

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - June 4, 2004**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Rick Rybeck

WMATA

WMATA -----

MARYLAND

Frederick Co. -----

Gaithersburg -----

Montgomery Co. David Moss

Prince George's Co. Cicero Salles

Kevin Thornton

Rockville -----

M-NCPPC

Montgomery Co. -----

Prince George's Co. -----

MDOT Fatimah Hasan

BJ Berhanu

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----

FTA -----

NCPC Michael Weil

NPS -----

MWAQC -----

COG Staff and Others

Gerald Miller, COG/DTP

Mike Clifford, COG/DTP

Jane Posey, COG/DTP

Robert Griffiths, COG/DTP

Mark Pfoutz, COG/DTP

Andrew Austin, COG/DTP

Jim Hogan, COG/DTP

Daivamani Sivasailam, COG/DTP

Anant Choudhary, COG/DTP

Michael Freeman, COG/DTP

Joan Rohlfs, COG/DEP

Sunil Kumar, COG/DEP

Dusan Vuksan, COG/DTP

Pat Mann, City of Alexandria

Randy Carroll, MDE

Howard Chang, Tri-County Council

Paul DesJardin, COG/HSPPS

Jill Locantore, COG/DTP

Tim Nutter, NVTA

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Jim Maslanka

Arlington Co. Harriet Dietz

City of Fairfax Alex Verzosa

Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny

Robert O. Owolabi

Falls Church -----

Loudoun Co. Art Smith

Manassas -----

Prince William Co. Rick Canizales

NVTC -----

PRTC Karen Waterman

VRE Tamara Ashby

VDOT Kanathur Srikanth

VDRPT Sharmila Samarasinghe

NVPDC -----

VDOA -----

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from May 7, 2004 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 reported to the Committee that the conformity assessment work is in progress on several fronts. Round 6.4 land use forecasts are available for 2005 travel demand forecasts. Updated land use forecasts for the two ICC alignments for years 2015 and beyond are expected soon. Year 2005 networks are complete. The networks for the remaining years are expected to be completed within the next few weeks. Transit fare matrices are being updated to reflect the transit agencies' rising fares. The travel demand model, Version 2.1D, was released at the Travel Forecasting Subcommittee meeting in May. A few updates are required before use in the conformity assessment analysis, but this draft version of the travel demand model is available upon request. No forecast results are available at this time. He told the Committee that the current production schedule for the conformity assessment (a draft report in July) will be difficult to meet. The MOBILE 6.2 model is available for emissions analysis and is currently being tested. TERMS updates are also in progress using updated travel and emission factor data.

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following: If we do not meet the July deadline, when would the analysis be completed? (a September deadline 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 increased; a technical memo identifying the emission changes will be prepared); How will the new standard affect the number of code red days? (A slight increase in the number of code red days is expected.)

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

Mr. Pfoutz distributed the draft FY2005-10 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) pointing out that transit operating information had only been received for Montgomery County and that many projects in the surface transportation section either did not show funding sources or showed no funds at all. He asked members to submit changes by Friday June 18.

Several Committee members asked whether corrections would still be needed by June 18 if the air quality conformity assessment could not be completed for the July TPB meeting and Mr. Miller stated that the TIP document needs to be finalized as soon as possible, but that it was likely it would not be released for public comment until September.

4. Report of the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee's Recent Activities

Mr. Sabastian, Chair of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, reported on the two educational/training events sponsored by the Subcommittee. The first event was Real Intersection Design seminar, on November 21st, 2003 in Riverdale Park, MD. An outside expert, Mr. King, led the workshop, while a panel of local instructors taught the group about the design requirements of various user groups, including motorists, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users, mobility-impaired pedestrians, visually-impaired pedestrians, and bicyclists. The seven groups then examined an intersection and produced recommendations. Most participants of this day-long workshop were engineers, and the primary purpose was professional training.

The second set of educational events were the Walkable Communities workshops, a set of eight half-day workshops held around the region during the first week of May, 2004. These workshops were open to the public, but focused on local residents, planning and engineering staff, and political leaders, with a view to creating a consensus for change at a particular location.

Mr. Sabastian explained that the second year of the Street Smart pedestrian and bicycle safety campaign was kicked off on Monday, April 5th, 2004 in Arlington. This year's budget was \$390,000, which mostly went for four weeks of radio, print, cable television, and outdoor advertising. Spanish-language ads were also run. The post-campaign assessment has not yet been finished. Last year's campaign showed significant increase in awareness of the major campaign themes.

Mr. Sabastian said that the subcommittee, in cooperation with ADC, The Map Company, have finished the Sixth Edition of the Washington Regional Bicycle Map. He said that the bicycle map offers information on bicycle routes which is as of yet unavailable on-line. The regional database of planned bicycle projects is nearly ready to be posted on the COG web site.

Mr. Sabastian said that committee members are concerned that WMATA participation in the subcommittee has been scaled back following the retirement of WMATA's former representative, even though there is a concern, highlighted at the recent walkable communities workshops, over persons with disabilities, pedestrian, and bicycle access at Metro stations. Subcommittee members would like renewed participation by WMATA to aid coordination for better access to Metro stations.

Mr. Rybeck agreed that it was a good idea. Mr. Sebastian added that the numbers of persons with disabilities have increased, and more of them are using motorized wheelchairs.

Ms. Waterman wanted to know when the regional database of pedestrian and bicycle projects would be available. Mr. Farrell replied that it would be available before the next bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee meeting on July 20th. Not all jurisdictions have submitted data, but the database will be made available as is.

Mr. Salles offered his congratulations on the Oxon Hill Walkable Communities Workshop, and mentioned that numerous short and long-term improvements had been identified.

Mr. Griffiths suggested that the subcommittee work closely with the TPB Access for All Committee, due to its high profile and WMATA representation. Mr. Farrell replied that he had briefed the committee, and we will continue to work with it.

Mr. Farrell commented that the local level, bicycle and pedestrian coordinators attend project design meetings to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian facilities into new projects. Since WMATA does not have a bicycle or pedestrian coordinator, local staff are not sure with whom at WMATA they should be speaking.

Mr. Griffiths noted that 2000 census data shows that bicycle commuting is up.

Mr. Sebastian asked when a new large-sample household travel survey might be available to replace the one from 1994. Mr. Griffiths replied that the next large-sample household travel survey will be done as soon as the significant funding it will require can be identified, perhaps in 2005 or 2006.

Mr. Moss applauded the pro-active Walkable Communities Workshops. He also mentioned that Montgomery County has a ten-year old video on wheelchair access, required viewing for all Montgomery County employees, that he'd like to share it with the bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee.

5. Report of the Travel Forecasting Subcommittee

Mr. Hogan distributed a handout, entitled "Briefing on Transportation Research Board Review of TPB Modeling Procedures and TPB Staff Comments", dated May 19, 2004. This had been deferred at the May TPB meeting and will be presented at the June 16th TPB meeting. He reviewed the documents (in the mailout) and summarized the milestones of the review which began in January 2003 and ended in May 2004.

He summarized the six topics identified in the first TRB report as areas needing attention in the modeling work program. He pointed out that staff prepared a proposed multi-year work program document (in the mailout) addressing these concerns, and this document served as the mechanism for organizing the second report of the TRB Committee. He explained that the second TRB report (in the mailout) provided elaboration on the topics identified in the first report, as well as overall observations on the state of travel demand modeling practice and the availability of documentation on current practices throughout the U.S. He summarized the TPB staff reply (in the mailout) to the second TRB report.

Members of the Committee commented about the reason for the review, the presentation that the TPB would receive, the level of detail provided in the presentation, and the major findings from the TRB review. It was also suggested that the presentation be expanded to include a conclusion page which specifically addressed the major points that emerged.

Mr. Clifford noted that, with respect to the validity of the TPB travel demand model, the FHWA, FTA, and EPA had approved the use of the model when making the conformity determination of the TIP and CLRP in February 2004.

Mr. Hogan commented that a major finding of the TRB Committee was that there is no state of the practice in travel demand modeling in the U.S. This has resulted in an effort getting underway, sponsored by the U.S. DOT, to have TRB conduct a synthesis of current travel demand model practice nationwide.

Mr. Hogan closed by indicating that the next step would be to present this report and the staff response at the next meeting of the TPB on June 16th. TPB staff will also review the proposed models development work program activities for the next several years in light of the completed TRB review and available planning funds. This will lead to recommendations to the TPB on refinements to the FY2005 UPWP, and on future work programs.

6. Briefing on the Evaluation of the Commuter Connections Program

Mr. Ramfos made introductory remarks on the Commuter Connections program and overall regional TDM Evaluation project and explained that we were in the middle of a three-year cycle of collecting data and that some of the most important data collection activities were occurring this fiscal year. Ms. Diggins with LDA Consulting briefed the Committee on the status of the Commuter Connections TDM Evaluation project. She summarized changes to the overall TDM Evaluation Framework methodology document and then presented the status of the 2003-04 data collection activities. Data collection activities include the FY04 database applicant placement survey, guaranteed ride home survey, the regional State of the Commute survey, Telecenter surveys, and a Bike To Work Day survey.

Ms. Diggins covered the overall methodology changes in the evaluation of Commuter Connections TERM's including, Employer Outreach, Employer Outreach for Bicycling, GRH, Integrated Rideshare (software upgrades and kiosks), Mass Marketing, the Telework Resource Center, and the Commuter Operations Center. She gave an overview of the evaluation plan, the changes, performance measures, and covered the evaluation approach for the recently implemented regional Mass Marketing TERM.

Next, Ms. Diggins reviewed the evaluation project objectives, discussed the purpose, goals, methods, and data sources for each TERM. She then reviewed the data collection tools and methods to calculate impacts, covered the overall evaluation schedule and reporting period.

Ms. Diggins explained that the current evaluation framework builds on the 1999-2002 evaluation plan and that key performance measures were reviewed and refined and that there were minor adjustments made to the existing tools to improve data quality.

In specific, the performance measures for the Mass Marketing TERM include the measurement of awareness and attitudes. The framework will include awareness on behalf of residents and commuters of the Commuter Connections program along with local and regional transportation facilities. Attitudes towards commuting and congestion solutions will be examined along with perceptions of congestion severity and attitudes towards the use of alternative modes.

Ms. Diggins explained that overall performance measures include measurement of participation, utilization, and satisfaction. Specific measurements include travel impacts, air quality impacts, energy savings, consumer cost savings, and overall program cost-effectiveness. These measures

will also be included in the analysis for the Mass Marketing TERM. Ms. Diggins then reviewed the objective of the Mass Marketing TERM and stated that there were two populations of interest: All commuters in the Commuter Connections service area and Commuter Connections clients influenced by Mass marketing that requested additional services or made mode shift changes. She added that six possible Mass Marketing effects on commuters would be tested:

- » Did it increase awareness?
- » Did it change attitudes and/or increase interest in the use of alternative modes?
- » Did it provide information on Commuter Connections resources?
- » Did it prompt contact with Commuter Connections?
- » Did it encourage trail use of alternative modes?
- » Did it encourage a permanent shift to alternative modes?

Next, Ms. Diggins explained the 4 step approach in evaluating the Mass Marketing TERM. First, there needs to be an assessment of change in awareness, attitudes, and interest among the general public and this data would come from the 2004 State of the Commute Report. Next, Commuter Connections requests with and without advertising would be tracked. Influence of Travel change would then be examined through the various data collection activities. Lastly, credits would be identified that could be attributable to Mass Marketing messages. Ms. Diggins noted that if there were multiple TERM program influences, credits would be split accordingly.

The next part of Ms. Diggins' presentation was to give a status report on the data collection activities for FY04. First, she discussed the FY04 Applicant Placement Rate Survey that was completed. Next, she gave the status of the GRH applicant survey that is currently underway and is a random sample telephone survey of 1,000 GRH registrants and one-time exceptions. Next, she gave a status report of the 2004 State of Commute survey which is also underway and is a telephone survey of 7,200 randomly-selected workers in 12 jurisdictions in the non-attainment region. She also discussed the data collection activities for the Telecenters. There are two surveys; one is a seat occupancy survey, and the other is a written survey of telecenter commuters. Lastly, she discussed the Bike To Work survey for FY03 participants, which is an on-line survey.

Ms. Diggins then proceeded to review the remaining timeline of the FY04 regional TDM Evaluation project schedule.

Mr. Salles asked if there was less participation in the 2004 Bike To Work Day event. Mr. Ramfos responded that there were 1,000 additional participants in this year's event than in last year's.

Mr. Heikimian asked whether we can find out from respondents to these various surveys their perceived benefit after they try out the program(s). Is the realized benefit tracked? Ms. Diggins responded that we do track the satisfaction of program users by asking how important these programs were to making mode shift changes.

Mr. Rybeck asked whether we look at how long these individuals stick to using alternative modes. Ms. Diggins responded that we do collect this type of data along with data on the reasons commuters are using their mode(s).

Mr. Griffiths asked why the refusal rate on the 2004 State of the Commute was not higher. Ms. Diggins wasn't quite sure but stated that commuter transportation is a hot topic in the region, however she also said that with caller ID, many potential survey participants may have elected not to participate in the survey. She stated that 320,000 dialings needed to be made in order to complete 7,200 surveys for the State of the Commute survey and this occurred over a two and a half month period.

Mr. Ramfos stated that once the reports are completed we would be presenting the information to the Committee.

7. Status Report on the TPB Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study

Mr. Griffiths reported that the Transportation Scenario Subgroup had met on June 1st to review the refinements to the transit network for the CLRP+ Scenario and the initial modeling results of this transportation scenario. Mr. Griffiths added that the quantification of the costs of the transit service improvements for this scenario had also been discussed. Mr. Griffiths reported that the results of a model run of the CLRP+ Scenario with the new Round 6.4 Cooperative Forecasts would be presented at the June 11th Joint Technical Working Group (JTWG) meeting.

Mr. Griffiths also reported that the results of the first phase of the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study were scheduled to be presented to the TPB in July. These results would include an analysis of a CLRP+ Scenario, the CLRP adopted by the TPB in December, 2003 with an added "Regional Congestion Management Plan" element. This CLRP+ Scenario would be analyzed with the new Round 6.4 Cooperative Forecasts and the five alternative land use scenarios developed by the Planning Directors' Technical Advisory Committee.

8. Other Business

None.

9. Adjourn

