

**METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

777 North Capitol Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20002-4226
(202) 962-3200

**MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
October 20, 2004**

Members and Alternates Present

Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board
Phil Mendelson, D.C. Council
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council
Cicero Salles, Prince George's DPW&T
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park
Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT-NOVA
Rick Canizales, Prince William County
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Dick White, WMATA
Harry J. Parrish, Virginia House of Delegates
Karina Ricks, DC Office of Planning
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT
Carol S. Petzold, Maryland House of Delegates
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force
Hilda Barg, Prince William County
Ludwig Gaines, City of Alexandria
Julia Koster, NCPC
Andrew Fellows, City of College Park
Skip Coburn, DC Councilmember Sharon Ambrose
David Moss, Montgomery County DPWT

Marsha Kaiser, MDOT
John A. Giannetti, Maryland Senate
Robert Dorsey, City of Rockville
David Umling, Charles County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Gerald Miller	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
Andrew Austin	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Jane Posey	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Deborah Etheridge	COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam	COG/DTP
Michael Farrell	COG/DTP
Jill Locantore	COG/DTP
Jim Yin	COG/DTP
Steven Kania	COG/OPA
Joan Rohlf	COG/DEP
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Howard Chang	Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Bob Chase	NVTA
Bob Grow	Greater Washington Board of Trade
Sharmila Samarasinghe	DRPT – VA
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Tom Biesiadny	Fairfax County DOT
Paul Kuhn	Citizen
Lee Epstein	Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Jana Lynott	NVTC
Toni Goodman	Montgomery County, MD
Douglas Stewart	Fairfax County
Roger Plaut	Longmead Crossing Community Services Association
Dean Choulas	Longmead Crossing Community Services Association
Valencia Williams	FHWA-MD Division
Christine Laurence	Zipcar

Ritch Viola	Arlington County
Amy Horner	SABW
John Z. Wetmore	
Max Kalhammer	
Keri Funderburg	Environmental Defense
Michael Replogle	Environmental Defense
Richard Parsons	Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce
Stephen Caflisch	Sierra Club Maryland Chapter
Ron Resh	Bethesda – Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce
Sam Raker	MDOT
Alex Hekimian	M-NCPPC-Montgomery County
Margaret Harper	Parsons
Dan Emerine	Sierra Club, DC Chapter
Carolyn Mulvihill	DC Office of Planning
Kellie Gaver	MDOT
Tom Masog	MNCPPC-Prince George’s County
Dolores Milmo	Audubon Naturalist Society
Harry Sanders	Action Committee for Transit
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Lora Byala	WMATA
Robert Pinkard	Greater Washington Board of Trade
Dan Wallace	Montgomery Intercounty Connector Coalition, Inc.
Patricia A. Thomas	Clovery Civic Association
Anne Ambler	Citizen
Roy S. Buyer	President, Intercounty Connector Master Plan Advocates
Andrea Arnold	Solutions not Sprawl
Barbara Medina	Friends of Maydale, Inc.
Joni Goodman	Citizen
Roger Diedrich	Chair, Virginia Chapter of the Sierra Club
Laura Olsen	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Tom Reinheimer	Citizen
John Parrish	Maryland Native Plant Society
Brian Henry	Save Our Communities
John Bayerl	Citizen

1. Public Comment

Because so many people signed up to comment, Chairman Zimmerman notified the speakers that they would be limited to two minutes each.

Roger Plaut, Longmead Crossing Community Services Association, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the Intercounty Connector (ICC) in the Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP). Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Bob Pinkard, Greater Washington Board of Trade, spoke in support of the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Dan Wallace, Montgomery Intercounty Connector Coalition, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Patricia Thomas, Cloverly Civic Association, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. She asked that the public comment period on the CLRP amendments be extended until the public has had a chance to review the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the ICC. Copies of her remarks were distributed for the record.

John Parrish, Maryland Native Plant Society, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. He asked that the public comment period on the CLRP amendments be extended until the public has had a chance to review the DEIS for the ICC.

Anne Ambler spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. She said it was inappropriate to approve the CLRP amendments before the DEIS for the ICC is released. Copies of her remarks were distributed for the record.

Dean Choulas, President, Longmead Home Owners Association, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP.

Roy Buyer, ICC Master Plan Advocate, spoke in support of the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Andrea Arnold, Solutions Not Sprawl, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. She asked that the public comment period on the CLRP amendments be extended until the public has had a chance to review the DEIS for the ICC. Copies of her remarks were distributed for the record.

Dolores Milmo, Audubon Naturalist Society, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. She asked that the TPB delay its vote on the CLRP amendments until the public has had a chance to review the DEIS for the ICC. Copies of her remarks were distributed for the record.

Paul Kuhn spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Brian Henry, Save Our Communities, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. He asked that the TPB delay its vote on the CLRP amendments until the public has had a chance to review the DEIS for the ICC.

Steve Caflisch, Sierra Club, Maryland Chapter, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. He asked that the TPB delay its vote on the CLRP amendments until the DEIS for the ICC and the TPB's Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study are released. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Barbara Medina, Friends of Maydale, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. Copies of her remarks were distributed for the record.

Joni Goodman spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. Copies of her remarks were distributed for the record.

Roger Diedrich, Sierra Club, Virginia Chapter, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. He asked that the public comment period on the CLRP amendments be extended until the public has had a chance to review the DEIS for the ICC. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Ron Resh, Greater Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support of the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Lee Epstein, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. He asked that the public comment period on the CLRP amendments be extended until the public has had a chance to review the DEIS for the ICC. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Michael Replogle, Environmental Defense, applauded members of the Board for recently securing funding for the Metro system. He said that the report on improvements in the TPB's travel models, under Item 10, omitted key information related to the poor performance of the model in its capacity to adequately reflect the amount of traffic on the region's roads. He distributed a letter explaining his concerns.

Laura Olsen, Coalition for Smarter Growth, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. She asked that the TPB delay its vote on the CLRP amendments until the public has had a chance to review the DEIS for the ICC. Copies of her remarks were distributed for the record.

Bob Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, spoke in support of the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Dan Emerine, Sierra Club, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. He asked that the TPB delay its vote on the CLRP amendments until the public has had a chance to review the DEIS for the ICC. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

2. Approval of Minutes of September 15, 2004, Meeting

Vice Chairman Mendelson moved approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Knapp and was approved unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Referring to the mailout report, Mr. Rybeck said the Technical Committee met on October 1 and discussed Items 9, 10, 11 and 12. He said the committee concurred with staff recommendations.

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Jaffe said the Citizens Advisory Committee met on October 14. The committee had a briefing on Disability Awareness Day and also reviewed a draft presentation that has been developed for the CAC outreach meetings on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Referring to the mailout packet, Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on October 1 and took one amendment action to the FY2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation.

Referring to the handout material, Mr. Kirby called attention to a draft letter from Chairman Zimmerman to Patricia Gallagher of the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC). The letter expresses support for a study that NCPC is undertaking to look at the potential for relocation of the freight rail lines through the center of Washington, D.C.

Mr. Kirby also said the handout material included a report from Mayor Porter, chair of the Access for All Committee, which provided comments on the draft CLRP.

Ms. Porter said this Access for All report for 2004 essentially reaffirmed comments from 2003. These include concerns that more transportation improvements in the CLRP are on the western side of the region and that there is a lack of planned transit improvements or studies in Prince George's County. The committee is also concerned that current transit services need to be maintained and improved in the short term. She said the expansion of Metrorail is very important, but many low-income people and people with disabilities rely on the services provided by Metro access, Metrobus and local community-based bus services. Further, she said the committee continues to be concerned about transit information for people with limited English proficiency and transit services for people with disabilities. In addition, the committee remains concerned that development around transit stations ought to be promoted, but there needs to be some concern for the communities that already exist around those stations.

Chairman Zimmerman asked Ms. Koster if she had anything to add regarding the NCPC initiative on exploring the possible relocation of the rail corridor.

Ms. Koster said that NCPC would appreciate the TPB's support and participation in this process. She said a study is already underway, including Virginia, Maryland and the District of Columbia's departments of transportation, the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), and the Department of Homeland Security.

Chairman Zimmerman asked Ms. Koster to what degree the corridor in question involves concerns about freight and to what degree passenger travel would be affected.

Ms. Koster said the study would look at both freight and passenger service, but the freight aspect has been the subject of most attention so far.

Chairman Zimmerman said that clearly the study needs to be done. He emphasized the importance of improving access for commuter rail, which he said is constrained, unfortunately. He said that Virginia Railway Express (VRE) service is facing a number of limitations. He said the rail service is growing tremendously and is about to hit its ceilings because of the capacity constraints. He emphasized the important role that rail could play in the event of an evacuation. He said he hoped the study would consider this potential role.

Ms. Koster said those concerns would be examined in detail.

Mr. Snyder said Chairman Zimmerman's comments were right on point. He said the study ought to look not only at realigning the rail, but other operational changes that would move hazardous materials without necessarily moving the rail line. He asked that the letter include language reflecting the Chairman's concerns. He also asked that the letter be modified to say that the TPB would like to know what the options are, how much it will cost and who would pay for them. He said the TPB needs to make clear that there may be significant financing issues presented and the TPB would hope that various options would be looked at, including not just physically moving the

rails, but also changing the operations of the railroads to divert hazardous materials from the D.C. core.

Chairman Zimmerman asked if staff could revise the language in the letter in the next half hour, pursuant to the comments made.

Mr. Kirby said alternatively, the letter could be revised and circulated via e-mail.

Mr. Fellows noted that legislation was pending in the District of Columbia to look at alternative routes for deadly chemical shipments. He said he hoped that would be included in this study.

Vice Chairman Mendelson suggested the letter should be revised as discussed and circulated via e-mail.

Ms. Porter said she wanted to be sure that communities in Maryland on the District of Columbia border are not excluded.

Chairman Zimmerman asked Ms. Koster if the study is looking only at issues as they relate to the core and the Capitol Hill area.

Ms. Koster said she believed the study was focusing primarily on the District of Columbia, but it would also look at the larger implications of any potential change. She said she welcomed wider participation.

Ms. Porter said that since none of the lines in question end at the D.C. border, that would be a useful thing to do.

Ms. Petzold moved approval of the concept of the letter that had been distributed, with additions as defined by Mr. Snyder and by Mayor Porter.

Chairman Zimmerman clarified that the letter would receive final approval by e-mail.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Gaines said that Alexandria, which has a CSX line running through, would have concerns similar to Ms. Porter's.

Mr. Salles said he wanted to echo the concerns expressed by Ms. Porter and Mr. Gaines. He noted that Prince George's County has a number of lines running through it.

Chairman Zimmerman noted that, as Mr. Snyder said, the solution to these problems in some cases might be moving the lines, but in other cases, the solution might be an operational change.

Mr. Roberts said he was in support of doing the study. He asked if there were any preliminary thoughts regarding where the lines might be relocated.

Mr. Koster said there were no such thoughts at this time because the study was just beginning. She said the commission is now trying to secure the funding and the partnerships to begin the study.

Mr. Roberts asked if the study would provide information on how much toxic material is being transported, and where it is going to and coming from.

Ms. Koster said she did not have the answer to that, but she could find out if those questions are in the current scope.

Ms. Pourciau offered an amendment to the motion, requesting that the letter be brought back to the next Board meeting for approval. She said there was a high level of interest that warranted such a final review.

Chairman Zimmerman asked if delaying the letter one month would create any problems.

Ms. Koster said that a full review by the Board was acceptable. She said NCPC would continue to pursue funding for the study.

Chairman Zimmerman asked Ms. Petzold if, as the maker of the motion, she was agreeable to delaying the final approval by one month.

Ms. Petzold said that would be fine. She withdrew the motion. The motion was reoffered to bring the draft back for final review and approval at the next meeting.

Senator Giannetti said he was very critical of rail security throughout the entire region. He said that he hoped the study would address the danger of hazardous material freight that has reached its destination and is sitting on rail tracks, unguarded in an accessible location, waiting to be used by a factory.

Chairman Zimmerman reiterated the motion which was to direct staff to redraft the letter, taking into account comments made at the meeting, and then bring the letter back for approval at the meeting on November 17.

The motion was passed unanimously.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Zimmerman waived his remarks.

7. Approval of Resolution Recognizing Importance of Accessible and Dependable Transit Service, Sidewalks and Safe Pedestrian Crossings for People with Disabilities

Ms. Porter thanked participants from the Disability Awareness Day event that morning. Referring to the mailout material, she moved approval of Resolution R2-2005 recognizing the importance of accessible and dependable transit service, sidewalks and safe pedestrian crossings for people with disabilities.

The motion was seconded.

Ms. Porter said the purpose of the event was to raise awareness about the importance of accessible and dependable transportation for people with disabilities. She described a number of accessibility improvements that were highlighted in the resolution.

Chairman Zimmerman agreed that the event that morning was very successful. He thanked participants and staff, especially Wendy Klancher.

Mr. Knapp extended his thanks to Ms. Porter and to staff. He emphasized the importance of building awareness and said that next year, the event might include employers and others from the private sector.

The motion was approved unanimously.

8. Approval of Resolution Declaring Funding Must Be Identified to Meet Preservation, Rehabilitation and Capacity Expansion Needs of Metrorail and Metrobus System

Chairman Zimmerman noted that the Metro Matters funding agreement had been signed that week. However, he noted that while the Metro Matters program is vitally important, it would be a mistake to think that it is a solution to funding problems for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA).

Mr. Kirby said the Board has spoken out on these issues for a number of years. He reported that the panel on dedicated funding for Metro, which was established in September, had its second meeting the previous day at COG.

Chairman Zimmerman asked Vice Chairman Mendelson to speak, noting that he had been emphasizing these long-term funding issues in recent months.

Vice Chairman Mendelson said that Mr. White had briefed the Board on Metro funding issues at

the September meeting. He said he believed the key lesson of that presentation was that Metro Matters represents only a portion of Metro's full needs. He asked that WMATA staff come back to the Board at the beginning of 2005 to provide a new status report on these issues.

Vice Chairman Mendelson moved Resolution 3-2005, with some changes on the second page:

- The middle bullet should become the first bullet. It should read: "The TPB declares that additional funding be identified to meet the preservation, rehabilitation and capacity expansion needs of the Metro rail and Metro bus system."
- The second bullet would be: "Support the efforts of the new panel co-sponsored by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, the Greater Washington Board of Trade and the Federal City Council to identify and recommend dedicated funding sources for WMATA."
- The third bullet would remain the third bullet, with a slight change, ". . . urges that dedicated and reliable sources of funding be committed by the federal, state and local governments at the earliest possible time to address the unmet needs."

The motion was seconded.

Ms. Petzold said she agreed to reverse the first and second bullet points. However, she said the authority of the TPB would be exceeded if the word "identified" were changed to "committed."

Chairman Zimmerman said that Vice Chairman Mendelson was only suggesting changing the word "identified" to "committed," so the resolution would still include the word "urges."

Mr. Snyder said that the resolution should refer to "safety and security." He also said that although it was important to call attention to long-term funding needs, it was also important to note that a number of local leaders and jurisdictions had extended themselves a long way to secure funding for Metro Matters, and this point should not be deemphasized.

Ms. Hudgins said she supported the resolution with the changes suggested by Vice Chairman Mendelson. She said the importance of these funding issues needs to be conveyed to the public. If this is not done, then the public commitment to Metro could be lost.

Ms. Barg said that Prince William County would be happy to support the resolution, even though it is not a WMATA member jurisdiction. But she said that in the future, the Board should consider a resolution regarding funding for other transportation systems, such as the Virginia Railway Express (VRE), other bus systems and for roads. She requested such a resolution at the next meeting.

Chairman Zimmerman said he was willing to look at something like that. He said that he understands the needs of VRE from serving on their board. He emphasized that solutions in terms of new funding are not necessarily going to be the same everywhere in the region because of the different legal and governmental and historical facts in Maryland, the District and Virginia.

Mr. Wren said he supported Ms. Barg's comments.

Mr. Snyder suggested the wording in the first bullet of the resolution be changed to read: ". . . be identified to meet the preservation, rehabilitation, safety, security and capacity expansion needs of the Metro and Metro bus system."

Chairman Zimmerman said that hearing no objection, the motion was so amended.

The motion was approved unanimously.

9. Review of Comments Received and Approval of 2010 Project Submissions and Scope of Work for 8-Hour Air Quality Conformity Assessment and 2004 CLRP and 2005-2010 TIP

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said that at the September 15 meeting, staff briefed the Board on the new requirements under the eight-hour ozone standard which will become effective June 15, 2005. He said the one-hour standard is to be revoked at that time. He said the TPB has a requirement to complete a conformity analysis under the ground rules of the eight-hour standard by June 15 of next year or face a conformity lapse.

Mr. Kirby said there are two issues that must be addressed:

- The attainment year under the eight-hour standard will be 2010, not 2005, as it is under the one-hour standard. He said that staff has not done an analysis for 2010 recently. In order to meet the conformity requirement under the eight-hour standard, staff will have to do an analysis for 2010. That analysis was included in the work program under this item. All the implementing agencies have been asked to check the completion dates for projects that they expect to be completed by 2010. That information regarding completion dates was included in the mailout material for this item. He said the conformity analysis for 2010 would be brought back to the Board in December or January.
- Under the eight-hour standard, the nonattainment area will not include Stafford County, which will join the Fredericksburg area in their own nonattainment area. Mr. Kirby said that question before the Board is what to do with Stafford County for this analysis. He said Stafford can either be kept in the region's emissions budgets and in the analysis, or it can be taken out. He said the staff is recommending keeping Stafford County in because it would be very complicated to take it out, at least in the short term. He said that the Metropolitan Washington

Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) has agreed with that recommendation, as described in the letter that MWAQC sent to the TPB, which was included in the mailout packet. He said the MWAQC comments were the only comments received regarding this item.

Ms. Kaiser moved approval of TPB Resolution R4-2005, which was seconded by Vice Chairman Knapp.

Vice Chairman Mendelson said that he thought the conformity results had been presented at the Steering Committee meeting.

Mr. Kirby said the results presented at the Steering Committee meeting were for the 2004 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) under the one-hour standard, which would be reported later under Item 11 on the agenda. He said that because that conformity analysis was for the one-hour standard, it did not include a 2010 analysis. That 2010 analysis would be included in the work scope under this item. He said that the TPB was currently in a transition year. Currently, the one-hour standard is still in effect, so any actions with regard to conformity, the CLRP or the TIP would still be done under the one-hour standard ground rules, which is what would be discussed under Item 11. However, he emphasized that the eight-hour standard would go into effect next June and the TPB would be required by June to have done the first conformity assessment under the ground rules of the eight-hour standard. The work item under this item would authorize staff to proceed with that analysis.

Vice Mendelson asked if the Board in January or February will again consider approval of a conformity determination under the eight-hour standard for the CLRP and TIP.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct, it will be considered under the eight-hour standard.

Vice Chairman Mendelson asked when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Intercounty Connector would be released.

Ms. Kaiser said the DEIS was currently expected at the end of November.

Ms. Pourciau asked for a clarification. She said the first item listed on the chart is Missouri Avenue, at Georgia Avenue and 13th Street. She said it was listed as a grade separation, but the project has been changed to an intersection improvement project and therefore would be dropped from this conformity analysis. She said she wanted to be sure that change had been made.

Mr. Kirby said that staff would be sure the change was made.

Ms. Porter asked for additional clarification on the difference between the conformity analysis under the eight-hour and the one-hour standards.

Mr. Kirby said the Clean Air Act stipulates that whenever a new standard is put into effect, a conformity analysis must be performed within one year. He said a key question has been how a conformity analysis can be done under the eight-hour standard when the requirements for 2010 are not known. He said that EPA has come up with an interim test, which is to use the same emissions budgets as for the one-hour standard, use the same methods, and make sure the new attainment year is analyzed. He said this is not really a test against the eight-hour requirements, which will be done after the new air quality plan is developed in the next two or three years.

Ms. Porter said she was concerned with how these issues relate to the Intercounty Connector (ICC). She recalled that Vice Chairman Mendelson had earlier in the year proposed that the CLRP should be tested both with the ICC in and out, so that its impact would be made explicit. She said many recent comments made by citizens and in the press displayed confusion about the project's impacts.

Ms. Porter moved that the air quality conformity analysis under consideration in this item be changed to include both an analysis with the ICC and one without that project.

Vice Chairman Mendelson seconded the motion.

Ms. Kaiser asked staff if conformity is a project level or a regional analysis.

Mr. Kirby answered that conformity is a system analysis. He said the requirement is that the system, as a whole, be shown to be within the established emissions budgets.

Ms. Kaiser asked if there is a requirement that projects be analyzed separately.

Mr. Kirby answered that there is no such requirement.

Mr. Fellows said it may not be a requirement, but this was an opportunity to look at the impacts both ways. He asked if staff saw value in looking at the impacts both ways.

Mr. Kirby said it could be done although it would mean considerable additional work and it certainly was not a requirement.

Vice Chairman Mendelson said he did not believe it was fair to ask staff if they saw value in this proposal. He said it was a policy question for the Board to consider. Regarding Ms. Porter's request, he said there has been precedent for this type of individual analysis. He noted that the conformity analysis under Item 11 included two separate analyses for two potential ICC alignments. He said he understood that additional analysis would require additional staff effort, but he said this was a choice for the Board to make which he believed could help clear up some confusion regarding the impact of the project.

Vice Chairman Knapp asked Mr. Kirby if establishing a precedent for a project-by-project analysis could mean that such an analysis would be required for every project added to the CLRP.

Mr. Kirby said that was a decision of the Board, but he believed it was a legitimate question as to why one project would be picked but not another. He said the only time that one project has been singled out was in cases in which that was the only amendment on the table, such as the Woodrow Wilson Bridge or the Redskins Stadium, which were submitted off the regular cycle for amending the CLRP and TIP.

Vice Chairman Knapp asked what timing could be expected if staff were to undertake a project-by-project analysis of all of those projects.

Mr. Kirby said it would essentially require redoing the entire analysis each time another alternative is analyzed.

Vice Chairman Knapp asked when federal requirements required the analysis to be completed.

Mr. Kirby said the approval must be in place by next June or the entire TIP will be in a lapse. He said it was important for everyone in the region to have this analysis completed expeditiously.

Vice Chairman Knapp asked how long a project-by-project analysis would take.

Mr. Kirby said it would take months to do it all. But he said that as far as the conformity requirement is concerned, the only thing the TPB was required to do was to analyze the entire system, which is the action that must be done in a timely manner.

Chairman Zimmerman said there was no dispute that a systemwide analysis was the minimum requirement. He said that supporters of Ms. Porter's proposal were not suggesting that a project-by-project analysis is needed for every project, just for very large new projects. He said he would favor doing this type of analysis any time a very large project is proposed for inclusion in the CLRP or TIP.

Vice Chairman Knapp said that if this kind of separate analysis is a good process, then it should be established as TPB policy and not determined on a case-by-case basis.

Chairman Zimmerman called for a vote. He reiterated the motion, which was to amend the resolution to include a separate analysis without the ICC. He said a vote in favor is a vote to do the additional analysis specifically focused on the ICC. A vote against is to maintain the collective analysis.

Following a voice vote, Chairman Zimmerman said that in the opinion of the chair, the "no" votes had it.

Moving on to the main motion, Chairman Zimmerman suggested that in the future, on items in which the substance of a proposed action is contained in an auxiliary document, that a passage in the resolution under consideration should refer specifically to that material. He suggested that such a reference might provide a specific identification for that material, such as “Item A1” or something similar.

Chairman Zimmerman asked if he understood the material correctly in that there were two parts to the table, the first part being essentially highway projects by jurisdiction and then public transportation projects by jurisdiction. He said he did not believe the heading identifies that. He asked that such identifications be clear in the future.

Chairman Zimmerman asked about the K Street Busway project. He noted that the project is listed on the last page but does not appear elsewhere.

Ms. Pourciau said the conformity part of the project is the added busway element and that is why it was included in the transit portion.

The motion on TPB Resolution R4-2005 to approve 2010 project submissions and the scope of work for 8-hour air quality conformity assessment on the 2004 CLRP and FY 2005-2010 TIP was approved with one dissenting vote by Mr. Roberts.

10. Briefing on Upgrades to TPB Travel Demand Model and Emissions Post-Processor Used for Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of 2004 CLRP and FY 2005-2010 TIP

Referring to the handout presentation material, Mr. Kirby briefed the Board on changes that have been made to the TPB’s travel models and the emissions post-processor. He noted that the Transportation Research Board (TRB) had conducted a review of the TPB’s modeling practices. His presentation listed six issues identified in the TRB review, and described steps staff has taken to address these six issues.

Ms. Porter said she was trying to understand the information provided by Mr. Kirby in relation to the comments made by Environmental Defense. She said she was most concerned about the comment made by Environmental Defense that in some of the highest volume freeway links, the TPB model, on average, underestimates traffic by 26 percent, and on the ten highest volume major arterials, the model, on average, underestimates traffic by 41 percent. She said she understood that the numbers Mr. Kirby provided in his presentation are for the system as a whole, but she wondered whether there might be more of a problem on high volume roads.

Mr. Kirby said the briefing he provided was a synthesis of a more detailed report. He said that some of the comments that were made by Environmental Defense are based on very detailed,

disaggregated tables that are produced for checking the models. He said these tables are publicly available and posted on the COG/TPB website. As a general comment, Mr. Kirby said that the more this information is disaggregated, the less that can be confidently said about it. He said he thought the issue with some of the disaggregated tables is that there is such a small number of data points, that they become significantly less reliable. But on an aggregate level, he believed the model was performing well.

Ms. Porter said she understood that models are an imperfect representation of reality of necessity. She said that if there is a tendency in the model to underestimate road traffic that would be of some concern.

Mr. Kirby said that in fact, road traffic was being slightly overestimated in aggregate. He said the question is that when looking at individual groups of facilities at different volume levels, the data do show the model tending to overestimate the lower volume links and underestimate the higher ones. He said these data are undergoing closer examination, but he said this was a level of disaggregation that he was not really concerned about in terms of the overall performance of the model.

Ms. Porter asked if higher volume roads were being underestimated and lower volume roads were overestimated, would this mean that overall, volume was being underestimated.

Mr. Kirby referred back to a table from his presentation that provided information on vehicle miles of travel on all road facilities in the region. He said that overall, forecasted data overestimated travel compared to observed data.

Ms. Porter said she hoped staff would continue to keep an eye on this. She said she was concerned that some of the bigger roads are the ones that she would be most concerned about.

Mr. Kirby said the Travel Forecasting Subcommittee would continue to pursue this issue and would be looking carefully at the traffic counts to see if there is a pattern. He said he would report the subcommittee's review back to the TPB.

Ms. Pourciau said that although on a regional level, forecasted data was relatively close to observed data, the difference was greater for the District of Columbia. She said this issue could be related to a continuing concern that the District of Columbia might be unfairly bearing a burden that should not be placed upon it.

11. Briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2004 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Referring to the mailout and handout material, Mr. Kirby briefly noted that information had been

provided, in exhibits 7 and 8 of the mail-out packet, on the emissions calculations for 2005, 2015, 2025 and 2030. He said these data showed that emissions forecasts are significantly below the emissions budgets and that emissions decline as the forecasts go into the future because technology is more than offsetting growth in vehicle miles of travel. He also noted that forecasted emissions are almost identical under the two alternatives for the ICC, which is not surprising, given that they start at the same place on I-270 and they connect in at the same place on I-95 and then Route 1.

Mr. Kirby said this material was released for public comment on October 1. He said a summary of comments, along with staff responses to comments, will be brought to the Board at the November 17 meeting.

12. Briefing on Presentation on the Results of the TPB Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study for the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Outreach Meetings

This item was deferred to a future meeting.

13. Other Business

Ms. Koster said that NCPC would be sponsoring a conference on November 8 with COG and the Greater Washington Board of Trade. The conference is called Surviving Security and it would attempt to engage the region on issues of the longer-term influences of security decisions on the region's transportation system, on land use, and on leasing and location choices.

14. Adjournment

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.