

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - July 9, 2004**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Rick Rybeck

MARYLAND

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

Montgomery Co. Alexander Hekimian
Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari

MDOT Fatimah Hasan
 Mike Haley
 BJ Berhanu

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Jim Maslanka
Arlington Co. Harriet Dietz
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny
 Robert O. Owolabi
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. -----
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
NVTC Jana Lynott
PRTC Karen Waterman
VRE Tamara Ashby
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT -----
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Lora Byala

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
FTA Deborah Burns

NCPC -----
NPS -----
MWAQC -----

COG Staff and Others

Ronald Kirby, COG/DTP
Gerald Miller, COG/DTP
Mike Clifford, COG/DTP
Jane Posey, COG/DTP
Robert Griffiths, COG/DTP
Mark Pfoutz, COG/DTP
Andy Meese, COG/DTP
Andrew Austin, COG/DTP
Jim Hogan, COG/DTP
Mark Moran, COG/DTP
Anant Choudhary, COG/DTP
Michael Freeman, COG/DTP
Joan Rohlfs, COG/DEP
Beth Lowe, COG/DEP
G. Toni Giardini, COG/DTP
Nicolas Ramfos, COG/DTP
Julie Ruszczyk, VDOT-NOVA
Randy Carroll, MDE
Howard Chang, Tri-County Council
Paul DesJardin, COG/HSPPS
Lalit Shavma, City of Alexandria
Tim Nutter, NVTA
Steven R. Brown, DCPD
Krute Singa, WMATA
Eulalie Lucas, COG-DTP
Michael Replogle, Environmental Defense
Radi Al-Saivafi, Environmental Defense
Harry Sanders, Action Committee for Transit

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the June 4 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Status Report on the Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2004 CLRP and FY2005-2010 TIP

Mr. Clifford summarized two mailout items and one handout item. The first mailout item was a copy of the air quality conformity assessment status report presented as Item 9 at the June 16, 2004, Transportation Planning Board meeting. The second mailout item was a staff memorandum dated June 29, 2004, entitled "Comparison of Mobile 6.2 vs. Mobile 6 emission rates." The handout item was a one-page document entitled "Proposed Year 2004 CLRP and FY 2005-2010 TIP Air Quality Conformity Schedule", dated July 7, 2004.

The Committee discussed this topic, including the following points: If we do not meet the July deadline, when would the analysis completed? (September reflects the new deadline for a draft report and is more realistic); MDOT is planning to include managed lanes without toll discounts for HOV. Can the new Version 2.1D model be used to analyze managed lanes? (Yes, managed lanes are being analyzed on the ICC project); How have emission factors changed after MOBILE 6.2 update? (Staff reported that CO decreased with 6.2; a technical memo identifying the emission changes will be prepared); How will the new 8-hour standard affect the number of code red days? (A slight increase in the number of code red days is expected.)

3. Update on Transportation Emission Reduction Measures (TERMs) for the 2004 CLRP and FY2005-2010 TIP

Mr. Kirby provided an update on the Transportation Emissions Reduction Measures (TERMs). Since the regional travel demand model was validated against 2000 data, benefits from projects implemented prior to 2000 are not included in the "TERM Tracking Sheet". He discussed attachment C in the handout which were additional TERMS that have been analyzed and could be adopted if needed. He discussed the results of the recent State of Commute survey and changes to the effectiveness of previously implemented TERMS. He described how the definition for telecommuting used in the survey has been refined and the new definition has reduced the percentage of telecommuters in the region. Using the latest definition the consultant will revise the benefits of telecommuting in the 2001 survey. In response to a question from Mr. Biesiadny, Mr. Kirby replied that the estimated number of telecommuters would go down by 20 to 30 percent. In response to a question whether the same impact would apply to TERMS 216 and 218 (expanded telecommuting), Mr. Ramfos said no since they are being implemented now and they will be evaluated based on the refined definition. In response to a question from Ms. Byala of why WMATA's comments have not been addressed, Mr. Kirby replied that the Technical Committee handout was the same as

was distributed at the last Travel Management Subcommittee meeting and the comments will be incorporated in the new handout. Mr. Rybeck suggested M-144 be considered for adoption since it has been proposed by Mr. Mendelson as legislation in the District Council.

4. Briefing on the New Air Quality Conformity Requirements Under the 8 Hour Ozone Rule, and on proposed EPA Non-attainment Area Designations for Fine Particles (PM 2.5)

Mr. Kirby presented the mailout items to the Committee and informed the committee that the 8-hour requirements go into effect on June 15, 2005. He told the Committee that Stafford County has been removed from the 8-hour non-attainment area. Mr. Kirby noted that there is a need for discussion of the pros and cons of using either the one-hour or 8-hour areas for the upcoming analysis, provided as options within the EPA regulations. TPB staff is recommending the one-hour area for analysis at this time. A new analysis year, 2010, will also be required for the upcoming conformity analysis. TPB staff will develop 2010 networks for use in the analysis.

Ms. Lowe gave a presentation with power-point handouts entitled "PM 2.5 Designation Process and Timeline".

The Committee then discussed this item, including the following points: Would Stafford County be included in the 8-hour analysis? (staff believes it makes sense to retain Stafford County for the 8-hour analysis, since it will have to be included in the one-hour analysis. However, in future inventory and attainment planning for the 8-hour standard, Stafford County will be removed.); How many PM monitors are in the region? (about three); Are there plans to add PM monitors? (staff is not aware of plans for additional monitors. PM monitors are more costly and more troublesome to maintain);

5. Briefing on Proposed Work Program to Address the Travel Demand Modeling Topics Identified in the Transportation Research Board (TRB) Review

Mr. Kirby distributed two handouts, entitled "Proposed Work Program to Address Six Topics identified in TRB Modeling Review" and "Descriptions of Proposed Work Elements for the TPB Models Development Program to a) Address Concerns Raised by the TRB Committee's First Letter Report and b) Advance the State of Modeling Practice in the Metropolitan Washington Region.", dated December 24, 2003 (and updated July 9, 2004). These materials are to be presented to the TPB at a special work session on travel demand models prior to the regular board meeting on July 21st. He reviewed and summarized the main points in each handout.

Several Committee members offered comments for improving the materials for communication with the TPB and the public on this topic. Mr. Srikanth noted that only technical details that are essential should be presented to elected officials. He observed that the TPB staff had been proactive in providing extensive responses to suggestions made by the TRB committee for improving the travel demand modeling process.

Mr. Biesiadny and Ms. Hasan offered specific suggestions on various pages in the handouts to help make the topic clearer for non-technical audiences.

Mr. Hekimian asked when will the TPB model be “good enough”, that is, what are the standards to be met. Mr. Kirby responded that one of the important findings from the TRB review was that such standards for the complex models used by MPOs across the country do not exist. The “state of the practice” in travel demand forecasting involves considerable professional judgment, and the data and applications used and viewpoints on best practice differ. He said that as a result of the TRB review and the lack of information on MPO models in use, the U.S. DOT is funding a synthesis of travel demand modeling practice in MPOs through the TRB. Such information will be very helpful in assessing and improving MPO models in the future.

Mr. Replogle distributed copies of a letter he had recently sent to TPB Chair Zimmerman which identified several concerns about the travel demand models at TPB. He said that the letter included a citizen guide to the critiques of the TPB model. He said that he felt that the TRB had voiced strong criticisms of the practice employed at TPB and urged a continuing oversight of the TPB demand model program. Mr. Kirby said that TPB staff would review the letter and respond to all comments received on the model.

6. Report on the First Phase Results of the TPB Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study

Mr. Griffiths reported that the modeling runs of the CLRP+ transportation scenario with the five alternative land use scenarios had just been completed and that he would be making a full report on these modeling results at the July 16th Joint Technical Working Group (JTWG) meeting. He urged interested Committee members to attend this JTWG meeting.

7. Review of Draft FY2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Pfoutz distributed the transit operating section of the draft FY2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He explained that there had been minor corrections made to the highway and transit capital sections and that no new information had been received from Virginia. He asked the Committee members to submit changes within two weeks.

Mr. Srikanth said that VDOT was still in the process of reviewing the previous draft and would have corrections soon.

8. Spotlight on Local Transportation Initiatives: Speed Enforcement in the District of Columbia

Sergeant Brown of the Metropolitan Police Department briefed the Committee on the operation of speed and intersection red light enforcement using automated cameras in the District of Columbia. He highlighted the safety impacts and described the observed

reductions in speed and crashes at the enforcement locations. He involved several members of the Committee in a wide ranging dialogue on the purposes and effectiveness of the program and on the operating and deployment details of the cameras and police. The enforcement of the new District law prohibiting cell phones while driving was also discussed.

Mr. Biesiadny pointed out that currently seven jurisdictions in Northern Virginia have state authority for red light photo enforcement, but that this authority expires in June 2005. Government intrusion and other issues are involved that could limit this type of enforcement in the future. Ms Hasan commented that there are some jurisdictions in Maryland with this authority but expanding it also is controversial. Chairman Rybeck noted that this is a safety program and not a revenue program and that crashes are down city-wide.

The Committee thanked Sergeant Brown for this presentation.

9. Other Business

None.

10. Adjourn

