

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - October 1, 2010**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
 Frederick Co. John Thomas
 City of Frederick -----
 Gaithersburg -----
 Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich
 Prince George's Co. Vic Weissberg
 Rockville -----
 M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. -----
 Prince George's Co. Harold Foster
 MDOT Lyn Erickson
 MTA -----
 Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
 Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
 City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
 Fairfax Co. Robert Owolabi
 Tom Biesiadny
 Falls Church -----
 Loudoun Co. George Phillips
 Manassas -----
 Prince William Co. Monica Bockmon
 NVTC -----
 PRTC Anthony Foster
 VRE Christine Hoeffner
 VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
 VDRPT David Awbrey
 NVPDC -----
 VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Mark Kellogg
 Scott Kubly

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
 FHWA-VA -----
 FTA Melissa Barlow
 NCPC -----
 NPS -----
 MWAQC -----

COG Staff

Ronald Kirby, DTP
 Gerald Miller, DTP
 Mark Pfoutz, DTP
 Bob Griffiths, DTP
 Sarah Crawford, DTP
 Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
 Ryan Hand, DTP
 Andy Meese, DTP
 Andrew Austin, DTP
 Michael Farrell, DTP
 Eric Randall, DTP
 Monica Bansal, DTP
 John Swanson, DTP
 Darren Smith, DTP
 Jane Posey, DTP
 Mark Moran, DTP
 Dusan Vuksan, DTP
 William Bacon, DTP
 Ron Milone, DTP
 Sunil Kumar, DEP
 Greg Goodwin, DCPS
 Joan Rohlfs, DEP

Other Attendees

Arlee Reno, Cambridge Systematics

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

October 1, 2010

Technical Committee Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from September 3, 2010 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP

Ms. Posey discussed the mail out item relating to the VDOT amendment to the 2009 CLRP and FY2010-2015 TIP to make an operational change to 2 ramps on I-66. She noted that with the operation change, there was a small drop in VMT and an associated small drop in all pollutants analyzed. She stated that all conformity criteria were met. She noted that a public comment period began in September and would end on October 9th, and that the TPB would be asked to approve the amendment at their October meeting.

Ms. Posey then distributed the summary report for the air quality conformity analysis of the 2010 CLRP and FY2011-2016 TIP. She noted that the major changes from the previous analysis were the use of the new Round 8.0 Cooperative Forecasts, the review of a 2040 forecast year, and the delay and/or removal of several highway projects. She also mentioned that transit fares increased for most providers, including paper vs. smartcard differences and peak-of-the-peak surcharges for WMATA. She pointed out that Attachment A contained a listing of significant changes to the project inputs. She reviewed the Round 8.0 Cooperative Forecast summaries included as Attachment B. She noted that compared to Round 7.2A, Round 8.0 had fewer jobs and households for each forecast year. The region is still expected to grow, but at a slower rate than previously forecasted.

Ms. Posey discussed Exhibit 2, and pointed out that, compared to the previous analysis, there is a drop in transit trips, vehicle trips, and VMT. She said that the drop in vehicle trips and VMT can mostly be attributed to the change in the Cooperative Forecasts. However, she noted that there is a 9-10% drop in transit trips due to the transit fare increase. Ms. Posey reviewed the emissions estimates, and reminded the group of the conformity requirements. She stated that all requirements were met. She noted that a public comment period starts on October 14th, and that the report will go to TPB for review in October. The TPB will be asked to approve the CLRP, TIP, and conformity in November.

Mr. Phillips asked what the numbers represent in Exhibit 2. Ms. Posey replied daily regional trips and VMT.

Mr. Kirby asked if we should discuss changes from last time or just give absolute results. Mr. Erenrich suggested that trips per household might be an interesting statistic to show. Mr. Kirby suggested that the presentation to TPB should include results first, and then comparisons to last year. Mr. Biesiadny suggested showing the impacts of inputs (land use, fares) with up or down arrows next to each item.

Mr. Biesiadny asked if there were any public comments on the VDOT I-66 ramps amendments. Mr. Austin replied that there were none.

Mr. Srikanth thanked everyone for expediting the conformity analysis of the amendments. He noted that the project is just the kind that the Feds are encouraging- a low cost, easily implementable change that improves traffic.

3. Briefing on the Draft 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP

Mr. Austin said the Draft 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP would be released for public comment at the October 14 meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee. The significant changes to the CLRP included four new projects in the District of Columbia, as well as a number of other changes, delays and removals of projects in Maryland and Virginia. Mr. Austin presented a brief financial summary of the funding in the draft TIP, including breakdowns of funding by year, by project type, by jurisdiction, by funding source and compared to funding in previous TIPs. He noted that some changes were still expected from DDOT and VDOT. He also noted that information on CLRP and TIP projects would be available via a searchable database in the CLRP web site.

Mr. Biesiadny suggested that the term "Other" in the Funding by Project Type chart should be further defined as "Maintenance, TERMS, ITS, etc."

Mr. Srikanth also suggested that the "Bicycle/Pedestrian" category on that same chart be changed to "Exclusive Bike/Ped." Mr. Austin suggested it might be possible to indicate the number of projects in the Highway and Transit categories that included bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.

Mr. Biesiadny asked it if was possible to get a further breakdown of the "Federal Match" and "State and Local" slices of the Funding by Source charts.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the trend for federal funding in the TIP had increased on the transit side, but decreased on the highway side, leaving the state and locals to pick up more funding.

Ms. Barlow suggested the colors in some of the charts be enhanced to provide better contrast.

Ms. Matthews asked where TIGER projects would be shown in the TIP. Mr. Austin said that the TIGER projects were listed in the TPB section towards the end of the

document. Any projects that had additional non-TIGER funding sources would also be shown in their respective jurisdiction's section.

4. Briefing on the Draft Financial Analysis for the 2010 CLRP

Mr. Reno of Cambridge Systematics, Inc. delivered a PowerPoint presentation to the Committee on the key issues and results from the draft report on the financial analysis for the 2010 CLRP. He explained that the financial analysis reviews and updates projected transportation revenues and costs for operating, maintaining, and expanding the regional transportation system through 2040. He said that all of the necessary financial forecast data from the DOTs, WMATA and local jurisdictions had been received and incorporated into the summary tables in the final report.

He presented a summary of the overall revenue and expenditure picture in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars through 2040. He noted that the highway expenditures have been constrained by postponing or deleting several highway projects in Virginia and Maryland. He said that the transit expenditures exceed the revenues because WMATA rehabilitation needs post 2020 are not provided with the full capital match, so the continuation of current Federal aid for WMATA rehabilitation after 2020 is not assumed for a total unfunded YOE amount of \$7.5 B. He said that as in the past this can be addressed by applying the transit ridership constraint to or through the core area at 2020 levels.

He also explained that the forecasts of District of Columbia operating revenues are short of funding WMATA's long term subsidy request by about \$3.5 B through 2040. He said that this issue needs to be addressed by the parties.

Mr. Reno said the full draft report would be released for public comment at the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting on October 14 and he would brief the TPB on the key findings of the financial analysis on October 20.

Mr. Phillips inquired if the forecast data could be presented by jurisdiction. Mr. Srikanth said that Virginia county data could be provided in an appendix on the web.

Mr. Biesiadny pointed out what appears to be an error in the totals shown in the table on page 4.

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of October 1, 2010**

Ms. Ricks said that DDOT did not agree with the growth in WMATA costs for Metrobus and MetroAccess, the ADA paratransit service, beyond 2020. She said that there will be improvements in paratransit services in the District by then and DDOT will be able to provide bus services at lower costs.

Mr. Kubly pointed out that the DC Circulator bus service costs currently are about 30 percent lower than Metrobus costs.

Mr. Kellogg commented that the WMATA expenditure and revenue forecasts were reduced based upon lower inflation rate assumptions since the September presentation. He said that MetroAccess costs move with use and that factors such as increasing road congestion will continue to cause Metrobus costs to grow in the future.

Mr. Kubly commented that WMATA's long-term capital expenditure requirements beyond 2020 need updating since they are based upon a 1998 study.

Mr. Biesiadny suggested that this concern cannot be addressed now. It was not raised earlier, and everyone has assumed the capital needs are not funded beyond 2020.

Mr. Kirby pointed out that the WMATA capital funding issue has been addressed by a transit ridership constraint in the CLRP since 2000. He said that the air quality conformity analysis for the plan assumed a level of bus service in the District. If DDOT identifies a more cost-effective way to provide these services with the identified revenues this is a good way to address the concern.

Ms. Ricks explained that the District will gradually reduce WMATA paratransit and bus costs over the next decades. She said that jurisdictions in Maryland and Virginia have been operating their own less costly services for years.

Mr. Kirby said that the District's response to the WMATA requests will be explained in the analysis report and presented to the TPB.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that local control of bus services is a main reason that the jurisdictions have for operating their own systems and not just cost savings.

5. Briefing on the Draft 2010 Update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region

Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint on the bicycle and pedestrian plan for the national capital region.

In response to a question regarding MDOT's policies, Mr. Farrell replied that MDOT's policy towards walking and bicycling is better characterized as "strong encouragement" than "complete streets". Mr. Meese suggested that a bullet should be added to the slide describing MDOT's policies.

Mr. Griffiths noted that bicycling and walking probably increased in some of the outer jurisdictions that had strong population growth.

6. Briefing on the Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2011 CLRP and FY 2012-2017 TIP

Mr. Austin gave a presentation on the Draft Call for Projects document. First, he outlined the proposed schedule for the Conformity Assessment for the 2011 CLRP which would begin when the TPB approved it in November 2010 and conclude with the TPB's approval in November 2011.

Next, Mr. Austin outlined the current annual TIP cycle and then presented a proposed new TIP cycle that would be formally updated every two years. He said under this proposal, the FY 2011-2016 TIP would remain the TIP of record until the approval of the FY 2013-2018 TIP in the Fall of 2012. He also explained that just as the CLRP had become a "living document" on the web, the TIP would also be available as a real-time, searchable database on the CLRP web site, instead of just a printed document that quickly became out-of-date as amendments and adjustments were processed. Mr. Austin affirmed that the CLRP and Conformity Assessment schedule would remain unchanged and continue on an annual basis. Once projects had been tested for Conformity, they could then be amended into the TIP. Other projects that are exempt from conformity requirements could be amended at any time.

Ms. Erickson stated that MDOT will continue to submit annual amendments to the TIP. She said that the proposed new cycle would benefit each DOT by allowing each to update the TIP according to their own schedule.

Ms. Backmon remarked that the database would be a good improvement, but noted that projects grouped in VDOT's appendix were often difficult to find. Mr. Malouff asked if the grouped projects would be searchable in the database. Mr. Austin replied that they would not be, in the current format, but suggested that if the grouped project listing was available in an Excel table format, they could possibly be incorporated into the search format. Mr. Srikanth said that he would work with VDOT's central office to see if this was possible.

Mr. Biesiadny expressed concern that the TIP could become out of sync with the CLRP and Conformity Assessment. Mr. Austin clarified that any new projects that required and Air Quality Conformity Analysis would still have to go through that process before being amended into the TIP – exactly the same as the current process, only the projects would be amended to the existing TIP, not a “new” TIP.

Mr. Kirby noted that the Conformity Assessment of the 2011 CLRP will use the 2.3 version of the travel demand model for the first time. He also emphasized the need to begin the Conformity Assessment before March 2, 2011 to pre-empt the required use of the MOVES air quality model.

7. Briefing on the Round 8.0 Cooperative Forecasts

Mr. Griffiths gave a PowerPoint presentation highlighting the results and implications of the Round 8.0 Cooperative Forecasts of future growth for the 2005 to 2040 time period. He stated that these forecasts were being used in this year’s Air Quality Conformity Analysis. He noted that these new forecasts showed (1) slower rates of job and household growth in comparison to last year’s Round 7.2A forecasts, (2) a slightly improved jobs/housing balance compared to Round 7.2A, (3) the greatest absolute increase in jobs is forecast for the inner suburban jurisdictions and the greatest absolute increase in households is forecast for the outer suburban jurisdictions and (4) significantly more higher density housing was now being planned for the regional activity centers identified in the Round 7.0 forecasts, making these regional activity centers more mixed use than in the earlier growth forecasts.

Mr. Srikanth commented that changes in forecast future growth between Round 7.2A and Round 8.0 help explain the Air Quality Conformity Analysis results presented earlier in the meeting by Ms. Posey and suggested that it would be good at the TPB meeting to have the briefing on the Round 8.0 Cooperative Forecasts to immediately follow the briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment.

Mr. Srikanth and Mr. Biesiadny suggested that briefing on the Round 8.0 forecasts include a reference to TPB Vision Goal #2 that promotes concentrating more of the region’s future growth in dynamic regional activity centers with a mix of jobs, housing and services in a walkable environment and that the region was now making some progress towards this goal.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that a slide be included in the presentation on the Round 8.0 Forecasts that showed the geographic location of the Regional Activity Centers.

Mr. Griffiths thanked the Committee members for their comments and agreed to incorporate their suggestions into the presentation on the Round 8.0 Forecasts to be given to the TPB.

8. Update on the Regional “Street Smart” Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign

Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint and hand-outs on the Street Smart pedestrian and bicycle safety campaign.

Mr. McFarland asked if we had information on the increase in hit and runs. Mr. Farrell replied that he did not.

Mr. Farrell announced that there would be a planning meeting for the fall Street Smart campaign on Monday, October 4.

Mr. Erenrich asked if we were working to provide signs on the buses telling people what to do when they get off the bus. Mr. Farrell replied that we did not have signs near the driver, but that there were bus cards and transit shelters telling people to cross after the bus leaves the stop. We will investigate the idea of adding signs.

Mr. Kirby announced that the TPB would discuss whether the local contribution should be made part of the COG dues.

Mr. Biesadny replied that he supported that idea, and suggested that Mr. Farrell’s two agenda items be placed back to back. Mr. Kirby replied that action items had to go first, but we would investigate changing the order of agenda items.

9. Briefing on Information for the TPB Task Force to Determine a Scope and Process for Developing a Regional Transportation Priorities Plan

Mr. Swanson briefed the Committee on the kickoff meeting of the new TPB Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force, which was scheduled for October 20. He explained that staff will brief the task force on the following background materials: 1) A draft regional inventory of unfunded transportation priority projects identified at the local and state levels; 2) Information on the financially unconstrained planning activities of other MPOs; and 3) Description of new tools to improve public information on the current planning process.

Mr. Malouff asked if it would be possible to still nominate participants for the next session of the TPB Community Leadership Institute in November.

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of October 1, 2010**

Mr. Swanson stated that registration was still open.

Mr. Erenrich asked how the Purple Line would be treated in the Inventory that Mr. Swanson described.

Mr. Swanson said the Purple Line was in the CLRP, so it would not be included in the Inventory of unfunded projects. However, he noted that it would be possible to enhance the Inventory to include both funded and unfunded projects.

Mr. Kellogg said that WMATA would be providing a list of unfunded projects for inclusion in the Inventory.

Mr. Erenrich said that the MDOT's Annual Tour session for Montgomery County would be held the following Thursday.

Mr. Erickson noted each meeting of the Annual Tour was different in every county.

Mr. Erenrich said that in Montgomery County the Tour was focused on getting input from elected officials.

Mr. Weissberg said that in Prince George's County, the Tour session was more of an "open mic." He said the Tour session in their county would be held at 2:30 pm on October 20.

Mr. Srikanth thanked staff for the background material for the task force. He said VDOT would be particularly interested in working on the Clearinghouse described in Mr. Swanson's memo.

Mr. Biesiadny expressed his appreciation to staff also. However, he noted the difficulty in reaching consensus at the Conversation in May, and he asked how staff intended to move toward consensus at the task force kickoff meeting on October 20.

Mr. Swanson agreed that consensus would be difficult to achieve, and he said he welcomed ideas for how to move in that direction. He suggested that an appropriate goal for the first meeting might be to get ideas on the table and not try to force consensus.

Mr. Biesiadny asked how MPOs in bi-state regions develop common priorities for their long-range plans.

Mr. Swanson said that in Philadelphia he understood that state-based subcommittees develop their project lists separately working from common regional goals.

Mr. Smith said that a similar system exists in Kansas City. Each state works with its own funding streams using a scoring system based upon regional criteria. He noted that a project in a state with more funding might get funded even if it has a lower score than a project in the other state.

10. Update on the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project Grant under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program

Mr. Randall gave a quick oral update on the TIGER Bus Priority project. The primary task is to reach agreement with the FTA on the TIGER Grant Agreement. He emphasized that the grant agreement for TIGER is considerably more extensive than the standard FTA grant agreement, with additional requirements due to American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) requirements. For example, there is a three-page list of certifications and assurances that COG has to verify, instead of the half-page list of a standard FTA grant agreement. A draft sub grantee agreement for the project owners to sign has been drafted, but COG needs to first reach agreement with the FTA on what the TIGER Grant Agreement between FTA and COG requires before disseminating the sub grantee agreement to project owners for review and signature.

Ms. Matthews requested confirmation that funding needed to be obligated by September 30, 2011, and if that was the due date for completing NEPA environmental documentation.

Ms. Barlow responded that to receive a grant agreement, all projects need to complete NEPA documentation. She emphasized that project owners need to be moving forward on this, as there is some discussion of Congress rescinding un-appropriated funds at the end of the calendar year.

11. Update on Ridership Data for the Local and Regional Transit Systems Serving the Washington Metropolitan Area

Mr. Randall distributed a memorandum on ridership data for the local and regional transit systems. This memorandum is a revision to that discussed at the September 3, 2010 meeting of the Technical Committee, which was then presented to the TPB at its September 15th meeting supplementary to a presentation by Mr. Overman, chairman of the Regional Bus Subcommittee. He explained that at the TPB meeting, several members made comments and requested additional information on the data table. This memorandum includes an updated data table for the ridership and cost of the transit systems, and also includes an additional table of passenger fare revenue. He commented that this data is taken from the FTA's National Transit Database. The

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of October 1, 2010**

data tables were reviewed at the September 28th meeting of the Regional Bus Subcommittee, but each jurisdiction should review the data for their transit systems and inform COG of any needed amendments.

12. Other Business

None.

13. Adjourn