

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the October 5, 2007 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved with clarification to statements under Item 2 and Item 8.

2. Briefing on a Proposed Amendment to the FY2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Conduct a Region-wide On-board Bus Survey

Mr. Griffiths reviewed the proposed UPWP amendment to conduct a region-wide on-board bus survey. He explained that this amendment would re-program \$300,000 in FY 2008 UPWP funds from the Household Travel Survey and \$75,000 in FY 2008 UPWP funds from a related WMATA Technical Assistance project to a new \$375,000 Supplemental Local Bus On-Board Survey UPWP project. In addition, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between WMATA and the Metropolitan Council of Governments (COG) would provide \$750,000 funding from WMATA to COG to conduct the 2008 Metrobus On-Board Survey. These two on-board bus surveys would be designed as a coordinated and complementary regional effort to be conducted by a single survey contractor managed by TPB staff.

Mr. Harrington stated that WMATA staff supported the proposed UPWP amendment and was currently working on the MOU between WMATA and COG to conduct the 2008 Metrobus Survey.

Ms. Samarasinghe asked if the scope of the on-board survey would include both publicly and privately operated bus transit service.

Mr. Griffiths responded that it would include public bus transit service operated by WMATA and local jurisdictions, but would not include privately operated commuter bus service.

Mr. Kirby asked if commuter bus service operated by the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) would be included.

Mr. Griffiths responded that MTA had just completed its own on-board survey of MTA commuter bus passengers and that MTA and TPB planned to share their respective on-board survey data with each other.

Ms. Harvey agreed that MTA and TPB staffs were working cooperatively to fit together their on-board bus survey data.

Mr. Griffiths ended his briefing by stating that the TPB Steering Committee would be acting on the proposed UPWP Amendment later that day.

3. Briefing on Proposed TPB Responses to the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's (FAMPO) Policies on Allocating and Sharing of Regional Transit Funds

Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee on revised proposed TPB responses to the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) resolutions presented to the TPB on September 20, 2006, which delineate FAMPO's policies with respect to the allocation and sharing of FTA formula funds for the Washington urbanized area. He explained that this version revised the 8/31/07 draft version of the TPB response letter that was reviewed at the October 5 Technical Committee meeting. He said that the language changes to the draft TPB response reflected the suggestions from Northern Virginia jurisdiction staff. He explained that this version would be presented as an information item to the TPB in December, and the Board would be asked to approve the letter at its January 16, 2008 meeting. He expressed his thanks to everyone who had worked with him on developing the letter.

Mr. Biesiadny thanked Mr. Kirby for his efforts in developing the letter.

4. Status Report on Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2007 Financially Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2008-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Clifford distributed an updated schedule for the conformity analysis of the 2007 CLRP. The update to the schedule reflects a month delay due to a change in the project completion date for the Virginia beltway HOT lanes. Mr. Clifford said that in a recent letter to TPB staff VDOT stated that the completion date was after 2010. He noted that staff has revised the 2010 networks to remove the HOT lane project, and that travel demand results of a re-run are currently under review. He expects that travel demand and emission results will be complete by next month. He told the group that the November TPB meeting has been cancelled.

Mr. Clifford noted that 2002, 2008, and 2009 travel demand and emissions analysis are done. For ozone pollutants we are close to the emissions budgets, but within the limits. PM2.5 and Winter CO will only be analyzed for 2010, 2020, and 2030.

Mr. Kirby noted that the Virginia beltway HOT lanes were added to the CLRP two years ago. With the addition this year of the Shirley Highway HOT lanes, it will be interesting to see the synergistic effect of the two facilities. With the VDOT update, only Shirley Highway will be in the 2010 network, and Shirley Highway and the beltway will be together in 2020 and 2030 analysis.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the beltway HOT lanes project was added in calendar year 2005 as part of the NEPA process. While the overall project EIS scope is the same, changes in details have emerged as detailed design drawings are being developed. Mr. Srikanth also noted that there is an added complication with the role of the private sector in this private/public project.

5. Review of Draft 2007 CLRP Documentation and Draft FY 2008-2013 TIP

Ms. Klancher described the schedule for documenting the 2007 CLRP and the two main products: the CLRP website and the accompanying brochure. She stated that this year there is more documentation to do because of the new Federal regulations and new elements in the Plan. When the Plan, TIP and air quality conformity determination is

released for public comment, currently scheduled for December 13, 2007, a draft website and short brochure will also be released. The short brochure will include descriptions and maps of the proposed new projects, maps of the entire plan for transit, HOV, highway and studies and information on how to comment on the plan.

After TPB adopts the plan (scheduled for January 16), the website will be complete and final, with the longer brochure released by February 1, 2007.

Mr. Austin presented the draft website to the Committee and walked through the menu items and structure.

Mr. Srikanth asked if the project listings in the Plan documentation were taken from the CLRP or the conformity table. Mr. Austin said that the major project listings include regionally significant projects in the CLRP and include segmented completion dates as per the conformity table. He added that a new feature that would be introduced to the web site in early 2008 was a searchable database of CLRP and TIP projects.

Mr. Shrestha asked what would happen if projects were withdrawn from the CLRP. Mr. Austin responded that a withdrawn project can be incorporated into any briefing on significant changes during any project submission cycle.

Ms. Klancher commented that several CLRP projects had been identified that show costs significantly below the amounts that have been reported in recent press articles. She emphasized that revised costs were needed for these projects. Mr. Austin said these costs should be updated in the iTIP database application.

Mr. Austin then turned to the Draft FY 2008-2013 TIP. He discussed the changes since the last draft, which included a summary of new, delayed and completed projects and a more complete Financial Analysis section. He said that December 3 would be the final deadline for any changes to be incorporated into the draft for the December 7 Technical Committee meeting. This would be the last draft the Committee would see before the TIP was released for public comment. Mr. Rawlings noted that DDOT staff was still continuing to review and edit data. Mr. Shrestha noted that MDOT/SHA was having some difficulty pinning down sources for funding the ICC, but said they should have that information by December.

Ms. Klancher asked the Committee to review the summary text of how the CLRP meets all the Federal requirements and asked for comments by November 16, 2007.

6. Review of Draft TPB Procedures for Processing Revisions to the CLRP and TIP

Mr. Miller noted that at the October 5 meeting, he had reviewed the final planning regulations that require TPB to document its procedures for an administrative modification or an amendment to the CLRP and TIP between scheduled periodic updates. He noted that the TPB procedures must also be consistent with DDOT, MDOT and VDOT procedures. He briefly reviewed the draft procedures. He pointed out that the main distinction in the procedures is in the definition of the funding limitations that qualify for an administrative modification as adopted by DDOT, MDOT and VDOT for their respective state transportation improvement programs (STIPs).

Mr. Rawlings commented that DDOT has submitted its definition of the funding limitations that define an administrative modification for its STIP to FHWA and is waiting for a response.

Mr. Weissburg asked what other MPOs are doing regarding these procedures. Ms. Erickson replied that the Baltimore MPO is using similar language.

Mr. Kirby commented that the criteria is different from state to state and reflects the STIP administrative modification procedures adopted by each DOT and its FHWA Division.

7. Review of Draft Agreement Between TPB, State DOTs and Public Transit Operators on Metropolitan Transportation Planning Responsibilities in the Washington Region

Mr. Miller explained that the final federal transportation planning regulations require that the metropolitan planning organization (MPO), the states and the public transportation operators have a written agreement that identifies their responsibilities for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process. He explained that this version of the MOU essentially describes the current responsibilities of TPB, state DOTs and public transportation operators for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process and does not create new ones. He said that the transit operators were briefed on the earlier version of the MOU at their October Regional Bus Planning Subcommittee meeting.

Mr. Miller said that he had contacted staff at FTA headquarters to discuss the requirement and had reviewed copies of agreements from three other areas. He summarizes the changes in the revised draft MOU that reflected this information dated November 2. He referred to the addition of the third WHEREAS, which was in response to a transit agency staff member's concern about the MOU's affecting an agency's legal authority. He explained an expanded description (in Article 2 on pages 2-3) of how the planning responsibilities for transit operators are covered by participating in the Regional Bus Subcommittee. He pointed out that all of the separate signature pages in the previous version were removed, and replaced with a page for the signatories that said "This MOU is approved by the respective parties as of the date shown above."

Mr. Kirby explained that this MOU is a SAFTEA-LU planning requirement that the TPB needs to meet when it adopts the new CLRP and TIP in January. He suggested that the Technical Committee review and endorse the next version on December 7. The TPB would then be asked at its December 19 meeting to transmit the MOU to the agencies for signatures by the January 16, 2008 TPB meeting.

Mr. Miller reported that a preliminary legal review of the earlier draft by MDOT and VDPT did not identify any problems.

Ms. Samarasinghe said a preliminary legal review by the DRPT of the earlier draft also did not raise any problems. She said that the new sections would have to be reviewed.

Ms. Harvey said that she would ask for a review of the draft MOU by MTA legal staff.

Mr. Biesiadny commented on who can sign for the transit operators, and expressed concern that local bus operators were being asked to become involved in federal regulations, even though the regulations only involve regional planning.

Mr. Kirby said that the real purpose of the requirement is to make sure that MPOs consult with transit operators and this happens quite well in this region. He said that staff would contact FTA headquarters staff again to explore the requirements for an MOU, and then try to simplify the transit operator text in the next draft. This draft would be sent to the Committee members at least a week before the December 7 meeting.

8. Congestion Management Process (CMP)

Mr. Meese introduced his staff working on the CMP, Ms. Wellman, and referred to a PowerPoint presentation. In addition, he referred to a mailout item containing the draft components of the CLRP, to be viewed as several web pages, intended to fit into the CLRP website presented earlier on today's agenda.

The draft components of the CMP were outlined in detail in the presentation, including the process, subcommittees providing CMP input, schedule, and outlook. Mr. Meese noted that the CMP is driven in part by the federal regulations and in order to be SAFETEA-LU compliant, a CMP must be a part of the CLRP.

Mr. Biesiadny asked if project submission forms will change to include information on what regional congestion management goals projects are addressing. Mr. Meese stated that the form already contains a question on congestion management, and that it is mainly a matter of documenting strategies considered and/or implemented in the proposed project. Mr. Srikanth agreed, noting that the CMP form has always been a part of the project submission form, but adding that the Travel Management Subcommittee has discussed re-visiting the exemption criteria to determine which projects in the CLRP need CMP forms and which ones do not.

In response to a question from Ms. Erickson, it was agreed to include the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program as providing input on the CMP.

Mr. Shrestha stated that the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) has some monitoring programs and hopes staff can work with them to include that information. Mr. Meese agreed, and stated the need to follow up with all agencies, find out what types of monitoring efforts are going on, and compile this information.

Mr. Mokhtari, referring to the top congested locations map, stated that though it is easy to see impacts of strategies on large scale projects, such as highways with new capacity, he questioned the possibility of examining the impacts of region-wide demand management strategies on smaller-scale situations (like bottlenecks, for example).

Mr. Meese responded that it is challenging to compile information for areas other than freeways because there is no comprehensive data set. Analyzing this type of information may be more qualitative than quantitative in nature, and may involve grouping situations into kinds of congestion and the types of strategies used to address it.

Mr. Kirby added that the overall philosophy of the CMP is that new capacity should not be added until all possible CMP strategies – demand and operational - have been considered. Once all of those strategies have been exhausted, capacity can be added, so long as that new capacity is managed effectively with demand and operational strategies. He agreed that we need to discuss further the difference between large-scale

projects on freeways, and smaller projects on arterials, and whether there is a threshold for projects that need to consider CMP strategies.

Mr. Srikanth further noted that when filling out the project submission forms, any public transportation or secondary road projects can be alluded to in order to explain what congestion management strategies are being implemented. The Travel Management Subcommittee is currently discussing these issues, and Mr. Meese encouraged everybody to attend those meetings to participate in CMP process development.

Mr. Biesiadny asked if these federal guidelines still apply to added capacity projects that completely use non-federal funds. Mr. Kirby referred to the federal regulations, which state that federally-funded projects must be addressed in a CMP. Non-federally-funded projects appear not to be subject to that requirement. However, even though a major project may not use federal funds initially, federal funds may be used on the facility in the future, making it advisable to address CMP requirements even if it is not initially federally funded. What is important is to make a determination between those projects that are significant capacity increasing projects and those that are not and make a good argument that the development of those projects appropriately considered congestion management strategies.

Mr. Meese asked for any comments on the draft CMP components to be sent to him by November 27.

9. Environmental Consultation and Mitigation Discussion

Ms. Bansal provided a PowerPoint presentation on the first year of the Environmental Consultation Process and the draft environmental maps that resulted from the process. She reviewed the new federal regulations that require consultation with environmental agencies on the development of the long-range plan and the comparison of the plan with inventories of natural and historic resources. Ms. Bansal then reviewed the TPB's initial efforts to comply with these new requirements, which in this first year focused on establishing contact with environmental agencies and sharing of information, such as GIS data. Maps showing comparing environmental plans with the transportation plan were presented as the initial product of this consultation.

Some Committee members inquired on the availability of more data for their jurisdictions or staff contacts for further consultation efforts. There were also comments regarding possible errors in transportation project shapes or descriptions. Ms. Bansal acknowledged that the maps are in a draft stage and that the project shapes are still being edited with updated information.

10. Transportation Safety Planning

Mr. Farrell spoke to both a PowerPoint presentation and a mailout item highlighting the transportation safety web pages for the CLRP. He outlined the federal regulations for transportation safety, as it is a federally-required element of the CLRP and very critical in reaching the region's transportation goals. Two meetings had been held to explore safety planning in the region, a Regional Safety Forum on June 6 with representatives from state DOTs, as well as a follow-up meeting on July 31. A TPB Transportation Safety Subcommittee is currently being formed, and will begin regular meetings. Representatives from member jurisdictions are encouraged to participate. Mr. Farrell noted that safety planning is relevant to the work of several TPB subcommittees and

program areas, including the CMP, management and operations, traffic signals, bicycle and pedestrian program, bus planning, and freight planning, among others.

In response to a question on the role of public health in the future Transportation Safety Subcommittee, Mr. Farrell stated that public health and emergency response agencies are encouraged to participate. He also noted that some safety issues could benefit from coordination at the regional level (such as regional media campaign), yet other issues (such as drivers licensing issues) are better addressed at the local or federal level.

Mr. Farrell referred to attendance lists, attached to the handouts, which provide information on who has participated in the June 6 Safety Forum and the July 31 Safety Stakeholders meeting.

In response to a question from Mr. Biesiadny, it was agreed that an email will be sent out to the Technical Committee regarding the formation of the Transportation Safety Subcommittee, inviting Technical Committee members to identify or designate persons from their agencies who will participate on the new subcommittee.

11. Update of the CLRP Financial Plan

Mr. Miller briefly explained how the revenue and cost estimates in constant 2006 dollars in the financial plan for the 2006 can be updated to reflect year of expenditure (YOE) dollars for the 2007 CLRP, as required by the final planning regulations. He said that he reviewed the forecasting methodologies and spread sheets prepared by most of the implementing agencies, and then developed factors based upon an annual inflation rate of 3.5 percent to convert the constant dollars in the summary tables for the 24 year period into YOE dollars.

He distributed Table 1 from the financial analysis of the 2006 CLRP showing the revenue forecast totals in constant 2006 dollars and a draft of the same table showing the revenues in YOE dollars. He also distributed Table 2 with the expenditures in constant dollars and the same table with the expenditures in year of expenditure dollars.

Ms. Harvey commented that the name of the Bi-County Transitway project shown in Table 2 should be changed to the Purple Line.

12. Status Report on Work Activities for the State Implementation Plans (SIP) For Fine Particulate matter (PM2.5)

Mr. Clifford distributed a handout, which consisted of a memo from him to the TPB Technical Committee with two attached data charts summarizing the draft mobile source emissions inventory results for the PM2.5 SIP. He noted on the first attachment, a bar chart showing direct emissions, that the blue bars show base year emissions and the purple bars show uncontrolled and controlled emissions for 2009. The differences in the 2009 emissions are the reductions being credited in the SIP. The second attachment is similar and shows precursor emissions. Mr. Clifford noted that mobile source emissions budgets will be developed for only direct PM2.5 and precursor NOx. He then asked Mr. Kumar of COG/DEP to speak to the overall SIP work program.

Mr. Kumar said that the deadline for the PM2.5 SIP submission is April 5, 2008. He outlined the SIP schedule, stating that the draft report is scheduled to go to MWAQC on November 14th, that a date will be announced in January for a February public hearing, that the report will be sent to the states and IAQC in March, and that the report will be sent to EPA on April 5th.

Mr. Kirby indicated that he hoped that TPB staff would get to review the measures in the voluntary bundle. Mr. Kumar responded that that would be no problem.

Mr. Srikanth noted that MWAQC is still working on contingency measures, and that the 2010 mobile budgets may be proposed. Mr. Kumar indicated that other sources are being looked at also.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the mobile budgets are usually set at the level of the inventory, but that there has been discussion of providing a safety margin to account for the uncertainty of input data changes. He asked if there would be possible input data changes. Mr. Clifford suggested that land-use changes and model revisions are typical. He also noted that there is usually an understanding that TERMS are available to provide additional emissions benefits, if necessary.

Mr. Srikanth asked if there are any scheduled registration data updates. Mr. Sivasailam responded that updates would be made in July, 2008. Mr. Clifford noted that there is a large margin of time between when the vehicle registration data are collected, and when they are ready for use in the model. Mr. Srikanth suggested that a safety margin should be provided. Mr. Kirby noted that other regions have safety margins, and that it would be good for this region, too.

13. Other Business

None.

14. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - November 2, 2007**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
 Anna Chamberlin

MARYLAND

Charles County Tony Chinere
Frederick Co. John Thomas
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. David Moss
Prince George's Co. Vic Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. Eric Graye
 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhari
MDOT
 Shiva Shrestra
 Del Harvey
 Scott Harris
 Patrick Fleming
 Lyn Erickson

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Maria White
Arlington Co. Rich Viola
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny
 Robert Owolabi
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Art Smith
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Monica Backmon
NVTC -----
PRTC Anthony Foster
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT Sharmilla Samarasinghe
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Tom Harrington

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
FHWA-VA -----
FTA Deborah Burns
NCPC -----
NPS -----
MWAQC -----

COG Staff

Ronald Kirby, DTP
Michael Clifford, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Jim Hogan, DTP
Monica Bansal, DTP
Bob Griffiths, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Erin Morrow, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Melanie Wellman, DTP
William Bacon, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Eulalie Lucas, DTP
Greg Goodwin, HSPPS
Sunil Kumar, DEP

Other Participants

Shirley Williams, FEMA-DHS
Jaak Pedak, FCDOT
Jim Gugel, Frederick County