

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
November 16, 2011**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Melissa Barlow, FTA
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Kerry Donley, City of Alexandria
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Edgar Gonzalez, Montgomery County Exec. Branch
Jason Groth, Charles County
Rene'e Hamilton, VDOT
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax County
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Julia Koster, NCPC
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick
Michael C. May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Art Rodgers, DC Office of Planning
Paul Smith, Frederick County
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
Lori Waters, Loudoun County
Jonathan Way, City of Manassas
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Sam Zimbabwe, DDOT

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby
Gerald Miller
Robert Griffiths
Daivamani Sivasailam
Andrew Meese
Andrew Austin
Jane Posey
William Bacon
Dusan Vuksan
Gareth James
Sarah Crawford
Karin Foster
Eric Randall
Ben Hampton
Erin Morrow
Debbie Leigh
Deborah Etheridge
David Robertson COG/EO
Steve Kania COG/OPA
Lewis Miller COG/OPA
Alex Verzosa City of Fairfax
Bill Orleans Citizen
Jim Maslanka City of Alexandria
Bob Grow Greater Washington Board of Trade
Bob Chase Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Judi Gold Councilmember Bowser's Office
Cody Christensen STV Incorporated
Patrick Durany PWC
Nick Alexandrow PRTC
Will Handsfield DC Office of Planning
Alyssa Seibert MDOT
Tina Slater Action Committee for Transit
Mike Lake Fairfax County DOT
Del. Al Carr MD General Assembly

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Chair Bowser thanked TPB members and staff for their cooperation on the new electronic mailing system for meeting materials. She also congratulated those members who recently won reelection.

Bob Chase of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance commended the TPB and the TPB

Citizens Advisory Committee for initiating the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. He said that for the Priorities Plan to be effective, the number of performance measures identified must be limited. He said prioritization of projects and the development of performance measures must be focused on congestion and the most effective solutions, not those considered the most politically actionable. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Stewart Schwartz of the Coalition for Smarter Growth spoke about regional priorities related to a potential increase in the Maryland state gas tax and Virginia transportation project funding. He said the Coalition is concerned about the I-95 HOT lanes and he suggested the TPB state a position in support of stronger environmental analysis for this project and future projects.

2. Approval of Minutes of October 19 Meeting

Vice Chair Turner made a motion to adopt the minutes of the October 19 TPB meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

3. Report of Technical Committee

Mr. Kellogg said the Technical Committee met on November 4 and considered six items on the TPB agenda: the draft conformity analysis of the 2011 CLRP, the draft 2011 CLRP, local government contributions for the Street Smart campaign, the Incident Management and Response Steering Committee's action plan, the composition of the 2011 vehicle fleet in the Washington region, and the development of performance measures for the TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. He said three other items were presented for information: the draft Regional Complete Streets Policy, the status of the TPB Regional Priority Bus project, and current TPB work activities related to climate change.

Chair Bowser asked if the TPB would be able to review the draft Regional Complete Streets Policy at its December meeting.

Mr. Kirby said the draft policy will require more time than anticipated and it is likely the TPB will have something to review in January.

Chair Bowser asked for a more detailed status update and noted that this issue has been significant for the Citizens Advisory Committee.

Mr. Kirby said much time-consuming effort has been devoted to reviewing existing agency policies on the subject in order to assure consistent regional representation in the draft policy.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Chair Bowser recognized Rob Mandle, an alternate member of the Citizens Advisory Committee

(CAC) representing the District of Columbia, whom she would like the consent of the Board to appoint as a voting member and 2011 Chair of the CAC due to Mr. Dobelbower's relocation. The appointment was made without objection.

Mr. Mandle said the CAC is glad to see the priorities planning efforts underway and said the CAC meeting focused exclusively on the plan. He said the CAC received a briefing from staff on the proposed performance measures and noted that there is an increasing emphasis among federal agencies on the use and integration of performance measures into planning and programming processes. He said this effort offers an opportunity for the Washington region to be prepared for a new anticipated framework for federal transportation funding and decision-making. He said the CAC discussed the public outreach component of the plan process, the regional goal setting, and the use of performance measures in developing the plan. He said the CAC believes that a robust discussion of the region's goals amongst the TPB and stakeholders and the public would provide a more solid foundation and give a more legitimate end product that will be the priorities plan. He said the CAC also discussed how the priorities planning effort ties into other TPB planning activities, including scenario planning and public outreach activities. He closed by noting the CAC would be holding an election by e-mail to elect six individuals to serve on the 2012 CAC.

Chair Bowser added that the TPB Officers would round out the appointments of the CAC to provide for a full complement of 15 members. She said the 2012 TPB Chair would select the 2012 CAC Chair.

5. Report of Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on November 4 and approved two resolutions included in the mailout packet, one for an on-the-job training program requested by MDOT and the second related to funding for the widening of Route 7 in Fairfax County as requested by VDOT. He noted that a status summary of the TPB TIGER I bus priority grant project was included in the mailout packet. He summarized items included in the handout packet, including a summary of the Street Smart kickoff campaign, a letter from WMATA Chair Cathy Hudgins to Senator Mikulski supporting extending the tax benefit for transit and high occupancy modes, and a letter from a citizen in Warrenton to Vice Chair Lori Waters regarding incident management in snowstorms.

Chair Bowser asked Mr. Kirby to make some general comments on the summary of the TIGER I project status.

Mr. Kirby said that, as experienced nationally, the TIGER projects have taken longer to implement than anticipated when applying for the grant. He said there were various design and federal administrative issues that are close to being resolved. He said it has also taken more time to get funding in place.

Chair Bowser asked if the TPB members could assist on that subject at the jurisdictional level.

Mr. Kirby said he does not believe so and added that the delays are mostly related to bureaucratic staff-level responsibilities.

6. Chair's Remarks

Chair Bowser congratulated the Virginia TPB members on receiving a funding commitment from the federal government on the Dulles Rail extension.

ACTION ITEMS

7. Appointment of Nominating Committee for Year 2012 TPB Officers

Chair Bowser appointed the members of the nominating committee for year 2012 TPB Officers: David Snyder from Virginia (Chair), Phil Mendelson from the District of Columbia, and Paul Smith from Maryland.

Mr. Kirby added that the nominating committee would report back to the TPB at the December 21 meeting and the Board will be asked to approve the 2012 officers at that meeting.

Chair Bowser confirmed that the officers would take office in January.

Mr. Kirby said that is correct.

8. Review of Comments Received and Acceptance of Recommended Responses for Inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2011 Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP), and for the 2011 CLRP

Mr. Kirby said the TPB did not receive any comments by the close of the comment period on November 12. He said there is no action to be taken at this time on this item.

9. Approval of Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2011 CLRP

Ms. Posey said that staff found a small error in the results and that the corrected information is included in the materials. She said staff received one comment on the air quality conformity determination from the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC). She said MWAQC acknowledged that the TPB met the mobile source emissions tests and commended the TPB for compliance with proposed budgets. She said MWAQC cautioned that EPA will soon release guidance for the more stringent 2008 National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

Vice Chair Turner made a motion to adopt Resolution R5-2012, approving the air quality conformity analysis for the 2011 CLRP. Ms. Smyth seconded the motion, which passed

unanimously.

10. Approval of the 2011 CLRP

Mr. Kirby said there were six amendments this year to the 2010 CLRP that was adopted in November 2010. He said the TPB is being asked to approve these amendments as part of the 2011 CLRP Update.

Chair Bowser made a motion to adopt Resolution R6-2012 approving the 2011 CLRP Update. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Turner.

Mr. Donley referred to Stewart Schwartz's remarks during the public comment period regarding the environmental analysis for the I-395/I-95 HOT Lanes project, specifically with regard to the two candidate build alternatives included in the environmental assessment. He asked TPB staff to comment on the validity of an environmental assessment that includes only two alternatives.

Mr. Kirby said the I-395/I-95 Corridor is a significant corridor in the region and that it is unfortunate that there has been a change that has resulted in not having an opportunity to conduct a full environmental assessment, noting that there will be serious congestion problems north of the proposed terminus at Edsall Road near the Mark Center. He said Mr. Schwartz made a valid comment and said it would be possible for the TPB to bring this issue to VDOT's attention.

Mr. Donley asked staff to confirm previously presented analysis demonstrating the negative effect of spillover traffic onto local roadways due to the exit of HOT lane travelers just north of the Capital Beltway.

Mr. Kirby said that analysis conducted by TPB staff was presented at the July TPB meeting and that the spillover traffic was due to less capacity available on the HOT lanes. He said this analysis is not part of the environmental assessment, which is VDOT's process.

Mr. Donley asked if a terminus location for the HOT lanes in the District had ever been considered. He recalled the terminus had previously been planned around the Pentagon.

Mr. Kirby said the Federal Highway Administration conducted a study a few years ago on the possibility of carrying the HOT lanes across the 14th Street Bridge and into the District of Columbia. He said that could have been studied further, but it is no longer relevant since VDOT has removed the portion of the HOT lanes from the Capital Beltway to the approaches to the 14th Street Bridge.

Mr. Donley said that in light of some of the preliminary traffic analysis and the fact that only two candidate build alternatives have been considered, he would like to offer an amendment to the resolution that would be inserted as a second resolve clause: "Be it further resolved, that the Transportation Planning Board encourages the Virginia Department of Transportation to expand its environmental analysis concerning the I-395 HOT lanes project to include more candidate

build alternatives, including transit options and a District of Columbia terminus.”

Ms. Hudgins seconded the motion.

Mr. Kirby suggested including I-95 in the designation of the roadway, as reflected in the project title, to which Mr. Donley agreed.

Ms. Hamilton clarified that assuming the amendment is encouraging and not directing VDOT, VDOT will consider it.

Chair Bowser asked Mr. Donley to provide more information about the implication of a District of Columbia terminus.

Mr. Donley said that transportation systems seem to work most successfully when connecting major activity centers. He said the currently proposed terminus of the facility just north of the Capital Beltway is hardly an activity center. He said it would likely require vehicles using the HOT lanes to exit the HOT lane portion of the facility and merge onto the general purpose lanes, causing a fair amount of congestion from that point all the way to the 14th Street Bridge. He said it seems that it would be wise to connect the sources of commuters with major destinations, which includes the District of Columbia.

Ms. Waters asked Mr. Donley to further explain his intent regarding the portion of the amendment related to increasing transit options.

Mr. Donley said transit is currently being provided via the HOV facility. He said that creating a seamless system throughout the corridor would enhance the ability to add transit options into the District.

Ms. Waters asked whether adding transit would be in place of passenger vehicles.

Mr. Donley said that anytime transit capacity is increased, the goal is to replace vehicles.

Ms. Waters clarified that there is limited capacity on the roadway and asked if Mr. Donley was suggesting more of that space be devoted only to transit.

Mr. Donley said he is not, but merely stating that additional transit options should be considered.

Ms. Hudgins said the discussion about terminus location and transit service has been an ongoing discussion related to this project. She said the discussion relates to what all jurisdictions hope to see out of the HOT lanes project: not just a capacity expansion, but an opportunity to reduce VMT by providing transit options, as well as protecting the neighborhood streets surrounding the exits from the facility. She said that making the terminus of the facility at an activity center provides an understanding that the HOT lanes project will benefit all and not be onerous to some.

Chair Bowser said she agreed and spoke in favor of the amendment. She said adding options

during the environmental assessment is a positive step, especially if it will permit greater transit capacity and a more seamless connection with the District of Columbia.

The motion made by Mr. Donley amending Resolution R6-2012 was approved unanimously.

The resolution as amended was approved unanimously.

11. Certification of the Urban Transportation Planning Process for the National Capital Region

Mr. Kirby presented Resolution R7-2012 for the Board's consideration. He explained that the certification of the urban transportation planning process is a voluntary certification the TPB does to indicate that it has met all of the federal requirements in the planning process as part of the annual update to the long-range plan. He explained that the certification document has been reviewed carefully by the three state DOTs, and that sign-offs have been received from Maryland and Virginia, with one from the District on the way.

Chair Bowser made a motion to adopt Resolution R7-2012. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Turner and unanimously approved.

12. Update on the Regional "Street Smart" Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign

Mr. Kirby presented to the Board a draft letter to be sent by the TPB to the Council of Governments (COG) Board of Directors expressing support for a COG Budget and Finance Committee recommendation to incorporate funding for the Street Smart program into COG's annual dues structure for FY2013. He explained that the level of contributions that the TPB has received over the years has been fairly uneven, and that some jurisdictions have said that receiving just one invoice from COG would be administratively simpler. He said that the letter highlighted the fact that the Street Smart program allows the TPB to receive more than \$400,000 in federal funding and more than \$1 million in earned media and PSAs in the region.

Chair Bowser expressed her support for the letter, saying that incorporating Street Smart funding into the dues structure makes practical sense, and that it sends a message that Street Smart is an important program. She asked whether the COG Budget and Finance Committee comprises representatives of each of the jurisdictions.

Mr. Robertson, COG's Executive Director, explained that the members of the committee include, by tradition, the chair and two vice-chairs of the COG Board, the chair of the TPB, the chair of MWAQC, and the COG secretary/treasurer. He provided some additional details about the committee's discussion leading up to their recommendation to the COG Board. Among other things, he noted that 12 percent of the COG budget is made up of members' assessments, and that the per capita assessment has been frozen at 65 cents since 2009. The committee's

recommendation to the Board calls for an increase of the per capita assessment to 66 cents, which would generate an additional \$91,000 in FY 2013 (a 1 percent increase in total COG revenue), \$63,000 of which will be dedicated to a line item to support the Street Smart program. He explained that the Street Smart program was the last major outlier in terms of supplemental fees.

Vice Chair Turner moved to authorize the chair's signature on the draft letter presented by Mr. Kirby. The motion was seconded by Mr. Snyder.

Vice Chair Waters asked whether the Street Smart assessment would be on top of the proposed 1-cent per capita increase in member assessments.

Mr. Robertson explained that the Street Smart funding would be included as part of the increase.

Vice Chair Waters pointed out that jurisdictions like hers, which have seen the greatest increase in population over the last several years, will be hit hardest by the proposed increase in assessments. She also expressed concern that the campaign, to date, has been very urban-centric, an approach to which residents and constituents in outer jurisdictions are less able to relate.

Mr. Robertson said that he agreed, but that he and Mr. Kirby had visited Ms. Waters' community to talk about the proposed increases, and that the community had agreed, on a voluntary basis, to participate.

Chair Bowser asked Mr. Kirby to explain the process for developing the Street Smart campaigns.

Mr. Kirby said that the campaign is put together by the TPB's Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, but that the jurisdictions that have been contributing to Street Smart, which have tended to be inner jurisdictions, have worked together to develop the campaign messages. He explained that, in moving toward incorporating Street Smart into the COG dues, all jurisdictions will now participate in developing the message.

Chair Bowser recommended that, in future, staff keep the Board updated on the Subcommittee's work and decision points, so that all of the members can be sure to weigh in with their members of the Subcommittee.

Mr. Way expressed concern that incorporating Street Smart funding into the dues structures as opposed to incorporating it into the budget structure hides it and is not transparent. He suggested leaving the system as-is or to combine it into the annual budget.

Mr. Robertson clarified that the proposed change is essentially combining it into the annual budget. He said that if the COG Board wishes to delete that line item and reduce assessments accordingly, it would be free to do so, just as it is free to do with other programs.

Mr. Snyder expressed his strong support for the draft letter, noting that safety has always been a priority for the TPB. He said that Street Smart is proven to be effective, and that with reliable

funding it will be even more effective. He pointed out that the program is entirely consistent with the TPB's major goal and priority of highway safety. The program, he said, reduces fatalities and injuries on our highways, which has many benefits region-wide.

Mr. Smith explained that his constituents might not favor paying for the Street Smart program, but that he was willing to support it as a regional program. He also said he thought the campaign materials were great, and that there shouldn't be too much focus on tailoring materials for one jurisdiction versus another.

Mr. Donley asked whether the proposed dues increase covered more than just the Street Smart program and whether the Street Smart program is largely a mass media marketing program using radio, television, the internet and other communication modes to promote pedestrian and bicyclist safety throughout the region.

Mr. Robertson confirmed both points, also explaining that the campaign includes enforcement components as well.

Mr. Donley asked whether the law enforcement community throughout the region is heavily in favor of this program.

Mr. Robertson said it is.

Mr. Donley suggested that it might be the case that currently some jurisdictions are paying to support Street Smart while all are benefiting because the mass marketing message goes out to the entire region. In his view, he said, incorporating Street Smart into the standard work program is a much fairer way and a more efficient way of supporting a program that benefits the entire region.

Mr. Robertson agreed with Mr. Donley, but also said that it is important to have discussions about such issues, as COG is a voluntary association and should concern itself with developing a work program that aligns with member jurisdictions' priorities.

Mr. Mendelson pointed out that the proposed incorporation of Street Smart funding into the COG dues structure was consistent with the second option Mr. Way suggested earlier in the discussion. He said that to have Street Smart as a project just like other projects in the budget was, in fact, what was being proposed.

Mr. Weissberg said that the issue being discussed was a critical one that needs to be addressed regionally. He expressed his support for the proposal but said that he would be interested in knowing how success of the program is measured.

Mr. Kirby explained that staff compile reports that show the degree to which people are hearing the messages the campaigns are putting out. He said that linking that awareness to an actual reduction of fatalities relative to what they would have been otherwise is more difficult, but that there is clear evidence to show that the campaign is reaching people.

Ms. Hudgins expressed her support for incorporating Street Smart funding into the COG dues. She said that Street Smart is a regional program but that it filters down into communities. She also pointed out that her constituents travel throughout the region, so safety for them wherever they are is important.

Ms. Krimm agreed with Ms. Hudgins. She said that even though the population in Frederick lives there and sleeps there, a lot of them work in inner jurisdictions, and so safety region-wide is important. She also said that the leveraging of a lot of federal dollars with a very small local contribution is an important point to remember. She also noted that it is important, when the Board talks about the region, that they not forget about outer jurisdictions like Frederick and Loudoun Counties.

Chair Bowser thanked Board members for their comments and reiterated the point that messages and feedback about the Street Smart program will need to get out earlier to ensure that messages will relate to people all over the region.

Chair Bowser called for a vote on the motion. The following “nay” votes were recorded: Mr. Jenkins, Mr. May, Ms. Waters, Mr. Smith, and Mr. Way. Chair Bowser announced that the “aye” votes outnumbered the “nay” votes and the motion carried.

INFORMATION ITEMS

13. Briefing on COG’s Regional Incident Management and Response (IMR) Action Plan

Mr. Andrews said that TPB members should each have received a full copy of the report by the Steering Committee on Incident Management and Response. The Steering Committee was established by the COG Board in the wake of the snowstorm on January 26th. He said that he would brief the Board with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, and referred to the first slide to summarize the factors that combined to cause the massive gridlock in the region on the day of the storm. He said that the Steering Committee was composed of emergency managers, transportation officials, chief administrative officers, public information officers, utility representatives, the Board of Trade, and the Red Cross, and that it was tasked with developing recommendations that would help prevent a repeat of that experience and that would have applicability beyond just a snowstorm.

Mr. Andrews said that the Steering Committee’s recommendations addressed the four focus areas that had been identified by the COG Board. The focus areas are looking at what type of regional situational awareness there is and needs to be, what type of real-time information needs to be provided to empower members of the public to make the best decisions possible, how to improve regional coordination, and what can be learned from other decision-making models such as TRANSCOM in New York City. He summarized the main recommendations that were outlined on slides five to seven of the PowerPoint: the establishment of a Regional Incident Coordination (RIC) Program located at the DC Homeland Security and Emergency Management Agency; revisions to employers’ release policies along the lines of those made by the federal

Office of Personnel Management (OPM); use of the new Virtual Joint Information Center established by Fairfax County to communicate information to residents of the region; the extension of the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program to a 24/7 operation; testing of evacuation coordination and communication plans; and, installation of backup power to major traffic signals to maintain road capacity during widespread power outages.

Mr. Andrews said that the Steering Committee's report had been unanimously approved by its members on October 26th and that it had been accepted by the COG Board at its November 9th meeting. He said two of the recommendations, the RIC Program and the Virtual Joint Information Center, would be implemented very shortly, as would the revised employee release policy at OPM. He thanked attendees at the meeting for their attention and invited questions.

Mr. Snyder thanked Mr. Andrews and everyone involved for their work, and said that the most attractive aspect of the report was the immediacy of being able to make some of the improvements, by making existing systems work better. He stated his belief that the recommendations fell short of ultimately solving the problem, because they would not stop the region from continuing to make decisions by conference call. He said that when an event evolves rapidly and seconds count, decisions should not be made by conference call, and that it is necessary to have established protocols and a clear line of authority to act immediately. He said that these recommendations would make the existing decision-making model work better, but it would not change its fundamental problem, which has caused it to repeatedly fail when incidents are unexpected or change very rapidly. He said he appreciated the work and would support the report, which he believed to be a clear step in the right direction, but he said the recommendation were inadequate for dealing with the kind of incident when seconds matter.

Mr. Andrews responded that he appreciated the comments and the ongoing commitment of Mr. Snyder and Mr. Mendelson on this issue. He said Mr. Snyder had provided the most detailed comments of any of the stakeholders the Steering Committee had reached out to, that his point of view was understood, and that the matter would continue to be debated. He said that in the meantime, these recommendations could be made quickly and could make a real difference.

Mr. Mendelson asked Mr. Andrews for clarification regarding the last bullet on slide five of the PowerPoint, an oversight group to measure the progress of the RIC Program.

Mr. Andrews responded that the COG Board had approved Mr. Snyder's suggestion to conduct a review of the RIC Program after six months, noting that several members of the Steering Committee had agreed to remain in their roles to monitor the progress of the recommendations. He said that the six-month report would be presented to the COG Board and the TPB. He added that the Emergency Preparedness Council, a permanent committee of which he was currently chair, would also monitor the RIC Program. He said it was important to have this kind of follow-up.

Mr. Mendelson asked if the group responsible for the six-month review would continue for a while after it had issued its report.

Mr. Andrews said that was yet to be decided but that it would certainly be meeting in between the implementation of the RIC Program and the end of the six-month period.

Mr. Mendelson said that he had another question that he would direct to Mr. Kirby. He said he was concerned about funding for MATOC, as it had taken ten years to reach the point at which all three DOTs had actually paid for the service, and he asked if it would be better funded through COG or the TPB to increase the predictability of its funding.

Mr. Kirby responded that the staffing for MATOC is actually provided through the University of Maryland, where the technical work such as the RITIS program is carried out. He said the TPB had offered to direct funding to MATOC through COG or the TPB, but MDOT had chosen to fund the University of Maryland directly, as it had an existing contact with the university. He said that VDOT had chosen to direct funding to MATOC through the TPB, and that DDOT had pursued both options before finally deciding to establish a direct contract with the university. He said the current arrangement was simply a matter of administrative convenience, and that the TPB would be able to manage MATOC funding for all three of the DOTs if they so desired.

Mr. Mendelson drew a comparison with WMATA and the issue of dedicated funding, stating that there was no guarantee that funding would be dedicated to MATOC going forward. He said that if funding was directed through the TPB, it would be dedicated to MATOC.

Mr. Kirby responded that it would still need to be approved by the state DOTs, so whether it came through the TPB or not was more an administrative matter than a funding decision. He expressed confidence that the three DOTs would continue to fund MATOC at its current level now that it was all in place.

Mr. Mendelson said this level of funding was not adequate for the recommended 24/7 MATOC operation.

Mr. Kirby said that the issue of funding the MATOC recommendation in the IMR report needed to be addressed. He expressed his appreciation and admiration for the way in which Mr. Andrews had chaired the Steering Committee, which he said was an extraordinarily productive effort. He said that the MATOC members were all on the Steering Committee, and that the three DOTs, WMATA, and TPB staff had been actively engaged in it, contributing and benefiting greatly. He said that the TPB had responsibilities that arose from the report, including the implications of funding MATOC as a 24/7 operation.

Chair Bowser asked Mr. Kirby to specify the current funding levels for MATOC.

Mr. Kirby said that it was \$400,000 per state and the District annually, a total of \$1.2 million.

Chair Bowser asked what the next steps would be regarding the MATOC recommendation.

Mr. Kirby said that they were currently under consideration, and that one option would be to provide sufficient MATOC staffing to be able to go 24/7 at short notice, such as in the event of an approaching storm. He said that this would not help with an unanticipated event like an earthquake, but that the RIC Program would be 24/7 and could contact MATOC even outside of its operational hours. He said he did not know if it would be feasible for MATOC to become 24/7 every day of the year, as is the case for TRANSCOM in New York, but that it had always been the intention to ultimately offer that level of service.

Mr. Mendelson stated that it was the TPB's responsibility as the MPO for the region to require the funding to implement the recommended expansion of MATOC to a 24/7 operation. He said this was a matter that they had to work on and that he would bring it up at another TPB meeting.

Chair Bowser asked for clarification regarding the funding of the RIC Program through the Urban Area Security Initiative, how the RIC Program would be staffed, and how its duties would differ from those of MATOC.

Mr. Andrews responded that the RIC Program would be housed at D.C. Homeland Security. He said the staff would be detailed from existing staff, but that they would be assigned to have a regional focus, not a focus that is just for one jurisdiction. He said that the Urban Area Security Initiative is funded through the federal government each year, and that there is sufficient money in that program to fund the RIC Program for the remainder of the year. He said that approximately \$200,000 was available to fund staffing, and that two staff, or perhaps three, would be assigned to RIC. He added that Millicent West, the Director of D.C.'s Homeland Security Emergency Management Agency, was already in the process of making the appropriate assignments.

Chair Bowser commented that part of the problem in dealing with incidents in the region is that none of the jurisdictions want to cede authority. She said that the RIC Program would be helpful so that there can be one regional voice. She said that the oversight group should consider using whatever funding it determines to be appropriate, but she was concerned that there would still be too many people involved in regional decision-making, and, more specifically, in speaking about the incident or problem. She asked for Mr. Andrews' comments on this matter.

Mr. Andrews said the Steering Committee had considered such concerns, and that the RIC Program might evolve to be able to speak with one voice for the region, but that the first step would be to get the RIC Program in place to enable its staff to win the confidence of the people they would be working with in different jurisdictions. He said that local jurisdictions would continue to put their own messages out, as what might be necessary in one jurisdiction might not be necessary in another, but that RIC staff would have the communication skills to be sensitive to the needs of the jurisdictions should they ultimately want the RIC Program to evolve beyond the initial recommendation.

Ms. Krimm asked if all three states had paid \$400,000 for MATOC for the current fiscal year.

Mr. Kirby confirmed this to be the case, and said they were already working on next year's MATOC contributions.

Vice Chair Turner asked Mr. Andrews for clarification regarding OPM's policy to do shelter in place.

Mr. Andrews responded that the new OPM policy was close to being adopted, but that the primary objective of the new policy was for people not to be at work in the worst conditions, either through an increase in telework and alternative work schedules, or through having people leave before the road conditions deteriorate. He said that 'stay put' might be a better term than 'shelter in place', as the latter term gives the impression that people will stay overnight, which would probably be very unusual. He said the new policy would encourage staff who do not leave work before the roads conditions deteriorate to stay put for a few hours until the roads clear and it is safe to leave.

Ms. Hudgins said that while the roads were really important, she noted that the Steering Committee's report had also included Metro, and she wanted to get a better understanding of how to coordinate communication with Metro. She said that bad weather conditions could seriously impact Metro, and she asked how that would fit into recommendations such as the Virtual Joint Information Center.

Mr. Andrews responded that Metro is a huge part of the regional transportation system, and that disruptions to Metro service could have a major impact. He noted that during the January 26th snowstorm, Metrorail was largely unaffected while the buses were hugely affected, and that the earthquake did not affect the buses but caused the trains to travel at reduced speeds due to concerns about structural damage. He said that it was crucial to communicate this kind of information to everyone who needs to know, including the public, as quickly as possible, and that recommendations like the Virtual Joint Information Center should help to facilitate this.

Chair Bowser thanked Mr. Andrews for his work in leading the region on this important issue.

14. Briefing on the Composition of the Vehicle Fleet in the Washington Region in 2011

This item was postponed until the TPB's December 19 meeting.

15. Status Report on the Development of Performance Measures for the TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)

Mr. Kirby said that while there was insufficient time to provide the full status report, he wished to draw members' attention to the part of the memorandum that summarized recent developments in performance-based planning and programming at the federal level. He said that the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee had just reported out its version of a new transportation bill, and that the House was expected to move toward a bill by the end of the year.

He said that there seemed to be bipartisan support for maintaining transportation funding at the current level, which he said is a good outcome in the current economic and political climate. He said that the Senate bill contained a lot of language concerning performance-based planning, some of which was directed specifically at the MPO process, and that the House bill could be expected to include similar language. He stated that developments at the federal level would tie in well with the TPB's work on the RTPP, so he wanted to provide this update as background information for the discussion that would take place on the draft report at the TPB's December meeting.

16. Other Business

Chair Bowser introduced a new member, Sam Zimbabwe, who would be representing the District Department of Transportation (DDOT).

17. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 1:59pm.