



*Local governments working together for a better metropolitan region*

**MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA  
COMMUTER CONNECTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE**

District of Columbia  
Bowie  
College Park  
Frederick County  
Gaithersburg  
Greenbelt  
Montgomery County  
Prince George's County  
Rockville  
Takoma Park  
Alexandria  
Arlington County  
Fairfax  
Fairfax County  
Falls Church  
Loudoun County  
Manassas  
Manassas Park  
Prince William County

**Tuesday, July 20, 2004**

**Noon – 2 p.m.**

*(Note: New Meeting Time)*

Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments

777 North Capitol Street, N.E.

**First Floor, Training Center**

Chairperson: Robin Briscoe, Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland

Vice Chairperson: Sharon Affinito, Loudoun County

Staff Contact: Nicholas Ramfos 202/962-3313

**Note: If you cannot attend this meeting, please call 202/962-3327.**

	<u>ITEM #</u>		<u>ACTION</u>
1.	Introductions		
2.	Minutes of June 15, 2004 Meeting		APPROVE
3.	Vice Chair Nominating Committee	<b>(5 min)</b>	APPROVE
	Robin Briscoe will appoint the Nominating Committee that will Select the next Vice Chairperson for The Subcommittee.		
4.	TDM Evaluation Project Update	<b>(60 min)</b>	INFORMATION
	Staff and the consultant will give an update on the recent data collection activities and preliminary results for the 2004 State of the Commute survey. Draft copies of the 2004 State of the Commute Technical Report, 2004 GRH Applicant Survey report, and the 2004 Telecenter Utilization and Teleworker Travel Behavior Surveys are enclosed for review.		
5.	Update on Transportation Emission Reduction Measures (TERMs) for the 2004 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY2005-2010	<b>(20 min)</b>	INFORMATION

777 North Capitol Street, N.E. Suite 300 Washington, D.C. 20002-4290

Telephone (202) 962-3200 Fax (202) 962-3201 TDD (202) 962-3213 Internet <http://www.mwcog.org>

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Ron Kirby will brief the Subcommittee on the Review of the effectiveness of the current and Proposed TERMS, including those under the Commuter Connections program, for the 2004 CLRP and FY2005-2010 TIP.

6. 2004 Employer Recognition Awards Update (10 min) INFORMATION

Nicholas Ramfos will update the Subcommittee on the progress of the regional Employer Recognition Awards program for 2004.

7. FY2004 Employer Telework Workshop Evaluation (10 min) INFORMATION

Danette Campbell will brief the Subcommittee on the results of the FY04 Employer Telework Workshops conducted by the Commuter Connections Telework Resource Center. A draft report is enclosed for review by the Subcommittee.

8. TMA Advisory Group Update (10 min) INFORMATION

Mark Hersey will give an update on the TMA Advisory Group training seminar And meeting that occurred on June 15<sup>th</sup>.

9. Other Business/Set Agenda for Next Meeting (5 min)

This is an opportunity for Commuter Connections Subcommittee members to bring up other business and to request agenda items for the next meeting.

**NOTE: The next meeting of the Commuter Connections Subcommittee will be held on Tuesday, September 14, 2004 at 12 noon.**

<u>Upcoming Meetings</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Time</u>
<i>Employer Outreach Ad-Hoc Group</i>	<i>July 20</i>	<i>10 a.m.</i>
<i>Regional TDM Marketing Group</i>	<i>August 3<sup>d</sup></i>	<i>10 a.m.</i>
<i>Commuter Operations Subcommittee</i>	<i>Sept. 14<sup>h</sup></i>	<i>10 a.m.</i>

# METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS



## Commuter Connections Subcommittee

### MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, June 15, 2004

**CHAIR: Robin Briscoe, Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland**

**VICE CHAIR: Sharon Affinto, Loudoun County**

**STAFF CONTACT: Nicholas Ramfos (202) 962-3313**

#### **Item #1      Introductions**

Ms. Briscoe was unable to attend the meeting and Ms. Sharon Affinto began the meeting by introducing herself and affiliation and all who were in attendance did the same. Ms. Affinto asked that everyone in attendance sign the attendance sheet. (*See attached attendance sheet*).

#### **Item #2      Minutes of May 18, 2004 Meeting**

Ms. Affinto proceeded with the review of the previous meetings minutes asking those in attendance if they had reviewed the minutes dated April 20, 2004 and if there were changes or additions and there were none. The Subcommittee approved the minutes as written.

#### **Item #3      TDM Evaluation Project Update**

*Ms. Lori Diggins updated the Subcommittee recent data collection activities and preliminary results for the 2004 GRH Applicant survey and the Telecenter Occupancy and User survey, and data collection activities for the 2004 State of the Commute survey.*

Mr. Nicholas Ramfos began talking about the recent data collection activities with the various surveys currently being done The State of the Commute survey, the GRH survey and the Telecenter Occupancy Users surveys. He said Ms. Lori Diggins is working with the data collection contractor to get the information in place by the July so the technical reports of the surveys can be completed. He stated the GRH and Telecenter Occupancy User surveys should be done by June 30<sup>th</sup>. The State of the Commute survey draft should be complete as well. Mr. Ramfos remarked that some delays have been experienced, but most of the data should useable this upcoming year.

Ms. Diggins began updating the Subcommittee by detailing data collection activities for the GRH & Telecenter surveys and the 2004 State of the Commute Survey. The triennial GRH survey is being done for the second time since 2001. The 2001 GRH survey was the first comprehensive look at commuter's regional use of the GRH program and how it affected their travel mode decisions.

The GRH survey is a telephone survey. It was done this spring and sampled 1,030 of the 23,000 registrants in the database. The survey tracked registrants who entered the database during the period March 2001 through February 2004 which is the start of a new evaluation period for this years survey. The last evaluation period was March 1998-February 2001. The survey sample included current and past registrants, one time exceptions and anyone who entered the database within that three year period. Ms. Diggins said the past registrants were difficult to contact on the phone because of factors such as they had moved or were not working at the same job. The data was weighted for the total number of applicants

back up to the to the total survey population. She said the primary reason to collect this information is to track GRH satisfaction and use but also collect information for the TERM analysis.

Ms. Diggins detailed information about the registrants. The average age of a GRH registrant is 44, average household income is \$95,000, which is higher than the Commuter Connections population, and considerably higher than the regional income as a whole, and 57% of the respondents were female. The ethnicity breakdown was 21% African American, 71% White, 3% Hispanic and 3% Asian. She stated the ethnicity numbers are from the GRH database only and not exemplary of the region as a whole. She talked about the registration status of the participants during the time the survey was being conducted. 59% were current registrants, 39% past, and 2% one-time exceptions. She mentioned length of time registrants have been registered. Over 50% of the registrants entered the database between 2002 and 2004 for the first time. This includes both current and past registrants because some past registrants entered during that time period. She discussed the reasons commuters are not re-registering for the GRH program. 14% of past registrants did not know they had to re-register for the program each year. Those numbers were higher in 2001. The database also included many past registrants who thought they were current. Some of the reasons past registrants did not re-register to the program included; they never used it, were not ridesharing the required two days to be eligible, or never got around to it. Few said they did not re-register because they were dissatisfied with the program or that it was not useful to them. The majority of respondent said they did not re-register because they changed jobs or work hours and their eligibility for the program was affected based on their mode change. Some said their car or vanpool didn't work out or they needed their car for work.

She then discussed the Source of Information question which was not asked in 2001. This was important because it assisted in knowing how participants heard about the program. 25% of the respondents said "word of mouth," a colleague/co-worker, a friend or spouse told them about the program; 16% heard about it on the radio; 11% saw it on the Internet; 10 % received the information from their employer; 7% saw a bus/train sign; 6% saw a brochure; 5% received direct mail from COG; 4% saw it in a newsletter/newspaper and 3% saw it on TV. 70% of the respondents said the saw or heard a GRH ad. Of those respondents three quarters said they had not registered for GRH prior to hearing an ad. 84% said the ads encouraged them to seek information about GRH or to register for the program.

Questions about the participants travel modes were asked as well. The question "How participants are traveling today" is divided into current and past registrants. Ms. Diggins discussed the current registrants' primary modes, which is the commute mode they use at least 4 days a week. 4% of these participants are driving alone at least four days a week. These commuters are not eligible for the program, but they are currently registered. She said their travel patterns have changed since they registered for the program and they probably will not re-register. Ms. Diggins remarked that this is one occurrence that makes it difficult to identify whether a registrant is eligible for the program at any given time. 36% were either car or vanpooling. Transit is the biggest category. 35% use the train, 17% use the bus, and a small percent bike or walk.

39% of the past registrants primary mode is driving alone. Nearly two thirds of these respondents are still using an alternative mode, even though they are no longer registered for the program. 18% car or vanpool, 18% use the train, 12% use the bus. She then discussed the commute length of GRH registrants compared to the COG region. The chart she displayed compared how far GRH registrants travel compared to the population as a whole, GRH registrants travel twice as far as commuters in the COG region. 61% of the GRH commuters travel fifty minutes or more. For the Commuter Connections it's fifty minutes on the average and thirty-two minutes for the COG region.

Ms. Diggins then discussed the GRH research questions. The questions were; "Did GRH encourage shifts from SOV to alternative modes? Encourage more frequent use of alternative modes? Did GRH extend the duration of their alternative mode use? Did someone stay in their carpool longer than they might have otherwise because GRH was available? How important was GRH relative to other factors in

influencing decisions in travel.” She talked about Alternative Mode use before and during GRH and detailed those numbers.

Ms. Diggins displayed a “Pre-GRH” and “With-GRH” travel modes graph. These numbers included all of the respondents both past and current. Past registrant’s current travel modes were not looked at and they were not asked how they are traveling today, but how they were traveling while they were registered in the program. The current registrant’s current travel mode is “With-GRH.” The graph displayed showed that 24% of the respondents were traveling alone with out GRH and 5% with GRH. For transit, 40% were using alternative modes before they registered with GRH and 57% are now using alternative modes with GRH. Transit had the biggest mode increase, with the GRH program in place. These numbers were reviewed during the last Applicant Placement survey and there was a large increase in VRE and MARC riders; VRE in particular. In the recent years VRE has increased substantially in the Rideshare database. One reason may be there has been more advertising for VRE recently. Mr. Ramfos added that VRE does incorporated GRH as part of their overall advertising package. Ms. Diggins stated the last Applicant Placement survey numbers found that the majority of VRE riders joined the program because of GRH and not to get more ridership information.

The question, why GRH became important to alternative mode use was asked and three factors were looked at; “How important was GRH to the decision to start using, continue using, or increase the frequency of using an alternative mode” and those numbers were detailed. The numbers showed that GRH was a more important reason to commuters to start using an alternative mode than to the other groups.

*Q: Does this mean that more people are going to sign up for GRH?*

*A: No. It means they started using alternative modes. They previously were driving alone all the time before GRH. The question is, how likely would a participant have been to start using an alternative mode if GRH was not available.*

Ms. Diggins talked about the question; “Were there benefits more important than GRH that influenced their decision to join the program?” 34% of respondents received benefits other than GRH that influenced their decision to sign up. The primary reason was the transit pass, which accounted for 28% of the respondents. Cash incentive was 3%, and 1% assistance from their employer, CP/VP discount parking or other types of employer assistance. In total, the reasons that involved money, accounted for 32% of the respondents decision to join the program. Essentially respondents were saying that the most important thing besides GRH that influenced their decision was some type of monetary benefit. She discussed other factors that influenced their decision to rideshare. Didn’t want to drive, save money and time were at the top of the list. She talked about how long people have been using alternative modes that they are currently in. This takes in account current registrants who are now in an alternative mode. The length of time compares the 2004 GRH results with the regional results of commuters who have been in alternative transit modes for 2 years or more. That is 73% of GRH respondents compared to about half of the registrants in the region. This makes it difficult to say that GRH is the reason that people are staying in the program longer. She then discussed the “Use of GRH.” 22% of the respondents took a GRH trip at some point and the reasons were; illness of self 8%, 7% said an illness of a child, 4% unscheduled OT, 3% illness of a family member, 2% other personal emergency and 1% missed CP/VP. 93% percent of the users were satisfied with the service. A small numbers of registrants, about 7%, were not satisfied with the program and the main reason was they had to wait too long for the guaranteed trip to arrive.

Ms. Diggins concluded her GRH update saying, GRH does seems to be valuable, but is not the primary reason for a shift in SOV. 23% percent of the respondents shifted from a full time SOV and 22% of them responded that they would not have likely made that switch without GRH, so it does appear it made more of a difference in a commuter’s choice to start using an alternative mode. The other point is that 70% of the commuters attracted by GRH are already in an alternative mode.

*Q: Why are the people who have an average length commute not showing up in the GRH database?*

*A: They don't show up heavily in any rideshare database they don't have as much motivation to use an alternative.*

She further explained the typical rideshare applicant whether in a carpool/vanpool, on commuter rail or Metrorail travels farther than the average regional commuter that is more than likely driving alone. Longer distance travel attracts commuters into alternative modes. A Subcommittee member commented, so we see the same thing in the Rideshare database? Ms. Diggins answered absolutely. The average distance that a ridesharer travels according to the database is about 32 miles. Transit and bus riders travel slightly less, but MARC and VRE commuters travel longer distances. The average vanpool travel distance is about 40 miles. A Subcommittee member commented about zip codes and how they are involved in the gathering of the database information. Ms. Diggins answered we don't detail the level of zip codes.

Ms. Diggins then discussed the Telecenter data collection effort and the two focuses of this information gathering; occupancy tracking for the 16 Telecenters, and the Telecenter User survey. The Telecenter User survey has been done three times in the past. It looked at available seats, the number of those seats that are reserved and how many of them are actually occupied. 16 centers were surveyed and 13 responded. A written survey of the Telecenter users was done as well to collect information such as how participants travel the days they do not use the Telecenter, what transportation mode they used before they teleworked, travel distance to their regular workplace, and travel distance from home. 126 Telecenter commuters responded to this survey.

Ms. Diggins then discussed the Telecenter Occupancy results, the seats available, the seats reserved, and the seats used, then detailed those findings. In 2001 there were 6,952 seats available 51% of those seats were reserved. In 2002, 6,720 seats available, 53% reserved and 37% used, in 2004 6,340, 50% reserved and 37% used.

Ms. Diggins discussed the Telecenter User Travel survey done in 2001 and 2004. This survey detailed the use of and travel to the Telecenters. The average days per week participants used the Telecenters, the drive alone rates to the Telecenters, and the average VMT saved on Telecenter days. The results of the survey were consistent for both years. The average Telecenter work day was 1.6 for 2004 and 1.4 for 2001. The "Drive Alone" rate for 2004 was 94% and 93% for 2001. The VMT saved on Telecenter workdays for 2004 is 36 miles, meaning participants traveled 36 miles farther to their regular workplace than they traveled to a Telecenter. The VMT saved in 2001 was 34 miles. Ms. Diggins remarked that the primary benefit for using the Telecenter was not to get commuters to shift commute modes but to reduce VMT. She additionally stated that use of Telecenters may affect carpools, so the participant's travel modes to their regular worksite before use of Telecenters and with use of Telecenters was examined in the survey. Ms. Diggins detailed those results in her presentation which primarily stayed consistent for 2004.

Ms. Diggins concluded by discussing the upcoming activities; the State of the Commute survey analysis, the remaining FY04 evaluation schedule and the FY05 evaluation activities. She gave some details about the State of the Commute survey. This survey was done in 2001 and this is the second triennial survey. There have been substantial additions since it was done in 2001. The new survey is longer but very comprehensive. It asks many questions on ad awareness and the influence of ads. Specific questions about GRH and telecommuting advertising was asked to try to separate respondents understanding of mass marketing ads verses more targeted program ads. This is a telephone survey of 7,200 randomly selected workers in the 12 jurisdiction areas, 600 per jurisdiction. Mr. Ramfos mentioned the market research firm discovered they had surveyed Fairfax City not Fairfax County so they are returning to Fairfax County to complete the survey. Mr. Ramfos remarked that as of June 14<sup>th</sup> 470 of the 600 respondents for had been surveyed in Fairfax County. The purpose of State of the Commute survey is to track regional travel and the attitudes of commuters to various modes and ad awareness. The survey also

collects data for TERMS; the Telework Resource Center, Mass Marketing and the kiosk portion of Integrated Rideshare.

Ms. Diggins concluded her presentation by discussing talking about the remaining FY04 activities which include; preparing the GRH Applicant report, completing the State of the Commute survey, preparing the State of the Commute draft technical report and preparing the Telecenter Occupancy and User reports, all scheduled for completion this month. The Applicant Placement Rate survey is scheduled for completion in November 2004, and the 2004 Bike To Work Day survey by this fall.

Ms. Diggins explained that this is the second year end of a three year evaluation cycle, which was set up by Commuter Connections and has been in place for some time. COG set up the evaluation cycles for each of the TERMS that would be triennial, so every three years there will be a comprehensive TERM report completed. There will be another Telecenter Occupancy survey done in March of 2005, and the Mini-Household survey scheduled for this winter, which is a similar version to the State of the Commute survey. It surveys 2,200 respondents as opposed to the 7,200 that the State of the Commute surveys. There is a Metrochek/Smart benefits employer survey scheduled for this winter which will look at the Metrochek/SmartBenefits services employers offer to their employees.

The TRC Employer survey is also scheduled for completion this winter to find out what is being done with information and how the information received by employer from the TRC helped them start or increase Telecommuting. All the information in these surveys and the tracking data from the Commuter Connections database the ACT database, the Applicant database and the GRH call volumes will be combined. This will all be done in the winter and spring of 2005. A TERM analysis report that will show the results of each of the TERMS individually and all the TERMS collectively and is scheduled to be completed next year.

Mr. Ramfos mentioned that because 2005 is an attainment year for the conformity determination, the mini-household survey will be used to validate some of the responses from the State of the Commute survey. Additional data collection may be needed for the mass marketing program so it can be determined that all of the credit for mass marketing is collected as well as information for the Telecommuting program for the expanded telework TERM so the data can be validated for that project as well.

#### **ITEM #4      Clean Air Partners and Air Quality Action Days Update**

*Ms. Jenifer Desimone updated the Subcommittee on the Air Quality Action Days marketing program in the region in addition to information on the Clean Air Partners activities.*

Ms. Sharon Affinto updated the Subcommittee on Loudon County's Clean Air Partners activities and efforts to bring attention to bad air quality days. She talked about an idea that is now in place, to display a four light traffic light in the lobby of the county government that blinks the current forecasted air quality color code. At the end of the day the header is changed along with the along with the stoplight color to alert commuter to the next day air quality forecast.

She talked about the postcards on display in the lobby of the county building. The postcards have five suggestions/alternatives for commuter and residents in Loudon County to follow on forecasted code orange and code red days. 8,000 of the postcards were given to the school system to distribute to faculty and students at the end of the school year. They also placed newspaper ads to notify commuters about the "Free Transit Rides" on Code Red days.

Ms. Jenifer Desimone proceeded updating the Subcommittee on the Clean Air Partners recent activities. She played four radio ads. One ad focused on health issues on Code Red days. The message in this ad was to advise area residents to reduce outside activities. The ad that focused on emissions suggested to viewers to restrict the use of gas mowers on bad air quality days. It encouraged residents to use an

electric mower on those days. There was an ad that encouraged commuters to Telework on Code Red days and a message to commuters and residents to use mass transit on bad air quality days.

*Q: Can the temperature, in degrees, be printed on the handout?*

*A: There was not enough spacing to do that but the information is available in the online version.*

A Subcommittee member suggested that carpools and vanpools be mentioned in the transit ad. She said that the results from a recent survey about the effectiveness of offering free transit rides showed that van and carpoolers were not aware of the program. Ms. Desimone answered, the ads are only 30 seconds and are as detailed as they could be.

#### **Item #5 Regional Park and Ride Map Update**

*Staff updated the Subcommittee on recent regional Park and Ride map activities.*

Mr. Douglas Franklin began acknowledging Mr. Giovanni Balsamo's work with the map and describing the map. The map will be bilingual. He went over the way the map folded and displayed a sample for the Subcommittee to view. He talked about the wide area the map covered from West Virginia to Baltimore. The map was last printed in 1996. Because information in the map changes rapidly, and because of the introduction of the Internet since the map was last printed, a clause was added to the map to direct readers to the Internet for updates. Transit phone numbers were also added to the map.

He reviewed other details of the map that make it user friendly for commuters in the area who don't speak English. A color code system was implemented into the map so commuters can also use the color code system to locate information in the map. For example, transit locations are identified by the color red, the vanpool/carpool locations are blue and green for Park & Ride lots. In addition icons were added that designate the type of service being offered. The icons were added to aid commuters who speak languages other than English and Spanish. The Access For All Committee at COG, who works with non-English speaking commuters and persons with disabilities helped coordinate this portion of the map and also will provide distribution information for the areas they serve, so those individuals can be better informed about transit in the area.

*Q: How long is the map supply expected to last and when will the maps be reprinted?*

*A: 10,000 maps will be printed to start. There are no current plans to reprint.*

*Q: What is the time frame for the maps to be available?*

*A: Within the month.*

Mr. Ramfos commented that VDOT does a Park and Ride Lot inventory analysis. The Commuter Connections web site has information available on Park and Ride Lots as well. If additional information is available or the information changes COG will display it on the Commuter Connections web site.

#### **Item #6 2004 Employer Recognition Awards Program**

*Mr. Douglas Franklin updated the Subcommittee on the regional Employer Recognition Awards program for 2004.*

Mr. Franklin discussed the upcoming Employer Recognition Awards event scheduled for next week. He said final plans and logistical details were currently being worked out and the program booklets being printed should arrive this week. The video was reviewed and it is currently being edited. Signage, trophies, give away items all have been delivered. A photographer has been booked and the invitations were mailed.



Mr. Franklin concluded talking about the ribbons that are being added to the nametags of attendees who companies meet the Best Workplaces standard. Employers will also be recognized by their ribbons as either platinum or gold employers under Commuter Connections. The speaker remarks are being edited and finalized and a media advisory will be going out early next week. An ad will also be run in the Washington Times and Washington Business Journal that will announce the Commuter Connections award winners.

**Item #7 Update on SmarTrip Farebox Rollout**

*Mr. Dick Siskind with WMATA will update the Subcommittee of the SmarTrip fareboxes on Metrobuses. Mr. Nicholas Ramfos updated the Subcommittee due to the fact that Mr. Siskind was unable to attend the Subcommittee meeting.*

Mr. Ramfos began by passing a SmarTrip farecard handout to Subcommittee members and spoke on behalf of Mr. Dick Siskind of Metro regarding the current SmarTrip Fare Box project that is in progress. Mr. Ramfos pointed out that Smart-trip cards will be required for Metro parking lots starting June 28<sup>th</sup> and will be the only form of payment accepted at the lots. Mr. Ramfos noted that the SmarTrip fareboxes are being added to the rest of the metro fleet. Currently the SmarTrip fareboxes has being to 730 buses, by August 2004 it is expected that the remaining 1500 buses in the Metrobus fleet. This information is updated on Metro's web site by Mr. Siskind. Mr. Ramfos instructed committee members with questions to contact Mr. Siskind directly at (202) 962-2792.

**Item #8 TEA-3 Reauthorization Update**

*Mr. Jason Pavluchuk with Government Relations, Inc. briefed the Subcommittee on recent activities with the Transportation Reauthorization bill. In particular, he focused on TDM initiatives related to Reauthorization.*

Mr. Jason Pavluchuk spoke about the TEA 21 Reauthorization. The TEA 21 Reauthorization is the legislation that sets forth federal policy on transportation.

Mr. Pavluchuk began his presentation by detailing the steps to securing TEA legislation. This is the same format of a bill that has been handed down by the president to the House and the Senate and how it becomes a law.

Mr. Pavluchuk then detailed the scheduled timeline for the TEA-21 Reauthorization starting with the summer of 2002 committee hearings the winter of 2003 the President's proposal submitted, spring committee hearing and then signature of the Bill by the president.

He discussed the actual schedules of the TEA 21 Reauthorization. The hearing by the House and Senate were held on schedule, however the president did not introduce his proposal SAFETEA until May 2003. The President signed a five month extension of the current TEA-21 law September 30<sup>th</sup> 2003 with an additional two month extension signed in March of this year. The Senate and House took action this spring to create their version of the Bill, however the funding was an issue. Both the House and Senate passed their individual versions of the Bill, but the President planned to veto the Bill if it exceeded the budget amount by the White House. We are currently in the midst of another extension which will expire June 30<sup>th</sup> 2004.

Mr. Pavluchuk then described the funding levels of the House and the Senate. TEA-21 was 219 billion dollars over six years. The President's Bill was written for 256 billion dollars over 6 years which is about a 20% increase over TEA-21. Mr. Pavluchuk remarked that increased amount is good for a federal program. The needs analysis, according to the federal government to keep the system the way it is now, would require \$418 billion over the next six years; meaning the House and Senate passed versions were three quarters of the way there to keep the system running as it is today. The Senate version of the Bill was passed at \$318 billion, the House was passed at \$275 billion.

He then spoke about the breakdown of transit funding shares in the House and Senate Bills. There is a five billion dollar difference between the House and Senate Bills. The big difference is in the highway programs and then more importantly the core highway programs. Congress is currently in conference committee to work out the details of both Bills. Mr. Pavluchuk then noted some upcoming important dates including June 30<sup>th</sup>, when the current law which has a tight deadline to be approved probably will need a 4<sup>th</sup> extension to either mid July or October when the fiscal year ends. Congress leaves for their convention and summer breaks July 23<sup>rd</sup>, and Congress should pass their version when they break for the summer, unless they are sure they are not close to an agreement with the White House and the need more time to work out details. Mr. Pavluchuck stated the Bill has less chance to pass without a definite number of how much the Bill will be.

He noted points on the five basic Reauthorization principals and support of the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality program (CMAQ), created through the federal government to assist local governments to improve air quality by reducing the number of vehicles on the road.

The five basic principals are:

1. Build upon foundations of flexibility and partnership established under TEA-21.
2. Recognize the important balance between the way we build transportation and the way we use transportation.
3. Increase support for partnerships that engage the private sector.
4. Enhance travel choices and provide incentives for smart choices.
5. Reward communities for investing in smart choices.

Mr. Pavluchuk then stated some of the positive factors of support for both Bills; SAFETEA and TEA-LU. SAFETEA supports a 60% CMAQ increase, and takes into account new non-attainment areas were added. There are no new major project additions. TEA-LU supports a 15% CMAQ increase.

Mr. Pavluchuk then mentioned the Motor Vehicle Congestion Relief program totals (% of core federal-highway programs needed to be spent on program).

- Virginia 5.65%
- Maryland 6.89%
- DC 10.0%
- Delaware 5.93%
- West Virginia 0%

Mr. Pavluchuk concluded his presentation discussing program investment incentives and innovation. SAFETEA will provide for Safe Routes to Schools, tolling of HOV lanes/FAST Corridor and research programs. TEA-LU will provide for Safe Routes to schools, tolling of HOV/FASTlanes, and a Non-Motorized congestion relief program.

**Item #9 Other Business/Set Agenda for Next Meeting**

*This is an opportunity for Commuter Connections Subcommittee members to bring up other business and to request agenda items for the next meeting.*

There were no other business or agenda items requested. The meeting adjourned at 12:15 PM.

*The next meeting of the Commuter Connections Subcommittee will be held on Tuesday, July 20, 2004.*