

**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  
May 18, 2011**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County  
Melissa Barlow, FTA  
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County  
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA  
Muriel Bowser, DC Council  
Colleen Clay, City of Takoma Park  
Barbara Comstock, Virginia House of Delegates  
Lyn Erickson, MDOT  
Jennie Forehand, Maryland Senate  
Tawanna Gaines, Maryland House of Delegates  
Edgar Gonzalez, Montgomery County Exec.  
Jason Groth, Charles County  
Rene'e Hamilton, VDOT  
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax Board of Supervisors  
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County  
Julia Koster, NCPC  
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick  
Phil Mendelson, DC Council  
Colleen Mitchell, DC Office of Planning  
Garrett Moore, VDOT  
Eric Olson, Prince George's County  
Glenn Orlin, Montgomery County  
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT  
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt  
Paul Smith, Frederick County  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
David Snyder, City of Falls Church  
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT  
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate  
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie  
Jonathan Way, Manassas City  
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County

---

Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park  
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby  
Gerald Miller  
Andrew Meese  
Andrew Austin  
John Swanson  
Michael Farrell  
Wendy Klancher  
Debbie Leigh  
Deborah Etheridge  
Rex Hodgson  
Deb Kerson Bilek  
Sarah Crawford  
Huijing Quiang  
Charlene Howard  
Daivamani Sivasailam  
Ron Milone  
Dave Robertson      COG.EO  
Paul DesJardin      COG/DCPS  
Sunil Kumar      COG/DEP  
Steve Kania      COG/OPA  
Lewis Miller      COG/OPA  
Zach Dobelbower      TPB/CAC  
Mark Kellogg      TPB/Tech Committee Chair  
Alex Verzosa      City of Fairfax  
Bill Orleans      Citizen  
Judi Gold      CM Bowser's Office  
Art Smith      Arlington  
Bob Owolabi      Fairfax County DOT  
Randy Carroll      MDE  
Jim Maslanka      Alexandria  
Anthony Foster      PRTC  
Steve McCoy      CAC/DC  
Michael Sharman  
Matthew Moskitis      NVT  
Andrew Wexler      University of Maryland  
Keith Haller      Potomac Inc; Purple Line  
Tyson Byrne      MDOT  
Harry Kay      Maryland Transit/MDOT  
Vaughn Lewis      Maryland SHA  
Ivan Rucker      FHWA - Virginia

---

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

There were no public comments.

## **2. Approval of Minutes of March 16 Meeting**

Vice Chair Turner made a motion to approve the minutes of the April 20 TPB meeting. Ms. Smyth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously

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

Mr. Kellogg said the Technical Committee discussed three items on the TPB agenda: the certification review of the regional transportation planning process, the draft scope and process to develop a regional priorities plan, and the proposed amendments to update the projects and funding in the Virginia section of the FY 2011-2016 TIP. He said the committee also addressed five information items: the implications of the FY 2011 U.S. DOT budget on TPB activities, Metro's Regional Transit System Plan, bus priority treatment guidelines, the status of the Version 2.3 travel demand model, and the bike share marketing brochures.

Related to the bike share marketing materials, Chair Bowser asked staff to provide information about possible expansion of the bike share network.

Mr. Kirby said the expansion effort was suggested by Mr. Erenrich, with the notion that staff would develop basic parameters of the bike sharing program to present to developers and business owners who might be interested in contributing to expanding the program in their locations, in some cases to help meet traffic management plan obligations set by local jurisdictions. He added that the premise of the concept is to build on the existing system with private funding.

Chair Bowser asked staff to keep the TPB informed. She said she is pleased that Montgomery County has shown interest in expansion of the system due to its proximity to the District.

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

Mr. Dobelbower said the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) discussed two items at its meeting on May 12. He said the CAC heard a presentation on public involvement activities at the Denver Regional Council of Governments in order to learn about the options for public outreach in the upcoming priorities planning process. He said the CAC also discussed the potential development of a regional Complete Streets policy and will develop a recommendation on this subject at its June meeting.

Mr. Dobelbower also presented a list of questions and comments on the priority plan scoping

---

process developed by the CAC, which is an attachment to the CAC report. He said the CAC believes that adding clarity to the document will only strengthen the process moving forward. He said specifically that the CAC would like to ensure public involvement is included at each stage of the process, and the CAC encourages the TPB to develop staff capacity and seek external professional support to conduct a multifaceted public involvement and strategy.

Chair Bowser asked what the CAC expects in terms of feedback regarding moving forward on the scope.

Mr. Dobelbower said the CAC merely wanted to present the questions and comments on the priorities plan scoping process for the record.

Chair Bowser said the TPB will ensure that there is some comparison between the comments made by the CAC and the document prepared for TPB review.

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

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on May 6 and approved two resolutions to amend the FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He reviewed the letters packet which was distributed at the meeting, and highlighted several items. He mentioned two recent TPB events: the April 27 Regional Freight Forum and the May 12 dedication of the District's wheelchair-accessible taxi program, rollDC. He said the TPB received a letter from David Robertson, COG's Executive Director, regarding the TPB's request for greater involvement in COG's Regional Major Incident Response Action Plan. He said the COG Board decided to keep the committee small and not add additional membership at this time.

## **6. Chair's Remarks**

Chair Bowser acknowledged the rollDC event and dedication of the District's first accessible tax program. She thanked Mr. Kirby and his staff, Wendy Klancher and Beth Newman, for seeing this program to fruition. She also acknowledged Tim Lovain, former chair of the Human Services Task Force for making sure the New Freedom funds were put to good use. She noted Bike to Work Day is May 20 and said she would be participating in a convoy riding from Ward 4 to Freedom Plaza. She said she recently became a member of Capital Bikeshare. She encouraged all commuters to be safe on Bike to Work Day and reminded automobile users to share the road.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **7. Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that is Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Add Funding for the I-95/Contee Road Project**

---

Ms. Erickson said the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) has requested a TIP amendment to add the I-95/Contee Road interchange project to the FY 2011-2016 TIP, as funding is now available for the project through a nontraditional method resulting from the execution of a three-party agreement between MDOT, Prince George's County, and the Konterra developer. She said the amendment will add \$7.1 million for right-of-way and \$43 million for construction, using a combination of National Highway System and Interstate Maintenance Highway funding. She said the parties agreed to construct a set of highway improvements to facilitate access from I-95 and the Intercounty Connector (ICC) to enable plan development in the area to move forward, in exchange for Konterra's donation of the land needed for both the ICC and related highway improvements.

Ms. Erickson made a motion to adopt resolution R17-2011. Mr. Turner seconded the motion.

Mr. Roberts said he understands the desire to encourage economic development on the Konterra site, but that his problem with the situation is that the proposed 2,000 acre development will be devoid of any public transportation, particularly a rail component. He said this development would increase the existing traffic problem on I-95. He said he wonders why the state, county, and developer are contemplating a large development with only road and highway access. He questioned why the money is not going to rail and other transit improvements. He asked for clarification on the use of Highway Maintenance funds when the project would not involved maintenance. He said he would not support the amendment.

Ms. Erickson said the specific agreement related to the way the ICC and I-95 connect has been in the works for a while and that the development has been planned for a long time. She said this stream of federal funding is specific to certain methods of construction, noting that it is only able to be used for highways and is not eligible to be used on transit.

Mr. Weissberg said the County sees the Konterra project as a vital economic development in the County, noting that it was an integral part of the County's support for the ICC. He said the parcel has been part of the County plans for decades and that the road connections are integral. He said the County is working with the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) to look at possible transit connections as part of the ICC bus service that will be provided through Phase II of the plan.

Mr. Roberts said that just because a project has been in the plan for a long time does not mean a body should approve a bad idea, adding that projects that rely only on roads are a bad idea today and should be reconsidered. He said that the citizens of Greenbelt have less service now than a year ago due to bus service cuts, so he is not optimistic about bus service provision. He said that if this is to be a good project, it needs to move beyond the highway mentality and become something different so that it will benefit the people that live around it.

Chair Bowser asked for clarification on the funding, specifically related to the interstate maintenance funding and if these funds are only able to be used for roads.

Ms. Erickson said that is correct.

---

Chair Bowser asked Mr. Weissberg to confirm if bus service is already planned or only being contemplated.

Mr. Weissberg said the transit is in development with MTA.

Ms. Erickson clarified that the transit component will occur in connection with the ICC. She said Phase I is already planned out and that MTA is still working on the details for Phase II, and that both are funded through the ICC project.

Mr. Wojahn said the bus lines will address the traffic going east to west, but that the traffic on the north/south corridor is still a large concern for that area of Route 1. He asked if there is a plan to address the level of traffic on Route 1 related to the impact of the Konterra project.

Ms. Erickson said there are no plans that she is aware of. She said the approval on the table will allow for MDOT to begin the design/build aspect of the project and that there is a lot of work left to be done. She said that the Maryland State Highway Administration will work with the County to analyze the implications of the traffic anticipated from the development.

Mr. Weissberg added that the County will push aggressively for traffic mitigation and additional transit services.

Ms. Clay asked for additional clarification on the usage of the Highway Maintenance funds for new highway constructions, rather than repairing some of the roadways currently in disrepair. She said she could not support spending state maintenance funds on new construction when the lack of maintenance on roads cost residents money on car repairs.

Ms. Erickson said the Interstate Maintenance funding is for a roadway classification (interstates) and cannot be spent on non-interstate roadways. She said the funding for this project was tied to the finalization of the three-party agreement and is specific to this project. She added that MDOT is choosing to use National Highway System and Interstate Maintenance funds, but that it could have chosen funds from other sources to fulfill the funding for the project. She said the funding cannot be spent anywhere else.

Mr. Weissberg added that the funding is allocated based on a specified formula and limited to Prince George's County.

Ms. Mitchell asked if the development is in one of the region's activity centers.

Mr. Weissberg said it is a Prince George's County activity center and that he believes it is also in an activity center identified by COG.

Vice Chair Turner noted that this project was a priority for Prince George's County. He said he appreciates the comments regarding transit and the potential impact to surrounding communities from additional traffic. He said he believes there is still discussion with the developer about

---

additional mitigation efforts. He said the agreement represents a unique public-private opportunity to move forward with this project. He said he believes additional concerns may still be addressed.

Mr. Olson said he shared Mr. Roberts concerns, and like Mr. Roberts, has fought for many years against the ICC. He said the Konterra development still must be approved by the Council in Prince George's County and that it will review the transit component.

Chair Bowser called for the vote. The motion was approved with Mr. Roberts voting no.

### **8. Approval of an Amendment to the 2010 Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) to Revise the Financial Plan for the Purple Line**

Ms. Erickson said MDOT is requesting an amendment to the CLRP to update the project costs for the Purple Line Transit Project, a 16.3 mile light rail facility that connects Bethesda in Montgomery County to New Carrollton in Prince George's County. She said the cost of the project is now anticipated to be \$1.925 billion, which means there is a \$135 million difference from the current costs in the CLRP. She said the different is due to several factors: a two year project extension caused an increase of \$104 million due to cost escalation; some refinements to the project scope elements caused an increase of \$13 million; and the use of a more conservative cost escalation rate resulted in an increase of \$18 million. She said MDOT is proposing no net change in the total amount of funding it has identified in the financial plan. She said the additional funding for the Purple Line would come out of \$679 million that was identified as a placeholder for MARC improvements, thus leaving \$544 million to fund MARC Growth and Investment Plan projects in the future.

Ms. Erickson made a motion to adopt resolution R18-2011, which was seconded by Mr. Olson.

Mr. Orlin said the Montgomery County Council unanimously supports the Purple Line. He said that it, along with the Corridor Cities Transitway, represent the top two priorities for the County. He reiterated that 90 percent of the funding increase is due to the fact that the project will open two years later than previously anticipated.

Mr. Olson echoed Mr. Orlin's sentiments and said that the Prince George's County Council also unanimously supports the project and that it is the County's top transit priority. He said it helps address the issue of the region divided, as well as connecting County job centers. He said part of the study that preceded the project showed that the Purple Line will provide a significant economic return in jobs by connecting these jobs centers.

Mr. Zimmerman commended his Maryland colleagues for moving ahead with a vital transportation project that will not only benefit Maryland communities, but also the entire region.

Chair Bowser agreed with Mr. Zimmerman and said the DC Council has been following the progress on the Purple Line project and is happy to see it proceeding.

---

Chair Bowser called for the vote. The motion passed unanimously.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **9. Briefing on the Transportation Planning Certification Review of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process for the Washington, DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area**

Ms. Barlow of FTA introduced herself, and said that she would make the presentation on behalf of Mr. Lawson of FHWA, who was unable to attend the meeting. She also recognized Mr. Rucker, from the FHWA Virginia Division. Referring to a PowerPoint presentation, she provided a summary of the Federal Certification Review process, including the timeline of the review and the organization of the review as a two-pronged effort that involved both the TPB and the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO). She explained that the review, which was jointly conducted by FTA and FHWA, included visits with TPB staff, attendance at a Citizens Advisory Committee meeting, and dialogue about travel demand modeling with TPB staff, as well as a separate site visit to FAMPO.

She summarized the highlights of the review, stating that the TPB staff is a stellar group that works hard to put forth efforts that support the decisions of the TPB. She provided an overview of the commendations of the TPB, which were in the following areas: TIP, air quality conformity, congestion management process, outreach/public participation, freight and goods movement, travel demand forecasting and models development, and land use integration and livability. She listed the recommendations of the review, which include areas relating to the 2004 planning agreement signed between TPB and FAMPO, self-certification, TIP, financial planning/fiscal constraint, outreach/public participation, and Title VI and environmental justice. She provided highlights of the review of FAMPO, including commendations on FAMPO's long range plan, TIP, congestion management process, and outreach/public participation. She also provided an overview of the recommendations for FAMPO, citing that FAMPO needs to update its public participation plan and establish procedural guidance for verifying the process and implementation of self-certifications.

She added that the certification review found four corrective actions for FAMPO relating to its TIP, and to Title VI and environmental justice. She said that the joint FTA/FHWA finding of the review is that the transportation planning process for the Washington DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area conducted by TPB and FAMPO is certified, but with conditions relating to the aforementioned corrective actions. She said that full certification is expected within 18 months, and that FHWA and FTA will follow up on a regular basis to ensure that concerns are addressed within the established timeframes.

Chair Bowser thanked Ms. Barlow, and asked Mr. Kirby to make a comment about the review.

Mr. Kirby expressed appreciation to the federal team for their extensive work on the review. He



---

said that some actions will require follow-up, and that TPB staff will move forward on the recommendations from the review and will address them in an amendment to the FY2012 UPWP. He said that FAMPO has some significant issues that need to be addressed, and that TPB staff has been working with FAMPO staff to provide assistance in complying with requirements. He mentioned that FAMPO staff has been working cooperatively with TPB staff, and has been receptive to getting the issues addressed quickly.

Mr. Snyder thanked the federal team for their time and effort. He said that the commendations in the report stressed many positive elements of core areas of the TPB process, and said that the recommendations in the report provide some good ideas for enhancements.

Mr. Way expressed concern that some recommendations would result in increased involvement in the TIP by TPB in state and local decision-making.

Chair Bowser summarized Mr. Way's general concern that the recommendations may pose more administrative directives from the federal government by way of TPB to local jurisdictions. She asked Ms. Barlow to comment.

Ms. Barlow clarified that the recommendations are not dissimilar from what occurs currently. She said that the recommendations provide guidance for strengthening ways for the public to understand what occurs at the local level, rather than require the TPB to take additional responsibilities.

Ms. Erickson added that, as a result of some of the review's recommendations, MDOT has worked to try to be more transparent in providing information. She referred to the earlier MDOT TIP amendment as an example.

Chair Bowser noted that the presentation separated the TPB recommendations from the FAMPO recommendations. She asked for clarification as to whether both MPOs must submit responses to these recommendations before the certification could be complete.

Ms. Barlow said that because the more significant recommendations rest with FAMPO, FAMPO would have to complete the recommendations and implement the corrective actions before full certification can be granted to the TPB and to FAMPO.

Mr. Kirby said that TPB would have to work closely with FAMPO, in part because the 2004 agreement states that FAMPO will be responsible for carrying out certain planning requirements within their portion of the transportation management area. He said that as a result of this agreement, the TPB is tied to FAMPO, and that TPB staff will pay more attention to this relationship in the future.

Chair Bowser thanked Ms. Barlow. She stated that she was very pleased that the balance of the report is positive and exhibits some innovative things that the TPB and TPB staff are doing.

---

## 10. Report of the TPB Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force

Chair Bowser asked Vice Chairman Turner, who chaired the TPB Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force, to introduce this item.

Vice Chair Turner explained that the TPB formed the task force as follow-up to the event last May called the Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities. He said the task force met four times over eight months, and held its last meeting in April. He said that the draft priorities plan scope that staff had developed, with the task force's input, offered a new direction for the regional planning process, which he said would be consistent with many of the signals that the federal agencies were sending. He said he hoped that the task force members who initially had reservations about priorities planning would be comfortable with this approach. He noted that the draft scope recognized the continued role of local and state decision-making and also sought to integrate key concerns, such as the east-west divide and WMATA funding, which were raised by task force members. He thanked the CAC for pushing this effort and he thanked staff for their work in pulling together the draft scope.

Mr. Kirby thanked Vice Chairman Turner for chairing the scoping task force. Referring to the draft scope document and a PowerPoint presentation, he described the process for developing a regional transportation priorities plan, which will last approximately two years. He said the purpose of the priorities plan would be identify some 10 to 15 regional priorities, above and beyond the CLRP, that the TPB and the region can get behind. These priorities will provide a source of specific program and project options when discretionary opportunities come along in the future. He said the program will include both long-range and immediate priorities that address regional goals and performance measures. He explained that the work scope was structured into three major tasks, which he described in detail.

Referring to a handout memorandum, Mr. Kirby described a nationwide grant opportunity from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for \$61 million in funding through the Transportation Community and System Preservation (TCSP) program. He said that grant applications would be due on June 3 and therefore he was seeking TPB support for a draft grant concept, as described in his memorandum, which would be used to develop an inventory of small-scale, pedestrian and bicycle capital projects near rail stations. He said this TCSP concept could also be linked to a future application for the next round of TIGER funding, which is expected to be announced this summer.

Mr. Snyder spoke in support of submitting a TCSP grant application. Regarding the priorities plan scope, he agreed with the focus on choice and safety. He also said it was important to maximize system effectiveness through management and operations.

Mr. Weissberg said that his jurisdiction was considering submitting its own TCSP application. He said that programs like TCSP provided the opportunity to meet a number of regional goals, including environmental improvements and congestion relief. In particular, he said such efforts should be used to address imbalances between the eastern and western sides of the region. He said one way to address this issue would be to encourage transit-oriented development near

---

Metro stations on the eastern side of the region.

Mr. Kirby agreed that there are significant opportunities near Metrorail stations on the eastern side of the region. He emphasized that there could be a big payoff in efficiency by using rail capacity that is already in place.

Ms. Koster commended Mr. Turner and Mr. Kirby for corralling a very vibrant discussion during the whole process. She said there is significant opportunity for the TPB to think about how the region can come together to discuss our transportation priorities. She said it is very critical for the TPB to think about the specific methods that it will use to come together and discuss what is a priority. She said she hoped that as this initiative moves forward, the TPB can identify in more detail how that dialogue will happen and how that will then be integrated with the broader public, as the CAC has called for.

Ms. Comstock asked if Mr. Kirby had details regarding demographics and location for the information on bicycle and pedestrian fatalities.

Mr. Kirby said there has been an overall drop in traffic fatalities for people in vehicles, but not bicyclists or pedestrians. He said that pedestrian and bicycle fatalities have been more prevalent in some places than in others, and that fatality data is available by jurisdiction and even by intersection.

Chair Bowser asked if Mr. Kirby was seeking an endorsement from the Board to submit an application for the TCSP grant, which was due on June 3.

Mr. Kirby said he was seeking such an endorsement to pursue this opportunity.

Chair Bowser said she had heard no disagreement from the Board, so without objection she said that staff should submit the application.

Chair Bowser thanked Vice Chair Turner and the members of the task force, as well as staff, for pulling the draft scope together. She said she would like to see the schedule be more aggressive, but she suggested the timeline could be discussed at the next TPB meeting.

## **11. Briefing on Regional Priorities for Bus Services**

Ms. Hershorn, Chair of the TPB Regional Bus Subcommittee, gave a presentation on the 2011 regional priorities for bus services. She said that in 2008, the Regional Bus Subcommittee developed a list of projects that was concentrated in three areas: improving bottlenecks and making running way improvements; making capacity improvements at major bus stops; and treating common regional needs. She said that a lot had been accomplished in spite of financial constraints, such as adding new Metrobus limited stop express services and opening the Shirlington Transit Center, and that the 2008 list had provided the impetus for the successful TIGER grant application. She said that the list of projects was being updated for 2011, and that

---

good contributions had been received from bus operators from across the region. She said that the subcommittee had identified eight major themes that meet regional needs, and she described all eight by referring to the PowerPoint presentation. She pointed out that an accompanying memo of the presentation had been included in the TPB mail-out, and she invited Mr. Kirby to add some further commentary regarding regional priorities for bus services.

Referring to one of the PowerPoint slides, Mr. Kirby outlined the Regional Bus Subcommittee's proposed schedule and summary of bus-related activities, and expressed his hope that these would respond to questions by Mr. Zimmerman at previous TPB meetings. He said the chart covered three fiscal years, beginning in 2009 and continuing through to 2012. He said that the most significant activity was in the technical assistance accounts for WMATA, DDOT, MDOT and VDOT, which together represent thirteen percent of the TPB's total work program. He said that each agency normally uses these accounts for purposes that are particular to their jurisdictions, but that in FY2012, a planned study of multimodal coordination for bus priority hotspots would involve a joint pooled effort. Drawing a comparison with the TIGER grant that Ms. Hershorn had mentioned, Mr. Kirby noted that this work was bringing together the highway planners and the transit planners, because both parties must be involved to make these bus projects effective. He said that this represented a significant change in focus.

Chair Bowser asked if any of the members had any questions.

Mr. Zimmerman asked Mr. Kirby for clarification concerning the list of regional projects that he had requested at previous meetings, explaining that he could not see it in the documents.

Mr. Kirby replied that Ms. Hershorn's presentation had referenced the set of priority bus projects from the Regional Bus Subcommittee, adding that her presentation highlighted major themes rather than specific projects.

Mr. Zimmerman said that his understanding had been that the presentation would include a list of regional projects this month, to be followed by a guidance document next month.

Mr. Kirby replied that the guidance document that has been prepared is directed more at engineers involved in bus prioritization, and asked Ms. Hershorn if she wished to elaborate on the matter.

Ms. Hershorn stated that the priority projects were those that individual bus operators had identified to accommodate their growth needs, respond to bottlenecks, and so forth.

Mr. Zimmerman asked where the list of those projects could be found.

Ms. Hershorn responded that it could be found in various places including the presentation and memo.

Mr. Zimmerman said he could not see such a list in the memo, and asked if he was missing something.

---

Ms. Hershorn replied that this was the information submitted by each bus company, and she said she would be happy to provide the original submissions if Mr. Zimmerman thought that would be helpful.

Mr. Zimmerman asked Ms. Hershorn to clarify her use of the word “this” in her previous statement.

Ms. Hershorn said she was talking about slide number four of the PowerPoint presentation, on page ten, which provided information concerning a central storage location layover place in the downtown area.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if this was a priority for D.C.

Ms. Hershorn replied that this proposal had not been submitted by D.C., and had in fact come from the suburban bus operators to respond to their service scheduling needs.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for confirmation that the information on this and subsequent slides was intended to fulfill the commitment to providing a list of regional projects.

Ms. Hershorn confirmed that this was the case.

Addressing Mr. Kirby, Mr. Zimmerman said he believed the information contained on the slides was a good start, but that an official TPB project list should be developed at some point. He also asked whether the guidance document would be presented to the TPB in June.

Mr. Kirby responded that the guidance document on priority bus treatments was complete and that a final report had been produced that could be brought to the TPB if a place could be found on the agenda. He said the draft agenda for June was very full, but that it might be possible to shoehorn it in there.

Mr. Zimmerman said he just wanted to make sure that it was not forgotten about, and he thanked Mr. Kirby for all of the work that had been done.

Chair Bowser thanked Mr. Zimmerman, adding that his concern was noted and that an attempt would be made to get the guidance document on the agenda.

## **12. Briefing on Draft Research Report for the WMATA Governance Work Group (GWG)**

Chair Bowser asked Mr. Kirby for the timeframe for submitting the WMATA governance research to Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

Mr. Kirby replied that the final version would be submitted at the end of June. He said that a PowerPoint presentation on the draft research report was ready to be given, but that there was not

---

time to give it as earlier agenda items had run long. He said that copies of the report and the presentation were available for any members who were interested in having them, and that the research was primarily factual information concerning the governance practices of thirteen peer transit agencies.

Chair Bowser invited members to take copies of the documents and said a short timeframe would be allotted at the next meeting, prior to the final submission of the research.

### **13. Notice of Proposed Amendment to Update Projects and Funding in the Virginia Section of the FY 2011-2016 TIP**

Chair Bowser requested members to look at the materials relating to this agenda item.

### **14. Other Business**

There was no other business brought before the TPB.

### **15. Adjourn**

Chair Bowser adjourned the meeting at 2:07 pm.