

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

777 North Capitol Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20002-4226
(202) 962-3200

**MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
February 18, 2009**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT
Jason Groth, Charles County
Don Halligan, MDOT
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Charles Jenkins, Frederick County
Tony Knotts, Prince George's County
Julia Koster, NCPC
Timothy Lovain, Alexandria City Council
Michael C. May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Suhas Naddoni, City of Manassas Park
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
Rick Rybeck, DDOT
C. Paul Smith, City of Frederick
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd Turner, City of Bowie
Jonathan Way, City of Manassas
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	
Michael Clifford	
Jim Hogan	
Gerald Miller	
Robert Griffiths	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Andrew Austin	
Sarah Crawford	
Beth Newman	
Rex Hodgson	
Mark Moran	
Karin Foster	
Jonathan Rogers	
Tim Canan	
Stuart Freudberg	COG/DEP
Joan Rohlfs	COG/DEP
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Jeanne Saddler	COG/OPA
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Bill Orleans	PG ACT
Eric Weiss	Washington Post
Robert Thomson	Washington Post
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Emery Hiwes	Baltimore County DPW
Kimani Choi	Maryland Dept. of Planning
Len Capelli	Virginia Economic Development Partnership
Mac (SN) Hans Semple	US Navy Medical Center (Bethesda)
Rachelle Brown	Examiner
Kytja Weir	Examiner
Al Francese	Centreville Citizens for Rail
Natasa Syeed	AP
Bob Owolabi	Fairfax County DOT
Jim Maslanka	City of Alexandria
Alez Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Dan Emerine	DC Office of Planning

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Len Capelli, of the Virginia Economic Development Partnership and liaison to Northern Virginia, spoke to the TPB about region-wide initiatives in economic development. He said that

Northern Virginia has a highly educated workforce, which is a big draw for companies looking to relocate to Virginia. He said it is important to have a region-wide initiative that helps people move around the region without concern for getting employees to and from their jobs. He said vanpools, carpools, and ride-sharing are an important aspect of maintaining business development in the region. He provided a copy of his remarks and a PowerPoint presentation.

Audrey Clement of the Virginia Green Party noted that some pro-growth advocates are lobbying transportation officials to use federal stimulus money to fund highway expansion projects in Northern Virginia as a solution to traffic congestion. She said that the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance reports that widening I-66 inside the Capital Beltway is a top priority of private-sector transportation officials. She noted that the credentials of these transportation officials are not provided. She said Governor Kaine's Commission on Climate Change recognizes that automobile emissions contribute significantly to the GHGs that are driving climate change and is concerned about the potential impact of highway induced GHGs on global warming. She said the Commission made recommendations to the Governor that, if implemented, would dramatically reduce the scale of road-building in Northern Virginia. She said that according to the Commission, Virginia needs to adopt policies that seek to reduce vehicular GHGs, a mandate that is not employed in Northern Virginia's transportation planning process. She said VDOT's revised six-year program emphasizes major new construction projects on I-95 and the Capital Beltway. She said completion of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge includes construction and demolition projects designed to expand road capacity and induce traffic around the Capital Beltway. She urged the TPB to heed the recommendations of the Virginia Climate Change Commission and approve projects for economic stimulus funding that repair or restore existing infrastructure and/or expand access to public transportation. Copies of her remarks were submitted for the record.

Stewart Schwartz, Executive Director of the Coalition for Smarter Growth, spoke to Item 11 on the TPB agenda, referring to the submission of projects by WMATA and the DOTs for stimulus funding. He noted that the DOT projects would likely not be approved by the TPB at this meeting, which he said is positive because the selection of projects for stimulus funding should be a transparent, open public process as residents of the region try to determine the best priorities for the stimulus funding. He said the Coalition for Smarter Growth, as well as other regional organizations, sent letters to the congressional delegation supporting a "fix-it-first" approach, including maintenance and repair of existing infrastructure. He provided a copy of his letter to the TPB. He said he hoped that STP funding would be available to avoid layoffs and cutbacks in transit service. He said his organization supports adding buses and rail cars to the system and fixing targeted bottlenecks. He noted the dearth of transportation funding, both in the stimulus package and also likely in the next six-year transportation authorization. He said the TPB should not merely "rubber-stamp" a set of projects from the DOTs, but should step back and recognize they should choose wisely the projects that are funded with the little money available. He said the TPB should reevaluate compiling big project lists that will never be funded. He said the region should invest funding where people already live, focus on the most crowded corridors,

and focus on energy efficiency and climate change. Copies of his remarks and a letter sent to the congressional delegation were submitted for the record.

Peter Harnick of the Maywood Community Association spoke against the widening of I-66. He reminded the TPB that the Arlington County Board continues to be unanimously against the I-66 Spot Improvements project. He said he was happy when the Commonwealth Transportation Board eliminated part of the widening when transportation funding was reduced, and that he is worried this project will be funded through the federal stimulus package. He said the TPB should be focused on better use of the roadway rather than just adding more lanes to have three lanes of congestion versus two lanes of congestion. He said he is concerned that the stimulus funding will be used to fund a lot of projects that haven't been properly vetted and analyzed. He said there are many other projects in Arlington that are more badly needed.

Allen Muchnick, with the Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation, noted that his organization has advocated an expeditious and permanent end to traffic congestion on I-66 inside the Capital Beltway. He said doing so will require little or no money, and no construction, but a realistic vision of sustainable multimodal transportation. He said I-66 has adequate capacity, but that the management of I-66 congestion has been inadequate. He suggested alternatives to decrease congestion on I-66, and noted the safety hazards of the proposed I-66 Spot Improvements project. He said that in May 2007, the TPB attached the following conditions to its approval of the I-66 Spot Improvements for inclusion in the CLRP and TIP:

“The State will conduct a comprehensive multimodal alternatives analysis for I-66 inside the Beltway to determine the most efficient way to move people through the corridor in the long term. The study will examine HOV requirements, transit alternatives, TDM strategies, and congestion pricing strategies. The State will convene a stakeholder working group under the auspices of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa) for the corridor...to review ways to maximize person throughput in the corridor while ensuring safety is adequately maintained and impacts on the surrounding local street network are minimized.”

He said that the VDOT initiatives, which were promised in a May 15, 2007 letter from Virginia's Transportation Secretary Pierce Homer, have not been realized. He also said VDOT has not reported back to the TPB on the regional impacts of the spot improvements or the multimodal study. He said the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VDRPT) initiated a bus-transit study for I-66, but that the study is narrowly scoped to look only at bus service and park and ride opportunities, without considering such vital operational changes as extending HOV2 restriction times, establishing congestion pricing, or providing a shoulder busway. He said the region will suffer from the lack of political will to pursue a vision for sustainable multimodal transportation. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Zimmerman thanked Ms. Clement for bringing the TPB's attention to the recent report of Governor Kaine's Commission on Climate Change and how those conclusions relate to decisions

the TPB makes about transportation funding. He noted that several speakers provided input about how the TPB ought to be thinking about what it will do with the stimulus funding and how it will set regional transportation priorities. He added that the recent passage of the economic recovery legislation will provide relief to the tremendous cutbacks experienced by the DOTs.

Mr. Zimmerman questioned how the TPB would select which projects to fund with the stimulus funding. He highlighted the I-66 Spot Improvements project, noting that it was not funded because of the result of priority setting, but because of a congressional earmark. Such earmarks are usually instituted by members of Congress to benefit their district. He noted that this earmark was not done by a member of Congress to benefit his district, but by a Congressman who wanted to spend it in another jurisdiction over the objection of the people in that district, and to their detriment. He said that in light of the very limited funding that is available to spend on needed transportation projects, the I-66 project seems like the type of project that should be low enough on the priority list that just about anything else ought to be funded first.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that those who spoke against the I-66 Spot Improvements project are concerned about the impact of ultimately widening I-66. He said this particular project is not a project to widen I-66, but that it will create new bottlenecks in place of the ones that currently exist. He questioned spending money on this project when the region's bridges are crumbling and interchanges remain unsafe. He said the TPB needs to be involved in setting real priorities for the small amount of transportation funding available in the region.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the January 28, 2009 Meeting

Mr. Zimmerman moved approval of the minutes from the January 28, 2009. The motion was seconded by Mr. Smith and was approved unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Referring to the handout summary, Mr. Erenrich said the Technical Committee has had very constructive discussions in recent months. He noted some important issues discussed at the March meeting:

- The projects to be included in the forthcoming air quality conformity assessment;
- The scope of work for the air quality conformity assessment, including assumptions regarding potential changes in HOV requirements and WMATA's core capacity constraint;
- The Transportation Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program;
- The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's (WMATA) list of stimulus funding projects;
- The MATOC program;

-
- The Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP);
 - The Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP);
 - The Household Travel Survey. Mr. Erenrich said the committee is looking forward to receiving the survey data broken down by county;
 - Updated vehicle registration data based upon the vehicle identification number (VIN) decoder; and
 - A draft version of the CLRP brochure and website.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

In his briefing Mr. Keough referred to the CAC's 2008 year-end report and the handout report from the February meeting. Mr. Keough noted that Mr. Martin, the 2008 CAC chair, was unable to attend the TPB meeting to provide the year-end briefing, so Mr. Keough gave a summary instead.

Mr. Keough described key issues highlighted in the CAC's 2008 End of the Year Report. He noted the committee's continuing position that the scenario study should be used to develop a financially unconstrained transportation plan of regionally prioritized projects. He said the CAC would continue its participation in the Scenario Study Task Force. He said the CAC's year-end report had emphasized the need to use the study to develop a process for project prioritization at the regional level, as opposed to state or district levels. He also spoke about the CAC's continuing interest in promoting priority sub-lists, public participation and the TLC program.

Regarding the CAC's activities for 2009, Mr. Keough noted that the Committee passed a resolution determining that at least two CAC meetings, one in Virginia and one in Maryland, will be held outside the COG offices in 2009. He said the Committee also agreed that teleconferencing would be used for future meetings, and the possibilities for videoconferencing would be explored. He said that consensus on the CAC seem to reflect a belief that the Scenario Study should be its number-one priority. Finally, he noted that the CAC was very interested in having more interaction with the state departments of transportation.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Referring to the mailout and handout materials, Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee took two actions at its February 6 meeting, in addition to reviewing the TPB agenda. The first one was to amend the TPB's work program to move some money within the WMATA Technical Assistance Account. The other item, for the District, was to add \$3.3 million of Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funding to the Bicycle Sharing Project and remove an equivalent amount from the Rock Creek Park Trail Project.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Jenkins asked if a TPB member would volunteer to chair the Scenario Study Task Force.

Ms. Tregoning volunteered to serve as chair of that task force.

Mr. Kirby noted that Mr. Tony Knotts from the Prince George's County Council was attending the meeting as a new member.

Chairman Jenkins welcomed Mr. Knotts.

ACTION ITEMS

7. Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that is Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Add Funding for the US Route 50 Widening Project between Route 28 and VA Route 742 in Fairfax and Loudoun Counties, as Requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Sorenson said this is a project in Fairfax and Loudoun Counties to provide additional funding for a Route 50 project, which is aimed at addressing a chokepoint in this primary roadway. She said the project is already in the 2008 CLRP. It has passed conformity analysis and has been funded in previous TIPs. She said that they are trying to make sure all the funding has been obligated so that the design-build phase of the project can begin.

Ms. Sorenson moved approval of the amendment. Ms. Waters seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

8. Review of Comments Received and Approval of Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP

Referring to the mailout materials for item eight, Mr. Kirby noted the TPB received a briefing on the project submissions for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP at the January 28, 2009, meeting. He said the public comment period ended on February 14, 2009, and that the three comments received during this period and the proposed responses are available as a handout at today's meeting. He summarized the three comments and responses. The first comment expressed disapproval of the expansion of I-66 in Arlington County. Mr. Kirby noted that the I-66 project was approved by the TPB in an earlier CLRP update, and is included in the submissions for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP. The second comment addressed the delay of the K Street Busway Project. Mr. Kirby said DDOT responded that feasibility studies have been completed and that additional design and engineering is needed, as well as right-of-way acquisition, before construction can begin. The project is proceeding, however. The third

comment requested removal of the Columbia Pike Streetcar Project in Arlington County because funding was not clearly identified. Mr. Kirby said that Arlington County staff responded that absent any other sources of funding, the County intends to fund this project from bond funds supported by the local transportation infrastructure fund (local commercial real estate tax) and the existing state transit capital formula reimbursement program.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that Mr. Kirby mentioned the I-66 Spot Improvements project was included in the submissions for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP. He asked whether the initial approval of the project included some specific conditions imposed by the TPB.

Mr. Kirby said that it did.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that one of the conditions was a requirement for a multimodal study.

Mr. Kirby said that he believed that to be the case.

Mr. Zimmerman said he did not believe the TPB has seen a scope of work for that study, or a report on its status.

Mr. Kirby asked Ms. Sorenson to comment.

Ms. Sorenson said that the scope for doing a NEPA study or an EIS is still awaiting funding. She said it is listed in the six-year plan with funding possible in the outer years, but that it is not funded now.

Mr. Zimmerman said it seemed to him that it would not be appropriate to fund the project until the study itself is funded and completed.

Ms. Sorenson said the I-66 Spot Improvements project is covered under a different NEPA. She said the multimodal study to which Mr. Zimmerman was referring is a multimodal study to analyze the entire I-66 corridor inside the Capital Beltway. She said it is still awaiting funding. She noted that the I-66 Spot Improvements project was reviewed by the TPB several times, and that it has been approved as a categorical exclusion under a separate NEPA process.

Mr. Zimmerman said he understood and that the I-66 Spot Improvements project was broken up into so-called "spot-improvements" so VDOT could get around the environmental requirements. He wondered whether the TPB, having put its own requirement that such a study be completed before devoting funding to the I-66 Spot Improvements, should be questioning whether the I-66 Spot Improvements project should move forward in any form without the requisite study having been completed.

Ms. Sorenson responded that both the study of and the NEPA document for the I-66 Spot Improvements project have been completed.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that this response does not answer the questions of where the multimodal study is that the TPB wanted to see to answer the question about the most efficient way to move people in this corridor before devoting tens of millions of dollars to a questionable widening project.

Ms. Sorenson said the NEPA study to look at the multimodal options is still awaiting funding and that it is not connected with the spot improvements.

Mr. Zimmerman said that while Ms. Sorenson reflected the view of VDOT, which wants the study and project disconnected from one another, he did not believe that was what the TPB agreed to in approving the I-66 Spot Improvements project. He said this situation is a good example of precisely the kind of analysis and priority setting that the TPB ought to be doing in allocating scarce federal dollars to these projects. He suggested it would not be appropriate to continue to spend money on a project if the study has not been funded which would inform the TPB as to just how valuable such an expenditure of dollars would be.

Chairman Jenkins asked Mr. Zimmerman is there was a motion.

Mr. Zimmerman moved that the further funding of projects related to I-66 inside the Capital Beltway not be allowed until such time as the previously required multimodal study has been advanced. Mr. Snyder seconded the motion.

Ms. Sorenson said the I-66 Spot Improvements were not contingent in any way on the multimodal project or the NEPA document. She said those are separate projects and that the TPB put no contingent requirement on completing the multimodal study before the spot improvements could proceed.

Mr. Zimmerman contended that that was clearly the expectation. He added that in any case, in light of diminished funding, this situation presents precisely the kind of careful look we ought to be taking before allocating such dollars.

Chairman Jenkins noted a motion had been made and seconded to exclude the project.

Mr. Kirby clarified that the requested action under item 8 is to approve projects for inclusion in the air quality conformity analysis, and he understood that Mr. Zimmerman's motion would be to remove the I-66 Spot Improvements project.

Chairman Jenkins agreed, and asked whether all of the TPB members understood the motion.

Ms. Waters recalled when the I-66 Spot Improvements were discussed some months ago she had raised some concerns. She said there is the need for both the spot improvements and the study of alternative modes. She said that to exclude this project until the multimodal study is complete is

not right. She added that many people living in Loudoun County have to drive. She said transit options do exist, but many people have to drive on I-66. She agreed that the I-66 Spot Improvements project is neither perfect nor everything we want. She added that it would be helpful to have multimodal options for people who live closer in so they have additional choices beyond just getting on the road. She concluded that any approach should include all options.

Mr. Snyder said he agreed with Ms. Waters' comments. He noted that the problem is that the TPB has requested studying all options at one time, but one part of the package keeps moving forward while the larger issue, namely improving transit and avoiding removing people from the existing transit system, does not. He said the TPB needs both options studied, and he thought the TPB voted to conduct both options simultaneously. He said that yet again the TPB is presented with only one part of the whole moving forward and the other parts stuck in neutral. He said he was going to support the motion for that reason. He said it is not because that is what he actually wants, but it is because the TPB cannot seem to drive home the message that we need to logically study all modes of transportation in the I-66 corridor. He concluded that to simply pay attention to automotive travel without transit is not the way this region should be planning.

Ms. Sorenson said the I-66 Spot Improvements are basically for safety, which VDOT has emphasized over the past couple of years. She said the spot improvements are not part of the multimodal study because that study needs to look at rail, constraints on rail, and bus rapid transit, which she noted is currently being studied by the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VDRPT). She said there are a lot of questions and issues that will be in the multimodal study that are different from looking at one spot improvement that is being carried forward as a design-build project, to get in, get it done, and get out. She said that people traveling on I-66 will have an opportunity to have less congestion and that is the point of the spot improvements project. She said this project has been debated several times over, and that almost everyone on the TPB has supported the project. She said that it is inappropriate to bring it up at the last minute and try to tie it in to a major EIS, which will be many years running before VDOT is able to complete the document and obtain funding.

Chairman Jenkins called for a vote. He asked for a show of hands.

Ms. Waters requested a roll call vote.

Chairman Jenkins asked if Mr. Kirby wanted a weighted vote or a roll call vote.

Mr. Kirby said both are options.

Chairman Jenkins said we should have a roll call vote.

Mr. Kirby called the names of the members of the TPB. The results were as follows:

For: Mr. Rybeck (DDOT), Ms. Tregoning (DCOP), Ms. Bowser (DC Council), Mr. Turner (Bowie), Mr. Wojahn (College Park), Mr. Elrich (Montgomery County Legislative), Mr. Lovain (Alexandria), Mr. Zimmerman (Arlington), Ms. Smyth (Fairfax County Legislative), Ms. Hudgins (Fairfax County Legislative), Mr. Snyder (Falls Church), Mr. Bottigheimer (WMATA).

Opposed: Mr. Halligan (MDOT), Mr. Groth (Charles County), Chairman Jenkins (Frederick County), Mr. Smith (City of Frederick), Mr. Erenrich (Montgomery County Executive), Mr. Weissberg (Prince George's County Executive), Mr. Knotts (Prince George's County Legislative), Ms. Sorenson (VDOT), Ms. Waters (Loudoun County), Mr. Way (Manassas), Mr. Naddoni (Manassas Park), Mr. May (Prince William County).

Abstain: None.

Absent: Mr. Mendelson (DC Council), Ms. Alexander (DC Council), Mr. Marraffa (Gaithersburg), Mr. Roberts (Greenbelt), Ms. Hoffmann (Rockville), Ms. Clay (Takoma Park), Ms. Forehand (Maryland Senate), Mr. Bronrott (Maryland House of Delegates), Mr. Drummond (City of Fairfax), Ms. Ticer (Virginia Senate), Ms. Vanderhye (Virginia House of Delegates).

Mr. Kirby confirmed 12 aye and 12 nay.

Chairman Jenkins said the motion fails on a tie vote.

It was noted that another member, Mr. Mendelson, had just arrived.

Chairman Jenkins said the motion had been made and voted on. He asked for a motion to accept the resolution.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the roll was still open.

Chairman Jenkins said the roll was not open and the motion had been voted on.

Ms. Waters made a motion to adopt resolution R12-2009. Ms. Sorenson seconded the motion.

Chairman Jenkins asked for a vote. He stated that the motion passed on a voice vote.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for a roll call vote.

Chairman Jenkins said the chair has ruled the ayes have it.

Mr. Kirby noted they could hold another roll call vote, if the Chairman wished.

Chairman Jenkins said he did not wish it and noted that Mr. Mendelson was not present at the time of the vote for the first motion. He said there was a second motion that was made and adopted.

Mr. Zimmerman objected to the Chair. An inquiry was made about whether a weighted vote can be requested.

Mr. Kirby responded that any member can call for a weighted vote after a regular vote, under the TPB Bylaws.

Ms. Tregoning asked Mr. Kirby to clarify if a member could call for a weighted vote on a tie.

Mr. Kirby said that was permissible. Any TPB member can ask for a weighted vote on any action within the time of the meeting. He noted that a member could even go back to an earlier item in the meeting agenda and ask for a weighted vote.

Chairman Jenkins clarified that if a member does not like the outcome of a vote, he or she would be able to go back and request the TPB conduct a weighted vote.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct.

Mr. Zimmerman clarified that what was being requested at this point was a roll call vote to determine the outcome of the voice vote. He noted that it's the same vote, retaken, to determine if in fact the motion did carry. He said it is not a new vote, but the same motion being put forward for purposes of clarifying whether the motion passed.

Chairman Jenkins confirmed that they would not take a weighted vote, but would instead conduct another roll call vote on whether or not the motion passed.

Ms. Waters clarified that the roll call vote would be on her motion to adopt the resolution.

Chairman Jenkins said that was correct.

Mr. Kirby confirmed the TPB would now take a roll call vote on Ms. Waters' motion to adopt the resolution.

Mr. May noted that at the last Prince William County Board Meeting, he was informed that the County had been granted an additional voting representative on the TPB. He said that representative was not present, but that his alternate, Ms. Backmon, was in attendance.

Mr. Kirby agreed Prince William County was indeed entitled to a second vote.

The results of the roll call vote were as follows:

For: Mr. Halligan (MDOT), Mr. Groth (Charles County), Chairman Jenkins (Frederick County), Mr. Smith (City of Frederick), Mr. Erenrich (Montgomery County Executive), Mr. Weissberg (Prince George's County Executive), Mr. Knotts (Prince George's County Legislative), Ms. Sorenson (VDOT), Ms. Waters (Loudoun County), Mr. Way (Manassas), Mr. Mr. Naddoni (Manassas Park), Mr. May (Prince William County), Ms. Backmon (Prince William County).

Opposed: Mr. Rybeck (DDOT), Ms. Tregoning (DCOP), Mr Mendelson (DC Council), Ms. Bowser (DC Council), Mr. Turner (Bowie), Mr. Wojahn (College Park), Mr. Elrich (Montgomery County Legislative), Mr. Lovain (Alexandria), Mr. Zimmerman (Arlington), Ms. Smyth (Fairfax County Legislative), Ms. Hudgins (Fairfax County Legislative), Mr. Snyder (Falls Church), Mr. Bottigheimer (WMATA).

Abstain: None.

Absent: Ms. Alexander (DC Council), Mr. Marraffa (Gaithersburg), Mr. Roberts (Greenbelt), Ms. Hoffmann (Rockville), Ms. Clay (Takoma Park), Ms. Forehand (Maryland Senate), Mr. Bronrott (Maryland House of Delegates), Mr. Drummond (City of Fairfax), Ms. Ticer (Virginia Senate), Ms. Vanderhye (Virginia House of Delegates).

Mr. Way said he believed that Mr. Mendelson was not present for the earlier vote, and this second vote was supposed to be a roll call vote to confirm the content of the earlier vote.

Chairman Jenkins clarified that Mr. Mendelson was indeed present for the vote on Ms. Waters' motion, but not for the first vote on Mr. Zimmerman's motion.

Mr. Kirby confirmed 13 aye and 13 nay.

Mr. Jenkins said Ms. Waters' motion failed on a tie.

Mr. Zimmerman said that if the issue is back before the TPB, he would move his original motion again. He said members could decide whether the whole issue is more important to them than this particular item.

Ms. Waters asked if this was an appropriate motion.

Chairman Jenkins said it was not.

Mr. Zimmerman asked why it was not an appropriate motion.

Ms. Waters said that it was not appropriate to have another vote on an amendment that already failed.

Chairman Jenkins said it is not appropriate, but that it would likely result in a tie, so he thinks that the TPB will have to conduct a weighted vote.

Mr. Zimmerman said he would submit that the motion is not out of order because the original motion had failed.

Ms. Waters asked Mr. Kirby what the impact would be of not adopting the resolution.

Mr. Kirby responded that the TPB would not be able to proceed with the air quality conformity analysis if the resolution were not adopted today.

Mr. Zimmerman offered a compromise. He presumed that the TPB is going back to the question on whether to adopt the inputs for the conformity analysis. He said he would make the same motion he put forth originally, but rather than remove the I-66 Spot Improvements project from the list of inputs, the TPB would indicate that it is the sense of the TPB that the expenditures on that project should not proceed without the completion of the multimodal analysis. Mr. Snyder seconded the motion.

Chairman Jenkins asked Ms. Sorenson whether it was correct that when the project was initially approved, there was no condition for a multimodal study.

Ms. Sorenson noted that there was a request for a multimodal study, but that it was not tied to the I-66 Spot Improvements project. She said VDOT is in complete agreement on the need for a multimodal study. She added that there is not funding at this point to conduct this very detailed and elaborate study of the entire portion of I-66 inside the Capital Beltway. She said that study would be a major NEPA study and EIS and would take at least three to four years to complete once the funding becomes available. She said the two projects are not connected; the multimodal study is not connected with the safety improvements for the I-66 Spot Improvements.

Ms. Hudgins said she would support the motion that has been made, but that she would like to refer to the initial vote of the TPB in support of the I-66 Spot Improvements project. She said many members supported the I-66 Spot Improvements project because they believed that the TPB would get the support of VDOT to conduct the study and be willing to live up to the results of the study to see the project move forward. She said that to not conduct the study leaves many members asking why the TPB would wait six years, likely after the spot improvements project had been completed and then changed the character of the corridor, to analyze what the effect would be. She noted how serious the matter is in determining the funding that has been committed and why the project is deemed important by many. She added that one of the underlying discussions is what is the role of the TPB. She reaffirmed that what the TPB has

voted to support was the I-66 Spot Improvements project with the understanding that the multimodal study would be done.

Chairman Jenkins asked Mr. Zimmerman whether his motion was to exclude the I-66 Spot Improvements from the air quality conformity submissions and move forward with analysis of the other projects.

Mr. Zimmerman said what he offered was to append to the action a statement of the TPB that the funding on those projects should not proceed until the multimodal analysis that the TPB requested is complete. He said he does not believe this analysis would take three to four years, and that VDOT could complete the study in far less time if they actually had to do it. He said this could then inform the subsequent decisions the TPB makes on funding, since the TPB votes on funding amendments regularly.

Ms. Waters said she did not see much of a difference between Mr. Zimmerman's original motion and the current motion on the table. She asked Ms. Sorenson to address how many years this decision would delay the I-66 Spot Improvements project if the completion of the project hinged on the multimodal study.

Ms. Sorenson said the work on the multimodal study has started in the sense that VDRPT is beginning on the part which could be implemented the quickest and the earliest, which is BRT in the corridor. She said this feasibility study is underway. She said VDOT is trying to complete the components of the EIS in pieces, rather than complete the entire EIS up front. She said the first piece is the BRT study, which has \$1.5 million available right now. She said for this first year VDOT is looking at BRT, but that it would take three to four years to get to the draft environmental impact statement, especially with all of the public involvement that would be involved.

Ms. Waters asked again what the amendment on the table would do to the timeline for the improvements.

Ms. Sorenson said it would stop the project.

Ms. Waters clarified that in essence the amendment was identical to the original motion.

Ms. Sorenson said that was correct.

Mr. Mendelson apologized for being late. He suggested that since the TPB is at an impasse with the tie votes, perhaps it would be possible to go back to the first amendment and have a weighted vote on that motion. He said the weighted vote would resolve the issue, and so, he asked for a weighted vote on the first amendment.

Mr. Kirby said the TPB could do that. He also noted that the I-66 Spot Improvements project is currently listed as a 2013 completion, which he understood was delayed from the original project schedule.

Ms. Sorenson said the design/build contract would be let within the next year.

Mr. Zimmerman said that if it is the Chairman's wish to take up Mr. Mendelson's suggestion, he would withdraw his motion.

Chairman Jenkins said the TPB would take a weighted vote on the original motion.

Mr. Kirby confirmed that the TPB would have to take another roll call.

Mr. Knotts said he understood the importance of what is being done today, and that he would like clarification on the status of all the motions.

Chairman Jenkins said he would ask the amendment maker to put his motion on the floor again, and the TPB will have a weighted vote on that motion, which will be called by jurisdiction. He added that the population centers carry the most weight.

Mr. Zimmerman said that as was described earlier his motion would remove the I-66 Spot Improvements project inside the Capital Beltway until the completion of the multimodal study that was previously requested by the TPB, which he would not equate to the NEPA document. He said the study would have to be done before VDOT could proceed with the spot improvements.

Mr. Lovain noted the importance of this issue. He asked Ms. Sorenson to confirm if the wording of the multimodal study request from the TPB required a full-blown EIS. He wondered if it is possible that an EIS would not be required.

Ms. Sorenson said that at the time it was discussed, it was clearly a full-blown multimodal study to decide what projects would go forward and could go forward in the corridor. She said it would be possible to conduct a feasibility study, but that a feasibility study would not lead to implementable projects. She said that what was included in the six-year plan for Virginia and is included right now in the TIP is funding to begin the study. She said that the study is underway. She said the project is being managed by VDRPT, but that it will take some time to look at the various pieces.

Chairman Jenkins asked Mr. Kirby to conduct the weighted roll call vote.

Mr. Kirby noted that TPB staff would have to compute the results of the vote, and suggested that the meeting move on until the results are ready. He confirmed that the roll call for the weighted vote is on the original amendment.

Chairman Jenkins said that is correct.

Mr. Kirby asked if anyone would like the amendment restated.

Mr. Zimmerman said: “as before, that the I-66 Spot Improvements project inside the Capital Beltway would not be permitted to proceed until the completion of the multimodal study.”

Mr. Kirby called the roll for the weighted vote:

For: Mr. Rybeck (DDOT), Ms. Tregoning (DCOP), Mr Mendelson (DC Council), Ms. Bowser (DC Council), Mr. Turner (Bowie), Mr. Wojahn (College Park), Mr. Elrich (Montgomery County Legislative), Mr. Knotts (Prince George’s County Legislative), Mr. Lovain (Alexandria), Mr. Zimmerman (Arlington), Ms. Smyth (Fairfax County Legislative), Ms. Hudgins (Fairfax County Legislative), Mr. Snyder (Falls Church).

Opposed: Mr. Halligan (MDOT), Mr. Groth (Charles County), Chairman Jenkins (Frederick County), Mr. Smith (City of Frederick), Mr. Erenrich (Montgomery County Executive), Mr. Weissberg (Prince George’s County Executive), Ms. Sorenson (VDOT), Ms. Waters (Loudoun County), Mr. Way (Manassas), Mr. Naddoni (Manassas Park), Mr. May (Prince William County), Ms. Backmon (Prince William County).

Abstain: None.

Absent: Ms. Alexander (DC Council), Mr. Marraffa (Gaithersburg), Mr. Roberts (Greenbelt), Ms. Hoffmann (Rockville), Ms. Clay (Takoma Park), Ms. Forehand (Maryland Senate), Mr. Bronrott (Maryland House of Delegates), Mr. Drummond (City of Fairfax), Ms. Ticer (Virginia Senate), Ms. Vanderhye (Virginia House of Delegates).

Mr. Kirby noted what WMATA does not vote in a weighted vote. He explained that a weighted vote included five votes each for Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. He said TPB staff would have the results shortly.

Chairman Jenkins called for the next item.

9. Approval of Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP

Ms. Posey referred to the scope of work for the air quality conformity analysis for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP, noting that it was presented to the TPB in January as an information item. She said the item contains a summary of the technical approach, which is similar to analyses conducted in recent years. She said the analysis will employ a new round of

cooperative forecasting. She highlighted the list of work tasks for the analysis. She also highlighted the changes to the proposed analysis since the beginning of the public comment period on January 15, 2009.

Ms. Posey noted the assumption the TPB makes in the travel demand model regarding the HOV definition. She said the TPB currently assumes that all HOV facilities convert to HOV-3 in 2010. She said the departments of transportation provided comments on that assumption, namely that the TPB defer the HOV-3 assumption until the 2020 forecast year. She said WMATA asked that the TPB defer the transit constraint to 2020, which would only affect the 2030 analysis.

Ms. Posey said the staff plans to have the conformity analysis complete, including a draft report, to be brought to the TPB for review in June. She said the TPB will be asked to approve the conformity analysis, the 2009 CLRP, and the FY 2010-2015 TIP in July.

Mr. Rybeck asked for clarification that the scope of work for the air quality conformity analysis revolves around the projects that are the subject of the previous agenda item.

Ms. Posey said that is correct.

Chairman Jenkins said the TPB would hold off on a vote for this item until the results of the weighted vote are in.

10. Approval of Technical Assistance Recipients under the FY 2009 Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Koster spoke as chair of the selection committee for the FY 2009 TLC project selection process. She noted that the TLC program is a reflection of the TPB's interest in encouraging innovative and closely linked transportation and land-use development, and in fostering collaboration between agencies, jurisdictions, and public stakeholders. She said this is the third year of the TLC program. Funding was set at \$180,000 for FY 2009; the Maryland Department of Transportation requested the selection committee's assistance in reviewing Maryland projects eligible for an additional \$80,000 in technical assistance funds. She noted changes in this year's program, including funding flexibility and an emphasis on potential implementation steps. She also noted that this was the first time an external selection panel was used to make project recommendations.

Ms. Koster commended all the project applicants. She said the recommended projects are diverse jurisdictionally, are located in a variety of urban and suburban contexts, and address several different transportation modes. She listed the recommended projects:

- District of Columbia / NoMa Business Improvement District: Gateway Transportation Enhancement Project;
- City of Bowie: Pedestrian Trail System Concept Development;

-
- Frederick County: MD-355 / MD-85 TOD Study;
 - City of Greenbelt: Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan;
 - Prince George's County / Town of Cheverly: Cheverly Non-motorized Transportation Study;
 - City of Rockville: Complete Streets Policy;
 - City of Manassas Park: Marketing the Redevelopment Potential of TOD; and
 - Prince William County: Mixed-use Development Study at Commuter Rail Stations

Ms. Koster thanked TPB staff for their professionalism and for developing a very clear and well-organized process.

Ms. Crawford of TPB staff thanked the selection panel for their work. She described the process for implementing the projects, including consultant selection. She noted that for the larger projects, staff anticipated that funding will be carried over into FY 2010.

Ms. Crawford said that in addition to being asked to approve the recommended projects, the TPB was also being asked to approve the schedule for the FY2010 TLC technical assistance program. She said that project solicitation for the next round will begin on March 16, 2009. She said that for the first time, a pre-application conference will be held for the jurisdictions and other interested agencies. She said the due date for the projects will be May 18, 2009, the selection panel will be convened in June, and the TPB will be scheduled to approve the FY 2010 technical assistance projects at the July 15, 2009, meeting.

Mr. Turner moved approval of the FY 2009 recommended TLC technical assistance projects and the schedule for the FY 2010 TLC program. Mr. Rybeck seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

11. Approval of Amendments to the FY 2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Include Federal Stimulus-Funded Projects

Referring to a handout memorandum, Mr. Kirby gave a summary of the final stimulus package with regard to transportation. He said that WMATA would be requesting the TPB's approval of a package of stimulus-funded projects and that MDOT would be requesting some administrative modifications to the TIP relating to stimulus projects.

Mr. Kirby said that the following estimates have been provided for stimulus funding for transportation:

- The District will receive \$123.5 million, \$37 million of which is sub-allocated (sub-allocated funds have to be obligated within one year, and are not subject to the 120 day time requirement).
- Maryland will receive a total of \$431 million, \$129 million of which is sub-allocated.
- Virginia will receive a total of \$694.5 million, of which \$208 million is sub-allocated.

Mr. Kirby noted that a major new item in the final bill was for high-speed rail, amounting to \$8 billion, which was an initiative of President Obama.

Mr. Kirby noted that the bill has a competitive grant program of \$1.5 billion, which is a multimodal program. He said at a meeting earlier that day the Scenario Study Task Force had discussed the idea of putting together a proposal for a regional priority transit network combining bus and roadway improvements into a high quality transit network. Regarding high-speed rail, he noted that staff would research the possibilities in the region for pursuing some of that funding and return to the TPB next month with information.

Referring to the handout material, Mr. Moneme briefed the TPB on WMATA's detailed list of shovel-ready projects for the economic stimulus program. He said the list has been prioritized, not just for the benefit of Metro, but for the region. He also said the projects are focused as the economic stimulus bill has been focused to create jobs and ensure a strong transit system. He said that a number of the projects will be ready within a matter of weeks. These projects are targeted towards improving passenger and maintenance facilities, improving safety and security, maintaining and improving information technology equipment, and making a vast improvement in WMATA's overall infrastructure.

Mr. Moneme called attention to a table in his memorandum showing the categories of funds and the specific projects. He briefly described the process for determining the priorities. He said the package includes replacement of the system's oldest buses; expansion and replacement of Metro Access paratransit vehicles; an energy-efficient staging lighting project; improved customer service facilities; and upgrade of the Smart Trip machines.

Mr. Moneme said that WMATA was requesting a \$230 million TIP amendment for the projects.

Ms. Hudgins thanked Mr. Moneme and emphasized the Metro Board's support for the prioritization. She moved approval of Resolution R13-2009. Mr. Snyder seconded the motion.

Mr. Snyder said he endorsed the comments made by Ms. Hudgins. He expressed disappointment that only about 7 percent of the stimulus funding is going for transportation. He noted that WMATA's request is constrained when compared with the enormous need for transportation infrastructure investment.

Chairman Jenkins said he wholeheartedly concurred. He said he would be remiss if he did not point out his disappointment that improvements on I-270 have not been included in the stimulus package.

Ms. Bowser thanked Mr. Moneme and commended the WMATA Board for being pro-active with this funding. She asked how this spending is going to save and create jobs. She asked if

there would be any priority for local employment, and what the plan is to let local businesses and local residents know how they can be a part of the stimulus.

Mr. Moneme said there is existing WMATA Board policy regarding contracts that encourages and actually requires DBE participation to make sure that our local business community can compete. Regarding how local jobs might be impacted, he said these funds are focused not on operating dollars, but on capital improvements. He noted that jobs would be maintained and created at the manufacturing base through the production of buses and the construction industry would be used to build facilities.

The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Halligan briefly described a letter from the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) that would not require action by the Board, but was being provided for informational purposes. He said that MDOT was asking TPB staff to process a TIP administrative modification for Phase 1 projects under the American Recovery and Revitalization Act projects for Maryland. He said these were projects that can be initiated in the next 120 days.

Mr. Kirby confirmed these are administrative modifications that can be made under the federal regulations without TPB action.

8. Review of Comments Received and Approval of Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP (*continued*)

Chairman Jenkins asked if Mr Kirby had an answer for the weighted roll call vote on Item 8.

Mr. Kirby said he did. He said the vote was 9.16 yes, and 5.84 no. [The calculations for this vote are attached to this document].

Chairman Jenkins said that Mr. Zimmerman's motion to amend R12-2009 was adopted. He called for a motion to adopt resolution R12-2009 to approve the project submissions for the air quality conformity assessment of the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP, as previously amended.

Mr. Mendelson made a motion to adopt R12-2009 as amended. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Mr. Mendelson recalled that at the January TPB meeting, he inquired about addition to the CLRP or the TIP of some sort of a process to assess signal optimization for the region. He asked for a status report.

Mr. Kirby said staff could provide a report on this issue at the March TPB meeting.

Mr. Mendelson asked that the report include a recommendation on how the TPB can monitor the progress and effectiveness of that program. He said he brought it up in conjunction with these items because he remembers that several years ago, such language was included in the adoption of the TIP and the CLRP, because it was necessary as a TERM.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct and the TPB has taken credit for that action. He said this would be included in the report.

9. Approval of Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP (*continued*)

Chairman Jenkins asked for a motion on Item 9 to approve the scope of work for the air quality conformity assessment.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the scope of work for the air quality conformity assessment for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP.

The motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

12. After-Action Briefing on the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program Activities for the Presidential Inauguration

Mr. Kirby introduced Mr. Ey, the staff person to the MATOC program, and asked Mr. Ey to provide an update on the program.

Mr. Ey noted that he was accompanied by Mark Miller, WMATA staff and vice chair of the MATOC Steering Committee.

Mr. Ey spoke to a memorandum provided in the TPB mailout packet. He provided a summary of the goals of the MATOC program and how they were applied during the presidential inauguration. He said MATOC staff attended planning meetings for the event and facilitated multiple activities during the two days preceding the event and during the inauguration. He said he used a variety of information sources to monitor incidents and congestion, and that he provided situation reports to agencies in the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, and to WMATA.

He spoke of two instances where he provided direct assistance on incidents: coordinating METRO parking lot status information with WMATA and the DOTs and coordinating information on a collision that closed the Clara Barton Parkway for several hours with the US Park Police, MD SHA, and Montgomery County. He described the technology used to assist

MATOC staff in coordinating incidents, namely the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS) and the Capital Wireless Information Net (Cap-WIN).

Mr. Eye said he has sent a questionnaire to stakeholders and participants requesting feedback about the effectiveness of the MATOC Program. He said the initial feedback he has received is positive on MATOC's contribution during the inauguration.

Mr. Mendelson congratulated Mr. Eye on his recent appointment as MATOC facilitator and on a positive experience during the inauguration events. He expressed concern about how MATOC would be able to respond to unplanned emergencies. He asked that the TPB receive an after-action report on any future unplanned event that MATOC participates in during the remainder of the trial phase.

Mr. Eye detailed several steps he has taken to be involved in communications systems in the event of an unplanned incident. He said he is trying to build a process that all the participating agencies understand and expect. He said he believes he is making progress and would be happy to report to the TPB on the effectiveness of MATOC during an unplanned event.

Mr. Bottigheimer noted a study that is underway, through funding made possible by VDOT, to enable WMATA to provide information to citizens about the degree to which Metro station parking lots are filled.

Mr. Snyder asked Mr. Miller to comment on the value added through MATOC participation during the inauguration event.

Mr. Miller agreed that the activities and coordination handled by Mr. Eye contributed to the success of the event. He said that individual events taking place around the region could create a regional situation, and he added that the MATOC program can provide valuable information to keep individual situations isolated, rather than building into a significant regional incident.

Chairman Jenkins asked Mr. Kirby if it would be possible to schedule another MATOC briefing on the June TPB Agenda.

Mr. Mendelson noted that the TPB is supposed to receive an update on MATOC every two months.

Mr. Kirby said either option is fine, but said that staff will plan to provide a briefing on MATOC in April.

13. Briefing on the Draft FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Kirby noted that the draft work programs for both items 13 and 14 were included in the mailout packet and were released for public comment at the February 12, 2009 TPB Citizens

Advisory Committee meeting. He noted that the FY 2010 UPWP is a flat-line budget relative to the FY 2009 UPWP. He said the TPB has been able to shift some funding from the Household Travel Survey work because that project has been completed and funding can be allocated to other programs. He said the TPB has not yet received the final funding information from the federal government, but that he anticipates receiving this information before the TPB is asked to approve the FY 2010 UPWP in March.

Chairman Jenkins asked that Mr. Griffiths report on the results of the Household Travel Survey be placed first on the March TPB Agenda.

Mr. Erenrich commented that part of the stimulus package includes a \$230 limit for the commuter benefit, and asked that information about how this increase affects the work program be presented in March.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that one item included in the FY 2010 UPWP is an evaluation of the benefits of the bus priority corridor network. He acknowledged the contributions of VDOT, DDOT, and MDOT in aiding WMATA to fund that study.

14. Briefing on the Draft FY 2010 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

Referring to the FY 2010 CCWP that was included in the mailout packet, Mr. Ramfos provided a PowerPoint overview of the Commuter Connection Program. He said Commuter Connections is a continuing commuter assistance program for the region that encourages commuters to use alternatives to the private automobile. He said it has been in existence since 1974, and has been used to assist and encourage individuals in the region to use alternatives to the single-occupant vehicle.

Mr. Ramfos provided an overview of the membership of the Commuter Connection Program, the benefits of the program, the geographic coverage, and several regional benefit programs that are run by Commuter Connections. He reviewed the daily impacts of reduced vehicle trips made possible by Commuter Connections, as well as other regional benefits realized through the program.

Mr. Ramfos spoke to the FY 2010 budget for Commuter Connections and compared the FY 2010 budget to the budget approved by the TPB for FY 2009. He noted that 65 percent of the Commuter Connections work program dollars go to the private sector or to local jurisdictions. He provided information on several new line items for FY 2010. He said the state funding agencies provided extensive comments on the FY 2010 CCWP, the Commuter Connection Subcommittee reviewed the draft in November 2008 and January 2009, and the TPB Technical Committee received a briefing on the FY 2010 CCWP in February 2009. He added that the draft FY 2010 CCWP was released for public comment at the February 12, 2009, TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting, and he provided an overview of the program to the CAC on that date.

Ms. Sorenson said she wanted to make absolutely clear that the money VDOT has removed from the FY 2010 CCWP will continue to be provided, but will be passed directly to the local jurisdictions instead of to Commuter Connections.

Chairman Jenkins said he had serious concerns about this withdrawal of funding from the regional Commuter Connections program. He said it sends a bad signal when one of the regional partners removes itself from a cooperative regional program.

Ms. Sorenson clarified that VDOT has not jumped out of the program.

Chairman Jenkins said that is an interpretation of the VDOT action.

Mr. Keough asked to read a motion passed by the CAC on February 12, 2009:

“Commuter Connections is a nationally recognized travel demand management program with a successful track record promoting regional transportation objectives. To support the current standard of regional coordination, the TPB CAC strongly encourages all participating DOTs to maintain their level of commitment to the Commuter Connections program.”

Chairman Jenkins noted the significant regional coordination and marketing efforts of Commuter Connections and said this issue would be before the TPB in March.

15. Briefing on Additional Findings from the 2007/2008 Household Travel Survey

This item will be on the agenda for the March 18, 2009, TPB meeting.

16. Other Business

There was no other business.

17. Adjourn

Chairman Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 2:12 p.m.

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board Proportional Voting Results

Resolution: _____

Date: February 18, 2009

Issue: Amendment to Remove I-66 Spot Improvements Project from Air Quality Conformity Assessment

	Vote	Population	Voting Share	% of Shares	Allocated Votes	Raw Yes	Raw No	Weighted Yes	Weighted No
District of Columbia									
Department of Transportation	Yes				1	1	0	1.25	0.00
Office of Planning	Yes				1	1	0	1.25	0.00
City Council	Yes				1	1	0	1.25	0.00
City Council	Absent				1	0	0	0.00	0.00
City Council	Yes				1	1	0	1.25	0.00
District of Columbia Total						4	0	5.00	0.00

= 5.00

Maryland									
Department of Transportation	No				1	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.25
Bowie	Yes	55,470	1	2.94%	0.09	0.09	0.00	0.11	0.00
Charles County	No	80,948	2	5.88%	0.18	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.22
College Park	Yes	26,392	1	2.94%	0.09	0.09	0.00	0.11	0.00
Frederick County	No	108,976	2	5.88%	0.18	0.00	0.18	0.00	0.22
City of Frederick	No	60,458	1	2.94%	0.09	0.00	0.09	0.00	0.11
Gaithersburg	Absent	63,903	0	0.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Greenbelt	Absent	21,183	0	0.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Montgomery County		695,946							
Executive	No		7	20.59%	0.62	0.00	0.62	0.00	0.77
Legislative	Yes		7	20.59%	0.62	0.62	0.00	0.77	0.00
Prince George's County		654,211							
Executive	No		6.5	19.12%	0.57	0.00	0.57	0.00	0.72
Legislative	Yes		6.5	19.12%	0.57	0.57	0.00	0.72	0.00
Rockville	Absent	64,860	0	0.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Takoma Park	Absent	17,229	0	0.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Jurisdiction Subtotal			34	100%	3.00				
Maryland House of Delegates	Absent				0.5	0	0	0.00	0.00
Maryland Senate	Absent				0.5	0	0	0.00	0.00
Maryland Total						1.37	2.63	1.71	3.29

= 5.00

Virginia									
Department of Transportation	No				1	0	1	0.00	1.25
Alexandria	Yes	138,000	3	6.52%	0.20	0.20	0.00	0.24	0.00
Arlington County	Yes	206,100	4	8.70%	0.26	0.26	0.00	0.33	0.00
City of Fairfax	Absent	22,563	0	0.00%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Fairfax County		1,096,323							
Legislative I	Yes		11	23.91%	0.72	0.72	0.00	0.90	0.00
Legislative II	Yes		11	23.91%	0.72	0.72	0.00	0.90	0.00
Falls Church	Yes	11,200	1	2.17%	0.07	0.07	0.00	0.08	0.00
Loudoun County	No	290,929	6	13.04%	0.39	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.49
City of Manassas	No	38,100	1	2.17%	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.08
City of Manassas Park	No	15,000	1	2.17%	0.07	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.08
Prince William County		402,163							
Legislative I	No		4	8.70%	0.26	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.33
Legislative II	No		4	8.70%	0.26	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.33
Jurisdiction Subtotal			46	100%	3.00				
Virginia House of Delegates	Absent				0.5	0	0	0.00	0.00
Virginia Senate	Absent				0.5	0	0	0.00	0.00
Virginia Total						1.96	2.04	2.45	2.55

= 5.00

Yes:	9.16
No:	5.84