

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

## **TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

### **1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the April 7 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

### **2. Review of Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region**

Mr. Meese referred to copies of the revised draft plan and an associated presentation. The draft plan had first been presented to the Technical Committee at its April 7, 2006 meeting. He suggested that Committee members review the new draft since it was significantly revised. Today's presentation highlighted changes made to the draft plan since the April 7 presentation, as well as providing a first cut of the proposed presentation to go to the Board on May 17.

Mr. Meese reviewed the changes made to the draft plan since April 7 including updates and corrections throughout the text, a newly-written executive summary, a revised Chapter 5 describing the overview of project listings in this plan with an associated revised updated project list (Appendix A), as well as new and revised maps. He suggested that the Committee members review project listings for their jurisdictions, and discuss any questions or concerns with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee representative from their jurisdiction. This was to ensure that all staff from a given jurisdiction are in agreement on what should or should not be in the listings.

Mr. Meese said that the review schedule was for the first presentation of the draft plan to the TPB on May 17. The draft plan would be formally released for public comment on June 15, the date of the June Citizens Advisory Committee meeting. This schedule would allow for ample time for reviews by the TPB Technical Committee and the Citizens Advisory Committee, with TPB final approval of the plan on July 19. An on-line version of the plan was to be produced subsequent to the approved print version.

Mr. Mokhtari asked about project prioritization and whether projects could be characterized as short-term, medium-term, and long-term. Mr. Sebastian, former Chairman of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, noted that the subcommittee left prioritization of the projects for the jurisdictions to decide for themselves. However, the Subcommittee annually does bring a priority list ("Top Ten") for consideration in development of the TIP. Mr. Meese noted that plan listings indicate whether a project was already in the CLRP and TIP. Mr. Kirby noted that the Subcommittee has identified criteria for recommending projects such as regional connectivity that are discussed with the Top Ten lists.

In response to a comment from Mr. Biesiadny, Mr. Meese noted that staff would look at adding relevant information such as project limits to Table 5-3 beginning on Page 5-9 of

the draft plan, which was the key for those projects that appeared in the maps in Figures 5-1 to 5-4.

Mr. Owolabi asked about facilities that would support suburb-to-suburb travel. Mr. Meese noted a number of projects in the plan that were lengthy given that they were bicycle or pedestrian facilities. Mr. Sebastian noted that the Subcommittee had focused on connectivity to regional activity centers.

Mr. Sebastian suggested that some photos be included in the presentation to add interest. It was also agreed to note the specific percentage of walk access to transit. Mr. Kirby noted that criteria such as regional connectivity was something that could be highlighted for the Board. TPB has a strong interest in bicycle and pedestrian issues.

During this discussion, it was determined that there were errors in the project identifications and numbering in Table 5-3, the key to the maps in Figures 5-1 to 5-4. Mr. Meese agreed to look into the problem, and provide a corrected Table 5-3 by email to Committee members the following week.

Mr. Biesiadny noted that due to a recent change, Fairfax County's listing for Bicycle Planner FTEs in Table 1-4 on Page 1-11 should be changed from 0.5 to 1, since the county now has a full-time bicycle planner.

In response to a question from Mr. Canizales, Mr. Meese noted that any comments on the draft plan or presentation that were received by close of business on Tuesday, May 9 might be incorporated into the draft sent to the Board for May 17. Mr. Kirby noted that there was an extra month for review and that this time could be used by Committee members for additional review and comment.

In response to a question from Ms. Erickson, it was noted that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee was longstanding and would remain active even after completion of the plan. Mr. Kirby noted that it was good to let people know how much good work was going on at TPB in this area.

In response to a question from Mr. Canizales, Mr. Meese noted that it was up to each jurisdiction whether bicycle and pedestrian projects from the Northern Virginia 2030 Plan were included in this plan. Mr. Austin noted that a number of them were in the plan, and they were easily identified, indicated by the Project ID of "XL".

In response to a comment from Mr. Mokhtari on differing map legends, these legends were to be made consistent to say "TPB members".

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

Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee on the status of the financial analysis for the plan, which was based upon the May 2 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 explained that Cambridge Systematics Inc (CSI), working closely with the state and local transportation agencies, has prepared draft 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. The estimates are in constant 2006 dollars. He noted 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 by May 30 assuming no new revenues from the state legislature. He noted that the financial analysis should be completed by June 30 when the CSI contract ends. The 2006 CLRP, including the financial plan, is scheduled to be released for public comment on September 14 and to be adopted on October 18.

Mr. Kirby explained that while WMATA has identified its capital needs beyond the current Metro Matters funding, the 2006 financial analysis does not assume the revenues associated with the Davis Bill (\$3 billion) to be reasonably expected to be available. Until specific commitments are obtained for this funding, the \$3 billion in transit expenditures will not be included and transit ridership into and through the core area will continue to be constrained at 2010 levels for 2020 and 2030.

Mr. Srikanth commented that he had recently received the revenue projections from VDOT Richmond, and that he would work with the local jurisdictions to prepare revenue and expenditure forecasts. Ms. Erickson said that MDOT would like to receive WMATA information reflecting the removal of the \$3 billion in expenditures.

Mr. Kirby said that WMATA staff would be asked to provide all of the jurisdictions this information.

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

Mr. Kirby reviewed for the Committee the briefing he gave to the Board on April 19 on how the TPB could support the promising longer-run land use and transportation strategies that have been identified in the TPB Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. He said that at the May 17 TPB meeting he would present three approaches for the Board to consider. The first approach would be to conduct a regional level planning

study under the TPB Unified Planning Work Program to specify locations for promising land use initiatives such as transit oriented development (TOD) and supporting transportation investments. The second approach would be to implement a program similar to the Philadelphia MPO program, with a regional project selection committee to review the applications for planning studies in specific locations to help implement promising land use and transportation incentives. The project planning funding would be pre-divided among the states and the District. The third approach would expand the project funding to include planning activities and transportation capital, such as in the San Francisco MPO program. He commented that it would be logical to do the regional planning scan first and then consider moving toward the development of a new incentive program with state-level funding. He asked for comments and suggestions from the Committee and indicated that a specific recommendation on how to proceed would be made by July.

Mr. Foster said that Prince George's County has a strategic plan for TOD and is looking at ways to provide effective incentives. He commented that to provide incentives regionally will need both a focus on revitalization like in Philadelphia and on managing growth like in San Francisco all the while recognizing market forces. Ms. Ashby suggested that TPB staff make a presentation on this topic at the NVT Technical Committee.

Mr. Rybeck supported a program that is not too timid and addresses the regional concerns such as more affordable housing in the region and more development near transit. It will have to deal with residents concerns about higher densities and describe what is good for the region and for neighborhoods. He suggested providing more information on how Arlington County accomplished its TOD. Ms. Ashby said that several examples are needed. Mr. Foster commented that development such as was planned and implemented in Arlington County took many years of political commitment and that counties with term limits for elected leaders face real challenges.

## **5. Report on the TPB Community Leadership Institute**

Mr. Swanson presented a PowerPoint briefing on the TBP Community Leadership Institute, which was held on April 26 and 29. Twenty participants attended the two-day workshop. The Institute curriculum included discussion of transportation/land use coordination and transportation project development. He said the event was successful because the participants were carefully selected, the workshops achieved a good balance between presentations and activities, and the event was expertly facilitated by former TPB Chairman Peter Shapiro. He emphasized that the event was a pilot and would be repeated in the future.

A Committee member asked whether the Institute had included representatives from the Spanish-speaking community.

Mr. Swanson said that one representative from a Spanish-speaking community was included. He agreed that efforts should be taken to increase representation from those communities in the future.

Mr. Foster said it is important to follow up with these community leaders and keep them engaged.

Mr. Biesiadny said he would have liked to have received a more extensive briefing on the Institute before it took place. He said he was contacted at the last minute to identify participants and he found it frustrating that he did not really know much about it.

Mr. Canizales agreed with Mr. Biesiadny, noting that he also had been asked at the last minute to help identify participants.

Mr. Swanson said that there had been some difficulty in identifying appropriate community leaders from Virginia to participate. He agreed that this process should be done better in the future.

Mr. Ashby asked for a list of participants.

Mr. Swanson said the list would be provided.

Mr. Griffiths said that the feedback from the event sounded almost too positive. He asked if participants expressed frustration about the lack of progress in transportation.

Mr. Swanson said the Institute was not designed to solicit input, but rather to give community leaders an understanding about how they can get involved in decision-making to address some of the frustrations they have.

Mr. Kirby emphasized that the Institute was a pilot. He said a key to its success was the facilitation techniques use by Mr. Shapiro. He underscored the point that the Institute was not designed to directly influence decision-making, but rather to educate community leaders on how to get involved in decision-making.

## **6. Update on Air Quality Planning Activities**

Mr. Sivasailam discussed the memorandum from Mr. Clifford addressed to the Committee. The first item he discussed was the completion of the vehicle identification number (VIN) decoding to develop the necessary input files for the Mobile 6 model and he referred to detailed memorandums. Next he discussed the sensitivity analysis of a seasonal versus monthly approach in estimating annual emissions inventories, and the results have been reviewed by the three state air agencies who have agreed with the staff recommendation to pursue a seasonal approach. However, the District of Columbia has requested some additional data which have been provided and are shown as an attachment to the memorandum. The third item he discussed was changes to the land use

to be used in the upcoming conformity assessment of the Plan and the TIP. Round 7.0a incorporates changes that are forecast due to the new baseball stadium. He also mentioned that Baltimore Metropolitan Council's latest forecasts, Round 6B would be used in the conformity analysis. The fourth item he discussed was the SIP schedule and work activities underway to support the SIP schedule.

In response to a question from Mr. Owolabi from Fairfax County as to why the employment numbers in the District of Columbia went down, Mr. Desjardin replied that the stadium site was planned to support mixed use development and the new employment projected for the site since the stadium approval is different and lower due to less space available for employment.

Mr. Biesiadny asked whether we would have emissions problems like we encountered with the sudden increase in SUV population. Mr. Sivasailam replied that since the interagency consultation procedure in place requires updating the registration data base once every three years and because we have instituted the use of VIN decoder software, a standard procedure is in place to develop registration information for the Mobile 6 model we do not anticipate encountering a similar problem. Mr. Kirby also reiterated that the update to the 2002 registration information showed a big increase in SUV population compared to the 1990 vehicle population and we are one of the first regions to use the VIN decoder.

#### **7. Review of the Draft Preliminary FY 2007-2012 Transportation Improvement**

Mr. Pfoutz distributed the draft FY 2007-2012 Transportation Improvement Program. He explained that not all jurisdictions had submitted updated projects. Mr. Srikanth said that VDOT was still working on their project submissions, and he was not sure they would be ready by the June Technical Committee meeting. Mr. Moss asked when transit operating should be submitted. Mr. Pfoutz answered that if the information was ready, it should be submitted. He also asked that any changes be submitted by May 19.

Mr. Austin explained that the web based data base was still being populated with projects and hoped that it would be up and running within two weeks. He told the Committee members that training would follow as soon as the data base was ready.

#### **8. Status Report on Pilot Project Using Volunteer Drivers to Enhance the Arterial Highway Congestion Monitoring Program**

Mr. Sivasailam recapped the pilot project and explained that staff has been testing different hardware, has selected a new GPS system and has been testing it in the field with updated software. He said he would continue to provide periodic updates on the status of the project.

**9. Briefing on Federal Guidance on Annual Listing of TIP Projects with Federal Obligations**

Mr. Miller reviewed the recent FTA/FHWA guidance that requires the DOTs, WMATA and the TPB in a cooperative effort to prepare an annual listing of projects for which federal funds have been obligated in the preceding fiscal year. SAFTEA-LU like TEA-21 requires this listing to be published or otherwise made available for public review and to be consistent with the funding categories in the TIP. He described the key terms and concepts in the statutory language and pointed out the important frequently asked questions.

Mr. Miller also described the latest (March 2005) TPB annual listing which has been produced since 2002 as required by TEA-21. He said that the new guidance calls for the the project information in the obligation listing to be linked directly to the project information in the TIP. He said that TPB staff will work with staff at the DOTs and WMATA to more directly relate the project listings and funding information. He commented that the annual TIP is a funding eligibility document showing multi-phase project funding. Each year, the costs and funding categories for many projects in the TIP are revised. He said that because of the time lag (of sometimes years) between when a phase of project funding is programmed in the TIP and when it is obligated, it is often difficult to connect the project funding information so it can be meaningfully interpreted.

In response to Ms. Erickson, Mr. Miller said that TPB staff requests this information from the DOTs in the Fall and produces the listing in the Spring.

**10. Other Business**

None.

**11. Adjourn**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - May 5, 2006**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                      Rick Rybeck

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

**MARYLAND**

Frederick Co.            -----  
Gaithersburg            -----  
Montgomery Co.        David Moss  
Prince George's Co.    Aaron Overman  
Rockville                -----  
M-NCPPC  
  Montgomery Co.        Eric S. Graye  
  Prince George's Co.    Faramarz Mokhtari  
                                Harold Foster

FHWA-DC                -----  
FHWA-VA                -----  
  
FTA                      Deborah Burns  
  
NCPC                     Michael Weil  
  
NPS                        -----  
  
MWAQC                  Deirdre Elvis Peterson

MDOT                    Lyn Erickson  
                                Shiva Shrestha  
                                Ian Beam

**COG Staff and Others**

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria              -----  
Arlington Co.          Tamera Ashby  
City of Fairfax         Alexis Verzosa  
Fairfax Co.             Tom Biesiadny  
                                Robert Owolabi  
  
Falls Church            -----  
Loudoun Co.             -----  
Manassas                -----  
Prince William Co.     Rick Canizales  
NVTC                     -----  
PRTC                     Anthony Foster  
VRE                      Christine Hoeffner  
VDOT                    Kanathur Srikanth  
VDRPT                  -----  
NVPDC                  -----  
VDOA                    -----

Ronald Kirby, COG/DTP  
Gerald Miller, COG/DTP  
Mark Pfoutz, COG/DTP  
Michael Freeman, COG/DTP  
Andrew Meese, COG/DTP  
Daivamani Sivasailam, COG/DTP  
Bob Griffiths, COG/DTP  
Dusan Vuksan, COG/DTP  
Jane Posey, COG/DTP  
Andrew Austin, COG/DTP  
Clara Reschorsky, COG/DTP  
William Bacon, COG/DTP  
Greg Goodwin, COG/HSPPS  
Keisha Ransome, COG/DTP  
Jeff King, COG/DEP  
Sumil Kumar, COG/DEP  
Jim Sabastian, DDOT  
Takumi Yamamoto, Japanese Ministry of  
                                Transportation  
Harriet Dietz, Land Design  
Josh Bennett, City of Alexandria  
Harry Sanders, Action Committee for Transit

**WMATA**

WMATA                    Kristin Haldeman