

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
September 18, 2013**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Melissa Barlow, FTA
Eulois Cleckley, DDOT
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Dan Emerine, DC DOT
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jason Groth, Charles County
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax County
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Emmett Jordan, City of Greenbelt
Carol Kissal, WMATA
Julia Koster, NCPC
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick
Tim Lovain, City of Alexandria
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT
Paul Smith, Frederick County
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Kanathur Srikanth, Virginia DOT
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Scott K. York, Loudoun County
Sam Zimbabwe, DDOT
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	
Nicholas Ramfos	
Andrew Meese	
Eric Randall	
John Swanson	
Rich Roisman	
Andrew Austin	
Deborah Kerson Bilek	
Dan Sonenklar	
Ben Hampton	
Bryan Hayes	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Michael Farrell	
Daivamani Sivasailam	
Erin Morrow	
Marco Trigueros	
Bill Orleans	Citizen
Christine Hoeffner	VRE
Doug Allen	VRE
Faisal Hameed	DDOT
Lezie Rupert	DDOT
Vic Siaurusaitis	Baker
George Clark	Committee of 100
Stewart Schwartz	CSG
Paul Bickmore	CSG
Tina Slater	ACT
Mike Lake	Fairfax County DOT
Judi Gold	CM Bowser
Christine Green	Greater Washington Safe Routes to School Network
Evan Gross	GMU
Elizabeth Beziller	DDOP
Thomas Taylor	NoMa BID
Galin Brooks	NoMa BID
Patrick Durany	Prince William County
Pierre Holloman	City of Alexandria
Steve Hetrick	Albeck Gerken, Inc.
Tim Davis	City of Frederick
Stephen Flippin	CSX
Rob Whitfeld	Committee for Dulles
Nick Alexandrow	PRTC

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Chair York opened the meeting and mentioned that he would have to leave at 1:45 p.m. and would turn the proceedings over to Vice Chair Wojahn at that time. He made note that Mr. Way was attending the meeting via telephone.

George Clark, representing the Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City, spoke about the importance of commuter rail in the region. He said the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan should call for improvements in commuter rail, including increased capacity and conversion to electric trains. He spoke of the importance of the Long Bridge and Virginia Avenue Tunnel projects. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Christine Green of the Greater Washington Region Safe Routes to School Network announced that the Network and the TPB's Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee would be hosting a Safe Routes to School regional meeting on October 29. She said this is the first regional convening of professional staff and advocates of Safe Routes to School. She said that the funding for Safe Routes to School programs changed under MAP-21, but that the movement is still strong. She said the change in funding makes this regional meeting even more important.

Jim Dinegar of the Greater Washington Board of Trade said transportation is critical to commerce in the Washington region and that rehabilitation of the Long Bridge is a project of regional significance. He believes that the study provides an opportunity to look at commuter rail run-through service. He said the Board of Trade is undertaking a transportation study that would be made available to the TPB and would look at transportation enhancements that would make the region function more effectively.

2. Approval of Minutes of July 17 Meeting

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the July 17 meeting. The motion was passed unanimously.

3. Report of Technical Committee

Ms. Erickson provided a summary of the September 6 Technical Committee meeting. She said the committee reviewed five of the TPB agenda items, including highlights from the 2013 State of the Commute Survey, the list of regional highlighted freight projects, DDOT's Long Bridge study, the final report on a study of the Public Acceptability of Congestion Pricing and implications of related requirements of MAP-21, and the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan comments to date and proposed revisions. She said that in addition to the TPB agenda items the committee was briefed on the results of a survey on traffic signal timing in the region, a potential draft Green Streets policy, an analysis of a comparison of past performance of regional transit forecasts to actual 2010 transit ridership, and the status and latest development of MAP-21 performance measure regulations.

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Mr. Still provided a summary of recent activities of the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee. He said the CAC met twice since the last TPB meeting: it had a special meeting on August 15 to discuss the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP) and had its regular meeting on September 12. He said the CAC feels the RTPP is very well written and organized. He said the main comments of the CAC relate to areas of the RTPP that the committee believes should be elaborated upon, including: selection of the 15 strategies; how the RTPP will be implemented and how it would be integrated with other planning processes in the region; and measurement of the RTPP's effectiveness and progress over time. He said the CAC is appreciative of the responsiveness of TPB staff to its comments on the RTPP.

Chair York said that would like to have a conference call with Mr. Still and Mr. Kirby to discuss the CAC's comments on the RTPP.

5. Report of Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on September 6 and acted on two amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program that were included in the TPB mailout packet. He summarized items in the letters packet included in the mailout. He also called attention to *The Region* magazine, the TPB's annual report. He noted the additional letters packet distributed at the meeting and specifically mentioned the Economy Forward event scheduled for September 27, encouraging members to attend. He also provided detail on the TPB's letter to Federal Transit Administration Administrator Peter Rogoff regarding the proposed regulations on the new 5310 Program under MAP-21. He asked staff to speak on the final item, the announcement of another session of the TPB's Community Leadership Institute.

Ms. Bilek said the next session of the TPB's Community Leadership Institute (CLI) will be held on November 14 and November 20, and is geared specifically toward staff of the region's elected officials. The program's primary goal is to help increase awareness of regionalism and regional transportation issues when making decisions. She said Kathy Porter, former Mayor of Takoma Park, will facilitate the CLI. She said the deadline for recruitment is October 18.

Mr. Snyder had three remarks: a request to VDOT that it will make sure that the safety of the traveling public and first responders is not degraded by use of shoulder traffic; a request for a briefing or report from MATOC on the role it played during the recent Navy Yard incident; and support for a request for a presentation on traffic signal timing.

6. Chair's Remarks

Chair York chose not to make any remarks.

ACTION ITEM

7. Amendment to the FY2013-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that is Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Include Funding for the Construction of a Replacement Interchange on MD 4 at Suitland Parkway and for the Reconstruction of US 1 in College park, as Requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT)

Ms. Erickson summarized that in July, MDOT gave notice of two amendments to the TIP, and that a public comment period that followed in August closed with no comments received. She said that MDOT is now proposing to amend the TIP to add \$154 million of federal and state funding for the replacement of an at-grade intersection at Maryland 4 and Suitland Parkway with a grade-separated interchange, and to add \$19.6 million of state funding for right-of-way for the reconstruction of U.S. 1 between College Avenue and Sunnyside Avenue in College Park. She moved approval of Resolution R7-2014 to approve these amendments. The resolution was seconded and passed unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

8. Briefing on the Results of the 2013 State of the Commute Survey for the Metropolitan Washington Region

Mr. Ramfos announced that Car Free Days were to be held on September 20-22, and said that a Twitter chat would be hosted after the TPB meeting to create a social media buzz around the event. He then turned to a PowerPoint Presentation and, referring to information that was provided in the agenda packet, provided an overview of some findings from the 2013 State of the Commute Survey. He explained the survey methodology, listed the survey topics – including new sections for 2013 – and reported some preliminary highlights on commute patterns, telework, travel facilities, commute ease and satisfaction, awareness of Commuter Connections, and employer services.

Mr. Ramfos said that, according to survey results, drive-alone percentages had been dropping since 2001, but had experienced a slight increase between 2010 and 2013 – from 64 percent to 66 percent. By comparison, other modes remain essentially unchanged. He added the fewer than half of the region’s inner core commuters drive alone, compared with 70 percent of commuters in the middle ring who drive alone, and 74 percent of commuters in the outer ring who drive alone. He added that in the core, workers bike, walk, and carpool and vanpool at higher rates than the rest of the region. He mentioned that the average commute distance (16 miles) and average commute time (36 minutes) have remained the same since 2010.

Mr. Ramfos also explained that there has been a steady growth in telework since 2001, with most growth attributed to the federal government, which he suggested is related to the federal Telework Enhancements Act of 2010. He added that the average frequency of telework is 1.4 days per week, which is an increase from 1.3 days per week reported in 2010. With regard to

proximity to transit, Mr. Ramfos said that 50 percent of respondents live less than ½ mile from a bus stop and 65 percent live less than 1 mile. He also mentioned that commuters who lived in outer jurisdictions were more likely to have HOV lanes available on their route to work, and were more likely to use them when available. He discussed survey responses regarding societal and personal benefits of ridesharing, satisfaction levels with commutes, and awareness of Commuter Connections. Finally, he addressed real-time ride-matching, or instant carpooling, and stated that about one-third of respondents expressed interest in paying for an instantaneous carpool trip that could be found using a smartphone. He concluded by saying that copies of a technical report are available, and that the report would be finalized in 2014.

Mr. Erenrich asked about analysis on federal worker travel patterns, specifically whether federal workers were traveling longer distances than other workers, since a large portion of federal jobs are concentrated in the region's core.

Mr. Ramfos replied that while this information is not explicitly called out in the report, the data collected on worker and employer demographics would allow TPB staff to analyze federal workers' travel patterns.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that in the future, respondents could be coded based on their jurisdiction so that disaggregated data could be summarized, and that information could be broken out by jurisdiction.

Mr. Zimbabwe suggested that that it would be useful to collect data on commuting mode choice for people who live within half a mile of transit.

Mr. Ramfos replied that both of these suggestions could be considered for a future survey.

Mr. Kirby emphasized that the State of the Commute Survey is designed to be significant at the jurisdictional level, and that data is purposefully aggregated in three categories: core, inner-, and outer-jurisdiction, which he said represents a broad brush picture of the region. He added that TPB conducts additional geographic surveys that allow for a more detailed analysis of selected smaller areas, and said that TPB members are welcome to offer suggestions for places where these focused surveys should occur.

9. Briefing on Regional Highlighted Freight Projects

Mr. Cleckley, chair of the TPB's Freight Subcommittee, briefed the Board on a 2013 update to the group's Freight Transportation Highlighted Projects list, which features ten road, rail, and other initiatives that the states and freight railroads in the region are pursuing to improve freight movements in coming decades. He explained that freight movement is critical to the region's economy, that a 66 percent increase in freight traffic is expected by 2040, and that most of the traffic will be by truck. He said that the list of highlighted projects includes one short-term initiative and one long-term initiative from each of the three states and from each of the region's two Class I railroads.

Mr. Cleckley spoke to a PowerPoint presentation that featured several of the projects, including, in the short-term: reconstruction of CSX's Virginia Avenue tunnel in the District; improvements to truck parking facilities in Maryland; and widening of a portion of the 18-mile "loop road" around Dulles Airport in Virginia. The long-term initiatives featured in the presentation included: a multi-state effort by Norfolk Southern to clear major bottlenecks and improve efficiency; deployment of a real-time motor carrier information system in the District; expansion of CSX's Long Bridge across the Potomac River between the District and Virginia; upgrades to I-70 near Frederick, in Maryland, to improve truck connections between the Port of Baltimore and markets in the Midwest; and an integrated corridor management initiative along I-95 and I-395 in Virginia. More complete descriptions of these and the remaining projects were included in the briefing memorandum provided to Board members.

Chair York asked whether the freight forecasts featured in the presentation included freight that only passes through the region.

Mr. Cleckley confirmed that the forecasts do include through-traffic. He said that the forecasts were generated using the Federal Highway Administration's Freight Analysis Framework, which looks both at freight moving within a jurisdiction as well as freight that is passing through, destined for, or leaving that jurisdiction.

Chair York asked whether the share of total freight traffic generated by the region itself was available.

Mr. Cleckley said that the through-traffic can be separated from the traffic traveling within, to, or from the region.

Mr. Erenrich expressed concern about the degree to which the TPB supports and promotes the major initiatives of CSX and Norfolk Southern -- through such things as the Highlighted Projects list -- even as both railroads seem to stand in the way of many of the region's major transportation initiatives. In particular, he called attention to the difficulty in working with CSX on the Purple Line light rail line in Maryland.

Mr. Lovain drew the Board's attention to the fact that MAP-21, the federal transportation authorization passed in 2012, puts even greater emphasis on freight issues than did the previous authorization. He said the law calls for development of a national freight plan, and encourages states to develop their own freight plans, too, in order to prioritize freight projects. He said he hoped that the work of the Freight Subcommittee was consistent with the work of the states in the region to develop plans, as well as similar work at the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Mr. Cleckley confirmed that the work of the subcommittee has been consistent with the state and federal efforts. He said that Maryland and Virginia have both developed freight plans, and that the District is about to complete its freight plan. He pointed out, too, that there are new federal incentives to encourage states to identify high-priority freight projects, and that about ten percent of the projects awarded funding under the most recent federal TIGER program were freight

projects.

Mr. Mendelson referred to comments made by the Committee of One Hundred on the Federal City during the public comment period earlier in the meeting. He echoed the group's concerns that increasing the freight capacity of the Virginia Avenue tunnel in the District, one of the projects on the list, could impact commuter rail service, in particular by increasing freight traffic and taking away capacity for commuter and other passenger rail service.

Mr. Cleckley said that representatives of both freight railroads regularly attend meetings of the Freight Subcommittee, and that the list of highlighted projects includes one in Virginia to alleviate a major bottleneck for Amtrak and VRE trains. He said the subcommittee works to identify where the most pressing chokepoints are and to facilitate and coordinate with different stakeholders to address those issues.

Mr. Mendelson reiterated his concern about the potential chokepoint for commuter rail in Southwest that might be created should the Virginia Avenue tunnel be expanded. He requested that the Freight Subcommittee look specifically at how to ensure that there continues to be capacity to grow commuter rail capacity in the corridor.

Mr. Cleckley said that the subcommittee would do that.

Ms. Koster echoed Mr. Mendelson's concerns, stressing the importance of thinking about freight in the CSX corridor in Southwest in the context of commuter rail, Metrorail, and Amtrak passenger service. She urged the subcommittee to work together to better understand how freight decisions are impacting those other travel modes, in particular commuter rail.

Mr. Zimmerman also echoed Mr. Mendelson's concerns. He asked whether the subcommittee had considered long-term options for separating freight traffic from passenger rail traffic, perhaps by building another nearby span, or even rerouting freight traffic around the District. He said the region will need a great expansion of passenger rail, both within the region and inter-regionally, to handle future growth, and asked whether the subcommittee had thought about such big, long-term needs.

Mr. Cleckley said that the latest iteration of the Highlighted Projects list did not consider such long-term projects, but that the next iteration probably would. He said the latest list focused on projects that had relative ability to be funded within a certain period of time or are already being planned.

Mr. Zimmerman said that he appreciates the focus on short-term, realistic projects, but reiterated the importance of looking at long-term needs and starting the conversation now about what improvements will be needed 20 or 30 years from now. He acknowledged the difficulty in getting all the right parties to start talking now about such projects, but said that it is both necessary and possible to do, and that if any group or body is in a position to facilitate such a conversation, it is the TPB.

Mr. Cleckley agreed with Mr. Zimmerman.

Chair York also echoed Mr. Zimmerman's concerns.

10. Briefing on the Long Bridge Study

Ms. Rupert, from the District Department of Transportation, briefed the Board on the progress of the Long Bridge Study to assess freight, passenger, and commuter rail needs along the Long Bridge. The study was funded by the Federal Rail Administration (FRA), and participating stakeholders include the FRA, TPB, Arlington County, the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, CSX, and Amtrak. The 2,529-foot Long Bridge was originally built in 1904 and was last upgraded in 1942. The bridge is the only freight and passenger rail crossing that spans the Potomac River between the District and Virginia. The Long Bridge is owned by freight operator CSX. The National Park Service owns the landings at either side of the bridge and the Coast Guard has oversight of the navigation channel that passes underneath. Two-thirds of rail traffic that crosses the bridge is operated by Amtrak and Virginia Railway Express (VRE), while the remaining one-third is freight trains operated by CSX.

Ms. Rupert said that the purpose of the study is to assess the bridge's structure and possible multimodal improvements that could increase capacity to accommodate future growth. When complete, the study will include preliminary cost estimates, a location report, and recommendations for the required National Environmental Policy Act study.

Mr. Siaurusaitis, consultant with the Michael Baker Corporation, said that the study would also contain modeling exercises that include projections into the future for freight and passenger rail using nationally available data. These projections are not currently available.

Ms. Rupert said that work on the project started in September 2012 and included a site visit to visually inspect the bridge's superstructure. Participants found that the superstructure was in fair condition, and that the substructure of the bridge was in satisfactory to good shape. Other project events include a stakeholder meeting in January 2013 for stakeholders and industry experts. Findings and recommendations from that meeting were submitted with the presentation and include: "The current two track system provides operational challenges due to the growing freight, commuter, and passenger service demands;" "The bridge should accommodate the future freight, passenger, and commuter rail needs;" and, "Provisions should be made to accommodate future high speed rail... double stacked trains and electrified trains."

Ms. Rupert stated that through this process with stakeholders and the public, the study team narrowed 100 development alternatives to six. The first alternative suggests making no changes to the Long Bridge. The second alternative expands the bridge from two to four tracks, and adds room for pedestrians and cyclists. The third alternative, also expands the rail to four tracks, includes the pedestrian and bicycle connection, and adds streetcar tracks to potentially connect with the Columbia Pike streetcar in Arlington County. The fourth alternative is identical to the third, except that on this bridge the streetcar lanes will be shared with automobiles. The fifth

alternative adds an exclusive lane for automobiles to the configuration for the fourth alternative. Instead of adding to the Long Bridge, the final alternative builds a tunnel with four rail tracks that go underneath the Potomac River.

Ms. Rupert also presented four different design alternatives and an animation that demonstrates what a trip across the updated Long Bridge might look like. She also mentioned that the study should be completed by early 2014, and will be followed up with consultation with FRA regarding the NEPA process.

Chair York asked if there was a current cost estimate for the proposals.

Mr. Siarusaitis responded that there is no current cost estimate because the bridge concept report is still being written.

Mr. Zimmerman asked why the proposed designs include elements that allow the bridge to open for ships to pass through, since large ships have not passed underneath the bridge since 1960.

Dr. Hamidi, of the project team, said that designs accommodate navigation because it is required by law and that an exception would need to be granted by the Coast Guard. He also responded that based on impact, stakeholders and the public believe that the bridge should have a monumental look, and the designs reflect that.

Mr. Zimmerman agreed that it is fine to make the bridge attractive, but he also wanted to draw attention to the additional related costs.

11. Update on the Final Report “What Do People Think About Congestion Pricing? A Deliberative Dialogue with Residents of Metropolitan Washington”

Ms. Swanson said the TPB received a briefing on this report in January. He said staff has since updated the report based on comments received from the TPB and from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). He said the study looked at three different road-pricing scenarios: priced lanes on all major highways; a vehicle-based system using GPS in which drivers would pay for all miles driven; and a priced zone similar to that which has been implemented in London. He said more than 300 citizens were polled using a technique called deliberative forums. He said more than 60 percent of people strongly or somewhat supported the first scenario.

Mr. Swanson said the consensus of participants was that they were cautiously open to congestion pricing concepts, but with a number of conditions, including the need to see clear benefits. However, he said that they have doubts that the benefits can be accomplished. He said that there is a lack of confidence that the proposals could be effectively implemented, as well as a fear of government over-reach. He said that people are specifically concerned with the loss of privacy, the effectiveness of the priced options, and the use of revenues generated by priced roadways. He said that people wanted to know that congestion pricing is part of a wider strategic vision.

Mr. Swanson highlighted some items in MAP-21 that relate to congestion pricing. He said under the law's general tolling provisions, MAP-21 increased the authority of public agencies to build new tolled roadway capacity, but it put restrictions and limitations on tolling existing capacity. He explained that under these provisions, new toll projects generally cannot reduce the previous number of toll-free general-purpose lanes. He noted that there are still opportunities to toll existing capacity through the federal Interstate System Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Pilot Program and the Value Pricing Pilot Program.

Vice Chair Wojahn asked for questions and noted that the Executive Summary of the report is available in the TPB meeting packet and that the full report is online.

Mr. Turner asked if the public opinion research was done prior to the opening of the Intercounty Connector (ICC) and the tolled lanes on I-495.

Mr. Swanson said the research was done before the I-495 lanes opened and immediately after the ICC opened. He said it would be interesting to understand the public's reaction to congestion pricing after those facilities became available and were understood.

Mr. Zimbabwe said he recalled that the study's first scenario included BRT on the tolled lanes. He asked if any of the other scenarios included specific transit improvements.

Mr. Swanson said the first scenario included BRT and third scenario included circulation improvements—short-range transit along with more facilities for walking and bicycling.

12. Briefing on the Comments Received on the Draft TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)

Mr. Kirby, referring to a memo that was included in the mailout, summarized the progress to date on the RTPP. He explained that the document was released on July 24 for a 30-day public comment period. He said that the comments received through the comment period, and via the public opinion survey, generally reflect a good understanding of the information presented in the survey and in the draft RTPP. He mentioned that initial review of the comments received indicated three general topics that needed to be clarified in a revised version of the RTPP: tolling of existing highway lanes; the relationship between regional strategies and specific programs and projects; and the relationship between the RTPP and the TPB's Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP).

With regard to tolling existing highway lanes, Mr. Kirby said that as a result of the MAP-21 legislative provisions on certain types of toll-financed construction activities, the CLRP Aspirations Scenario was revised to eliminate the instances where the number of toll-free lanes was reduced. The revised scenario network, which was reported to the TPB in April 2013, was used in the RTPP web-based survey and the subsequent July 2013 RTPP report. With regard to the comments pertaining to the relationship between regional strategies and specific programs

and projects, Mr. Kirby said that the RTPP presented potential benefits and costs of alternative strategies in qualitative terms that would help survey respondents to rank the relative importance of alternative approaches. He added that survey respondents were invited to suggest additional strategies throughout the survey itself, and that as the RTPP process moves forward, highly ranked strategies can be developed into more specific programs and projects.

Mr. Zimmerman asked when the RTPP would be brought before the TPB for formal action.

Mr. Kirby recommended that the TPB discuss a revised draft of the RTPP in October, which would be followed by a second comment period.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if this schedule would mean that the TPB would receive an information item on the RTPP in October.

Mr. Kirby said yes.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the TPB would then take action on the RTPP in November of December.

Mr. Kirby responded that November would be the earliest time for the TPB to take action on the RTPP.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the RTPP was not only the most important thing on the day's agenda but it was perhaps one of the most important things that the TPB would ever take up – not only this year, but for the foreseeable future. He therefore said that it was unfortunate that this item began seven minutes prior to the TPB meeting's scheduled adjournment. He suggested that it deserves significantly more time for discussion. He advocated placing it as the first item after 'Action Items' on a future TPB agenda, and that the TPB block off time – separate from a staff presentation – to discuss the item as a Board. He said he thought the draft document was a good start but there are some significant questions the Board ought to be deliberating.

Vice Chair Wojahn agreed with Mr. Zimmerman.

Mr. Kirby followed up by offering an option of holding a work session prior to a regular TPB meeting, which he said would provide an opportunity for Board members to delve into details of the RTPP.

Mr. Zimmerman responded that while he would be willing to participate in a work session, it is important that the board itself set aside time to discuss the RTPP.

Vice Chair Wojahn agreed with Mr. Zimmerman.

Mr. Kirby responded that a future meeting agenda could include time for discussion of this item. He continued with his final point about the comments received, regarding the relationship between the prioritization strategies and the CLRP, saying that the next draft of the RTPP would

address this topic in greater detail. He added that the TPB would soon be launching the TPB Information Hub, a one-stop-shop website that will describe transportation planning activities at the regional, state, and local levels, and provide links to high profile projects and documents.

Mr. Zimbabwe requested that the upcoming TPB dialogue on the RTPP address the connections between the draft RTPP and the goals outlined in MWCOG's *Region Forward* document, and with WMATA's Strategic Plan, *Momentum*.

Mr. Kirby replied that Mr. Zimbabwe's comment provided him a chance to publicize an upcoming Economy Forward event planned for September 27. He said that event would address the topics and linkages mentioned by Mr. Zimbabwe.

Mr. Turner thanked the members of the TPB, CAC, and the Technical Committee who participated in the online survey. He encouraged TPB members to attend the Economy Forward event on September 27, and concurred with Mr. Zimmerman's comments about giving the TPB ample time to discuss the RTPP at a future meeting.

13. Other Business

There was no other business brought before the TPB.

14. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:06pm.