

**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  
February 16, 2005**

Members and Alternates Present

Phil Mendelson, D.C. Council  
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board  
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park  
David Snyder, City of Falls Church  
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT-NOVA  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT  
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT  
Ludwig Gaines, City of Alexandria  
Ron Spalding, MDOT  
Kael Anderson, NCPC  
Karina Ricks, DC Office of Planning  
David Moss, Montgomery County DPWT  
Art Smith, Loudoun County  
Damon Harvey, DDOT  
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force  
Cicero Salles, Prince George's County  
Susan Hinton, NPS  
Lora Byala, WMATA  
Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park  
Hilda Barg, Prince William County  
Wally Covington, Prince William County  
Bruce Reeder, Frederick County  
Skip Coburn, DC Council  
Sandra Jackson, FHWA  
Rick Canizales, Prince William County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

---

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Nick Ramfos	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
Andrew Austin	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Deborah Etheridge	COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam	COG/DTP
Michael Farrell	COG/DTP
Jill Locantore	COG/DTP
Dave Robertson	COG/EO
Steven Kania	COG/OPA
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Nicole Lewis	Arlington DOT
Bob Chase	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Randy Carroll	MDE
Howard Chang	TCCSMD
Sharmila Samarasinghe	VDRPT
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Deborah Burns	FTA
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Phil Tarnoff	University of Maryland
Noah Goodall	PB (Parsons Brinckerhoff)
Jim Burren	VHB
Ken Wilkinson	VDOT
Stephen Walter	Parsons Transportation Group
Douglas Stewart	Fairfax City
Allen Muchnick	CAC/TPB
Gary Groat	FLUOR
Theresa Defore	VDOT
Mike Lake	Fairfax County Department of Transportation
Alex Hekimian	M-NCPPC – Montgomery County

## 1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

---

Allen Muchnick, president of the Virginia Bicycle Federation said the list of bicycle and pedestrian projects under Item 8 was developed through the bicycle and pedestrian program managers at the TPB member jurisdictions, and not by the bicycle advocacy community. He said the list should have been thoroughly vetted through the local governing bodies. He also said the list is nearly identical to the priority list that the TPB approved in 2002. He commended COG staff and Mr. Kirby in particular for their long-term support of bicycle and pedestrian planning activities at COG. But he said the TPB's bicycle and pedestrian planning program should be much more robust and more importantly strategic. He said one of the most important areas for improvement would be to track and report both funding commitments and actual implementation of bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the region.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that Mr. Muchnick has been a long-standing member of the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee. He said that Mr. Muchnick's comments had laid out some specific policy directions, and he suggested that these issues might be discussed and vetted in the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). He asked if Mr. Muchnick planned to take these issues to the CAC for its consideration and possible advice to this body.

Mr. Muchnick said he would do that.

Mr. Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, expressed concern that the Joint Technical Working Group for the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study appears unwilling to consider new Potomac River crossings in its analysis of scenarios. He questioned the point of the study if a major potential solution is not permitted to remain on the table. He said that several months ago, the immediate past chair of the TPB expressed dismay that the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance entertains doubt as to whether the TPB is up to the task of addressing major regional issues. He said such doubts could be allayed by instructing staff to prepare and test a transportation scenario with new suburban parkways, regional bypasses, Potomac River bridges and public transit.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that he was the immediate past chair of the TPB and he said he wanted to correct Mr. Chase's statement. He expressed surprise that Mr. Chase would express the view that the TPB was not the appropriate body because it contained elected officials who had voted against a project that Mr. Chase and his group supported. He said he had noted that Mr. Chase's comments were particularly surprising given the fact that Mr. Chase's side won the vote on that controversial project and won easily. But simply the fact that a couple of TPB members happened to be on the other side of the issue seemed to be cause to doubt whether the body should function with elected officials serving on it.

Mr. Zimmerman also referred to Mr. Chase's comment that the land use scenarios in the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study would cost billions of dollars, while achieving little of note. In fact, he said, those scenarios would save billions. Given anticipated increases of 2 million people and 1.6 million jobs in the next 25 years, he said that most everyone agrees the key question is not

---

whether the region is growing or not, but where that growth will occur. He said it makes sense to think about how the region's policies affect where those people and jobs will be most efficiently located, particularly because of their impact on the transportation infrastructure.

Mr. Chase said that the study is not looking at the costs of these land use shifts in terms of non-transportation infrastructure, including schools, hospitals, police and emergency services.

Mr. Zimmerman said he was foreseeing all those things and he believed that more compact development and development located more efficiently near transportation infrastructure mostly tends to reduce those other costs.

Mr. Snyder commended NVTAA and Bob Chase for his comments last month in support of the Blue Ribbon Panel's recommendations regarding Metro funding. He noted that State Senator Mary Margaret Whipple had introduced a resolution, which passed the Virginia Senate unanimously, that would have carried forward the recommendations that the TPB endorsed. Unfortunately, the House of Delegates Rules Committee had voted to table that resolution. He called upon other jurisdictions within the TPB to pursue the Metro funding issue as well. He again thanked Mr. Chase for his advocacy on this issue.

## **2. Approval of Minutes of January 19, 2005 Meeting**

A motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

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

Referring to the mailout report, Mr. Mokhtari said the Technical Committee met on Friday, February 4 and reviewed five items on the TPB agenda. Three additional items were presented, including one which presented tables from the 2004 Census showing numbers of workers by place of residence and place of work by mode of transportation.

Mr. Salles congratulated Mr. Mokhtari for his appointment as chair of the TPB Technical Committee.

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

In the absence of Mr. Jaffe, the CAC chair, Mr. Swanson of the COG/DTP staff reported on the meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee on February 10. Referring to the handout report, he

---

said that because the 2005 CAC had not yet been fully appointed, the 2004 members met along with a few new people who anticipated being appointed. He said the committee discussed recent developments in the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study, particularly the development of transportation scenarios. The committee also discussed outreach meetings regarding the issues raised in the study. The committee decided they would like to have their first outreach meeting this year in Prince George's County.

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

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on February 4 and amended the TPB work program for this year to modify some tasks and budgets for the remainder of this fiscal year. He said the committee also amended the TIP at the request of the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) for projects related to congestion management activities on the Interstates, and preliminary engineering for projects in the City of Manassas and City of Alexandria.

Referring to the handout letter packet, Mr. Kirby called attention to a letter from the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) which said that with the adoption of the Metro Matters program, the system will be able to accommodate ridership growth projected through 2010. The ridership growth between 2005 and 2010 previously had been constrained in the conformity analysis. WMATA has asked that the new conformity analysis constrain ridership at the 2010 level, rather than the 2005 level. He said the draft scope of work for air quality conformity analysis, which was included under Item 14, would need to be revised to reflect this change.

Mr. Kirby said that the City of Bowie had also written a letter indicating that they had appointed a council member to the TPB. That letter also referenced a project, known as the Willowbrook Parkway, which was listed in the 2003 Constrained Long Range Plan brochure. The City of Bowie requested the removal of this project. Mr. Kirby said he checked on this item and found that it was removed last year. He suggested that a letter should be sent from the chairman indicating that this request was fulfilled.

Chairman Mendelson agreed to send the letter.

Chairman Mendelson asked if there was information on whether there would be even more growth in ridership if WMATA purchased even more rail cars than currently planned.

Mr. Kirby said that staff had not made an estimate of that.

Mr. Zimmerman said that Chairman Mendelson seemed to be suggesting the possibility of induced demand for transit, and he said he believed the answer was yes, it would occur. He said an

---

additional question was how much additional ridership would be obtained even without additional cars. He noted that ridership has consistently outpaced projections. He said that the point at which it will not be possible to accommodate ridership might be earlier than 2010.

Ms. Byala said that there are two issues at hand: There is the question of modeling and the question of what happens in real life on the WMATA system. She said that when WMATA put together the Metro Matters funding agreement, their staff did some internal analysis based on WMATA's demand projections and determined that with the Metro Matters cars being funded, project demand could be accommodated just beyond 2010. That is why they have requested this change to the TPB travel demand analysis. However she emphasized that this is essentially a modeling exercise and it should not be imputed that there is now plenty of room on Metro.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if Ms. Byala was saying that with Metro Matters, things can be kept from getting any worse.

Ms. Byala said that with the Metro Matters funding, WMATA staff had projected that the system would be above what WMATA considers to be high levels of congestion. She said that this would mean it would prevent things from getting any worse.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if that meant that conditions would not get much better but would stay the same as they are now.

Ms. Byala said this was correct.

Mr. Salles said he hoped that with Metro Matters reliability will also improve.

Chairman Mendelson said it is important to remember that Metro Matters includes much less funding than earlier proposals. He said that anticipated serious crowding on Metro has simply been delayed for a few years. He said his question earlier in the conversation had asked whether more ridership growth would occur if a program more ambitious than Metro Matters were funded and therefore trains were less crowded and more attractive. He said he understood from Mr. Kirby that such an analysis had not been performed.

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

Chairman Mendelson noted changes in membership of the TPB. He said that new members included Ellen McCarthy for the D.C. Office of Planning, Gail Booker Jones for Bowie, Arthur Holmes for Montgomery County, and Haitham Hijazi for Prince George's County. New alternates include Geraldine Edens from Gaithersburg, Konrad Herling from Greenbelt, Marc Elrich from Takoma Park and Wally Covington from Prince William County. He said Kael Anderson was present at the meeting, filling in for Julia Koster, who usually represents the National Capital

---

Planning Commission.

### **7. Approval of Appointments to the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for the Year 2005**

Referring to the handout memorandum, Chairman Mendelson said the Board was being asked to approve nine appointments to the CAC, which were being nominated by the three TPB officers. He said that four alternate members were also being nominated for the District of Columbia. He said he understood that alternate members would be allowed to sit at the table at CAC meeting and participate in discussions.

A motion was made to approve the nominations. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for an indication of which of the nominations were new appointments.

Mr. Swanson said the new members were Grace Malakoff for the District of Columbia, Kim Shiley for Maryland and Jim Larsen for Virginia. He said Samantha Nolan will be a new alternate member for the District of Columbia.

Chairman Mendelson noted that Dennis Jaffe would be reappointed as chair.

The motion was approved unanimously.

### **8. Briefing on Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans as a Context for the Project Priorities Identified in the Solicitation Document for the 2005 CLRP and FY 2006-2011 TIP**

Referring to the handout presentation and the mailout material, Mr. Sebastian, chair of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, briefed the Board on current bicycle and pedestrian plans in the region, and on the rationale and criteria for the selection of the priority projects by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee. He noted that this item was on the TPB agenda in January, and that TPB members had several questions. He gave a presentation that explained the larger context for this list, including the project selection process, and reviewed information about the overall funding commitment for bicycle and pedestrian projects in the region.

Chairman Mendelson asked whether his understanding was correct that the federal government is requiring the inclusion of bicycle or pedestrian facilities in almost every project.

Mr. Sebastian said that was correct unless there are extenuating circumstances.

Chairman Mendelson said he recalled that there were concerns about bicycle and pedestrians

---

provisions in the Intercounty Connector project.

Mr. Spalding said the Intercounty Connector is being developed and planned with a bicycle facility, but the details were unclear. He said the state is working with the counties on this issue. He said the original bike facility that had been planned is being reanalyzed. He said the record of decision is expected later this year.

Chairman Mendelson asked what kind of bike facilities would be or had been considered as part of the ICC project.

Mr. Spalding said it would be adjacent to the actual roadway facility.

Mr. Salles said he represents Prince George's County on the ICC team. He commended the State Highway Administration for its work on this issue.

Ms. Porter said she had chaired the TPB Greenways Committee that had compiled a priorities report in 2000. She said that the Greenways Committee had identified many of the same priorities. She said her committee had included both staff of the TPB and of the jurisdictions, as well as advocates. She said she thought this structure worked very well. She asked whether the work of the advocacy community and the work of staff could be better coordinated.

Mr. Sebastian said that was a good point. He said the Bicycle/Pedestrian Subcommittee meetings currently include as many advocates as staff.

Ms. Porter asked if they participate in the development of priorities.

Mr. Sebastian said they do participate extensively in the development of priorities. He said that staff can look at ways in which their role can be enhanced.

Ms. Porter said she believes it is very important to get these groups involved because it gives the recommendations greater weight.

Mr. Zimmerman said the presentation addresses some of the questions that a number of members, including himself, raised at the last meeting. He noted that in Virginia, the Department of Transportation in recent years had established a provision requiring substantial consideration of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in every transportation project. He referred to language in the TPB Vision calling for convenient and safe bicycle and pedestrian access, but he said he did not believe that any additional TPB policy statement on this subject had been developed since then. As an example, he suggested the next steps might include looking at the Complete Streets concept. He said it might be appropriate to consider developing policy guidance that would relate in greater detail to specific projects.



---

Regarding the question of funding, Mr. Zimmerman noted that the chart on page 7 of Mr. Sebastian's presentation indicates that in the entire program, the share of bicycle and pedestrian programs is about three percent. He said he believed that number speaks for itself. He also noted that the priority list includes only nine projects and most of these projects had been on the list previously. He said that this fact was telling. He said this seems to be the area of transportation to which the region is giving the least attention. He noted that he had asked Mr. Muchnick to work with the Citizens Advisory Committee to push these issues. He said he would like to see the TPB taking a look at what more can be done to increase the contribution of these kinds of projects which are such a major part of daily living and the overall transportation needs of the region.

### **9. Report on the Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Farrell gave an update on the Street Smart Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Campaign. He described the origins of the campaign and how the campaign was run in past years. He said this will be the third year for the campaign. He said it includes drive-time radio, posters, bus backs, printouts, and cable television and radio spots. The campaign generally runs in English and Spanish for a four-week burst. The campaign this year is planned for April. He described the evaluation of the program.

He said the local funding thus far has been run on a fairly ad hoc basis, but staff is now looking at ways to institutionalize the funding. As far as suggested contributions, Mr. Farrell said the Fairfax County annual funding level of five cents per capita might be considered a guide. He said that if every jurisdiction provided five cents per capita, total local funding would be about \$200,000, which would tremendously increase the program, probably leverage more federal money, and perhaps run the campaign in two waves, instead of just one.

Mr. Zimmerman thanked Mr. Farrell for the presentation. While he said there are limitations to the impact of education alone, it was an important part of a comprehensive effort to improve safety. He said this was a good example of a project which makes sense to conduct on a regional basis. He said he continued to be interested in the question of whether the campaign is big enough to really have a substantial impact. He said he thought the current level of funding was barely adequate; he said if it were funded at a little less than current levels it might not be worth doing. He said he was stressing this point to underscore the point in Mr. Farrell's message regarding the need to make funding for the program predictable and uniform. He noted that at the beginning of the program Montgomery County provided a substantial portion of the funding, but that seems to have changed and now Fairfax County was the largest contributor. He said that that if the TPB was going to continue this program, participants must figure out a way to ensure everyone is contributing an equitable share. He asked for responses from the other members as to whether they were willing to contribute in a proportional basis at the same level as Fairfax County.

Chairman Mendelson said he believed a better approach would be to ask Mr. Kirby to develop a

---

recommendation for the Board to consider next month.

Mr. Zimmerman said he believed the memo was a recommendation.

Chairman Mendelson said he understood the item was simply informational.

Mr. Kirby said that in staff's discussion with the jurisdictions it was clear that the current ad hoc nature of the funding created difficulties in terms of the budget process. He said that Fairfax County has put the funding into their budget, which makes it more reliable on a yearly basis. He suggested the other jurisdictions might be encouraged to put the funding into their budgets.

Chairman Mendelson suggested this recommendation could be brought back to the Board in March in the form of a draft resolution.

Mr. Zimmerman said he would appreciate seeing such a resolution at a future meeting. He said he believed it was important for members to be asked explicitly whether they would support paying a specified amount, and if not the jurisdictions should let the Board know so the program can proceed on that basis.

Chairman Mendelson said that if a majority of members agree, then the TPB would be the regional forum by which that coordinated request would be made.

Mr. Moss said that the Technical Committee had discussed the need for a formal letter that should be sent requesting the funding so that higher level individuals might get involved in the decision making on this issue.

Mr. Gaines recalled that last year a report on this program had provided some comparative data evaluating the effectiveness of the program. He said that before a decision is made that more money is warranted, it was important to have a better understanding of the program's impacts.

Chairman Mendelson said that was a fair request. He added that he would like specifically to see accident data.

Mr. Farrell said that he believed that accident data was a bit ambitious at this point. He noted that there are many different factors that would affect accidents much more than this campaign. He said that considering behavior modification campaigns, such as seat belt usage and drunk driving, the target period for actually accomplishing a major change in behavior was seven to nine years. In terms of the crash data, the data for 2004 will not be available until the middle of the year. He said a campaign like this is a drop in the ocean; it would be hard to show a meaningful result in terms of number of deaths reduced in such a brief time frame. He said that does not mean there are no measures of success for this program. At the most basic level, it is possible and useful to measure whether or not people are hearing the messages of the campaign, like the need to yield to

---

pedestrians or watch out for bicyclists.

Chairman Mendelson said he would like to see accident data to get a sense of the problem. Mr. Jaffe suggested the insurance industry in the region might be worth consulting to evaluate the effectiveness of the campaign.

Chairman Mendelson said it would be left to staff to determine how to provide these evaluations.

## **10. Review of Draft FY 2006 Unified Planning Work Program**

Referring to the handout presentation, Mr. Kirby briefed the Board on the draft FY 2006 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). He said that at this point every year, staff brings to the Board a draft of the UPWP for the coming fiscal year, which begins July 1. He described the various components of the work program.

Chairman Mendelson noted that this was an information item on the agenda. The Board would be asked to vote on it next month.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the draft UPWP had been reviewed by the Technical Committee on January 7 and had been given to the Citizens Advisory Committee on February 10. He asked if releasing a document for public comment meant it was released at the meeting of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). He asked what else is done in releasing a document for public comment.

Mr. Kirby said the meeting of the CAC typically is used for releasing documents for public comment. He said the CAC meets the Thursday before the TPB meeting and always has the entire TPB mailout packet for its meeting. He said the use of that date provides a full 30 days before action.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if there is any other action accompanying the release of a document.

Chairman Zimmerman asked if it was available on the website.

Mr. Kirby said it is.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if there is any effort to let anyone know that they might want to look at the document on the website. He asked if a press release was sent out.

Mr. Kirby said a press release was not normally done for the work program.

Mr. Zimmerman said this seemed to mean that only the members of the CAC would have seen it.

---

Mr. Kirby said this is a very regular and visible exercise for anyone who's following the TPB process.

Mr. Zimmerman said that "visible" is not the word he would use, but it is regular. He asked whether the document was distributed to jurisdictional staff besides the Technical Committee itself.

Mr. Kirby said that it is mailed to every member of the Technical Committee as well as others on the committee mailing list.

Mr. Zimmerman suggested that a notice should be sent to jurisdictional staff saying the document can be found on the website. He said that not everyone who should go to the Technical Committee is able to make the meetings or to participate. He said he just found out that some staff who should be attending the Technical Committee did not even know they should be participating. He said it is a good idea to inform people that the document is available and they might want to take a look at it.

Chairman Mendelson asked if Mr. Zimmerman was requesting that all members of the Technical Committee be notified that this is available.

Mr. Zimmerman asked how the members of the Technical Committee are appointed.

Mr. Kirby said the members are appointed by their jurisdictions. He said there is no formal TPB appointment process. Staff at the jurisdictions designate individuals to attend.

Mr. Zimmerman said he was concerned that if the jurisdictions know about it, they designate somebody, but if they do not know, there might not be a member.

Chairman Mendelson said that Mr. Zimmerman was being a little unfair. He noted that a membership list for the Technical Committee was available every month.

Mr. Zimmerman said his question was not who the members are, but how they become members.

Mr. Kirby said the process relies on the local jurisdictions to make the appointments. He said attendance at the Technical Committee is excellent. He said they have never found a jurisdiction that is not aware of the committee. He said if a member leaves, another appointment is made.

Mr. Zimmerman said reappointments do not always happen and he knew of an example of such a case. More broadly regarding the topic of public release of documents, he said he did not think there was a lot of outreach.

---

Mr. Kirby said that if Mr. Zimmerman was not comfortable with the appointment made for his jurisdiction, it would be his prerogative to make a change.

Mr. Zimmerman said that was not his point. He said he was simply saying it would be a good idea to send a notice out to jurisdictional staff that such documents are available.

Mr. Kirby said staff would make sure they know.

Ms. Barg said this has never been a problem with Prince William County. She said the board of supervisors makes the appointments and makes sure they attend the meetings. She said this has never been a problem and she assumed it was the same for other jurisdictions.

Mr. Zimmerman said the Arlington County Board has never made the appointments.

Ms. Ricks asked for clarification regarding the doubling of resources for cooperative forecasting and transportation planning. She asked what would be done under this item that has not been previously done.

Mr. Kirby said there will be a more extensive effort to work with the planning directors examining the cooperative forecasts by each jurisdiction, for households and employment. He noted that there also is an effort underway with the Baltimore Metropolitan Council. He noted that a public comment a couple of months ago from Environmental Defense argued that the employment and household forecasts for the Baltimore and Washington regions when considered jointly were not viable. Specifically, the argument was that there are not enough workers to fill the jobs. He said this issue would be extensively examined. He said it was important to work with the planning directors on this issue because it was becoming a major concern.

Ms. Ricks asked what the end-product would be.

Mr. Kirby said staff is hoping the issue would be reconciled. He said another pressing question relates to the assumptions about the external jurisdictions, including those beyond the TPB's modeled area. He said it is time to have a very explicit discussion about those points.

Mr. Griffiths added that another activity under this item would be the development of finer level analysis zones for activity centers. He said staff would be working with the planning directors to get explicit forecasts, not only for the activity clusters, which are larger geographic areas, but for the activity centers themselves. He also said that as growth expands to outer suburban counties, additional transportation zones would be needed in those areas.

## **11. Status Report on Staff Proposals for FY 2006 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)**

---

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said that normally at this time in the year, a detailed work program would be presented in draft. However, he said that this year staff was taking a completely new look at the Commuter Connections Program and will restructure its components and develop funding proposals for the departments of transportation (DOTs) to review. He said the program has evolved over the years as various Transportation Emissions Reductions Measures (TERMs) were added, but that the funding shares for the DOTs had never been revisited. He said proposals regarding funding were currently being discussed and the item would be brought back to the Board at the next meeting.

## **12. Briefing on Project Submissions for 2005 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby briefed the Board on the submissions for this year's Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He said the Board would be asked to approve these submissions for inclusion in the air quality conformity analysis at the March 16 meeting. He said that approval is sought at this stage in the process because the air quality conformity analysis takes several months and it is very costly to have to do it again. He said it was important at this point to ensure that all the requirements have been met for inclusion in the plan.

Mr. Kirby presented a memorandum, including a map, summarizing the significant changes that have been submitted this year. He highlighted some major projects, including a section of the Capital Beltway in Northern Virginia which is being submitted as a High Occupancy/Toll (HOT) lanes project that would be funded through a private funding agreement with Fluor Engineering. The other project he highlighted is a bypass around the Manassas National Battlefield Park in Fairfax and Prince William Counties, which was submitted by the Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division of the Federal Highway Administration. He said that Mr. Van Dop from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) had briefed staff on the project. He said that staff has some continuing questions about the costs and sources of funding for the project. He said that information would be needed before March 16 in order for the project to be included in the project submissions that will be approved for air quality conformity analysis.

Ms. Smyth said the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors had not had a chance to review the Manassas Battlefield bypass project, and in particular, she noted that the Board of Supervisors had not received an indication of funding. She questioned whether that information could be made available by March 16.

Mr. Van Dop, representing the FHWA said the agency was trying to meet the conformity cycle for this year. He said the draft Environmental Impact Statement had just been released. He said he had met with Supervisor Frye from Fairfax County who asked that this issue be brought to the full

---

Board of Supervisors sometime after the Draft Environmental Impact Statement has been released and a public hearing has been held on it, which is not scheduled to occur until the middle or end of March. He said that from a financial point of view, the agency understood that information is needed and hoped it would be available before March 16.

Chairman Mendelson asked if it was correct that the presentation to the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors would take place after the TPB's vote on March 16.

Mr. Van Dop said that was the way it is scheduled right now. He said the FHWA and the National Park Service have a preferred alternative and a draft EIS. He said that comments at the public hearing and the comments from the Boards of both Fairfax and Prince William counties and VDOT would provide information that might change the alternative.

Ms. Hudgins said the timing for this project raises some concerns. She said she hoped that before March 16, some answers could be provided regarding the project, particularly related to funding.

Mr. Van Dop said his agency appreciated these issues. He said this ultimately came down to a question of timing: A record of decision could not be issued until the project had been included in the regional conformity analysis.

Chairman Mendelson said the item before the TPB was simply a presentation of the document. He said that when the Board is asked next month to vote on the document, it would have the authority to delete the project if the majority so voted.

Mr. Kirby asked that every TPB member review the projects that were listed to ensure the information provided was accurate.

### **13. Update on Actions to Improve Regional Transportation Communications and Coordination During Incidents**

Mr. Snyder introduced Phil Tarnoff from the University of Maryland to make the presentation.

Referring to the handout presentation, Mr. Tarnoff briefed the Board on the development of an organization to coordinate transportation information during major incidents. He said an organization named CapCom has been proposed to provide this coordination. He said that CapCom, as currently proposed, will be initiated in a three-phase program: Preparation, Prototyping and Operation. He described these phases. He emphasized that CapCom would make sure that transportation information gets out to the public, to the media, and to transportation and public safety officials who need to know it.

---

Mr. Tarnoff said that full operation of CapCom has been estimated at \$4.9 million per year. He said that four potential sources of funding have been identified: 1) Homeland Security funding under the Urban Areas Security Initiative (UASI), 2) Congressionally earmarked funding, 3) traditional transportation federal aid funding, and 4) contributions by the jurisdictions. Regarding the UASI funding request, he said that the proposal had passed the initial screening and would be submitted to COG's Chief Administrative Officers (CAO) committee for review. For Congressional earmarks, he said some encouraging meetings had taken place with Congressional staff. He said that TPB Chairman Mendelson would be asked to send a letter of endorsement to the region's Congressional delegation regarding this request. He said a final recommendation was being developed regarding the governance of CapCom.

Mr. Snyder moved approval of the draft letter that would be sent by Chairman Mendelson to the Congressional delegation and the COG Chief Administrative Officers (CAOs) Committee in support of funding for CapCom.

Chairman Mendelson said that this was the first time he had seen the letter, so he asked for the opportunity for editing. He asked that he be authorized to send a letter to the Congressional delegation and CAOs in support of the funding.

The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

Chairman Mendelson noted that emergency preparedness was one of the issues that he had asked to be highlighted in the Solicitation Document. He asked Mr. Kirby how that was being handled.

Mr. Kirby said staff would report back on how well the project was being funded. He said there were strong indications that the project would be funded and moving forward.

Chairman Mendelson asked what information regarding the CLRP would be before the TPB in March.

Mr. Kirby said all the significant projects would be provided for the Board to approve for inclusion in the air quality conformity analysis. He said that as the year goes on, staff will receive all the projects for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), including the ones that are not sensitive to the air quality.

Chairman Mendelson asked if his understanding was correct that the CapCom proposal was conformity neutral and therefore it did not need to meet the March deadline.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct.

#### **14. Briefing on Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for 2005**



---

## **Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Clifford briefed the Board on the draft scope of work for the air quality conformity assessment for the 2005 CLRP and FY 2006-2011 TIP.

He said the scope of work covered conformity assessment for the eight-hour ozone standard, but at this time it does not include a conformity assessment for the PM 2.5 standard for fine particulates because EPA has not yet issued guidance on this standard. However, he noted that a conformity assessment for fine particulates would have to be performed for this CLRP and TIP by the end of 2005. Mr. Clifford described key points regarding the scope of work. He also called attention to the conformity schedule. He said the submitted projects are scheduled to be approved in March for inclusion in the conformity assessment. He said staff will develop a draft report on conformity in July. TPB action is scheduled for September.

Mr. Kirby called attention in the documents regarding the closing date for public comment. He said the front page of the mailout memorandum indicates a closing date of March 12, which was the correct date. Page 10 of the memorandum listed March 13 as the closing date, which was incorrect.

### **15. Notice of Proposed Amendments to the FY 2004-2009 and FY 2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) That Are Exempt from Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Modify Funding for 15 Projects in Frederick, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as Requested by Maryland DOT**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Spalding called attention to 15 amendments to the FY 2004 and FY 2005 TIPs. He said these projects reflect the Maryland General Assembly's approval of revenue enhancements this past year for Montgomery, Prince George's and Frederick Counties. He said these amendments were out for a 30-day review and public comment period. The Board would be asked to approve these amendments at the next meeting.

### **16. Other Business**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:03 p.m.

