

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - MAY 2, 2003**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT Rick Rybeck

**MARYLAND**

Frederick Co. -----  
Gaithersburg -----  
Montgomery Co. David Moss  
Prince George's Co. Cicero Salles  
Rockville -----  
M-NCPPC

Montgomery Co. Alexander Hekimian  
Prince George's Co. -----

MDOT Fatimah Hasan

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria James Maslanka  
Arlington Co. Ritch Viola  
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa  
Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny  
Falls Church -----  
Loudoun Co. Arthur J. Smith  
Manassas -----  
Prince William Co. Rick Canizales  
NVTC Jana Lynott  
PRTC Michael Ibay  
VRE Tamara Ashby  
NVRC -----  
VDOT Grady Ketron  
VDRPT -----  
VDOA -----

**WMATA**

WMATA Lora B. Byala

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

FHWA-DC -----

FTA -----

NCPC -----

NPS -----

MWAQC -----

**COG Staff and Others**

Ronald Kirby, COG/DTP  
Mike Clifford, COG/DTP  
Gerald Miller, COG/DTP  
Jim Hogan, COG/DTP  
Robert Griffiths, COG/DTP  
Andrew Austin, COG/DTP  
Daivamani Sivasailam, COG/DTP  
Patrick Zilliacus, COG/DTP  
Joan Rohlf, COG/DEP  
Aelee Reno, Cambridge Systematics, Inc.  
Valencia Thompson, FHWA - MD. Div.  
Leonard Wolfenstein, Fairfax County DOT  
Randy Carroll, MDE  
Glen Smith, MD SHA  
James Wamsly, FCSG  
Howard Chang, Tri-County Council

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - MAY 2, 2003**

**COG Staff and Others Continued**

Andrew Meese, COG/DTP

Jane Posey, COG/DTP

Bill Bacon, COG/DTP

Robert Snead, COG/DTP

G. Toni Giardini, COG/DTP

Dusan Vusan, COG/DTP

Andrew Burke, COG/DTP

Anant Choudhany, COG/DTP

Beth Lowe, COG/DEP

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

*for*

## **MEETING OF MAY 2, 2003**

### **1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from April 4, 2003 TPB Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved with clarification to projects in Item 3 and data in Item 9, as well as several other minor corrections

### **2. Update on the Financial Analysis for 2003 Update of the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP)**

Mr. Reno, Cambridge Systematics, Inc., reviewed the information in the mailout that was presented to the TPB on April 19, including draft summary tables of forecast total revenues and expenditures for the 2003 CLRP over the period 2004 to 2030. He commented on the transit and highway expenditure issues that need to be addressed by DDOT, MDOT and VDOT. He noted that the expenditures shown for the District exceed the projected revenues by almost \$1 billion. Mr. Rybeck said that DDOT would address this issue.

Mr. Reno said that the Northern Virginia local jurisdictions have not signed off on their expected revenues that will be available for WMATA's requested expenditures. Mr. Biesiadny indicated that a meeting in Virginia had been scheduled twice to address this. Chair Byala commented that Mr. Srikanth of VDOT said that he would be sending out a table to the local jurisdictions which indicated the specific WMATA requests for each jurisdiction.

Mr. Reno said that if some of the projected WMATA operating costs remains unfunded, the timing for expanding transit services needs to be examined. Ms. Hasan commented that MDOT would look into when the short fall in Maryland's transit operating expenditures would occur. Chair Byala commented that beyond 2010, WMATA operating costs go up and that it appears that MDOT's projected expenditures for transit operating costs do not match. She said that if the System Access & Capacity (SAP) expenditure requests are not funded then the impacts on the Metrorail core capacity constraint need to be examined.

Mr. Kirby suggested that a new table be prepared for the TPB presentation on May 21 that would clarify the transit funding shortfalls. Mr. Reno commented that the projected highway expenditures are down compared with the last analysis for the 2000 CLRP and that there are also highway funding shortfalls that are not indicated. Mr. Kirby said that these funding issues need to be highlighted for the TPB for consideration during the plan update.

Ms. Ashby asked why the projected "local transit fare" revenues shown in Table 1 for Virginia and Maryland were so different. Mr. Reno replied that there were differences in the way each state classifies local bus and commuter rail revenues, but that he would check further.

Mr. Biesiadny asked about the statement in Mr. Reno's memo regarding federal non-discretionary formula grant funding. Mr. Reno said it should be changed to clarify that WMATA and other transit agencies funding is included.

### **3. Briefing on Project Submissions for the 2003 CLRP and FY2004-2009 TIP**

Mr. Austin distributed a revised table with some minor technical corrections to the Virginia listings of proposed significant changes for the 2003 CLRP and FY 2004-2009 TIP. He reviewed the changes. Mr. Maslanka said that there were changes to the information for the Potomac Yards Metro station and indicated that a revised project description form was available. Mr. Smith said that the term “upgrade” shown in the project listing for Maryland US 29 referred to new interchanges.

Mr. Miller asked if the study described recently in the news for a new Potomac River crossing was going to be submitted by the states. Chair Byala suggested that MDOT and VDOT get together on this before the May 21 TPB meeting.

Mr. Miller distributed a first-cut draft set of project listings and maps indicating the existing projects in the current 2002 CLRP and showing in bold the proposed projects for the 2003 update. He asked the implementing agencies to review the information, which would be finalized after the TPB action on the proposed project submissions on May 21. He said that these draft materials would not go to the Board on May 21. A final version of the maps and listings will be prepared to describe the projects in the entire plan.

Mr. Rybeck asked when the proposed project submissions were final. Mr. Kirby replied that they were released for public comment on April 10 and that the Board will be asked to approved them for air quality conformity analysis on May 21. If a project change that affects conformity is proposed at that date then there would have to be a new public comment period before the Board could act.

### **4. Update on Emissions Factors for “Technical Corrections”, Air Quality Rate of Progress, Attainment Results and Implications for SIP Measures**

Mr. Clifford began the item by summarizing the mailout material. This consisted of a set of six tables of mobile source emissions results. The first two tables represented summary VOC and NOx emissions by inventory component for all forecast years completed by the mailout date and tables 3 - 6 showed ‘technical corrections’ (primarily consisting of air management agency changes to I/M program specifications) results compared to the original estimates for 1990, 2002, and 2005 baseline conditions, and 1996, 1999, 2002 and 2005 ‘adjusted to 1990’ conditions. The results indicated that, after 1990, the technical corrections had very little emissions impacts.

Mr. Clifford then distributed replacement tables for Exhibits 1 and 2, which showed the now completed analysis. Changes to the mailout version included: (1) completion of ‘uncontrolled’ conditions for 2002 and 2005; (2) correction of a programming error for start-up emissions (the insertion of an omitted parenthesis into the code, which had the effect of increasing emissions slightly); and (3) inclusion of a ‘Round 6.3 Adjustment’, which reflects the order of magnitude emissions impacts of Round 6.3 Cooperative Forecasts.

Staff then distributed 4 single sheet information items which had been discussed at the April 30, 2003 MWAQC meeting. Ms. Rohlf briefed the Committee on the items. The first sheet represented a checklist of “SIP Commitments” associated with EPA’s conditional approval of the severe area SIP, the second sheet described “Control and Contingency Measure

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following comments / questions: is this the final emissions inventory? (no, mobile sources only); does this reflect the mobile budgets for VOC and NOx? (it reflects the starting point for development of the budgets); regarding EPA's conditional approval and the states' requirements to adopt a fee for stationary sources in the event of missing the attainment deadline, what is the best and worst case scenarios? (it could lead to sanctions and a conformity lapse, but first an 18 month sanctions clock would be triggered); where do the 5 VOC multistate measures fit in the process? (these ozone transport commission (OTC) measures appear on the MWAQC Task Force's short list of control / contingency measures); are we still on schedule? (MWAQC's SIP submittal date has slipped somewhat, but, depending on the time EPA needs in assessing adequacy, the TPB could perhaps still act in October); would an August TPB meeting help? (no, it will be dependant upon EPA's adequacy determination time); how are emissions computed for other pollution sources? (EPA provides emissions factors for area and off-road sources; point sources are 'permitted' facilities and therefore are constantly monitored and recorded).

#### **5. Update on Mobile Source Emissions Requirements for the State Implementation Plan (SIP), CLRP and TIP Process**

Mr. Kirby began by briefing the Committee on the mailout item: the information package mailed to the TPB for its April 16, 2003 meeting which primarily consisted of an April 16, 2003 letter from TPB Chair Shapiro to MWAQC Chair Mendelson. Mr. Kirby then distributed a May 2, 2003 memo from him to the Technical Committee, which provided an update on the mobile source emissions requirements. He highlighted the memo, which covered the following areas: emissions reduction requirements; transportation emissions reduction measures (TERM)s and transportation control measures ( TCM)s; reasonably available control measures (RACM); contingency measures; and schedule.

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following comments / questions: what are the emissions reductions for the TCMs in the SIP? (Attachment C of the memo shows the benefits, which have been recomputed for year 2005 using Mobile6); the calculations do not appear additive (they are not: a close review of some rows indicates that some contain multipliers); have the travel demand numbers been factored to 2005? (no, there is no need to recompute demand, e.g., the measures reflect vehicle replacement or park and ride lots, which do not vary in size by model used); what are the next dates for discussion of these issues? (May 9 - MWAQC Task Force; May 12 - Conformity Subcommittee; May 14 - MWAQC Task Force; May 28 - MWAQC).

#### **6. Update on TERMS for the 2003 CLRP and FY2004-2009 TIP**

Mr. Sivasailam spoke to the handout distributed at the meeting. The handout had three attachments. The first attachment included revised analysis of a number of TERMS that were aimed at the heavy-duty vehicle market. The second attachment showed the emissions inventory of the public sector heavy-duty vehicle fleets for the jurisdictions that had submitted information. The final attachment contained updated TERMS aimed at high mileage light duty vehicles such as taxicabs. He pointed out the small impact TERMS have on the VOC emissions.

Mr. Srikanth pointed out the “Rate of Progress Analysis” underway and the need for control measures to reduce VOC emissions. Mr. Kirby said “Point” and “Area” source control measures may be a more cost-effective method of reducing VOC emissions than mobile measures.

#### **7. Briefing on the Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment, 2003 CLRP and FY2004-2009 TIP**

Mr. Clifford referred to the scope of work which was contained in the mailout. He highlighted the technical approach, consultation, work tasks and schedule. He noted that a WMATA fare increase was planned, but not yet finalized.

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following comments / questions: language specific to WMATA’s proposed fare increase was available (staff would like to wait until the proposed TPB action in June on adoption of the work scope before incorporating specifics of the draft fare increase); MARC and VRE also have fare increases planned for July 1, which should be incorporated into the analysis (staff will add these references and reflect the new fares in the analysis).

#### **8. Briefing on 2002 Metro Core Cordon Count Report**

Mr. Zilliacus presented the draft “2002 Metro Core Cordon Count” report to the Committee. There were two report handouts, the draft report text and PowerPoint slides.

Mr. Biesiadny asked about what makes up transit sub-modes other than Metro and for clarification as to where HOV shows up. Mr. Zilliacus responded that it is transit buses (Metrobus, DASH, and Fairfax Connector), commuter buses (PRTC, Loudoun County, Dillon (MTA), Eyre’s (MTA) and on I-66 and I-395 HOV lanes “other” buses (charter and school buses). MARC and VRE commuter rail are also in this category, but not car-pools or van-pools, and that there are tables showing HOV traffic in detail.

Mr. Biesiadny also expressed concern about how low VRE patronage was. Mr. Zilliacus said that relative to all travel across the Metro Core Cordon line, VRE patronage is a small percentage of the total. However, staff is willing to revise this figure if updated information can be provided.

Mr. Kirby asked where patronage data are obtained from, and was told that the data came from the transit providers themselves.

Ms. Lynott asked if the methodology for collecting data has changed. Mr. Zilliacus replied that the methodology has not changed.

A member asked if transit providers that are counted now were counted in 1975. Mr. Zilliacus replied that predecessors to MARC rail and PRTC bus (called Colonial Transit) were not counted until about 1980.

A question was asked about the comparability of Metro Core Cordon Count data with Census Journey-to-Work data. Mr. Zilliacus replied that they are not the same, since the cordon counts quantify travel crossing the cordon line regardless of trip purpose.

It was also mentioned that some trips crossing the cordon line pass entirely through the Metro Core, though there is no way to quantify such movements.

There was a discussion of transit fares. Fares have not been increased for over eight years, while the Metrochek program has increased the number of persons using transit by about 50,000. While the cordon counts are not a survey, it seems that some trips crossing the cordon line have shifted from car-pools to transit.

Members of the Committee were asked to submit written comments to Mr. Zilliacus no later than the close of business on Friday, 23 May 2003.

### **9. Update on Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study**

Mr. Griffiths reported that the region's Planning Directors were currently developing the Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ)-level land activity data for the five alternative land use scenarios to be examined in the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. He stated the Planning Directors were meeting on May 9<sup>th</sup> to review this work and that the full Joint Technical Working Group (JTWG) would be reviewing the land activity data for the alternative land use scenarios on May 16<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Rybeck asked when the Transportation Scenarios subgroup of the TPB Technical Committee would be meeting to discuss the transportation scenarios to be paired with each of the alternative land use scenarios.

Chair Byala responded the Transportation Scenarios subgroup would be meeting sometime in early June after the alternative land use scenarios had been reviewed by the JTWG on May 16<sup>th</sup> and staff had the opportunity to execute some initial transportation modeling runs of the alternative land use scenarios with the TPB's 2000 Constrained Long-Range Plan. She stated that she would notify the Committee as soon as a date for the meeting of the Transportation Scenarios subgroup is set.

### **10. Other Business**

Ms. Hasan described the condition of Ron Spalding who had injured his leg to the Committee, letting members know how to get in touch with him.

### **11. Adjourn**



