

TDM Evaluation Group
Meeting Notes
April 18, 2006

1. Introductions
(Please see attached attendance sheet)
2. FY 2006 Placement Rate Survey Update

Nicholas Ramfos stated that the draft FY 2006 Placement Rate survey report was presented to the Commuter Connections Subcommittee on March 14th. The report was released for comments which were due by April 4th. There were no comments or edits received. Staff is currently working with LDA Consulting to make any necessary revisions and the report will be presented for final approval at the May 16th Commuter Connections Subcommittee.

3. Evaluation Schedule

A set of materials was distributed on the Long Range Plan update. Mike Clifford with COG/TPB staff stated that there is a formal outreach process established for a call for projects. The schedule from the Scope of work was distributed. The Plan has to adhere to conformity requirements in order for the CLRP and TIP to be acted upon by the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB). Mr. Clifford also stated that a new 8 hour ozone condition has been implemented in the region and that the area is in violation of Particulate Matter 2.5 (PM 2.5). Emissions for the region have been able to meet EPA requirements; however a 1 hour budget is being used until the formal guidance is issued. For PM 2.5 there is an interim period until the ir Quality State Implementation Plan (SIP) is developed. The criterion is to demonstrate that the emission is at 2002 baseline conditions.

Next, Daivamani Sivasailam with COG/TPB discussed the TERM tracking sheet. Gus Robey asked what the time frame would be when new TERMS would be needed. Mr. Sivasailam stated the evaluation of the budgets and inventory would happen after 2007. Ms. Robey then asked how the rest of the TERMS were being analyzed and whether they are as rigorous as Commuter Connections. The group discussed the merits of how often evaluation should be conducted. Nicholas Ramfos also stated the cost of evaluation ranges between two to seven percent. Mr. Clifford also stated that some of the other TERMS' evaluation is a check-off box on whether the program was completed, however, with an operating program it's different because impacts need to be shown in terms of the initial assumptions.

Valerie Pardo asked what would happen if a TERM was discontinued and taken off the sheet. Mr. Clifford stated that the recent Federal Certification of the

regional plan from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) made a recommendation that the region continue implementing TERMS as have regional bodies such as MWAQC. Mr. Ramfos also stated that TERMS may be needed down the road due to the changing fleet mix, population changes, and new projects such as HOT Lanes. Mr. Ramfos distributed the results from the TERM Analysis report and discussed how the impacts shown in the document pertain to the Regional TERM Tracking sheet. The group then discussed the possibility of looking at projects in terms of corridor impacts and in terms of congestion management.

Mr. Clifford said that congestion mitigation and management is important in measuring the TERMS' effectiveness.

The group then discussed the TERM Evaluation schedule. There was a great deal of discussion on the Placement Rate survey and the frequency of it. The group elected to only conduct the Placement Rate Survey once every three years. The group then discussed the timing of the TERM Analysis report. Mr. Sivasailam stated that he would check on the reporting date and that it would more than likely be in the summer of 2009.

Mr. Ramfos also stated that the schedule will drive the Scope of Work for the upcoming TDM Evaluation project RFP.

4. Review of Progress Report Data Collection Activities

Mr. Ramfos distributed the February 2006 monthly progress reports. He reviewed the narrative sections and then the Operations performance statistics. There was discussion on Tables 6A and 6B. Mr. Ramfos distributed a table showing the percentage of local jurisdictions submitting information for Tables 6A and 6B going back to July 2004 and stated that the highest percentage of self-reporting from the jurisdictions was in September 2005 and the normal self-reporting percentage was at 50% or lower. The group agreed to review the reports and provide any feedback.

5. Employer Survey Review

Mr. Ramfos distributed a copy of the regional Employer Survey used at employment sites. The group discussed the merits of changing the survey questions. Mr. Ramfos stated that a work group would be formed through the Employer Outreach Ad-Hoc Group and would probably meet in May or June.

The next meeting of the TDM Evaluation Group will be held on Tuesday, May 9th at 1 p.m.