

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
June 15, 2011**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Melissa Barlow, FTA
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Barbara Comstock, Virginia House of Delegates
Kerry Donley, City of Alexandria
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Tawanna Gaines, Maryland House of Delegates
Jason Groth, Charles County
Rene'e Hamilton, VDOT
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax Board of Supervisors
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Maurice Keys, DDOT
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick
Bill Lebegern, MWAA
Michael C. May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Paul Smith, Frederick County
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Ron Kirby | |
| Gerald Miller | |
| Andrew Austin | |
| Wendy Klancher | |
| Jane Posey | |
| Michael Farrell | |
| Karin Foster | |
| Gareth James | |
| Debbie Leigh | |
| Deborah Etheridge | |
| Rex Hodgson | |
| Deb Kerson Bilek | |
| Beth Newman | |
| Lewis Miller | COG/OPA |
| Zach Dobelbower | TPB/CAC |
| Alex Verzosa | City of Fairfax |
| Bill Orleans | Citizens |
| Randy Carroll | MDE |
| Pierre Holloman | City of Alexandria |
| Greg McFarland | NVTC |
| Patrick Durany | Senior Aide – Prince William County |
| Mike Sherman | Pepper & Hobbes |
| Mark Baskin | Maryland Transit Administration |
| Emily Shaw | Commonwealth Consultants |
| Carl Schuettler | Prince George’s County DPW&T |
| Jennifer Fioretti | Arlington County DOT |
| Bob Chase | Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance |
| Mike Lake | Fairfax County Department of Transportation |
| Chris Daddio | MWAA |
| Tina Slater | Action Committee for Transit |
| Mike Hackett | MWAA |
| Betsy Massie | PRTC |

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Robert Buchanan spoke on behalf of the 2030 Group, a 501(c)(3) organization comprised of business leaders focused on regional long-term decision-making and solutions, with a mission to initiate research and analysis to better understand the growth trends affecting the region today and over the next 20 years. He said that he hopes that timely, meaningful, and credible research will lead to action-oriented results for greater regional cooperation. He said the Suburban Maryland Transportation Alliance and the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance were commissioned by the 2030 Group to perform a transportation survey of the region’s

transportation experts. He said the results would be released on June 16.

Rich Parsons of the Suburban Maryland Transportation Alliance spoke about how the 2030 Group survey was conducted. He said the survey was conducted by telephone and focus group interviews between February and June 2011. He said 40 transportation professionals participated in the process. He said participants were asked about regional and sub-regional priorities within their areas of expertise, the most important criteria upon which to base priority selection, and how to improve the current planning and priority-setting processes. He said that upon completion of the interviews, participants were gathered for a series of focus groups to get a deeper understanding of the results.

Bob Chase of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance (NVTVA) commended the TPB on moving forward with the development of a regional transportation priorities plan and also commented on the key components of the 2030 Group survey, and how the 2030 Group's research complements the TPB's priority planning process. He said the results of the survey provide greater specificity and focus on several topics, including which highway and transit investments offer the greater benefits, which investments the experts consider to be of greatest importance, the criteria most important in determining which projects rise to the top in terms of congestion relief, and how transportation experts view the existing regional and sub-regional planning processes. He said that NVTVA encourages the TPB to condense the proposed three-year timetable for developing a regional transportation priorities plan.

Stewart Schwartz of the Coalition for Smarter Growth commented on the immense amount of work produced by the TPB on regional transportation planning and said there is much to commend about the regional transportation planning process. He said he agreed with the NVTVA that the TPB should accelerate its schedule for the regional transportation priority setting process. He said the TPB has a good starting point in the wealth of information it has generated through past technical work. He said that due to the economic and environmental climates, smart land use solutions must be at the core of the approach to the regional transportation network. He said he is concerned about the research developed by the 2030 Group and questioned whether it provides an unbiased picture of the transportation debate. He closed by saying that the proposed projects for I-95 and I-66 under Item 11 would take the region in a negative direction in terms of air quality, land use, and VMT. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

2. Approval of Minutes of May 18 Meeting

Vice Chair Turner made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 18 TPB meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

3. Report of Technical Committee

Mr. Harrington said the Technical Committee met on June 3 and reviewed a number of items on the TPB agenda, including the Virginia updates to the FY 2011-2016 TIP, the JARC and New

Freedom grant programs, the scope of work for a regional transportation priorities plan, the air quality conformity analysis for amending the 2010 CLRP to include the I-95 HOT lanes and I-66 project, and WMATA's Regional Transit System Plan. He said that the Committee also discussed four additional items: the draft documentation for the 2010 CLRP, a housing and transportation affordability cost measure developed for the DC Office of Planning, the spring 2010 Regional HOV study, and draft marketing brochures on expanding the current Capital Bike Share program.

4. Report of Citizens Advisory Committee

Mr. Dobelbower said the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) met on June 9 and discussed several items on the TPB agenda: the draft 2010 CLRP documentation, the JARC and New Freedom grant programs, and the scope of work for a regional transportation priorities planning process, which the CAC voted to support. He said the CAC thought the CLRP documentation was user-friendly and contains a nice combination of visual material and text. He said several long-standing CAC members noted a significant improvement in the CLRP documentation over the past several years. He said CAC members offered suggestions for improving interpretability of the documentation.

Mr. Dobelbower said the CAC also voted to request that the TPB develop a Regional Complete Streets Policy. The CAC agreed on a recommendation for such a regional effort and supports the premise that complete streets recognize that streets should be designed, built and operated to enable safe access for all users, including pedestrian, bicyclists, motorists, and transit riders of diverse ages and abilities. He said the CAC recommended that each TPB member jurisdiction adopt a Complete Streets Policy by 2014, noting that there is not a one-size-fits-all approach for such policies. He said a regional policy would support the notion that a complete streets approach to planning is cost-effective and would act as a catalyst to encourage complete streets across the region. He said the CAC proposed that the TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee take the lead in developing the regional policy in conjunction with the TPB Access for All Advisory Committee, the CAC, and the committee that oversees the TPB's Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.

Vice Chair Turner asked TPB staff to comment on the next steps for a Regional Complete Streets Policy.

Mr. Kirby said staff will take this proposal to the TPB Technical Committee and TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee for review, and then bring it back to the TPB for action.

Vice Chair Turner noted that some jurisdictions already have complete streets policies.

Mr. Kirby said that some do, and the TPB committees will be able to provide greater insight on existing policies and needs.

Mr. Erenrich said that in addition to the committees Mr. Dobelbower mentioned, the TPB

Regional Bus Subcommittee should be involved in review and development of a complete streets policy.

Chair Bowser thanked Mr. Dobelbower and the CAC for bringing the proposal for a Regional Complete Streets Policy to the attention of the Board. She asked when the Technical Committee might review the proposal.

Mr. Kirby said the Technical Committee would discuss the concept at its July 8 meeting. He said the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee meets later in July, so the TPB will receive feedback from both committees at its September meeting.

5. Report of Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on June 3 and approved two amendments to the FY 2011-2016 TIP to include nine bridge replacement and rehabilitation projects requested by Montgomery County DOT and to add about \$7.5 million to the Fort Belvoir ramps project, funded by the Defense Access Roads Program. He referred to several items in the letters packet, including the application the TPB submitted to the FHWA's Transportation, Community, and Systems Preservation (TCSP) Grant Program. He said the TPB application is for \$200,000 (\$160,000 federal and \$40,000 COG match) and will analyze opportunities throughout the region to enhance walk and bike access to rail stations that will promote housing and employment development, ultimately enhancing the efficiency of the transportation network. He said that a memo distributed at the meeting details additional applications submitted throughout the region for TCSP funding. He said the letters packet also includes a memorandum on TPB bus supportive activities. He said the TPB held the annual transit forum on May 24 and asked Mr. Werth to comment on the forum.

Mr. Werth said this was the 22nd annual transit forum and that 26 representatives of transit agencies and 14 private providers attended. He said it was a great forum and included lively discussion on diversity of mobility aids among other topics. He thanked TPB staff for their support.

Mr. Kirby highlighted a memorandum in the letters packet on an Eco-Driving campaign developed by the I-95 Corridor Coalition, noting that eco-driving was examined in the What Would It Take? scenario work conducted by the TPB. He said the TPB will participate as a partner in the Eco-Driving campaign that the I-95 Corridor Coalition will publicize for the Fourth of July weekend.

Mr. Kirby said the final letter in the packet is the approval of the FY 2012 Unified Planning Work Program from the Federal Highway and Transit Administrations. He said staff will bring to the TPB in July and September modifications to the UPWP to reflect final budget numbers following the budget processes at the federal level.

Ms. Tregoning spoke to the list of TPB bus supportive activities. She said the themes expressed

in the memo are helpful, but that she was not able to geographically understand where the activity is happening in terms of bus routes and locations. She asked if it is possible to get a list or a geo-coded map that would show the TPB where bus planning and bus supportive activities are occurring.

Mr. Kirby said that information was included in a report that was presented last month to the TPB by the Regional Bus Subcommittee. He said that while the information exists, the subcommittee did not think it appropriate to present it at the project level, since the level of development varied by project. He said there will be more intensive work required to get more specifics as the projects move forward. He said the hot spots that the TPB will be reviewing are location-specific.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for clarification on the work plan for this effort in terms of when the TPB would see another report. He also asked Mr. Kirby to compare this effort to the annual priority list developed by the TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee.

Mr. Kirby said the work is very similar in the sense that the processes used by both the Bicycle and Pedestrian and Regional Bus Subcommittees will lead to specific projects. He said the Regional Bus Subcommittee is starting at the broad-brush level and will be getting more detailed. He said the themes would lead to more specific projects, which will be advanced as part of the priority planning process along with the bicycle and pedestrian projects. He believes that the idea for the process was based on the TPB's bicycle and pedestrian project development process in terms of recommending projects for inclusion in the annual TIP cycle and reporting on how projects fared over the past year.

Mr. Zimmerman asked how long it would take to get to a specific project list.

Mr. Kirby said the TPB would likely see specific projects later in the fall.

Mr. Erenrich said the current process undertaken by the Regional Bus Subcommittee focuses more on themes and concepts than specific projects with dollar amounts that the subcommittee can put forward for consideration. He said the subcommittee would likely be moving in that direction in the next several months. He said there is one project that has come up many times in discussion – the need for the commuter bus operators to have a staging location in or near downtown. He said there has been much discussion with the operators and the District of Columbia, but that a specific solution has not yet been identified.

Mr. Zimmerman said he understands there are challenges to many specific projects, bus, bicycle, and pedestrian projects alike, but asked if Mr. Erenrich sees the Regional Bus Subcommittee getting to the point of developing specific solutions and projects.

Mr. Erenrich said he believes this will happen.

6. Chair's Remarks

Chair Bowser said she is very pleased to see the list of projects submitted for TCSP funding, and noted that the TPB submitted an application. She said this demonstrated that a lot of planning agencies are prepared to take advantage of federal money, even under a tight deadline. She thanked and congratulated everyone for being prepared.

ACTION ITEMS

7. Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that is Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Update Projects and Funding in the Virginia Section

Chair Bowser said this item requests approval of an amendment to the FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program that is exempt from the air quality conformity requirement to update projects and funding.

A motion was made and seconded to adopt resolution R19-2011.

Ms. Hamilton said this item represents an annual update of Virginia's TIP that reflects the latest funding obligations for both the highway and transit projects as reflected in the current six-year improvement plan for FY 2011-2016. She explained the difference in the funding levels, which results from adding three more years of projects to the TIP. She said that this request does not include the new funding that will be part of the new six-year improvement plan on which the Commonwealth Transportation Board would vote on June 15. She said those changes would be reflected in an amendment requested of the TPB in the future.

The motion passed unanimously.

8. Approval of CY 2011 Projects for Funding Under the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom Programs of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

Chair Bowser explained that this item concerned the approval of the CY 2011 projects for funding under the Job Access Reverse Commute program, or JARC, and the New Freedom program of the FTA. She recognized Mr. Wojahn, who had served as Chair of the Selection Committee, to introduce the item.

Mr. Wojahn thanked the staff and the members of the Selection Committee, and said it had been a pleasure to serve as Chair. He said it had been the most competitive process since the TPB had taken over the allocation of these grants, with the requested funding totaling more than two and a half times the available funding. He said that of the fifteen projects recommended for funding, eight would receive funding through JARC and seven through New Freedom. He explained that the TPB had served as the designated recipient for these two programs since 2006 for the D.C.,

Virginia and Maryland urbanized area, that JARC serves the purpose of assisting low-income workers in getting access to job sites, and that New Freedom is intended to provide transportation for persons with disabilities. He noted that the projects require a non-federal match, 50 percent for operating grants and 20 percent for capital projects.

Mr. Wojahn said a competitive process for choosing projects is federally mandated, and that the TPB process involved a six-member Selection Committee that scored the applications based on all the criteria that were approved by the TPB on December 16th, 2009. He said that the Selection Committee was independent and geographically balanced, and included both local and national representatives from transit, private providers, and human services agencies. He said that the six members of the committee were Gwen Rubinstein from the Washington Area Women's Foundation, Michael Artson from Fastran Fairfax County, Joyce Taylor from The Arc of Montgomery County, Neil Sherman from the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, Carolyn Jeskey from the Community Transportation Association of America, and Harold Morgan from the Taxicab, Limousine, and Paratransit Association.

Mr. Wojahn reiterated that it was a very competitive process, noting that the TPB received 24 JARC and New Freedom project applications, and that 15 of them were recommended for funding. He said that those applicants whose projects were not funded would receive letters with feedback from the Selection Committee discussing how they might improve their applications for next year. He then invited Ms. Newman of TPB staff to present a PowerPoint describing the 15 project recommendations in greater detail.

Ms. Newman described each of the recommended projects, noting that they were also described in the memo that had been included in the mail-out. She said that if these projects were approved, over \$2.4 million of the JARC funds would be obligated, leaving a little over \$61,000 reserved for the FY 2012 solicitation, and that all \$1.9 million of New Freedom funds would be obligated. She concluded her presentation by stating that the FY 2012 solicitation would occur in the same timeframe as this year's, and would include \$1.5 million in JARC funding and \$1.1 million in New Freedom funding. She said that the Task Force would again be asked to establish priority projects.

Mr. Wojahn moved to adopt Resolution R20-2011 to approve the New Freedom and JARC projects for funding. The motion was seconded.

Chair Bowser asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Roberts said that all of the projects looked good, but that the bike-sharing project for Montgomery County Department of Transportation did not seem particularly suited to assisting low-income workers, and he asked for clarification concerning the program guidelines.

Mr. Erenrich said that the aim of this project was to make the connection to work sites and education sites where transit leaves off. He said that transit in suburban areas is not as ubiquitous as it is in other areas, that it is sometimes peak period only, and that locating bike stations at Rockville and Shady Grove Metro stations would provide low-income job-seekers with access to

jobs by filling these voids in the regular public transportation system. He said that the Montgomery County Department of Transportation was partnering with the City of Rockville, which he called a very bike-accessible community, as well as three universities that would provide job training, education, and classes on bicycle riding. He explained that 20 locations between the two Metro stations had been chosen to serve work sites that traditionally have low-income job opportunities, such as hospitals and universities.

Mr. Roberts asked whether there was likely to be a sufficient number of low-income people in that area for the project to pay off.

Mr. Erenrich responded in the affirmative, stating that the concentrations of low-income and moderate-income people in that area were already mapped, and that people could also reverse commute from the District or from Virginia to gain access to this rich job market.

Vice Chair Turner thanked Mr. Wojahn for serving as Chair of the Selection Committee and expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to discuss the recommendations and to talk with staff about potential improvements for the future. He asked what kind of evaluation would be carried out once the grants had been awarded, whether there was a federal requirement, and what kind of reporting was involved.

Ms. Newman replied that grantees are required to submit quarterly milestone reports, as well as annual performance measure reports that correspond with those established by the FTA. She said that ways to augment those reports were being considered, because they are very trip-based, and some additional qualitative measures might be useful for some projects.

Ms. Tregoning said that one of the issues in jurisdictions that already had the bike-share program had been access for low-income potential users of the system, because a credit card is basically the price of entry. She said the solution that Montgomery County comes up with for this concern would be of great interest and could perhaps be implemented region-wide. She commended the approach and said that she was looking forward to seeing Montgomery County embrace bike-share in an even bigger way.

Ms. Comstock asked for an explanation concerning the type of employee that might take advantage of the project and how it would operate.

Mr. Erenrich said the intention was to get at least 200 people to take advantage of the program over a period of time by networking with social service agencies and human resource agencies that provide services to low-income and unemployed populations. He said these agencies would certify people to bring them into the program and to identify how they could take advantage of it to gain access to job training and job locations. He said that in general terms, the qualification for participating in the program would be certification of low-income status by one of the partnering agencies.

Ms. Comstock asked whether this meant that participants would basically be provided with access to a bicycle to the different locations.

Mr. Erenrich replied that it would be like elsewhere in the region, where people would use an I.D. to take a bicycle from a bike station, and would be able to use that bike at no additional charge for half an hour before depositing the bike at another station. He said that there was an issue with what would happen if the bike was needed for a longer period of time, and that this is the kind of issue that would need to be worked on.

Ms. Comstock asked if most of the cost involved in the project would be in connection with the creation of the bike stations themselves.

Mr. Erenrich replied that there are two types of costs, the initial capital cost of the bike station, and the operating costs, which he said were relatively high and included maintenance of the bicycle.

Ms. Comstock asked how much each bicycle cost.

Mr. Erenrich said he believed it was about a thousand dollars per year to maintain each bike.

Ms. Comstock asked if it might be better to give each of the 200 people a bicycle.

Mr. Erenrich explained that the advantage of bike share is that you can pick up a bike when you need it at a location where you need it, that you can drop it off, and that you do not have responsibility for the bike during the time that you do not need it, so other people can take advantage of that bicycle. He said that he understood that people who own bicycles use bike-share because they like the freedom of not having to return to collect their bike. They could take a bus home or carpool instead. He said another advantage is that you always know the bike is in good shape. He said that someone could purchase a bike once they had found a job, but that the key is to have the bicycle available to access those jobs.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the bike-share program had only started last fall, and that participation in the District and Arlington County had been tremendous. He said that the program in Arlington had begun in just one part of the county, Crystal City, and that it was now being expanded into the Rosslyn-Ballston corridor. He said that they were finding the same thing that other cities such as Montreal and Paris had found: that you need to deploy a critical mass of bikes, because the real value of the program is to know that you can go anywhere. He said that when the District had previously tried a smaller program, it had not really worked, but that the larger scope of the new program had brought about tremendous participation. He said that the economics of the program would improve as the level of participation increased still further, but that it was already having a positive impact.

Ms. Tregoning said that there are roughly 1,100 bikes at 110 stations, that the bike-share program has 14,000 members, and that there is an average of 4,000 daily trips. She said that every bike gets used around four times each day on average, and that some are used far more than that. She said the proposed project could mean that someone could get from Montgomery County to a transit station, ride the Metro into an employment center in the District or Arlington,

and then take a Capital Bike Share bike at the other end of their trip to get to their actual destination. She said that bike-share could be the last mile solution or the last two miles solution at both ends of the trip.

Ms. Barlow said it was her understanding that the low-income people participating in the new project would use the same bikes as other bike-share members, and she asked how one could guarantee that there would be a bike available to them.

Mr. Erenrich responded that this was an excellent question, and said that the bikes would have to be periodically repositioned in order to ensure that the availability of the bikes corresponded to demand. He also noted that bike stations are relatively mobile, so if it emerges that a particular station is not well-used, it can be moved to a location that needs it.

Chair Bowser expressed her appreciation for all the hard work carried out by Mr. Wojahn, the Selection Committee members, and staff. She asked Mr. Erenrich if Montgomery County would also consider locations in Silver Spring for future bike-share expansion.

Mr. Erenrich responded that they would.

Chair Bowser said that this would provide synergy with the District as well, which would leverage the investment that it had made and would continue to make. She said that the District plans to install 40 additional stations over this fiscal year and the next.

Chair Bowser noted that the TPB had tasked staff with responding to some concerns that were raised after the previous year's JARC and New Freedom solicitation, calling for a greater emphasis on larger regional projects. She noted that the number of regional projects submitted had increased from six to nine, which was a big improvement. She said the TPB had also asked the staff to investigate whether it would be possible to make the application process simpler, as some jurisdictions had been put off applying because they thought the application process and reporting requirements were too cumbersome. She noted that staff had sent letters expressing these concerns to the TPB's congressional delegation. She said that the TPB had also wanted everybody to take some part in the process, because sometimes jurisdictions hear about great projects and wish that they had also taken advantage of them. She asked Ms. Newman what was the difference between this year and the last.

Ms. Newman said that around twice the number of applications had been received: 24 were received this year and she believed it had been 11 the previous year.

Chair Bowser called this a significant increase and expressed her thanks to everyone around the table for engaging city administrators and DOTs to pull together fantastic project applications.

Chair Bowser called for a vote on approving Resolution R20-2011, and it was passed unanimously.

9. Approval of a Scope and Process to Develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan

Vice Chair Turner said that the recommendations and proposed scope of work were the culmination of eight months of work on the part of the Regional Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force. He thanked the CAC for their unanimous support on the scope, and emphasized that this effort would be a work in progress.

Mr. Kirby, referring to a PowerPoint and to the mailout, said that the revised version of the scope and schedule includes comments from TPB staff that respond to comments received by the CAC. Regarding the proposed schedule, he said that the process would take two years of ongoing activity, which would be completed in time to enter the update cycle for the next update of the CLRP in FY 2014. He emphasized that work would begin immediately, and said that a lot of work has already been done to review goals, performance measures, and challenges. He said that the TPB needs sufficient calendar time to receive public input during the process. He summarized the TPB staff responses to the CAC comments, and concluded by providing an overview of the TPB grant for submission to the Transportation Community System Preservation Program. He said this competitive grant program could provide the TPB with an opportunity to help build stronger linkages between land-use and transportation throughout the region, and that a submission to this program could potentially link with a potential TPB grant submission under the TIGER III program, which he said is expected to be announced later this summer.

Chair Bowser thanked Mr. Kirby and asked Mr. Dobelbower if he had any initial comments on behalf of the CAC.

Mr. Dobelbower recommended that a public involvement consultant be brought on board throughout the process for setting priorities. He said this consultant would be dedicated to the task of public involvement, and would identify and ensure that the appropriate level of public comment is integrated throughout each phase of the initiative. More generally, he said that the CAC felt that there is a lot of detail that has yet to be worked out, but that the CAC also understands that this is the beginning of a process and that much has yet to be worked out.

Vice Chair Turner moved to approve the scope to develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan for incorporation into the FY2012 UPWP. Ms. Ticer seconded the motion.

Mr. Zimmerman, referring to the timetable on slide 5 of the PowerPoint, expressed concern that the proposal extends the existing work of the TPB, rather than moving forward in a definitive manner to narrow priorities.

Ms. Krimm, who served on the Priorities Scoping Task Force, said that public participation was heavily discussed, and said that this would provide TPB staff an opportunity to travel around the region, including Frederick, and ask members of the public to give input on what TPB regional priorities should be.

Chair Bowser asked if a more truncated version of the schedule would be possible. She asked if

Task 2 could last for three months, rather than for 12 months, as it was proposed.

Vice Chair Turner reiterated that the goal of the Task Force was to develop a process in order to begin developing a plan. He said that the proposed plan was originally set to last for three years, but that the Task Force scaled this timeframe back to two years before bringing the scope before to the TPB. He said that, throughout the Task Force meetings, concern about the role of implementation and project selection was expressed. He said that, ultimately, determining regional priorities is a conversation that the TPB must have as a full body. He stated that this kind of decision-making takes time, and that the product that comes at the end of the proposed time-period should be either a TPB policy or plan that articulates what individual member jurisdictions should consider when presenting proposals to the TPB, based on set priorities.

Ms. Tregoning emphasized that one initial goal of this process was to position the TPB to be able to compete for funding that is episodically available from federal sources. She expressed her impression was that the fear of committing to priorities is undermining the benefits of what could happen if the TPB were to move quickly with this process. She said that the proposed scope is loaded with items that will slow it down, and agreed with Chair Bowser that Task 2 could be accomplished in a shorter period of time.

Mr. Kirby responded that the proposed timeframe provides the ability to accommodate input from everyone, and said that a lot of work can be accomplished quickly. He said that the proposed schedule attempts to strike a balance between several objectives, including providing adequate time for public involvement.

Mr. Keys commented that the USDOT seems to be moving rapidly towards soliciting for competitive grant funding, and that it is important that the region is aware and able to provide a rapid response to such solicitations. He asked for clarification about whether the intent was to approve the scope of work or the concept behind the scope of work.

Mr. Kirby clarified that the request is to approve the scope of work. He said once this has been approved, more specific language can be put into the 2012 UPWP, which will then be brought before the TPB. He reiterated that work could begin immediately.

Chair Bowser summarized the shared sense that there was uneasiness about committing to a process that will take the TPB out to 2014, particularly in light of the anticipated TIGER solicitation. She asked if the TPB meets in July.

Mr. Kirby confirmed that the TPB will hold a regular July meeting.

Chair Bowser proposed that the TPB consider postponing this vote until its July meeting.

Mr. Smith said that he is hearing that we do not have to wait, and that the scope is flexible enough to revise the schedule. He said that he supports the scope.

Vice Chair Turner said that there are many opportunities for the TPB to determine short-term

priorities. He recommended that the vote move forward, unless there is significant uneasiness.

Mr. Kirby suggested that the scope be revised to include interim products and deliverables.

Mr. Roberts said that developing regional priorities is more important to him than competing for competitive federal funds. He said priorities will contribute a better vision to long-range planning for transportation.

Chair Bowser agreed with Mr. Roberts.

Mr. Roberts said he was worried about what might happen in the next ten or 20 years in the absence of regional priorities.

Chair Bowser referred to an old public administration adage that work expands to fill the time provided for it. She questioned if taking two years rather than three years would have any substantial change on the final product.

Ms. Tregoning suggested that the TPB call for short-term regional priorities as a subset of the larger process. She said that developing these short-term priorities would include public input, which would inform what applications the TPB submits for competitive funding.

Chair Bowser asked if Ms. Tregoning would like to make her suggestion into a formal amendment.

Ms. Tregoning replied that she would, but asked for a minute to consider how to phrase the amendment. She said she would be happy to accept suggestions from anyone else on the TPB on wording.

Mr. Smith emphasized that he thought it was important to state long-term priorities and have an interim statement of long-term goals. He advocated moving forward with a long-term regional approach with interim deliverables due in one year.

Chair Bowser suggested that the June 2012 item in the proposed schedule be amended to say “interim report,” and could be a presentation to the TPB of short-term priorities.

Mr. Zimmerman advocated support for Chair Bowser’s original proposal to condense the schedule, which would make June 2012 the deadline for the final report. He also expressed support to postpone a vote until July, and stated that he does not believe stretching the process for an additional year will result in a better product.

Ms. Tregoning said she would be happy to propose an amendment that cuts the entire schedule in half.

Chair Bowser replied that this would be a dramatic change, and said she would be more comfortable if the suggestion was to consider the proposal next month.

Vice Chair Turner concurred with Chair Bowser, and said postponing a formal vote for one month would allow staff the opportunity to make a presentation to the TPB with a new schedule.

Chair Bowser asked if Mr. Turner would formally suggest postponing the vote for one month.

Vice Chair Turner formally suggested postponing the vote on the scope to develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan until July.

Chair Bowser thanked Mr. Turner and the members for their patience. She claimed that this process is a significant undertaking for the TPB, and that it should and will be done correctly.

INFORMATION ITEMS

10. Briefing on Final Research Report for the WMATA Governance Work Group (GWG)

Mr. Kirby said that the final report had been included in the mail-out and that due to a shortage of time, he would go straight to the concluding slide of the PowerPoint presentation. He said that TPB staff had reviewed the literature and the practices of thirteen of WMATA's peer agencies regarding the way board responsibilities, board selection processes, and chair responsibilities were defined. He said that in part as a result of the recent work by the WMATA Governance Committee, WMATA was broadly in line with its peer agencies in most regards, the only exception being the board appointment process. He noted that this matter fell outside of the scope of the board itself, and that it would be up to the appointing authorities to decide whether to implement changes like term limits to make WMATA's process more consistent with its peers.

Mr. Kirby said that there was one other point worth making in relation to funding needs, as summarized on slide 8. He said that a 2009 Federal Transit Administration study had found that all the major transit agencies had major unfunded capital needs, and that WMATA had been in line with everyone else at that point. He said that since 2009, the Davis Bill providing \$150 million federal and \$150 million from the District, Maryland and Virginia each year had passed and that this additional funding was enabling WMATA to move expeditiously to get on top of its capital needs. He said the key was to keep this funding going, as it needs to be appropriated every year and the authorization only lasts through 2020. He suggested that one of the regional priorities, perhaps the most important one, was to ensure that the Davis Bill funding continues beyond 2020, as it is so fundamental to all of the region's other objectives. Referring to slide 9, he noted that the Federal Transit Administration Administrator had, in his presentation to Congress in May, suggested that there could be a formula program for the entire country aimed at state of good repair. Mr. Kirby said the research had indicated that other transit agencies would benefit from their own versions of the Davis Bill.

Chair Bowser asked if the report was ready to be sent back to the jurisdictions.

Mr. Kirby responded that the report was prepared at the request of the Governance Work Group established by the Governors and Mayor, to assist with their ongoing work. He said that the TPB staff's report was now complete.

11. Briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis of an Amendment to the 2010 CLRP to Modify the I-95/395 HOV/HOT Lanes Project, Widen I-66 between US 29 and Route 15, and Add a Ramp from the HOV Lanes of I-395 to Seminary Road as Requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)

Ms. Posey said that in February, VDOT had requested an amendment to the 2010 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP), and that the amended projects required a conformity analysis that was now completed. She described the amended projects by reference to the map on slide 2 and the information on slides 3 and 4 of her PowerPoint presentation. She said that the technical approach for the new analysis was the same as that which had been adopted by the TPB the previous fall, and that the only change was the network inputs. She said that the bottom line for the new analysis was that the decrease in capacity would result in a decrease in emissions, and she detailed the decrease in emissions by reference to the charts on slides 7 to 10 of the PowerPoint presentation. She said the public comment period would run from June 15th to July 15th and that the TPB would be asked to approve the conformity analysis and adopt the amendment to the 2010 CLRP at its July 20 meeting.

Mr. Donley asked Ms. Posey whether this analysis contained both good news and bad news, as air quality requirements are being met, some vehicle miles of travel are down, but some of the trips being diverted to other areas.

Ms. Posey said this was correct, and that even with a welcome decrease in vehicle miles traveled, there would be an increase in congestion.

Mr. Donley asked if one of the reasons for the anticipated increase in congestion is the addition of the HOT element without the transit improvements.

Ms. Posey said that the congestion comes from the reduction in capacity in the corridor, and some trips that were HOV are not going to be HOV anymore. She said these trips would become LOV instead, because people would change their trip patterns in response to the increased congestion.

Mr. Donley said that he recalled that when the item had come before the TPB a few months previously, VDOT was committed to providing additional transit and park and ride in the corridor in order to enhance transit. He said he did not believe anything specific had been proposed with the current amendments, and asked if this was correct.

Ms. Posey confirmed this was the case.

Mr. Donley asked for more clarity from VDOT concerning the commitment to enhanced park

and ride or transit in this particular corridor, both in terms of the nature of the projects and the level of funding that will accompany them.

Ms. Hamilton responded that VDOT is still working on the specific details, but the commitment is definitely there.

Mr. Donley asked if he might request that the list of projects that is currently under evaluation be submitted to the TPB in advance of next month's consideration of this item in order to provide some idea of the level of commitment to enhanced transit or park and ride.

Ms. Hamilton said that the requested information would be provided.

Chair Bowser asked Mr. Kirby if the Steering Committee and the Technical Committee could consider this information in advance of the TPB meeting.

Mr. Kirby replied that it could. He then referred to a letter from VDOT that had been distributed to members that presented the financial plan for the HOT lanes project, including the reduction in toll revenue due to the northern section's removal. He said that for the CLRP to be approved next month, it would need to be shown that the project was still viable. He said VDOT had made its best estimates as to how the cost of the project would be shared between the public and private sectors, as documented in the letter and attachments, and that questions or comments concerning the matter could be part of next month's action.

12. Briefing on WMATA's Regional Transit System Plan (RTSP)

Chair Bowser expressed her regret that there was not sufficient time for this item. She said that Mr. Harrington had an interesting presentation to make that would require the full twenty minutes, and she asked TPB staff to put the item at the top of the information items for the July meeting.

13. Other Business

There was no other business brought before the TPB.

14. Adjourn

Chair Bowser adjourned the meeting at 2:05pm.