

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES
FOR MEETING OF
JUNE 6, 2003

TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES

ATTENDANCE – JUNE 6, 2003

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Rick Rybeck

MARYLAND

Frederick Co. James Gugel
 Gaithersburg -----
 Montgomery Co. David Moss
 Prince George's Co. Cicero Salles
 Rockville -----
 M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. -----
 Prince George's Co. Faramarz Mokhtari
 Harold Foster
 MDOT Fatimah Hasan
 Mike Haley
 BJ Berhanu

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Maria White
 Arlington Co. Ritch Viola
 City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
 Fairfax Co. Tom Biesadny
 Mike Lake
 Falls Church -----
 Loudoun Co. -----
 Manassas -----
 Prince William Co. Rick Canizales
 NVTC Jana Lynott
 PRTC Michael Ibay
 VRE Tamara Ashby
 NVRC -----
 VDOT -----
 VDRPT -----
 VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Lora B. Byala

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
 FTA -----
 NCPC -----
 NPS -----
 MWAQC -----

COG Staff and Others

Ronald Kirby, COG/DTP
 Mike Clifford, COG/DTP
 Gerald Miller, COG/DTP
 Jim Hogan, COG/DTP
 Robert Griffiths, COG/DTP
 Mark Pfoutz, COG/DTP
 Daivamani Sivasailam, COG/DTP
 Nicholas Ramfos, COG/DTP
 Patrick Zilliacus, COG/DTP
 Joan Rohlf, COG/DEP
 Arlee Reno, Cambridge Systematics, Inc.
 Randy Carroll, MDE
 James Wamsly, FCSG
 Howard Chang, Tri-County Council
 Jane Posey, COG/DTP
 Bill Bacon, COG/DTP
 Eulalie Lucas, COG/DTP
 Anant Choudhary, COG/DTP
 Beth Lowe, COG/DEP
 Michael Freeman, COG/DTP

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from May 2, 2003 TPB Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved with clarification to a sentence under Item #2.

2. Review the Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment, 2003 CLRP and FY2004-2009 TIP

Mr. Clifford began the item by summarizing the mailout material, which was the draft work scope for the air quality conformity assessment of the 2003 CLRP and FY2004-09 TIP. He briefly highlighted the scope, since the Committee saw a very similar first draft at its May meeting, and also provided a status report of work activities. The TPB had released the draft scope in May for a 30 day comment period, with approval scheduled for the June 18 Board meeting. He indicated that staff had not yet received specific project inputs for the Corridor Cities Transitway in the I-270 corridor. Following the presentation the Committee discussed the topic, including the following comments / questions: were inputs specified in sufficient detail on the highway side for the I-270 corridor? (staff would like to confirm assumptions with MD SHA after the meeting); could the models be made more sensitive to land use? (use of traffic analysis zones and cooperative forecast data at the regional level defines a grain of analysis which differs from design at the site level; corridor, subarea and site level represent a better context for such micro level analysis); what are the consequences of a conformity lapse? (this would prohibit new contracts for project engineering, right-of-way, and construction); if a lapse were to occur, when would it happen? (staff would have to check the exact date, but it would be around January 20, 2004). Note, the 2000 CLRP received federal approval on January 22, 2001.

3. Update on the Financial Analysis for 2003 Update of the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP)

Mr. Reno, Cambridge Systematics, Inc., reviewed the information in the mailout that was scheduled to be presented to the TPB on May 21, including draft summary tables of forecast total revenues and expenditures for the 2003 CLRP over the period 2004 to 2030. He noted that the presentation was distributed at the TPB meeting, but the item was differed to the June meeting. He said that the tables reflect that the Northern Virginia local jurisdictions have not yet provided their expected revenues that will be available for WMATA's requested expenditures. He indicated that he was available to assist any jurisdiction and said that a draft final report on the analysis will be presented at the next meeting on June 27.

Chair Byala commented that the TPB handout on May 21 was complete for the District of Columbia and Suburban Maryland and that TPB needs to discuss the transit funding shortfalls. Mr. Kirby said that the complete tables and funding issues need to be mailed for the TPB meeting on June 18.

Mr. Biesiadny said that a meeting in Virginia had been held to discuss this information and local staff have been preoccupied with the air quality planning issues. He said that local staff are

working with Mr. Srikanth of VDOT to finalize the information for each jurisdiction. He said that everyone would try to get the figures by Wednesday for the TPB mailout .

Chair Byala said that she hoped that complete information will be available for the TPB mailout and for discussion at the TPB meeting on June 18.

4. Briefing on the Region's Draft State Implementation Plan (SIP) and Schedule

Ms. Rohlf's began the item by distributing and highlighting the Executive Summary from the draft SIP which was just approved by MWAQC for public hearings. The hearings were set for July 8 in Maryland and Virginia, and for July 9 in the District of Columbia. MWAQC was scheduled to meet on July 30th to review the comments from the hearings and draft responses, and to finalize the SIP for state submittal to EPA.

The Committee then discussed the topic, including the following comments / questions: were both control and contingency measures included in the document? (yes, although the states may decide to forego specification of the contingency measures until the March 2004 SIP submissions); did the SIP address both rate of progress and attainment? (yes).

Mr. Kirby then spoke to the mailout material, a May 21, 2003 letter from TPB Chair Shapiro to MWAQC Chair Mendelson, which addressed the topics of: the Mobile Emissions Budgets and TCMs. The Committee briefly discussed the emissions budget calculation aspects of the letter and encouraged members to attend the June 24th meeting of the Travel Management Subcommittee to review details of all TCM / TERM calculations.

5. Update on TERMS for the 2003 CLRP and FY 2004-2009 TIP

Mr. Sivasailam handed out a memorandum on TCMs and TERMS. He discussed the proposed budgets for mobile sources and the TCMs out for public comment. The Travel Management Subcommittee would meet on June 24, 2003 and would review the documentation of the TCMs. He discussed the next steps in the conformity process, which include updating the emissions benefit of the TCMs in the SIP and the TERMS in the tracking sheet for all the analysis years and the budget test, which would indicate whether additional TERMS are needed to meet the budget. Mr. Kirby thanked Ms. Lowe of DEP for all the work in putting the SIP together. In answer to a question as to why the mobile budget in the SIP summary and the handout differ, Mr. Sivasailam replied that they are same but the SIP document is rounded to the tenth digit (single digit) and the staff memo is rounded to the hundredth digit (double digit).

6. Report on TPB Sponsored "Value Pricing Conference" Held on June 4

Mr. Kirby described the purpose and background of the conference. He commented that there was a very good turn-out of over 185 people and many good presentations. He distributed the agenda and summarized each session and announced that the speakers presentations will be available on the COG/TPB web site.

Mr. Salles commented that we need to look beyond the current HOT lanes payment technology to ways to integrate paying tolls and transit fares because there are so many jurisdictions in our region. Mr. Kirby noted that the conference identified different toll payment technologies exist across the nation.

Ms. Lynott complimented COG staff for the well organized and informative conference.

In response to Mr. Mokhtari's question, Mr. Kirby said that the TPB will be briefed on the conference on June 18 and asked to follow up in July with an action to examine how value pricing could benefit the Washington region.

Mr. Mokhtari said that the public perception that HOT lanes are for rich people was a big issue in the US 50 HOT lane proposal. He asked how the HOT lanes affect the low-occupant vehicle (LOV) users?

Mr. Kirby replied that the conference presenters agreed that HOT lanes should be implemented only on existing or new HOV lanes, and that existing LOV users should not be made worse off. He said that public awareness will need to be increased about how HOT lanes operate and the demographics of the users.

Ms. Hasan said that it was a well organized conference with good presentations, especially Professor Wachs' comments on tolls, gas and sale taxes and transportation financing challenges. Mr. Kirby said that a paper by Dr. Wachs on this topic is available on the Brookings Institution web site.

7. Review of the Implementation Plan for the Commuter Connections Regional Mass Marketing TERM

Mr. Ramfos briefed the Committee on the regional Mass Marketing TERM components that are being implemented through Commuter Connections. He then introduced representatives from Dudnyk Advertising & Public Relations. The representatives, Mr. Powers, CEO of Dudnyk and Mr. Magnus, Sr. Vice President then gave a review of the deliverables of the project.

The briefing from Dudnyk included the following deliverables: Review of prior marketing efforts, review of regional TDM marketing research, regional stakeholders research, integrated marketing communications plan development for the TERM, and evaluation.

Mr. Powers reviewed all of the new research conducted to date on the project. He began with the stakeholder research and then discussed the in-depth employer surveys conducted as well as the consumer research.

Next, Mr. Magnus reviewed the development of the integrated marketing communications plan. The communications strategy was reviewed along with the media, ethnic and urban, and overall public relations strategy. Lastly, he discussed the direct marketing and interactive strategy for the plan.

Mr. Kirby stated that the implementation of this regional TERM would need some input from the TPB. He stated that staff would be reviewing the aspects of the TERM with TPB at its June 18th meeting. Some initial programs and services that could be promoted in the campaign would include the regional SmartCard, which will be debuting in about a year on the entire transit system.

Mr. Kirby also stated that the end product of the promotion needed to address what commuters are currently responding and it also needs to address specific products that need improvement such as transit signage. He also said that additional highway signage for Commuter Connections

may be another option to consider under this measure. Mr. Griffiths added that the Commuter Connections web site address should be added to the highways signs.

Chair Byala asked what would happen if the TERM did not meet its stated goals during the course of implementation. Mr. Ramfos responded that it would be an opportunity to either improve the implementation of the measure or select another regional measure that would provide a greater amount of transportation and emission impacts. Mr. Sivasailam also stated that there was a four-year ramp up period for the implementation of this TERM. Final results will not be realized until 2007.

8. Review of the Preliminary Draft FY 2004-2009 TIP

Mr. Pfoutz distributed the preliminary draft FY2004-09 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to the Committee. He explained that Prince Georges County's project listings would be included in the next draft. Questions were asked about whether it was possible or not to download only specific jurisdictions from the COG web site rather than having to do the entire document. Mr. Pfoutz answered that we would check out how to rearrange the web files so that it would be possible to do that.

Mr. Moss asked why there was no transit operating figures shown and was told that they are being assembled and would be included in the draft to be presented at the July 16 TPB meeting.

Mr. Pfoutz asked that any updates and corrections be forwarded to Mr. Austin by Monday June 16.

9. Update on Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study

Mr. Griffiths reported that the region's Planning Directors were going to review the Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ)-level land activity assumptions for the five alternative land use scenarios at their June 13th meeting. The Planning Directors would then be presenting their comments and recommendations on these alternative land use scenarios to the entire Joint Technical Working Group (JTWG) at noon. He added that after the JTWG had signed off on these alternative land use scenarios, staff would perform some initial modeling of these scenarios and work with the Technical Committee Transportation Scenarios subgroup to match a transportation scenario with each alternative land use scenario. He stated that the Transportation Scenarios subgroup would be meeting on June 18th after the TPB meeting to begin the development of the transportation scenarios.

Mr. Griffiths also reported that the HOV/HOT Lanes transportation scenario for the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study had been discussed at the TPB's recent June 4 Value Pricing Conference and that there was much interest in testing this scenario. He reminded the Committee that HOV/HOT lanes scenario had been put on the back burner until it could be brought forward at the same time as the alternative land use scenarios. He stated that it was now time to further flesh out the assumptions for this scenario as well. He stated that in terms of land use the HOV/HOT lanes was supportive of the Round 6.3 Cooperative Forecasts and the Regional Activity Clusters that had been identified by the Planning Directors. He added that in his opinion the HOV/HOT lanes scenario would likely result in some greater concentration of jobs and households in Regional Activity Clusters than in the Round 6.3 forecasts.

Mr. Sanders expressed the concerned that the HOV/HOT lanes scenario would lead to greater sprawl to outlying areas and asked if the Planning Directors had looked into this issue.

Mr. Griffiths responded that the HOV/HOT lanes scenario would not necessarily lead to greater sprawl. He stated that the land use effects of this scenario would depend of the configuration of the HOV/HOT lanes, the entrance and exit points, the assumed toll levels and the amount and type of transit service assumed on HOV/HOT facilities. He added this issue would be further discussed with the Planning Directors once the assumptions for the HOV/HOT lanes scenario had been further fleshed out.

Chair Byala encouraged members of the Committee to attend the June 13th JTWG meeting at noon and the meeting of the Transportation Scenarios subgroup meeting on June 18th at 2:00PM.

10. Response to Comments Received on the Report: “2002 Metro Core Cordon Count of Vehicular and Passenger Volumes”

Mr. Zilliacus distributed a memorandum which responded to four comments received on the report. Staff agreed to provide a reference to the WMATA Metrochek program in the report. At the request of Ms. Ashby, staff has agreed to provide train-by-train passenger loads in the revised report, reflecting conditions as of Spring 2002. At the request of Chairman Byala, staff will try to provide a more legible map of the cordon in the report. Finally, Mr. Kirby noted that there is confusion about the definition of “Metro Core”, which in the vision plan describes the area bounded by D.C., Arlington County, and the City of Alexandria, which is much larger than the boundary of the cordon being described in the report. After discussion, it was agreed to revise the name of the Metro Core Cordon to read “Central Employment Area Cordon”.

Several additional comments were made at this review:

- Need to provide sector delineations on the cordon map;
- Possibly need to break the map into two maps, one for D.C. sectors and one for Virginia sectors;
- Desire to see further breakdown of transit modes in a set of tables;
- Figure 2 should be reconfigured as a set of bar graphs;
- Need more discussion of why bus transit usage crossing the cordon has declined, and need to put this in context of bus transit usage increasing in other parts of the region;
- Desire to see private and public bus usage separated out.

Staff responded that effort would be made to incorporate these suggestions into a revised report, hopefully to be brought back to the Committee in September. There would be no time available to produce a revised report for the next meeting on June 27th. Staff noted that the transit data contained in the report were developed by the transit providers and solicited any additional data for the Spring 2002 time frame that could help support the additional points the Committee wished to make.

11. Other Business

None.

12. Adjourn

