

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - December 3, 2004**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Rick Rybeck

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----

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

FTA -----

NCPC -----

NPS -----

MWAQC -----

COG Staff and Others

MDOT Fatimah Hasan
 Glen Smith
 BJ Berhanu

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
Ron Milone, COG/DTP
Eulalie Lucas, COG/DTP
Nicolas Ramfos, COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, COG/DTP
Mark Moran, COG/DTP
Andrew Austin, COG/DTP
Jeff King, COG/DEP
Paul DesJardin, COG/HSPPS
Joan Rohlf, COG/DEP
Sunil Kumar, COG/DEP
Tim Nutter, NVTA

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Jim Maslanka

Arlington Co. Ritch Viola

Nicole Lewis

City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa

Fairfax Co. Tom Biesiadny

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

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MINUTES

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the November 5, 2004 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved with an addition of a clarification that the Corridor Cities Transitway project has had a DEIS under Item #6.

2. Briefing on the Draft Results of the 8-Hour Conformity Assessment of the 2004 CLRP and FY2005-2010 TIP

Mr. Clifford discussed the “*8-Hour Ozone Standard Conformity Assessment*” report that was distributed at the meeting. He explained that in July, EPA released the new regulations related to the 8-hour conformity requirements. He stated that non-attainment areas must demonstrate conformity by June 15, 2005 or suffer a lapse. Because there are no SIP budgets yet with the 8-hour standard, EPA is allowing the use of the 1-hour budgets. EPA is also allowing options for changes in geography, so that Stafford County, which has been removed from the non-attainment area for the 8-hour standard, will still be included in the analysis until new budgets are set. Mr. Clifford pointed out the TPB and MWAQC correspondence in Attachment A, discussing this issue.

Mr. Clifford discussed the work tasks on page 2 of the report. He noted that the implementing agencies had been asked to review the conformity project input table for accuracy of completion dates, and that an updated project input list had been developed. The new project list that went through a public comment period, and was adopted by the TPB, is included in Attachment B of the report. Mr. Clifford noted that the inputs also included using the Version 2.1D travel model, Mobile 6.2 emissions factors, and Round 6.2 land activity forecasts.

Mr. Clifford briefly reviewed each of the exhibits, pointing out the travel demand summary in exhibit 2, VMT comparison to the 2003 CLRP in exhibit 3, and the dramatic drops in emission rates in exhibit 6. He noted that exhibit 6 showed a bottom line of a 35 ton/day margin for VOC and greater than 100 ton/day margin for NO_x, when compared to the mobile budget for each pollutant.

Mr. Clifford listed the contents of each attachment, and explained that attachment 4 contains a letter from MDOT selecting Corridor 1 as a placeholder in the CLRP for the ICC alignment.

Ms. Byala asked if change in the analysis of other forecast years was necessary for the 8-hour standard. Mr. Clifford replied that no changes in the other years were necessary. Ms. Byala asked if transit was constrained in the 2010 analysis, and Mr. Clifford replied that it was. Mr. Kirby noted that staff was waiting for official notice from WMATA to change the current status of the transit constraint. It was noted that “Metro Matters” funding should change that. Ms. Byala said that there is uncertainty about the federal match for “Metro Matters”. Mr. Biesiadny stated that “Metro Matters” will borrow the funding if federal funding is not available. Mr. Srikanth noted that for the next

conformity analysis there would probably still be a transit constraint, but that the allowed capacity would be greater. Ms. Byala agreed.

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 reviewed the Draft Solicitation Document for projects and strategies to be included in the 2005 CLRP and FY 2006-2011 TIP. The Committee was asked to review the document and provide comments by Monday, December 6, by the close of business. The key dates in the schedule for the air quality conformity analysis were reviewed. A new section on how the plan performs in relation to the TPB vision was added to the document. The draft Solicitation Document will be reviewed by the TPB at the December meeting and they will be asked to approve the final document in January 2005.

Mr. Srikanth requested that the ETIP be available earlier this year and also suggested that the solicitation document for next year be adopted by the TPB in December, instead of January, to give the implementing agencies more time to prepare their inputs. Mr. Biesiadny further supported having a solicitation document earlier, given Virginia's schedule for the STIP.

Staff replied that the ETIP would be available in the next week and that next year staff will prepare the solicitation document earlier.

Mr. Kirby highlighted the importance of the financial constraint requirement for the CLRP and TIP, as summarized in Section 2 of the draft solicitation document. Mr. Kirby stated that last year the financial constraint requirement was a major issue for the ICC project and that this requirement is just as important as the air quality conformity analysis. Mr. Kirby stressed that funding plans for new projects with financial complexities must be final by the 16th of March, 2005.

Mr. Srikanth commented that VDOT learned that agencies must consider not only how a new project will be funded but also how funding a large project will impact obligations already made to projects in the CLRP. Mr. Srikanth asked how much transit detail should be provided with project submissions. Mr. Kirby and Mr. Clifford replied that transit routes must be included in the submissions in March, and more details can be provided during the final sign-off in the summer.

Ms. Hasan asked if all the financial details for project submissions must be finalized by February, and Mr. Kirby confirmed that they must be.

Ms. Byala asked about bus and other transit services programmed without funding last year and new transit services needed for growth. Mr. Kirby replied that funding for all transit services must be identified in order to be in the plan or TIP and that more information is needed from local jurisdictions on transit networks in 2025 or 2030 so it can be included in the TPB model, which is one of the comments from the TRB panel.

Chairman Rybeck commented that the solicitation document provides information on how much forecast growth is concentrated in the activity clusters but not the centers, which are referred to in the TPB Vision (not clusters). He further stated that using center data would make a more dramatic point about the lack of concentration in the region than the cluster data. Mr. Desjardin explained the difference between clusters and centers, and that the clusters tend to include groups of centers. Desjardin said that MDPC and the Planning Directors will review and possibly redefine the activity centers when land use forecasts for Round 7.0 are developed.

4. Briefing on the Impacts of the Commuter Connections Program as Measured by the Results of the State of the Commute Survey and Other Data

Mr. Ramfos briefed the Committee on the purpose of collecting data on TERMS operated by Commuter Connections and stated that program measurements include number of users, placements, and reductions in VT, VMT, and emissions. He covered the evaluation time periods which began in COG's FY1997. There have been three evaluation periods that commenced with the implementation of the regional TERMS and at the end of each three year time period a TERM Analysis report is produced. Data from this report is then put into the regional TERM tracking sheet. He then covered the various data collection surveys that have been implemented during the three year evaluation cycle which will culminate in the production of the Commuter Connections TERM Analysis Report.

Mr. Ramfos revised the 2004 State of the Commute regional survey and stated that a draft technical report was recently endorsed by the Commuter Connections Subcommittee. Results from the survey will primarily be used to evaluate telecommuting, the Integrated Rideshare measure; primarily the kiosks, and regional mass marketing measure. He stated that results from the survey are also used to examine commute patterns, telecommuting, attitudes regarding commute options, recall and influence of commuter marketing advertisements, awareness and use of commute services, awareness of employer-provided commute benefits, and Guaranteed Ride Home. He discussed the commute pattern results including current commute mode splits and commute length and made comparisons between 2001 and 2004 survey results. He also reviewed length of time using alternative modes and the comparison between 2001 and 2004 results.

Mr. Ramfos reviewed employer provided commute assistance services. He discussed the differences between employees drive alone habits whose employers offered commute benefits versus those whose employers did not offer commuter benefits. He then discussed incentive/support services offered at employment sites, including free on-site parking offered and the percentage of employers offering free parking in 2004 compared to 2001.

Mr. Ramfos reviewed the awareness and attitudes of commuters towards commute alternatives. In particular, he covered the percentages of commuters saying that they had access to HOV lanes and the resulting time savings as compared to 2001 as well as the predominant reason why commuters did not carpool. Next, he reviewed the percentage of commuters who said they had access to public transportation and the predominant reason why commuters don't ride the bus and don't take the train. Next, Mr. Ramfos

discussed attitudes and awareness towards the overall commute and how commuters felt about their commute compared to one year ago.

Mr. Ramfos reviewed commute advertising and overall advertising recall, the percent of commuters who recalled Commuter Connections as the sponsor of the message, and the percent of commuters who may have taken an action after seeing or hearing the advertisements and the percentage of those who were drive alone commuters. The percent of commuters who knew of a phone number or web site they could use to obtain commuter information was compared to 2001. He also covered the percentage of commuters who said they had heard of Commuter Connections as well as the percentage of commuters who were aware of HOV marketing. He reviewed results of those commuters who tried using alternative modes. He then discussed the results of access mode to transit and ridesharing and compared the results to 2001. He reviewed telecommuting results from the survey and discussed the new definition of telecommuting, overall regional telecommuting statistics, and the potential for additional telecommuting in the region.

Mr. Ramfos reviewed benchmarks for the Washington region in use of the web and toll-free telephone number, employer outreach, ridematch database, vanpool and GRH program, and marketing and advertising to other regions in the country. He also gave benchmarking data for carpooling for the Washington region compared to those regions with one million or more workers.

Lastly, Mr. Ramfos gave overall conclusions of the results from the 2004 Commuter Connections State of the Commute regarding commuting patterns, telecommuting, advertisements and regional commute services awareness, employer services programs, parking, and the role TDM plays in maintenance and operations of the region's transportation infrastructure.

Chairman Rybeck asked what the match rate meant versus the placement rate in the benchmark table for ridematch databases. Mr. Ramfos explained that the match rate meant the success of finding a match versus the placement rate which is those commuters receiving a match actually being placed in an alternative mode.

Ms. Byala asked whether more east coast cities such as Philadelphia and New York could be shown in the benchmark tables. Mr. Ramfos explained that much of the information in the studies used for the benchmark tables did not include many east coast cities and that both Philadelphia and New York were more than likely in the top 25 cities versus top 10 or 15 in terms of carpooling rates.

Chairman Rybeck asked whether the information from the State of the Commute survey showing the effect of pay for parking has on the use of alternative modes at employment sites could be added to the presentation to the TPB. Mr. Ramfos stated that this information is available and would be shared in the presentation to the TPB. Mr. Kirby noted that paying for parking is not the only reason why commuters would shift from driving alone to an alternative mode.

Ms. Samarasinghe asked about the conclusions of the presentation and in particular why driving alone keeps rising despite all of the efforts being put into TDM programs.

Mr. Ramfos stated that overall TDM has been successful in the region but it's not going to be the only answer to bringing down the drive alone rate. There are high violation rates in the HOV lanes, transit is overcrowded as well as parking at transit and more employers are offering free parking to their employees. Conditions need to be more favorable in order for many of these programs to work.

Mr. Biesiadny stated that the mode split chart was hard to read and the length of alternatives chart did not match up with the text. Mr. Ramfos replied that these charts would more than likely be taken out for the TPB presentation.

Mr. Hekimian stated his concerns with HOV lanes disappearing in Montgomery County by being converted to HOT lanes.

Ms. Byala said that the presentation given needs to be revised for the TPB and asked about the status of DDOT's funding of Commuter Connections. Mr. Kirby responded that DDOT restored the funding for FY06 however staff and the state funding agencies would be reviewing the program

5. Use of the Traffic Volume Estimates in Transportation Planning

Mr. Griffiths spoke from a handout that described the procedures used by state and local transportation agencies to develop annual average daily traffic volume estimates for many segments of the regional highway network from a small sample of actual traffic counts. He identified a number of issues in using these traffic volume estimates in transportation modeling validation efforts. He concluded his presentation by stating that we may need to locate many more permanent traffic counting stations in our metropolitan region to better validate our regional transportation model.

Mr. Milone commented that he was very dismayed to discover that even at the limited number of permanent counting stations that we have now; there were significant gaps in the collection of daily traffic volume data because all stations did not operate year round.

Mr. Griffiths acknowledged that because of equipment failure and roadway construction projects, traffic counting loop detectors are sometimes out-of-service until they can be safely repaired. He added that the time these permanent counting stations are out-of-service can vary from a few days to several months depending on type of problem and the physical location of the monitor.

Mr. Versosa commented that new technology and methods for the collection traffic volume data would improve both the availability and reliability of this information in the coming years.

Mr. Griffiths commented that the 2004 version of the Transportation Data Clearinghouse, containing the most recently available daily traffic volume estimates, would be distributed to participating agencies on CDs at the end of the Technical Committee meeting.

6. Update on TPB Models Development

Mr. Milone briefed the Committee on the current status of the models development work program, which is overseen by the Travel Forecasting Subcommittee. The objective of the program is to produce travel forecasts in support of regional and project planning studies. He stated that the models development program promotes ongoing improvement to COG's travel forecasting capabilities. The current application process is known as the Version 2.1 D #50 model. The model incorporates many improvements that were recommended by an expert review of the previous application model (Version 2.1/TP+, Release C).

7. Briefing on the 2000 Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP) Worker Flow Data

Mr. Griffiths reported that the corrected CTPP – Part 3 worker flow data had been received from the Census Bureau and that he had begun the tabulation of this data. He said because of time considerations at this meeting he would be making a fuller presentation on this worker flow data at the January Technical Committee meeting.

8. Other Business

Mr. Kirby noted that December was the last meeting that Mr. Rybeck would Chair the Technical Committee and thanked him. Mr. Kirby told the Committee that starting in January 2005, Mr. Mokhtari from Prince George's County would be the new Chair of the Technical Committee.

9. Adjourn