

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE - September 5, 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.    Faramarz Mokhtari  
-----  
MDOT                     Fatimah Hasan  
                              BJ Berhanu  
                              Mike Haley

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria                Maria White  
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                        Michael Ibay  
VRE                         Tamara Ashby  
VDOT                        Grady Ketron  
VDRPT                       Sharmila Samarasinghe  
NVPDC                      -----  
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  
Mark Pfoutz, COG/DTP  
Anant Choudhary, COG/DTP  
Bill Bacon, COG/DTP  
Joan Rohlf, COG/DEP  
Beth Lowe, COG/DEP  
Randy Carroll, MDE  
Howard Chang, Tri-County Council  
Harry Sanders  
James Wamsly, FCSG

**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 Zilliacus, COG/DTP

Kenneth Todd, NCBW

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

## **TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

### **1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from June 27, 2003 TPB Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

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

Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee on the consultant report presented at the July 16 TPB meeting on the financial analysis for the 2003 Update of the Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP), and on the issues raised on the presentation of the results of the analysis in WMATA's July 16 letter to the TPB. He reviewed the discussions at a September 3 meeting with WMATA and implementing agency staff that addressed the issues raised in the WMATA letter. He said that he would brief the TPB on September 17 on the implications of the CLRP results and emphasize the serious transit funding shortfall facing the region in the short-term. He said that the new analysis discussed at the September 3 meeting could be undertaken in the next few months to quantify the region's near-term transit and highway funding needs and to identify specific sources of revenues over the next 6 years. He noted that it appears that Congress will delay for several months acting on the reauthorization of TEA-21 and that the results of this study could help focus on WMATA's near-term needs.

Chair Byala commented that WMATA did not have a problem with the long-term financial analysis for the CLRP, but was concerned about the near-term funding short falls in the next 6 years. She said that a focused study on the near term revenues and transit and highway needs could be conducted in the next few months with the firm that completed the CLRP financial analysis and that the WMATA technical assistance program had funding for such a study.

Ms. Hasan commented that MDOT was aware of the funding short falls and that a legislative commission had documented over \$10 billion in statewide needs. She said that the state was trying to identify more transportation revenues.

Mr. Biesiadny pointed out that even without the passage of the recent Northern Virginia sales tax referendum, the 2003 CLRP analysis shows that there is more funding for transit than was in the 2000 analysis and that there has been a shift in revenues from highways to transit. Chair Byala said that the new near-term study will identify both highway and transit needs.

Mr. Verzosa said that local jurisdictions have provided Congress lists of priority funding needs and asked how they are going to agree on making Metro funding their top priority. Chair Byala said that Metro funding does not need to be the first priority of each jurisdiction but WMATA would like it's needs to have a clear regional focus and be a priority for every jurisdiction. Mr. Kirby said that the TPB can focus on this issue and speak for the region as it did in 2000 and recently in its November 2002 letter to the Congress.

near-term  
transit and highway funding needs and to identify specific sources of revenues over the next 6 years .

### **3. Briefing on the Region's Updated State Implementation Plan (SIP) Submission to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)**

Ms. Rohlf reported to the Committee that the Washington area's 'severe area' SIP had been approved by MWAQC at its August 13, 2003 meeting and had been submitted to EPA shortly thereafter, by Virginia only. Maryland had submitted the SIP the previous Friday and the District of Columbia had yet to submit it to EPA. She highlighted the elements of the plan by referring to the mailout item, which consisted of the plan's Executive Summary. She reported that EPA would review the SIP for adequacy of the mobile budgets. She indicated that the SIP needed to be revised by March 2004, which would necessitate additional technical work activities to be carried out in the next three months. She also noted that a SIP Management Task Force was to be convened on September 12, 2003 to guide the next steps in that process.

The Committee then discussed the topic including: what was the problem which prevented DC from filing the SIP? (staff was uncertain, but it was expected to be submitted in the next week); why did the additional technical activities need to be finalized in the next three months? (since public hearings and response to comments were required); what is the status of the eight hour ozone standard? (implementation is on the horizon, but a number of issues have yet to be resolved, e.g., the nonattainment area will be larger but has yet to be established; will we face both the one hour and the eight hour standards; if we don't attain the one hour standard by then, will mobile budgets be developed or will the "build / no-build" test be reinstated; will CMAQ funding be spread out over more areas and jurisdictions).

### **4. Status Report on the Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the 2003 CLRP and on the Draft FY 2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Clifford began the item by addressing the schedule of work activities. When the Committee last met (June 27<sup>th</sup>), the schedule for MWAQC's adoption of the SIP was to be in July. Allowing ninety days for EPA's emissions budget adequacy review could have enabled the TPB to act in October. However, since MWAQC acted in August and the soonest adequacy could be established would be in November, the TPB's schedule had to slip to November. Accordingly, Mr. Clifford indicated that he would only provide a status report, not a draft final report, on the conformity assessment. He then reported on the network development, travel demand modeling, emissions factor development, and emission estimation activities for each of the four forecast years - 2005, 2015, 2025, and 2030. Only 2005 had been completed from network development through emission estimation and the results indicated that no additional emissions mitigation measures would be necessary.

The Committee then discussed the topic including: was transit ridership constrained in the analysis? (yes, as in the past, core area ridership in 2015 and beyond would be constrained at 2005 levels).

Next, Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee on the benefits of producing an interim 2003 CLRP and FY 2004-2009 TIP to be applied in the event that federal approval of the new CLRP and TIP does not occur by January 21, 2004, when the current CLRP and TIP lapse. He discussed what happens if the current CLRP and TIP lapse and distributed sets of federal guidance on the details of the types of projects that can proceed during a lapse.

Mr. Miller distributed a memorandum to the Committee on steps to prepare an interim CLRP and TIP and circulated two draft sets of project listings that need to be reviewed for possible inclusion in an interim TIP or CLRP. He reviewed the steps, tables for exempt projects and federal guidance documents referenced in his memo.

Mr. Salles and Mr. Hekimian asked about what constitutes federal approval of a non-exempt project. Mr. Miller said that the memo tries to explain it and that only approval of the project funding is needed and it does not have to be under contract. He said that the FHWA and FTA guidance was detailed and somewhat complex and that specific project questions should be clarified with the federal approval agencies. Ms. Dietz commented that we need to make sure that the federal guidance is uniformly applied to all projects in the region.

Mr. Kirby suggested that the Committee have a special meeting to review the projects for the interim TIP and CLRP. Chair Byala agreed and the meeting was scheduled for September 23 at 9 am.

Mr. Biesiadny inquired about projects that only have local funding and no federal funding. Mr. Kirby referred to the specific federal guidance for these types of non-exempt projects and said that local approval of the funding would be required.

Mr. Miller explained that the second list showed all of the non-exempt projects from the draft 2003 CLRP that were not in a TIP and thus would not be in an interim 2003 CLRP.

The Committee agreed that an interim CLRP and TIP should be prepared and released for public comment and TPB approval on the same October 15/November 19 schedule as currently anticipated for the new CLRP and TIP.

## **5. Briefing on Recommended Updates to Methods and Data for Estimating Mobile Source Emissions for the 2005 Cycle.**

Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee on the topic through reference to the mailout material - a June 6, 2002 memo from him to the Mobile6 Task Force. The memo focused on future updates to methods and data for estimating mobile emissions, dealing in turn with schedule, travel forecasts, vehicle registration data, and VMT by vehicle class. The schedule envisioned a three year cycle of updates, consistent with most immediate past practice. Travel forecast updates referred to the continuing updates to the modeling process which occur as new data are collected and analyzed, and as new methods are developed. Vehicle registration and VMT by class referred to new research initiatives proposed by TPB staff which would: (1) further stratify vehicle registration

data to be more consistent with Mobile6 categories, and (2) utilize odometer data recorded with I & M inspections, and (3) consider collection of additional traffic count data to enhance existing procedures.

Mr. Kirby indicated that staff would be back next month with additional details of the work items, with the intention of also advancing the recommendations to TPB and MWAQC for review.

## **6. Update on the Regional Mass Marketing TERM**

Mr. Ramfos and Mr. Franklin gave an update on the Commuter Connections Mass Marketing TERM and presented the following information:

Mr. Ramfos reported that the TERM goals and marketing objectives are to convert 17,050 SOV trips to alternative forms of transportation by the end of FY05 and by an additional 17,050 by the end of FY07. The overall objective is to establish the Commuter Connections brand and provide reinforcement to commuters currently using alternative commute modes.

The campaign aims to provide year-round marketing support to promote all forms of alternative commuting including telework. The focus is on the segment of SOV population that is likely to consider switching to alternative forms of transportation.

In addition to reviewing all pertinent existing research conducted over the past several years within the region, new research was initiated. Qualitative research has been conducted in preparation of the campaign in order to understand opinions of stakeholders, employers and consumers. Methodologies included telephone and written surveys, focus groups and round table discussions.

Previous research spoke of time, cost and convenience while the new research defined commuter frustration as the key emotional trigger that sets off the desire to change commute modes. It also identified the morning commute as when these emotions are at their highest peak.

The following inputs contributed to the foundation of the marketing plan; past marketing initiatives, previous research, new research and feedback from groups including the TPB, TPB Tech Committee, Access for All and the Citizens Advisory Committee.

The focus of the marketing efforts are aimed primarily at consumers and secondarily at employers within the region. Mass marketing components will include a heavy rotation of radio spots backed by a TV commercial. Other marketing efforts will include advertising on WashingtonPost.com, WTOP web site, search engine keyword sponsorship, direct mail to select regional activity centers, highway signage and public relations.

The campaign will also reach out to urban and Hispanic audiences through airtime on radio stations with high concentrations of Latinos and African Americans. Additional direct mail to ethnic neighborhoods is also under consideration.

The Advertising Contractor developed six radio concepts, which were voted on by both the Commuter Connections Subcommittee and the Regional TDM Marketing Group. Three of the concepts were created into radio scripts and produced into rough-cut commercials for focus group testing. The State funding agencies assisted by providing feedback on the radio spot verbiage. Findings from the creative focus groups identified the testimonial campaign as the preferred choice.

A work session was held for the TPB in July to present progress of the Mass Marketing campaign. The TPB feedback was in concert with the focus groups, and the endorsed direction was to proceed with the testimonial format. Direction was given to expand the testimonial format to include variations of alternative transportation modes and feature a representation of the metropolitan areas diversity. Additionally, the TPB asked that new tag lines be tested.

In order to validate the campaign, 300 commuters participated in a survey and were asked to rate the testimonial commercial. This research provided validation of the testimonial themed concept, as it received strong marks by both SOV and non-SOV commuters. Of the tag lines that were tested, the most favorable was "Flexible Solutions for a Better Commute".

Results via phone calls and web applications will be monitored throughout the campaign to ensure effectiveness at accomplishing TERM objectives. A formal evaluation will be conducted by a third party contactor.

The next steps will be to give a final presentation to the TPB at a Work Session on September 17<sup>th</sup>, and to launch the campaign later in September 2003.

Mr. Sanders suggested that incorporating a free offer is typically popular with consumers. Mr. Ramfos mentioned that Commuter Connections has trialed a free transit pass promotion with many of the transit partners in the past through direct mailings. At the present time, the focus is on establishing the broadcast media aspects of the campaign, but the results of this past promotion warrant the possibility of trying the approach again at some point in the future in order to boost underutilized transit routes etc.

Mr. Salles expressed that the radio spot was good up until the end (the tag). Mr. Franklin acknowledged that this tag was weak and for the final production, would be substituted for the tag which received strong ratings during the rounds of consumer research.

Mr. Hekimian asked if we had plans to advertise on bus exteriors. Mr. Ramfos mentioned that we were working with WMATA regarding available opportunities and that at this stage WMATA is re-evaluating whether an outside contractor will administer this function. If made available, the timing would be Spring 2004. For this fall we are working with WMATA on the possibility to place Metro station dioramas as Public Service Announcements for the Guaranteed Ride Home program.

Mr. Salles asked about the Street Smart Campaign in regard to posters on bus shelters. Mr. Ramfos stated that Commuter Connections is open to any suggestions and will consider all options in order make the best use of marketing resources.

Mr. Griffiths asked for clarification of the presented charts explaining the quantitative creative research. Mr. Franklin explained that respondents rated the commercial as to its likeability (Did the spot make a positive connection?) and believability (Was the message credible, did they believe that Commuter Connections could deliver on the promise of providing better commute options?).

Ms. Klancher asked whether the campaign would be able to extend in other ways to the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) audience beyond the Hispanic radio commercial. Mr. Ramfos stated that we are looking at the possibility of reproducing the outdated regional Park & Ride map (based on whether additional funding for printing becomes available) and that it could perhaps have a Hispanic version. He invited the Access for All Committee to provide any further suggestions on behalf of the LEP outreach.

Chair Byala provided a suggestion to eliminate or improve some of the charts and graphs prior to the scheduled presentation to the TPB on Sept 17<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Ramfos and Mr. Franklin said that the presentation would be pared down to the essential information before the upcoming TPB Work Session.

Chair Byala also asked if last minute changes could be made to the radio spots based on feedback received at the September TPB Work Session. Mr. Ramfos stated that he already notified the advertising agency of the possible need to tweak the materials after the TPB Work Session and prior to radio airplay.

## **7. Briefing on the Establishment of a TPB Value Pricing Task Force**

Mr. Kirby reviewed the goals and membership of the TPB Value Pricing Task Force established at the July 16 TPB meeting. He outlined the potential agenda for the first task force meeting scheduled for September 10 and identified several activities for the task force to consider, including identification of a regional HOT lane network, determination of regionally consistent pricing and operating policies and technologies, and discussion of the use of the revenues. He said that the task force's HOT lane network and parking pricing ideas can be input to the on-going Regional Mobility Study. Chair Byala said that the Committee's comments on HOT lanes in the June 27 meeting minutes should be shared with the task force. Ms. Hasan commented that the task force should be sure to address the equity issues of value pricing and the impacts on low income people.

Chair Byala asked if this topic was on the September 17 TPB agenda. Mr. Kirby replied that it was not because this was the first meeting of the task force. Mr. Miller said that TPB Chairman Shapiro, who also is chair of the task force, would probably comment on the task force meeting during his remarks to the TPB.

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

Mr. Griffiths reported that he had briefed the TPB at its July meeting on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study and that his status report had been well received. He noted that the next steps in this study were to: (1) detail the specifications for the “regional congestion management” element of the study, the so-called CLRP Plus Base Case scenario, (2) define the transportation assumptions for each alternative land use scenario and (3) develop the detailed specifications for the Regional HOV/HOT lanes scenario.

Mr. Griffiths also reported that the Technical Committee Transportation Scenarios subgroup would be meeting on September 9<sup>th</sup> to discuss the proposed methodology and detailed assumptions for the "Coordinated Regional Bus and Transit Service" component of the region congestion management element and to begin the process of specifying transportation scenarios for each of the alternative land use scenarios.

Chair Byala added that the plan was to have the Transportation Scenarios subgroup focus on the transportation assumptions for one alternative land use scenario each month for the next several months.

Mr. Sanders stated he was concerned about schedule slippage, if the Transportation Scenarios subgroup only focused on one transportation scenario a month.

Mr. Griffiths responded that it would take time for the network coders to code the transportation facilities assumed for each scenario and if they were given all the assumptions for each transportation scenario all at once it would still take them about five months to complete all of the coding. Mr. Griffiths stated he believed that working on one scenario a month would make the most efficient use of everyone’s time and would permit the Joint Technical Working Group (JTWG) to learn more about each scenario by focusing on one scenario a month.

Mr. Griffiths noted that the next meeting date of the JTWG had been changed to Friday, September 19<sup>th</sup> to accommodate a change in the Planning Directors meeting schedule.

Mr. Kirby noted that Mr. Griffiths would be briefing the COG Board on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study on September 10<sup>th</sup>.

## **8. Other Business**

None.

## **10. Adjourn**

---

