

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – October 1, 2004**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Rick Rybeck
 Damond Harvey
 Susan Cheno

MARYLAND

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

MDOT Fatimah Hasan
 Mike Haley

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Maria White
Arlington Co. -----
City of Fairfax Alex Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny
 Robert O. Owolabi
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Arthur Smith
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
NVTC Jana Lynott
PRTC Karen Waterman
VRE -----
VDOT -----
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
Andrew Austin, COG/DTP
Jim Hogan, COG/DTP
William Bacon, COG/DTP
Anant Choudhary, COG/DTP
Michael Freeman, COG/DTP
Dusan Vuksan, COG/DTP
Jinchul Park, COG/DTP
Joan Rohlf, COG/DEP
Sunil Kumar, COG/DEP
Daivamani Sivasailam, COG/DTP
Mark Moran, COG/DTP
Hamid Humeida, COG/DTP
Robert Snead, COG/DTP
Andrew Meese, COG/DTP
Jim Yin, COG/DTP
Eulalie Lucas, COG/DTP
Jeff King, COG/DEP
Randy Carroll, MDE
Paul DesJardin, COG/HSPPS
Tim Nutter, NVT
Amy Horner, SABW
Michael Replogle, Environmental Defense
Pat Mann, Alexandria Planning & Zoning
Kenneth Todd

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

Minutes were approved with changes to Item #4 clarifying that staff recommended option 2 because of the tight timeline for completion of the air quality conformity assessment under the new 8-hour ozone rule. Also, leaving Stafford County in the emissions budgets is the conservative option from an air quality perspective.

2. Status Report on Upgrades to the TPB Travel Model and Emissions Post-Processor Used for the Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2004 CLRP and FY2005-2010 TIP

Mr. Kirby reviewed the mailout item, entitled “Status of the TPB Regional Travel Model, Version 2.1 D, Draft #50” which had been presented to the TPB Travel Forecasting Subcommittee at its meeting on September 17th. He reviewed the six topics identified in the TRB modeling review and indicated that much work in addressing these concerns had been accomplished in this latest release of the Version 2.1 D model. He said that the introduction of new volume/delay functions has greatly improved the performance of the TPB travel demand model while permitting the elimination of several adjustment factors and the dampening of most of those that remain. The new model also has successfully incorporated a complete feedback process with respect to the mode choice step.

Mr. Kirby then distributed a handout, entitled “Status of the Emissions Post-Processor for the TPB Travel Model, Version 2.1 D, Draft #50.” He explained that previous emissions post-processors were developed for the purpose of computing mobile emissions only, and that this latest version was also developed to better integrate a peak spreading procedure with the Version 2.1 D travel demand model.

Mr. Replogle commented that the latest draft of the Version 2.1 D model continues to have serious shortcomings with regard to broad travel patterns not being replicated when compared with observed data. He expressed the view that corrections for employment definitions in the input data to the model have simply moved the adjustment factors from within the model to the data being entered into it. He criticized the underestimation of traffic by the model on high volume freeway segments in the region.

Mr. Kirby replied that the reporting of underestimation on high volume freeway links applies to a handful of all freeway links in the region and may be due as much to the quality of the traffic counts as to the model performance. He indicated that staff is busy examining the traffic counts that are employed in the model comparisons and will have a report to the TPB Travel Forecasting Subcommittee at its next meeting on November 19th. He encouraged Mr. Replogle and others interested in this topic to attend this meeting. Mr. Smith indicated that Loudoun County has a set of traffic counts which he would like to make available to TPB staff. Mr. Griffiths indicated that he would like to receive this data.

Mr. Nutter congratulated the TPB staff for its effort to improve the travel demand model. Chair Rybeck noted that a lot of work had been accomplished and commended the staff for its effort.

Mr. Biesiadny asked how much of this technical information would be going to TPB on October 20th. Mr. Kirby responded that the TPB presentation will focus on the six TRB topics, with no more than one slide on each.

3. Briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2004 CLRP and FY2005-2010 TIP

Mr. Clifford distributed an October 1, 2004, memo from him to the Technical Committee entitled "Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2004 Update of the CLRP and FY 2005-2010 TIP." The results provide a basis for a determination of conformity by the TPB, for either of the two alignments of the Inter-County Connector.

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following: During the development of the revised land use forecasts, did the Maryland Planning Directors have input from the expert panel? (Yes, several times. There was also a special meeting with the final numbers presented.); How do estimated VMT results compare with VMT published with HPMS? (The new model compares more favorably with HPMS); What toll values for the ICC were assumed in the analysis? (\$0.20 per mile in peak hours and \$0.15 per mile in off-peak hours); Does ICC toll need to be approved by legislation? (No. The toll authority will determine the price of tolls); The emission results were performed for the two alternate ICC alignments. Was emission analysis performed for an ICC No-Build scenario? (Not for this year's conformity determination. However, a comparable analysis without the ICC is included in the Mobility / Accessibility Study. The results will be presented in agenda Item 7 of today's meeting.)

4. Briefing on the Draft FY-2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program

Mr. Pfoutz distributed the final draft FY 2005-2010 TIP explaining that only minor corrections had been made in the listings for the District of Columbia, Virginia and WMATA. Ms. Byala explained that the most significant change for WMATA was removing \$19 million from the CNG Facility and adding it to the bus replacement program. Mr. Pfoutz told the Committee that the TIP would be released for public comment at the noon Steering Committee meeting.

5. Briefing on Improved Public Comment Procedures for 2004 CLRP and FY2005-2010 TIP, and Associated Air Quality Conformity Assessment

Mr. Kirby began by discussing the memo that had been included in the mail-out. He said that when the project submissions for the 2004 CLRP and FY 2005-2010 TIP had been released for public comment in the spring of this year, too many comments had been received to be reproduced and distributed in hard copy to Board members. As an alternative, staff posted all comments received on COG's web site. Mr. Kirby said that there were some criticisms that significant comments submitted by organizations had been lost in the masses of individual comments. He explained that TPB had revised its public comment process on the web site with an automated form and a display that

separates out comments from organizations, government agencies, businesses and individuals.

Ms. Hasan asked if comments received directly via email would still be accepted. Mr. Austin explained that all comments received online or by email, mail, fax or phone would still be accepted, but that they wouldn't be sorted by name or any other criteria.

Mr. Kirby said that the Board members would have to view all comments on the web and noted that comments received after the close of the public comment period would be set aside and not presented to the Board for review.

Mr. Biesiadny asked if it was possible to provide summaries for Board members and if searches could be conducted by members of the Technical Committee. Mr. Austin replied that all comments displayed on the web site could be sorted by name, city, state, zip code, and date submitted. He also remarked that an Excel spreadsheet of comments could be produced upon request.

Ms. Byala asked for clarification on when the public comment period was set to end. Mr. Kirby said that in order for staff to prepare responses to comments prior to the Board meeting, the public comment period would end on October 31, 2004.

Mr. Replogle expressed concerns that comments received after the 31st would be disregarded even though they may contain new information based on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement that was scheduled to be released subsequent to the close of the public comment period. Mr. Kirby replied that it was necessary to set a deadline so that responses could be prepared for the TPB. He noted that it was possible that the content of some of the comments may require a change to the process and require a rerun of the conformity determination or extension of the public comment period. Mr. Rybeck added that it was still possible for concerned members of the public to contact the members of the TPB outside of this public comment process.

Mr. Replogle asked if comments received after the close of the comment period could be provided to Board members in hard copy at the meeting. Mr. Kirby replied that staff had been criticized for doing that during the public comment period in the spring by people who thought that doing this gave higher visibility and prominence to people who submitted comments late and that this was unfair. Mr. Rybeck asked if it was possible to continue to display comments received after the close of the public comment period with the understanding that staff would not prepare responses to these comments. Mr. Owolabi supported this idea. Mr. Replogle suggested that if some substantial comments were received after the close of the public comment period, they should be selected out and provided to the Board in hard copy. Mr. Kirby said that it would be unfair for staff to make a determination as to whose comments were more important. Ms. Hasan stated that any additional information could be presented by speakers during the normal public comment period of the Board meeting. Mr. Nutter stated that concerned organizations or citizens could email Board members if an issue of substance arose. Ms. Byala made a motion that any comments received after the close of the public comment period would be displayed on the web site, but would not be considered for responses by staff or the TPB. The motion was seconded and approved.

6. Status Report on Draft 2010 Project Submissions and Scope of Work for the 8-Hour Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2004 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Clifford presented two mailout items from the September TPB meeting, both dated 9/15/04. The first was entitled “ TPB Technical Committee – Item 9, Release for Public Comment of the 8-Hour Air Quality Conformity Assessment Draft Scope of Work and 2010 Project Submissions, and Transmittal of Letter to the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC)””; the second item was a memorandum from Mr. Kirby to the TPB entitled “Release for Public Comment of 2010 Project Submissions.” He noted that the “draft” letter to MWAQC from the TPB had now been sent and that MWAQC had referred it to its Technical Advisory Committee and Executive Committee.

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following: Has TPB received comments on the scope yet? (None to date; MWAQC’s Technical Advisory committee and its Conformity Subcommittee will be reviewing the materials in the next week and will probably have comments.)

7. Briefing on Presentation of the Results of the TPB Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study for the TPB Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) Outreach Meetings

Mr. Kirby explained that the PowerPoint presentation under this item had been developed as a citizen-friendly, non-technical briefing on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study (RMAS).

Mr. Swanson presented the draft PowerPoint briefing. He explained that staff has developed the presentation for use in public forums this fall and winter that will be hosted by the TPB’s Citizens Advisory Committee. He said the presentation was designed to show that the various scenarios in the RMAS were developed to address key challenges the region is facing, such as the jobs-housing imbalance.

Ms. Lynott suggested the jurisdiction boundaries should be clearer in one of the slides.

Mr. Repogle said that Vehicle Miles of Travel per capita should be used in the presentation.

Mr. Nutter said the study and presentation needs to be realistic about market forces which are encouraging people to move farther out.

Mr. Rybeck said public policies, including road building and parking fees, affect the market.

Mr. Schoenecker said the presentation overemphasized that too much development is already in place. He said it should emphasize what can be done.

Mr. Rybeck said the presentation is good and was very comprehensible. However, he suggested that slide 32 had a bad headline which suggested that the scenarios will not

alleviate congestion. He said the headline should state that impacts of the scenarios were significant, especially given the small amount of jobs and housing that the scenarios are shifting.

Mr. Schoenecker said he was concerned that if the broad message is that the scenarios do not have significant impacts, then the public is likely to say "let's not spend the money."

Mr. Rybeck said that the presentation should use vehicle miles of travel per capita, which was a measure with significant impact. He said a key message or headline in the presentation should be "land use works."

Mr. Swanson said the impact for VMT per capita was dramatic for only the first scenario. He said that it was important to honestly ask why some of the performance measures did not have a significant impact.

Mr. Replogle said the impacts revealed in the VMT per capita measure would be even greater if the study measured vehicle hours per day.

Mr. Kirby said a challenge in developing a PowerPoint presentation was keeping the information to a minimum.

Mr. Rybeck again emphasized that the VMT per capita should be included in the presentation instead of total VMT. He said that he had been involved in some issues 20 years ago in which people had said that land use changes would have a minimal impact, but if changes had been made back then, the region would be far ahead today.

Mr. Biesiadny asked what baseline was being used for the presentation.

Mr. Kirby said that staff had gone back and forth as to whether the CLRP or the CLRP+ should be used as the baseline, but had finally decided to use the CLRP+, which was called "Enhanced Transit" in the presentation.

Mr. Swanson said the first public forum on the RMAS had been preliminarily scheduled for December 8 in Gaithersburg.

8. Briefing on Travel Characteristics for Minority and Disadvantaged Populations from the 2000 Census

Postponed to the November 5 meeting.

9. Other Business

None.

10. Adjourn
