

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - November 5, 2004**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Rick Rybeck
 Damond Harvey

MARYLAND

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

MDOT Fatimah Hasan

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Maria White
Arlington Co. Ritch Viola
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny
 Mike Lake
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Arthur Smith
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
NVTC -----
PRTC Karen Waterman
VRE -----
VDOT Valerie Pardo
VDRPT Sharmila Samarasinghe
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Kristin Haldeman

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----

FTA Deborah Burns

NCPC Michael Weil

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
Brian Maher, COG/DTP
Anant Choudhary, COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, COG/DTP
Mark Moran, COG/DTP
Jim Yin, COG/DTP
Jeff King, COG/DEP
Randy Carroll, MDE
Paul DesJardin, COG/HSPPS
Glen Smith, MD SHA
David Zaidain, NCPC
Kenneth Todd

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

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

Minutes were approved with a correction to the attendance list and a clarification to one sentence for agenda Item 7.

2. Briefing on the Regional Transportation Data Clearinghouse

Ms. Howard gave a presentation on recent updates to the Regional Transportation Data Clearinghouse including the newly added Census data and detailed traffic volume views.

Ms. Kile then demonstrated the new detailed traffic volume view. This new feature gives Clearinghouse users the ability to access hourly traffic count data for selected links of the regional highway network.

Mr. Griffiths commented that the Regional Transportation Data Clearinghouse provides users with easy access to a wide variety of traffic volume data for many links in the regional transportation network. He also observed that as users of this traffic volume data we also have a responsibility to consider the quality and applicability of the Clearinghouse data for specific purposes. He noted that while 5500 link segments in the Clearinghouse network had Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) volume values coded to them, less than 60 of these AADT values were actual averages of continuous daily traffic counts taken at permanent counting stations in the TPB modeled area.

Mr. Griffiths further commented that most of the AADT volumes included in the Clearinghouse were factored estimates of daily traffic volumes based on factors developed from continuous counts taken at permanent counting stations. He noted that a data quality attribute had also been included in the Clearinghouse for links with AADT values so that Clearinghouse users could determine whether the AADT volume shown for a specific link was based on an actual traffic count or if it was some type of factored estimate.

Mr. Smith stated that traffic counts had been taken as part of a number of planning studies conducted in Loudoun and asked if there was interest in including these traffic counts in the Clearinghouse.

Mr. Griffiths responded that staff would be very interested in including any traffic counts internal highway links in the Clearinghouse.

Chair Rybeck noted that the Clearinghouse identified roads with truck restrictions and asked if this listing included roads around the U.S. Capitol with truck restrictions.

Ms. Howard responded that the roads around the Capitol with recently enacted truck restrictions were not currently included in the Clearinghouse, but could be easily added if these data were provided.

Several members of the Committee asked about if it were possible to add transit ridership by route to the Clearinghouse.

Ms. Howard responded that if WMATA, PRTC, VRE, and/or any local jurisdiction were able to provide this ridership information it could be added to the Clearinghouse. She noted that data on Metrorail boardings by station had already been added to the Clearinghouse.

Ms. Hasan asked about the availability of emergency preparedness data and asked if such data could be included in the Clearinghouse.

Ms. Kile responded that emergency preparedness data in the form of "event/evacuation" routes developed by DDOT were available and could be added to the Clearinghouse.

Chair Rybeck asked if the Clearinghouse was available on-line or if it was only being distributed via compact disk (CD).

Ms. Howard responded that at the present time the Clearinghouse was only available as an ArcView project on CD, but that staff was also looking into the possibility of providing access to Clearinghouse databases via a web-based application such as ArcIMS.

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

Ms. Klancher told the Committee that the Access for All Advisory Committee, which advises the TPB on issues and projects important to low-income communities, minority communities and people with disabilities, expressed an interest in learning more about travel patterns of transportation disadvantaged populations. Staff used 2000 Census data at the tract and PUMA level to produce information on commuting mode share for African-American, Asian, Hispanic/Latino, low-income, below poverty, limited English speakers and person's with disabilities. In addition, a proximity analysis of transit access was also conducted. The results of these analyses were presented in a PowerPoint presentation to the Committee. Ms. Klancher explained that the analysis found that most minority and disadvantaged workers are more likely to use alternative modes to driving alone, especially bus, compared to all workers. These groups are also more likely to live near transit stops, compared to the general population.

Questions and comments from the Committee included 1) transit mode share for everyone is significantly lower than driving alone, 2) whether commuter rail was included in the category "Subway", 3) how the low-income population group was defined 4) how the mode share by population group percentages were calculated 5) the different radii used in accessibility to rail and bus (1/2 mile and 1/4 mile radius) and 6) what the rationale was for using different scales in the maps of locations of low-income and minority population groups.

Ms. Klancher responded to question 2) that commuter rail was probably included but will double check, question 3) low-income was defined as two times the poverty line, and question 6) the map scales are based on the regional average for each population group in the region.

4. Briefing on the National Capital Planning Commission's (NCPC) Study of Relocation of the CSX Rail Line Within the District of Columbia

Mr. Zaidain gave the Committee a comprehensive powerpoint presentation on the NCPC study of the relocation of the active seven-mile stretch of CSX rail line within the District of Columbia. The presentation covered the current rail operations and conditions near the line, transportation and security concerns, and urban design and development issues. It outlined the study organization and objectives.

Mr. Smith commented that the study should be expanded beyond the District and that it was an important study that the TPB should support. In reply to Mr. Hekimian, Mr. Zaidain said that Union Station was not a security risk in terms of hazardous material and that Amtrack owns the rail line into the station. He also said that CSX was supportive of the study but did not have any funds. In response to Mr. Biesiadny, he commented that passenger service would be examined but that a possible outcome would be to move the freight line and keep the passenger line where it is. Mr. Verzosa asked if there was any "ball park" realignment under consideration. Mr. Zaidain replied that there was not.

5. Review of the Effectiveness of Current Transportation Emissions Reduction Measures (TERMS) for the Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2004 CLRP and FY2005-2010 TIP

Mr. Clifford distributed a memo containing the TERM tracking sheet and a comment letter from MWAQC encouraging the maintenance of commitments to TERMS. He reminded the Committee that the TERM tracking sheet contains summary information on TERMS used in the past to demonstrate conformity or to mitigate emissions increases. He described the information in each column. He directed the group to the bottom line, on page 6, and indicated that the totals are very similar to those in past years. He listed various updates, including: deleting measures prior to 2000 because the benefits of those measures would be reflected in actual traffic counts, scaling of rates using Mobile 6 designer rates for specific categories, and modifying values based on status reports from implementing agencies. He also pointed out MWAQC's message in the comment letter.

Chair Rybeck inquired about the location of a TERM discussed in the past that would add a \$1 fee per parking space. Mr. Clifford noted that the TERM tracking sheet lists only projects that have been adopted, and that the \$1 parking fee measure is included on a list of projects reviewed, but not selected for adoption.

Mr. Hekimian asked why the Mass Marketing TERM was not labeled as "underway" when it was showing benefits in 2005. Mr. Sivasailam replied that the project was ongoing, and that while it took some time for the benefits to be realized, the status

category should be shown as underway. Staff said they would make this designation and also review the sheet for any other projects lacking a specific designation.

6. Review of Comments Received and Draft Recommend Responses for Inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Assessment, the 2004 CLRP, and FT 2005-2010 TIP

Mr. Kirby distributed two handouts relating to comments on the air quality conformity analysis and the 2004 CLRP and FY2005-2010 TIP. He mentioned that the public has submitted approximately 1200 comments on the web, most of which could be grouped into one of several categories. The handouts listed these grouped comments and contained suggested responses. Mr. Kirby said that Mr. Miller would review comments relating to process issues and that he would review comments relating to modeling.

Mr. Miller reviewed the first handout, which included 24 comments received throughout the close of the public comment period on the air quality conformity assessment, the 2004 CLRP, and the FY2005-2010 TIP. Draft responses to the comments were also included. Mr. Miller stated that there were about 500 comments in support of including the ICC in the CLRP, and about 650 opposed. He indicated that the first comment listed, requesting that the public comment period should be extended until after the EIS on the ICC is released, was the main comment made. Mr. Miller reviewed the suggested response which notes that many projects, including the Corridor Cities Transitway and HOV on the beltway, are studied before undergoing an EIS. He also stated that an EIS cannot be completed until the project is included in a conformity analysis. Mr. Kirby noted that all projects need to be treated in the same manner, and reminded that group that including a project in the CLRP does not circumvent the EIS process. Mr. Biesiadny suggested noting that the original TIP schedule was already delayed, and that further delays could hold up other projects. Chair Rybeck suggested adding a statement saying that inclusion in the CLRP does not guarantee that a project will go to construction. Ms. Hasan suggested noting that the EIS process offers plenty of opportunity for public comment.

Mr. Miller continued reviewing each comment and draft response. Ms. Haldeman said that, in the response in comment #2, the statement about WMATA's requests being "nearly funded" was confusing. The Committee agreed to remove the sentence. Mr. Desjardin stated that the response to comment #10 was not completely accurate, in that 6.4 cooperative forecasts were never officially adopted. Mr. Desjardin offered to work with Mr. Miller to modify the language of the response. Mr. Miller asked the Committee to review the comments and responses and offer any suggested changes by close-of-business on Tuesday, November 9.

Mr. Kirby reviewed the second handout relating to comments and draft responses regarding travel models and the emissions post-processor. He stated that it was important to be very clear that these comments related to the Version 2.1D_50 model, and that responses to comments on earlier versions of the model had been finalized and are posted on the web. He noted that as of October 1st everything relating to the model and the post-processor was on the web for public comment. Mr. Kirby reviewed each comment and draft response in detail. He asked for comments from the Committee by close-of-business Tuesday, November 9.

7. Other Business

Mr. Todd asked the Committee several questions about which TPB committee dealt with safety and traffic operations issues. It was suggested that Mr. Todd could attend the Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems Task Force which is interested in these issues.

8. Adjourn