

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES**

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the December 3, 2004 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved with minor changes to Item #2 as requested by Ms. Byala.

2. Review of Comments Received to Date and Draft Recommended Responses for Inclusion in the 8-Hour Conformity Assessment of the 2004 CLRP and FY 2005-2010 TIP

Mr. Clifford began by summarizing the three handout items. The first item was a memorandum from Mr. Clifford to the Transportation Planning Board dated December 8, 2004, and entitled "Draft Results of the 8-Hour (ozone standard) Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2004 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)." The second item was a memorandum from Daivamani Sivasailam to the TPB Technical Committee dated January 5, 2005, entitled "TERM Tracking Sheet for the 8-Hour (ozone standard) Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2004 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)." The third item was a package of materials from EPA, including a fact sheet, press release and timeline, on the subject of Fine Particle (PM 2.5) pollution.

Mr. Clifford notified the Committee that the Draft 8-Hour Conformity Assessment was still in the public comment phase until January 9, 2005. After the public comment period has closed, approval will be sought at the January 19, 2005, Transportation Planning Board (TPB) Meeting.

Mr. King from COG/DEP spoke about MWAQC's comments letter which was in preparation. Mr. King noted that the draft letter would be considered by MWAQC's Executive Committee on January 12, 2005, for transmittal to the TPB.

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following: What geographic area is covered with the PM 2.5 designations? (This includes the 8-hour ozone area, excluding Calvert County); Will the one-hour standard not be required in the future? (Current regulations revoke the one-hour standard as of June 2005, however, a lawsuit challenging this has been filed); If the one-hour standard is revoked, would year 2005 be required? (No, the new 8-hour attainment year, required for conformity assessments, is 2010; analysis years would include 2010, 2020, and 2030).

3. Review of Draft Solicitation Document and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2005 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Ms. Klancher presented the draft solicitation document for the 2005 CLRP and FY 2006-2011 TIP and described changes since the Committee reviewed the document in December. The TPB reviewed the document in December and will be asked to approve the final document at the January 19 meeting.

Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee on Chairman Mendelson's request to include three priorities for project submissions related to the TPB Vision. The three priority areas, as Chairman Mendelson proposed to the TPB, include traffic signal optimization, regional communications for incident management and supporting connections to the regional core and regional activity centers. Staff will summarize the projects in the 2005 plan that address these three priorities.

Mr. Biesiadny said that there are many projects that may meet other TPB Vision goals, but not necessarily the three that the TPB outlined.

Mr. Smith commented that in Virginia existing roads that used to be only locally funded are now being funded with federal money and therefore may be new to the plan and TIP.

Ms. Samarasinghe stated that her agency was wondering why the three priorities were chosen and not other priorities or goals in the TPB Vision.

Mr. Spalding commented that MDOT is interested in highlighting information items in the plan similar to the Baltimore region, that relate to the three priorities.

Mr. Moss asked if state and locally funded projects that relate to the three priorities should be put in the plan or TIP as information items.

Mr. Srikanth stated that VDOT discussions on the three priority areas in the Solicitation document included a suggestion to clarify that all the Vision goals are important. He also commented that Question 5 in the CLRP forms is where local agency staff can provide more detail about how the project may address the three priorities.

Mr. Spalding stated he felt it was important that the TPB get credit for projects meeting regional goals—such as funding WMATA's programs – and not just focusing on one or two projects.

4. Briefing on Outline and Preliminary Budget for FY 2006 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Miller reviewed the information in the mailout on the preliminary budget levels and outline of the work activities for the FY 2006 UPWP, which begins July 1, 2005. He reviewed the estimated funding totals and noted that the new budget levels were assumed to be the same as FY 2005 based upon preliminary information from the DOTs. The preliminary FY 2005 budget shows a 1.3 percent increase from the current FY 2005 budget level due to having more unspent funds from FY 2004 than the unspent funds from FY 2003 in the current budget. He said that the FY 2006 UPWP budget levels from the DOTs are to be finalized later in January and he expected this budget estimate to increase somewhat. The outline, which contains summary descriptions for each work activity, will be the basis for the narrative in the draft of the full document.

Mr. Miller reviewed the work activities and budget changes under area I in the outline. He pointed out under the activity, I.E. Financial Plan, a task to conduct the financial analysis for the three year update of the 2006 CLRP should have been included with an additional budget of \$50,000 for consultant assistance. He then highlighted the proposed

major work program funding change from FY 2005 and asked the team leaders to reviewed them.

Mr. Griffiths noted that the Census Journey to Work Analysis task under activity IV.C. will be completed this year and that this budget is reallocated to other activities. He explained that much of the reallocated budget would be added to activity II.D., Coordination of Cooperative Forecasting and Transportation Planning Processes, to define additional smaller area land activity transportation analysis zones (TAZs) for Regional Activity Centers and Clusters and, also to subdivide very large zones in outer suburban jurisdictions into smaller ones. This activity would also review data and assumptions on the projected growth of “in-commuting” at external stations. He then gave the rationale for the proposed budget decrease for the Household Travel Survey work activity. He explained the need to design a new survey approach to address the challenge of increasing the sample rate across the region and the declining response rates for telephone surveys. A new survey approach is needed to address these challenges and it will need an estimated \$1.8 to \$2.0 million in additional funding. He said that one possibility for this higher funding might be the still pending federal reauthorization.

In response to Mr. Srikanth’s question about why the household survey data was needed, Mr. Hogan explained that these data were necessary to validate the travel demand model and to improve model calibrations. Mr. Srikanth said that this data is critical for the regional model and suggested that perhaps a smaller group should focus on this funding problem and it may be necessary to consider possible sources outside of the UPWP. Mr. Owolabi supported his remarks and asked if the region could consider adding on the national travel survey. Mr. Griffiths said that the costs would be about the same with an add-on and that this survey was a telephone survey with the same challenges in terms of response rates.

Mr. Hogan reviewed the proposed work and budget changes in the Network Development, Models Development activities in area III., and the Cordon Counts activity from area IV. He distributed pages from the FY 2005 UPWP for three activities and explained that some modifications to them in the current work is recommended. Under Models Development, two changes are proposed: the competition of the migration of the transit-submodel task is deleted in order to focus on a new task to enhance the capability of the modeling process to address value pricing. It is also proposed to transfer \$340,000 in FY 2004 funds from the IV.C. Household Travel Survey work activity to the IV. Cordon Counts activity in order to expand the number of counting sites for the truck and commercial vehicle classification count. He said that the FY 2005 UPWP will need to be amended in February to reflect these changes and asked if there were any concerns about the recommendations. Ms. Samarasinghe asked what the transit-submodels do. Mr. Hogan explained their purpose and that the on-going work to upgrade transit modeling with a nested logit mode choice model will produce rail and bus ridership estimates directly.

Mr. Biesiadny asked about the NVTC’s concerns about past cordon counting and its request to do additional counts in Northern Virginia. Mr. Griffiths replied that DTP staff is working with staff from NVTC, WMATA and local transit agencies, and VDOT to develop a work scope and budget that would expand the NVA HOV facilities monitoring task under the new Virginia Technical Assistance Program.

Mr. Clifford reviewed the proposed work and budget changes in the Air Quality Conformity, Mobile Emission Analysis, Software Support activities in area III. and Congestion Monitoring and Analysis activity in area IV.

Mr. Miller said that a complete draft of the FY 2005 UPWP will be presented at the February 6 Technical Committee meeting, released for public comment at the February 10 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting, and reviewed at the February 16 TPB meeting. He noted that the Technical Assistance Work Program activities need to be identified for the draft. A final version will be reviewed at the Technical Committee at the March 5 meeting and presented for TPB approval at the March 16 meeting.

5. Briefing on Outline of FY 2006 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

Mr. Ramfos gave an overview of the mailout materials which included a memorandum from Mr. Kirby to the Technical Committee, a draft outline of the FY06 CCWP and the memorandum that was given to the TPB on November 10th in regards to the District of Columbia's funding for the TIP and the Commuter Connections Work Program.

Mr. Kirby then discussed his memorandum and reviewed the cost effectiveness of the Commuter Connections program and then the associated funding tables from the TIP along with the current state funding shares and proposed funding levels for FY06. He then discussed the restructuring of Commuter Connections and stated that the draft outline is the baseline program that would have been moving forward if we were to continue under the current structure. He also stated that staff would be putting together a "strawman" restructured program that would be similar to the UPWP in terms of a "core" program and add-on programs that the funders could participate in. For example, add-on programs could include a "live where you work" campaign that would target companies in the District of Columbia and DDOT could fund this type of a program.

Mr. Harvey stated that this approach is very amenable with DDOT and that he was looking forward to reviewing the strawman proposal. He also asked about getting more detailed information on core program areas. For instance, what is the difference between integrated Rideshare and the Commuter Operations Center? Mr. Kirby responded that in this particular instance, task components in the Integrated Rideshare program element for the software upgrades could be added to the Commuter Operations Center where all of the task components are core and the kiosk task components in Integrated Rideshare program element can be add-on.

Mr. Hekimian asked why there was a drop in local membership fees from FY05 to FY06. Mr. Ramfos explained that the staff forecast was that there would be less client members accessing the regional database in FY06. Mr. Hekimian then asked what the flexibility was of administratively moving dollars from one TERM to another in the CCWP. Mr. Kirby said that there is flexibility and that it would involve a TIP amendment and adjusting the TERM goals in the conformity tracking sheet so that we were keeping faith with the regional air quality commitments.

Mr. Smith stated that his concern was that there seemed to be a diminishing amount of dollars going into the program in the out years and given the uncertainty with the new 8

hour standard, there may be a need to increase the funding levels to meet the air quality goals.

Mr. Kirby added that staff would be taking a look at who is actually benefiting from the TERMS, for instance programs such as Guaranteed Ride Home help keep commuters in carpools and vanpools thus remove vehicles from District of Columbia streets, the same holds true for telecommuting. Mr. Harvey said that this type of information would be beneficial for the state DOT's to review.

Mr. Biesiandy said that it would be beneficial to see what the base program would be before the next meeting. Mr. Kirby said that the state DOT's would be reviewing the core and add-on programs as a first cut and that the local jurisdictions and members of the Commuter Connections Subcommittee would have an opportunity to provide comments as well.

Mr. Ramfos then stated that the program elements shown in the outline are about the same as in previous work program documents and that little has been changed. He also mentioned that staff would be making recommendations for program evaluation schedule changes and that perhaps the current three year evaluation cycle may be extended to a five year cycle.

Mr. Srikanth said that re-structuring the CCWP into the UPWP format is a good idea. Mr. Spalding echoed the same remarks. Mr. Kirby stated that the "strawman" proposal would be out for the DOT's to review soon.

6. Briefing on the Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign

Mr. Farrell reviewed a hand-out on the Street Smart campaign. After briefly reviewing the origins of the program, he discussed the evaluation, which concludes that the target market is hearing the message, and that driver behavior with respect to pedestrians is improving. He explained that the Street Smart program lacks a reliable local funding base to match the federal funding received through the states and that the states do not provide any matching funds. A formal process for applying for local funding is needed rather than informal requests for funding at the TPB and at the bicycle and pedestrian staff level. Mr. Biesiadny noted that the local funding from Maryland has dropped and asked why. Mr. Farrell replied that staff had cited local budget concerns.

Mr. Spalding asked what staff at the state level was involved. Mr. Farrell explained that Virginia and Maryland had formal application processes, and that contacts at other agencies were with mid-level staff, primarily those responsible for bicycle and pedestrian planning. Mr. Biesiadny suggested that TPB be asked to make formal requests for local funding. Just raising the issue at a TPB meeting has not been sufficient to ensure that the right people get the request at the right time to get it into local budgets. Mr. Moss added that if the funding is not in the budget it has to be found somewhere, and a formal process is needed. Mr. Kirby replied that this suggestion would be conveyed to the TPB, and asked for suggestions on how to determine the amount requested.

7. Review of Top Regional Unfunded Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Mr. Farrell briefed the Committee on the latest list of priority unfunded regional bicycle and pedestrian projects for consideration in the FY2006-2011 TIP, which was recommended by the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee in October, 2004. Projects funded from previous priority lists are also listed, and project descriptions provided. Projects are removed from the list when they are funded, or upon the request of the jurisdiction. The TPB will be briefed on the list at the January 19 meeting. Chair Mokhtari asked if a map was available showing the projects in the table. Mr. Farrell replied that none had been prepared.

8. Briefing on Regional Travel Trends Report

This item was deferred to the February 4 meeting.

9. Other Business

None.

10. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - January 7, 2005**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Damon Harvey

MARYLAND

Frederick Co. -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. David Moss
Prince George's Co. Aaron Overman
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. Alexander Hekimian
 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari

MDOT Ron Spalding
 Glen Smith
 BJ Berhanu

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Maria White
Arlington Co. Nicole Lewis
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny
 Robert Owolabi
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Arthur Smith
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
NVTC -----
PRTC Karen Waterman
VRE -----
VDOT Kanathur Srikanth
VDRPT Sharmila Samarasinghe
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
Wendy Klancher, COG/DTP
Jim Hogan, COG/DTP
Michael Freeman, COG/DTP
Nicolas Ramfos, COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, COG/DTP
Andrew Austin, COG/DTP
Jeff King, COG/DEP
Greg Goodwin, COG/HSPPS
Joan Rohlf, COG/DEP
Jim Wamsley, FCSG
Howard Chang, TCC SMD
Randy Carroll, MDE