

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the January 7, 2005 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Status on Project Submissions for the 2005 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Kirby informed the Committee that the submissions were due today, would be summarized and mailed out next week, and released to the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) February 10, 2005. The submissions will then be presented to TPB on February 16, 2005. After a month of public comment, we will seek approval from TPB at its March 16, 2005 meeting. The Committee then discussed the topic including the following:

Mr. Srikanth distributed a handout that identified major updates from VDOT. These updates included changes to I-495 (one HOV lane in each direction to two 24 hour HOT lanes in each direction), advancement in scheduling of the Springfield interchange, and the addition of a busway along the Route 1 Corridor in Arlington and Alexandria there was considerable discussion among committee members concerning details of the beltway project, e.g., degree of access, i.e., whether barrier separated; interchange points (Tysons Corner, I-66, Springfield); state of the EIS. Any remaining details would need to be specified before network coding can proceed. Other discussion of the VDOT project list centered on the "Jefferson Davis Corridor Busway": its specific location and the operational characteristics envisioned. Arlington County staff offered to provide some additional information, including a map of the project area.

Mr. Van Dop of Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) spoke to a handout identifying FHWA's submissions. The first submission consists of constructing a Route 1 – Telegraph Road Connector Road through Fort Belvoir. Woodlawn Road and Beulah Street would be closed as part of this project. The second submission is located in the vicinity of Manassas National Battlefield Park and consists of closing US 29 and Business VA 234 within the park and widening VA 234 from two to four lanes and constructing a new four-lane VA 234 Bypass North Extension to I-66. Mr. Canizales of Prince William County mentioned that the county has not yet officially adopted these plans for Manassas National Battlefield Park vicinity.

Committee members also discussed whether WMATA's "transit constraint" in the core area would be relaxed, given the funding of "Metro Matters" and what would be the critical capacity element attributed to the constraint (platform capacity, power constraints, or number of railcars). Mr. Kirby mentioned that staff is expecting to hear from WMATA regarding the effect that this additional funding will have on the capacity constraint. All submissions will need to be submitted by next Wednesday to be included in the mailout.

Mr. Smith of Loudoun County mentioned that the county is making a significant addition to its bus fleet.

3. Briefing on the Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2005 CLRP and FY2006-2011 TIP

Mr. Clifford spoke to two items which were distributed to the Committee: the first was the Air Quality Conformity Assessment, Scope of Work, DRAFT, dated January 28, 2005, and the second was a package of materials consisting of: A) an email from MWCOG/TPB staff dated December 27, 2004 with "Particulate Matter Calculation using Mobile 6.2" as its subject and B) excerpts from the July 1, 2004 Federal Register on transportation conformity rule amendments. Mr. Clifford highlighted the primary elements of the work scope. He then briefly discussed the second information package, which addressed fine particulate matter (PM 2.5) which would be applicable in a subsequent conformity assessment, effective starting April 5, 2005.

The Committee then discussed the topic including the following: On April 5, 2005, a one-year clock begins for conducting the conformity assessment, including federal approvals. Calculations of direct particle emissions can be performed in two different ways: 1) compare build and no-build emissions or 2) reduce future years from 2002 base emissions. Staff indicated that the first option would require much more staff effort to accomplish. Before April 5, we should also receive guidance from EPA as to analysis of PM 2.5 precursors. Since conformity has not been performed on these pollutants yet, we don't know how difficult this analysis will be or if any additional TERMS will be needed.

Committee questions included: Before the April 2006 deadline, who approves the PM 2.5 analysis once the TPB has acted? (FHWA and FTA, in consultation with EPA; therefore, we need to forward our findings to FHWA and FTA in January 2006, or sooner, to give all of the federal agencies adequate time for review.); Is determination done on each particulate or the aggregate? (All nine particulates are added together to get total PM; we don't know yet if we need to do individual analysis or total aggregate analysis, but EPA's forthcoming guidance should address this.)

4. Briefing on Draft Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans as a Context for the Priority Projects Identified in the Solicitation Document

Mr. Farrell gave a PowerPoint presentation on the background for the selection of the top unfunded regional pedestrian and bicycle projects. The presentation covered information that the TPB had requested at the January meeting, including further information on selection process for the projects identified in the list, a description of regional bicycle and pedestrian projects and funding, and information on regional pedestrian activities. A copy of the list of priority unfunded projects was distributed, along with a memo discussing the selection process, and lists of bicycle and pedestrian projects in the TIP and the CLRP.

Mr. Kirby suggested that the order of topics in the presentation be reversed for the TPB, with the regional policy context to be discussed first, then specifics on the selection process for the list of priority unfunded projects. Mr. Srikanth agreed with Mr. Kirby that more of the planning and policy context was needed, and suggested that a draft of the regional bicycle plan projects be made available.

Mr. Canizales noted that according to Charts 8 and 9, the number of projects in the TIP was greater than the number in the CLRP. Mr. Miller explained that TIP projects are often pieces of CLRP projects, so the number of projects in the TIP can be greater than the number in the CLRP. He said we should probably avoid the confusion by avoiding discussion of the number of projects. Mr. Kirby suggested that we focus on funded projects, then discuss the unfunded projects.

Mr. Smith asked if we were accounting for privately funded bicycle and pedestrian projects. Mr. Farrell replied that such projects were not included in the list of TIP projects. Mr. Smith suggested that Mr. Farrell work with him to get a better picture of what was being built through developer proffers.

The Committee members suggested that we should get a more detailed breakdown of what was being spent on bicycle and pedestrian facilities as part of larger projects. Mr. Farrell replied that that was not possible with the information currently in the TIP, and given that the member jurisdictions and agencies themselves often do not break out bicycle and pedestrian costs within a larger project, it would be very difficult to gather that information on a regional basis.

Mr. Harvey suggested that the selection criteria for the priority unfunded bicycle and pedestrian project list be included in the presentation to the TPB.

5. Review of Draft FY2006 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Miller reviewed the draft UPWP document in the mailout and commented upon various sections that needed further information from the DOTs. He asked the Committee to review the narratives for the work activities for the program, which begins July 1, 2005. He said that the FY 2006 UPWP budget levels from the DOTs are still not finalized, and that the budgets may not be firm until March. He pointed out that staff is working with agency staff to specify the activities for the technical assistance programs in the District of Columbia, Virginia, and WMATA.

Mr. Miller said that the draft of the FY 2006 UPWP will be released for public comment at the February 10 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting and reviewed at the February 16 TPB meeting. The final version will be reviewed at the Technical Committee at the March 4 meeting and presented for TPB approval at the March 16 meeting.

6. Status Report on Staff Proposals for the FY2006 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

Mr. Kirby provided a status report on the FY2006 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP). A restructured draft CCWP is about 80% complete and should be sent to the state funding agencies the second week of February. TPB staff will present a draft CCWP to the TPB Technical Committee at the March 4th meeting. The goal is to have the CCWP approved by the TPB in April so that funding commitments can be obtained by the start of FY2006, July 1, 2005.

The draft FY2006 CCWP will be restructured in a manner similar to the UPWP, and reflect core program activities that are regional in scope, activities that are implemented at the local jurisdictional level, and ad-on programs that the states have an option of implementing. Mr. Kirby also addressed concerns regarding the funding formula for the Commuter Connections programs. He said that the funding formulas for the CCWP programs were created when the programs began (many of the CCWP programs were implemented in 1996 and 1997, and the regional ridematching program started in the mid 1970's) and the formulas may need to be revised. TPB staff is gathering data on employment and household trends since the Commuter Connections program began, to assist with any recalculation of funding formulas. This information will be included in the draft CCWP and provided to the state funding agencies. Also included in the draft CCWP is a comparison between Commuter Connections programs and similar programs in other metropolitan areas, such as, Atlanta, Los Angeles, and Phoenix.

7. Briefing on Goals for a Regional System of Variably-Priced Lanes

Mr. Kirby presented the background of the TPB Value Pricing Task Force, which discussed these goals for almost two years, and reported that it just achieved consensus on the set of goals in the mailout. He said that these goals were reported to the TPB at its January 19 meeting, and that the TPB would be asked to adopt them in April when the task force chair, Delegate Petzold, would be available. He noted that information on the task force and its meetings is on the TPB web site. He reported on each of the 11 goals and commented on the main points and issues addressed.

Mr. Hekimian commented that MDOT policy on its proposed express toll lanes requires everyone to pay tolls and does not have HOT lanes like VDOT is considering that allow high-occupancy vehicles not to pay tolls. Mr. Kirby said that the tolling eligibility and the use of toll revenues are important issues that the goals address. Ms. Lewis asked if there were HOT lanes where some of the toll revenues were used for transit services. Mr. Kirby said that this was the case with the HOT lanes in San Diego where lanes were converted to HOT lanes. He commented that in our region it will depend on the situation, and if new lanes are built with toll revenues it is not clear that any revenues would be left for transit services.

Mr. Replogle informed the Committee that Environmental Defense was very interested in variably-priced lanes. He said Environmental Defense had launched a joint effort with a think tank to examine how revenues on toll lanes could be optimized for supporting transit services and to explore the charging tolls on existing lanes as well as on new HOT lanes. He said that he would welcome the opportunity to work cooperatively on this topic.

Mr. Harvey commented that ability of the District of Columbia to charge tolls on its roads was unclear.

8. Briefing on Regional Travel Trends Report

Mr. Griffiths distributed a handout that presented commuting data from the 2000 Census that tabulated workers by jurisdiction of residence, jurisdiction of work, and usual means of transportation to work. He briefly described the tables in this handout and explained how these tables could be used to analyze commuting patterns in the metropolitan Washington region.

Mr. Griffiths received a couple of suggestions for adding additional data columns to these tables. He responded that there was always a trade-off between packing too much information into a single table and the ease of understanding the primary data that was being presented in the table. He added that he would take into consideration the suggestions being made to see if there was an easily comprehensible way of including these additional data items in the presentation.

Mr. Smith thanked Mr. Griffiths for his presentation and stated that this was exactly the type of information his Board was interested in receiving.

9. Briefing on DDOT Downtown Congestion Report

Mr. Harvey with the District Department of Transportation presented a PowerPoint summary of a report from the Downtown Congestion Task Force. The goal of the Task Force is to better manage congestion and to support economic development. The Task Force was divided into five topic-area committees in order to study relevant transportation issues in more detail and discuss potential strategies. Each committee was co-chaired by a member of the Council of the District of Columbia and by a private sector Task Force member. The committees met over the course of May and June to research and discuss potential strategies. In July the full Task Force met to develop recommendations that were put into a report. He presented the 25 recommendations.

Mr. Harvey said that anyone who wants a copy of the report or his PowerPoint presentation can contact him and he will mail or email a copy. Mr. Austin of COG staff said that he will post both the report and presentation on the COG Web site.

10. Other Business

Mr. Austin handed out a memo to Committee members explaining the elimination of mailing monthly materials to the Technical Committee. The last mailout will be for the March meeting and he explained how to sign up for e-mail notification that the Committee materials were posted on the COG Website.

11. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - February 4, 2005**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Damon Harvey

FEDERAL/OTHER

MARYLAND

FHWA-DC -----

Frederick Co. James Gugel
 Denis Supercznski

FTA -----

Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. David Moss
Prince George's Co. Aron Overman

NCPC Michael Weil

Rockville -----

NPS -----

M-NCPPC -----
Montgomery Co. Alexander Hekimian
Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari

MWAQC -----

COG Staff and Others

MDOT Ron Spalding
 Glen Smith
 BJ Berhanu

Ronald Kirby, COG/DTP
Gerald Miller, COG/DTP
Mike Clifford, COG/DTP
Robert Griffiths, COG/DTP
Mark Pfoutz, COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher, COG/DTP
Jill Locantore, COG/DTP
Jim Hogan, COG/DTP
Michael Freeman, COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, COG/DTP
Andrew Austin, COG/DTP
Christopher Arabia, COG/DTP
Jeff King, COG/DEP
Joan Rohlf's, COG/DEP
Sunil Kumar, COG/DEP
Randy Carroll, MDE
Jack Van Dop, FHWA
Michael Replogle, Environmental Defense
Sanjeev Malhotra, DMJM & Harris

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Maria White
Arlington Co. Nicole Lewis
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Robert Owolabi
 Mike Lake
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Arthur Smith
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
NVTC Jana Lynott
PRTC Karen Waterman
VRE -----
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT Sharmila Samarasinghe
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Lora Byala