

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - December 5, 2003**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Rick Rybeck

MARYLAND

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

 MDOT Fatimah Hasan
 BJ Berhanu

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Maria White
 Arlington Co. -----
 City of Fairfax -----
 Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny
 Mike Lake
 Falls Church -----
 Loudoun Co. Art Smith
 Manassas -----
 Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
 NVTC -----
 PRTC -----
 VRE -----
 VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
 VDRPT -----
 NVPDC -----
 VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA -----

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
 FTA -----
 NCPC -----
 NPS -----
 MWAQC -----

COG Staff and Others

Ronald Kirby, COG/DTP
 Gerald Miller, COG/DTP
 Jim Hogan, COG/DTP
 Joan Rohlf, COG/DEP
 Beth Lowe, COG/DEP
 Robert Griffiths, COG/DTP
 Andrew Meese, 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
 Dusan Vuksan, COG/DTP
 Paul Dejardin, COG/HSPPS
 Greg Goodwin, COG/HSPPS
 Arlee Reno, Cambridge Systematics
 Kiran Bhatt, Cambridge Systematics
 Phillip Strong, American Council of the Blind
 Tim Nutter, NVTA
 Howard Chang, Tri-County Council

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from November 7 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)

Mr. Kirby informed the Committee all documents required for the severe area ozone SIP update has been transmitted to MWAQC. At its meeting on 12/17/03, MWAQC will consider the draft SIP update for approval and release for public hearings.

Two internal staff memos were distributed with supplemental mobile source inventories information. The first memo, dated 11/17/03, provided final wintertime CO inventories. The second memo, dated 11/26/03, provided 2002 and 2005 ozone season inventory results.

Ms. Rohlfs informed the Committee that the mobile emissions analysis prepared for this SIP update did not itemize emission effects of individual programs. Instead, the aggregate effect of all programs working together was analyzed. Programs interact in the calculations performed by the new MOBILE 6 software used for analysis, thus benefits of individual programs cannot be clearly identified.

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following: will the absence of an itemization of emission benefits by project affect CMAQ funding requirements? (this is not expected to impact CMAQ funding requirements).

Mr. Kirby then briefed the Committee on an updated draft of the SIP, Section 9, Mobile Source Conformity. The update was transmitted with a letter from TPB to MWAQC on 11/24/03 to replace the earlier version sent 11/14/03. This consisted of updates to numerical budgets based upon latest planning assumptions and no significant changes were made to the text of the document.

Designation of non-attainment area boundaries for the eight-hour standard is expected from EPA in April of 2004. These requirements will become effective in May, 2004 and non-attainment areas will have one year to develop a conforming plan or the conformity determination will lapse. Conformity analysis for the Washington area will be challenging due to the new geographical boundary for the non-attainment area. New areas may be added that have not been collecting socio-economic data at the level of detail needed to perform conformity analyses.

A revised draft of Section 9 of the SIP was distributed at the meeting. Section 9.4 has been drafted to identify trends in mobile emissions. Mr. Kirby stated that after reviewing the draft, MWAQC requested Section 9.4 be revised to include a discussion of factors contributing to increased emissions through time (i.e. trend toward heavier vehicles, growing population, employment, and VMT). Mr. Kirby stated that he will work with COG/DEP staff to develop a revised Section 9.4 addressing MWAQC's concerns. Mr. Kirby suggested also adding a

discussion of the significant emissions reductions in out-years not analyzed in the short term of the SIP, i.e. positive emission benefits are forecasted despite the impacts of negative trends.

Ms. Rohlfs stated that it would be helpful if State DOT represented at the meeting could forward the memo to their agency's representatives on the MWAQC technical advisory committee.

3. Status Report on Approval of 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

Mr. Kirby reviewed a letter contained in the mailout, dated 11/24/03, from MWAQC to TPB. The letter supports the conformity determination and will be included in the packet for the 12/17/03 TPB meeting.

Ms. Rohlfs stated that the EPA Region 3 Administrator is expected to send a conformity adequacy determination letter to state air agencies and hoped the approval would be reflected in the Federal Register next week. The budgets can be used 15 days after appearing in the Federal Register. TPB may have to adopt the conformity analysis on 12/17/03 with a later effective date.

Mr. Miller stated that the interim TIP was finalized and copies were available for Committee members to review. Mr. Miller also noted that copies would be submitted to state and federal agencies next week, for their review and approval.

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following: Should Virginia consider not amending the STIP with the interim TIP if the full TIP will be available in 30-40 days? (the Virginia STIP does not expire until fall of 2004. Therefore, the TIP availability in 30-40 days will not cause a lapse of the STIP).

4. Draft Solicitation Document and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2004 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Kirby reviewed the changes that had been made to the draft document. He noted that the TERM reporting section would be distributed separately but that the new schedule remained the same as the version in the mail-out. He also said the document included a section on the Interim 2003 CLRP and FY 04-09 TIP. Mr. Miller said that this draft would be revised if the TPB adopted the full Plan and TIP by January 2004. Mr. Kirby said that other changes included an updated conformity history, new materials on the MOBILE6 emissions model, the second phase of the SIP, and the 8-hour standard designations that would be made in May 2005. He added that EPA did not concur with all of the state proposals for 8-hour attainment areas.

Ms. Rohlfs said that EPA had sent letters to the District, Maryland and Virginia and also posted those letters on its Region 3 web site. She said that the District of Columbia's plan was accepted without change. She said that EPA had made a change to the parts of Maryland that would be designated as non-attainment areas. She noted that the Baltimore and Washington CMSAs would be separate. Ms. Rohlfs said that in Virginia, Stafford County had been removed from

the Washington region and added to Fredericksburg area MPO's region, while Fauquier County would be added to the Washington region. She said these EPA letters were under a 60-day comment period. Ms. Rohlf's said that Virginia would have to submit a SIP amendment to move Stafford County over to FAMPO. She said that all areas including Baltimore and FAMPO would be given the same designation. Mr. Kirby said that the 1-hour budgets cannot be used for the 8-hour tests and that it was possible that the region would have to use a "build/no-build" or "below baseline" test.

Mr. Kirby spoke to the conformity schedule. He characterized the schedule as very aggressive, noting that TPB approval of the 2004 CLRP and the FY 2005-2010 TIP was slated for July. He said that this was tied to the October 1 beginning of the federal fiscal year. Mr. Kirby pointed out potential issues with the schedule. He said that it is possible that the federal budget allocations will not be approved on time. He also said that the state DOTs needed all of the approved MPO TIPS in order to prepare and submit the state TIP for federal approval. Mr. Kirby said that VDOT has revised its STIP process and was working with all of the MPOs to get their TIPs approved by August, adding that the VDOT pre-allocation period had been moved into the fall, similar to Maryland. Mr. Kirby said meeting the project submission deadline in February to begin the public comment period was critical so that the final project inputs affecting conformity are defined by March 17 so the conformity analysis process can begin.

Mr. Srikanth commented that there may be changes to financial information for some projects after that date, but it would be very unlikely to have any change to projects that affect conformity after February. Mr. Biesiadny said that Fairfax County's secondary road program won't go to a public hearing until February, but added that the county would provide all possible inputs by March. Ms. Hasan said that MDOT would try to meet the schedule.

Mr. Kirby said that the challenge was synchronizing the conformity analysis cycle with the annual state and federal budget processes. He said that there were potential alternative solutions if the schedule could not be met. He said that the TPB could act on a conformity-neutral Plan and TIP in July. When major projects that affect conformity are identified, the conformity analysis would be performed and the plan and TIP would be amended. Mr. Kirby said that a decision on whether to run conformity or not and on which set of projects would have to be made at the March 17 TPB meeting. Mr. Biesiadny said that it was possible that conformity modeling may need to be run more than once.

Mr. Sivasailam distributed a hand-out item on TERM analysis and reporting. He said that the TERM analysis had incorporated the MOBILE6 emissions factors and used an average speed of 41 miles per hour. Mr. Sivasailam pointed out the project category column. He said this would be used to cross classify the TERMS with SIP project listings. Ms. Hasan asked when the TERM tracking reports were due. Mr. Sivasailam requested they be submitted by the end of March. Mr. Srikanth noted that if the TPB decides in March not to run conformity, then the TERM analysis might not be needed at that time.

Mr. Austin said the eTIP database application would be available by the end of December and that the full 2003 CLRP and FY 2004-2009 inputs would be used as the baseline.

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

Mr. Reno of Cambridge Systematics Inc. (CSI) distributed a set of preliminary draft tables to the Committee which presented the initial compilation of the six year highway and transit needs and the unfunded portion of needs for the District of Columbia, Suburban Maryland, Northern Virginia, and WMATA. He explained that these were drafts for review only. He asked the implementing agencies and local governments to review them quickly so revised tables could be mailed to the TPB for its December 17 meeting. For each jurisdiction, he commented on what needed to be done to review and complete each of the draft tables. He thanked the staffs of all the agencies for their efforts in providing the needs and revenue data.

Mr. Rybeck asked how current the District's needs information is and if it includes the Anacostia light rail line and other lines. Mr. Reno replied that the comprehensive highway and bridge needs study for the District was completed in 1997 by CSI. He said that the data has been reviewed and utilized for the 2000 and 2003 CLRP financial plans. He said that he would meet soon with Mr. Rybeck to review the needs and revenue information and to discuss the more recently identified projects.

Mr. Srikanth reviewed the processes for developing and reviewing the state and local government transit and highway needs for Northern Virginia. Mr. Biesiadny asked the value of presenting the needs year by year. Mr. Reno commented that the total over the six years is perhaps more important. Mr. Kirby reminded the Committee that showing the year by year needs is very important to WMATA. Mr. Srikanth explained that the detailed analysis of each unfunded project to examine how new resources would be spent has not been done and so it is not clear what the year to year figures would be. He said that the agencies could be held accountable to any year to year average estimates and that he was not comfortable with such estimates. Mr. Kirby suggested that all the tables could just present the totals for the six years and comments could be added on the critical timing for specific needs like WMATA's in the earlier years. Mr. Srikanth agreed and said that the Northern Virginia table should note that the year to year analysis has not been done and more information on cash flow would be available when it is completed. Mr. Miller commented that since the audience for the results in the study brochure is the public and elected officials that the message and data presentation need to be kept as simple as possible.

Mr. Reno reviewed the WMATA table and explained that the major system expansion project needs are included in the appropriate jurisdiction tables. He said that the WMATA data and the transit data from the local governments should be reviewed by all parties. Mr. Biesiadny asked about the operating needs mentioned in some tables. Mr. Reno explained that the needs should be for capital. He pointed out that the local jurisdictions in Maryland should review the MDOT data to ensure that their needs are included. He said that he would work with Mr. Rybeck to reconcile the DDOT and WMATA data.

Mr. Kirby asked that the revisions to the tables be provided to CSI by close of business on Monday December 8 so they can be included in the TPB mailout on December 11. He said that if possible the mail out tables would be e-mailed to the Committee members before the 11th.

6. Status of Regional Traffic Signal Optimization Program

Mr. Farrell reviewed the memo that would be presented to the TPB on traffic signal optimization. He said that the region had committed to optimizing 856 signals by January 2005. Mr. Farrell reported that the region was in very good shape to meet and surpass that goal. He said that as of September 8 the District had optimized over 400 signals and that Maryland had optimized 182 signals and was working with Montgomery County to do another 255. Mr. Farrell said that VDOT was expected to meet its commitment as well.

Mr. Srikanth expressed his concern with the language in the memo that stated that VDOT was to provide funds to local jurisdictions to perform the optimizations. He noted that some local jurisdictions were funding their own signals. Mr. Biesiadny stated that FY 2004 CMAQ funds were approved for Arlington County and other Northern Virginia jurisdictions. Mr. Kirby said that this memo would be presented to the TPB and that he would work with Mr. Farrell to correct the language and CMAQ information pertaining to Northern Virginia.

7. Review of Top Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Mr. Farrell told the Committee that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee had adopted a list of regionally significant, unfunded needs to be considered for TPB approval and inclusion in the 2004 CLRP and FY 2005-2010 TIP. He distributed a listing of projects from previous lists that had been funded. Mr. Kirby suggested that this topic be placed on the January agenda due to time constraints. Mr. Mohktari asked if there was a map that showed the listed projects. Mr. Farrell said that a map had not yet been developed.

8. Report of the Travel Forecasting Subcommittee

Mr. Hogan reported that the TPB Travel Forecasting Subcommittee met on November 21st to discuss the TRB Committee's effort to review the TPB travel demand model and emissions post-processor. At the request of the TRB Committee, a straw man multi-year work program in models development and data collection had been prepared by the staff on October 10th. This work program was presented to the TFS at this meeting, and was included in the mailout packet for this TPB Technical Committee meeting. Key elements of this work program are:

- It responds to the observations made by the TRB Committee in its first letter report on September 8th;
- Presents a staff proposal for future upgrades to the travel demand modeling process, including requisite data collection needed to accomplish the upgrade; and
- Continues the multi-track approach to incremental improvement in the travel demand forecasting procedures.

Mr. Hogan also reported that communication with TRB indicates that a no cost extension of the contract will be needed, the length of which has not been determined. Other items discussed at the TFS meeting were proposed improvements in transit modeling and truck modeling, both of

