

TDM Evaluation Group
Meeting Notes
May 9, 2006

1. Introductions
(Please see attached attendance sheet)

2. Evaluation Schedule and RFP

Nicholas Ramfos stated that the draft Evaluation schedule was discussed at the last meeting in April and was in the mailout packet. Mr. Ramfos pointed out that the TDM Evaluation schedule distributed at the last meeting would not include the Placement Rate Study in FY 2008 given the group's election to only conduct the Placement Rate survey once during the 3 year period. Mr. Ramfos also discussed the request from DDOT for a regional car-sharing evaluation to occur. The timing of it would be in FY 2008. Gus Robey stated that in order to move forward on this it would make sense to have others on the committee who are conducting car-sharing evaluations such as Arlington and Montgomery County.

The group asked to add the Vanpool Survey in for \$10,000 for FY 2008. Mr. Ramfos stated that a clean version of the schedule would be prepared and distributed to the group. The group asked whether or not the schedule could be distributed to the Commuter Connections Subcommittee.

3. Progress Reports

The group discussed the monthly progress reports. Mr. Ramfos stated that Table 6A and 6B were the tables that needed to be discussed given the percentage of self-reporting occurring with these tables. Christopher Arabia asked if we could add work sites to Table 2B. Mr. Ramfos asked that additional comments be submitted to him by June 2nd on any additional changes to the monthly progress reports. He also stated that beginning in FY 2007 the reports would be issued quarterly. This new format would need to be reviewed internally by MDOT to see how it would fit in to the invoicing since there is a requirement that progress reports be accompanied by invoices. Lyn Erickson stated she would look into the issue and contact staff regarding how to proceed.

4. Gas Price Survey

The group then discussed the possibility of conducting a regional gas price survey to see if there were any travel behavior changes. There was discussion on the

coverage area of the survey. Both Maryland and Virginia wanted to include areas outside of the MSA including Howard County, Northern Shenandoah, Rappahannock Rapidan, Northern Neck, Northern Shenandoah, and Fredericksburg.

Gus Robey stated that VDRPT is conducting some secondary research on gas prices. Bob Moore felt that it may be better to focus on empirical data that is already in existence (i.e. phone calls, park and ride lot use, transit use etc).

5. Commuter Connections TERM Goals

The group then discussed the TERM Analysis Goals. Daivamani Sivasailam explained the TERM Analysis results. Mr. Sivasailam recommended that we take the goals from 2005 and freeze the numbers at that rate and assume a growth rate consistent with jobs and population. The TERMS could still be tracked individually, but results could be presented as a total.

Valerie Pardo asked if we could get additional numbers in terms of number of added transit trips and carpools formed. Mr. Sivasailam stated that he would update the participation goals and other goals and would get a copy out to the group.

Valerie asked if additional program benefits could be explored by the consultant through the RFP.

Gus Robey stated that maintenance of the program is not acceptable because everything is still growing and we want to see consistent growth with all of the programs.