distributed copies of the initial draft report on the progress made since early 2004 in identifying resources to meet the region's unfunded transportation needs highlighted in the TPB “Time to Act” brochure. He briefed the Committee on the sections in the report that inform the public and elected and appointed officials about the transportation funding accomplishments since 2004, highlighted continuing funding challenges, and present potential long- term funding solutions. He requested members to review the information on the project accomplishments and provide him comments. Mr. Biesiadny noted that there will be new VRE cars (mentioned on page 2) in July 2006.

Mr. Mokhtari suggested providing a summary table to better show the accomplishments since 2004. Mr. Reno agreed that such a summary would be helpful.

Mr. Miller commented that growing congestion on the transit system should be highlighted. Mr. Rybeck suggested that the text on the transit capacity constraint in the draft financial analysis report could be helpful for this discussion.

Mr. Srikanth said that the challenges and options discussions were good and asked what are the next steps regarding the report.

Mr. Kirby said that we need to have a good draft of the report for presentation to the TPB in July. The Board could be interested in pursuing some of the longer-term revenue options and might want to express support to Congress and the state legislatures for them.

Mr. Mokhtari said that the numerous tables on revenue options were difficult to absorb and suggested a consolidated table or figure to help compare them.

#### **4. Update on Transportation-Land Use Incentive Programs**

Mr. Kirby introduced a PowerPoint presentation that was to be given to the TPB at the May meeting but was bumped from the agenda due to time constraints.

Mr. Rybeck sought to clarify that this was indeed a new presentation and had not already been given to the Committee at a previous meeting.

Mr. Kirby responded that the presentation built off of previous versions and contained much new material, although some present would have already seen it at the meeting of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority Technical Committee earlier in the week. He said that a modified presentation on the topic of transportation-land use incentive programs would be on the agenda for the June TPB meeting.

Referring to the PowerPoint slide show, Mr. Kirby gave the presentation, which included information about the status of coordinated transportation and land use planning, especially Transit-Oriented Development (TOD), in the Washington region. He also spoke about strategies used by MPOs in other regions to encourage such coordination and promote specific transportation projects that advance regional land use and transportation goals. He presented options for similar initiatives in this area for TPB consideration.

Mr. Owolabi asked Mr. Kirby if he had any examples of development in the Washington region that would be classified as Transit-Adjacent Development as opposed to Transit-Oriented Development.

Mr. Kirby asked DTP staff members present if they had any examples. Mr. Smith declined to name any specific examples in the area.

Ms. Hughey, referring to the same slide, suggested that getting the development community to engage in a TOD vision early on be listed as an additional challenge in the region.

Mr. Farrell, responding to Mr. Owolabi's earlier inquiry, put forward land use around the Rhode Island Ave. Metro station as an example of development activity that is not appropriate for a transit station area and not conducive to increasing Metro ridership.

Mr. Rybeck said that planning efforts around that station will lead to improvements in the coming years.

Mr. Foster, referring to the same slide, suggested adding to the list of challenges the idea that the TOD in the region easiest to do has already been done, and that many stations left that have not experienced development activity are problematic for various reasons,

including station siting issues and challenges of inter-jurisdictional coordination. He said that the next phase of TOD in the region would require an evolving approach.

Mr. Biesiadny encouraged avoiding the citation of specific locations in the region as bad examples, and suggested using only examples from outside the region in discussing the issue in future presentations and before the TPB.

Responding to Mr. Foster's point, Mr. Kirby said that earlier TOD activity may not have been viewed as easy at the time. He said that TPB staff would be working to modify the presentation and working through issues of how to apply knowledge about initiatives in other jurisdictions to circumstances in this region. He also said that the examples of TOD listed in the presentation did not constitute a complete inventory, and that such an inventory might be a first step forward.

Mr. Mokhtari suggested broadening the analysis to consider the regional activity centers and how they relate to transit stations.

Mr. Kirby responded that future presentations and discussion would be more focused on the activity centers as a foundation.

Mr. Rybeck said that he thought the list of area TOD examples was useful and not objectionable. He also said that he thought Chairman Knapp wanted a more aggressive approach that included getting the state departments of transportation to allocate money for local infrastructure that facilitates desired land use patterns, though it will be difficult to get the state agencies to do so.

Ms. Erickson said that the state DOTs likely would not be amenable to such a plan.

Mr. Rybeck suggested continuing to look to the state agencies for help. He also suggested looking at what state agencies have done as far as TOD "tool kit" information including guidance on implementation techniques at the local level.

Ms. Erickson said that rearrangement of funding from state DOTs is pretty much out of the question.

Mr. Kirby said that the process still involves a considerable amount of learning what is going on in the region, both in terms of development activity itself but also planning activity and education/promotion resources being produced by various agencies and organizations.

Mr. Srikanth said that the ATLAS report done by a consultant for VDOT is a good example of the type of "tool kit" mentioned by Mr. Rybeck, and includes information about Virginia enabling acts that allow certain local strategies.

Mr. Canizales said that he felt the discussion should be broadened to include community development and revitalization, not just TOD, since some of the region's jurisdictions don't have many TOD opportunities.

Mr. Rybeck said that TOD applies to bus service as well, and that he is aware of significant TOD successes around bus service in South American countries.

Mr. Canizales said that he assumed the South American examples were in areas with frequent bus service, which would not necessarily be applicable in this region's suburban jurisdictions.

Mr. Rybeck pointed out that Leesburg could be an example of an area where TOD attention could be focused even though it is not served by Metro. He said that concentrating development in nodes would be consistent with the original form of the city.

Mr. Canizales maintained that TOD as a concept is not applicable across the region.

Mr. Kirby said that it is important to include other transit besides Metrorail in discussions of TOD in the region.

Mr. Canizales pointed out that the TOD examples in the presentation focused on locations with Metrorail service.

Ms. Hughey suggested changing the discussion to "Transportation-Oriented Development" instead of Transit-Oriented Development, to be inclusive of bus systems as well as roads.

Mr. Canizales concurred and said it was important to make any new initiative broad enough to apply to areas of the region that are not compact.

Mr. Rybeck said that he considers the question of transit service and concentrated development to be a chicken-or-egg situation – if outer jurisdictions work to concentrate density then frequent transit service would be feasible, and if better transit service is instituted, it could make concentrated development more feasible, and that the negative is also true.

Mr. Foster said that he also thought the discussion should not be limited to "TOD" and that this region needs a broader approach to connect land use and transportation in many types of locations.

Mr. Rybeck suggested calling the issue "Pedestrian-Oriented Development".

Mr. Kirby said that TPB staff would be modifying the presentation and working to broaden as well as clarify the issue.

Mr. Biesiadny said it was important to note that the region's land use patterns are the result of many decades of development and that trends cannot be reversed quickly. He said that not all TOD is successful, and that some parts of the region are far from being able to support TOD.

**5. Update on Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region**

Mr. Kirby introduced the item and urged the Committee to provide comments in time for the June TPB meeting. Comments should be provided by June 9. Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint presentation on the draft bicycle and pedestrian plan. This plan will be presented to the Committee again at its July 7 meeting.

Mr. Biesiadny suggested that the criteria for selecting which projects are to be mapped be displayed, since clearly not all 400 projects can be mapped. Mr. Farrell replied that Chapter Six lists the criteria for mapping projects.

Mr. Mokhtari noted that slide ten implied that recreation was no longer an important justification for bicycle and pedestrian projects, though most of the example projects clearly had recreational use. He promised to change the wording of the slide so as not to downgrade the recreational aspect.

**6. Briefing on SAFETEA-LU Regulatory Requirement for a "Conformity State Implementation Plan (SIP)"**

Mr. Clifford spoke to two mailout items: 1) "Excerpts from Fact Sheets for Highway Provisions in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU)", August 23, 2005, by Federal Highway Administration; 2) "Excerpts taken from Interim Guidance for Implementing the Transportation Conformity Provisions in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU)", February 2006, Environmental Protection Agency. Jeff King of MWCOG/DEP spoke to a handout power-point presentation entitled "Conformity SIPs", for the Committee, June 2, 2006.

There was no discussion by the Committee on this topic.

**7. Update on Air Quality Planning Activities**

Mr. Clifford introduced Ms. Rohlfs of MWCOG/DEP, who then proceeded to speak from the mailout item, a memorandum from Ms. Rohlfs to MWAQC with a subject heading entitled "SIP Development Update". Ms. Rohlfs also spoke to a handout item entitled "MWAQC 8-Hour Ozone Planning Schedule". She also noted that the Draft SIP is being produced and is scheduled for completion in October, 2006, with public hearings in late October or November, 2006.

There was no discussion by the Committee on this topic.

**8. Report on the Composition of the Vehicle Fleet in the Metropolitan Washington Area – “VIN Decoder” Results**

Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee on the composition of the vehicle fleets in the region prepared using the VIN decoder software. He discussed the composition of light, and heavy duty vehicles and their age by jurisdiction. He also said that hybrid vehicles were of particular interest in the region. The region has one of the highest hybrid vehicle concentrations in the country and within the region northern Virginia came in first. He pointed out that using the VIN decoder software really helped staff perform this analysis.

**9. Review of Draft FY 2007-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Pfoutz told the Committee that no new information or changes were received since the May meeting. Mr. Beisiadny commented that Virginia was in the process of completing the update for the submissions. Mr. Mokhtari said that Prince George’s would be adding one additional project. Mr. Austin updated the Committee on the progress of the new Web based data base for submitting CLRP and TIP projects.

**10. Update on Pilot Project Using Volunteer Drivers to Enhance the Arterial Highway Congestion Monitoring Program**

Mr. Sivasailam updated the Committee on the status of the pilot project to enhance the arterial highway congestion monitoring program. He discussed the results of an evaluation of new software and hardware to be used to collect the data. In response to a question as to what time periods data will be collected he mentioned morning and evening peak periods.

The system is capable of collecting information whenever the subject vehicle is being driven and staff has not decided whether we will analyze the data from other time periods. He also discussed other issues such as the volunteers uploading the data on a daily basis versus saving the data on a memory card. Staff is investigating all options and will select the best and most effective option.

**11. Briefing On FAMPO Proposal for Allocating and Distributing FTA Formula Funds Available to the Washington Urbanized Area**

Mr. Kirby distributed materials and briefed the Committee on the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) proposal to TPB for allocating and distributing annual FTA formula funds for the portion of the Washington urbanized area within Stafford County. He distributed a map showing how the Washington urbanized area has expanded into Stafford County from 1990 to 2000. He also noted that the recent FHWA/FTA TPB planning certification review recommended that the TPB work cooperatively with FAMPO to reach a resolution on the allocation of regional transit funds.

Mr. Kirby said that the funds currently generated by the mileage-based measures in the FTA Section 5307 formula are distributed to the specific rail or bus operator that provides the route and revenue vehicle miles through agreements between designated recipients and operating agencies. He suggested that this process is fair and should be continued.

He explained that currently WMATA as the designated recipient keeps all of the funding attributable to the urbanized area population and population density in the funding formula. He said that this is the main funding issue for Stafford County, and that the same issue might be raised for Loudoun and Prince Williams Counties . In order to address this issue, the TPB will consult with WMATA and the involved jurisdictions and agencies, primarily in Virginia. He said that the formula would be run with and without the Stafford County population and density to identify the amount of funds in question.

He also said that ridership survey data from WMATA and VRE will be examined to estimate how many riders on these systems are from Stafford County.

Ms. Hugley commented that WMATA believes that the onus is on FAMPO to justify its proposal to change the allocation methodology.

Mr. Kirby concluded by saying that the TPB has the final responsibility to make the decision and the strongest rationale should be developed and documented for the position because it may be challenged.

Chair Canizales commented that there is great interest in this issue in Stafford County.

**12. Other Business**

None.

**13. Adjourn**