

**METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

777 North Capitol Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20002-4226
(202) 962-3200

**MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
June 16, 2004**

Members and Alternates Present

Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board
Phil Mendelson, D.C. Council
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT
Marsha Kaiser, MDOT
Carol Petzold, Maryland House of Delegates
Cicero Salles, Prince George's DPW&T
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park
Jeff Jennings, Councilmember Jim Graham's office
Ludwig Gaines, City of Alexandria
Brian A. Glenn, FTA
Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park
Richard White, WMATA
Edgar Gonzalez, Montgomery County Executive Branch
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Ron Spalding, MDOT
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT-NOVA
Andrew M. Fellows, City of College Park
D.M. Staton, Jr., Loudoun County
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Rick Canizales, Prince William County
Maurice Keys, DDOT
Wayne Cooper, Charles County Commissioners
David Moss, Montgomery County DPWT
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Richard Stevens, WMATA

Edward Thomas, WMATA

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Gerald Miller	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
Andrew Austin	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Deborah Etheridge	COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam	COG/DTP
Hailemariam Abai	COG/DTP
Jill Locantore	COG/DTP
Joan Rohlf	COG/DEP
Beth Lowe	COG/DEP
Steven Kania	COG/OPA
Dave Robertson	COG/EO
Allen Muchnick	TPB/CAC
Bob Chase	NVTA
Fatimah Hasan	MDOT
Howard Chang	Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland
Randy Carroll	MDE
Michael Replogle	Environmental Defense
Jim Maslanka	City of Alexandria
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Alex Hekimian	M-NCPPC-Montgomery County
Patricia Nicoson	Dulles Corridor Rail Association
Sharmila Samarasinghe	VDRPT
Harry Sanders	Action Committee for Transit
Jon Williams	TRB
Robert Puentes	Brookings Institution
William Haynes	City of Alexandria
Harriet Dietz	Arlington County
Danielle McCray	VDOT
Thalia Williams	FHWA
Kevin Thornton	Prince George's County DPWT

Al Francese
Tom Biesiadny
Glen Burton

Centreville Citizens for Rail
Fairfax County Department of Transportation
MNCPPC-Prince George's County

1. Public Comment

Michael Replogle, Environmental Defense, said that he had distributed copies of his organization's newly released document, "A Citizen Guide to Critiques of the Washington Area Travel Model." He said his organization has concerns that despite recent improvements in the TPB's travel models, it believes the review by the Transportation Research Board indicate that the models still fall short of good modeling practice.

Bob Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, said that instead of wasting more time studying remote hypothetical possibilities, the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study should test scenarios that reflect how most people are most likely to live and travel. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Harry Sanders, Action Committee for Transit, said the TPB should look at more than just air quality conformity in the annual process for updating the Constrained Long Range Plan. For example, he said, staff in the past has examined the accessibility to jobs measures, but only after the CLRP has been approved, and not during the approval process. He said he thought it was important for decision makers to know how the projects in a new CLRP help with accessibility to jobs by both auto and transit, for residents east of the regional divide, for low-income and minority areas. He said expanded analysis could help identify those bus and transit routes that provide significant transit accessibility. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

2. Approval of the Minutes of May 19, 2004

Mr. Gonzalez asked that the minutes be amended to show that he was present at the May 19 meeting.

Chairman Zimmerman asked that the minutes be changed to reflect Mr. Gonzalez' presence.

Chairman Zimmerman asked for unanimous consent to accept the minutes as amended. With no objection, the minutes were accepted with the one amendment.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Referring to the mailout report, Mr. Miller of the TPB staff gave the report because Mr. Rybeck,

the Technical Committee chair, was not present. Mr. Miller said the Technical Committee met on June 4 and reviewed two items that are on the TPB agenda:

- Briefing on the Transportation Research Board's review of the TPB's modeling procedures and staff comments on the review.
- A status report on the air quality conformity work for the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the new Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Information items discussed by the Technical Committee included:

- A report on the recent activities of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, and
- Evaluation of the Commuter Connections Transportation Emission Reduction Measures.

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Referring the handout report, Mr. Muchnick, CAC vice chair, said the June 10 meeting of the Citizen Advisory Committee focused on three main topics:

- *Land use planning activities.* The members viewed the COG video on smart growth and discussed its purpose and how it might be disseminated.
- *CAC outreach meetings in the fall.* The committee has decided to focus its outreach meetings this fall on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. At the CAC's July meeting, the committee will be briefed on the land use analysis for the study and in September, the committee hopes to review a draft presentation for the public meetings.
- *Posting and accessing public comments on the COG/TPB website.* CAC members and others have noted that the arrangement of the comments regarding the Intercounty Connector on the website was difficult to sort through and easily locate particular comments. After discussing various options, the committee asked staff to investigate the feasibility of allowing comments to be submitted via the website as formatted electronic file attachments, such as PDF or Word formats.

5. Report of the Program Committee

Mr. Kirby began by expressing his thanks to the CAC and Mr. Muchnick for their helpful suggestions regarding the numerous public comments.

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said the Program Committee approved four resolutions at its June 4 meeting.

Referring to the handout packet of letters, Mr. Kirby drew attention to four requests for Draft 18 of the TPB travel demand model, Version 2.1D.

Mr. Kirby also said the packet included a staff response to a request from Mr. Muchnick regarding the history of the I-66 HOV restrictions.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Zimmerman called attention to a brochure for the Railvolution Conference in September, which will be held in Los Angeles.

7. Approval of a Proposed Amendment to the TPB Bylaws to Change the Name of the Program Committee to "Steering Committee"

Chairman Zimmerman commented that the process to make this relatively small change was very lengthy and required a number of procedural steps.

A motion was made to approve the amendment to the TPB Bylaws to change the name of the Program Committee to "Steering Committee." The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

8. Briefing on the Transportation Research Board Review of TPB Modeling Procedures

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said that the Board had received a copy of the second letter report that was prepared by the Transportation Research Board (TRB) on May 10, 2004. The Board also received the TPB staff comments on the report, which were dated May 13, 2004. Mr. Kirby used a briefing paper, which was handed out, to describe the TRB review and the steps that are being taken to improve the travel modeling process at the TPB.

He described the origin of the study. He said the TPB contracted with TRB, effective January 1, 2003. The contract of \$130,000 over the calendar year 2003 was subsequently extended through May of 2004. The review committee sent its first letter report on September 8, 2003, to which the TPB staff responded in a letter dated September 8, 2003. The second and final report from the review committee was received on May 10, 2004, and TPB staff provided comments on this second letter report on May 13, 2004. Mr. Kirby described the structure of the review process, including membership on the committee.

Mr. Kirby said that in response to the first letter report, the TPB staff prepared a detailed proposed work program for models development for fiscal year 2004 through 2008. The TRB's second letter

report responded, in part, to this proposed work program. The first letter report included 11 observations. The TPB staff agreed with five of these observations. The remaining six observations were the subject of the TPB's proposed work program activities. Mr. Kirby listed these six key points: model validation; modeling truck and commercial vehicles; characterizing the bus system in future years; adjustment factors in the model; the process for feeding speeds back through the model; and the way traffic speed and volume are estimated for computing emissions.

Mr. Kirby said the TPB staff had asked that the review committee, in its second report, provide comments on a number of other questions, which he described. Mr. Kirby said that the next step for the TPB staff is to review and refine the work program in light of the second letter report. He said staff was determining which improvements should be implemented relatively quickly, and which would require more time to implement. He said that he does not think these changes will change the budget allocation significantly.

Mr. Kirby described some overall observations regarding the review process. He said it was a very productive and valuable undertaking. He noted that the use of the model that was reviewed, the Version 2.1C model, was approved by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency as part of the February 2004 approval of the 2003 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP), FY 2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the associated air quality conformity determination. He said a refined model, Version 2.1D, would be used for conformity analysis for the 2004 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Mr. Kirby said one of the conclusions of the review panel was that the state of the practice in travel demand modeling is not well documented throughout the United States, and is not well understood. As a result of the panel's first letter report, the U.S. Department of Transportation has started the process to fund the Transportation Research Board to conduct a national synthesis of travel demand modeling practice. This effort will probably take two years to complete. In the meantime, U.S. DOT is planning to support workshops on modeling issues that are particularly pressing.

Chairman Zimmerman asked for a clarification of the sequence of comments issued by the TRB panel and the responses provided by the TPB staff.

Mr. Kirby explained the sequence of activities and reports in the review process.

Chairman Zimmerman asked that a side-by-side comparison be developed that would summarize each point made by the TRB and how that point has been responded to. He suggested that a work session before the next TPB meeting might be appropriate.

Mr. Fellows asked if the TRB process was helpful in uncovering inconsistencies regarding Census journey to work data.

Mr. Kirby said one of the changes reflected in the 2.1D model was a definitional change to the way employment is characterized. He explained that previously some Maryland jurisdictions used a different definition for employment. He said that by making the definition consistent, staff was able to actually reduce some of the calibration adjustment factors.

Mr. Griffiths explained that a review of Census data revealed significant differences in the definitions of employment. He said the Baltimore area jurisdictions that are included in the TPB's modeled region previously used a different definition.

Ms. Porter said that models should be continuously improved to make sure they are as accurate as possible. She said she was concerned that improvements would be contingent upon funding availability. She said she would like to see some kind of mechanism in place that will ensure the models are continually improved.

Chairman Zimmerman asked if Ms. Porter thought it was good idea to have a work session on this topic before the Board meeting next month.

Ms. Porter said she thought this would be a good idea.

Commenting on the subject of resources, Mr. Kirby said that he had been hoping for months that the reauthorization of TEA-21 in Congress would provide a significant increase in planning funding that would that would permit more model upgrades and improved travel data collection. He said the reauthorization was still being debated. Regarding the issue of keeping up to date, he said the staff has long sought to keep track of modeling improvements around the country, but it was important that the U.S. DOT provide a synthesis of modeling practices.

9. Status Report on the 2004 Constrained Long-Range plan (CLRP) and FY 2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and on the Associated Air Quality Conformity Analysis

Referring to the handout memorandum, Mr. Kirby gave the Board a status report on this year's amendments to the Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He said that since the Board approved the inclusion of project submissions for the CLRP and TIP on April 21, staff has been working on the analysis for air quality conformity. He said that in particular, the Intercounty Connector (ICC) has required significant time. He described details of the analysis necessary for the ICC analysis, including coding the specifications for two potential alignments for the road, and modeling the road as a managed facility with variable tolls by time of day to be applied to maintain a 50 mph operating speed. He said this "managed facility" factor was the most challenging aspect of the analysis. He described other aspects of the analysis for the CLRP and TIP, including land activity forecasts,

transit fare increases, the recent travel model refinements and mobile emissions modeling.

Chairman Zimmerman expressed interest in the challenge of modeling a managed facility. He said he understood that rather than simply plugging in a fixed toll price, the price would become a variable dependable upon the flow of traffic.

Mr. Kirby said this was correct. He said the effects of the variable pricing would feed back into the model. For example, if the toll gets too high, travelers will go somewhere else, they may shift to buses or they may stay home. He said the modeling would become even more complicated for proposals like the Beltway in Virginia, which would have tolled and untolled lanes that would interact with each other. The ICC is actually a little simpler, he said, because all of its lanes would be tolled.

Mr. Fellows asked if each jurisdiction was using the same methodology for the land use forecasts. He also asked how the land use forecasts could change to reflect the proposed transportation facilities.

Mr. Kirby said staff has a continuing dialogue with the planning directors and provides them with information on the proposed transportation improvements. The planning directors from each jurisdiction work cooperatively at COG to develop the land use forecasts for the travel demand model. He said the planning directors have acknowledged that the ICC will affect their forecasts and are working on how to address these effects.

Mr. Salles congratulated the Maryland Department of Transportation and the State Highway Administration for hosting a successful public meeting on the ICC the previous evening.

10. Status Report on the Task Force on Value Pricing for Transportation in the Washington Region

Referring to the handout material, Mr. Kirby briefed the Board on the progress of the task force on value pricing. His presentation included information on the origin, structure and activities of the task force. He said the task force has agreed on a network of HOT/HOV lanes that will be tested in the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. He said the task force is working on a set of principles on value pricing that may be brought to the Board in the fall.

Mr. Kirby said that during the task force meeting held that morning, one issue emerged that the task force believed needed to be moved forward immediately: Under proposals for reauthorization of the federal transportation programs, there are concerns that if an existing HOV facility is turned into a high occupancy toll facility, the Federal Transit Administration may not continue to regard that facility as a fixed guideway facility, which might make it ineligible for formula funding for transit. He said the task force recommended that morning that a letter be sent immediately to the

regional congressional delegation and the conference committee that is working on the reauthorization, as well as the secretary of transportation and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), urging that variably priced lanes be recognized as fixed guideway miles so that federal transit funding would not decrease as a result of implementing variably priced lanes.

Chairman Zimmerman said that Ms. Petzold had brought this issue to the attention of the task force. He said that in a number of jurisdictions, the calculation of federal transit aid might be affected.

Vice Chairman Mendelson asked for further explanation of this issue.

Chairman Zimmerman explained that HOV lanes now count under federal law as transit facilities, and therefore transit funding is awarded on that basis. If lanes become high occupancy/toll lanes, it is not currently clear that under future legislation, they still would be eligible for that funding.

Mr. Kirby said that the concern of the Federal Transit Administration is that letting toll-paying vehicles into HOV lanes could degrade bus service.

Vice Chairman Mendelson asked if transit would be paying a toll on the lanes.

Mr. Kirby said that was a good question. He would expect not, but that could be a possibility.

Mr. White said that representatives from FTA were present who might be able to provide additional information. He said that one basis for the distribution of formula money is the amount of fixed guideway miles in a community in relationship to the national total. He said it is important that innovative approaches to managing traffic flow and demand do not disadvantage the region in terms of losing its share of formula funds.

Mr. Glenn said that in the case of an HOV facility built with transit funds, a key issue would be whether tolling would be considered an "incidental use" in the case of a conversion to use as a HOT lane. He said an option might be for FTA to require that some of the toll revenues be returned to the transit agency.

Chairman Zimmerman said he did not believe there were any facilities in the Washington region that were built with transit funding.

Mr. Glenn said he believed that was correct.

Ms. Petzold moved that the letter be sent as recommended by the task force.

Ms. Kaiser seconded the motion.

Ms. Pourciau asked if there are limitations on using existing lanes that were paid for with highway dollars for HOT lane purposes.

Mr. Kirby said that there are different provisions related to value pricing in the different reauthorization proposals. He said that one proposal on the House side would prohibit the use of tolls once a facility has been paid off.

Ms. Pourciau suggested that the letter include language that would allow tolls to be used on a broader set of facilities, including existing facilities.

Vice Chairman Mendelson said he thought this was a different issue.

Ms. Pourciau said this issue could be addressed separately or both issues could be grouped as a Department of Transportation issue rather than separate FTA and Federal Highway issues.

Chairman Zimmerman said the issues were somewhat related and he also noted that Ms. Pourciau had articulated these concerns on a number of previous occasions.

Ms. Pourciau said that a key concern is that if facilities are tolled in Maryland and Virginia, that would affect traffic movement in the District of Columbia. She said it is critical that existing interstate facilities in the District of Columbia be able to be priced in order to facilitate a network that achieves the goal the committee is trying to achieve.

Ms. Pourciau moved an amendment to the motion to include this concern in the proposed letter.

The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Mendelson.

Ms. Petzold said she had no objection to debate of Ms. Pourciau's amendment.

Hearing no objection, Chairman Zimmerman asked for unanimous consent to Ms. Pourciau's amendment.

Ms. Sorenson said that she was reluctant to support this amendment because the language of the letter had not yet been developed. She said the content of the letter itself, as proposed by Ms. Petzold, had been fully discussed at the task force meeting and she was therefore more comfortable with it.

Chairman Zimmerman said that even Ms. Petzold's proposed letter was not yet written. He said that normally he would prefer the Board to vote on an actual draft, but in this case that was not possible because this was an urgent matter.

In regard to Ms. Pourciau's proposal, Mr. Kirby suggested that staff investigate the positions taken

by interest groups, and align the TPB's position with those stated principles consistent with Ms. Pourciau's proposal.

Ms. Sorenson said she would like to see that language.

Chairman Zimmerman asked that the letter be distributed in draft form 24 hours before it is sent out.

Vice Chairman Mendelson said that if the issue is that transit should not be impeded, he would like that caveat added to this recommendation when the Board votes on it.

Ms. Pourciau suggested the problem might be solved if two letters were developed.

Chairman Zimmerman asked Vice Chairman Mendelson what he wanted to say.

Vice Chairman Mendelson said he had raised the question about tolls on transit vehicles and he still wanted to make sure that that was clear. But he said his main point was that he wanted it to be clear that the Board was not saying that lanes should be eligible for transit funding if transit is actually impeded.

Mr. Kirby suggested the phrase "variably priced lanes that provide for unimpeded transit service."

Chairman Zimmerman suggested that the language specify that the facilities in question would not degrade the quality of transit service.

Vice Chairman Mendelson said that was acceptable.

Ms. Kaiser said the discussion during the morning meeting dealt with holding transit funding harmless should existing HOV lanes be converted to variably priced lanes. She said the issue now being discussed went beyond the morning discussion.

Chairman Zimmerman said that he believed Vice Chairman Mendelson's point was consistent with the morning discussion. The point was essentially that if transit funding is to be held harmless, then transit service needs to be held harmless too.

Ms. Kaiser expressed concern that this point was not discussed that morning. She said they were really concerned this morning with making sure that the Federal Transit formula did not end up giving the region less funding if one of the HOV lanes should be converted to a variably priced lane.

Chairman Zimmerman said that Vice Chairman Mendelson's position would simply clarify that the region is not expecting to receive transit funding if transit service is degraded.

Ms. Hudgins asked Mr. Mendelson if his proposal was stressing the point that if HOV lanes are converted to HOT lanes in the future, then bus access should not be lost.

Vice Chairman Mendelson said that Chairman Zimmerman had best summed up his concern: if funding is held harmless, then service should be held harmless as well.

Ms. Sorenson said this point was not discussed at the task force meeting earlier in the day at which everyone had agreed to the letter.

Chairman Zimmerman agreed that it had not been discussed but that did not mean it was not a valid point that could be discussed by the full Board. He asked for a show of hands on Vice Chairman Mendelson's amendment.

In a show of hands, ten members voted for Vice Chairman Mendelson's amendment. Seven voted against.

Chairman Zimmerman said that both Ms. Pourciau's amendment and Vice Chairman Mendelson's amendment would be incorporated in the directions given to Mr. Kirby regarding the letter that would be drafted.

The motion to send a letter to the regional congressional delegation and the conference committee was approved unanimously.

Chairman Zimmerman said Mr. Kirby would send a draft to the Board by e-mail.

Ms. Pourciau said she wanted to emphasize that upon its formation, the task force had agreed to discuss parking pricing, and she hoped that issue could be taken up in the near future.

Chairman Zimmerman said Ms. Pourciau was correct; the task force had earlier agreed to look at pricing issues beyond HOT lanes.

11. Briefing on the Research Report: "Washington's Metro: Deficits by Design"

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Puentes of the Brookings Institution briefed the Board on the recent Brookings report on funding for Metro. He said the purpose of the report was to illuminate some of the key issues that go into the annual debates and deliberations about funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA). He emphasized a few things that set WMATA apart from other transit agencies in the county: its large size; the fact that it has almost no dedicated sources of revenue for either capital or operating costs; and its over-reliance on state and local subsidies to keep the system running. His comments focused on these last two

points. He said the report argues that the over-reliance on local and state subsidies presents some long-term challenges that could negatively affect the Metro system, including preventing systematic capital planning on the infrastructure side and hampering future borrowing. He described some of the revenue options that might be available for Metro funding.

Chairman Zimmerman said that Mr. Puentes' fundamental points, especially the dependence on passengers and general funding subsidies, were well made on the tables in the report.

Ms. Hudgins said that no matter often she hears this information it still makes a powerful impact. She said the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission recently decided that it would be helpful to look at the TPB research from a few years ago regarding funding sources. She suggested that it might be worthwhile to update that information on a regional basis.

Mr. Fellows suggested that WMATA may have done some of this research and might provide input.

Chairman Zimmerman noted that WMATA was dependent on an outside organization, the Brookings Institution, performing this research.

Mr. Salles said the conversation was helpful, but he pointed out that he understood that roughly 50 percent of the riders during peak periods are federal workers and many of these get Metrocheks. He said this benefit should be kept in mind when considering out-of-pocket expenses to riders. He asked if Metrochek is provided in other metropolitan areas.

Mr. Puentes said he understood that Metrochek can be employed by any agency, but it's used to the largest degree in the Washington region because of the large federal workforce.

Chairman Zimmerman said it is employed to a higher degree in some other places because there are some agencies here that specifically refuse to implement it, notably the Department of Labor. But there are not as many federal workers in other places.

Mr. Salles said it might be useful to have that information. He said the numbers, as presented, look quite burdensome to Metro's users, but the numbers might not be so bad when the Metrochek subsidy is considered.

Chairman Zimmerman said that on the private side there are transit benefits as well. He said that the tax benefits made available to transit riders are still not as high as the benefits for free parking.

Mr. Glenn asked how much revenue might be generated through a fee on rental cars. He said rental car taxes are used for transit in Raleigh-Durham.

Mr. Puentes said this was not examined, but it was a good suggestion.

Chairman Zimmerman said this option would depend on how much these taxes are already being used. He said rental cars are taxed fairly heavily and the funds are used for other things.

Ms. Kaiser said the recent governor's package on revenue increases in Maryland found that rental car agencies in the region are already pretty heavily taxed. An additional issue was opposition from the rental car companies and therefore, MDOT did not follow through on that option. She said that Maryland is the only state in the nation that funds fully the non-federal share of operating two major transit systems. She said the Hellman Commission recommended that a task force be established to deal with the issue of transit funding. The governor would be appointing this task force in the next four or five months. She said transit operating subsidies are growing at a rate that is higher than the rate of inflation. She said transit is taking a larger portion of the transportation trust fund every year.

Ms. Pourciau said a huge part of the District's general fund is dedicated to Metro's operating payment. Because of the way the formula is derived, the District pays the largest share of the overall funding for Metro. She said they have been in discussions to look at ways to relieve that burden. She thanked Mr. Puentes for the report.

Mr. White thanked Mr. Puentes. He said that Brookings undertook this report on its own initiative. He said it was particularly important to put WMATA's position into a national context.

Mr. Jennings asked if Mr. Puentes would be available to do the presentation in other contexts.

Mr. Puentes said he would welcome any opportunities. He said staff at Brookings has talked preliminarily about having a summit on this subject at Brookings, possibly in the fall. He said staff at Brookings need to further discuss whether and when to go forward with this.

Ms. Hudgins said it was important to look at funding issues regionally. She said it might be appropriate to come back to the Board and determine whether it would be an appropriate TPB action to provide for the kind of study and research that needs to be done, and in particular, looking at it on a regional basis.

12. Briefing on the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 8-Hour Ozone Rule and Non-Attainment Designations, and Potential Air Quality Conformity Implications for the Washington Region

Chairman Zimmerman left the meeting and Vice Chairman Mendelson assumed the role of chair for the meeting.

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Rohlf's gave the Board a brief presentation. She said that in April, EPA designated the Washington metropolitan area as a moderate non-attainment area for the 8-hour ozone standard. She said that on the previous day, EPA released its conformity rule for the 8-hour standard. She said the conformity guidance says that for non-attainment areas that have a 1-hour State Implementation Plan (SIP) and a 1-hour ozone mobile budget established, that such a non-attainment area may use that budget for doing transportation conformity for the 8-hour conformity until such time as a new SIP has been submitted with an 8-hour mobile emissions budget submitted to EPA. Although there are other options, it seems that this is probably the most workable. The rule also requires the 8-hour non-attainment areas, such as Washington, to do transportation conformity on the 8-hour standard before June 15, 2005. On June 15, 2005, the 1-hour ozone standard will be officially revoked.

Ms. Rohlf's said the conformity guidance also goes into discussion about what is required to establish a new 8-hour mobile emissions budget. She said it essentially lays out the path for establishing a budget before the attainment modeling is completed, which probably will take until 2007 to complete. She said that 2010 is this region's attainment date for the 8-hour standard. She said MWAQC is required to submit a SIP in 2007 for the 8-hour standard. Ms. Rohlf's said the guidance suggests that a "reasonable further progress SIP" or some kind of "rate of progress SIP" should be submitted in 2007.

Vice Chairman Mendelson said he understood that the mobile budget set for this year's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is based on the one-hour standard, and therefore for this year, as well as for the 2005 and 2006, the TIP will have to conform to the one-hour standard. He said he understood that the 8-hour SIP is due in 2007.

Ms. Rohlf's said that was correct.

Vice Chairman Mendelson said this all means that for the next three years, the region will have to worry about conformity to the mobile emissions budget that was established last year.

Ms. Rohlf's said there are other options, including a baseline year test and a build/no build test.

Vice Chairman Mendelson asked if the region was likely to be using an alternative to the one-hour budget.

Mr. Kirby said he thought the one-hour budget is an excellent way to proceed.

13. Other Business

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:12 p.m.

