

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - November 7, 2003**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Rick Rybeck

MARYLAND

Frederick Co. -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. David Moss
Prince George's Co. -----
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
Montgomery Co. -----
Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari

MDOT Fatimah Hasan
BJ Berhanu
Mike Haley
Edward Strock

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Jim Maslanka
Arlington Co. Harriett Dietz
City of Fairfax Alex Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Art Smith
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
NVTC Jana Lynott
PRTC -----
VRE Tamara Ashby
VDOT Grady Ketron
VDRPT -----
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Lora B. Byala
Krute Singa

FEDERAL/OTHER

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

COG Staff and Others

Ronald Kirby, COG/DTP
Mike Clifford, COG/DTP
Gerald Miller, COG/DTP
Jim Hogan, COG/DTP
Joan Rohlfs, COG/DEP
Robert Griffiths, COG/DTP
Mark Pfoutz, COG/DTP
Andrew Austin, COG/DTP
Jane Posey, COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, COG/DTP
Michael Freeman, COG/DTP
Anant Choudhary, COG/DTP
Toni Giardini, COG/DTP
Arlee Reno, ChambridgeSystematics
Kenneth Todd, NCBV
Randy Carroll, MDE
Lily Langlios, Coalition for Smarter Growth
James Wamsly, FCSG
Tim Nutter, NVTA
Howard Chang, Tri-County Council

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from October 3, 2003 TPB Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Update on the Region's State Implementation Plan (SIP) Submissions to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

Ms. Rohlfs briefed the Committee on the status of the severe area ozone SIP. She started with an overview of past events, e.g., MWAQC's approval in August of the 'first phase' of the SIP which satisfied many of the plan's requirements and also led to EPA's ongoing adequacy review of the mobile emissions budgets. EPA had received comments from the Sierra Club during the public comment period and would respond to them as part of the process. She continued with a description of current work activities, such as developing measures needed to meet rate of progress control and contingency requirements and also the new initiative of developing a 'gold book' of additional measures. She concluded by outlining next steps in the process, including: presenting the draft plan to the MWAQC Technical Advisory Committee at its November 14, 2003 meeting and to MWAQC at its November 24th meeting, with release by MWAQC scheduled for December 17, 2003 for public hearings in January 2004.

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following: what did the 'gold book' consist of? (it is like a waiting list of programs, i.e., primarily measures to be implemented beyond the 2005 attainment date); what was the nature of the Sierra Club's comments? (their comments mirrored their previous SIP comments, e.g., 'the SIP did not demonstrate attainment, there were not enough TCMs').

3. Status Report on the Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the 2003 CLRP and the FY 2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and the 2003 CLRP and FY 2004-2009 TIP Documents

Mr. Clifford began the item by highlighting the material mailed to the Committee two weeks earlier - a memo from him to the TPB originally dated October 8, 2003, then issued with revisions on October 23, 2003. By way of background, he reported that whereas the previous month staff presented summary results of the conformity assessment to the Committee, since then staff had documented the analysis in a full technical report and had also transmitted an overview of the technical methods and results to the TPB in the October 8, 2003 summary memo. He reported that staff had subsequently detected an error in the 2015 emissions calculations and consequently issued the October 23 revised memo to the TPB. Following his overview of the memo, Mr. Clifford noted that the Board had released the conformity assessment for public comment and interagency consultation, with approval action scheduled for its November 19, 2003 meeting, but that EPA would need to find the mobile emissions budgets in the SIP to be adequate for conformity first.

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following: why was the budget adherence margin different compared to Mr. Kirby's memo in the next agenda item? (his memo also included emissions reductions from TCMs, which is a more comprehensive picture and which would be utilized in the final conformity report).

Mr. Kirby presented the second part of the agenda item, which consisted of the TIP and CLRP status. He referred to the mailout material which highlighted the highway, HOV and transit elements of the plan, but noted that, without the conformity assessment action, only the interim plan and TIP, i.e., with only conformity-exempt projects, could be adopted by the TPB in November. The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following: could the full CLRP and TIP be sent to the federal agencies in advance of the TPB action for processing? (it would not be realistic to submit them to the federal agencies as they could not process them); it was believed that project #39 in Prince George's County, Willowbrook Parkway, should have been dropped from the plan (staff would check the project submission sheets).

4. Briefing on Proposed TPB Comments to MWAQC on the Revised SIP Related to Mobile Budgets and Conformity Requirements

Mr. Kirby highlighted his October 31, 2003 memo to the Technical Committee on proposed comments to MWAQC on the revised SIP. The comments covered three subject areas: (1) updates to the 2005 mobile budgets: updates from the current conformity assessment are yielding slightly lower mobile emissions estimates compared to the August 2003 SIP; (2) TCM substitution procedures: the anticipated ease of TCM substitution under such procedures does not appear to be significant; (3) budgets under the 8 hour standard: EPA's proposed transportation conformity rules indicate that next year's conformity assessment could be affected by requirements for the 8 hour standard; larger geographic areas and the 'build / no-build' test could be issues. Given the discussion of the 8 hour budgets dealt with next year's conformity assessment, he also distributed a draft schedule for those activities.

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following: would additional TCMs or TERMS be used to further lower the budgets? (TCMs have already been specified according to what is realistic; TERMS provide an additional margin of reduction, but are not included in the SIP); will we face build / no-build emissions tests? (there are different options within EPA's proposed rules, which affect areas differently according to its 1 hour and 8 hour geographic boundaries; but if a nonattainment area's boundaries increase, there will not be relevant emissions budgets beyond the 'donut hole' area; since conformity would have to be established within 1 year of designation, we may need to go the build / no-build route as a fallback approach); VDOT has expressed an interest in advancing the conformity schedule for next year; can Maryland and the District meet the February 6, 2004 timetable for project submissions? (agencies will have to review the schedule); will Round 6.4 or Round 7 land use be available by the March 17, 2004 notice to proceed date in the schedule? (staff will need to confer with COG's land activity planners to assess the feasibility of the schedule).

5. Briefing on the Interim 2003 CLRP and FY 2004-2009 TIP Information

Mr. Austin distributed a revised version of an item that had been included in the mail-out. He said that the list of Major Highway and Transit/HOV Improvements indicated the status of each CLRP project or phase. He said that the projects in Table 1a would be removed from the

FY2004-2009 TIP and the projects in Table 1b would be modified as shown to create an Interim TIP.

Ms. Byala clarified that the list of CLRP projects or phases were to be included in the plan as shown. Mr. Kirby suggested use of the terms “full” versus “interim” when discussing the two versions of the Plan and TIP.

Mr. Canizales stated that CLRP project number 91 (VA 3000, construct 4 lanes, 2004) was being funded with local bonds and not federal funds and therefore should not be excluded.

Mr. Mokhtari suggested that the TPB mail-out include a listing of only projects and phases that would be included in an interim plan. Mr. Kirby and Mr. Miller recommended keeping the current format that showed the status of each project in the full plan under the interim restrictions. Mr. Kirby said that a simplified list of interim projects could be prepared following TPB approval. Ms. Byala suggested using the term “project included” in place of “no change” for projects that were not being affected in the interim plan.

Mr. Canizales asked if planning and engineering (P.E.) were excluded for projects that were noted as having right-of-way and construction excluded. Mr. Miller said P.E. was exempt and would not be affected. Mr. Biesiadny asked if and why P.E. was affected on projects that were noted as being completely excluded. Mr. Miller said that there were likely no planning funds

programmed for these projects and so they were removed from the plan. If funds were available for P.E. that phase could be included. Mr. Biesiadny noted that project 74 (VA 411 Tri-County Parkway, construct 4, 6 lanes) should probably be shown as only having right-of-way and construction phases excluded.

6. Briefing on the Study of Near Term Regional Transportation Funding Needs, Funding Availability, and Project/Program Priorities

Mr. Reno of Cambridge Systematics Inc. (CSI) distributed a memo to the Committee, which reviewed the process for the study and suggestions for the TPB presentation on November 19. He first reviewed the process for determining the available revenues for the six-year period 2005 to 2010. He then detailed the status of the definition and compilation of the six-year needs and unfunded portion of needs for the District of Columbia, Suburban Maryland, Northern Virginia, and WMATA. For each jurisdiction he explained the action steps needed to complete and formalize the estimates.

Mr. Rybeck asked how current the District’s needs information is and if it includes the Anacostia line. Mr. Reno replied that the comprehensive highway and bridge needs study for the District was completed in 1997 by CSI and that the data has been reviewed and utilized for the 2000 and 2003 CLRP financial plans. He also said that he would meet soon with Mr. Rybeck to review the revenues and needs information and the recently identified project needs. Chair Byala noted that she had examined the first six years of the transit revenues in the District’s 2003 CLRP data and suggested that the assumptions be reviewed.

After Mr. Reno reviewed the process for compiling transit and highway needs for Northern Virginia, a number of comments were made. Mr. Biesiadny pointed out that while VDOT was responsible for most highways, the counties and cities controlled the secondary system and need

to be involved. Mr. Canizales noted that VDOT staff had not contacted his county yet. Mr. Reno said that CSI staff could work with the local jurisdictions to assemble the data. He said that all of this work would be coordinated with Mr. Srikanth of VDOT.

Mr. Reno said that CSI recently completed the transit needs study for the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VDRPT) which will provide very useful data for the TPB study. Ms. Ashby and Mr. Maslanka said that they need to review this data. Chair Byala suggested that the VDRPT study be sent to the Northern Virginia jurisdictions.

Mr. Reno outlined what he could present at the November 19 TPB meeting including some preliminary draft tables to illustrate the results.

Mr. Biesiadny and Mr. Canizales said that incomplete information for Northern Virginia should not be presented but an example from another jurisdiction could be.

Mr. Reno said that he would prepare a sample table for Suburban Maryland and have it reviewed by MDOT before the presentation. Mr. Biesiadny suggested that the Northern Virginia needs numbers be presented to the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) meeting on December 11 for policy review.

Mr. Kirby pointed out that the schedule for the study is very tight and that the draft study results and draft brochure are to be presented to the TPB for comments on December 17 and publication in early January.

7. Briefing on the Update of the Maryland Transportation Plan

Mr. Strock of MDOT summarized the revision process for the Maryland Transportation Plan. He explained that it is being updated to reflect the new policy direction of the administration to focus on efficient operations, new facilities, safety in construction and operations, and customer responsiveness. He said that the draft was on the web. He also explained that MDOT is having meetings throughout the state on the plan and the recommendations of the Transportation Task Force (TTF) chaired by former Secretary of Transportation William Hellmann on funding strategies for critical transportation needs. These joint public hearings/open houses provide citizens an opportunity to comment on the TTF. He described what is presented at the meetings and said that this information is on the web site shown in the materials he distributed.

In response to Mr. Mokhtari. Mr. Strock described a MDOT telephone survey of 1500 people statewide, which asked, about their transportation priorities and highway priorities. In response to Ms. Lynott, he said that there was no transit question because transit services are not available throughout the state. He said that the survey is being analyzed and the results when they are available will be on the web site.

In response to Mr. Kirby, Mr. Strock said that the TTF funding recommendations would go to the governor in December and then to the legislature in January. Ms. Hasan commented that these funding recommendations could affect the submissions for the FY 2005 TIP.

8. Status Report on Activities Related to the Transportation Research Board (TRB) Review of Travel Demand Modeling

Mr. Kirby reported that the Chairman of the TRB Committee reviewing the TPB travel demand modeling had requested that TPB staff prepare a “straw man” work program addressing models development and surveys for the balance of FY2004 and the next several years. This information was transmitted to the TRB Committee on October 10th. Staff is preparing additional information for the TRB Committee and expects to transmit this material in the near future. Given the delay in receiving the first letter report, it is anticipated that the time for the TRB Committee to prepare the second letter report may require an extension beyond December 31st, possibly into March of next year.

Mr. Kirby commented that a major lesson learned from this peer review is that the transportation travel demand modeling profession does not know what is the state of the practice. FHWA and FTA are discussing getting a synthesis of the practice underway in the near future.

Chairman Byala and Mr. Biesiadny expressed concern that a future presentation of the peer review panel’s report to TPB communicate the national, state, and local significance of the recommendations. Chairman Byala asked what changes proposed to the modeling would be used in the next round of air quality conformity. Mr. Kirby responded that better results with the Version 2.1 model are presently being obtained through adjustments at the corridor level (e.g., ICC and Bi-County Transitway studies). Traffic counts are being refined as well as other inputs to the model, and this is having a significant impact regionally on the performance of the model,

without any changes to the model structure itself. Mr. Kirby concluded by stating that the TPB would see a reflection of the updating of the model in the work program submission early next year.

9. Update on Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study

Mr. Griffiths reported that the TPB Technical Committee Transportation Scenarios subgroup had met on October 20th to review some initial travel demand modeling runs and screen line analyses for the 2000 Base, 2030 CLRP and the “More Household Growth in the Region” alternative land use scenario. He further reported that Transportation Scenarios subgroup had requested additional information and analysis of the geographic distribution of zero vehicle households, transit modal shares, and transit trip productions and attractions for the “More Household Growth” scenario to aid them in determining what new transportation facilities should be tested with this alternative land use scenario. Mr. Griffiths stated that this additional information, as well as the screen line analyzes, had been posted on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study webpage.

Mr. Kirby commented that he had recently heard about a program in the San Francisco region that linked transportation funding to increases in housing in the inner areas of the region. The purpose of this program was to reduce the rapid growth in-commuting from outside the region and to redevelop rundown areas in San Francisco and the inner jurisdictions in the region. He stated that he found it interesting that intent of this program was similar to what was to be tested in the “More Household Growth in Region” land use scenario.

Mr. Griffiths concluded his report by stating that the next meeting of the Joint Technical Working Group was scheduled for Friday, November 14 at 12:15 PM and the next meeting of the Transportation Scenarios subgroup was scheduled for December 2 at 12:00 noon. The purpose of the December 2 meeting was to determine what transportation facilities should be tested with the “More Household Growth” land use scenario.

Chair Byala encouraged all interested Committee members to attend these two meetings.

10. Other Business

None.

11. Adjourn

