

**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 19, 2010**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County  
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County  
Kerry Donley, City of Alexandria  
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT  
Lyn Erickson, MDOT  
Jason Groth, Charles County  
Don Halligan, MDOT  
Tom Harrington, WMATA  
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County  
Julia Koster, NCPC  
Christopher Lawson, FHWA  
Michael C. May, Prince William County  
Mark Rawlings, DDOT  
Karina Ricks, DDOT  
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt  
Morteza Salehi, VDOT  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park  
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT  
David Snyder, City of Falls Church  
John Thomas, Frederick County  
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning  
Todd Turner, City of Bowie  
Jonathan Way, Manassas City  
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County  
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force  
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park  
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

---

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby  
Michael Clifford  
Gerald Miller  
Andrew Meese  
Robert Griffiths  
Ron Milone  
Mark Moran  
Tim Canan  
John Swanson  
Jane Posey  
Andrew Austin  
Wendy Klancher  
Jane Posey  
Debbie Leigh  
Deborah Etheridge  
Michael Farrell  
Darren Smith  
Rex Hodgson  
Sarah Crawford  
Robert Snead  
Wenjing Pu  
Jim Yin  
Karin Foster  
Dave Robertson      COG/EO  
Randy Carroll      MDE  
Bill Orleans      Citizen  
Maureen Budetti      TPB/CAC Chair  
Tom Biesiadny      Fairfax County DOT  
Dan Malouff      Arlington DOT  
Jodi Gold      CM Muriel Bowser  
Lon Anderson      AAA  
Kiman Choi      Maryland Dept. of Planning  
Greg McFarland      NVT  
Alyssa Brown      Prince William BOCS  
Betsy Massie      PRTC

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

Eric Gilliland, former Executive Director of the Washington Area Bicyclists Association (WABA), expressed support on behalf of WABA for the bike lane pilot project submitted by DDOT for the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP. He said that the protected bike lanes would

---

be important additions to the D.C. bike network, especially given planned expansion of bike-sharing in the region. He said that contrary to claims by the American Automobile Association (AAA)-Mid Atlantic, the bike lanes would have no significant impact on vehicle level of service. He said that a AAA survey of its own members demonstrated support for bicycle facilities, and that the bike lanes are a low-cost way to help relieve congestion. He also said that AAA's call for more impact assessment for the bike lane project runs counter to their opposition of further impact assessment for HOT lanes projects in Virginia. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Lon Anderson, Managing Director of Public and Government Affairs for AAA-Mid Atlantic, said that the proposed pilot bike lane project should undergo the same scrutiny that other transportation projects receive because it will have significant traffic and air quality impacts. He noted that the project submission states that if DDOT decides to make the pilot project permanent, it will have to submit the project again for air quality conformity testing at that point. He said that the potential ripple effects of the project need to be identified and understood before permanent changes are approved. He also noted that DDOT had recently submitted additional documentation concerning the project, and said he hoped that affected parties would have an opportunity to review it before a decision is made. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Matthew Moskitis from the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance commented regarding the "What Would It Take" greenhouse gas reduction scenario (Item 10 on the TPB agenda). He said that while the region has experienced large increases in transit ridership, teleworking, and carpooling in the last two decades, these increases are dwarfed by the increases in registered vehicles and vehicle miles traveled. He said that despite this increase in driving, the region's air quality has improved significantly, largely due to technological breakthroughs. He said that rather than fuel efficiency and alternate fuels, over which the TPB has little purview, the TPB should focus on improving travel efficiency through reducing congestion. He said that the Alliance agrees with the scenario report's finding that additional strategies should be analyzed, with additional roadway capacity at the top of the list. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Stewart Schwartz, Executive Director of the Coalition for Smarter Growth, said in response to Mr. Moskitis that the region needs to adapt to a world of higher energy prices and address land use and community design while investing in alternative modes of transportation. He commended the TPB for the "What Would It Take?" Scenario activities, and endorsed the idea of a multi-sector policy committee to prepare the region for new federal initiatives, including those to address climate change. He said in relation to Item 12 on the TPB's agenda that diverting transit funding to Martz National Coach would be a terrible precedent, and noted that these services are already subsidized by the public through construction and maintenance of highways. He said that his major concern was over the lack of reference to regional scenarios and other regional initiatives in the project submissions for the CLRP, even though the TPB amended the solicitation document in November 2009 to request such information. He said that the CLRP needs a fundamental reevaluation rather than just an extension of the horizon by ten

---

years, and should be more than a stapling together of project submissions. He said that if asked by members of the public if they should be involved in the TPB process in the coming months, he would be skeptical because there is not much opportunity to effect fundamental change.

## **2. Approval of Minutes of April 21 Meeting**

Vice Chair Turner moved to approve the minutes of the April 21 TPB Meeting. Mr. Donley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

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

Mr. Versoza said that he was unable to attend the May 7 meeting of the Technical Committee, and asked Mr. Erenrich to give the report from the meeting.

Mr. Erenrich praised the Technical Committee for its work in developing project submissions for the CLRP (Item 7 on the TPB agenda), and noted the arduous effort that is required to review and edit project lists. He said that the Committee discussed the air quality conformity scope of work (Item 8), particularly the assumptions involved. He said that the Committee also continued to discuss implementation of the TIGER grant the region received, as well as preparation for applying to the new TIGER program (Item 9). He noted that the Committee also received a presentation regarding the “What Would It Take?” Scenario activities (Item 10), and praised TPB staff for reflecting Technical Committee comments and concerns in the final version.

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

Ms. Budetti said that the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) met on May 13. She said that Mr. Kirby briefed the Committee on the preliminary findings of the federal certification review, and that the CAC looked forward to the final report. She said that the CAC spent most of the meeting on preparation for the May 26 Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities, and is enthusiastic about the event. She said the Committee went over a proposed outline for CAC remarks at the event. She also said that 14 of the CAC members planned to attend the event, and encouraged TPB members to attend.

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

Mr. Kirby said that the Steering Committee met on May 7 and acted on one amendment to the FY 2010-2015 TIP, to add funding at the request of VDOT for a statewide BRAC administration project, widening of U.S. 1 in Prince William County, and funding to close out three completed road projects in Fairfax County.

---

Mr. Kirby described the contents of the letters packet, including a letter from the City of Bowie regarding CLRP submissions, which would be addressed later in the meeting. He said the packet included a response to the federal certification review comments presented at the April 21 TPB meeting, offering some additional information that the federal review team might find useful in completing their final report. He also noted a letter from COG Executive Director David Robertson to the Office of the Secretary of Transportation commenting on the new TIGER program and the idea of combining DOT and HUD planning grants. He said that the final item in the packet was a press release from AAA that spurred many public comment submissions regarding the CLRP submissions.

Mr. Kirby also referred to a handout distributed at the meeting with information about a new policy statement from Transportation Secretary LaHood calling for full consideration of bicycling and walking in transportation planning at the state and community level.

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

Chairman Snyder recognized TPB staff member Robert Snead, who is retiring June 11 after 36 years of service. He noted that Mr. Snead is a veteran of the Vietnam War, and joined the Council of Governments in 1972 as a temporary employee before moving up to his current role as manager of the TPB's highway and transit network development process. Mr. Snead received a standing ovation from attendees at the meeting in recognition of his long and outstanding service to the region.

Mr. Snead thanked Chairman Snyder and the TPB for the recognition.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **7. Review of Comments Received and Approval of Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2010 Financially Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Kirby noted that final project submissions had been included in the mailout packet, and that some revisions and corrections had been made to the version presented at the April 21 TPB meeting. He said that the public comment period closed on May 16, and drew Board members' attention to a packet handed out at the meeting containing the comments received and responses. He said that 351 comments were received, including 342 in support of the bike lanes pilot project in D.C. He summarized additional comments regarding the bike lanes and noted that DDOT had supplied additional materials related to the project. He said that remaining comments concerned the delay or removal of some highway projects by MDOT and VDOT, including letters from the City of Bowie and the Loudoun County Chamber of Commerce, and comments regarding Safe Routes to School projects and suggested improvements to TPB public comment processes.

---

Ms. Posey described the conformity table distributed at the meeting and explained the organization of the list, noting that it includes information about project location, type, and completion date. She said that changes since the previous analysis are highlighted in yellow, or pink for changes made since the April 21 TPB meeting. She also noted that the list includes project studies that are not coded in the network used for the conformity analysis, denoted as “study” on the list.

Chairman Snyder clarified that the TPB was being asked to act on the resolution, inclusive of the attached project list. He also asked if the information supplied by DDOT related to the bike lanes pilot project was part of the Item 7 discussion. He said he wanted Board members to be aware that the issue was dealt with at some length by DDOT.

Mr. Kirby said that the DDOT information applied to this item, and responded to the concern expressed by AAA-Mid Atlantic that there wasn’t enough analysis done about the potential impacts of the project.

Vice Chair Turner moved to adopt Resolution R22-2010 to approve project submissions for inclusion in the air quality conformity assessment for the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP. Mr. Donley seconded the motion.

Mr. Donley said that because the region has been unwilling or unable to adequately fund transportation projects, it renders the debate over modal priorities somewhat moot. He said that this funding inadequacy will have an adverse impact on the mobility of the region until a strategy for sufficient funding is developed.

Vice Chair Turner thanked TPB and MDOT staff for responding to concerns raised last month regarding the delay and movement into the study category of a project affecting the City of Bowie. He thanked Ms. Erickson and Mr. Halligan in particular for their assistance.

Mr. Zimmerman said he wished to second Mr. Donley’s point regarding the inadequacy of funds, and asked if Mr. Salehi could explain how much Virginia has had to remove from the region’s transportation program cumulatively over the last two years.

Mr. Salehi said he did not have the exact figure on hand, but noted that the Commonwealth Transportation Board would be holding a public hearing on May 26 that would provide details.

Mr. Zimmerman said he thought that the scale of cutbacks was on the order of \$4 billion.

Mr. Salehi said that was probably close to the amount that has been removed since 2009.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the order of magnitude of the cuts emphasizes Mr. Donley’s point that there is little opportunity to debate the merits of various strategies, but said that he would assert it is more of an unwillingness than an inability to fund transportation projects. He said that in Virginia, state leaders could choose to increase revenues for transportation but have chosen not

---

to do so, which has major consequences in the National Capital Region.

Mr. Salehi said he welcomed Mr. Zimmerman's comments and noted that due to factors beyond its control, VDOT is not in a position to reconcile the state's transportation needs with the overall funding available.

Ms. Tregoning noted the comments by Mr. Schwartz during Item 1, related to the TPB's action in November 2009 to amend the CLRP and TIP solicitation document. She quoted from the document, citing the language directing implementing agencies to consider and describe the relationship of project submissions to the evolving federal and regional policy context, including scenario work and climate change initiatives. She asked Mr. Kirby how the change had been addressed in the project submission document, noting that she did not see mention in the document of any additional analysis done to look at the project submissions in relation to the various contextual factors.

Mr. Kirby noted that the project submissions were put together by the implementing agencies, which were asked to address regional priorities in their submissions. He said that analysis of plan performance in relation to those priorities had not yet been conducted. He noted that the implementing agencies were addressing these priorities in a context of very limited funding, but that the project submissions nonetheless reflect these priorities given that highway projects are being cut while transit and bicycle projects have recently been added.

Ms. Tregoning added that while she realizes the region is desperate for additional transportation funding, the ability of the region to take an integrated approach to transportation planning and address regional priorities will enhance the region's prospects for obtaining funding through new federal discretionary programs. She noted that the climate bill in the U.S. Senate contains \$8 billion in funding for sustainable transportation projects.

Mr. Kirby said that while the TPB should make every effort to take advantage of funding opportunities from federal discretionary programs, the amount of funding included in those programs is still small in comparison with the overall funding inadequacy for transportation investment, and that a large part of that deficit will have to be addressed by state and local sources.

Mr. Erenrich said that Maryland jurisdictions had faced a difficult decision in cutting back on projects while also extending the plan horizon by ten years. He pointed out that the first thing the state administration suggested in its guidance to the local jurisdictions was to fully fund all transit obligations, including the Purple Line, Corridor Cities Transitway, and both capital and operating costs for Metro. He said that what remains after those commitments is a significant reduction in the state's highway program. He said that these choices by the state demonstrate an awareness of and conformance with regional priorities, and should be applauded.

Ms. Koster asked when analysis of plan performance in relation to regional priorities would be available for consideration by the Board. She said that the TPB needs to be thinking about a

---

regional approach and getting the information it needs at the right time to make its decisions and help the region be competitive in obtaining funding through federal discretionary programs.

Mr. Kirby pointed out that the summary brochure for the 2009 CLRP was available at the meeting, which looks at the existing plan in relation to broad performance measures that are responsive to federal and regional priorities. He invited Board members to look at the document and suggest ways in which it can be more responsive to those needs. He noted that the plan performance analysis is dependent upon completion of the air quality conformity analysis, which would be finished for the 2010 CLRP in October or November. He said that staff could potentially do a cursory analysis of the project submissions in relation to regional goals and priorities before getting results of the conformity analysis.

Chairman Snyder said that the region continues to make the best of the available revenues and maximize each dollar for various modes of transportation. He also said that the TPB would be looking forward to status reports on the D.C. bike lane pilot project to ensure that congestion is reasonably managed and emergency response is not degraded.

The motion to adopt Resolution R22-2010 passed unanimously.

## **8. Approval of the Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2010 CLRP and the FY 2011-2016 TIP**

Ms. Posey reviewed the technical approach to the air quality conformity analysis for the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP. She said there are two changes to the analysis for this CLRP update: staff will be using the Round 8 Cooperative Forecasts and the CLRP will be forecast to 2040. She said staff expects to produce a draft report of the analysis in October, subsequently release the analysis for public comment, and bring the conformity analysis, the CLRP, and TIP to the TPB for approval at the November 17, 2010, meeting.

Ms. Posey provided additional information on two items related to the policy and technical input assumptions. She said staff hopes to be able to reflect the updated transit fares in the travel demand model, but noted that staff would need to have these figures by the June TPB meeting in order not to delay the modeling process. She said that if staff does not have access to the updated fares, they would likely use the current fares. She reminded the TPB that the model currently constrains transit trips into and through the regional core (which includes the Pentagon) at 2020 levels. She said that due to lack of the identification of additional funding for Metro, the analysis for the 2010 CLRP will continue to constrain these trips at the 2020 level.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for clarification about the timing related to incorporating the transit fares into the modeling process.

Ms. Posey said that as long as staff has the fare data by the June 16 TPB meeting, they will be able to input the fare data into the model.



---

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the analysis would be impossible without the new data, or if the analysis would just be really hard to complete.

Ms. Posey said that not having the fare data would make the analysis more difficult. She said that after staff codes the networks, it is one of the first inputs into the travel demand model. She said that staff cannot begin the model without the inputs.

Mr. Zimmerman said he would work very hard to see that TPB staff has the fare inputs by June 16.

Mr. Zimmerman emphasized the issue regarding constraining Metro core capacity to the 2020 level, noting that was recently relaxed from 2010 due to additional funding through Metro Matters. He said that the \$3 billion provided through Metro Matters allowed Metro to buy new rail cars, which moved the constraint on the system to the 2020 level. He said there is not currently a Metro Matters renewal agreement, but that the Metro Board is currently working to secure such a funding agreement for the next six years. He said the Metro Board is discussing a maintenance of effort at the regional level for the proposed capital plan. He noted that even with the maintenance of effort and federal funding, Metro would be short by several billion dollars just to maintain the existing system. He said that it is important that people understand that the current funding identified for transit is not sufficient for the transit agency to be able to do what people expect it to do.

Mr. Turner made a motion to approve the scope of work for the air quality conformity assessment for the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP. Mr. Zimmerman seconded this motion, which passed unanimously.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **9. Update on the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program, and Briefing on the “TIGER II” Grant Program Announced on April 26**

Mr. Kirby said that on April 26 the US Department of Transportation (USDOT) issued a solicitation for applications under the TIGER II discretionary grant program. He said there is \$600 million available in competitive grant funding for surface transportation projects, and that pre-applications are due July 16 and final applications due August 23. He said this program reflects the same concepts as the TIGER – multimodalism, benefit-cost, sustainability, and livability. He said \$140 million has been set aside for projects in rural areas. He added that given there will be \$460 million remaining, it would be prudent to consider submitting an application for the region in the \$10-\$15 million range. He said there is a 20 percent local match. He suggested the TPB develop an application package on regional bike sharing, building off of the project that was submitted, but not selected, for TIGER funding. He provided more information

---

about the details of the pre-application request, as well as potential components of the TPB application. He said TPB staff would be able to present a project concept at the June 16 TPB meeting.

Mr. Kirby said TPB staff has been working with the USDOT and the five project owner agencies to get all of the paperwork and memoranda of understanding in place and the grant funding flowing for the TIGER projects. He said the project owners have been compiling detailed project scopes, timelines, and costs for the projects.

Mr. Erenrich asked if there was any discussion about where the local match would come from for the TIGER II projects.

Mr. Kirby said that it would have to come from the project partners. He added that with the bike sharing project, there also needs to be a commitment for ongoing operations of the system.

Mr. Erenrich suggested a possible strategy for local jurisdictions to come up with the match. He said most jurisdictions are using local money to build trails and bikeways. He asked whether the money used to construct those facilities could be used for the match.

Mr. Kirby said that local money already committed to such efforts should be used to leverage more federal money.

Ms. Tregoning said that the application could show that some of the jurisdictions in the region have already funded, with local funds, bike sharing programs that would contribute to part of a network, and that perhaps those jurisdictions would be willing to use local funding for the regional match.

Ms. Ricks said that DDOT would possibly support that option. She said DDOT has obligated approximately \$6.5 million for bike sharing in the District. She cautioned that in order for bike sharing to be successful, there needs to be a network of bicycle trails and facilities that users of the shared system can access. She noted that, by and large, users of the bike sharing system would not be wearing helmets, which is a concern in the District. She said DDOT would support a regional bike sharing program because the local program has shown great promise. She added that concurrent with that submission, the TPB should contemplate what the regional bicycle network plan is and perhaps see if any gaps in the network could be filled with the submission.

Mr. Kirby said that one possibility would be to add some components of that bike plan into the package, noting that if the local match exists, there is a no reason not to add these components. He said the TPB could set up its submission as a menu, so that it could be funded and successfully implemented in part or as a whole.

Mr. Harrington said that Metro has a study that is looking at bike and pedestrian access to stations. He said the report will generate a table of recommended improvements or new facilities. He noted that the facilities would not generally be constructed by Metro, but would provide

---

greater access to Metro stations.

Mr. Weissberg asked if the local match would have to be committed before the TPB submits its application, at the time at which the TPB submits the applications, or at a later point.

Mr. Kirby said the TPB has to demonstrate that the match is available as part of the application submission. He said this could be demonstrated in the form of a letter. He reiterated that July 16 is the deadline for the pre-application which should include all necessary components. He said the intent of the pre-application process is to screen out applicants who are clearly not ready.

Mr. Way asked if a local bike trail that connects to a VRE station would be part of a regional network in the context of the application.

Mr. Kirby said that it could be.

Mr. Halligan noted that the TIGER II grant may include a potential joint award with HUD and that a more competitive grant would have a housing element to it. He asked if this is the case.

Ms. Tregoning said she has heard HUD describe the challenge grant as money that would be used to conduct code and zoning reform, and that \$40 million has been set aside for that specific activity.

Mr. Kirby agreed, noting that the language in the mailout states that activities eligible for HUD's grant include corridor or station area plans, revisions to zoning or building codes, and the creation or preservation of affordable housing for low-income families. He said that Mr. Halligan is correct that collaboration is clearly what the federal government is seeking. He said that a strong application should contain elements of sustainability and livability, regardless of the formal requirements.

Mr. Zimmerman said that Arlington County would be willing to contribute its money to expanding the bike sharing program through leveraging federal resources.

Mr. Turner asked about the timeline for the MOUs that the TPB is initiating with FTA and then with the sub-recipients of the TIGER grant. He expressed concern that these would be completed and the projects finished before the funding expires.

Mr. Kirby said that the federal government softened the 2012 deadline so that the money must be obligated by the deadline, but not necessarily fully spent.

Mr. Turner noted that the bike sharing program in question for TIGER II was submitted with the TIGER application, but not selected. He asked if it is viable to submit again.

Mr. Kirby said that DOT held a webinar on TIGER II and said that there were many projects included in TIGER applications that were very competitive and were not awarded funding. He

---

said that DOT staff suggested those projects would be competitive once again under TIGER II and could be strong candidates for funding.

Chair Snyder asked if Mr. Kirby would review the dates between this meeting and the June 16 meeting so the Board and staff would know how to proceed.

Mr. Kirby said TPB staff will start working with member agencies to develop a pre-application that would be brought to the TPB in draft form on June 16. He said staff has already done a lot of work so we should be able to proceed quickly. He said the Technical Committee will review the options at its June meeting.

Chair Snyder asked if anything would up for discussion at the May 26 Conversation.

Mr. Kirby said that was possible, however he noted May 26 is only a week away. He said the Conversation could be an opportunity to hear additional ideas.

Chair Snyder asked by what date people could provide additional ideas for the TIGER II application.

Mr. Kirby said additional ideas for the application would need to be provided by May 28, and added he would like to see the application stay within the bike rubric.

Chair Snyder reiterated that TPB staff would need comments on the bike sharing concept or other application ideas by May 28. He noted that there are multiple opportunities, so to the extent to which the TPB can begin work on several potential projects, with only one or two potentially selected for TIGER II funding, wouldn't preclude going forward on other projects as opportunities present themselves.

Mr. Kirby outlined a potential scenario where the federal government puts out a final solicitation on May 28 that looks considerably different from what has been released to date. He said staff could begin working with the Technical Committee at the June meeting to respond to any new solicitation.

Chair Snyder said that at the June meeting, the TPB will likely get a proposal for a TIGER II pre-application and then decide whether to move forward on this opportunity. He said that comments or additional ideas must be presented to TPB staff by May 28.

Mr. Kirby said it would be prudent to use the same approval procedure as the TPB did for the TIGER application and have the TPB empower the Steering Committee to sign off on the application at the July Steering Committee meeting.

Chair Snyder said staff should proceed as outlined.

---

## **10. Briefing on the Final Results for the “What Would It Take?” Greenhouse Gas Reduction Scenario**

Mr. Kirby noted that TPB staff had been asked to present these scenario results to the COG Climate, Energy, and Environment Policy Committee on May 26.

Ms. Bansal, referring to a PowerPoint presentation distributed at the meeting, highlighted the results of the “What Would It Take?” scenario. She said that it is one of two scenarios included in the recent phase of the Scenario Study and builds off of regional climate change mitigation goals set by the COG Climate Change Report issued in November 2008. She said that report set targets for greenhouse gas emissions reductions by different sectors, including transportation, in 2012, 2020, and 2030. She explained that the “What Would It Take?” scenario looks at what actions and trends would be necessary for the transportation sector to meet the three regional targets as well as the overall cumulative goal.

Ms. Bansal described the development of the scenario baseline, and the analysis that showed the effects of various interventions and other factors on carbon dioxide emissions in relation to that baseline. She detailed the role that the composition of the vehicle fleet, the type of fuel used, and travel behaviors all play in determining emissions. She noted in particular the number of trips under three miles in length that could potentially be shifted to alternative non- or low-polluting modes, and that a comprehensive strategy for reducing emissions must also incorporate congestion reduction measures.

Ms. Bansal summarized interventions within three categories of strategies for reducing greenhouse gas emissions – fuel efficiency, alternative fuels, and travel efficiency – and described the cost-effectiveness of each and their implementation time frames. She showed that a combination of strategies at the federal, state, and local levels could come close to achieving the 2012, 2020, and 2030 cumulative emissions reduction goals. She noted that although the cost-effectiveness of different interventions at reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions varies widely, it is important to recognize that emissions reduction is likely not the only benefit of each strategy. She said that additional analysis would seek to incorporate those other benefits in the effectiveness calculation.

Ms. Bansal said in conclusion that the region needs to look at additional strategies in order to meet the challenging goals set by the Climate Change Report for the transportation sector, and that no single intervention from any sector will accomplish the goals. She presented a list of action items that the TPB and local governments could implement in the short-term to begin to have an impact on emissions, including eco-driving education, pay-as-you-drive auto insurance, and facilitation of bicycle and pedestrian modes, as well as supporting federal interventions dealing with fuel efficiency and alternative fuels.

Mr. Way said that he wanted to repeat a comment made during the Scenario Study Task Force meeting, which was to emphasize a statement on page two of the Item 10 memorandum: “It is important to note that not all the strategies examined in this study are necessarily feasible or

---

desired by every jurisdiction.”

Mr. Roberts asked Ms. Bansal what the current percentage is of natural gas-fueled vehicles in the region’s fleet, noting that it was not visible on the fuel usage chart included in the presentation.

Ms. Bansal said she did not know the exact percentage, but confirmed that it was minimal. She noted that the chart showed national averages, and that the regional fuel-type breakdown could differ.

Mr. Roberts said that he was concerned that the presentation did not mention natural gas as an alternative fuel and instead focused on ethanol and bio-diesel. He noted that ethanol takes a lot of energy to produce and may have little overall benefit in terms of reduced greenhouse gas emissions. He said that he has promoted natural gas-fueled vehicles in the City of Greenbelt for several years, but that little progress has been made due to the lack of infrastructure for fueling natural gas vehicles. He noted that natural gas is almost entirely domestically produced, and said it is an excellent option for a cleaner alternative fuel.

Ms. Bansal clarified that projections included in the presentation regarding alternative fuels were based on information from the Department of Energy and reflect current federal policy that is focused on ethanol.

Chairman Snyder thanked Ms. Bansal and said he found the presentation to be easily understandable and a good foundation for further work. He asked Mr. Kirby what the next steps would be.

Mr. Kirby said that after the presentation to the COG Climate, Energy, and Environment Policy Committee on May 26, staff would report back to the TPB on the feedback from that meeting. He also said that staff would be looking into further interventions to try to actually meet the cumulative emissions reductions goals, as discussed by the Scenario Study Task Force at its earlier meeting. He said that the analysis would also be re-benchmarked using the new travel forecasting process and the new horizon year of 2040.

Chairman Snyder suggested that the presentation be made available to attendees of the May 26 Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities.

Mr. Kirby said that copies would be available at the event.

Mr. Erenrich said that he found the presentation and report to be among the most substantial, quality pieces of work on the subject, and wanted to recognize the work and leadership that went into the effort. He also suggested that the materials be made available to the relevant federal agencies.

Chairman Snyder, hearing no objection to this idea, asked that the materials be forwarded to relevant federal agency contacts, and emphasized that the caveat mentioned by Mr. Way should

---

be clear.

Mr. Kirby said that staff would forward the materials as requested.

### **11. Status Report on “Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities,” May 26, 2010**

Referring to the mailout memorandum, Mr. Kirby spoke about the event scheduled for May 26 called a “Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities.” He described the logistics for the meeting and said that more than 60 invitees had indicated they would be attending. He said the event would include four context-setting presentations, followed by ten roundtable discussions.

### **12. Briefing on Proposed Response to the Request by Martz National Coach for Federal Assistance for Commuter Bus Service between Fredericksburg and Washington DC**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said the TPB would be asked at the June meeting to approve a draft letter to the Martz Company. He explained that Martz is a private bus company, which operates from Fredericksburg into the central area of the Washington region. Martz has sent the TPB a letter saying that since 2008, it has been reporting its mileage to the Federal Transit Administration's national transit database, which is the basis on which formula transit funds are allocated to urbanized areas. Martz's reporting its service to FTA means it is generating more transit funds to the Washington region than the region would otherwise get. Therefore, Martz has requested that the TPB program some funding in the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Martz for bus purchases or other types of eligible assistance. A similar request was made to WMATA. The Martz request has been discussed by the TPB Technical Committee on several occasions.

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby described each point in the draft TPB response letter to Martz. These points included a number of administrative and logistical questions, as well as questions related to the implications of setting a precedent in responding to this request. He said the letter ends by indicating that the TPB is receptive to discussing this request, but further information is needed. He said the letter needed to go through additional discussion with the Technical Committee and through other channels before it is brought back to the TPB for final approval in June. He said there are significant reservations on the part of the TPB's partner agencies as to whether it would be appropriate to accede to the Martz request.

Ms. Tregoning asked whether information was available on the amount of bus service in the region that is provided by WMATA compared to local providers and private firms.

Mr. Kirby said that information would be provided to the TPB in June. He noted that a sizeable amount of local bus services are provided by non-WMATA local government operations, which

---

currently report their mileage to FTA. That reporting helps get funding for the region, but that money goes to WMATA. He said that if local operations began to request sub-allocations, it would have significant implications for the current arrangement.

Mr. Erenrich thanked Mr. Kirby for raising that point. He noted that the dollar value of Montgomery County's contribution is much higher than Martz's. He said that all of the local jurisdictions in the past have been willing to have the federal funding in question be allocated to WMATA because our system is regional and it is important to work together. He noted that there is limited money available, so if funding were taken away from WMATA, then somehow that lost funding would need to be made up. Mr. Erenrich noted that if in the future, current formulas are used to distribute new funding under programs like TIGER or other stimulus programs, then the local governments might want to support an adjustment in the current formula allocations.

Mr. Werth asked for confirmation that the term "private" provider, as used by Mr. Kirby, did not refer to the local government operations, but would include services such as shuttles serving Metro stations.

Mr. Kirby said that the local government bus services would not be considered private.

Mr. Werth announced that the annual Private Providers Transit Forum would be held on Tuesday, May 25. He said they would be interested in hearing from Martz at that meeting.

Mr. Way said that the draft letter seemed to suggest that the TPB was asking Martz to ensure existing recipients are made whole, which he said seemed to be beyond the competency or responsibility of Martz. He asked if Martz should expect to get a favorable response to their proposal if they provide the information requested.

Mr. Kirby said he believed the questions in the letter are reasonable, given the proposal that Martz is making. While he said the question might be changed, he said he believed it was important for Martz to acknowledge that there is a finite amount of money and the implications of its request need to be addressed. He further said that it was important to consider higher administrative costs that could arise from the Martz proposal.

Mr. Harrington repeated that WMATA had received a similar letter from Martz. He said that points 1-3 in the draft TPB response were of particular importance to WMATA. He noted that point 2 addressed the question of setting a precedent and point 3 addressed the impact on existing recipients. Regarding point 1, he noted he believed the intention of the federal law and the urbanized formula grant program was to provide funding for a public body. He said this point makes the Martz request different from a past request from the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO), which involved another public agency. He suggested this question should be addressed to FTA before too much effort is expended on points 4 and 5, which address the specifics of how the Martz request might be accommodated.

Mr. Kirby said he believed Martz's response would be that this type of arrangement is already



---

occurring in other states, which demonstrates that it can be done under federal regulations.

Chairman Snyder noted that the Martz letter was sent on January 21 and the TPB response was scheduled for final approval in June. He suggested that TPB staff should be in contact with Martz staff to provide them with information about how this matter is proceeding.

Mr. Kirby said that TPB has been in touch on an informal basis with Martz. He said it was important to respond as soon as possible.

### **13. Briefing on the Strategic Plan for the Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Program**

Because of the lack of time, Mr. Meese offered a few key points. He said the MOITS Policy Task Force for a number of years has been discussing the possibility of developing a strategic plan that would guide upcoming MOITS activities as well as provide a list of potential regional projects for future funding opportunities.

Chairman Snyder said this item would be put on the June agenda as an action item. He noted that the emphasis of the strategic plan is not on big new projects, but rather on making the current system work better.

Mr. Salehi asked if the work of the consultant in developing the plan was complete.

Mr. Meese said the work by the consultant has been completed. This strategic plan has provided sketch-level information on potential projects, which can be adjusted in the future. He said this is intended to be the initial list.

### **14. Notice of Proposed Amendment to the FY 2010-2015 TIP to Update Project Information on Use of New Federal Funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Harrington said this item is related to the new dedicated funding that would come to Metro for the first time this year. He said a public comment period was currently underway.

### **15. Other Business**

There was no other business.

### **16. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:01 p.m.