

**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  
October 20, 2010**

Members and Alternates Present

Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County  
Alex Block, DC Office of Planning  
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA  
Muriel Bowser, DC Council  
Colleen Clay, City of Takoma Park  
Kerry Donley, City of Alexandria  
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT  
Lyn Erickson, MDOT  
Jason Groth, Charles County  
Tom Harrington, WMATA  
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County  
Julia Koster, NCPC  
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick  
Glenn Orlin, Montgomery County Council  
Mark Rawlings, DDOT  
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
David Snyder, City of Falls Church  
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT  
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie  
Jonathan Way, Manassas City  
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County  
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force  
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park  
Blaine R. Young, Frederick County  
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

---

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby  
Gerald Miller  
Elena Constantine  
Robert Griffiths  
Nicholas Ramfos  
Andrew Meese  
John Swanson  
Andrew Austin  
Michael Farrell  
Wendy Klancher  
Jane Posey  
Debbie Leigh  
Deborah Etheridge  
Darren Smith  
Rex Hodgson  
Gareth James  
Paul DesJardin      COG/DCPS  
Lewis Miller        COG/OPA  
Randy Carroll       MDE  
Bill Orleans         HACK  
Maureen Budetti    TPB/CAC Chair  
Tom Biesiadny      Fairfax County DOT  
Art Smith            Arlington Citizen  
David Awbrey        VA DRPT  
Betsy Massie        PRTC  
Mike Hackett        MWAA  
Gregg Stevenson    Prince William DOT  
Danielle Wesolek    WMATA  
Rick Canizales      Prince William County DOT  
Alvin Turner        Parkeon, Inc.  
Dave Jamieson      TBD.com  
Famarz Mokhtari    M-NCPPC/Prince Georges County  
Adam Tuss            WTOP

**1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities**

Bill Orleans requested that the TPB address the issue of WMATA Board Governance. Specifically, he said that the WMATA Board should adhere to the requirements of the WMATA compact, including the requirement that it should conduct a public hearing when a major service change is proposed.

---

Carroll George presented an approach to relieve congestion at major merge points through the design of a non-stop merge reform. He said this merge reform will eliminate the stopping safety hazard as well as the motivation for selfish behavior or risky behaviors often exhibited while merging. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

## **2. Approval of Minutes of September 15 Meeting**

Mr. Turner made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 15, 2010, TPB meeting. Mr. Zimmerman seconded this motion, which passed unanimously.

## **3. Report of the Technical Committee**

Mr. Verzosa said the Technical Committee met on October 1 and reviewed seven items on the TPB agenda:

- Item 8: An update to the TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.
- Item 9: The Street Smart Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign.
- Item 10: The consultant briefed the committee on the draft Financial Analysis of the 2010 CLRP, including the implications for a transit ridership constraint.
- Item 11: The committee was briefed on the draft Air Quality Assessment for the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP, which was released for public comment on October 14.
- Item 12: The committee was briefed on key results from the Round 8.0 Cooperative Forecasts, which show a slightly slower rate of growth in jobs and households than previously forecast.
- Item 13: The committee was briefed on the draft 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP. Mr. Verzosa noted that based on the financial analysis of the CLRP, it was necessary to remove or delay a number of projects in the CLRP and TIP.
- Item 14: The committee was briefed on the call for projects for the 2011 CLRP and FY 2012-2017 TIP.

Mr. Verzosa said the committee was briefed on three additional items at its meeting: a proposed agenda for the October 20 meeting of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan Task Force; an update on the implementation of the TPB regional priority bus project; and revised ridership and cost information for local and regional bus transit service.

## **4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee**

Ms. Budetti said the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) met on October 14 and had a two-part meeting: a regular business meeting followed by a public forum on the financial outlook of the TPB's Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP).

Ms. Budetti said the portion of the meeting on regular CAC business included preparation for the

---

Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force, which met before the TPB meeting. She said she thought the idea of generating priorities is interwoven in all agency planning efforts at all levels of government. She said there seemed to be much willingness to consider a regional priorities plan and a tremendous amount of creative ideas on ways to achieve this. She said that at its meeting, the CAC also discussed the Board of Trade and COG work on the WMATA Governance Task Force. She said the CAC has been in contact with the Metro Riders Advisory Council and that the two groups are considering holding a joint meeting.

Ms. Budetti said the public forum focused on the financial forecasts for the CLRP. She said that the consultant on the financial analysis for the CLRP presented a comprehensive picture of limited revenues and growing costs. She said one member noted that the CLRP does not include projects that are not funded, which speaks for the need of a regional priorities plan that identifies key investments necessary to implement the region's vision.

## **5. Report of the Steering Committee**

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on October 1 and reviewed the agenda for the TPB meeting. The Committee approved one amendment to the FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to include the TIGER projects that were funded under the grant received from the original TIGER program. He reviewed several items in the letters packet: the agenda of the Climate, Energy, and Environment Policy Committee meeting on November 17; a letter from Vice Chair Muriel Bowser encouraging agencies to take advantage of the Job Access Reverse Commute solicitation that will be coming out shortly; a letter summarizing a grant proposal COG/TPB submitted to the Kaiser Permanente "Healthy Eating Active Living" (HEAL) grant program for \$500,000 to complete a first step of the bike-sharing program the TPB had initially submitted under the TIGER II application; an updated memorandum from the September TPB meeting from Eric Randall on local and regional bus transit in the region; and a memorandum from Supervisor Hudgins summarizing the comments of the Access for All Committee on the 2010 CLRP.

Ms. Hudgins highlighted the concerns that the Access for All (AFA) Committee had identified related to the needs of low-income communities, minority communities, and persons with disabilities, as reflected in the 2010 CLRP. She said the AFA expressed a desire that the new CLRP projects provide options and include more pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvements. She urged local jurisdictions to make use of the regional bus stop inventory and improve bus stops for people with disabilities. She said the AFA recommended that the departments of transportation be more cognizant of how construction projects can produce barriers to pedestrian facilities. She said many AFA members raised concerns about MetroAccess fares, noting that the fare increases and conditional eligibility procedures have a significant impact on users. She said the AFA received an update on the new process for MetroAccess conditional eligibility at its last meeting. She said the AFA recommends that WMATA implement eligibility changes judiciously while both tailoring customer assessments and ensuring fairness in the eligibility process. She said that the AFA requests that an independent study be conducted on the impact of MetroAccess

---

on customers and persons with disabilities.

Ms. Hudgins said that as a Metro Board Member, she thinks that the AFA works diligently on trying to highlight the issues of concern to persons with disabilities and at-risk populations. She said that she hopes that a study would not be needed, but rather that a strong partnership be developed between AFA members and Metro staff to work through current issues. She said that there is a movement within Metro's Customer Service Committee to allow Metro's Accessibility Advisory Committee to report directly to the Board of Metro, which would allow for a direct voice for MetroAccess issues. She said that she recommends that a member of AFA serve jointly as a member of the Accessibility Advisory Committee.

Mr. Way thanked staff for reissuing the local and regional bus transit memorandum and noted that the comparison of fare revenue to operating cost was particularly instructive.

Mr. Erenrich said it was unfortunate that the regional bike-sharing proposal was again not funded through a federal grant program. He said he thinks that the TPB could still advance bike-sharing in the region without federal funds, but noted several items missing from the overall concept. He said the TPB needs marketing materials for the program. He said this would enable jurisdictions to present the concept to developers as part of contributions that they make as part of the development approval process.

Mr. Kirby said staff would be happy to develop these materials.

Chairman Snyder asked if Supervisor Hudgins' comments would be included in the TPB's consideration of Metro issues.

Mr. Kirby said they would and that it would be beneficial for a joint meeting to occur between the AFA and Metro's committee. He echoed Ms. Hudgins points that it would be useful to further develop a partnership than to continually conduct studies. He noted that a joint meeting between the TPB's CAC and the WMATA Riders Advisory Council had occurred in the past, so the precedent has been established.

Chairman Snyder asked Ms. Hudgins if she thought this is a responsive approach.

Ms. Hudgins said it is a very good start.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that, as a member of the Arlington County Community Energy and Sustainability Task Force, he wanted to recommend the speaker, Peter Garforth, who will be presenting at the Climate, Energy, and Environment Policy Committee meeting on November 17 to which Mr. Kirby referred.

Chairman Snyder asked what criteria the federal reviewers used to reject the TPB's TIGER II application. He expressed frustration that the region did not receive TIGER II funding given the enormity of the transportation problems and the significance of the region as the nation's capital.

---

Mr. Kirby said he would ask for a debriefing, and noted that it may have something to do with the fact that the region received a grant under the first TIGER program. He said he would want to know how many people that received funding under TIGER II also had received funding under TIGER I. He noted that the Atlanta region did not receive any funding under TIGER I, but did receive a TIGER II grant. He added that these discretionary programs are open to the entire country and that there is not enough money to fund every worthwhile proposal. He said that USDOT is funding about ten percent of the applications it receives.

## **6. Chairman's Remarks**

Chairman Snyder thanked Vice Chairman Turner for his leadership of the new TPB Regional Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force, along with all the other members who volunteered to serve on the Task Force.

Chairman Snyder referred to the earlier public comment item and directed TPB staff to forward to WMATA Mr. Orleans' comments regarding the lack of public hearings on Metro service changes. He also asked representatives of the three state DOTs to review and respond to Mr. George's proposal regarding merge protocol.

Mr. Rawlings introduced Alex Block of the D.C. Office of Planning, a new attendee of the TPB meeting serving as an alternate to Ms. Tregoning.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **7. Approval of an Amendment to the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that is Not Exempt from Conformity for HOV Ramp Operational Changes on I-66 as Requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT).**

Mr. Kirby noted that notice of this item was given at the September 15 TPB meeting, and described it as an operational change on HOV ramps on I-66. He asked Mr. Srikanth of VDOT to present the item.

Mr. Srikanth, on behalf of VDOT and Fairfax County, requested consideration by the TPB of the amendment, which would open up exit ramps at Monument Drive and Stringfellow Road on westbound I-66 during off-peak periods. He said these ramps are currently being used only in the peak periods and only for HOV use. He said that the project was determined to affect the air quality conformity analysis, and as such TPB staff conducted an analysis of the project's impacts that was subsequently released for public comment in September. He noted that no comments were received. He said that the analysis indicated a slight reduction in vehicle miles traveled and in the emissions of pollutants. He said that the project will be funded through VDOT's

---

operational budget, and that environmental impact assessment will be completed by December 2010. He noted that completion of air quality conformity analysis and inclusion of the project in the CLRP is one of the requirements of NEPA documentation for the project.

Mr. Srikanth moved approval of Resolution R3-2011 to amend the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP to include the HOV ramp operational changes on I-66. Ms. Smyth seconded the motion.

Vice Chairman Turner asked for confirmation that VDOT would be reimbursing the TPB for the additional air quality conformity analysis required by the amendment.

Mr. Srikanth said that the TPB would be reimbursed through the technical assistance account that VDOT has with the TPB.

The motion passed unanimously.

## **8. Approval of the 2010 Update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region**

Mr. Kirby introduced Jim Sebastian, bicycle planner for DDOT and current Chairman of the TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee. He noted that Mr. Sebastian is a former member of TPB staff, and has been a leader in expansion of bike facilities and bike sharing in D.C.

Mr. Sebastian said that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan could be considered a model for regional planning and praised the work of Michael Farrell of TPB Staff for his work on the plan. Referring to a PowerPoint presentation that was distributed at the meeting, he described the plan as including a list of funded and unfunded projects, a collection of best practices from the region along with the rest of the country and around the world, and demographic data about bicycling and walking in the region. He called the project list a snapshot of where the region is as of July 1, 2010, and said that it was compiled with extensive input from local and state staff. He said that criteria for inclusion of projects in the plan included regional connectivity, access to transit, and improvement of safety.

Mr. Sebastian said that the Plan lists 409 individual projects – 73 completed since the first Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan was approved by the TPB in 2006 and 336 projects planned for the future, at an additional cost of \$1 billion. He said these planned projects would triple facility mileage (including bike lanes and shared-use paths) by 2040 in comparison with 2006, and that the result of fully implementing the Plan would be a regional network of 541 miles of bicycle lanes and 1,173 miles of shared-use paths in 2040. He cited examples of projects that were included in the 2006 Plan and have since been built, including the Woodrow Wilson Bridge Trail connecting Alexandria with Oxon Hill, and the contraflow, separated bike lane on 15<sup>th</sup> Street in D.C. He also noted the launch of the Capital Bikeshare Program on September 20, 2010 and said that the program already has more than 3,000 members.

---

Mr. Sebastian also noted the strong connection between the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and the TPB Vision as well as the COG Region Forward Report, which calls for more rapid implementation of the projects in the TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. He said that although there has been substantial progress since 2006 in expanding the network of facilities, the region will have to move faster to meet 2040 goals. He said that the full Plan document would continue to be updated every four years, but that there will also be annual updates of the project list to facilitate grant proposals and respond to media inquiries. He thanked the rest of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee for their work on the Plan.

Mr. Roberts asked what percentage of the new bike lanes would be on-street as opposed to separated lanes.

Mr. Sebastian clarified that in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan “lanes” refers to on-street facilities, while “paths” refers to off-street facilities.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that he is concerned about the perception that bike and pedestrian projects are just adornments of the regional transportation plan rather than strategic efforts with broad benefits. He said he hoped that analysis of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and the CLRP as a whole would address the question of how bicycle and pedestrian improvements can be strategically wise investments in cost-effectively improving travel conditions in the region. He gave the example of school trips during peak periods as trips that contribute significantly to congestion but which could be substantially converted to alternative modes given appropriate infrastructure. He said that it would be interesting to see how the cost of such projects would compare to the cost of expanding auto capacity to deal with peak period transportation demand.

Mr. Sebastian noted that it is much more cost-effective to get bicycle and pedestrian facilities incorporated into all appropriate projects as a matter of routine, and said that the TIP submission form now requires implementing agencies to indicate if a project includes bike and pedestrian projects. He said this has hopefully helped jurisdictions not to miss opportunities to invest in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure in efficient ways. He said that it would indeed be useful to have more data about cost-effectiveness of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in terms of congestion impacts.

Mr. Farrell said that there are demographic data in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan regarding mode share, and trips by purpose and time of day. He said that the question of returns on investment in bicycle and pedestrian facilities is dependent on factors at the local scale, and that the Plan data is focused on the macro, regional scale.

Mr. Sebastian pointed out that in addition to the progress made in expanding facilities, numbers for bicycling have gone up in most jurisdictions in the last ten years, likely in part as a result of the investments in facilities.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that while he understood the difficulty in measuring the effects of specific



---

facilities, an analysis could be based on a sampling of different environments in the region and extrapolated to the region as a whole to approximate the potential impact at a regional scale.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for clarification of the figures presented on the extent of bike lanes in the region. Upon clarification by Mr. Sebastian, Mr. Zimmerman noted that of the total of 91 miles of bike lanes in the region as of July 2010, about 75 are in D.C. and Arlington County. He asked if it could really be accurate that the total bike lane mileage in the other jurisdictions is only 16 miles.

Mr. Farrell said that there are few bike lanes outside of the District and Arlington, and that although jurisdictions such as Fairfax, Montgomery, and Prince George's Counties have numerous facilities planned, there are few actually in existence at this point. He said that while the numbers may be slightly off, they had been checked with multiple sources and are likely very close to reality.

Mr. Zimmerman said that he was surprised that after a decade of concerted effort in the region to implement bike lanes there aren't more facilities in more of the region's jurisdictions.

Mr. Sebastian noted that in many of the suburban jurisdictions the shoulders of roads serve as de facto bike lanes even though they are not defined as such and may not meet bike lane standards.

Mr. Zimmerman said that he would think any shoulders formally designated as bike lanes would be included in the figures.

Mr. Farrell confirmed that if the jurisdiction reports a shoulder as a formally designated bike lane it is included in the bike lane mileage figure. He said there was some question about whether or not to count signed bicycle routes and shoulders, but the decision was made not to include them because of a lack of consistency in the standards for shoulder width and maintenance. He said that the suburban jurisdictions and VDOT are very ambitious in their plans for adding bicycle lanes, which is a relatively recent development, and that the number for bike lane mileage is likely to go up substantially in the near future.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the number for planned bike lane mileage is encouraging, and noted that in times of limited funding, striping bike lanes is an economical way to improve conditions for bicycling and walking.

Mr. Zimmerman moved to adopt Resolution R4-2011 to approve the 2010 Update of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region. Mr. Roberts seconded the motion.

Vice Chairman Turner said that the TPB Regional Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force, which met before the TPB meeting, had discussed how to determine if projects are regionally significant and should be included in regional priorities planning. He said that the Task Force should look to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee for assistance in determining that threshold, particularly for bicycle and pedestrian projects.

---

Mr. Sebastian said that the Subcommittee struggles with the issue of regional significance, but that it is important to note that even a small project can be regionally significant if it makes an important connection or facilitates access to a crucial area. He said that a recent project in D.C. had filled a certain amount of sidewalk gaps, and while each project may not seem regionally significant, if they are all put together it is certainly regionally significant.

Vice Chair Bowser asked how the Subcommittee plans to address the challenge of getting more people to see bike commuting as a viable option, and if there are data that support or refute the notion that only a narrow slice of people or a specific demographic is actually taking advantage of bike facilities. She asked if there are discussions or plans to try to overcome cultural barriers to bike commuting.

Mr. Sebastian said that the number of people commuting by bicycle has gone up significantly in D.C. and other jurisdictions, due at least in part to the COG Commuter Connections program and Bike to Work Day, along with the Bicycle Ambassador program in D.C. He said that there are also efforts in many jurisdictions to reach out to schools and teach children to bicycle safely and confidently, as well as teaching pedestrian safety to younger children. He said that these efforts can help lead to a generation of people familiar with bicycling and not seeing it as something that only certain groups of people do. He said that jurisdictions are also trying to implement more bicycle facilities for basic cyclists who do not feel as comfortable without separation from auto traffic. He said that facilities with some separation such as the 15<sup>th</sup> Street bike lane have led to a more diverse bicycling population.

Vice Chair Bowser asked if Mr. Sebastian had any data to support the assertion that the bicycling population is diverse. She said that it is important to make sure that residents have equal access to such facilities, and that facilities cater to basic cyclists if the quantity and diversity of bicycle commuters are to increase.

Mr. Sebastian said that DDOT does not collect data on the race of cyclists, but does keep track of bike sharing members by gender and helmet usage.

Mr. Farrell said that there is some information on the demographics of different types of commuters from the recent State of the Commute survey, including race. He said that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan contains information on where, by jurisdiction, people are bicycling and walking, along with the trip purposes. He said this shows that many of the trips are not just recreational.

Ms. Krimm noted that the City of Frederick Comprehensive Plan has a shared-use path system and that the City is making improvements toward being more bicycle-friendly. She said she wanted to share that even the outer jurisdictions are trying to move forward in that regard. She also said that the City of Frederick has emphasized connecting the shared-use path system to the western side of the city, which has a lower-income population, to facilitate affordable transportation access to jobs.

---

Ms. Hudgins said that she also wanted to point out efforts of her jurisdiction, and noted that it has extensive mileage of shared-use paths even if it currently has fewer bike lanes. She said that the paths are very valuable in connecting at-risk populations to jobs and other destinations with low-cost transportation.

Mr. Bottigheimer asked if TPB staff could possibly develop guidance material for transportation departments in the region to include investments in bicycle facilities as elements of Title VI requirements in plans. He said that could force the collection of additional data on demographics and income of facility users, and how bicycle investments actually advance Title VI goals of the region.

Mr. Roberts pointed out that the City of Greenbelt was the first municipality in Maryland to have on-street bike lanes. He said that at the time, state-level planners discouraged the effort because they thought it was too dangerous, and that the City is still trying to work with the State to implement better facilities for bicycling and walking. He said that if the region really wants a better transportation system that includes providing options for people to commute by bicycle, there has to be more money put into bicycling facilities. He said it needs to be a funding priority and not an afterthought, as it traditionally has been.

Mr. Wojahn noted that during much of the year, especially during evening commuting hours, a large portion of the bike network is either actually or practically inaccessible because it is closed after dark or not sufficiently lit to feel safe. He asked if there is any effort in conjunction with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan to look into safety issues on trail systems. He said this is a significant barrier to bicycle commuting during the times of year when people must return home after dark.

Mr. Sebastian said that the Subcommittee includes trail safety issues in best practices information and has hosted trail training classes, and will continue to work on the issue.

Chairman Snyder noted that the City of Falls Church is undergoing a comprehensive review to determine how the city can become more bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly.

Chairman Snyder directed TPB staff to compile the ideas put forward by members in the discussion of this item, and report back about how the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan might be further improved and how these modes could be even better incorporated into the regional transportation planning process. He said that while focusing on facilitating these transportation modes has gotten off to a slow start, it is now really taking off and the TPB needs to try to capture all of the activity and improvements that are underway and the impact they are having on travel behavior.

The motion to approve the Plan passed unanimously.

---

## INFORMATION ITEMS

### 9. Update on the Regional “Street Smart” Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign

Mr. Farrell, referring to a PowerPoint presentation , provided a briefing on the evaluation of the Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 Street Smart media campaigns, and on the status of the funding and planning for the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 campaigns. He said that the trend since 2009, the last year for which complete regional data is available, shows that pedestrian and bicycle fatalities have remained flat, while the total number of motorized fatalities has fallen. He summarized Street Smart as a public education campaign that uses radio, transit, cable television, and internet advertising in order to change motorist, pedestrian, and bicyclist behavior. He mentioned that the campaign is supported by concurrent law enforcement activities, which are contributed by member jurisdictions on a voluntary basis.

He said that funding for Street Smart comes from federal funds, along with significant contributions from WMATA and some of the TPB member jurisdictions. The campaign runs twice annually – in the fall and spring – to coincide with the change to and from Daylight Savings Time. He said that in FY2010, the campaign ran in November 2009 and April 2010, and the overall budget was \$658,700, \$500,000 of which was frontloaded towards the spring campaign and included extensive development costs for a television spot. He mentioned that details are available in the annual report, which is available at <http://bestreetsmart.net/>.

He reviewed the campaign materials, noting that the Fall 2009 campaign used the same instructional materials as the previous Spring campaign. He stated that all materials are available in both English and Spanish. He said that new materials were developed for the Spring 2010 campaign, and that the images resorted to a “shock” kind of message that would impress upon people the consequences of overlooking safety. He pointed to an image of a woman and a stroller being hit by an automobile as an example of the “shock” imagery.

He summarized various media events associated with Street Smart for both Fall 2009 and Spring 2010, including one of March 23, where an estimated 2.5 million people in the region saw press and television coverage of the event. He also mentioned that the March 23 event’s effectiveness was reflected in similar events in both Baltimore and in front of the U.S. DOT headquarters building, where on October 12, USDOT Secretary LaHood hosted a speed demonstration using the same props as those that were used on March 23. He added that the total added media value to the Street Smart campaign is \$555,000, which includes free radio spots, outdoor messages on transit shelters, and interior bus cards, bus backs, and bus sides. He said that the estimated value of press coverage generated by public relations activity was \$169,000.

He summarized information regarding enforcement during the campaign, stating that during the Fall and Spring campaigns, 30,221 citations and 7,804 warnings were issued to motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists. He also reviewed the evaluation component of the program, citing a

---

before-and-after web-based survey of 500 area motorists. He highlighted some survey results, including that the greatest perceived danger is driving while texting, and that the target audience for the Street Smart campaign – 18- to 42-year old males – is hearing and remembering Street Smart messages. He added that the target audience reported that driver behavior was more dangerous than pedestrian behavior.

He provided a funding history for the program, noting that local government voluntary contributions have been reduced in recent years due to budget constraints. He stated that on March 15, 2010 letters were sent to TPB member jurisdictions requesting a contribution of funds for FY 2011 at a level of 5 cents per capita.

He provided a summary of projected activities for FY 2011, stating that the confirmed budget so far is \$397,800. He said that it is expected to be \$600,000, which will be sufficient for both Fall and Spring, but may require cutting back on television elements or reusing existing materials. He concluded by mentioning that the next campaign will occur in November, and welcomed any jurisdiction to provide assistance by volunteering concurrent law enforcement. He also stated that it is not too late to contribute funding to the program.

Mr. Kirby, presenting for the COG Executive Director, Mr. Robertson, said that funding for this program is uncertain each year. He referenced a memo from Mr. Robertson that was distributed, and said that there has been mixed results in response to the TPB request for contribution based on five cents per capita, which is a separate request for this program apart from the COG regular dues. He said that Mr. Robertson is interested in advancing to the COG Budget and Finance Committee and the COG Board of Directors an option to add a small increment to the COG dues structure to support the Street Smart program so that the additional voluntary request from TPB for funding would no longer be necessary. He summarized the memo, stating that current member dues to COG are 65 cents per capita, none of which goes to support the Street Smart campaign. He said that Mr. Robertson asked the Budget and Finance Committee members if they would be receptive to a proposal at their upcoming meeting on November 10 to add an additional incremental fee to the current 65 cents per capita to be used for Street Smart. He said that an increase of one cent per capita would generate \$49,000, that one and a half cents per capita would generate \$73,500, and that two cents would generate \$98,000. He concluded by stating that Mr. Robertson would like to know if the TPB would support his moving forward with this request to the Budget and Finance Committee, based on the presentation that was just delivered.

Mr. Jenkins asked whether this incremental contribution would be voluntary.

Mr. Snyder replied that the incremental contribution would not be voluntary and would be part of COG dues.

Mr. Turner made a motion for the TPB to authorize the signature of the Chair to a letter to the COG Budget and Finance Committee supporting the request to the Committee to include the Street Smart Program in the COG dues. The motion was seconded.

---

Mr. Roberts asked if any other COG dues increases were being contemplated.

Mr. Kirby replied that the COG dues will likely be frozen for this year, so that they would be the same for everybody next year as they were this year, but that this would be an incremental addition.

Ms. Koster asked if there were opportunities for Street Smart funding from other federal, nonprofit, or private sources.

Mr. Kirby, referring to the memo, said that the total federal contribution for the past year was \$393,000, and that the total contribution from WMATA was \$150,000. He said that \$65,7000 came from local voluntary contributions. He mentioned previous attempts to raise funding from other sources, such as Honda Motors, and said that these attempts were not very successful.

Chairman Snyder said that this program underscores a current concern, and stated that the TPB would like a campaign that maintains continuity throughout the year. He said that information that is pushed out in waves should maintain momentum by continuing the message in schools and other places where people are paying attention, such as cable television.

Mr. Turner asked if information is available about fatalities that occur by jurisdiction.

Mr. Farrell replied that this information could be provided to TPB members, and that it is available in the TPB bicycle and pedestrian plan.

Chairman Snyder called for a vote to authorize sending the letter. The motion was passed, with Mr. Beacher abstaining, and Mr. Jenkins voting nay.

Mr. Zimmerman said he appreciated the action that was just taken. He said that the last few years have seen a tremendous drop-off in contributions to this program, resulting in three jurisdictions carrying the whole weight of the program for the rest of the region. He said this funding stream is not sustainable, and stated that either everyone should contribute or the program cannot continue. He also pointed out that \$150,000 of program funding comes from WMATA, and said that those jurisdictions that fall within the WMATA compact and contribute to Street Smart are in effect paying twice. He pointed out that some counties have tens of thousands of Metro riders but do not contribute to the Metro system, and said that these counties are also being subsidized for Street Smart. He concluded by stating that if the final decision is not to include the incremental adjustment to COG dues, he would recommend to his community to stop funding this program through voluntary contributions.

---

## **10. Briefing on the Draft Financial Analysis for the 2010 CLRP**

Referring to the draft report and the handout presentation, Mr. Reno briefed the Board on the new financial analysis for the Constrained Long-Range Plan, which includes revenue forecasts through the plan period of 2040 and anticipated expenditures over that same period. He spoke about major new expenditures since the last financial analysis in 2006, as well as new revenues. His overall conclusion for this analysis indicated that forecast revenues and expenditures through 2040 are balanced and therefore the region's CLRP is financially constrained as required by federal planning regulations. Of the forecast total revenues, 39 percent are state (including DC), 24 percent transit fares, 18 percent federal, 12 percent local, and 7 percent tolls/bonds and private sources. He noted that not all of WMATA's requests for capital and operating support were funded in the analysis.

He explained that WMATA requested funding for capital investments with a continuation past 2020 of the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008, but neither federal legislation nor local matching funds have been identified, so this funding is not included in the CLRP financial analysis. He said that such differences have occurred for prior updates of the CLRP and have been addressed by applying a transit ridership constraint to account for a shortfall in transit capacity due to the constrained funding. Thus, the region will again apply the transit ridership constraint beyond 2020.

Mr. Reno explained that WMATA requested operating subsidy funding of \$2.8 billion more than the District identified for the support of its operating subsidies. He said that the District has determined that by building upon its recent experience and the experiences of the other jurisdictions with alternative ways of delivering Metrobus and MetroAccess services, it will develop alternative services to substitute for WMATA services. With less expensive services, the District will provide the levels of service in the CLRP within the funding that it has identified.

Mr. Reno further spoke about a wide array of candidate revenue sources, including fuel taxes and tolling, but he observed that there is not a one-size-fits-all solution. He said that in response to the nation's transportation funding crisis, Congress created two commissions in SAFETEA-LU to identify a long-term approach to sustained transportation funding. He described actions that would be needed to implement new revenue sources. Finally, he noted that on November 17, the TPB would be asked to approve the 2010 CLRP, which includes the financial analysis.

Ms. Erickson said that MDOT is painfully aware of the region's transportation funding shortfall. She drew the Board's attention to a handout she distributed titled "Blue Ribbon Commission for Maryland Transportation Funding." She said the Maryland General Assembly enacted a law this past spring establishing this committee to review, evaluate and make recommendations concerning Maryland transportation funding.

Mr. Srikanth said that on December 8-10, Virginia's governor and the Secretary of Transportation will be hosting a conference in Roanoke titled, "Reforming and Revitalizing

---

Transportation in Virginia." He said that registration is open. He also noted that, shortly after taking office, the governor created through an executive order the "Government Reform and Restructuring Commission" to look at all aspects of state-provided services and the programs operated by the state, including transportation. He noted that, among other things, the commission is tasked with exploring innovative ways to promote telework services, and achieve cost efficiencies that might be applied to transportation. The commission's report is due in December.

Referring to slide 13 in Mr. Reno's presentation, Chairman Snyder said he believed the solution to the revenue problem is clearly linked to the need to raise fuel taxes. However, he pointed out that national leaders continually object to such an increase. He asked Mr. Kirby if staff could perform some analysis on how the breakdown of funding sources in this region compares to other regions of the country. He said it appeared that local government and transit users are carrying a fairly significant burden in the Washington region.

Mr. Kirby noted that the TPB's principles on reauthorization included a recommendation to increase revenues through fuel taxes and other sources. He also noted that this issue could come up in a lame duck session of Congress and therefore it might be a good time for the TPB to again provide comments to Congress regarding transportation funding. He suggested the Board might want to revisit this issue at its November meeting when it is asked to adopt the CLRP.

Chairman Snyder agreed that Mr. Kirby's suggestion might be a good approach. He asked staff to provide information on this issue in advance of the November meeting so the TPB members will have a chance to make up their minds regarding their positions.

## **11. Briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2010 CLRP and FY2011-2016 TIP**

Ms. Posey, referring to the summary conformity report for the 2010 CLRP from the mailout, said this analysis is very similar to the analysis from previous years, with two major differences. She mentioned the Round 8.0 cooperative forecasts are new to this analysis, which shows a slower growth rate in households and jobs, as compared with the previous 2009 Round 7.2A cooperative forecast. She said that this analysis also extends to 2040, whereas last year extended to 2030.

Referring to a PowerPoint Presentation, Ms. Posey provided a travel demand summary for modeled area trips and vehicle miles traveled during average weekday traffic, and said that transit trips, vehicle trips, and vehicle miles traveled increase over time. She also summarized VOC emissions for the 1-hour and 8-hour ozone nonattainment area. She pointed out that emissions are forecast to decrease between 2002 and 2030, but are also forecast to increase slightly from 2030 to 2040. She noted that emissions budgets have been submitted to EPA, but have not yet been approved adequate for use in conformity. She said that the region adheres to these budgets, even though it is not yet a requirement. She stated that mobile source NOx emissions also are expected to decrease over time for both the 1-hour and the 8-hour Ozone



---

nonattainment area. She said that fine particles pollutants also are expected to decrease, and noted that the count for 2002 is higher than all the forecast years, per the requirement.

Ms. Posey reviewed some observations about how this year's analysis compares to last year's analysis. She said there was a decrease in VMT and a decrease in emissions in forecast years, which can be attributed to change in the land activity, since Round 8.0 has a slower growth in households and jobs. She also said that, because of input to the demand model of the increases in tolls and transit fares over the past year, 10 percent fewer transit trips are forecast for 2020 and 9 percent fewer transit trips for 2030 in the 2010 CLRP than there were in the 2009 CLRP. She concluded by stating that the full 400-page report is available online, and that a 30-day public comment period began on Thursday, October 14. She said the TPB would be asked to approve this analysis, along with the TIP and CLRP, at the November meeting.

## **12. Briefing on the Round 8.0 Cooperative Forecasts of Population, Households and Employment in the Washington Region.**

Mr. Griffiths said that new Round 8.0 forecasts go to 2040 in this year's conformity analysis. He mentioned key economic factors that influenced the Round 8.0 household and job growth forecast, including the national recession, higher rates of unemployment, foreclosures and reductions in home values, tight capital markets, a slower pace of housing sales and leasing office space, and BRAC. He reviewed the impact of key economic factors on Round 8.0 growth forecasts, and said that the service-providing economy of the Washington region, specifically scientific, engineering, and technical business, is projected to grow nationally and throughout the region.

Mr. Griffiths said that in the big picture, jobs will increase by 47 percent, households by 43 percent, and population by 38 percent, and that the greatest absolute increase in household growth would occur in the outer suburban jurisdictions, with the greatest relative increase occurring in the outer ring of Virginia and West Virginia. He said the population growth would follow the same pattern, but be slightly less than household growth, suggesting a slight reduction in average household size in the region. With regard to Activity Centers, he mentioned that preliminary analysis shows that employment in these centers will increase at about the same rate as overall job growth in the region, and that the household growth rate in Activity Centers would be double the regional growth rate. He said that by 2040, about 55 percent of the total regional jobs and 19 percent of households in the region would be concentrated in Activity Centers, which cover less than 5 percent of the region's total land area.

Mr. Griffiths highlighted some key findings, including slower growth rates than those realized in the Round 7.2A forecasts, slightly improved regional job/housing balance, an absolute increase in jobs in the inner suburbs and an absolute increase in households in the outer suburbs. He also stated that the forecast suggests significantly higher density housing is now being planned for the regional activity centers, making them more mixed-use, which supports Goal #2 of the TPB vision policy framework.

---

**13. Briefing on the Draft 2010 CLRP and FY2011-2016 TIP**

Mr. Kirby said the briefing on the draft 2010 CLRP and FY2011-2016 TIP could be presented next month.

**14. Briefing on the Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2011 CLRP and FY 2012-1017 TIP.**

Mr. Kirby said this item is the call for projects for next year's plan and TIP, which would be released later in the month. He mentioned the process is similar to what has been done in previous years, and that the TPB would be asked to approve this document at its November meeting.

**15. Other Business**

There was no other business.

**16. Adjournment**

Chairman Snyder adjourned the meeting at 2:06 pm.