

**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  
March 21, 2007**

Members and Alternates Present

Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA  
Andrew Fellows, City of College Park  
Brian A. Glenn, FTA  
Jason Groth, Charles County  
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Sandra Jackson, FHWA  
Sakina Khan, DC Office of Planning  
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council  
Timothy Lovain, Alexandria City Council  
Michael Lyles, City of Bowie  
Michael May, Prince William County  
Phil Mendelson, DC Council  
Sam Minnitte, MDOT  
Emeka Moneme, DDOT  
David Moss, Montgomery County  
Eric Olson, Prince George's County Council  
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park  
Mark Rawlings, DDOT  
Rick Rybeck, DDOT  
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT-NOVA  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County  
David Snyder, City of Falls Church  
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT  
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate  
Robert Werth, Private Provider's Task Force  
Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax  
William Wren, Manassas Park  
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board

---

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	
Michael Clifford	
Jim Hogan	
Bob Griffiths	
Nick Ramfos	
Wendy Klancher	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Andrew Meese	
John Swanson	
Erin Morrow	
Darren Smith	
Sarah Crawford	
Dusan Vuksan	
Mark Moran	
Daivamani Sivasailam	
Beth Newman	
Dave Robertson	COG/EO
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Jeanne Saddler	COG/OPA
Makeda Saggau-Sackey	COG/OPA
Tom Harrington	WMATA
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Harry Sanders	Action Committee for Transit
Randy Carroll	MDE
Tony Chinyere	Tri-County Council – Southern Maryland
Angelica Betts	Occoquan Dist. Supervisor's Aid
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Jeff Cole	Fluor
Tim Young	Transurban
Jennifer Aument	Transurban
J. Rick Gordon	Prince George's County
Allen Muchnick	Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation
Michael Replogle	Environmental Defense
Bob Chase	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Larry Martin	TPB CAC

---

## 1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Mr. Replogle, Transportation Director for Environmental Defense, spoke on behalf of Environmental Defense, the Maryland Sierra Club, and the Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation. He commented on the Citizen Advisory Committee's (CAC) recommendation on pricing strategies for High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lanes presented at the February TPB Meeting. He said it was important for elected officials and the general public to consider a full array of transportation alternatives to support growth in the region, as well as minimizing fuel use and emissions. The organizations asked the TPB to look at HOT lane strategies for maximizing the effectiveness of the existing network through pricing, traffic management, and operations. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Chase of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance spoke about highway improvements that the TPB will act upon at the April 18, 2007 meeting, including I-66 westbound spot improvements and I-95/I-395 HOT lanes for air quality conformity testing. He said the TPB should expedite such projects that provide more capacity to the transportation network, noting the projected population growth for the region. He said the I-66 spot improvements are meager but essential improvements, producing benefits many times their cost. He added that the HOT lanes are a more complex issue subject to environmental and other analysis in the months ahead. However, he said it is important to approve both for air quality conformity testing at the April 18 TPB Meeting. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Muchnick spoke on behalf of the Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation (ACST), a group that has advocated solutions to traffic congestion on I-66 in Arlington via better traffic management, demand management, public transportation, and ride-sharing options. He said the ACST opposes VDOT's proposed CLRP and TIP amendments to construct I-66 spot improvements. He said this project has moved forward with minimal consideration for the environmental and regional travel impacts, disregarding clearly superior alternatives, strong local opposition, and the landmark 1977 U.S. DOT decision that established I-66 inside the Beltway as four managed travel lanes with Metro Rail in the median. He said the TPB should deny VDOT's off-year amendments as premature and direct all implementing agencies to only submit major new projects during the triennial or quadrennial CLRP update. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Sanders of Action Committee on Transit spoke about what he perceives is a lack of attention to transit projects for the TIP and CLRP updates, relative to the focus on HOT Lanes. He said that expansion of a rail transit system deserves as much regional attention as a variably priced lane study at TPB. He said that expanding the rail system will encourage suburb-to-suburb rail trips, as well as drive land use decisions in the right direction. He said that there is a hole in regional planning efforts, namely in the amount of attention focused on transit projects and funding devoted to such projects in the TIP and CLRP. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

---

Chair Hudgins thanked the speakers for their comments.

## **2. Approval of Minutes of January 17, 2007 Meeting**

A motion was made by Mr. Zimmerman to approve the minutes of the February 21, 2007 meeting of the TPB. The motion was seconded by Ms. Winter and passed unanimously.

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

Mr. Harrington provided the TPB with a summary of the Technical Committee Meeting held on March 2, 2007. He directed the TPB to the meeting highlights and reported that the Committee reviewed the following items on the TPB Agenda:

- Items 7 and 8: the Committee reviewed the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) FY 2007 carryover and FY 2008 program, with particular interest in the use of the technical assistance funding. He said TPB staff discussed the travel demand model work activity and a recent press report on the estimation of transit ridership levels for new light rail or express bus projects under study in Maryland.
- Item 9: The Committee reviewed the Commuter Connections Work Program.
- Item 12: TPB staff briefed the Committee on the Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program.
- Item 13: TPB staff briefed the Committee on the major new projects submitted for air quality conformity of the 2007 CLRP. Due to the complexity of some of the projects, particularly the I-95/I-395 HOT lanes, a special meeting of the Committee was held on March 9, 2007. Mr. Harrington said most of the comments focused on the I-95/I-395 HOT lanes. He said committee members commented on the level of cost for the transit component of the project, practical matters like garages to hold buses, and on the transit service plan.
- Item 14: The Committee reviewed the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan and recommended the TPB endorse this plan.
- Item 15: The Committee was briefed on the on-going review of potential transportation emissions measures and the development of mobile source emissions budgets for the 8-hour ozone SIP.

In addition, he said TPB staff demonstrated for the Committee the “beta” version of a visualization of the projects in the 2006 CLRP.

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

Mr. Martin presented the report of the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) because Chair Jim Larsen was unable to attend. Mr. Martin reported that the March 15 meeting featured a discussion of the TPB staff responses to the CAC's recommendations on the Regional Mobility

---

and Accessibility Scenario (RMAS) Study and briefings on the proposed 2007 CLRP amendments and the Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) program. He referred the TPB members to Item 16 on the agenda, staff's proposed action plan for implementation of the CAC recommendations. He said the CAC was pleased with extended outreach efforts that include presenting to existing organizations and helping them to understand the nexus between transportation and land use. He said the CAC voted unanimously to accept the staff implementation plan and requested the staff to develop a timeline for the implementation activities.

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

Mr. Kirby referred to the TPB packet for a list of actions taken by the Steering Committee at its March 2 meeting related to the 2006 TIP and the 2007 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). He highlighted several items in the letters packet. The first was a letter from the Board of Trade's Transportation Environment Committee commenting on the projects being released for air quality conformity analysis. He then reviewed the memorandum from TPB Staff updating the TPB on the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program Steering Committee and said the authorizing documentation for this Committee was almost complete. He commented on the included article from the Traffic Technology International magazine written by Phil Tarnoff of the University of Maryland.

Mr. Snyder emphasized the significance of the MATOC Program and the need for it to be formally established as soon as possible. He said that MATOC is critical to the welfare of this region and to the welfare of everyone who uses the highways, mass transit, and any other transportation asset within the region. He also spoke about the importance of using technology to get more out of the existing transportation system without having to add more capacity.

Mr. Snyder made a motion to refer the article on traffic management system technology to the Management, Operations and Intelligent Transportation Systems Policy Task Force and ask them to review the article and report back to the TPB in two months on what the region is doing to improve the safety and efficiency of the transportation system, as well as make recommendations on additional steps for the TPB. Ms. Ticer seconded this motion, which carried unanimously.

Mr. Kirby continued with his report on the Steering Committee meeting by speaking about transit demand forecasting in Maryland and a recent press report about delays in this work. He detailed work that staff has done with consultants towards meeting the stringent requirements that the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has for its discretionary New Starts Program. He said the FTA requirements are enforced nationwide for this competitive pool of funding, and that the time and effort needed to meet these requirements is a national issue. He said that he believed that coordinated efforts between the Maryland Mass Transit Administration (MTA) and COG/TPB are on track to meet the FTA requirements as expeditiously as possible.

---

Mr. Minnitte spoke in support of the TPB with regards to assisting MTA in meeting the FTA requirements for the New Starts Program for transit projects in Maryland. He reiterated that the bar has been set high by the FTA for these projects and it requires the highest level of effort from all participants. He said he wanted to be on the record in support of MWCOG and Mr. Kirby's comments.

Chair Hudgins thanked Mr. Minnitte.

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

Chair Hudgins asked Mr. Fellows for a motion to approve the Maryland appointments to the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC). Mr. Fellows made a motion to nominate Mr. Nathaniel Bryant of Fort Washington, MD, Mr. Todd Reitzel of Beltsville, MD, and Mr. Jahantab Siddiqui of College Park, MD, to serve on the 2007 CAC. Mr. Knapp seconded this motion, which carried unanimously.

Chair Hudgins asked members from Virginia and Maryland for an update on the status of their state transportation legislation.

Ms. Ticer said that the transportation bill was passed by the Commonwealth Legislature and that it borrows money for projects and has no dedicated funding source to replenish the money. She said the bill relies heavily on local government's willingness to tax their residents to fund certain projects, which she said is unpopular in most jurisdictions. She commented that there is a lot of pressure on Governor Kaine to develop amendments that solve some of the funding questions and that will satisfy a majority of the legislature.

Mr. Knapp said that there have been a number of bills on transportation introduced to the Maryland General Assembly. However, it is likely that all revenue measures will be combined under one bill next session to address the state's structured deficit. In the meantime, he said that he has had conversations with various members of the congressional delegation to emphasize the importance of transportation funding requirements, with emphasis on funding for WMATA.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **7. Approval of Amendments to the FY 2007 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), and Approval for FY 2007 UPWP Carryover Funding to FY 2008**

Mr. Kirby explained that projects in the UPWP are evaluated annually before the end of each fiscal year to determine what projects will not be completed and what funding will remain unspent. He said the first resolution under Item 7 deprograms those activities that will not be completed in FY 2007, and the second resolution carries them over into FY 2008. These

---

projects will be incorporated into the new UPWP for FY 2008. He reviewed a memorandum from TPB staff that summarizes the activities that will be carried over to FY 2008.

Ms. Ticer made a motion to adopt Resolutions R15-2007 and R16-2007 to approve the amendment to the FY 2007 UPWP and FY 2007 carryover funding to FY 2008. Mr. Lyles seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

### **8. Approval of FY 2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Kirby reviewed the final version of the FY 2008 UPWP. He referred to Table A, which explains several changes to the work item budgets that were in the February version of the program. These changes were needed to reflect a recent reduction in the funding anticipated from VDOT. He clarified that while the structure and content of the work program has not changed, there were reductions in some item budgets. The carryover funding for the items the TPB approved in Item 7 will help to offset these reductions in FY 2008.

Ms. Ticer made a motion to adopt Resolution R17-2007 to approve the final FY 2008 UPWP. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

### **9. Approval of FY 2008 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)**

Mr. Ramfos summarized the final version of the FY 2008 CCWP. He said the Technical Committee reviewed the draft document at its February and March meetings. He said the comments received at these meetings, along with those received from DDOT, MDOT, and VDOT, were addressed in the final draft of the CCWP. He said the Commuter Connections Subcommittee endorsed the FY 2008 CCWP at its meeting on March 20, 2007. He commented that the Subcommittee discussed the importance of the CCWP with regards to regional air quality and the new congestion management process required under SAFETEA-LU.

Ms. Ticer made a motion to adopt Resolution R18-2007 to approve the final FY 2008 CCWP. Ms. Smyth seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

### **10. Approval of Amendments to the FY 2007-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that are Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Realign Project Funding, as Requested by the District of Columbia Department of Transportation (DDOT)**

Mr. Rybeck said that Mr. Moneme would be presenting the amendments.

Mr. Moneme distributed a memorandum from Mr. Kirby describing a number of changes in

---

addition to the amendments described in the mailout materials. He said that the additional changes modified the timing of expenditures for the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Bridge project, and removed duplications and ambiguities between the listings of WMATA and DDOT transit projects in the TIP. Regarding the Roosevelt Bridge, he said that DDOT had decided after completion of an environmental assessment to delay full reconstruction of the bridge and instead to perform some maintenance work on the bridge until they are ready to move forward with the larger reconstruction project. He noted that the full reconstruction and widening of the bridge had thus been delayed in the draft TIP until 2009, with completion in 2012.

Mr. Moneme then highlighted the changes to the transit capital portion of the DDOT draft TIP amendments, as listed in Mr. Kirby's memo. He said these changes reflected better coordination between WMATA and DDOT, and listed the following:

- Deletion of a Rapid Bus Transit item that had inadvertently been listed twice in the draft amendments;
- Deletion of a bus shuttle service item that was a duplication of part of the circulator program;
- Deletion of funding related to the CSX Shepherd Park Severn Branch Railroad, which was a duplication of funding shown in the WMATA budget;
- Change of the item name "Downtown Circulator" to just "Circulator" to include broader efforts;
- Modifications to the timing and levels of funding for the east entrance to the Foggy Bottom Metro station, Farragut Square stations pedestrian tunnel, and Yellow Line extension;
- Deletion of items reflecting the Metro bus replacement program and the Metro rail and bus CIP which are already present in the WMATA TIP; and
- Deletion of an item for a pedestrian passageway in Union Station.

Mr. Moneme moved to adopt Resolution R19-2007 to approve amendments to the FY 2007-2012 TIP that are exempt from the air quality conformity requirement to realign project funding as requested by DDOT. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Kirby noted that a comment by the Demarch Alliance on the DDOT TIP amendments had just been circulated. He said that the Alliance had done a close review of the projects in the TIP and had raised the issue of whether the reallocation of funding reflected in the draft amendments was equitable across the wards of the District of Columbia. He noted that DDOT had prepared a response and asked if Mr. Moneme or Mr. Rybeck wished to describe that response.

Mr. Moneme said that the comment had been discussed internally and was well received and appreciated. He emphasized that most of the changes to the TIP he had described were the elimination of duplications, so although it might have appeared that DDOT was reducing investment in certain parts of the city, that was not actually the case. He said that the desire of DDOT is to present a balanced transportation program that serves all of the District's citizens,



---

and that the input reflected in the comment would be considered in the process of building the TIP in future years.

Chair Hudgins asked to verify that the amendments as described were still fully exempt from the air quality conformity requirement.

Mr. Kirby confirmed that the amendments are exempt. He also clarified that the comment received had been on the set of amendments released last month, and the changes just described by Mr. Moneme were in addition to that, so any motion would need to incorporate that list of additional changes.

Mr. Moneme emphasized that the recent changes did not represent any additions to the TIP but rather mainly involved removal of duplications.

Chair Hudgins asked if the notice that went out could then essentially be seen as adequately describing the comprehensive intent of the amendments even without the additional changes described by Mr. Moneme.

Mr. Kirby said that the recent changes are relatively inconsequential, being primarily removal of duplications, with the most significant change being the delay in the Roosevelt Bridge project because of some items from the environmental assessment that would need to be addressed.

Mr. Harrington noted that WMATA had worked closely with DDOT on the changes and would continue to work to make sure that transit items are properly shown in the TIP. He also pointed out that WMATA is conducting a transit service equity study this year that may help address some of the equity issues raised in the public comment by the Demarche Alliance.

Mr. Fellows asked when the transit service equity study was expected to be complete.

Mr. Harrington said that he thought the study was to be completed by the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. Fellows asked if that study would be brought to the TPB.

Mr. Harrington said that it could be.

Chair Hudgins sought to clarify that the motion on the floor incorporated the additional changes detailed by Mr. Moneme. The mover and seconder of the motion confirmed as such, and the motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Moneme thanked the TPB members for their support of the amendments.

---

**11. Approval of Amendments to the FY 2007-2012 TIP that are Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Realign Project Funding, as Requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)**

Ms. Sorenson said that VDOT was requesting amendments to the TIP approved last October to update project funding information and incorporate technical adjustments and amendments submitted by VDOT to the TPB and TPB Steering Committee since October.

Ms. Sorenson moved to adopt Resolution R20-2007 to approve amendments to the FY 2007-2012 TIP that are exempt from the air quality conformity requirement to realign project funding as requested by VDOT. The motion was seconded.

Ms. Smyth asked if the description on page 4 of the item materials of the Gallows Road-Lee Highway project as an “interchange” was correct.

Ms. Sorenson said that it should be listed as an “intersection,” and that a correction had been submitted after the date of the mailout item.

Ms. Smyth asked to confirm that the change would be present in the final version.

Ms. Sorenson said that the final version would say “intersection.”

Mr. Zimmerman asked where in the amendments document the I-66 spot improvements project appeared.

Ms. Sorenson said that the I-66 spot improvements project was not part of this amendments package because it was approved in October 2006 as part of the initial package.

Mr. Zimmerman said that it was his impression based on the public comments from earlier in the meeting that the TPB would be addressing that project as part of an agenda item at today’s meeting.

Chair Hudgins clarified that the project would be part of Item 13, an information item on project submissions for the Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP).

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the TPB had in a previous resolution adopted criteria for the I-66 spot improvement project, and it was not clear that those criteria had been met. He specifically cited the issue of right-of-way acquisition and potential impact on the Dulles Rail project. He said he hoped that VDOT would provide more information on the issue in the near future.

Chair Hudgins and Ms. Sorenson noted that the I-66 spot improvements project was not a part of the amendment package before the TPB for approval in this agenda item.

---

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the TPB had previously approved the project's inclusion in the TIP but that the approval was predicated on a good-faith assumption that the criteria approved in the TPB resolution would eventually be addressed by VDOT.

Ms. Sorenson said that VDOT would be happy to work with the TPB to provide additional information addressing the criteria.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the TPB would look forward to receiving such information.

The motion to approve R20-2007 was passed unanimously.

## **12. Approval of Technical Assistance Recipients under the Transportation/Land Use Connections (TLC) Pilot Program, and Approval of TPB Application for a Local and Regional Corridor Planning Grant from VDOT.**

Mr. Kirby asked TPB staff member Darren Smith to review developments regarding the TLC Program.

Mr. Smith briefed the Board on recent activities related to the TLC program, including the applications for assistance through the program received in February, the projects recommended by staff for funding by the TPB in the pilot phase, and plans for moving forward with those projects in the coming months. He reviewed previous action by the TPB to allocate \$250,000 for the TLC program in FY 2006-07, to launch a web-based clearinghouse and begin funding technical assistance for TPB member jurisdictions. Referring to a spreadsheet included in the mailout packet listing the applications received for the initial round of technical assistance, he noted that a total of 22 applications had been submitted, with one coming from the District of Columbia, 11 from Maryland and 10 from Virginia. He said that staff was pleased and excited to see the range of applications and the creativity demonstrated in them.

Mr. Smith, referring to a memo included in the mailout packet, briefly described the process through which the applications were narrowed down, noting that the TPB Technical Committee and Steering Committee were briefed at the beginning of March on the selection process to be followed. He said that the staff recommendation was based on several considerations, including achieving a good geographic distribution and range of assistance types, along with the urgency of the projects and their potential to yield information and lessons applicable across the region. He said that the staff recommendation was circulated to the TPB officers for comment, and with their concurrence brought forward to the full Board for approval under this item.

Mr. Smith briefly summarized the six projects in the staff recommendation, including the following:

- 
- Montgomery / Prince George's Counties, Langley / Takoma Parks Pedestrian Study
  - St. Charles Urbanized Area, Urban Roads Standards
  - Fairfax County, Levels of Service around Transit Oriented Development
  - Prince William County, Scoping Assistance for BRAC Impacts
  - District of Columbia, Potomac Avenue Metro Station Area Scoping
  - Public Presentation on Density and Transit Service Issues for use in response to applications by College Park, Greenbelt, Manassas Park, and Takoma Park, and/or other jurisdictions as requested

Mr. Smith noted that the last project responded to a need expressed by many smaller jurisdictions for public presentations that could serve as a foundation for constructive dialogue about specific local projects and needs. He pointed out that localities could decide whether or not to use the presentation after it was developed.

Mr. Smith said that assuming approval of the six projects, staff would move forward with project scoping meetings and identification of the appropriate consultants to work on each, and would simultaneously be moving forward with development of the Web-based TLC Clearinghouse. He said that staff found all of the project submissions were technically sound and could potentially be considered for funding in future rounds.

Mr. Smith also noted that staff had sent a letter of intent (included in the mailout packet) to apply for funds through the 2007 Virginia Multimodal Planning Grants Program to supplement TPB funds for TLC assistance projects in Virginia. He said that the application had been accepted into a second stage of the grant selection process, and staff would be submitting additional details about how Virginia grant funds would be used.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for clarification on what the TPB was being asked to approve.

Chair Hudgins said that the Board was to approve the projects for assistance referenced on page 2 of the memo included in the mailout, along with submitting an application for additional funding for the TLC program through the Virginia grant program.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the document did not seem to be a proper action item but that he supported the action as he understood it.

Mr. Zimmerman moved to approve the TLC projects recommended for completion by June 30, 2007, and approve the application to VDOT for a grant under the Local and Regional Corridor Planning program to fund TLC technical assistance projects in Northern Virginia beginning in July 2007.

Ms. Ticer seconded the motion.

---

Mr. Snyder asked if funding obtained through the Virginia Multimodal Planning Grants program would be available to the Virginia projects not selected in this round of the TLC technical assistance program.

Mr. Smith said that money received through the Virginia grant program could be used as such and also potentially to fund additional Virginia projects that could be identified through a subsequent call for applications.

Mr. Snyder asked if Mr. Zimmerman would accept as an amendment to the motion on the floor that those projects submitted by Virginia jurisdictions for TLC assistance that were not selected for the pilot program be forwarded to the Virginia Multimodal Planning Grants program coordinator as part of the TPB's submission.

Chair Hudgins noted that the packaging of the selection of the projects for the initial round of technical assistance along with the application for additional funds through the Virginia program into a single action item was intended to convey that obtaining the additional funds would give the TPB the opportunity to provide assistance to the Virginia projects not selected in this round.

Mr. Smith noted that TPB staff was not able to provide information about all of the Virginia applicants for TLC assistance along with the letter of intent for the Virginia Multimodal Planning Grants program because the letter of intent had to be submitted before the TLC application deadline. He said that staff will be forwarding information about the projects to be assisted in this round and the other Virginia projects not selected in this round to the Virginia grant program coordinator as part of the next phase in the application process for that grant.

Mr. Snyder said that he wanted to be able to tell his local colleagues that additional funding has been requested that could enable funding assistance for the project in his jurisdiction along with others in Northern Virginia.

Mr. Zimmerman said that as a representative of another jurisdiction whose project was not selected for the initial round of TLC assistance, he and Mr. Snyder could commiserate.

Mr. Minnette commended TPB staff and officers on having conducted a good selection process and said that MDOT supported the program. He said, however, that he had hoped for more coordination with MDOT and the other implementing agencies during the selection process, particularly in the evaluation of applications and identification of selection criteria. He said that he thought the program could be strengthened through additional coordination with the implementing agencies at this stage as these agencies have a lot to offer in terms of insight into the selected projects and assistance in their implementation.

Ms. Porter commended staff on the idea of putting together a public presentation on density and development issues, and suggested that the discussion go beyond helping citizens understand various concepts and also encourage involvement of all stakeholders early on in development

---

planning processes. She said this may help prevent situations in which development plans are presented to the public at a point at which they are already pretty much set and there is little opportunity for public input. She said that getting together all the parties early on can help the public and the developer understand better the compromises that may be necessary. She suggested that the focus of the public presentation project be broad enough to include setting the stage for a collaborative process between planning agencies, developers, local officials, and members of the public.

Mr. Smith agreed that this would be useful and said that Ms. Porter's comments were very helpful in beginning to think about what that presentation might entail.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that he wanted to echo Mr. Minnette's and Ms. Porter's comments. He suggested that rather than being involved in developing application criteria for TLC project selection, WMATA and the other implementing agencies could share information about past and current projects that are closely related to TLC projects, including observations about possible scopes of work that would be appropriate given past experience.

Mr. Bottigheimer also said that WMATA supported the approach Ms. Porter suggested to the public presentation project, focusing on identification and involvement of all stakeholders. He noted that WMATA had hosted a training program conducted by public involvement experts from the National Charrette Institute. He said that attendees included professionals from the D.C. Office of Planning, the WMATA Office of Joint Development, FHWA, and several other local jurisdictions, along with Mr. Swanson and Ms. Crawford of TPB staff.

Mr. Lyles asked for clarification of the amount of money allocated to technical assistance for the selected projects. He noted that the memo indicated that the TPB allocated \$250,000 for the program in FY 2006-07, \$100,000 of which was to go toward technical assistance projects with up to \$20,000 per project, but pointed out that the TPB was being asked to approve six different projects for assistance.

Mr. Kirby said that the \$20,000 figure was intended to be a ceiling for each project and that some might be completed for less than that amount. He also said a little more than \$100,000 might be available for the technical assistance projects depending on spending for the other aspects of the TLC program such as the Clearinghouse Web site. He said that between those two factors, staff was confident that the six recommended projects could be adequately funded this fiscal year.

There being no further questions, a vote was taken and the motion on the floor was approved unanimously.

---

### **13. Briefing on Project Submissions and Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2007 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2008-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Kirby said the mailout packet included detailed summaries of major CLRP projects, plus a table showing all of the changes to the significant projects that affect air quality conformity that are being proposed this year. He said a comment period on the project submissions began at the CAC meeting on March 15. He said the briefing today was intended to ensure that the Board understands what has been released for comment. He said the Board would be asked to approve the project submissions at its meeting on April 18.

Mr. Kirby asked Andrew Austin of the TPB staff to present a PowerPoint briefing on the project submissions.

Referring to the mailout material and the handout presentation, Mr. Austin described the significant projects that have been submitted for this year's CLRP and TIP. He said there are four major projects: 1) In Maryland, a new intersection on U.S. 340 serving Jefferson Technology Park, which is a new development; 2) I-66 spot improvements inside the Beltway in Virginia; 3) I-95/395 HOV bus and HOT lanes project in Virginia; and 4) the Potomac Yard Transit Way in Alexandria.

He said that three new studies were also being added to the CLRP this year: 1) The U.S. 301/Waldorf Bypass, 2) the Manassas National Battlefield Bypass and 3) VRE expansion to Gainesville and Haymarket in Virginia.

Mr. Austin highlighted some proposed changes to existing projects that are of interest. These changes included the following:

- The Inter-County Connector completion date has been pushed back about two years.
- The Springfield Interchange completion date has been pushed back about one year.
- The Tri-County Parkway has been realigned from what was previously in the CLRP. This new alignment is actually along the existing alignment of other projects already in the CLRP, so that the completion date for the project has been advanced from 2020 to 2012.

Mr. Austin said that more information can be found at [www.mwcog.org/clrp](http://www.mwcog.org/clrp). He said the comment period would be open through April 14. He said that people were encouraged to submit comments online through the website.

Mr. Zimmerman said the local governments and regional bodies in Northern Virginia continue to have concerns about the I-95/395 HOT lanes project. He said they are particularly concerned about operational questions and about the effects on transit. As an example, he noted that the documentation referred to the expansion from two lanes to three lanes as a "transit

---

improvement.” He said this label was incorrect. He said in fact the key question is whether the additional capacity will be sufficient to accommodate additional cars without actually degrading the transit service. He said there are a number of other questions and that he would continue to press these issues through the appropriate channels and he wanted to alert people to that fact.

Regarding the I-66 Spot Improvements, Mr. Zimmerman echoed Allen Muchnick’s statement during the public comment period that the project was neither “spot” nor “improvements.” He said that the project was actually an indirect way of taking easy steps toward the larger but more controversial and expensive goal of widening the road. He said that VDOT’s own studies do not support this spot improvement project.

Regarding the I-95/395 HOT lanes project, Chairman Hudgins emphasized that the TPB Steering Committee and the local jurisdictions, echoing Mr. Zimmerman’s comments, had accepted the project with the full understanding that it is to improve or provide some relief to transit. She said continuing discussion on this point is essential.

Ms. Smyth said it was also important to have the ability to address the impacts of the Base Realignment and Closing (BRAC) changes on the HOT lane project.

Mr. Lovain said he supported Mr. Zimmerman’s comments on the I-95/395 HOT lane project. He said he was particularly concerned to see a footnote indicating the Seminary Road connection is currently under evaluation.

Vice Chairman Fellows said that given the limited time and the extensive discussion regarding the project submissions, he hoped that the April agenda would have adequate time to fully explore the submissions before they are considered for approval.

Mr. Rybeck said he was speaking for Mr. Moneme who had to leave. He said that DDOT supports the comments of Mr. Zimmerman regarding both the I-95/395 HOT lanes and I-66 spot improvements. He said that both of these facilities funnel traffic toward the District and therefore DDOT has vital concerns about the projects.

Mr. Rybeck also brought to the Board’s attention a project that will be funded by the General Services Administration (GSA) to build a new intersection between I-295, Malcolm X Boulevard, and the St. Elizabeth's West Campus to accommodate new government workers who are being scheduled to populate that facility. He said it was not included in the DDOT submissions for the CLRP because DDOT is not funding it. He said it might be appropriate for TPB staff to get details on that project for potential inclusion in the CLRP.

Ms. Sorenson said that VDOT has heard the comments and concerns that had been expressed regarding the VDOT projects. She said that VDOT would be responding to those comments and that the CLRP input sheets that were provided to the Board would be modified to reflect the answers to the questions and concerns that have been expressed.



---

#### **14. Briefing on the Draft Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan for the National Capital Region**

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Porter reminded the Board that the TPB has been designated the recipient for funding projects under two Federal Transit Administration (FTA) programs, the Job Access and Reverse Commute Program and the New Freedom Program. In September the board established a task force to develop a coordinated plan, which is required in order to give out grants under these two programs. The purpose of the plan is to improve transportation for people with disabilities, for low income individuals and for older adults. She said the board approved in September the membership of the task force. It includes transit agencies, human service agencies, nonprofits, private operators and consumers, including consumers with disabilities. She said the draft plan includes criteria for the competitive selection process that will be used in making the grants. The task force intends to evaluate the plan and its operation and make any needed improvements after the first round is completed.

Ms. Porter said the TPB would be asked in April to approve the plan. She introduced Wendy Klancher of the COG/TPB staff to further brief the Board.

Referring to a PowerPoint presentation and handout, Ms. Klancher said there is approximately \$2 million, with the match requirement, available for project grants in both the Job Access Reverse Commute program and the New Freedom program. She said this is relatively little money compared to what is spent overall in the region for specialized transportation services. Therefore, the whole approach of this plan is to encourage innovative pilots that can show new ways of addressing old problems. She said the plan identified four main categories of unmet need: Customer Focus; Better Information; Improved Reliability; Additional Funding; and Transportation Choices. She said that project proposals will be required to address one or more of these strategies:

- Tailor transportation services to better respond to needs;
- Provide improved, user friendly information to customers;
- Develop services that improve reliability and augment existing paratransit and fixed route service; and
- Develop and implement new programs to provide additional transportation.

She described recommended priority actions in the plan for Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) Funding:

1. Brochure for low-income commuters on transportation options;
2. Low-interest loans to low income individuals to purchase cars;
3. Expanded guaranteed ride home program; and
4. Expanded shuttle service to employment sites.

She also described recommended priority actions in the plan for New Freedom Funding:

- 
1. Accessible taxis in jurisdictions without them;
  2. Sensitivity training for front line employees (for bus drivers, taxi cab drivers, etc);
  3. Personalized Travel Training on how use the fixed route;
  4. Same-day service for MetroAccess users;
  5. Escorted transportation or door through door service; and
  6. Accessible pedestrian infrastructure at bus and rail stations.

Finally, she described the competitive selection process for the JARC and the New Freedom funding. She said a selection committee would be chaired by Kathy Porter and would include the three TPB officers, and task force members representing the different stakeholder groups that have been so important to putting this plan together. Projects would be ranked according to criteria with points allocated.

She said that in April the draft plan will come back to the TPB for approval. In May or June the TPB would solicit projects. In July to August the selection committee would meet, rank the projects and make recommendations on which ones should be funded. Those recommendations would be brought back to the TPB for approval in either September or October, and then included in the TIP for funding.

Finally, Ms. Klancher acknowledged the assistance of TPB Member Robbie Werth who provided insight on the role of private operators. She also recognized DTP staff member Beth Newman for her assistance in writing the draft plan.

Mr. Snyder noted two unmet needs that should be identified in the report: a regional approach to bus shelters and better bus information.

Ms. Porter agreed that these are priorities. She noted that they were included in the recommended priority actions under the “Accessible Pedestrian Infrastructure at Bus and Rail Stations” and “Improvements to Bus Stops.”

## **15. Update on the Development of the Region's 8-Hour Ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP), and the Establishment of 2008, 2009, and 2010 Mobile Emissions Budgets**

Mr. Kirby reported that the ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP) was released for public comment last week by the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC). He said staff was comfortable with the SIP's mobile emission requirements and budgets.

---

**16. Briefing on Staff Responses to the TPB Citizen Advisory Committee's (CAC) Recommendations for the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Scenario Study (RMAS)**

Mr. Kirby said this information was well covered in the CAC report under Item 4.

**17. Other Business**

There was no other business.

**18. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.