

**NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**  
**777 North Capitol Street, NE**  
**Washington, D.C. 20002-4226**  
**(202) 962-3200**

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**  
**May 17, 2006**

Members and Alternates Present

Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA  
Rick Canizales, Prince William County  
Wally Covington, Prince William County  
Robert Dorsey, City of Rockville  
Lyn Erickson, MDOT  
Andrew M. Fellows, City of College Park  
Ludwig Gaines, City of Alexandria  
Brian Glenn, Federal Transit Administration  
Charles Graves, III, D.C. Office of Planning  
Jason Groth, Charles County  
Susan Hinton, National Park Service  
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Sandra Jackson, Federal Highway Administration  
Michael Lyles, City of Bowie  
Phil Mendelson, D.C. Council  
David Moss, Montgomery County  
Carol Petzold, Maryland House of Delegates  
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park  
Rick Rybeck, DDOT  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
David Snyder, City of Falls Church  
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT  
Kanathur Srikanth, VDOT  
Mick Staton, Loudoun County  
Patricia S. Ticer, Virginia Senate  
Vic Weissberg, Prince George's County DPWPT  
Robbie Werth, Private Providers Task Force  
Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax  
Bill Wren, Manassas Park

---

Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Gerald Miller	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Jim Hogan	COG/DTP
Nick Ramfos	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Deborah Etheridge	COG/DTP
Mark Moran	COG/DTP
Darren Smith	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Paul DesJardin	COG/HSPPS
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Faramarz Mokhtari	Prince George's-MNCPPC
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Harry Sanders	Action Committee for Transit
Randy Carroll	MDE
Deborah Burns	FTA
Tamara Ashby	Arlington County
Ian Bean	MDOT
Takumi Yamamoto	Japanese Ministry of Transport
T.K. Welp	Montgomery County Citizen's Advisory Board
Shiva Shrestha	State Highway Administration
Karen Wolf-Branigin	Easter Seals Project Action
Al Abeson	Easter Seals Project Action
Tom Biesiadny	Fairfax County DOT
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Leah Nicholls	Washington Lawyers' Comm.
Adam Ortiz	UMD
Mel Franklin	Greater Marlboro Democratic Club
Karen McManus	Office of Congressmen Chris Van Hollen
Michael Replogle	Environmental Defense
Mary E. Williams	Metro Riders Advisory Council MetroAccess Subcommittee
Carolyn Curtis Bellamy	Metro Riders Advisory Council MetroAccess Subcommittee
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Randy Carroll	MDE – Air Quality

---

## 1. Public Comment

Dr. Alan Abeson described the work of Easter Seals Project Action, of which he is the director. He noted that the organization is involved with increasing the availability and use of accessible transportation by people with disabilities. He commended the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA) for being responsive to and engaging in discussion with persons with disabilities, as well as commending the people with disabilities who have participated in efforts to improve service. He said that the foundation has been laid for shared problem-solving, and that in its work around the nation his organization will cite these efforts as a positive example of the disability community and the transportation industry coming together to move forward.

Ms. Mary Williams, chair of the Metro Riders Advisory Council MetroAccess Subcommittee, described some of the comments and suggestions that arose at a forum held for MetroAccess riders in March. She noted that most of the suggestions are similar to those contained in the report that the TPB would be briefed on later in the meeting (Item #9). She appealed to the Board to connect with MetroAccess riders on a personal level and to make use of the knowledge that MetroAccess riders have as users of the system who are willing to help make it better.

Mr. Michael Replogle, speaking on behalf of Environmental Defense, called to the TPB's attention the potential implications of new EPA fine particulate conformity rules for projects proposed to be included or already present in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), especially the Intercounty Connector. He asserted that the project-level conformity analysis for the project does not meet the new requirements. He said that his organization is asking the TPB to remove funding commitments from the TIP for large regional projects that will likely be significant sources of fine particulate pollution, or PM 2.5. He specifically cited the Intercounty Connector as a project that should be removed from the TIP until further analysis that will meet the new federal standard can take place. He distributed copies of a letter with enclosures that he had sent to TPB Chairman Michael Knapp on this topic.

Ms. Carol Bellamy, member of the MetroAccess User Group in Montgomery County, encouraged the TPB to view the challenges of getting around the region from the perspective of a person with a disability. She asked the TPB to carefully consider and place high priority on improvements to MetroAccess.

Ms. Karen McManus, a staff person for Maryland Congressman Chris Van Hollen, read a statement on behalf of Congressman Van Hollen, copies of which were distributed at the meeting. The statement applauded efforts by WMATA and MetroAccess users to improve MetroAccess service. It also expressed concerns that MetroAccess still does not operate as well as it should, based on feedback that the Congressman has received from his constituents who use the service.

Ms. Porter thanked Congressman Van Hollen for his efforts on this issue, and asked Ms. McManus

---

to convey that appreciation to the Congressman.

Mr. Harry Sanders, representing the League of Women Voters in Montgomery County, for which he serves as Transportation Committee Co-Chair, described the brown-bag dinner held by the organization at which they heard a presentation by TPB staff on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. He said the presentation was well received and that attendees expressed support for TPB goals. He also mentioned that he had attended the Community Leadership Institute (CLI) in April and found the interactive nature of it to be very powerful. He encouraged the TPB to have a more ambitious outreach schedule and hold another CLI before next spring. Finally, he encouraged the TPB to apply more vigor in using the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study as a tool for regional visioning, especially in looking at integrated land use and transit system expansion. Copies of his remarks were distributed at the meeting.

## **2. Approval of the Minutes of April 19, 2006**

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

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

Referring to the mailout report, Mr. Canizales said that the TPB Technical Committee met on May 5 and reviewed several items for the TPB agenda:

Related to TPB Agenda Item 8, the committee was briefed on the Community Leadership Institute in April, including information about the participants, program, and next steps.

Related to TPB Agenda Item 10, the committee received a briefing on ongoing air quality activities including the vehicle fleet census, comparison of mobile source emissions estimates, Round 7.0A cooperative forecasting and eight-hour ozone implementation.

Related to TPB Agenda Item 11, the committee reviewed the draft bicycle and pedestrian plan and discussed the proposed schedule for public comment and approval of the plan.

Related to TPB Agenda Item 12, the committee was briefed on the status of the financial analysis for the 2006 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP).

Related to TPB Agenda Item 13, the committee was briefed on TPB staff efforts to collect information about transportation and land use incentive programs in different metropolitan areas, along with relevant activity in the Washington region.

The Technical Committee also discussed three items not on the TPB agenda: preliminary draft project submissions for the Fiscal Year 2007 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); a pilot

---

program for data collection and congestion monitoring using volunteer drivers and GPS technology; and new federal guidance regarding the annual listing of projects obligated for federal funds the previous year.

There were no questions for Mr. Canizales.

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

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Tydings said that the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) had met the previous week and described the main item on the program, a presentation by Mr. Canizales on TransAction 2030, a long-range transportation plan for Northern Virginia. He mentioned that CAC members were particularly interested in some of the new multi-modal level of service analysis techniques used in the plan, as well as the design and results of the transportation poll conducted as part of the planning process.

Mr. Canizales noted that the TransAction 2030 plan is currently in draft form, and it will be presented to the TPB as soon as it is adopted by the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority.

Mr. Fellows asked if the CAC had discussed air quality issues in relation to the TransAction 2030 plan.

Mr. Tydings said that he thought one CAC member had raised the issue, but it was not discussed in detail.

Mr. Fellows asked if Mr. Tydings had a response to the concerns Mr. Replogle had raised earlier in the meeting regarding air quality standards and new transportation projects.

Mr. Tydings responded that he could not comment for the CAC on that issue, but that it could be brought up at the next CAC meeting for more in-depth discussion.

Mr. Fellows said that he thought the topic would be worthy of more discussion.

Mr. Tydings said that CAC members had also asked questions about the purpose of the TransAction 2030 plan and its relevance to other planning efforts at different levels, including the scenario analysis conducted by TPB staff. He said Mr. Canizales had explained that the plan is supposed to prioritize projects for inclusion in state-wide and regional plans, but that it was not really tied to the TPB scenario study activities. He also said that the CAC has been interested in the idea of the TPB developing unconstrained plans that would evolve from the scenario studies.

Mr. Tydings said that CAC member Alan Greenberg had been asked by his employer to resign from the CAC, and Mr. Tydings asked that the District of Columbia act quickly to replace Mr. Greenberg. He said that the CAC was also updated on community outreach activities by TPB staff,

---

introduced to a new TPB staff member, and given a summary of the agenda for the upcoming TPB meeting by Mr. Kirby.

Mr. Rybeck assured Mr. Tydings that the District of Columbia would act quickly to replace Mr. Greenberg.

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

Mr. Kirby reported that the Steering Committee had made two amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) at its May 5 meeting, one dealing with Prince George's County and the other with Northern Virginia, and noted that details of the amendments were included in the mailout. He also said that the Fiscal Year 2007 Unified Planning Work Program to start July 1 was approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

Mr. Rybeck asked for clarification about possible rescission of planning funds.

Mr. Kirby said he believed that would not affect the adopted work program, but referred the question to Ms. Jackson of FHWA.

Ms. Jackson said that the rescinded funds had not been obligated or apportioned, so the rescission would not affect the adopted work program.

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

Vice Chairman Hudgins declined to comment in the absence of Chairman Knapp.

## **7. Approval of Amendments to the FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that are Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirements to Modify Funding for Eleven Transit, Commuter Rail and Ridesharing Projects in Charles, Frederick, Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, as Requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT)**

Referring to the mailout, Ms. Erickson explained that the Maryland Department of Transportation had released a package of 15 amendments to the TIP as a result of additional available federal funding. She said that the amendments do not require changes to the air quality conformity analysis conducted for the current TIP. She said that no public comments had been received.

Mr. Fellows asked if Ms. Erickson had a response to Mr. Replogle's concern about addressing new air quality conformity standards, especially in regards to the Intercounty Connector.

---

Ms. Erickson said that Mr. Replogle's comment was not about the amendments in question, but that the impact of the new air quality conformity standards is part of a larger question that Mr. Kirby would likely address.

Mr. Fellows asked if there was time to raise the question under Item 7, since it provides an opportunity to address the new information about air quality conformity.

Ms. Erickson said that the information was also new to her.

Mr. Fellows said that it made sense to have discussion about the new air quality conformity information in the context of Item 7.

Vice Chairman Hudgins asked if Mr. Fellows would first like to present a motion.

Mr. Fellows moved to amend the amendments in question to include provision to remove the Intercounty Connector from funding commitments until air quality conformity is determined in relation to the new standards.

Ms. Porter seconded the motion.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for procedural clarification as to what the motion on the floor actually entailed.

Vice Chairman Hudgins verified that no motion to adopt the 15 new amendments had been made.

Ms. Porter said that her understanding was that the motion was to remove the Intercounty Connector from the TIP, and that another motion to adopt the 15 new amendments would be necessary, though she was not certain if Mr. Fellows had intended to include such adoption in his motion.

Mr. Fellows said that his intent was to modify the action item, which was to approve the 15 new amendments for the TIP, to include removal of the Intercounty Connector from the TIP, as he thought that the action item was already on the floor.

Ms. Erickson said that she had yet to actually move to approve the 15 new amendments.

Ms. Porter said that withdrawal of the motion by its seconder would be necessary in order to move to adopt the 15 amendments to the TIP. She withdrew the motion on the floor made by Mr. Fellows and seconded by Ms. Porter in order to facilitate a new motion that would include the action item of approving the 15 new amendments.

Mr. Fellows moved for adoption of the 15 amendments to the TIP with the amendment that he

---

earlier proposed.

Ms. Erickson asked for clarification as to the actual motion and the amendment proposed by Mr. Fellows.

Vice Chairman Hudgins confirmed that the motion is to amend the TIP to include the entire package of 15 amendments.

Mr. Fellows said that the supplemental amendment is to remove the Intercounty Connector from funding commitments. He said he did not know of any other way to accomplish reconsideration of the project given the new information about air quality conformity requirements.

Ms. Erickson suggested that it might be more appropriate to get clarification from Mr. Replogle if his comments address the entire TIP rather than just the Intercounty Connector, and perhaps instead add to the motion adopting the 15 amendments some provision for future general discussion of the new information put forward by Mr. Replogle.

Vice Chairman Hudgins said she believed that the intent of Mr. Fellows was to move forward the action item adopting the 15 amendments and amend the item to include removal of the Intercounty Connector.

Mr. Fellows said that was correct.

Vice Chairman Hudgins said that meant that general discussion of Mr. Replogle's comments was therefore not provided for in the motion on the floor.

Ms. Erickson asked what it actually meant to remove the Intercounty Connector as called for in the motion.

Mr. Fellows said that although the package of 15 amendments is to be exempt from air quality conformity requirements, his concern was about air quality conformity of projects already in the TIP.

Vice Chairman Hudgins asked for Mr. Kirby's opinion on the matter.

Mr. Kirby said that the long-range plan and the TIP as a whole have passed the conformity requirement for ozone and PM 2.5, and that the issue raised by Mr. Replogle is about project-level conformity. He said this issue is being addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process by the Maryland DOT. He said that he believes Mr. Replogle's comments to be taking issue with the validity of that work, and that such an issue needs to be addressed as part of the EIS process and does not affect the TPB's action today.

Ms. Petzold moved to substitute the motion on the floor with a motion that would adopt the



---

package of 15 amendments without any supplemental amendments.

The motion was seconded, and a voice vote was taken.

Vice Chairman Hudgins asked for a show of hands to verify the vote, and the motion to substitute was passed, with Mr. Fellows and Ms. Porter dissenting, and Mr. Snyder abstaining from the vote.

Vice Chairman Hudgins asked for a vote on the new motion that was substituted. The motion passed on a voice vote.

## **8. Report on the TPB Community Leadership Institute**

Referring to the mailout report and the PowerPoint handout distributed at the meeting, Mr. Swanson described the Community Leadership Institute (CLI) held in late April. He said that public involvement activities by TPB staff include education of community leaders and citizens, improvement of methods for receiving public input, and improvements in vehicles for public information such as the Web site.

Mr. Swanson said that the CLI was a successful pilot program. He emphasized that the purpose of the CLI was educational, not a method of gathering citizen input. He described the participants, noting that TPB members had been contacted to nominate potential participants, and said that the intent was to include people not already active with the TPB in some capacity. He mentioned the diversity of the participants and explained how the program was organized and staffed, including the involvement of several consultants.

Mr. Swanson summarized the CLI agenda, a copy of which was included in the handout. He said the first day focused on giving participants a sense of the magnitude of transportation challenges in the region and the complexity of the decision-making process. He described the set-up and results of the first day's interactive exercise.

He said that the second day of the institute focused largely on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study, challenging participants to think about how to address the regional challenges identified in the study through a simulation game. He said that the game demonstrated the ability of a diverse group of people to come together and reach some consensus about regional challenges and strategies. He said that the final part of the program was a discussion of the transportation project development process, including real-world examples of projects in the region.

Mr. Swanson said that the CLI was designed to have a good balance of technical information and interactive, experiential learning, and was skillfully facilitated by former TPB Chairman Peter Shapiro. He said that the CLI made use of many materials and presentations developed previously by TPB staff.

---

Mr. Swanson said that participants were eager for follow-up to the institute and hoped to stay in communication with fellow participants and perhaps organize similar events in their communities. He said that the reasons why the pilot was well received were the enthusiasm and diversity of the participants, and the dynamic, balanced curriculum. He said that next steps could include another CLI in Spring 2007, as well as distilled versions of the program that could be presented in shorter formats at venues around the region, focused especially on the scenario study findings.

Mr. Swanson introduced several CLI participants who offered comments.

Ms. Tuva K. Welp of Montgomery County said that she was honored to be invited to participate and that the CLI had provided a great overview of regional transportation issues and the role of the TPB in bringing the region together. She said that she felt she could now be a better advocate in her community with a regional understanding. She thanked the TPB for the experience and expressed hope that the program will be repeated.

Mr. Mel Franklin of Prince George's County said that he echoed Ms. Welp's comments and that it was an empowering opportunity for him to understand the process and share the knowledge in his community. He said he hoped to get other community activists more involved in the visioning process at an early stage in the hope that transportation policy in the region can be more comprehensive and responsive. He thanked COG, the TPB, and the CLI facilitators and presenters.

Mr. William Shelton of the District of Columbia reiterated the previous comments and appreciation. He said that he came into the institute focused on one particular transportation problem in his community, and came to understand the regional nature and complexity of transportation challenges. He thanked Mr. Kirby, Chairman Knapp, and the other facilitators and presenters, and said that he hopes the institute will be repeated and that the group of participants can move forward to work on transportation issues together.

Mr. Suresh Narasimhan of Loudoun County said that he was also appreciative and had added considerably to his knowledge about the transportation decision-making process. He said that he especially got out of the workshop a commitment to share the challenge of addressing complex regional transportation issues. He also said that the workshop pointed out that while it may be easy to build local consensus and get smaller projects moving forward, it is difficult to build regional consensus about larger issues. He said that he would strive to communicate the importance of regional issues at the local level.

Ms. Ticer said that she had recently met with Mr. Shapiro and was excited about the potential of the CLI to go beyond past TPB public involvement activities and get people interested and involved. She said it sounded like the CLI had exceeded her expectations, and she hoped it could be compressed and presented in individual communities.

Mr. Fellows said that he was excited to hear from participants and asked if there was any intent to develop new CAC members as a result of the outreach efforts.

---

Mr. Swanson said that while that is a possibility, and that it is good to keep the CAC refreshed with new members, he sees the CLI as part of a larger effort to go outside of the current committee structure and reach out to communities to talk about the TPB process as well as regional issues and challenges.

Vice Chairman Hudgins thanked staff and support for the CLI effort and said that it had met the expectations of the TPB and should be continued. She said that the TPB needs people at the local level to recognize the regional challenges.

Vice Chairman Hudgins presented the four CLI participants in attendance with certificates of recognition, and they were applauded.

## **9. Report on Improving MetroAccess Service for People with Disabilities**

Vice Chairman Hudgins said that the presentation would be given by Ms. Porter, chair of the TPB Access for All Committee and member of the WMATA MetroAccess Ad Hoc Advisory Committee, as well as TPB staff member Wendy Klancher. Vice Chairman Hudgins said that Mr. Kauffman, co-chair of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee, had intended to be present but could not be, and she acknowledged his work and that of the committee.

Ms. Porter also commended Mr. Kauffman's leadership, open-mindedness, and dedication to the concerns of Metro riders with disabilities.

Ms. Porter said that the TPB Access for All Committee recently issued a report on problems with MetroAccess, and that around the same time there was considerable publicity surrounding the MetroAccess program and the switch between contractors. She said that the WMATA Board had responded positively by creating the ad hoc advisory committee and charging it with looking at the problems and making recommendations. Referring to the mailout report, she listed the members of the ad hoc committee. She said that it has been valuable to have people with disabilities on the committee and commended them for their involvement. She also commended WMATA for involving them.

Ms. Porter said that other public involvement processes included a MetroAccess riders forum in March and the formation of a new MetroAccess users group, to continue dialogue between MetroAccess users and WMATA. She said that the WMATA Board asked the committee for a 45-day interim report, which is the one included in the mailout packet, and a 90-day final report which will be issued in June. She said that WMATA staff are already working on two of the high priority recommendations of the interim report: improving MetroAccess materials and the complaint process.

Ms. Porter said that the ad hoc committee had established a best practices working group chaired

---

by Ms. Klancher, who she said has been critical to the process. She also said that the TPB is fortunate that the Access for All Committee report came out at a time when MetroAccess was in the news, and fortunate that the WMATA Board responded positively.

Referring to a PowerPoint presentation that was distributed at the meeting, Ms. Klancher summarized the tasks and findings of the Best Practices Working Group. She said that the group had many different areas to research, but had the involvement of several experts on the group including Ms. Bellamy and Ms. Williams who spoke earlier at the meeting. She said that the group was split fairly evenly between MetroAccess users and paratransit industry experts, and expressed appreciation of everyone's work.

Ms. Klancher listed some observations of the working group, including the conclusion that the problems experienced during the contractor transition are symptoms of a longstanding structural problem, and the finding that it is unusual in large urban areas for a paratransit system to use only one contractor/broker. She said it is important that WMATA be involved in monitoring and managing the system.

Referring to the mailout report and the presentation, Ms. Klancher listed the preliminary recommendations of the best practices group, including improvements to customer service and communication, ensuring adequate, experienced and stable staffing, utilizing scheduling and software strategies, and strengthening contract oversight and monitoring. She noted one item that was not included in the interim report, which is the recommendation that MetroAccess become a door-to-door service rather than curb-to-curb, and that other programs around the country have found that this actually can speed up service.

Ms. Klancher said the next step is for the working group to present its final recommendations to the ad hoc committee next week, with the final report of the ad hoc committee expected in June. She said that the TPB will also be starting work on a human service transportation coordination plan related to MetroAccess to address SAFETEA-LU requirements, and conducting an independent review of MetroAccess which is included in the FY 2007 work program.

Ms. Porter asked if the WMATA representative on the TPB would like to make any comments.

Mr. Bottigheimer expressed appreciation for the leadership of the Access for All Committee, and gave an update on recent actions by WMATA to improve MetroAccess service. He said that on-time performance has improved from 87% under the previous contractor to a sustained 94% level, and that complaints are down by 55% since January. He also said that excessively late trips have been reduced by 58% and missed trips are down by 73%. He said that WMATA has formed a critical trip management team and is implementing a pilot cell phone program to give drivers more flexibility in contacting customers en route. He said that the program serves around 4300 trips per weekday and 1500 per day on the weekend. He said he thinks things are getting better and that WMATA looks forward to continuing to work with the TPB on these issues.

---

Mr. Lyles noted that many of the complaints are personnel-related and asked if pay is an issue looked at by the committee.

Ms. Klancher said that the working group believes that training and pay is an issue, and that the recommendations include ensuring adequate pay and adequate training, especially sensitivity training.

Vice Chairman Hudgins thanked both presenters and said that she thinks it is an important issue and that TPB and WMATA participation will be critical in solving the problems.

## **10. Update on Air Quality Planning Activities**

Referring to a May 10<sup>th</sup> memo included in the mailout packet, Mr. Clifford said he would address the last three of the four topics listed in the memo, and then get Mr. Kirby's assistance in addressing the first topic regarding an analysis of the region's vehicle fleet.

Mr. Clifford said that in regards to the second item, monthly versus seasonal approaches to estimation of yearly mobile source emissions, the TPB Technical Committee had thoroughly discussed the issue, that the analysis indicates close correlation between both methods, and that TPB staff will be proceeding with the seasonal approach.

Mr. Clifford said that the next item relates to the Round 7.0a Cooperative Forecasts.. The mailout included a copy of a memo from Mr. Desjardin indicating approval by the planning directors of the Round 7.0a forecasts for testing by TPB staff. He said that the packet also includes a letter to Mr. Desjardin from Mr. Graves of the District of Columbia transmitting the socio-economic data related to the new baseball stadium for the forecasts.

Mr. Clifford said the last attachment for this item is the state air quality implementation schedule for the 8-hour ozone plan that is under development. He said that many major tasks are underway and that the State Implementation Plan (SIP) is expected to be ready for adoption by the air quality committee in October. He also said that as part of this process, new mobile source emissions budgets will be created.

Returning to the first topic, Mr. Clifford said that the results of the Vehicle Identity Number (VIN) decoding were attached to the mailout item. He said that aside from being important in determining emissions rates, they also yield some interesting statistics associated with the primary registration data.

Mr. Kirby, referring to a PowerPoint presentation that was distributed at the meeting, summarized some of the results of the VIN analysis. He said this was the first time such detailed data on the vehicle fleet has been available to the TPB, and that the data were obtained by using a software program to decode VIN's acquired from the departments of motor vehicles.

---

Mr. Kirby said that the data are from July 1, 2005, and that national fleet data from the EPA and from hybridcars.com were used to allow comparisons with national averages. He summarized the results showing the number of vehicles per person and per household in each of three vehicle categories broken down by state, and noted that the averages of vehicles per household in Northern Virginia and Suburban Maryland are almost twice the average for the District of Columbia. He also pointed out that the rate of hybrid ownership is much higher in Virginia than in Maryland or the District, and attributed this to the privilege of using HOV lanes with hybrid vehicles in Virginia.

Mr. Kirby said that the vehicle fleet is made up more of larger vehicles in Maryland and Virginia, with more smaller vehicles in the District of Columbia. He also said that Virginia has the youngest vehicle fleet while Maryland has the oldest. Referring to charts breaking down the numbers into categories of core jurisdictions, inner suburbs, and outer suburbs, he pointed out that average vehicles per household and vehicle size increase while average vehicle age decreases as we move out from the core of the region.

Referring to results regarding hybrid vehicle ownership by individual jurisdiction, Mr. Kirby said that there is tremendous variation among jurisdictions, with Virginia jurisdictions, especially Prince William County, having much higher rates of hybrid ownership. He said this presumably has to do with access to HOV lanes.

Mr. Zimmerman said that while it made sense intuitively, he was not certain how much of the variation in hybrid ownership rates could be explained by access to HOV lanes. He said that in particular the "inner suburb" category could be difficult to analyze because the three inner suburban jurisdictions (Fairfax, Montgomery, and Prince George's Counties) are very large and feature transitions from urban to semi-rural conditions. He also said that what he noticed especially were the high rates of hybrid ownership in Arlington County and the City of Alexandria, and pointed out that the numbers showing hybrid vehicles per thousand households may be even more significant because the general rate of car ownership is much lower in those jurisdictions compared to suburban jurisdictions like Fairfax County. He said it is curious because Arlington and Alexandria residents do not get much benefit from the HOV privilege, and said it would be good to know to what degree the incentive to purchase hybrids is based on fuel economy or on HOV access.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the large difference in hybrid ownership rates between Montgomery County and Prince George's County, neither of which would have the HOV incentive, points to another explanation. He suggested that more analysis be done to see what is driving people to buy hybrids, especially in inner jurisdictions without much or any HOV incentive.

Mr. Kirby said that Mr. Zimmerman's comments were good. He said that in looking at the national data, in previous years Virginia has ranked with California as a top state for hybrid ownership, but that other states without any kind of HOV incentive have now moved up on the list. He said he

---

thinks this reflects the fact that hybrids are catching on in general for reasons other than access to HOV, and that he anticipates seeing less evidence of that factor playing a role in future years.

Mr. Graves said that the information was fascinating and asked how often it would be updated.

Mr. Kirby responded that the current plan is to update the information every three years, along with the cycle for calculating emissions for air quality analysis purposes. He said air quality was the real reason for the research, because emissions are quite sensitive to vehicle fleet age and size characteristics, but that in this case there was other interesting information to bring to the TPB's attention. He said that because it is difficult to make the calculations, it is not planned to be done more frequently than every three years unless there is good reason to do it more frequently. He said the next update would thus be July 1, 2008.

Ms. Porter in jest ascribed the difference in hybrid ownership rates between Montgomery and Prince George's Counties to the number of hybrids in Takoma Park. She said she agreed with Mr. Zimmerman that it would be interesting to know more about what encourages people to buy hybrids, especially in relation to current debate about whether higher gas prices influence driver behavior. She said that it may be useful to have data for an additional year before 2008 to see if the sharp increase in gas prices has an effect on hybrid ownership rates. She said more knowledge about what drives hybrid ownership would be very useful.

Mr. Fellows said that as a hybrid-owning resident of Prince George's County, he hoped in particular his county could benefit from more knowledge and thought about the issue. He said that the data also seem to reinforce the idea of "a region divided" given the disparity in hybrid ownership rates between eastern and western jurisdictions.

Vice Chairman Hudgins said she needed to close the discussion due to time constraints, but that the policy decisions that would have to be made regarding HOV lanes and hybrid access would be aided by information like that presented by Mr. Kirby.

Vice Chairman Hudgins asked Mr. Kirby if agenda items 12 and 13 could be moved to the next meeting.

Mr. Kirby said that they could, and that the bicycle and pedestrian plan (item 11) was the highest priority.

## **11. Briefing on Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region**

Mr. Sebastian with the District of Columbia Department of Transportation said that he has been leading a group within the TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee to create an updated regional bicycle and pedestrian plan. He said that it is the most comprehensive effort of its kind in the region, and likely one of the most comprehensive in the country in terms of a bike/ped plan

---

developed by an MPO. He emphasized that the plan was not made up by the subcommittee but instead includes projects identified by the jurisdictions as the most significant for a regional network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Referring to the draft plan included in the mailout packet and a PowerPoint presentation that was distributed at the meeting, Mr. Farrell highlighted the major features of the plan and examples of included projects. He summarized other TPB activities in promoting bicycle and pedestrian uses including the Street Smart safety campaign, the Commuter Connections program, Bike to Work guides and events, assistance with the ADC Regional Bicycle Map, and periodic training workshops for facility design

Mr. Farrell said that the plan identifies major projects and proposes best practices, and that it is the first ever regional pedestrian plan and first regional bicycle plan since 1995. He said it builds upon the 1999 TPB Vision and the 2001 Greenways and Circulation Systems reports, and contains both funded and unfunded projects.

Mr. Farrell said that in submitting project listings, state and local jurisdictional staff were asked to consider criteria including size and scope, promotion of regional connectivity, promotion of access to transit, and presence in an existing jurisdictional plan. He said that the plan included about 400 projects, at a total estimated cost of \$580 million.

Mr. Farrell said that the plan responds to the TPB Vision which calls for walkable activity centers, reduced reliance on the automobile, and safe, convenient walking and bicycling. He said that the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study has predicted that adding growth to activity centers will increase biking and walking, so priority should be given to projects that serve activity centers and correspond to the goals stated in the TPB vision.

Referring to the PowerPoint, Mr. Farrell listed examples of projects in the plan that address the TPB Vision goals, including the Anacostia River Walk Trail, College Park Trolley Trail, Bethesda Bikeway and Pedestrian Facilities project, Woodrow Wilson Bridge bicycle and pedestrian accommodation, the Reston Plaza America project, and the Rosslyn Circle Crossing.

Mr. Farrell presented statistics about current bicycle and pedestrian system characteristics, mode share, and safety. He said that in the area of federal and state policy it is important to note that the trend is toward “routine accommodation” or “complete streets” where pedestrian and bicycle considerations are included in every project.

Mr. Farrell said that the plan would be formally released for public comment on June 15<sup>th</sup>, and that after further review by the TPB Technical Committee, Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, and Citizens Advisory Committee, a final version should be ready for TPB approval by July 19<sup>th</sup>. He said there will be an online version of the plan produced subsequent to the approved print version.

Ms. Hinton asked if there was a deadline for submission of comments by TPB members.



---

Mr. Sebastian said that the subcommittee hoped to get all comments by June 9<sup>th</sup> if possible.

### **13. Other Business**

There was no other business discussed.

### **13. Adjournment**

Vice Chairman Hudgins adjourned the meeting at 2:05 p.m..