

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
February 5, 2010

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - February 5, 2010**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
 Frederick Co. -----
 City of Frederick -----
 Gaithersburg -----
 Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich
 Prince George's Co. -----
 Rockville -----
 M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. -----
 Prince George's Co. -----
 MDOT Lyn Erickson

 Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
 Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
 City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
 Fairfax Co. -----
 Robert Owolabi
 Falls Church -----
 Loudoun Co. George Phillips
 Manassas -----
 Prince William Co. Monica Backmon
 NVTC Greg McFarland
 PRTC Anthony Foster
 VRE Christine Hoeffner
 VDOT -----
 VDRPT David Awbrey
 NVPDC -----
 VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Mark Kellogg

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
 FHWA-VA -----
 FTA Brian Glenn
 Beth Day
 NCPC -----
 NPS -----
 MWAQC -----
 FEMA/DHS -----

COG Staff

Ronald Kirby, DTP
 Mike Clifford, DTP
 Gerald Miller, DTP
 Mark Pfoutz, DTP
 Andrew Austin, DTP
 Deb Bilek, DTP
 Dusan Vuksan, DTP
 Jinchul Park, DTP
 Feng Xie, DTP
 Bob Griffiths, DTP
 Monica Bansal, DTP
 William Bacon, DTP
 Eulalie Lucas, DTP
 Erin Morrow, DTP
 Jane Posey, DTP
 Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
 Andy Meese, DTP
 Ron Milone, DTP
 Mark Moran, DTP
 Anant Choudhary, DTP
 Robert Snead, DTP
 Rex Hodgson, DTP
 Michael Farrell, DTP
 Joan Rolhfs, DEP

Other Participants

Randy Carroll, MDE
 Joseph Madison, MTA
 Bill Orleans, HA EK

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the January 8, 2010 Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Proposed Changes in the Eight-hour Standard for Ozone, and EPA's New Nitrogen Dioxide Standard

Ms. Rohlfs told the Committee that On January 6, 2010, EPA proposed to strengthen the national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for ground-level ozone. EPA proposed to strengthen the 8-hour primary ozone standard to a level within the range of 0.060-0.070 parts per million. The proposal is based on scientific and technical information showing effects in healthy adults at 0.060 ppm. EPA will take public comment for 60 days after the proposal is published in the Federal Register. Then EPA will propose the final ozone standard in August 2010. Final designations will be made in 2011. The State Implementation Plan (SIP) is due in 2013.

Ms. Rohlfs also told the Committee that EPA issued a new Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) standard on January 22, 2010. EPA set a new hourly standard at the level of 100 parts per billion (ppb). The level defines the maximum allowable concentration anywhere in an area. EPA is retaining the current annual average NO₂ standard of 53 ppb. EPA is also requiring monitors located near major roads. Additional monitors will be required in large urban areas. MWAQC commented on EPA's proposed rule last fall, expressing concern about the resources that will be required to establish a new monitoring network. The new monitors are expected to be in place by 2013. Designations will be made in 2012 based on current community monitoring. They will be revisited in 2016-2017 when three-year's worth of data is available from the new hourly monitors.

3. Update on the Use of EPA's Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulation Model (MOVES) for State Implementation Plans (SIP) and Transportation Conformity

Mr. Clifford discussed two items. The first was an item that is posted on COG's website listing several links for MOVES information, including policy and technical guidance. This document also contains questions and answers from EPA related to the MOVES2010 model.

Mr. Clifford discussed several of the questions in the Q&A section of the document. He noted that Question 4 asked when should MOVES2010 be used for conformity. EPA

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of February 5, 2010**

says asap, but it will not be required until 2 years after the regulations are published in the Federal Register. Question 9 asked how the MOVES2010 inputs and outputs compare to those of previous mobile models. EPA says that MOVES2010 is very different, in that it is a database driven system with a GUI, as opposed to older models which are DOS based. Question 11 asked how do MOVES2010 emissions estimates compare to those of previous emission models. Mr. Clifford noted that both EPA's and TPB's testing showed an increase in emissions with the new model. Question 14 asked how are the changes in emission rates in MOVES2010 expected to affect attainment demonstrations. Mr. Clifford noted that it may be impossible to adhere to budgets, but that EPA notes that there might not be a problem because the base emissions are also increased, and the relative difference is what is pertinent.

Mr. Clifford noted that the MOVES Task Force is testing the model and that the MOVES model is very different from the Mobile model. He cited the example that the information from the VIN decoder is not useful with the new vehicle categories in MOVES.

Mr. Clifford discussed the second item which included a time line of air quality planning activities. He pointed out that the ozone designations should be out in August, 2011, and that the ozone SIP is due in December, 2013. He noted that new conformity guidance would probably be provided. He noted that the NO₂ designation is scheduled for January, 2012. The timeline identified the two-year grace period after MOVES2010 regulations are included in the Federal Register beyond which the model is required to be used for all new conformity analyses. He pointed out that the testing schedule for MOVES includes 2 phases: the first to develop local inputs and a modeling approach and apply those to 2009 CLRP travel data, and the second to apply the model to 2010 CLRP travel data. He noted that after the testing is concluded that a decision would need to be made regarding the need to develop a new SIP to set MOVES-based emissions budgets.

Mr. Clifford went over a table listing the travel demand models, TAZ area system, and emission models planned for use in the 2010 through 2014 CLRP conformity analyses.

Mr. Erenrich asked if data analysis related to the MOVES model should be included in the UPWP and if the region should have a major CLRP update in 2012 to allow the maximum amount of time before it would be necessary to update the CLRP using the MOVES model. Mr. Clifford replied that the data analysis efforts are included in the UPWP. Mr. Kirby answered that we would be obliged to redo the conformity analysis with any other major change anyway, so we would not gain anything by doing a major CLRP update early. He noted that MOVES is a national model and that everyone has to deal with it.

Chairman Verzosa asked if removing a project from the CLRP constituted a major change. Mr. Kirby replied that it did.

Mr. Kirby asked Ms. Rohlfs if she expected that there might be a new geographic area defined for the new ozone and NO₂ designations. Ms. Rohlfs replied, yes, especially in Virginia. Ms. Erickson asked if the new counties would be on their own or part of our region. Ms. Rohlfs said that it would be hard to predict what will happen.

Mr. Kirby asked Mr. Clifford to give an example of how vehicle data requirements change with MOVES. Mr. Clifford noted that trucks used to be categorized by weight, but now is not. For example, trash trucks are in their own category. Also, trucks are divided by long-haul and short-haul. Mr. Erenrich noted that identifying trash trucks should not be a problem. Mr. Clifford acknowledged that, but noted that it is additional data that need to be collected.

Mr. Owolabi asked if there could be a VIN software update. Mr. Clifford replied that staff had contacted the vendor about such an update, but that no timetable had been established by the company. While the software currently relates to the Mobile6 categories, we can always use EPA's "converter" if we have nothing better available.

4. Status Report on the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project Application under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program and Potential Transportation Funding under a New Stimulus Bill

Mr. Kirby provided a status report on the Regional Priority Bus Project Application under TIGER. Mr. Kirby stated that the USDOT had contacted TPB staff with questions about the K Street bus priority project. He believed that the TPB application made it into the final round of applications being considered for funding. No decision had been made by USDOT yet. Ms. Erickson stated that she had heard that a decision would be announced in mid-February and that \$500 million in additional funds would be available to fund grant applications.

Mr. Kirby stated that in Jobs/Stimulus bills being considered in the Senate and House included an extension of SAFETEA but that the Senate was less enthusiastic about a second stimulus bill. Ms. Day from the FTA headquarters and Ms. Erickson both stated that additional opportunities for TIGER grants are in these bills. Mr. Erenrich asked what the TPB should consider applying for in its next application. Mr. Kirby responded that it's too difficult to speculate. Mr. Erickson stated that the parameters for TIGER in the new bills are identical to the first stimulus bill; she reminded the Committee that the requirement for having projects contracted out in 90 days means the projects have to be ready to go which is a difficult requirement to meet.

5. Briefing on the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) New Policy on Funding New Starts and Small Starts Projects

Ms. Beth Day, Director, Office of Project Development, Federal Transit Administration (FTA) distributed a handout and provided a comprehensive briefing to the Committee on the FTA's new policy on funding New Starts and Small Starts transit projects. She reviewed the purpose and history of FTA's New Starts and Small starts programs and the funding decision process. She explained the rationale for the new policy and described the steps for the rulemaking process that will be initiated to implement this policy. She responded to several questions from members regarding the details about the FTA project review process and the role of Congress in funding decisions.

6. Review of Draft FY2011 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Miller distributed a draft of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY 2011 (July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011). He said the final draft of the FY 2011 UPWP will be presented to the Committee for review at its March 5 meeting and to the TPB for approval at its March 17 meeting.

Mr. Miller explained that it is assumed that the FY 2011 funding allocations to be provided by DOTs will be the same as the current FY 2010 levels. In addition, this budget estimate assumes \$1,128,100 of unobligated funds from FY 2009 will be available, which is \$666,100 less than the unspent funds from FY 2008. He referred the Committee to the table following the title page which shows the changes from FY 2010 and identifies seven work activities with reduced budgets totaling \$666,100. He pointed out new text that has been included in Section I that presents the regional planning goals and describes how the changing planning priorities in the region are addressed. He also pointed out the new figures on pages 4 and 5 in Section 11 that depict the program structure.

Mr. Kirby reviewed the changes in the FY 2010 work tasks in the Regional Studies work activity as amended in December 2009 and the proposed tasks for FY 2011. He said that in FY 2011, further work to analyze strategies and combinations to reduce mobile CO2 emissions will continue under the 3. B Mobile Emissions Analysis work activity. He explained that in FY 2011 the CLRP Aspirations scenario will be revised and updated looking to 2040. He said that the two TIGER grant application follow-on activities that began in FY 2010 would be completed. Specifically, these include the completion of guidelines for prioritizing bus transit on arterials in the region and the development of a regional arterial corridor network with 3- and 5-year phases, including visualization and cost/benefit analysis. He stated that this continued focus on bus prioritization responds to Mr. Bottigheimer's comment at the January TPB meeting regarding WMATA's support for more resources devoted bus priority planning.

Mr. Erenrich inquired whether the Value Pricing study grant from FHWA that the TPB applied for last year was included in the program. Mr. Kirby said that this study does not involve UPWP funds and that he heard that FHWA was moving slowly in deciding on grant awards. Mr. Erenrich suggested that since the study was a good idea that we may want to consider doing it under the UPWP if the grant application is not successful.

Mr. Kellogg said that WMATA is looking at activities to support for its long range transit planning under its technical assistance program. He also said that he was pleased that resources and activities to support bus priority planning were included in the Regional Studies task.

7. Update on the Regional Bus Stop Improvement Application for the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Livability Program

Ms. Klancher briefed the Committee on the application for the FTA discretionary Livability Bus Grant program. A grant application for a Regional Bus Stop Improvement Program was jointly developed by TPB, WMATA and local jurisdictional staff. As the 5307 designated recipient for the region, WMATA will submit and administer the grant. The TPB endorsed the application at its January meeting and gave the Steering Committee the ability to approve new projects or changes. Local jurisdictions had until January 27 to submit changes. Four changes were made: Arlington and Prince George's increased their grant request, Greenbelt widened the geographic area that the bus stop improvements would be targeted towards and WMATA added project administrative costs.

Ms. Klancher stated that if Technical Committee members found fatal flaws in the draft application that was distributed, they should comment on those items immediately. She said that the next steps were the Steering Committee would be asked to approve the changes, and then the application document would be finalized by WMATA and submitted to FTA.

8. Review of the draft FY 2011 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

Mr. Ramfos stated that the Fiscal Year 2011 draft Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP) was in the agenda packet for today's meeting. A presentation was then distributed which covered background information on Commuter Connections, the benefits of Commuter Connections, an overview of what is new with the program and budget, and next steps for the CCWP. An additional handout was distributed which outlined changes made to the draft CCWP which was in the agenda packet.

Based on the Commuter Connections Strategic Plan, Commuter Connections is a network of public and private transportation organizations, including COG, state funding agencies, and local organizations, that work together to achieve the mission.

Program benefits for jurisdictions include contributions to managing and reducing congestion which allows for commuter, tourist, and goods mobility. The programs also help reduce emissions and play a role in supporting local economic development efforts to recruit and retain employers. Commuter Connections also provides a variety of commuting options that help reduce stress, costs, and the time it takes for the region's workforce to get to and from work. Commuter Connections programs also help to support quality of life for the region's commuters.

Mr. Ramfos then discussed the Commuter Connections service area and stated that it is much larger than the MSA for workers eligible for the guaranteed ride home (GRH) program, and larger still for workers who can access the Commuter Connections ride-matching services. He also showed a chart with US Census rankings for carpools for urban areas. The Washington DC region ranks 6th in the nation in total number of carpools and 7th in the country in terms of percentage of workers carpooling.

Mr. Ramfos then covered the total daily impacts of the Commuter Connections program for VT, VMT, NO_x, and VOC. Federal planning regulations require the TPB to approve a congestion management process which includes Transportation Demand Management as part of the metropolitan transportation plan. Commuter Connections is the major demand management component of the region's congestion management process (CMP), which is currently in the process of being updated. Commuter Connections also provides transportation emission reduction measure benefits for inclusion in the air quality conformity determination approved by the TPB. This is part of the annual update of the region's CLRP and TIP. In the future, benefits from the program may be needed to address regional or national green house gas emission targets set for transportation.

Commuter Connections has been shown through many evaluation studies to be a highly cost-effective way to reduce vehicle trips (VT), vehicle miles of travel (VMT), and vehicle emissions associated with commuting in the Washington metropolitan region. Mr. Ramfos then shared the overall cost-effectiveness measures for the Commuter Connections program which are based on the results of the Commuter Connections TERM Analysis for VT, VMT, NO_x, and VOC.

Mr. Ramfos then showed the comparison of the FY 2010 budget to the proposed FY 2011 budget and stated that there are some slight variations for some of the program areas. He stated that there is a decrease in the budget from FY 2010. The budget breakdown includes about 32% of the costs going to COG/TPB Staff & Overhead, 51% of

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of February 5, 2010**

the cost for private sector services, 7% of the costs are passed through to local jurisdiction TDM programs, and 10% of the costs for direct costs.

Next, the FY 2011 CCWP also has some new features and projects, including a new Executive Summary section that has section titles, updated TERM impacts for emissions and transportation, a products and services section in each project area showing the parties responsible for products and/or service delivery, tie-ins for each project area to committee groups relating to oversight, and potential expansion and/or continuation of the Carpool Incentive Demonstration study based on FY 2010 evaluation results. The Monitoring and Evaluation program area will include the production and distribution of the 2010 State of the Commute Final Technical Report and production of a draft General Public Report, an Employer Telework Survey for Maryland and Virginia, an analysis of the Employer Outreach TERM, a Bike to Work Day participant survey, and a draft TERM Analysis Report.

Lastly, Mr. Ramfos discussed the next review and approval steps for the document. He stated that the Virginia Department of Transportation had written a letter asking that certain tasks of the Employer Outreach TERM that were removed from the Program Administration project in FY 2010 be re-instated. In specific, these included the production of customized Employer Outreach marketing materials and Employer Outreach training for sales representatives provided by COG/TPB staff and its contractors. The earlier handout reflected the changes to the document for both of these areas as well as the associated funding.

Ms. Erikson stated that COG/TPB staff worked hard with the state funding agencies earlier this fiscal year to make changes to the CCWP that made it similar to the UPWP. She also stated that the funding shown for the FY 2011 CCWP is not a reflection of the state funding agency commitments but rather a reflection of program activities and the presentation should point this out. Mr. Kirby agreed and stated that the current presentation gives the impression that the budget has been cut, however the reality is that there is no reduction in funding commitment by the state funding agencies. Mr. Ramfos concurred and stated that the presentation would be changed to reflect the comments.

Mr. Owolabi asked about the pass-through dollars for Employer Outreach from VDOT and whether the increase in funding to the CCWP for the Employer Outreach tasks would affect the local jurisdiction's contract amounts. Mr. Ramfos explained that the funding removed from the FY 2010 Employer Outreach TERM for Program Administration affected more than just COG/TPB staff time for monitoring and overseeing the pass-thru funds to the local jurisdictions. There were more tasks associated with project including customized marketing materials, sales training sessions, and other contract support tasks for the pass-thru dollars. In all of these instances, the materials produced and the information from the sales training courses

has only been available to Maryland and DC. Mr. Ramfos was not able to answer whether or not VDOT's action to include these tasks in the FY 2011 CCWP would alter the local jurisdictions' FY 2011 Employer Outreach contracts with VDOT.

Mr. Erenrich asked about the \$230 transit benefit amount going away at the end of the calendar year based on legislation passed. Mr. Ramfos stated that it would be up to Congress to make the transit/vanpool \$230 benefit permanent.

9. Briefing on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program

Mr. Meese reported that Mr. Euler, MATOC Program Implementation Manager for Telvent, Inc., was slated to provide an update presentation to the TPB at the February 17 meeting. This was in lieu of former MATOC Facilitator Mr. Ey, who left the MATOC Program at the end of January for a position with the Maryland urban search and rescue program. Ms. Jordan, who was introduced at the November TPB Technical Committee meeting, was continuing in her role as a MATOC notifications operator.

MATOC was continuing its regional coordination, monitoring, and notification activities, though with the number of weekly hours of coverage temporarily reduced because of the vacant facilitator position. MATOC also continued to face the challenge of identifying all of the funding needed for a full FY2011 program.

A number of examples were cited of MATOC involvement in recent traffic events, including a January 7 convergence of transportation-impacting events in the Georgetown area, a January 14 gasoline tanker truck fire on Montrose Road near I-270 in Montgomery County, and a January 26 incident where two Metro technicians were struck and killed by a piece of track equipment near the Rockville Metrorail Station, and a segment of the Metrorail system in that vicinity was closed for the resulting investigation. MATOC monitored these situations and made appropriate notifications for each.

Regarding funding for the MATOC Program, the original federal grant funding agreement provided funding through June 30, 2010, and the partners were looking at a short no-cost deadline extension. \$1.2 million per year was estimated to fully sustain the program thereafter, including both MATOC and supporting Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS) activities. The MATOC Steering Committee was continuing to work to identify sources of funding to continue MATOC after the federal earmark ends. MDOT had pledged \$400,000 for FY2011; a letter from MDOT announcing this commitment was distributed to the Committee. DDOT and VDOT shares were still under consideration within those agencies. Consistent with the amendment to the UPWP approved by the TPB in January, it was anticipated that there would be

**TPB Technical Committee Minutes for
Meeting of February 5, 2010**

continued TPB UPWP funding for FY2011 for eligible MATOC planning expenses (\$60,000 for MATOC consultant services and \$60,000 for TPB staff support). A potential \$100,000 from Northern Virginia CMAQ was anticipated to become available later in FY2011. There were also potential additional federal earmarks in authorization or appropriations bills under exploration.

The outlook for MATOC activities was for the short term, to seek to extend the eligibility period for the original federal grant to bolster the transition period; for the long term, to continue to operate the MATOC program and look for ways to strengthen its structure and activities. The program will use existing and/or additional staff to return to 5 day/16 hour monitoring operations as soon as possible, and will hire a new MATOC Facilitator as soon as feasible (when funding uncertainties are resolved). The committed funding to date makes the basis of a minimum program to continue for FY2011; the program partners will make the best use of limited funding, and will continue to seek full funding.

In response to a question from Mr. Erenrich, Mr. Meese noted that Ms. Jordan was now Working more than full-time to provide monitoring coverage for most rush hours, unfortunately excepting Monday mornings and Friday afternoons. Mr. Erenrich further asked about the possibility of partner agency staff persons being assigned to MATOC for training purposes, thus also temporarily filling in for MATOC operator positions, and Mr. Meese replied that the MATOC Steering Committee was looking into that. However, the different partner agencies were in different situations as to how easily they could assign staff, so there may be a "one size fits all" answer.

In response to a question from Mr. Malouff, Mr. Meese stated he would look into whether MATOC and the Virginia 511 traveler information system shared information with each other through the RITIS system.

10. Briefing on TPB Endorsement of the Establishment of the Virginia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (VAMPO)

Mr. Austin spoke to the draft resolution included in the meeting materials. He said the resolution recognizes NVTA's role in the planning process and outlines the expected activities that VAMPO would carry out. The resolution only asks for an endorsement of formation, not to join. The resolution also stated that the TPB would be represented in collaboration with NVTA.

Mr. Austin stated that seven of the fourteen MPOs in Virginia have passed similar resolutions. The VAMPO bylaws were still under development.

Mr. Miller reported that Mr. Srikanth said this issue had been discussed at NVTA and there was a general level of comfort with the resolution and that the TPB members had been briefed. Ms. Erickson stated that Maryland supports the TPB's involvement.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION AND DISCUSSION

11. Update on the Financial Analysis for the 2010 Update to the CLRP

Mr. Miller said that the working group for the analysis of the financial plan for the 2010 CLRP met on January 26. He reviewed the status of the financial analysis and said that it was hopeful that all of the DOTs would provide the consultant with their revenue and expenditure forecast data to 2040 in time for the next meeting on February 23. He commented that the DOTs are using their financial information to prepare the air quality conformity project inputs for the 2010 CLRP that are due March 1. He explained that every effort needs to be made to have a draft financial analysis for the federal planning certification review in April.

Ms. Backmon commented that staff from the Northern Virginia agencies will meet with VDOT on February 22 to finalize their 2010 CLRP inputs.

Mr. Kellogg explained that the WMATA revenue and expenditure forecasts to 2040 assume that current "Metro Matters" funding commitments will continue beyond 2010 and that identifying funds for additional Metrorail capacity beyond 2020 could be a challenge. Mr. Miller commented that the previous financial analyses to 2030 have identified these same concerns.

12. Status Report on the Version 2.3 Travel Demand Model

Mr. Milone distributed a PowerPoint presentation on the status of the TPB's Version 2.3 travel model which currently remains in development. He explained that the Version 2.3 model is being developed with several new sources of observed data, most notably, the 2007/08 Household Travel Survey (HTS). It is also being developed over a more detailed traffic analysis zone area system consisting of 3,722 zones. Much of the development effort to date has been concerned with the editing and cleaning of observed data files and the preparation of inputs with respect to the new zone system (i.e., land activity and transportation networks). The Version 2.3 model features a revised set of truck models and a more advanced mode choice model. Additional features are being considered, including a more complete representation of non-motorized travel modes, a more detailed delineation of area types in the region, and an expanded set of trip purposes. The Version 2.3 model development is scheduled for completion by the end of calendar year 2010, at which time it will be considered for formal adoption.

Mr. Erenrich expressed his support for TPB's plan to revisit area types used in the regional travel model as this variable is used to determine free-flow speed inputs to the model. Based on his past experience with the existing TPB model, he said that the current area type scheme could be improved to better reflect free-flow speeds more accurately. He also stressed the importance of accurate network coding. Mr. Malone noted both of these points.

Mr. Owolabi expressed concern that an increase in the number of trip purposes used in the regional travel model might result in a double-counting of trips if not done carefully. Mr. Milone agreed with the concern and added that proper accounting would be observed in the development of trip rates by trip purposes using the 2007/08 HTS.

13. Update on Analysis Results for the "CLRP Aspirations and the "What Would it Take?" Greenhouse Gas Reduction Scenarios and Potential Next Steps.

Mr. Kirby provided an update on the "CLRP Aspirations" and the "What Would it Take?" scenarios. He gave an overview of the January 20th Scenario Study Task Force and TPB meetings at which the draft results of both scenarios were presented. He stated that in the interest of time the next Task Force meeting, scheduled to be held on February 10th, would focus on the inputs, assumptions, and next steps for the Aspirations Scenario, while the meeting on February 17th would solely focus on the "What Would It Take?" scenario. He also stated that the "What Would It Take?" scenario would be presented at the March meeting of COG's Climate, Energy and Environment Policy Committee (CEEPC), at which point staff would evaluate the next steps for that scenario.

14. Other Business

None.

15. Adjourn