

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 21, 2006

Members and Alternates Present

Hilda M. Barg, Prince William County
Rick Canizales, Prince William County
Wally Covington, Prince William County
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Andrew M. Fellows, City of College Park
Kellie Gaver, MDOT
Charles Graves, III, DC Office of Planning
Jason Groth, Charles County
Susan Hinton, National Park Service
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Sakina Khan, DC Office of Planning
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council
Deborah Lipman, WMATA
Sam Minnitte, MDOT
David Moss, Montgomery County
Carol Petzold, Maryland House of Delegates
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park
Rick Rybeck, DDOT
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Mick Staton, Loudoun County
Patricia S. Ticer, Virginia Senate
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Gerald Miller	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP

Jim Hogan	COG/DTP
Nick Ramfos	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Deborah Etheridge	COG/DTP
Michael Farrell	COG/DTP
Darren Smith	COG/DTP
Michael Eichler	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Paul DesJardin	COG/HSPPS
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Randy Carroll	MDE
Deborah Burns	FTA
Tamara Ashby	Arlington County
Ian Bean	MDOT
Sharmila Samarasinghe	Dept. of Rail & Public Transportation – VA
Megan Furtcher	Transurban
Patrick Fleming	MDOT
Tomika Hughey	WMATA
Bill Orleans	PGACT
Harold Foster	MNCPPC/Prince George’s
C. Hudson Pinkney	P.G. DPW&T
Douglas Ham	PB Farradyne
Takumi Yamamoto	Ministry of Transport of Japan
Allen Greenberg	DC Citizen
Stewart Schwartz	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Catondra Noye	DDOT

1. Public Comment

Stewart Schwartz, Coalition for Smarter Growth, said he wanted to register his group’s objections to the inclusion of the Charles County Connector in the CLRP. He said that the proposal would be a new alignment and would damage Mattawoman Creek. He said the 1996 environmental study for the project is no longer current. He said they believe that a viable alternative exists, which includes widening an existing road, and connecting the existing cross county connector, Route 228. He made a general comment that he would like the TPB to take a more pro-active stance in transportation decision making. He urged the TPB to use the current update cycle of the Constrained Long-Range Plan adopt a more sustainable, alternative scenario for regional growth, using the results of the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of May 17, 2006 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Referring to the mailout report, Mr. Canizales said the Technical Committee met on June 2. The committee reviewed several items on the TPB agenda:

- Related to Item 9, the committee reviewed recent transit-oriented development activities around the region.
- The committee reviewed the new requirements under the new federal transportation reauthorization act regarding air quality.
- Related to Item 12, the committee reviewed the draft bicycle and pedestrian plan, which is scheduled for adoption by the TPB in July.
- Related to Item 13, the committee reviewed the status and schedule for completing the analysis of the financial plan for the 2006 Constrained Long-Range Plan. This analysis includes information on the region's continuing transportation funding shortfall.

Other items discussed at the Technical Committee included the following:

- Staff provided an update on the submissions for the draft FY 2007 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- Staff briefed the committee on the details of the pilot program of using volunteer drivers and GPS technology to record the travel times and distances to enhance the arterial highway congestion monitoring report.
- Staff briefed the committee on the results of applying the vehicle identification number (VIN) decoder program for the July 1st, 2005 vehicle registration data.
- Staff briefed the committee on the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's proposal to the TPB for allocating and distributing annual formula funds from the Federal Transit Administration for the portion of the Washington urbanized area within Stafford County.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Tydings said the CAC met on June 15. The meeting primarily focused on the presentation by Mr. Kirby, called Strengthening the Linkages between Transportation and Land Use Planning in the Washington Region, which was on the TPB agenda under Item 9. Mr. Kirby spoke about the possibility of using the TPB's Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study (RMAS) to provide the basis for implementing transportation land use linkages. Among other things, Mr. Kirby said the study might be used to identify specific transportation priorities. Mr. Tydings said the CAC members are very interested in taking the study to this next level. He noted that in January the committee had approved a recommendation that the TPB should develop a list or plan of unfunded priority projects that would use the RMAS as a starting point. He said the CAC would be pursuing this issue in the coming months.

Mr. Tydings said that TPB Vice Chair Michelle Pourciau had nominated Merle Van Horne to fill a vacancy on the CAC.

Chairman Knapp said it might be a good idea for Mr. Tydings to stay at the meeting for Item 9 when the Board would be discussing some of the issues raised by the CAC.

Mr. Staton asked why the mailout had not included the briefing information for Item 9. He said he would have liked to review it.

Mr. Kirby said it is a work in progress, and has been frequently updated. He said that the Board would not be asked to take any action at the meeting, but to comment on some alternatives.

Chairman Knapp said he appreciated the question, but emphasized that the presentation is simply intended to get the discussion started.

A motion was made to approve the nomination of Merle Van Horne as a CAC member for the District of Columbia. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

Chairman Knapp said that Item 9 was intended to engender a fair amount of discussion, but not to develop consensus at this time. He said that if there is consensus so far, it is a consensus that the TPB would like to take some action on the issue of transportation/land use linkages, but it is not yet clear what that action might be.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on June 2 and approved an amendment to the Transportation Improvement Program to reallocate some of the funding for the Commuter Connections program to align it with the approved budget.

Referring to the letters packet, Mr. Kirby noted several items:

- An email from Dana Kauffman, who is the co-chair of the ad hoc MetroAccess Advisory Committee, and Dennis Jaffe, the other co-chairman, expressing their appreciation for the work that Kathy Porter and Wendy Klancher have done in participating in the committees that were set up to review the Metro Access program.
- A letter from Dan Tangherlini, WMATA acting director, responding to a letter that the TPB sent earlier in the year about the designation of a person to coordinate pedestrian and bicycle activities at WMATA. Mr. Tangherlini wrote that WMATA intends to designate a person to serve in this capacity before the end of the calendar year.
- A letter from Debbie Lipman of WMATA expressing WMATA's support for a proposal regarding the administration of federal human service transportation funds. That proposal would be presented under Item 10.
- Another letter from Debbie Lipman of WMATA regarding the allocation of transit formula transit funds for a portion of Stafford County that is now connected to the Metropolitan Washington Urbanized Area. Mr. Kirby indicated that this issue would need to be brought before the TPB later this year. He noted that the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO), which includes Stafford County and other locations further south, is requesting that the TPB give consideration to allocating some of the money that is allocated on behalf of its population back to it for its use, as opposed to it be retained by WMATA as it is at present. He said that WMATA staff and others are currently working to address this request. Mr. Kirby noted that last year's Federal Certification Review report directed the TPB to resolve this issue. FAMPO had appealed to the federal agencies to get involved. The federal agencies had provided information on the federal requirements, but had responded that this was a local issue that should be worked out between the two MPOs.

Chairman Knapp asked if there were any specific deadlines associated with the Stafford County transit funding issue.

Mr. Kirby said that the federal certification review had indicated the issue should be resolved within six months from the date of the report, which was March.

Mr. Kirby said that the letter in the mailout packet from the government of Charles County refers to a roadway project that has been under development for several years. He said that because the county is a new member of the TPB and part of the air quality non-attainment area, the project needs to be included in the region's air quality conformity analysis in order for it to move forward.

Mr. Kirby said that due to factors such as staff turnover and their only recent joining of the TPB, Charles County missed the April deadline for approval of projects for the conformity analysis. He

said the county is requesting an exception to the deadline so that the project can be included in this year's conformity analysis. He said that the action would not delay the conformity analysis, but that such exceptions are not routine.

Mr. Kirby said that if the TPB chooses to entertain the request, it would go out as a notice item today and have a month-long comment period. At its July meeting, the TPB would then decide whether or not to include the project in this year's conformity analysis. He then introduced Mr. Groth, the recently appointed alternate TPB member from Charles County.

Mr. Groth apologized for the necessity of the Board's attention to the matter, and explained that in the transition from representation at the TPB by the Tri-County Council of Southern Maryland to self-representation, Charles County missed the deadline for project submissions.

Mr. Groth, in response to comments made by Mr. Schwartz earlier in the meeting, noted that the road project is entirely locally funded, which led to confusion about whether the project needed to be included in the conformity analysis. He said that construction of part of the road has been underway for four years, and that environmental review of the project took place in 1996. He said that full National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review was not required at that time, but that when Charles County recently applied to the Army Corps of Engineers for a Section 404 permit for the latter phases of the project, the Corps encouraged a more detailed update to the environmental assessment and raised the issue of inclusion in the regional air quality conformity analysis. He said that revision of the environmental assessment is now nearly complete.

Mr. Groth also said that there has been extensive public participation during the permitting process and the planning process in the 1990s. He said that the design and alignment of the project have not changed since those previous planning discussions.

Chairman Knapp asked Mr. Kirby what action was required today by the TPB.

Mr. Kirby responded that unless the TPB decided today not to entertain the request by Charles County, the item would go out as a notice item and the Board would consider its inclusion in the conformity analysis at its July meeting. He said that now would be a good time for TPB members to raise any issues about the project, but that there will be an additional opportunity for discussion at the July TPB meeting.

Mr. Fellows asked for clarification on the timing of inclusion of the project in the conformity analysis and the Financially Constrained Long-Range Plan.

Mr. Kirby said that an exception would be made to include the project in this year's analysis.

Chairman Knapp said that such exceptions are highly unusual, but may be appropriate in this case because of the unfamiliarity of Charles County with the TPB processes.

Mr. Fellows asked if there would be any additional cost imposed by adding the project to the conformity analysis.

Mr. Kirby said that TPB staff have reviewed the requirements for re-coding the network to include the project. He said that there is virtually no additional cost and there should be no time delay because it is a relatively simple project to code.

Ms. Smyth noted that Mr. Schwartz had mentioned the possibility of alternative routes. She asked if alternatives were considered during the public participation process to which Mr. Groth referred.

Mr. Groth said that around 20 alternatives were evaluated through the initial environmental assessment, including simply expanding the existing road. He said that for this phase of the project, however, there were safety issues with the existing road and the choice was made to go with a new alignment. He also mentioned that the project includes a ten-foot-wide trail for bicycle and pedestrian connectivity.

Ms. Smyth asked if information on the alternatives analysis could be provided to Mr. Schwartz.

Mr. Groth said that he could do so.

Mr. Fellows asked if information about the discussion of alternatives would come before the TPB.

Mr. Kirby said that more documentation on project alternatives could be requested from Charles County for inclusion in the mailout packet for the July TPB meeting.

Chairman Knapp said that he also would like to see further documentation on the project timeline and scope.

Mr. Rybeck asked that information about impacts of the new road on open space and development patterns be included.

Chairman Knapp thanked the TPB members for their questions. He also thanked Ms. Klancher and Ms. Porter for their activities with the MetroAccess Ad Hoc Advisory Committee. He said that the efforts of the committee achieved significant results.

6. Chairman's Remarks

The chairman had no remarks under this item.

7. Approval of the Amendment to the FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which is Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirement, to Fund Rapid Bus Transit on Georgia and Pennsylvania Avenues, and to Reconstruct Portions of 18th Street NW in the Adams Morgan Neighborhood, as Requested by the District Department of

Transportation (DDOT)

Mr. Rybeck moved approval of the amendment. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Rybeck explained that this amendment would use Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding to deploy rapid bus transit along two corridors, Georgia Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue. The Georgia Avenue corridor will also include traffic signal preemption technology. He said that DDOT hopes that, by providing patrons with faster transit trip times, this service will encourage more people to use transit and less people to drive. He said that DDOT has asked TPB staff to use some of DDOT's leftover technical assistance funding to evaluate the emissions impact of the project. When that evaluation is done, the project will be submitted to the Federal Highway Administration for CMAQ funding.

Mr. Rybeck also briefly described the 18th Street/Adams Morgan project, which included safety improvements, particularly for pedestrians, and some minor channelization changes to improve traffic flow and reduce vehicular conflicts.

Chairman Knapp said that this project had been raised at the Steering Committee. He said he understood that DDOT would provide information to the TPB regarding how effective the rapid bus service will be. He said it would be useful for the rest of the region to learn from this experience.

Mr. Rybeck said that was correct. WMATA and DDOT will be conducting that evaluation.

Mr. Zimmerman said he was happy about any bus service improvements in the region. He asked how this rapid bus service will differ from Bus Rapid Transit (BRT).

Mr. Rybeck said that he understood that BRT is almost like rail transit with high-level platform boarding and off board payment. The rapid bus service project would not be that extensive.

Mr. Zimmerman said that BRT does not have to have high platform boarding, but that was beside the point. He asked if the service would have exclusive lanes.

Mr. Rybeck said it would not have exclusive lanes; it would be in mixed traffic. He said the project essentially would be limited-stop service. On the Georgia Avenue service there may be signal prioritization.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if this would take away from the existing service.

Mr. Rybeck said it would not.

Mr. Zimmerman said this basically meant that people going longer distances can opt for this rapid service.

Mr. Rybeck said that was correct.

Ms. Sorenson said she was confused as to why this was being characterized as “no additional capacity” when it would be adding service but not taking any away. She questioned why this would not need to be analyzed for conformity impacts.

Mr. Rybeck said it was essentially a tweak of existing service.

Mr. Kirby referred to the draft resolution, which contained a “whereas” clause referring to the conformity requirements. He noted that there is an exemption for local transit projects, such as changes in routes, schedules or fares, that are not regionally significant. He said this project appears to meet that requirement.

Mr. Zimmerman said he would not have thought that an addition of bus service would have required a conformity analysis, but in any case, he said that everyone should be confident that if this has any impact at all, it will be positive.

Ms. Sorenson explained that her question was procedural in nature.

The motion to amend the CLRP and TIP as requested by DDOT was approved unanimously.

8. Status Report on the Regional Transportation Coordination Program

Referring to the handout memorandum, Mr. Kirby said that as requested by the Board, staff will be providing updates on this effort every two months.

Mr. Kirby provided background on the Regional Transportation Coordination Program (RTCP, previously referred to as “CapCom”). He said the purpose of the RTCP is to facilitate coordination and information sharing among the region’s transportation agencies, as well as public information dissemination, during both everyday transportation incidents and regional emergencies. He said the TPB amended the region’s FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) on October 19, 2005, to include \$2 million over five years to initiate the program. He said the program is guided by a Steering Committee composed of DDOT, MDOT, VDOT, and WMATA. The Steering Committee has been meeting regularly throughout 2005 and 2006.

Mr. Kirby said that through support from DDOT, the Steering Committee worked with experts from the U.S. Department of Transportation’s research arm, the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center, to detail the steps for RTCP development. Volpe drafted a program management plan with timelines and cost estimates, a mission needs statement, and a Steering Committee charter. The management plan addressed technological issues, operating procedures and information sharing issues for the regional program. A critical component of the Volpe effort was the increased buy-in that was gained from the region’s key transportation operations management personnel on the RTCP

concept.

At its December 21, 2005 meeting, the TPB endorsed contracting for a program manager through COG/TPB, to work with Steering Committee operating agencies to move the regional coordination program forward. A Request for Qualifications (RFQ) seeking a “Program Implementation Manager and Technical Support Team” was issued by COG/TPB in March. A number of proposals were received. The Steering Committee and staff selected a winning team on May 22.

Mr. Kirby said that a consultant team led by PB Farradyne, Inc. has been chosen to provide the program implementation management and technical support team for the RTCP. The consultant team will also include additional technical support from Sabra, Wang, and Associates, and Street Smarts, Inc. The new program implementation manager for the RTCP will be Mr. Douglas B. Ham of PB Farradyne. Mr. Kirby said that Mr. Ham has extensive experience with emergency preparedness in the Washington region.

Mr. Kirby said the contract is being accomplished through federal SAFETEA-LU transportation funding with state matching funds. It does not use Department of Homeland Security (DHS) funds, and is not affected by the cuts in the DHS Urban Area Security Initiative program that were recently announced in the press.

Mr. Kirby introduced Mr. Ham to the TPB.

Mr. Ham thanked the TPB for selecting his firm for this important role. He acknowledged the considerable efforts that have gone into the decision to establish the RTCP, and he said the establishment of the RTCP will take continued close coordination with the key agencies. He described the team that has been contracted to establish the program. As program implementation manager, he said he will be responsible for ensuring there is momentum behind the development of the RTCP. He said he has a background in both public and private sectors, including work on Capitol Hill, and at the U.S. Department of Transportation, where he ran an agency. As a consultant, he said, he has worked for every member agency of the RTCP. He mentioned the two subcontractors that will be working on the project: Sabra, Wang, and Associates, and Street Smarts, Inc. He said this team has experience with the efforts of other regions, including TRANSCOM in New York and the TRAVINFO system in San Francisco. He said he looks forward to working with the TPB staff and the TPB’s member jurisdictions.

Mr. Snyder said that the Washington region experienced a number of breakdowns in communications and coordination following the attacks of September 11, 2001. He said New York had a much better experience, because it had an agency that was operational and accountable for assuring that coordination happened. He said that arising from that experience, the TPB determined to establish a similar operational and accountable coordinating entity that would work with the existing agencies. He emphasized that increased coordination and communication is important not just for major emergencies, but on a day-to-day basis as well. He said that some agencies had initially opposed the establishment of the RTCP. However, the TPB stuck to this issue, not allowing

it to slip away. As a result of that commitment, along with good work by TPB staff and funding provided through Congressman Jim Moran, he believed the right direction had been established.

Mr. Snyder noted, however, that the memorandum distributed to the Board was rather general. He asked for more specific information about what the contractor was going to do, when they would be doing it, and when the region would see, at the end of the day, an operational and accountable entity.

Mr. Kirby said this kind of specific information would be presented to the TPB in September. He noted that this effort, at least at this point, would not be setting up a separate agency, like TRANSCOM in New York.

Mr. Snyder noted that this program was not conceived as an additional command/communications center. But it was conceived so that accountable people could be identified and clearly responsible for ensuring the necessary coordination is accomplished.

Mr. Kirby agreed that this is the intention. He said that Mr. Ham will be that point person.

Chairman Knapp thanked Mr. Snyder for his perseverance and leadership, which has maintained the need for clarity of purpose and accountability. He also thanked his predecessor as TPB chair, Mr. Mendelson, for ensuring this issue moved forward. He said he looked forward to hearing from Mr. Ham in September.

9. Update on Transportation-Land Use Incentive Programs

Chairman Knapp said that he hoped to have time for substantial discussion on this item. He said he expected it to raise questions and that discussion would likely not be concluded today, though he hoped that all the issues surrounding it would be raised. He urged TPB members to think through the options and provide feedback in the next week, so that the item can be addressed more fully at the July TPB meeting.

Mr. Kirby, referring to a PowerPoint presentation that was distributed at the meeting, spoke about the context of linking transportation and land use in the region and discussed three options for TPB consideration. He described forecasted transportation trends, including a significant increase in congestion and limitations on transit capacity over the coming decades. He said that these problems are partially linked to regional land use challenges that have been highlighted in the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study (RMAS), including the jobs/housing imbalance and the east/west economic divide.

Mr. Kirby said that on a short-term basis the TPB has sought to address transportation problems with capacity increases and better management of existing capacity. He said that in the longer term, the TPB has been conducting the scenario study known as RMAS, which has dealt with a number of “what if” questions but has not focused on the “how to” questions of implementing shifts in land use

patterns and transportation investment. He described grant programs instituted by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in other areas that direct transportation funding toward projects that advance regional land use goals.

Mr. Kirby also spoke about the potential for using the scenario study to play a more active role in establishing a link between transportation and land use decision making, in particular to identify specific transportation improvements with high potential to facilitate land use shifts. He said it also might help build consensus around needs and serve as a source of information in discussions related to particular projects.

Mr. Kirby, upon concluding his presentation, said that he hoped TPB members would provide feedback on which options for implementation they would like to explore further, with Option 1 being a grant program to fund selected planning and capital projects, Option 2 a grant program to fund planning activities only, and Option 3 to involve identification by TPB staff of priority transportation needs for implementation of preferred scenario(s) from the RMAS work. He said that in the discussions he has had about the issue, no clear consensus has emerged on how the region should proceed, with some wanting aggressive action and others believing such action to be impractical in this region.

Mr. Zimmerman thanked Mr. Kirby and TPB staff for their work on the issue. He said that he views Option 1 to be the least timid option but that all three options are fairly timid in a region that demands aggressive action. He said that the examples given of other initiatives are from regions that do not necessarily share the same issues as the Washington region, and that there is even more reason to be taking aggressive action here than in the other regions cited. He said that any effort would be a good start, however.

Mr. Zimmerman said that it takes a long time to have an impact on land use and transportation trends and that the problems will only grow if something is not done soon. He said he looked for the TPB to be doing something even more substantial than the first option.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the agenda item was only an information item, and asked what the next steps were and when the TPB would be at a decision point.

Mr. Kirby responded that with some direction from the TPB today, he would come back at the July meeting with more detail about particular options of interest to the Board, including potentially a proposal based on one of the programs in another region, or a fourth option that TPB members would like to have laid out. He said that the intent is to make a decision at the September TPB meeting.

Mr. Zimmerman said he supports moving quickly, and if that means working off another program as a model then that would be acceptable to him.

Ms. Ticer asked if telecommuting had an effect on future regional scenarios.

Mr. Kirby said that there is not a scenario that deals with telecommuting in itself, but that estimates of future telecommuting were incorporated into all of the scenarios.

Ms. Ticer said that she does not support Option 3 because it does not represent enough of a change from the way decisions are currently made. She said she agrees with Mr. Zimmerman that the region is in a real crisis, and that although she is not certain where funding could be obtained, she supports Option 1 in some form.

Ms. Porter said she agrees that more needs to be done, but that she thinks administration of capital projects by the TPB is problematic. She said she would like to see something like Option 2 expanded to be more aggressive and provide more funds for planning activities. She said she agrees that Option 3 sounds like it would not mean enough of a change, but that the TPB should stick with planning activities, where its expertise and experience lie.

Ms. Barg asked if the presentation had been given to the TPB Technical Committee yet.

Mr. Kirby said that several briefings had been given using earlier versions of the presentation, but that the Technical Committee had not yet seen this latest evolution of the presentation. He said that he thought it was necessary to go ahead and present the board with a preliminary set of options at this juncture.

Ms. Barg said that given the limited funding available and the limited amount of funds sub-allocated to the Northern Virginia region, she is concerned about losing any of that money. She wondered how grants would be distributed evenly around the region, since the projects would go through an application process and would be weighed against each other. She said that for those reasons Option 3 doesn't seem that bad to her, because it does not threaten her interests. She said she is interested in knowing more, and that she may be more comfortable with other options after more exploration of how money would be divided.

Mr. Kirby said that some source of funding would have to be identified if a grant program were to move forward. He noted that Option 2 would require less money but that given funding limitations it will be a big issue to find almost any amount of money for a new initiative.

Mr. Graves said that because he was formerly the planning director in Atlanta, he could speak to the benefits of the program in that region, especially how competitive the selection process was to receive grant funding. He said that although the severity of congestion in Atlanta is similar to that in the Washington region, there are some differences between the regions. He said the presence of three different state-level jurisdictions in the Washington region is a big difference and presents the challenge to think boldly and creatively about making an impact with limited funds.

Mr. Staton asked about other scenarios in the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study that were not emphasized in the presentation, particular the scenario to bring more job growth to outer

jurisdictions.

Mr. Kirby said that the results of all the scenarios could be presented again to the TPB, but that the two highlighted in the presentation were the ones with the greatest regional impact and were most illustrative of the concept. He said that the scenario study will hopefully be coming up with a composite scenario that would draw key elements from each of the individual scenarios.

Mr. Staton said that he inferred that the scenarios call for mixed-use, transit-oriented development, and asked Ms. Smyth about the square footage breakdown of various uses in the MetroWest project referred to in the presentation.

Ms. Smyth said that the development included approximately 300,000 square feet of office space, 2,250 residential units, and a minimum of 100,000 square feet of retail space.

Mr. Staton asked if such a project would be considered a small or large mixed-use development.

Mr. Kirby said it is considered to be a large project, especially given the time and effort put into planning it, and that it does represent the idea of concentrating a mixture of uses near transit. He said that the scenario study shows that there are transportation benefits from that type of development.

Mr. Staton asked if any market studies had shown the viability of mixed-use projects as stand-alone developments in terms of the residential units generating enough market for the office and retail uses.

Mr. Kirby said he thought that such analysis was done in the design of MetroWest.

Mr. Staton asked if there had been demographic data or studies indicating that urban-style, high-density development is attractive to families with children.

Mr. Kirby said that while such development does not appeal to everyone, there seems to be evidence for a strong market for such development especially among young, single, and/or retired people, as well as strong interest from the development community if such development can be facilitated.

Mr. Staton said that in his experience in his jurisdiction, there is significant demand for suburban-style development, and large numbers of people have moved to Loudoun County in the last 30 years to escape the urban-style development that is being discussed as something to encourage and expand in the region.

Mr. Staton said that he was concerned about using STP and CMAQ funding that is already used by Loudoun County to fund congestion management activities, and how that would impact the situation of large numbers of people commuting from outer jurisdictions into jobs in the core. He said that he thinks it is a mistake to try to urbanize and centralize jobs, and instead that more job growth should

take place in outer jurisdictions where the most housing growth has occurred, resulting in shorter commutes.

Ms. Hudgins said she was glad this discussion was taking place, because she thinks it is an area that the TPB needs to focus on to plan solutions for the future. She said that she does not think the TPB can look at the MetroWest project as an ultimate answer to all the problems of the region. She said that the synergy of different land uses in proximity to each other is valuable, and especially so in areas such as Vienna where a concentration of mixed-use development can serve and be supported by surrounding single-family residential areas already in existence. She said that existing single-family residential areas close to transit-oriented developments in Fairfax County are not losing school-age population and therefore do not indicate that families with children are looking to escape the area because of the nearby concentration of development. She said that the relationship between the mixed-use centers and the surrounding neighborhoods is very important.

Ms. Hudgins said that interests in the region need to come together in the recognition that regardless of the development pattern desired in one place or another, jobs and housing cannot continue to be so far apart. She said that she hopes the TPB will focus on the planning option, because funding capital projects will be difficult with limited resources, but sharing best practices and addressing the larger regional issue of land use and transportation coordination could be very helpful.

Chairman Knapp said he thought the discussion had been good and that the TPB should revisit the issue in July. He said that the main question is moving from asking “what if?” to asking “how to?”. He said that he views the scenario study process as not about making a choice between putting all the jobs or all the housing in the core or outside the core but rather to look at how to get jobs and housing closer together and how to address the east-west divide. He said that there needs to be a starting point and that results of further scenario studies can be rolled in later on. He also said that the idea is to make progress on a selected number of projects that address local issues but could have impacts for the broader regional goals, though the limited amount of activity that could be facilitated will not completely solve the problem.

Chairman Knapp asked Mr. Kirby to look further at how Option 3 would be used to prioritize projects within the CLRP, especially given that the scenario study process has been underway for some time and has not had a great impact on the CLRP. He also asked if different sources of money might be available for grant programs and if the TRB could try to leverage access to those resources. He asked Mr. Kirby to look in to how the different alternatives would be applied to the Washington region logistically, especially Options 1 and 2 dealing with creating a grant program.

Mr. Kirby said that Options 1 and 2 could be fleshed out in more detail for the July TPB meeting.

Chairman Knapp encouraged TPB members to e-mail any further comments to himself and Mr. Kirby so that they could be encapsulated in advance of the July meeting. He thanked Mr. Kirby and TPB staff for their efforts on the issue.

10. Proposed Role of the TPB in Human Service Transportation Coordination

Referring to the handout presentation, Ms. Klancher briefly described three human service transportation programs that were provided by the 2005 federal transportation reauthorization legislation (SAFETEA-LU): 1) the Elderly Individuals and Persons with Disabilities program (5310); 2) the Job Access Reverse Commute program (5316); and 3) the New Freedom Program (5317), which is intended to provide transportation that goes above and beyond the Americans with Disabilities Act. She described the funding levels that SAFETEA-LU provided for these programs, and what those funds can be used for. She said that SAFETEA-LU requires a coordinated plan that will pull these programs together, set out the priorities for where the monies will be spent, and bring in other federal funding, including Medicaid, and Department of Labor funding. The plan must be developed with stakeholders, projects for JARC and New Freedom must be competitively selected, and the designated recipient for the JARC and the New Freedom programs must conduct the competitive process.

Ms. Klancher described a proposal which was developed with stakeholders over the last few months, including the state DOTs, WMATA, public and private transportation providers, human service agencies, and members of the Access for All (AFA) Advisory Committee. The first element in the proposal is that the TPB would develop the coordinated plan through a new task force that would include a wide range of stakeholders. She said that recent TPB work would inform the development of the coordinated plan, including the regional JARC plan and work of the AFA.

Ms. Klancher said that it is proposed that the TPB be the designated recipient for JARC and New Freedom funding. The TPB would oversee the competitive process for JARC and New Freedom. She said that Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance clarifies that because the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) is an operator of transit services and could be interested in using these program funds to augment its services, WMATA should not be the designated recipient because that designation might put WMATA in a conflict of interest position. Ms. Klancher called attention to a letter of support from Debbie Lipman of WMATA for the proposed designation of the TPB for this role. In being a designated recipient, the TPB would have to oversee a competitive selection process. The Coordinated Plan would influence that process because it would set up a framework for the selection criteria. Final project selection would be subject to the TPB's approval. If this proposal goes forward, the TPB staff would apply for up to ten percent of the JARC and New Freedom funds that are provided under SAFETEA-LU for the administrative costs of this program.

Ms. Klancher said the TPB was being asked to consider the proposal, which would be brought back to the TPB in July. The next steps then would be to set up a task force and begin discussion about the development of a coordinated plan.

Mr. Snyder said the real value of this proposal will not be in the individual projects that will be funded, but in the benefits of regional coordination, including shared "lessons learned," avoidance of

duplication and increased efficiencies.

Mr. Kirby said this was correct. He noted that the JARC program funds were previously earmarked. He said the reason this proposal has been made is that there needs to be a neutral agency to administer these funds.

Ms. Erickson said this proposal would represent a big change for the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA), which has an award-winning competitive selection process for its JARC program. She said that while MDOT supports the proposal that the TPB develop the coordinated plan, MDOT needs further time to consider the proposal that the TPB become the designated recipient for JARC and New Freedom funds.

Chairman Knapp asked what would be the impact of MDOT's request on the proposal that Ms. Klancher presented.

Ms. Klancher said it could slow down the process to get the designation.

Ms. Smyth noted that Ms. Klancher had indicated that TPB staff would be applying for the 10 percent of funds for administrative costs, but she asked for a breakdown of what the actual costs would be.

Ms. Klancher said that 10 percent of the funding would be equivalent to \$200,000. She said she did not have a breakout of the anticipated costs, although it was assumed that at least one additional staff member would be needed. She said that it was anticipated that the 10 percent in funding might not be enough ultimately and may need to be augmented with funding from the TPB's work program.

11. Update on Air Quality Planning Activities

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby called attention to a draft letter that TPB staff was proposing should be sent the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) saying that the TPB recognizes that state implementation plans (SIPs) are being developed to document the consultation procedures between transportation and air quality agencies. The letter states that the TPB would like the opportunity to review the draft consultation SIPs before they are submitted.

A motion was made to approve the letter. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

12. Report of Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby noted that this draft plan had been released for public comment and was scheduled for action in July.

13. Status Report on the Draft Financial Analysis for the 2006 Financial Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan

Mr. Kirby said this briefing could be deferred to a future meeting. He noted that staff was still waiting on final data from Virginia on cost and revenue projections.

14. Other Business

Ms. Porter said she wanted to report on what the WMATA Board of Directors decided regarding MetroAccess. She said the board basically divided the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee on Metro Access into two parts. The first part includes those recommendations that could be implemented without additional funding. Those were passed by the WMATA board as they were recommended by the task force. The second group included those items that had costs attached to them. The board decided to perform additional study of those recommendations. She commended the WMATA board for acting on the recommendations. She also thanked Wendy Klancher for her exceptional staff work in developing the recommendations, and she thanked Mr. Kirby for providing the necessary staffing resources to perform this work. She said it was very worthwhile for the TPB to be involved in this effort.

Chairman Knapp thanked Ms. Porter and Ms. Klancher and also expressed his appreciation to the WMATA board.

15. Adjournment

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.