

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 17, 2007**

Members and Alternates Present

Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Bill Bronrott, Maryland House
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Andrew Fellows, City of College Park
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council
Bill Lebegern, MWAA
Timothy Lovain, Alexandria City Council
Michael Lyles, City of Bowie
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Emeka Moneme, DC DOT
David Moss, Montgomery County
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
C. Paul Smith, City of Frederick
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT-NOVA
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Patricia Ticer, Virginia Senate
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	
Gerald Miller	
Michael Clifford	
Jim Hogan	
Bob Griffiths	
Nick Ramfos	
Wendy Klancher	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Andrew Meese	
Andrew Austin	
Beth Newman	
Darren Smith	
Sarah Crawford	
Monica Bansal	
Daivamani Sivasailam	
Dusan Vuksan	
Melanie Wellman	
Paul DesJardin	COG/HSPPS
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Chinyere Uzoukwu	COG/HSPPS
Randy Carroll	MDE
Bill Orleans	PG ACT
Ian Beam	MDOT
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Harry Sanders	Action Committee for Transit
Greg McFarland	NVTC
Monica Backmon	PWC DOT
Unwanna Dabney	FHWA – VA Div.
Bob Owolabi	Fairfax County DOT
Greg McFarland	NVTC
Vicky Leonard Chambers	Office of Councilmember Harry Thomas, Jr.
Gregory W. Stardard	AAA Mid-Atlantic
Anthony Foster	PRTC
Jim Maslanka	City of Alexandria
George Schoener	I-95 Corridor Coalition
Jadeth Yopez	FHWA-VA
Yolanda Jordan	FHWA-VA

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Mr. Greenberg provided an endorsement for the approval of the amendment to the FY 2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to implement the second year of the Transportation Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program under Agenda Item 8. He said he believes the program has encouraged creative thinking in the region related to better serving regional goals through the integration of transportation investments and land use decisions. He said the program is small, and urged the TPB to provide more resources to the TLC Program. He commended the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) for providing additional resources to the TLC Program to better serve Virginia's localities. He also supported the formation of the TPB Scenario Study Task Force, which he hopes will work to align transportation planning and capital funding to further specific objectives related to transportation and land use, as is demonstrated in other regions across the country. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Chase of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance commented on the TPB Draft Participation Plan, noting that it is a good document that will meet federal requirements. He said that he believes it will make little difference because the fiscal, people, and information resources committed to its implementation will fall short of what is required for a region of five million people. He said the public does not need more information, but it desires results from officials elected to pursue the best solutions, which he said is not happening. He noted that the TPB has invested millions in the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Scenario Study, which has not included road and transit improvements that he says transportation professionals agree would generate the greatest return on the transportation dollar. He said federal, state, and regional officials need to achieve consensus on regional transportation priorities and implement regional funding to provide a transportation system that works. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Chair Hudgins thanked the speakers for their remarks.

2. Approval of Minutes of September 19 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the September 19, 2007 meeting of the TPB. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Mr. Harrington provided the TPB with a summary of the Technical Committee Meeting held on October 5, 2007. He directed the TPB to the meeting highlights and reported that the Committee reviewed the following items on the TPB Agenda:

-
- Item 7: The Committee was updated on the Draft Call for Projects and the accelerated schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2008 Financially Constrained Long- Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The Committee recommended that the TPB approve the Call for Projects document.
 - Item 8: The Committee was briefed on the draft evaluation of the Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Pilot Program and on a proposed amendment to the FY 2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to implement the second year of the program. The Committee recommended that the TPB approve the amendment.
 - Items 9 and 10: The Committee received a presentation from the I-95 Corridor Coalition and a presentation on the Texas Transportation Institute's 2007 Urban Mobility Report.
 - Item 11: The Committee reviewed an initial draft of the FY 2008-2013 TIP and was updated on the status of the air quality conformity analysis of the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP. The Committee was also briefed on a public meeting on the TIP to be held in conjunction with the CAC meeting on October 11.
 - Item 12: The Committee reviewed a draft memorandum of understanding (MOU) that identifies the responsibilities of TPB, state DOTs, and public transportation operators for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process. The Committee provided comments on the MOU, and some members that operate public transit systems said that the MOU would be reviewed by their legal staff.

Mr. Harrington said the Committee discussed several information items, including a draft letter to be sent to Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) regarding FAMPO's policies with respect to allocating FTA formula funds. He said some changes to the letter were proposed by Virginia jurisdiction members regarding the 2010 Census designation of the urbanized area. The Committee also discussed a request from the Regional Bus Subcommittee for a regional bus survey, which it is hoped could be conducted in Spring 2008. He said there will be a special meeting of the Committee on October 26 to discuss staff work to meet the federal requirements under SAFETEA-LU.

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Mr. Larsen, the Chairman of the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC), briefed the TPB on the October 11 CAC meeting. He said the meeting was shortened to one hour to accommodate the public forum on the draft FY2008-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He said the CAC received a briefing from TPB staff on the status of the pilot phase of the

Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program. He said the CAC has been supportive of the TLC Program, particularly with its ability to meet community planning goals envisioned by the TPB's Regional Mobility and Accessibility Scenario (RMAS) Study, and would like to see the TLC Program expanded in the future. He added that the CAC was pleased to learn that five additional Virginia projects would be funded through the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Multimodal Grant Program.

Mr. Larsen said the CAC discussed the TPB Scenario Study Task Force, which he said met for the first time prior to the TPB meeting. He said CAC members have been encouraged to attend the Task Force meetings. He said Mr. Kirby reported that the Task Force will review the CAC's recommendations on the RMAS Study, which were presented to the TPB in February 2007. He said the CAC expressed concern that the work of the Task Force not be solely focused on data analysis, but more on actions the TPB can take to promote elements of the RMAS Study. He added that the CAC wanted to be sure that the COG Board's Greater Washington 2050 initiative will be made aware of the TPB's scenario planning efforts.

Mr. Larsen said TPB staff briefed the CAC on additional outreach efforts related to the RMAS Study, including two meetings scheduled in the District of Columbia: a meeting on October 23 hosted by the DC Federation of Citizens Association at the Sumner School; and a meeting on October 29 hosted by the Ward 7 Advisory Neighborhood Commission Chairs at the Lutheran Church at Alabama and Branch Avenues. He added that the public comment period for the Draft TPB Participation Plan closes on October 29.

Mr. Larsen gave an overview of the public forum on the TIP. He said TPB staff provided presentations on the TIP development process and that representatives from DDOT, VDOT, MDOT, and WMATA described how projects are developed, prioritized, and funded within their agencies, as well as opportunities for the public to be involved in the project development process. He said participants had a number of questions. He said one participant asked if there was an effective process for engaging regional transportation priorities in the Washington region including strategies for the agencies to identify projects of regional significance. He said another participant commented that it is difficult for the average citizen to make connections between how the TIP relates to local plans and to the CLRP and suggested that staff should develop materials to show how the individual projects listed in the TIP fit into the wider regional context. He said the CAC plans to discuss their reactions to the public forum on the TIP at their next meeting.

Mr. Knapp thanked the CAC for their comments and said the TPB Scenario Study Task Force welcomes participation from CAC members. He also said that, as a member of the COG Board, one of the goals of the Greater Washington 2050 initiative is to build off the strengths of current COG work, including the TPB RMAS Study.

Chair Hudgins thanked Mr. Larsen for his comments.

5. Report of Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said that at its meeting on October 5, the Steering Committee reviewed the TPB agenda. He said the Committee approved two amendments to the FY 2007-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that are exempt from the Air Quality Conformity requirement. He said the first amendment, TPB SR2-2008, was requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) to add funding for the interchange project at Maryland Route 5, Maryland Route 373, and Brandywine Road. He said the second amendment, TPB SR3-2008, was requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to include initial funding for the I-66 Multimodal Study, add five new projects, and update funding for one project.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chair Hudgins reported that the transportation planning staff and TPB recently received an award from the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) at its national conference in Little Rock, Arkansas, for the TPB Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan for the National Capital Region. She said the Award of Excellence in Metropolitan Transportation Planning is a significant recognition. She acknowledged the hard work of TPB staff Beth Newman and Wendy Klancher, as well as the guidance of Mayor Kathy Porter, Chair of the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force.

Chair Hudgins announced that this meeting of the TPB would be Mayor Porter's last meeting. She said Mayor Porter has been active with the TPB for 15 years, representing well the City of Takoma Park, but also championing regional issues. She said Mayor Porter chaired the Green Space Advisory Committee, the Transportation Funding Summit at Union Station, the TEA-21 Reauthorization Task Force, the Access for All Advisory Committee, and the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force. She said Mayor Porter's leadership has made each of these endeavors a success. She asked Mayor Porter to step forward and allow the TPB to acknowledge her for her contributions with a framed photo collection that summarizes much of the work she has done at the TPB. Chair Hudgins said Mr. Snipper will be replacing Mayor Porter in representing Takoma Park on the TPB.

Mayor Porter thanked the TPB for their kind acknowledgement, noting that her years of service on the TPB have meant so much to her. She said she has seen the TPB evolve into a much more pro-active entity, taking positive steps toward improving transportation in the region. She said she had the honor to be part of the vision planning. She also thanked the TPB staff, noting the TPB takes much of the credit for all the hard work staff does. She said she has had the privilege of working with some excellent staff during her years of service with the TPB.

ACTION ITEMS

7. Approval of the Final Call for Projects Document for the 2008 Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Kirby said that the draft call for projects document is similar to years past and that the major change is in the schedule. He said staff is proposing an accelerated schedule for completion of the CLRP and TIP in 2008, with the goal of having the CLRP and TIP approved by July, in advance of the start of the federal fiscal year on October 1. He said this necessitates an initial deadline of January 4, 2008 for project submissions that will affect the conformity process. He noted that detailed project information could be submitted later on in the year.

Mr. Kirby said that the consensus on the Technical Committee had been that achieving this accelerated schedule would be very advantageous, recognizing that if necessary the schedule could be relaxed. He noted that there would be some significant new inputs, particularly from Northern Virginia.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority would not be meeting to hold a public hearing and adopt a program of new projects until January 10th, which would be six days after the January 4th deadline for the call for projects.

Mr. Kirby said that the critical date would be January 16th, when the TPB would release the inputs for public comment. He said that the Technical Committee had discussed the January 10th NVTA meeting and noted that it should not pose a problem for moving forward on January 16th.

Mr. Zimmerman said that perhaps the deadline listed in the call for projects document should be changed to January 16th or some other date, as he didn't want to go forward with a deadline he knows NVTA will miss because of its meeting schedule.

Mr. Kirby said that the hope was to get basic information on the projects that would affect the conformity process from the staff level by January 4th, but wait until after the January 10th NVTA meeting to put the material out to the TPB.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the deadline could just be moved to January 11th.

Mr. Kirby said that staff had hoped to get the information in time for the January 10th TPB mailout in advance of the January 16th TPB meeting, but that if the deadline needed to be January 11th to accommodate NVTA it could be changed.

Mr. Zimmerman moved to approve the final call for projects document for the 2008 CLRP and FY 2009-2014 TIP for distribution to state, regional, and local agencies, with the deadline given on page

9 amended to January 11, 2008. Ms. Smyth seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

Chair Hudgins noted that she had neglected to mention that Mr. Lovain had been appointed to replace Ms. Porter as chair of the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force.

Mr. Lovain thanked Chair Hudgins for the acknowledgement, and said he looked forward to working with the task force to best match the available money to the many human service transportation needs.

8. Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Implement the Second Year of the Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program

Mr. Kirby said that the TLC Program is included in the current version of the FY 2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) as a placeholder, noting that when the FY 2008 UPWP was approved in March 2007, the nature of the FY 2008 TLC Program was unclear. He asked Ms. Crawford to provide the TPB with a brief review of the evaluation of the pilot phase of the TLC program.

Ms. Crawford gave a PowerPoint presentation that provided an overview of the pilot phase of the TLC Program, the evaluation conducted with the participants of the pilot phase, and staff's recommendations for the FY 2008 TLC Program. She said TPB staff worked with consultants to develop and populate the TLC Regional Clearinghouse on national best practices and regional examples of projects that link transportation and land-use. She said five location-specific projects were completed in the pilot phase in the District of Columbia, Takoma Park and Langley Park, St. Charles Urbanized Area, Fairfax County, and Prince William County. She said a copy of the project information posted on the website was provided to the TPB for review. She said the region-wide public presentation on density issues will be presented to College Park and Takoma Park once completed.

Ms. Crawford summarized the feedback received from interviews with awardees, consultants, and agency stakeholders who participated in the pilot phase of the TLC Program. She said respondents agreed that the TLC Program provided an opportunity for convening internal and external agency partners who might not otherwise be involved in small, local projects, which resulted in better information sharing. She said that many respondents felt the products would have been stronger had more time and money been available. However, she also noted that respondents felt the short timeframe helped the projects stay focused. She said the respondents felt the TLC Program helped emphasize regional goals, and recommended the TPB encourage jurisdictions and agency stakeholders to work together in developing project applications in future rounds of the TLC Program. She said that virtually all respondents felt the TLC Program has regional benefits and highlights common local issues faced by the jurisdictions.

Ms. Crawford said the TPB is being asked to adopt Resolution R7-2008 to amend the FY 2008 UPWP based on staff recommendations for the FY 2008 TLC Program. She reviewed the language proposed in the amendment, noting that the TPB will fund at least six location-specific projects up to \$20,000; the TPB will provide staff support to projects funded through the VDOT Multimodal Grant Program; staff will maintain and update the TLC website and Regional Clearinghouse; and staff will refine the application procedures to reflect comments from the evaluation. She reviewed the TLC Program schedule for FY 2008, which includes administering the VDOT Grant for five Virginia jurisdictions, and noted that some of the projects were already underway. She added that these five VDOT projects are distinct from other projects funded directly to the jurisdictions under the VDOT Multimodal Grant Program, all of which were approved by the TPB in July in an amendment to the UPWP.

Ms. Crawford said the call for TLC projects for FY 2008 would be issued in November with a due date of January 15, 2008. She said staff would work with the TPB Officers on developing a recommended project list to be approved by the TPB in February. Projects will be completed by June 30, 2008.

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to adopt resolution R7-2008, which was seconded by Mayor Porter.

Mr. Knapp asked staff to comment on providing more funding for each project versus providing funding for more projects. He noted that the participants' comments seemed to reflect the desire for more funding per project. He asked if the TPB would have flexibility to provide more resources for a project, should an appropriate project arise.

Mr. Kirby said staff discussed this trade-off, and noted that there were pros and cons to the budget limit and time limit. He said the decision was made to recommend keeping the \$20,000 limit and do another project, rather than increasing the funding for each of the projects.

Mr. Knapp noted that the goal of the TLC Program was to identify projects that effectively tie land use policies and transportation improvements in hopes of establishing a better set of priorities for the Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP). He asked if there was a mechanism in place to track the TLC projects so that if larger funding needs arise as a result of these projects, they may merit moving up the project list in the CLRP because they address regional priorities.

Mr. Kirby said staff is planning to track these projects and monitor how they evolve over time.

Mr. Zimmerman echoed Mr. Knapp's concerns, and noted he worries about the trade-off between how many projects can be completed and how well each project can be completed, given the financial constraints and staffing demands. He asked for flexibility in project funding, and said his preference would be to increase the amount of resources devoted to the TLC Program, which he thinks will have long term benefits for the region. He said he supports the

amendment, but encourages staff to seek additional resources from the TPB in future years for the TLC Program.

Mr. Kirby said staff will begin developing the FY 2009 UPWP in the next three months, with approval by the TPB scheduled in March 2008. He said that the FY 2009 UPWP would provide an opportunity to increase funding for the TLC Program and reevaluate the funding level per project.

Chair Hudgins thanked staff for bringing options for the TLC Program to the TPB and noted that the TLC Program can promote region thinking while filling a gap at the local levels. She said the TPB thanks VDOT for providing additional funding to the TLC Program and she urges other agencies to do the same.

The motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

9. Briefing on I-95 Corridor Coalition Activities in the Washington Region Including the Mid-Atlantic Rail Operations (MAROps) Study

Mr. Schoener, referring to a PowerPoint presentation, briefed the TPB on activities of the I-95 Corridor Coalition, specifically activities and projects in the Washington Region. He explained how the Coalition is structured, its membership, and how it operates, and said that it has a broad, multimodal focus with an emphasis on long-distance travel. He noted that funding for the Coalition comes from the FHWA, and the Coalition has no direct investment or operating authority.

Mr. Schoener discussed rail freight issues in the Mid-Atlantic Region, and specifically the Mid-Atlantic Rail Operations (MAROps) study work, as well as future related work that has been proposed. He noted in particular the expected increases in freight traffic in the United States in the next several years, and said that the Coalition has been studying options for accommodating some of that growth with modes besides trucking, including rail. The MAROps study identified potential projects to upgrade the rail system and address critical choke points in anticipation of greater freight use, and said that the Coalition is trying to encourage cooperation among the public and private sectors to fund these improvements. He said that the Coalition had worked to identify the public benefits of this private infrastructure, in terms of air quality and congestion, and that Phase 2 of the MAROps study would explore this question further and look at the possibility of multi-state financing mechanisms or funding authorities.

Mr. Schoener also described a long-range vision study being undertaken by the Coalition, and said that it would be looking out to 2040 and 2050 to analyze the effects of future demographic, economic, land-use, and travel projections on the I-95 Corridor. He said this study would include a

baseline scenario and alternatives that would explore pricing options, technological applications, and aggressive multimodal investments. He said that this study would not be at the level of detail of the regional transportation modeling done by the TPB, but that the goal would be to take a broad, strategic look at the corridor and how the information might influence some of the activities the TPB will be carrying out through the CLRP.

Mr. Schoener noted that the I-95 Corridor recently received the “Corridor of the Future” designation from the U.S. Department of Transportation. He said that the Coalition has been doing a lot of work with real-time traffic information, bottleneck improvement financing, expedited incident clearance, and better integration of inter-city air, bus, rail, and local transit services in the I-95 Corridor. He said that the Coalition would have a better idea after a meeting next month with the Secretary of Transportation what kind of additional funding will be available from FHWA in support of these activities. He noted that the TPB is a member of the Coalition and he hoped the two entities could work closely together, especially in relation to the upcoming federal transportation reauthorization.

Mr. Lovain said he was glad that Mr. Schoener had mentioned short-sea shipping which could divert freight from highways. He said he thought the Coalition for America’s Gateways and Trade Corridors, with which the I-95 Coalition has had some contact, would be a vital forum for the development of federal freight strategy in the reauthorization process. He asked if, like some other corridors in the “Corridors of the Future” program, the I-95 Corridor had received any money for specific projects.

Mr. Schoener said that much of the funding announced for the I-95 Corridor in the “Corridors of the Future” program was going towards a separate proposal, supported by the I-95 Coalition, that focused on a multi-state approach to widening I-95 in the five southeastern states through which it passes. He said that subsequent dialogue with USDOT indicated that there will be some additional funding to support the activities he identified in his presentation, in particular real-time travel time information in the Coalition region.

Mr. Fellows asked if Mr. Schoener could describe in more detail the Coalition’s process for prioritizing needs, and in particular if there has been tension between advocates of highway and rail expansion.

Mr. Schoener said that the Coalition benefits from the broad representation present at meetings and the bottom-up nature of ideas. He noted that one of the Coalition’s program track committees focuses on intermodal issues and is made up of railroads, trucking interests, state DOTs and MPOs, and other interested parties, and said that the Coalition provides a good forum for discussion of ideas. He said that the MAROps study came out of this broad-based, multimodal process, and that while there are tensions between advocates of different modes, the dialogue has been about dealing with the challenges on a multimodal, multi-state basis. He said that the Coalition puts information out and the public and private entities can choose to do with it what they please. He noted that the MAROps study has been used by several states as well as railroad companies to identify project priorities.

Mr. Fellows asked if the project priorities represented the consensus of the various groups at the table.

Mr. Schoener said that they do in effect represent a consensus, but that the products of the Coalition have no binding authority. He said that they aren't intended to suggest, for example, to the Washington Region that all of these projects should be in the CLRP or TIP, but the information is out there for the TPB to consider. He said the Coalition tries to add a multi-state perspective to the process.

Mr. Fellows referred to the Camden Line between Baltimore and Washington, and the lack of mid-day MARC commuter rail trips on the line because of the priority of the CSX freight service. He asked if that came up in discussions and if there is a clear way to resolve the issue.

Mr. Schoener said that the regional commuter railroad operators were not directly engaged in the development of the original MAROps study, but for the second phase of the study the Coalition planned to reach out and get the involvement of those operators.

Mr. Fellows said it is important to involve the commuter railroads in the discussion.

Ms. Winter asked if the Coalition was looking at adding rail lines or upgrading existing lines.

Mr. Schoener said that the MAROps study involved both strategies, including rehabbing existing lines and addressing choke points through additional rail lines. He cited as an example of possible improvements to existing lines the suggestion to raise the clearance height in the Virginia Avenue Tunnel in the District of Columbia to allow for double-stacked container traffic.

Ms. Winter asked if the rails could handle the weight of double-stacked freight cars given their age.

Mr. Schoener said that the rails could handle the additional weight.

Ms. Winter thanked Mr. Schoener for his presentation and for representing a big-picture, outside-the-box perspective.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that in the diagram provided in the MAROps study of projects identified along the I-95 corridor, about 15 of the projects are between Baltimore and Richmond. He asked if the individual projects could be made into a comprehensive program of all the improvements necessary to make the corridor function as desired, how much it would cost, and how it could be phased in year by year. He also asked if the idea had been discussed of charging fees on freight travel to fund improvements to the rail corridor.

Mr. Schoener said that in fact the improvements to a rail bridge in Delaware had been funded by fees on the rail carriers, essentially as a toll bridge with the revenues coming back to the State of

Delaware to pay for the improvements that were made. He said that Phase 2 of the study would explore more options like that for financing improvements to the corridor.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the key to obtaining support for the effort, including federal funding for corridor improvements, is to turn the state-by-state and project-by-project basis into a comprehensive program with a defined end date. He said he is interested in how the TPB, as a member of the I-95 Coalition, can be involved in moving forward a comprehensive program and assist in whatever legislation is necessary to make it happen.

Chair Hudgins thanked Mr. Schoener for the presentation and said it had provided more information about a larger context around transportation planning in the region.

10. Review of Texas Transportation Institute's (TTI) 2007 Urban Mobility Report

Mr. Kirby reviewed a memorandum on TTI's 2007 Urban Mobility Report that was included in the mailout materials, and provided a PowerPoint presentation summarizing the Report. He said the Report, which was first developed in 1982, is updated annually. He said the data in this report depict that congestion continues to worsen in American cities of all sizes and corresponds to a \$78 billion drain on the U.S. economy. He said the key data source is the National Highway Performance Monitoring System, a federal database to which state DOTs are required to report regularly on a number of characteristics

Mr. Kirby said the primary measure that TTI used for its ranking in the 2007 report is "travel delay per person," which is the sum of the recurring delay due to congestion that occurs on a regular basis, and non-recurring delay, which occurs from incidents. He said that TTI does not have data on the delays resulting from incidents in this region, and that instead it uses general formulas to come up with some of those numbers. He added that TTI previously used different indices to rank congestion across the country, and noted that sometimes the changes in the rankings are due more to changes in the methodology than conditions on the ground. He said that TTI has changed certain factors in the 2007 report, including the speed estimate used for congested conditions.

Mr. Kirby commented on some limitations of the Report. He said TTI measures average conditions across an entire metropolitan region. He said TTI does not have any facility, direction, time, or location-specific information on individual regions, meaning they cannot provide information about a specific corridor. He said the TPB has data on specific transportation facilities through the congestion freeway monitoring program, which uses aerial photography collected every three years, and arterial monitoring using GPS systems. He said that all data collected through these methods will factor into the TPB's congestion management process, which will rank locations on the freeway system according to severity of congestion. He said the TPB will look at how these locations are being addressed as part of the long-range plan update.

Mr. Kirby said the primary value of the TTI Report is that it documents that congestion is worse in urban areas of all sizes. He noted that the report says, "Please do not place too much emphasis on small differences in the rankings." He said the national trend suggests congestion has much to do with national policies and how the policies are reflected on the state and local levels. He noted however, that it is necessary to recognize that the TTI ranking for the Washington region has been moving upwards over the years towards the highest rankings for congestion in the country. He then reviewed several ranking factors for the Washington region since 1982.

Mr. Kirby commented on some of the implications to the nation resulting from increased congestion, including that the traditional federal and state funding sources have not kept pace with capacity needs. He said the reauthorization of the federal transportation legislation is due October 1, 2009 for the six-year period 2010-2015. He suggested the TPB engage in a discussion about regional transportation issues relating to the reauthorization, specifically focusing on two reports currently being prepared by commissions tasked by Congress with reevaluating transportation funding: the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission, which is charged with completing a comprehensive study of the National Surface Transportation System and the Highway Trust Fund; and the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission, which is focused more narrowly on analyzing future highway and transit needs in making recommendations regarding alternative approaches to financing transportation infrastructure. He said the Policy and Revenue Study Commission is expected to release its report in December 2007 and the Infrastructure Financing Commission is expected to release its draft report in December 2007 and its final report in early 2008.

Mr. Kirby suggested the TPB establish a task force to review the reports and develop a policy brochure on the reauthorization. He said one of his colleagues from the San Francisco metropolitan area serves on the Policy and Revenue Study Commission and recently informed the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) that the final report is likely to have recommendations on a major restructuring of the federal program, including reducing the number of earmarks in the legislation.

Mr. Lovain commented that he worried about the intentions of the Infrastructure Financing Commission, noting it might place greater emphasis on private investment in transportation and congestion tolling. He said that the first commission Mr. Kirby mentioned should provide a more interesting report.

11. Status Report on the draft 2007 CLRP, FY 2008-2013 TIP and Air Quality Conformity Assessment

Mr. Kirby noted that a schedule of milestones in the CLRP and TIP preparation process was included in the TPB mailout packet. He said that a citizen forum on the TIP was held on October 11th, following a special meeting of the Technical Committee on October 6th to put together the

details of the TIP and CLRP. He said that staff hoped to have a complete draft for review by the Technical Committee on November 2nd, and review by the TPB on November 14th. He said that November 14th would also mark the beginning of the public comment period, which would end December 15th. The CLRP and TIP would then come before the TPB for approval on December 19th. He said that much work remains to be done by TPB staff and staff from local and state agencies and WMATA to complete the CLRP and TIP, but for now things are on schedule.

12. Review of Draft Agreement Between the TPB, the State DOTs and the Public Transportation Operators on Metropolitan Transportation Planning Responsibilities in the Washington Region

Mr. Miller said that the draft agreement was prepared in response to a federal planning regulation that requires that the MPO, the states, and the public transportation operators have a written agreement that identifies the responsibilities of the various agencies for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process. Mr. Miller said he had consulted with the staffs of the DOTs and WMATA to prepare the draft agreement, and that versions of it had been presented to the Technical Committee and Regional Bus Subcommittee over the last two months.

Mr. Miller said that the eleven articles in the agreement describe the current planning roles and responsibilities of the DOTs, transit operators, and the TPB, and try to tie them to the specific new requirements as they have been codified in the federal planning regulations. He said that in his opinion, the agreement does not really impose any new roles or responsibilities but just relates the existing ones to the federal planning regulations. He said the DOTs and the transit operators are reviewing the draft agreement and the TPB would be briefed on these reviews at its November 14th meeting. Assuming that all the agencies are prepared to execute the agreement, the TPB would be asked at its December 19th meeting to authorize the chair to sign it.

Mr. Weissberg asked for more detail on the specific requirement and if a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is the only instrument for fulfilling that requirement.

Mr. Miller said that the regulations provided no more detail on the nature of the requirement other than the statement that he had quoted at the beginning of his presentation.

Mr. Kirby said that alternatives to an MOU were considered by staff, but the regulation specifically requires an agreement that is signed by all the agencies. He said that requiring everyone's signature makes it difficult, because it raises questions about who exactly should sign the document and what its implications are, and answering these questions often entails legal review.

13. Other Business

There was no other business.

14. Adjourn

Chair Hudgins adjourned the meeting at 1:52 p.m.