

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES**

**ATTENDANCE - October 3, 2003**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT Rick Rybeck

**MARYLAND**

Frederick Co. James Gugel  
 Gaithersburg -----  
 Montgomery Co. David Moss  
 Prince George's Co. Cicero Salles  
 Rockville -----  
 M-NCPPC  
 Montgomery Co. Alexander Hekimian  
 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari  
 -----

MDOT Fatimah Hasan  
 BJ Berhanu  
 Glen Smith

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria Jim Maslanka  
 Arlington Co. Harriett Dietz  
 City of Fairfax Alex Verzosa  
 Fairfax Co. Mike Lake  
 Leonard Wolfenstein  
 Falls Church -----  
 Loudoun Co. Art Smith  
 Manassas -----  
 Prince William Co. Rick Canizales  
 NVTC Jana Lynott  
 PRTC Michael Ibay  
 VRE Tamara Ashby  
 VDOT Grady Ketron  
 Kanathur Srikanth  
 VDRPT Sharmila Samarasinghe  
 NVPDC -----  
 VDOA -----

**WMATA**

WMATA Lora B. Byala  
 Krute Singa

**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  
 Mark Pfoutz, COG/DTP  
 Andrew Austin, COG/DTP  
 Jane Posey, COG/DTP  
 Daivamani Sivasailam, COG/DTP  
 Dusan Vuksan, COG/DTP  
 Lyla Peter, TCCSMD  
 Randy Carroll, MDE  
 Harry Sanders, Action Comm. for Transit  
 James Wamsly, FCSG  
 Michael Replogle, Environmental Defense

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

## **TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

### **1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from September 5, 2003 TPB Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved with the addition of Valerie Pardo to the list of attendees.

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

Mr. Clifford made the presentation on the 'severe area' SIP since Ms. Rohlfs was unable to attend. He began by distributing: (1) a set of materials which had been distributed at the September 24, 2003 MWAQC meeting, and (2) an announcement sheet for a MWAQC TAC Work Session planned for October 10, 2003. He then highlighted the materials from the MWAQC meeting. These included: a chart listing SIP work tasks, responsibility and due date; a draft schedule for the work tasks; an MWAQC resolution adopted on August 13, 2003 dealing with emissions control measures; and a list of voluntary measures being considered for the SIP. Mr. Clifford noted that MWAQC needed to approve the draft SIP in December in order to allow for public hearings, comments, and response to comments, to occur prior to its submission to EPA by March 1, 2004. He then referred Committee members to the Work Session announcement and noted that the TAC meeting would primarily deal with analysis of the above-referenced voluntary measures.

The Committee then discussed the topic including: what was the significance of the measures listed in the handouts? (the list represents candidate transportation and other source measures being proposed for consideration to meet additional emissions reduction requirements and the work shop appears to highlight local government initiatives); are the measures proposed for control or contingency purposes? (they could be for either purpose, depending on the measure, and the list is preliminary - others could be advanced); could staff email any additional information to the Committee prior to the meeting? (yes, staff would forward any additional information received (note: MWAQC staff did not issue any additional information in advance of the meeting); was VOC or NOx the targeted pollutant? (VOC; NOx substitution is allowable, but might be even more difficult to achieve).

### **3. Briefing on Draft Results of the Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the 2003 CLRP and the FY 2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and the Draft 2003 CLRP and FY 2004-2009 TIP Documents**

Mr. Clifford began the item by distributing a package of material, which summarized the results of the conformity analysis. He highlighted the tables, which described: (1) the emissions picture in total, through time for each pollutant in each analysis year, and by component, according to network and off-network elements, and (2) land use and travel demand, with a focus on 2005 for which comparable data from recent SIP work were available. He noted that the emissions totals for each plan and program analysis year adhered to the draft emissions budgets contained in the

severe area SIP. He then concluded by referring to tables distributed that morning by Ms. Posey, which documented the 2003 CLRP and FY2004-09 TIP highway, HOV and transit projects included in the analysis.

Mr. Sivasailam then continued the presentation, distributing the 'Tracking Sheet' - a summary table documenting the implementation status and emissions reduction credits of all projects previously credited in air quality analyses (calendar years 1993 - 2002). He noted that Mobile6 had been used in all calculations and that some projects' emissions credits had been removed from the table since they had been implemented prior to year 2000, and would therefore now be in the base 2000 network conditions for which the model had been validated. These additional VOC and NOx emissions reductions in 2005 now totaled 3.8 and 7.7 tons per day, respectively.

The Committee then discussed the topic including: does the COG model balance trips according to productions in trip distribution and if so doesn't this understate VMT? (the modeling approach does balance according to trip productions: this is a long standing, and sound practice, since land use planners are generally better able to forecast households throughout the region); in the travel demand tables, why does VMT decrease region wide and in Howard County which shows an increase in jobs? (two elements work together to cause this: (1) there is a drop of 8,600 in forecast households in 2005 in Howard County, which obviously will significantly reduce VMT, and (2) the increase in jobs in Howard County of nearly 27,000 will enable shorter trip lengths in Howard and in the MSA, as a better job-to-household balance is achieved); what accounts for the dramatic reductions in the VOC and NOx emissions through time? (this results from a combination of factors, such as cleaner fuels and I/M programs, but is especially due to the cleaner vehicles associated with the 'Tier 2' and 'heavy duty truck' programs); the modeling is very technical and may not be suitable for the Board (staff will work on preparing an appropriate summary for the TPB; a recent article contained in *The Region* magazine provides a good example of technical material presented to a wide audience).

Other discussion included: what are the differences between the 2005 conformity and SIP estimates? (between the SIP work performed 6 months ago and the current conformity analysis the following inputs changed: fares increased for several transit operations; Round 6.3 zone level forecasts, as well as forecasts for outlying, non-COG member areas, were made available; the project list changed to reflect 2003 CLRP and FY2004-09 TIP submissions); was a sensitivity analysis performed to distinguish the impacts of each change? (no, this is an assessment of conformity, i.e., to see whether emissions budgets are adhered to with the new plan and program, not a research effort); why are the emissions reductions for projects implemented before 2000 removed from the summary results in the tracking sheet? (otherwise, their benefits would be double-counted).

Mr. Pfoutz announced that copies of final Draft FY 2004-2009 TIP were available at the meeting. The Committee agreed that the TPB could release the Draft Conformity Analysis, the Draft 2003 CLRP, and Draft FY2004-2009 TIP for public comment at the October 15 TPB meeting.

#### **4. Briefing on the Draft Projects to be Modified to Create the Interim 2003 CLRP and FY2004-2009 TIP**

Mr. Austin distributed a series of handouts that detailed projects to be reviewed for inclusion in an interim CLRP and TIP. He stated that changes had been made since the previous draft and

that new additions had been highlighted in bold, italic font. He also said that the shaded lines indicated projects that had not been found in a previously conforming TIP or Plan, and that these would be removed from an interim plan unless it could be shown that they were already in the plan.

Chair Byala asked each jurisdiction to give a status report on their review of the lists. She began by saying that WMATA had reviewed the list and would examine the revised list to see if they needed to make any additional comments.

Mr. Srikanth said that VDOT staff had reviewed the previous draft and provided comments to COG staff. He said they would review the new list and provide comments.

Mr. Rybeck said that DDOT was reviewing their list and looking at the Anacostia Rail Demonstration project since they would like to include that in an interim plan.

Ms. Hasan said that MDOT would be sending a letter detailing which phases could be included.

Mr. Austin commented that some projects on the revised list might be exempt and able to stay in the interim plan and TIP.

Mr. Moss said that he was reviewing Montgomery County's projects and would be sending a letter to COG detailing which projects should be included in the interim plan.

Mr. Salles said that he was still reviewing Prince George's County projects.

Chair Byala asked if it was possible to get a revised list after comments were received before it was sent to the TPB. Andrew replied that he could do this. Comments and edits were requested by the close of business on Tuesday, October 7.

Mr. Kirby asked the jurisdictions to fax or email letters stating which projects should remain in the interim plan by October 15<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Srikanth asked what information would be presented to the TPB. Chair Byala asked if it would just be a list of what would be excluded from the interim TIP and Plan. Mr. Kirby responded that we needed enough information to be able to create a new document. Mr. Miller added that it would need to be more than a basic list of projects to be removed, since some projects were being modified so that they could be included.

The Committee agreed that the TPB could release the project information for the interim CLRP and TIP for public comment at the October 15 TPB meeting.

## **5. Briefing on the Analysis of Regional Transit and Highway Short-Term Funding and Revenue Requirements**

Mr. Kirby distributed a copy of a proposed resolution to be considered by the Program Committee after today's Technical Committee meeting. He briefed the Committee on the resolution to amend the FY 2004 UPWP. It responded to the Committee's recommendation, which was accepted by the TPB on September 17, to conduct a new study to quantify the region's near-term transportation funding needs and priorities and to identify specific sources of revenues over the six-year period 2004 to 2009. He noted that WMATA technical assistance

funds would be reprogrammed in the UPWP for the study. He reviewed the scope of work which was attached to the resolution and said that the study with Cambridge Systematics Inc. (CSI) consultant support is scheduled to be completed by January 2004.

Mr. Reno of CSI said that the near-term focus is very important and valid. He said that because of the tight time frame, the study would primarily utilize existing sources of data and current studies and reports.

Chair Byala commented that the study will not just address transit needs and that the end result will be useful for everyone if a regional perspective can be developed for Congress as it considers the reauthorization of TEA-21.

Mr. Srikanth thanked WMATA for funding the study. He commented that the Northern Virginia jurisdictions have identified the near-term revenues available for transit needs but may not have information on all of the near-term highway needs. He said that they might have to identify specific projects for this time frame.

Mr. Verzosa suggested that criteria are needed so that project “wish lists” are not created.

Mr. Miller said that with such a short time to conduct the study, the focus needs to be on the critical needs that have been identified from available sources such as the Northern Virginia referendum.

Mr. Maslanka commented that the NVTAT Technical Committee is currently developing new lists of priority projects for the Virginia legislature to consider.

Mr. Reno said that CSI staff would work intensively with each jurisdiction to try to move beyond just current needs and focus on critical needs.

Ms. Hasan commented that a new analysis might be needed in Maryland.

Mr. Kirby said that WMATA’s six-year needs focused on what transit system maintenance and rehabilitation were critical and that this needs to be done on the highway side. He said that major highway and bridge rehabilitation projects and critical gaps need to be identified. He said that the study would have to rely on published documents.

Mr. Srikanth stated that identifying these projects could take time and that policy-level review by each jurisdiction will be necessary.

Chair Byala said that the financial plan steering group and the Committee members would be informed as the study progresses.

## **6. Report on Travel Forecasting Subcommittee Meeting**

Mr. Hogan distributed the briefing materials presented at the TPB meeting on September 17, 2003 which describes the process for conducting a peer review of TPB’s travel demand modeling

by a committee selected by the Transportation Research Board. The materials also summarize the findings from the first letter report from the TRB Committee, dated September 8<sup>th</sup>, commenting on the performance of the TPB Version 2.1C travel demand model and the emissions post-processor, and provide TPB staff comments.

The TRB Committee made eleven observations about the TPB modeling process. The TPB staff commented that there is agreement with five of these observations, with no further attention required. TPB staff also agrees that three additional observations offer recommendations for improvement to the modeling process that can be addressed in the near term, while the remaining three observations require further information and discussion.

A conference call with the TRB Committee was held on September 12<sup>th</sup>, during which it was agreed that TPB staff would prepare additional information on certain panel observations, and on future plans for model upgrades and data collection. The TRB Committee will utilize this additional information in preparing its second and final letter report on December 31, 2003.

The TPB Travel Forecasting Subcommittee (TFS) met on September 26<sup>th</sup> (postponed from September 19<sup>th</sup> due to Hurricane Isabel) and heard Mr. Williams of the TRB staff review the scope of work for the peer review process. Mr. Kirby presented the staff response to the first letter report, and the subcommittee engaged in a discussion of the report, offering a variety of opinions.

The TFS then heard from Mr. Shapiro of BMI regarding refinements to the Version 2.1C model as it is applied at the corridor and sub area level in the ICC Study. Extensive review has taken place with respect to traffic counts and other local data, as well as network coding changes, which improve the simulation of travel demand with the new model. Mr. Kirby noted that this type of review needs to occur with other project planning studies around the region, which are making use of the Version 2.1C model.

TPB staff is now preparing information in more detail for the TRB Committee, to be transmitted by October 10<sup>th</sup>. This information will be shared with the TFS at its next meeting on November 21<sup>st</sup>. The second and final letter report from the TRB Committee will be reviewed with the TFS in January 2004, as it has implications for the development of the work program for the balance of FY2004 and beyond.

Mr. Mokhtari inquired about the use of adjustment factors in travel demand models in other regions. Mr. Hogan responded that the staff was presently engaged in a review of modeling in eleven major metropolitan areas of similar size to Washington around the country. Information developed from this investigation will be shared with the TRB Committee and others.

Mr. Rybeck commented that the TRB Committee had expressed concern that the model was not fitted to data as well as hoped; yet it felt that there were too many adjustment factors present. Mr. Hogan responded that the use of adjustment factors was one of the issues for which more information is being developed for the TRB Committee to review. The TPB staff views these factors as necessary to address the influence of military installations, universities, other major generators, as well as the proximity of Baltimore. Some of the factors are commonly used to

take models calibrated at a disaggregate level and apply them in an aggregate setting for production. He further observed that the less-than-hoped-for fitting of the model to the available data reflects the fact that the staff did not simply apply adjustment factors to achieve that outcome.

Mr. Replogle commented that he hopes the region takes the peer review seriously. Failure to respond to the issues raised in the review will expose the region to legal challenges. He urged that the region strive to develop world class models, reflecting experience beyond U.S. practice (e.g., Stockholm). He stated his desire to work with TPB staff in this regard.

Mr. Srikanth commented that he felt the peer review process was progressing in a positive manner, and there should be no need to be defensive. He felt that new information is being developed which can be applied to improve the process in the future. The stance taken by TPB staff in having an open discussion regarding the future work elements in the models program was commendable.

Mr. Wolfenstein inquired whether other MPOs had engaged in peer reviews of travel demand modeling. Mr. Kirby replied that, while there have been technical peer reviews conducted elsewhere, including the one that was performed here in 1995, this review is the first one to his knowledge that had been performed by the Transportation Research Board.

## **7. Briefing on 2000 Census Journey to Work Analysis**

Mr. Griffiths distributed a handout that described the content of the Census Transportation Planning Package 2000 (CTPP 2000); a special tabulation of responses to the U.S. Census long form questionnaire intended to provide data to support a wide range of transportation planning activities. He reported that staff had received the CTPP 2000 Part 1 – Place of Residence data in mid-August, checked jurisdictional control totals and identified a couple of issues with the Part 1 data. He stated that most of these issues were minor in nature and could be overcome, but that they had to be kept in mind in analyzing and using the CTPP 2000 data. He added that the CTPP 2000 data that the staff was most interested, TAZ to TAZ worker commuting flows, would not be available until early 2004.

Mr. Maslanka asked if transit commuting data would be available from the CTPP 2000.

Mr. Griffiths responded the CTPP 2000 had commuting data by all travel modes, including transit, cross tabulated by a number of worker characteristics.

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

Mr. Griffiths reported that the TPB Technical Committee Transportation Scenarios subgroup had been very active in the last month and asked Chair Byala if she would like to report on the activities of this subgroup.

Chair Byala explained that the primary task of the Transportation Scenarios subgroup was to define the transportation facilities that would be modeled with each of the alternative land use

scenarios. She further stated that the subgroup's plan was to develop the transportation assumptions for one alternative land use scenario each month, starting the "More Household Growth in Region" land use scenario this month.

Chair Byala further reported that the TPB's Value Pricing Task Force was very interested in the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study HOV/HOT lanes scenario and would be taking the lead role in deciding what transportation facilities would be tested in this scenario.

Mr. Griffiths interjected that while the Value Pricing Task Force would be playing a leading role in providing input on the HOV/HOT lanes scenario, the Transportation Scenarios subgroup would still be actively involved in helping the Value Pricing Task Force specify the transportation assumptions for this scenario and in providing technical assistance and guidance.

Chair Byala also reported that Transportation Scenarios subgroup had reviewed the detailed assumptions for the "Coordinated Regional Bus and Transit Service" element of the Regional Congestion Management Program component of the study and achieved a great deal of consensus on these assumptions.

Mr. Kirby stated that the detailed regional bus and transit service assumptions developed for the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study would also be very useful in helping to refine out year transit service assumptions for the regional travel demand model. This was an issue the

TRB Models Peer Panel had suggested that staff look into in improving the regional travel demand model for longer range forecasts of future transit and highway travel.

Mr. Griffiths stated that the next meeting of the Joint Technical Working Group was scheduled for Friday, October 10<sup>th</sup> at 12:15 pm and the next meeting of the Transportation Scenarios subgroup was scheduled for October 20<sup>th</sup> at 1:00PM.

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

## **9. Other Business**

None.

## **10. Adjourn**





**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - June 27, 2003**

**COG Staff and Others Continued**

Jane Posey, COG/DTP

Andrew Austin, COG/DTP

G. Toni Giardini, COG/DTP

Patrick Ziliacus, COG/DTP

Kenneth Todd, NCBW