

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the December 7, 2007 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Update 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 the summary report on the conformity assessment. He noted that the public comment period ends on January 12th, and that staff will provide comments and responses when the report goes to the TPB. He indicated that staff had been doing quality assurance checking since the original release of the report, and that some minor technical corrections, resulting in a change of about a tenth of a ton in 2030, are reflected in the updated report. Mr. Clifford noted that some comments may be generated when the report goes to MWAQC TAC at its upcoming meeting.

Mr. Rawlings asked if there were any comments to date. Mr. Clifford responded that there were none.

Mr. Kirby noted that CAFÉ standards are law now, and that if we can quantify the benefits of these we could use them, but that we would probably not do anything until EPA approves methods for using them.

Mr. Clifford agreed, saying that we are obliged to use EPA's Mobile model. He noted that EPA is currently focused on the development of their new model, MOVES.

Mr. Kirby mentioned that climate change and greenhouse gases are becoming bigger issues. He noted that mobile sources produce about 30 percent of greenhouse gas emissions and reminded the group that there is a climate change steering committee at COG. He reported that current projections are for a 48 percent increase in emissions by 2030, but that with CAFÉ standards the increase would be 16 percent. He noted that we will be able to include CAFÉ benefits in the baseline.

Mr. Srikanth asked if we could reflect the manual calculations of CAFÉ benefits as we do for other pollutants' TERM analysis. Mr. Kirby replied that it was possible, but that we should probably wait for EPA guidance. Mr. Srikanth suggested that since we know we are likely to be required to do it in the future, that we should start looking at it now. Mr. Kirby said he would make a note about it. Mr. Clifford remarked that the current analysis method developed by our consultant includes many assumptions which would have to be verified against the new law. He noted that there are 28 vehicle types in the mobile model, and that only some of them affect greenhouse gas emissions. He recommended waiting until the Feds produce guidance before attempting more analysis.

3. Update on Draft 2007 CLRP Documentation and Draft FY 2008-2013 TIP

Ms. Klancher updated the Committee on the Draft 2007 CLRP Documentation. A draft brochure has been produced and was distributed at the meeting. The CLRP website is live and has more information than what is contained in the brochure. Ms. Klancher

stated that after the TPB adopts the plan, staff will work on analyzing the performance of the plan and add that information to both the brochure and the website. Staff hopes to have the 2007 CLRP documentation complete in February. The Committee had no comments or questions about the CLRP documentation.

Mr. Austin stated that about eight public comments on the draft 2007 CLRP and TIP have been received so far. A draft TIP was distributed and Mr. Austin briefly reviewed the TIP. He encouraged members to review major project data to ensure that we have the most up to date information. Mr. Foster asked about the cycle for the next TIP, and Mr. Austin replied that would be discussed in another agenda item.

4. Update on Agreement Between TPB, State DOTs and Public Transit Operators on Metropolitan Transportation Planning Responsibilities in the Washington Region

Mr. Miller explained that the TPB on December 19 was briefed on the MOU between it, the DOTs and the public transportation operators that identifies their responsibilities for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process. He said that the Board authorized the chair to send copies to the appropriate official at the state DOT and public transit agencies for execution. He said that the signatures are expected to be received by the January 16 TPB meeting. Mr. Miller thanked the members of the Committee who helped him with the MOU.

5. Update on TPB Procedures for Processing Revisions to the CLRP and TIP

Mr. Miller explained that the TPB was briefed on the draft TPB procedures for an administrative modification or an amendment to the CLRP and TIP between scheduled periodic updates on December 19. He said that the Board will be asked to adopt them at its January 16 meeting.

6. Update on Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2008 CLRP and FY 2009-2014 TIP

Mr. Kirby reviewed the schedule for the development of the 2008 CLRP and FY 2009-2014 TIP and said January 11 is the deadline for project submissions for inclusion in the air quality conformity assessment. On January 16, the Board will be asked to release the project submissions and draft air quality conformity assessment scope of work for a public comment period that will end February 15. He said that the TPB mailout will be on January 10 and that a supplemental mailout will be made with the project submissions. He asked the representatives of the transportation agencies to report on the major projects proposed for the 2008 CLRP and FY 2009-2014 TIP.

Mr. Srikanth distributed a draft air quality conformity table which highlighted the proposed project submissions for Northern Virginia. He said that this was not a final version but included all of the new projects. He then reviewed the projects associated with the BRAC actions at Quanico and the Fort Belvoir and EPG sites, the new projects with new funding selected by the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA), and the various ramp and design changes to the I-495 HOT Lane Project in the 2007 CLRP.

Mr. Van Dop described the BRAC projects and their funding sources. Mr. Kirby asked about the BRAC jobs forecast at the EPG site. Mr. Goodwin said that the Round 7.1 Cooperative Forecast has some of these jobs at a Springfield site. Mr. Van Dop said that the current EA was looking at where 3,000 jobs would go but he was not sure when

the decision would be made. Mr. Kirby commented that a Round 7.1a could be considered for updating a few traffic zone forecasts.

Mr. Kirby noted that it appears that all of the BRAC related projects are included in this submission. Mr. Biesiadny said that these are the projects that are funded but not all of the projects that are needed. Mr. Srikanth noted that the Fairfax County Parkway was not going to be built to its full lanes by 2011 because there was not enough funding now.

Ms. Haldeman inquired why the park-and-ride lot at the EPG site was not funded with BRAC DOD funding. Mr. Biesiadny said that the DOD funding is for highway improvements.

Mr. Biesiadny acknowledged all of the Northern Virginia staff who worked hard to get all of the project information to VDOT.

Ms. Erickson explained that the state legislature had identified \$400 million per year in new revenues this past November, which includes \$250 million for system preservation and \$150 million for expansion projects statewide. She said that MDOT would not be able to provide project information until January 15. She commented that there would be no change to the transit projects.

Mr. Moss said that he did not anticipate any Montgomery County project changes that would affect conformity.

Mr. Mokhtari said that he also did not anticipate any Prince George's County project changes.

Mr. Rawlings said that there were no changes to the District's highway projects and that two of the transit projects would change their date of completion.

Mr. Kirby said that staff needs the project description sheets to prepare a presentation on the new projects for the TPB meeting on January 16. The Board will be asked to release the project information for public comment. Ms. Posey said that she would e-mail the conformity table with all of the proposed project changes to the Committee on Tuesday January 8th and would need any corrections by noon on the 10th.

Mr. Meese distributed a congestion management process (CMP) template for use by the submitting agencies in completing the CLRP project submission forms. He reviewed the template and said that TPB staff was available to help in completing the forms that must be complete for the new projects by April.

Mr. Srikanth thanked Mr. Meese for the template and requested that the CLRP forms be sent to him in Word format.

Mr. Biesiadny said that the CMP requirement applies to federally funded projects. He said that for projects funded entirely with NVTAs monies the forms would not be submitted. Mr. Meese said that he recommended that some CMP information be provided for every project in case federal funding is utilized in the future. He said, however, that this decision is up to every submitting agency.

7. Update on Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2008 CLRP and FY 2009-2014 TIP

Mr. Clifford discussed the Scope of Work for the upcoming conformity analysis of the 2008 CLRP. The scope had been distributed during the Item 6 discussion. Mr. Clifford pointed out that Table 1 shows a summary of the technical approach. He noted that MWAQC is scheduled to submit a PM2.5 SIP to EPA at the beginning of April. Since it is possible that EPA will produce an adequacy finding by July (when the TPB is scheduled to act on the conformity finding), it will be necessary to assess the pollutant levels relative to the new budgets, as well as doing a comparison to the 2002 base. Mr. Clifford pointed out the parenthetical note relating to 'Land Activity', showing that the analysis would include any updates made to the Round 7.1 Cooperative Forecasts. He also noted that a 2002 analysis is listed as a possible, but unlikely, scenario. He mentioned that 2008 would not be included in this analysis.

Mr. Rawlings asked if an update to the land activity input would allow the current schedule to be maintained. Mr. Clifford responded that as long as we had the information by the beginning of the analysis (end of February), that a change would not affect the schedule.

Mr. Kirby pointed out that transit ridership is still constrained at 2010 levels. He mentioned that WMATA staff had suggested that the level of constraint is probably conservative, but that they were not ready to make a change yet. Mr. Kirby stated that the constraint level for this analysis could be changed, but that it would require a request in writing, before the February TPB meeting, to do so.

8. Review of Priority Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Mr. Farrell spoke to a handout on a list of top priority unfunded bicycle and pedestrian projects that were approved by the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee at its November 2007 meeting.

Mr. Kirby explained that the \$19 million was the amount already committed, and that an additional \$30 million was being requested over and above that.

Mr. Mokhtari asked if total funding needed was shown. Mr. Farrell replied that only the funding requested was being shown. Mr. Kirby suggested that a total cost column be added to give a better feel for the size of the project. Mr. Farrell replied that such a column could be added.

Mr. Srikanth said that NVTa had numerous bicycle and pedestrian projects to be included in the upcoming TIP that were not included on this priority unfunded project list. Mr. Farrell noted that once a project is funded it is not on this list. This is not a comprehensive list of all unfunded projects. Mr. Kirby also suggested that we take credit for projects being funded at the local level. Mr. Farrell replied that once a project on this list is fully funded it is placed in the table of projects that have been funded.

Mr. Maslanka asked if the funding requested amount was sufficient to finish the project. Mr. Farrell replied that it was sufficient to finish a phase, but not necessarily the entire project. Mr. Maslanka said that the Alexandria project had been funded. Mr. Farrell replied that this was a different section of the same trail.

9. Review of Outline and Preliminary Budget for FY 2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Miller distributed a handout with the preliminary budget and outline for the for FY 2009 UPWP (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009). He reviewed the overall budget estimates and said that the estimates assumes the same levels of new funding from the DOTs as in the current FY 2008 program. He described the time line for developing the document and said that the first draft of the FY 2009 UPWP will be presented for review at the February 1 meeting and to the TPB at its February 20 meeting. He explained that the structure of the program was the same as the FY 2008 program. He then highlighted the proposed budget changes from the FY 2008 levels in the work activity budget table.

Mr. Mokhtari asked why the TLC program budget was not increased more than the proposed \$100,000.

Mr. Kirby explained the reasons for the proposed increase in the TLC program and the decrease in the Scenario planning effort. He said that the TPB Scenario Task Force would be briefed on the proposed activities and budgets for these work activities on January 16. He highlighted the proposed modifications to the TLC program and then explained the scenario activities proposed for the remainder of FY 2008 and for FY 2009. He said that the Task Force guidance on these work activities will be incorporated into the February 1 draft.

In response to Mr. Chinyere, Mr. Kirby said that the TLC program is intended to fund new technical assistance projects each year rather than to continue funding current ones.

Mr. Srikanth expressed support for developing a “what would it take to get reduced CO₂ levels” scenario and the need to look at technology changes. He said the levels of congestion also influence behavior.

Mr. Meese highlighted budget changes for the Congestion Management Process and Transportation Safety work activities in Section II.

Mr. Clifford reviewed the activities under his direction and said that they were essentially unchanged from the current ones.

Mr. Hogan reported that the budget increases of \$25,000 in Network Development and \$102,000 in Models Development were to provide added consultant support in these two work elements. The Network Development consultant project is to assist staff with better integration of multimodal networks in GIS, a project that is already underway in the current fiscal year. The added funding in Models Development is to go toward funding a competitively bid contract for consultant assistance in moving to new tour based and/or activity based models. This may get underway with the completion of the household travel survey in the first half of FY2009. Staff would also put out for bid a contract to continue the scan of modeling practice in other MPOs, bringing the level of consultant effort to approximately thirty percent of the total Models Development budget in FY2009.

Ms. Haldeman inquired whether the contractor employed on the network integration with GIS project in FY2008 would continue with the project in FY2009. Mr. Hogan replied that this would be the case.

Mr. Kirby mentioned that the recently released TRB Special Report 288 _ Metropolitan Travel Forecasting would be discussed at the upcoming TRB Annual Meeting on Wednesday evening, January 16th. He noted that the report reveals two distinct points of view regarding the emerging new modeling methods, namely, a group of practitioners who feel they are ready for implementation and another group which feels they are not yet ready.

Mr. Hogan called attention to the Cordon Count element for FY2009. It would support the staff data collection effort for the Central Employment Area Cordon Count, a count of multimodal travel performed every three years with the assistance of WMATA staff in furnishing Metrorail and Metrobus data.

Mr. Griffiths described the editing and other activities to complete the regional household travel survey.

Mr. Biesiadny commented that a lot of good activities have been included in the current and proposed UPWP to address SAFETEA-LU requirements. He said that now that the NVTA is involved in programming and implementing projects, more coordination is needed between the TPB and NVTA and VDOT planning and programming activities. He suggested that funding be identified in the work program for TPB staff to help coordinate these activities.

Mr. Kirby suggested that this support could be identified in the Virginia Technical Assistance Program and it should be explored with VDOT staff.

Mr. Foster voiced support for more TPB coordination support for the Northern Virginia process.

Mr. Biesiadny said that he would discuss his request with VDOT staff.

10. Briefing on the Draft TPB Regional Value Pricing Study Report

This item was the last item addressed at the meeting, as Items 11 and 12 were brought forward in the agenda. The chair adjourned the meeting following Mr. Kirby's presentation, as it continued past the ending time of the meeting.

Mr. Kirby presented a Power Point presentation on the December 5 preliminary draft report of the Regional Value Pricing Study. He highlighted the preliminary study results, including cost analysis, impact of enhanced transit services, and the discussion on the social impacts of tolling existing lanes.

11. Report of Regional Bus Subcommittee

Mr. Hamre, chair of the TPB Regional Bus Subcommittee, presented the Status Report on the Bus Systems in the National Capital Region to the technical committee. This report describes the different bus transit systems in the region, and spotlights their importance to the regional transportation network. For example, 45% of the transit trips in the region in 2006 were bus trips, and 45% of the transit operating costs were experienced by bus transit operators. The report also spotlighted the growth trends in bus ridership between 1996 and 2006: like Metrorail, the bus systems have experienced consistent growth in ridership and costs over that 10-year period. Mr. Hamre pointed out that while the needs of the Metrorail system are highly publicized, the needs of the region's bus systems remain largely unknown. He then described the financial needs of

the region's bus systems, and finished his presentation with a set of recommendations which are proposed to help raise the profile of the region's bus systems.

Mr. Foster asked whether the Regional Bus Subcommittee has addressed the issues of homeland security and emergency evacuation from the nation's capital. Mr. Hamre responded that the subcommittee has touched on such security topics as using buses for evacuation. However, he noted, the role of the subcommittee in emergency preparedness has not been fully defined, suggesting that the TPB MATOC task forces are taking the lead in this area.

Mr. Mokhtari inquired about the relationship between increasing ridership and increasing costs, suggesting that it seems that the costs are increasing faster than ridership. Mr. Hamre replied that a lot of factors are resulting in bus transit operating costs increasing faster than ridership. These factors include fuel costs, inflation and labor. Mr. Eichler then mentioned that regional bus operators throughout the region have reported that increasing local congestion has increased the cost of providing transit, as more buses must be added to existing routes to maintain scheduled headways.

Mr. Kirby thanked Mr. Hamre for the presentation, and remarked that this report will be a great opportunity to get the attention of the TPB. He suggested that the message in the report and accompanying presentation be fine-tuned and focused before being presented to the board. Mr. Hamre said he will be working with TPB staff over the next month to refine the presentation, and suggested that the TPB under the new leadership of Chairman Mendelson would be very receptive to increasing focus on bus transit planning and funding issues.

Mr. Foster asked whether the report incorporated any of the household travel survey data currently being collected and processed by TPB staff. Mr. Griffiths stated that the data is not yet ready to be made generally available, and that the report of the subcommittee contains a good level of data. Mr. Kirby suggested that the bus transit data in the subcommittee's report could be merged with the pending TPB travel trends report.

Mr. Biesiadny suggested that a "looking forward" slide be added to the presentation before it goes to the board, which could include mention of upcoming NVTAs projects which have finally identified funding sources.

Mr. Smith stated that he attended a recent meeting of the subcommittee and was impressed with the quality of the discussion. He said that bus operators from Loudoun County often report being trapped in the urban core, unable to return to their jurisdiction for another trip. He suggested that the subcommittee discuss bus congestion hot spots. Mr. Hamre replied that WMATA has performed a preliminary estimate of the costs of congestion to bus transit operators: \$60-million per year to adjust schedules to accommodate for congestion. He also stated that one solution could be to increase parking for commuter buses downtown.

12. Briefing on Draft Report on Regional Travel Trends Report

Mr. Griffiths briefly reported that the draft Travel Trends Report had been updated since the last meeting to include a section on the growth in transit ridership on local jurisdiction transit systems, but that he and Mr. Kirby had not had the opportunity to further discuss any other additions or changes to this report since the last Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Rawlings reiterated his suggestion that when the Travel Trends Report presentation went to the TPB it should specifically address what the travel trends data tell us about progress toward achieving TPB Vision goals.

Mr. Kirby stated that, given the limited amount of time left at this meeting, the draft Travel Trends report would be an item for discussion at the next Technical Committee meeting.

13. Other Business

Mr. Kirby Distributed the final letter to the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) on TPB policies on allocating and sharing of regional transit funds which was approved by the TPB at its December 19, 2007 meeting.

14. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - January 4, 2008**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings

MARYLAND

Charles County Tony Chinere
Frederick Co. John Thomas
City of Frederick Tim Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. David Moss
Prince George's Co. -----
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery Co. Eric Graye
Prince George's Co. Famararz Mokhtari
MDOT Lyn Erickson
 Shiva Shrestha

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Jim Maslanka
Arlington Co. Rich Viola
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny
 Robert Owolabi
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Art Smith
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Monica Backmon
NVTC Greg McFarland
PRTC Anthony Foster
VRE Christine Hoeffner
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT -----
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Kristin Haldeman

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
FHWA-VA -----
FTA -----
NCPC -----
NPS Susan Hinton
MWAQC -----
FEMA/DHS -----

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
Karin Foster, DTP
Darren Smith, DTP
Sarah Crawford, DTP
William Bacon, DTP
Melanie Wellman, DTP
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Michael Eichler, DTP
G. Toni Giardini, DTP
Robert Snead, DTP
Erin Morrow, DTP
Anant Choudhary, DTP
Tim Canan, DTP
Greg Goodwin, HSPPS
Sunil Kumar, DEP

Other Participants

Randy Carroll, MDE
Sean Kennedy, WMATA
Jack VanDop, FHWA-EFLHD