

**NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

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

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

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County  
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County  
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA  
Robert Catlin, City of College Park  
Colleen Clay, City of Takoma Park  
Dan Drummond, City of Fairfax  
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County  
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT  
Lyn Erickson, MDOT  
Brian A. Glenn, FTA  
Tom Harrington, WMATA  
Gary V. Hodge, Charles County Commissioner  
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Charles Jenkins, Frederick County  
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County  
Gabe Klein, DC DOT  
Tony Knotts, Prince George's County  
Bill Lebegern, MWAA  
Timothy Lovain, Alexandria City Council  
Michael C. May, Prince William County  
Mark Rawlings, DDOT  
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt  
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  
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate  
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning

---

Todd Turner, City of Bowie  
Margaret Vanderhye, Virginia House of Delegates  
Lori Waters, Loudoun County Board of Supervisors  
Jonathan Way, City of Manassas  
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County  
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force  
Bill Wren, Manassas Park  
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby  
Michael Clifford  
Gerald Miller  
Robert Griffiths  
Nicholas Ramfos  
Debbie Leigh  
Deborah Etheridge  
Andrew Austin  
Sarah Crawford  
Beth Newman  
Rex Hodgson  
Tim Canan  
Daivamani Sivasailam  
Ron Milone  
Jonathan Rogers  
Erin Morrow  
Feng Xie  
Joan Rohlfis COG/DEP  
Jeanne Saddler COG/OPA  
Steve Kania COG/OPA  
Bill Orleans PG ACT  
Betsy Massie PRTC  
Jim Maslanka City of Alexandria  
Alez Verzosa City of Fairfax  
Dan Maloff Arlington County  
Trish Hendren WMATA  
Edward Jones Prince George's Co. DPW&T  
Joseph Madison Maryland Transit Administration  
Steve Suder FHWA – Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division  
Dan Emerine DC Office of Planning  
Brooke Taylor DC Office of Planning

---

Tom Biesiadny	Fairfax County DOT
Yvonne Dawson	WMATA
Erik Dahlberg	WMATA
David Awbry	DRPT – Northern Virginia Office
Angelica Betts	PWC BOCS Aide
Rick Canizales	PWC DOT
Jim Dinegar	Greater Washington Board of Trade
David Guernsey	NVTA
Sarah Vilms	Citizen
Leo Schefer	Washington Airports Task Force
Carey Campbell	Independent Greens of Virginia
Mark Ingrao	Arlington Chamber of Commerce
Eric Gilliland	Washington Area Bicyclist Association
Mary Ellen Schehl	Citizen
John Reeder	Arlington Green Party
Peter Harnik	Maywood Community Association
Roger Diedrich	Virginia Chapter, Sierra Club
Allen Muchnick	Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation
Charles Denney	Citizen of Arlington
Carroll George	Private Citizen – Washington
Stewart Schwartz	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Patrick Herrity	Fairfax County Board of Supervisors

## **1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities**

Jim Dinegar, president and CEO of the Greater Washington Board of Trade, asked the Board to change its February decision not to include the I-66 spot improvements in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP).

David Guernsey, chairman of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, asked the Board to change its February decision not to include the I-66 spot improvements in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP). Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Sarah Vilms, Arlington resident, asked the Board not to change its February decision regarding the I-66 spot improvements. Copies of her remarks were distributed for the record.

Leo Schefer, speaking for the members of the Washington Airports Task Force, asked the Board to change its February decision not to include the I-66 spot improvements in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP).

---

Mark Ingraio, representing the Arlington Chamber of Commerce as its past chair, asked the Board to change its February decision not to include the I-66 spot improvements in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP). Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Eric Gilliland, director of the Washington Area Bicyclists Association, urged members of the Transportation Planning Board to ensure that priority bike and pedestrian projects are funded with infrastructure dollars from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. He also urged the Board not to include the I-66 spot improvements in the TIP and CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Mary Ellen Schehl, Arlington resident, asked the Board not to change its February decision regarding the I-66 spot improvements.

John Reeder, Arlington resident and representative of the Arlington Green Party, asked the Board not to change its February decision regarding the I-66 spot improvements.

Peter Harnik, representative of the Maywood Community Association, asked the Board not to change its February decision regarding the I-66 spot improvements.

Roger Dietrich, speaking for the Sierra Club, asked the Board not to change its February decision regarding the I-66 spot improvements.

Allen Muchnick, Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation, asked the Board not to change its February decision regarding the I-66 spot improvements. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Charles Denny, Arlington resident, asked the Board not to change its February decision regarding the I-66 spot improvements. He also spoke in support of the comments of Mr. Gilliland regarding bicycle and pedestrian facilities to be funded with the federal stimulus funds.

Carroll George said the problems of I-66 could be addressed with a simple engineering solution described in his handout. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Stewart Schwartz, executive director of the Coalition for Smarter Growth, echoed Mr. Gilliland's comments regarding the stimulus funds. He expressed concern about the TPB's decisions to delay the tightening of HOV requirements from HOV-2 to HOV-3. He also asked the Board not to change its February decision regarding the I-66 spot improvements.

Patrick Herrity, Fairfax County Supervisor and TPB alternate member, asked the Board to change its decision in February to not include the I-66 spot improvements in the TIP and CLRP. He said that the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors had discussed this issue at length at its last meeting and had supported the inclusion of all three phases of the I-66 project in the CLRP/TIP

---

without the conditions included in the draft resolution that had been distributed to the Board. He urged the Board to support inclusion of all three phases of the project without conditions.

## **2. Approval of the Minutes of the February 18, 2009 Meeting**

Mr. Weissburg made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 18, 2009 meeting, which was seconded by Mr. Snyder.

Mr. Jenkins from Prince William County noted that he was not present at the meeting in February. He said he would be abstaining from voting on the February minutes.

The motion passed unanimously.

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

Referring to the handout summary, Mr. Erenrich said the Technical Committee met on March 6. He noted that the committee had a full discussion on most items on the TPB agenda, with special attention given to the I-66 spot improvements. He also said the Technical Committee extensively discussed and felt comfortable with the FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The committee also discussed the federal stimulus program, traffic signal optimization and the household travel survey.

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

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Keough said the CAC at its meeting the previous Thursday had discussed the following items:

- The TPB Scenario Study, including the CLRP Aspirations scenario and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Network. He said the committee learned that the TPB intends to apply for a \$300 million grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation to implement BRT services in the region. The CAC hopes to remain involved in this effort;
- The TPB travel demand forecasting model. Mr. Kirby provided information on the inputs and functions of the model;
- The TPB Access for All Advisory (AFA) Committee. He said the CAC discussed sending a CAC member to the April 23rd meeting of the AFA to learn more about it and to begin a dialogue between the two committees;
- The Air Quality Public Advisory Committee (AQPAC) to the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee. He noted that there is interest in that committee in coordinating with the CAC.
- The new round of projects under the Transportation/Land Use Connections (TLC)

---

program. Mr. Keogh said the CAC stressed the need to isolate funding for capital improvements that have been recommended through TLC technical assistance programs.

Mr. Keogh closed by re-reading a CAC resolution from February that called upon the state departments of transportation to fully fund the TPB's Commuter Connections programs.

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

Mr. Kirby said that the Steering Committee met on March 6, and in addition to reviewing the TPB agenda, the committee approved one amendment to the FY 2009 work program at the request of the District of Columbia to fund a study to analyze parking space occupancy and turnover in the area around the Washington Nationals Ball Park.

Mr. Kirby called attention to a letter in the mailout packet from the Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee in the House and the Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Highways and Transit asking the TPB, as the region's Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), to provide a significant amount of monitoring data on the stimulus funding and to provide an initial report by April 4 of this year. Mr. Kirby noted that these are additional requirements that the Transportation Infrastructure Committee is imposing on MPOs and on the state DOTs and transit agencies. He said that TPB staff would be working on it diligently. He also called attention to an article from the New York Times that highlighted Maryland's "fix-it-first" approach with the stimulus funding.

Referring to the letters sent/received packets, Mr. Kirby noted that the TPB received a large number of letters focused on the I-66 project. He noted that the letters received since the mailout were included in the handout packet with the blue cover sheet.

He noted that a count of all communications showed that there were 20 letters, 108 emails or online comments and 326 postcards. The vast majority of these, 439, were in favor of reversing the action and including the I-66 project in the conformity analysis; 15 were opposed to reversing the action. As a caveat, he noted that there was some duplication between the emails and the postcards, which had not been eliminated.

Ms. Crawford of TPB staff spoke briefly about the FY 2010 Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program project solicitation. She said the call for projects opened on March 16 and will close on May 18. The TPB will commit a minimum of \$220,000 toward technical assistance projects for FY 2010, and MDOT is expected to commit an additional \$100,000. She encouraged TPB members to speak with their staff to encourage them to submit applications.

Ms. Ticer asked Mr. Kirby if the work program has funding for staff to provide the information requested by the Congressional Committee.

---

Mr. Kirby said the TPB has not budgeted for that activity, but that staff will be able to do the work as part of their regular efforts for the CLRP and TIP updates.

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

Chairman Jenkins welcomed new members: Gabe Klein, new director of the District Department of Transportation; County Commissioner Gary Hodge from Charles County; and County Supervisor John Jenkins from Prince William County. He also welcomed City of Greenbelt alternate member Konrad Herling.

Mr. Jenkins (Prince William County) noted that the Board of Supervisors in Prince William had appointed him to the new position on the TPB that was created as a result of that county's increasing population.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **7. Reconsideration and Clarification of the TPB Action on February 18, 2009 to Remove the I-66 Spot Improvements Project from the Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2009 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Ms. Hudgins moved reconsideration of the TPB action of February 18 to remove the I-66 spot improvement projects from the project submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for 2009 CLRP and the 2010-2015 TIP. She explained that her motion was reflected in an amended version of TPB Resolution R12-2009. The motion was to reinstate the I-66 spot improvements project in the TIP and CLRP, while placing some conditions on moving forward with two of three of the improvements.

Ms. Hudgins noted that she had been present at the February 18 meeting and had voted in support of the resolution to remove the I-66 spot improvement project from the project submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment.

Mr. Snyder seconded the motion. The motion to reconsider the TPB action of February 18, 2009, to remove the I-66 Spot Improvements project from the air quality conformity analysis carried unanimously.

Ms. Hudgins made a motion to adopt the amended Resolution R12-2009, which she distributed to the TPB members. Mr. Zimmerman seconded this motion.

---

Ms. Hudgins said that the resolution reaffirms the position that TPB took in 2007 in supporting the Spot Improvements Project with the condition that a multimodal study be conducted for I-66. She said that the document on yellow paper that had been distributed was the amended resolution that was on the floor. The highlighted text in that document indicated the changes that were made since the TPB received its copy by email. She read the most important insertions that had been made.

Ms. Hudgins said that there seemed to have been a misunderstanding at the February 18 meeting when Ms. Sorenson of VDOT appeared to indicate that the multimodal study was not underway. Ms. Hudgins said it now appears that Mr. Sorenson was responding to a different question when she appeared to indicate that the study was not underway. Ms. Hudgins said the vote to remove the I-66 project was partly based upon that perceived comment from Ms. Sorenson. Ms. Hudgins indicated she was further confused by the fact that on February 23 she had received a copy of a letter from Virginia Transportation Secretary Pierce Homer indicating that the multimodal study was underway.

Ms. Hudgins noted that in 2007 the TPB spent considerable time discussing the multimodal study with VDOT staff. That discussion included agreement of the conditions under which the spot improvements would be included. She said the resolution currently before the Board represented a reaffirmation of those commitments from 2007.

She said the resolution clarifies that the study will be conducted separately as a long-term study on multimodal conditions in the corridor.

Ms. Hudgins noted that the “resolved” clause states that the TPB approves the inclusion of the I-66 spot improvements in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2009 TIP and CLRP. She said the resolution acknowledges that the first “spot improvement” has federal funding and is ready to proceed. The other two spot improvements have not yet been funded and are not in the TIP, and therefore there is time to complete the studies before those projects are ready to move forward. She asked for support of the resolution.

Mr. May said that Ms. Hudgins description of the motion did not seem to be consistent with the comments of Mr. Herrity during the public comment period. He said he had understood that the spot improvements and the multimodal study were not conditioned upon each other and they were, in fact, two separate things. He said it seemed that Ms. Hudgins motion would not really result in action to put the spot improvements back into the TIP and CLRP and in fact could still result in a delay of several years in the project. He said that he understood that this issue would be revisited. He said a lot of people in Prince William County were looking forward to this project.

Ms. Hudgins clarified that the first spot improvement is already in the TIP and is funded. The resolution at the last meeting would have taken all three spot improvements out of the air quality conformity analysis that is required for the upcoming TIP. The resolution on the table would



---

restore all three spot improvements to the air quality conformity analysis. Ms. Hudgins asked Ms. Sorenson for further explanation.

Ms. Sorenson confirmed that in terms of funding, spot improvement number one is fully funded, and the other two spot improvements are not.

Ms. Hudgins asked if the action before the Board would put the projects in jeopardy.

Ms. Sorenson said there were questions from the last meeting as to whether the projects had been removed or not. She said Mr. Kirby would have to explain.

Ms. Kirby said that in reviewing the minutes from the last meeting, he believed it was quite clear that the action the Board took last month would have removed all three spot improvements from this year's conformity analysis. He said if that action were to stay in place when the TIP and CLRP are up for approval in July, those projects would have been removed from the plan and the program, and could not have gone forward. He noted that Ms. Hudgins had pointed out that the first spot improvement is already in the FY2009-2014 TIP, which was approved by the Board in November of 2008. It is fully funded through an earmark and it could go forward anyway at this point.

Mr. Kirby said the resolution before the Board would put all three spot improvements back into the conformity analysis for this year. He said that in order for the second and third spot improvements to move forward, there would have to be a TIP amendment adding specific funding for those two projects. He said that the resolution before the Board indicates that approval of such a TIP amendment would be contingent on the completion of the short-term and longer-term studies.

Mr. May asked what would the effect be if the TPB were simply to completely reverse the action it took on February 18th, as compared to the resolution that has been moved.

Mr. Kirby said that if the February resolution were simply reversed, then there would be no condition on funding for spot improvements two and three. If funding were identified, then VDOT could ask for a TIP amendment from the TPB, which would normally be approved. But the new resolution, as moved, made it clear that the TPB would not approve funding for the projects until the multimodal studies are completed. Mr. Kirby said that he had received indications from VDOT that they have no intention to fund the projects in the near future, so there should be ample time to complete the studies.

Referring to resolution before the Board, Ms. Waters noted that there was no indication as to when the longer-term study would be done. She asked what "long-term" means?

---

Ms. Hudgins said the long-term study would address potential changes that are not being addressed in the short-term study, including HOV, congestion pricing, managed lanes, and road improvements.

Ms. Waters asked if VDOT has the funding and ability to do the longer-term study.

Ms. Sorenson said the present study, which has been under way for months, is being conducted by the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VDRPT). It is focusing predominantly on public transit and transportation demand management, as well as some other issues. She said there are some long-term consequences arising from other potential changes, such as increasing the requirement from HOV-2 to HOV-3 or changing the hours for HOV. Those questions are complicated and require a larger group of stakeholders, including the District of Columbia and Maryland, and going as far out as Front Royal. She said these questions will require more effort and more time. She said there is some funding for this analysis.

Ms. Waters said she wanted to make sure that the contingency that is being put on Spot Improvements 2 and 3 are not unachievable conditions.

Ms. Sorenson commented that the rate the study is going, she could not say that it would be done in two years.

Mr. Way objected to receiving changes in the resolution at the last minute. He also noted that the current resolution only releases one of the three projects from its "hostage status." He proposed a substitute resolution that would simply state that resolution R12-2009, which removed certain I-66 spot improvements from the 2009 CLRP and the 2010-2015 TIP, is hereby rescinded. Mr. May seconded this motion.

Ms. Hudgins said the resolution she had offered did not stipulate conditions that were any different than those agreed upon in 2007. She noted that VDOT had not voiced objections to the language in the resolution regarding the studies.

Vice Chairman Snyder said his recollection was the same as Ms. Hudgins. He said that from the beginning there has been a commitment to comprehensive multimodal approaches as well as spot improvements. He said these two approaches have proceeded together and progress is being made. He said Ms. Hudgins motion was a motion for a comprehensive approach and was a motion for progress. He said he thought the approach being taken for I-66 is a good government approach.

Chairman Jenkins called for a vote on the substitute motion to rescind the amended R12-2009.

The voice vote being inconclusive, Chairman Jenkins called for a show of hands.

The motion was defeated.

---

Chairman Jenkins called for a vote to approve amended TPB R12-2009 as moved by Ms. Hudgins.

The motion was approved by voice vote.

### **8. Approval of Amendments to the FY 2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), and Approval of FY 2009 UPWP Carryover Funding to FY 2010**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby explained that the documents under Item 8 were a set of amendments to the current year's work program to move projects and funding that will not be completed this year into the next fiscal year. He said a similar action is taken every year. He said that without this action, any money that is unexpended on June 30 will be lost until one year later.

Mr. Kirby said the Technical Committee has reviewed this material. He explained that there were two resolutions: 1) R15-2009 would remove from the FY 2009 UPWP project activities and funding that will not be completed by June 30. 2) R16-2009 would take those funds and carry them into FY 2010. He said these resolutions included \$445,000 of the basic core program and \$527,000 from the technical assistance accounts for the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, and WMATA.

Ms. Ticer moved approval of the two resolutions under Item 8. Mr. Snyder seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **9. Approval of FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said that the draft FY2010 UPWP has been in development for several months. It has gone through several reviews with the Technical Committee and was presented to the TPB in draft form in February. It was released for a month of public comment and no comments were received.

Mr. Kirby said the draft FY2010 UPWP had a grand total of \$11,135,000 for FY 2010. He noted that funding on July 1 was assured because of Congressional passage of a federal omnibus spending bill for federal FY2009. He said a new federal transportation reauthorization is due in October of this year.

Ms. Smyth made a motion to approve Resolution R17-2009. The motion was seconded and was passed unanimously.

---

## **10. Approval of FY 2010 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Ramfos briefed the Board on the FY 2010 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP). He said the document was released for public comment on February 12 at the CAC meeting. The TPB was briefed on the draft work program at the February meeting.

Mr. Ramfos noted two letters from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), which reduced VDOT's participation in the Commuter Connections Telework Transportation Emissions Reduction Measure (TERM) and in a portion of the Employer Outreach TERM. Together, these requests resulted in a reduction of about \$513,000 in the FY 2010 Commuter Connections Work Program.

He said that TPB staff is on record in support of VDOT's request to use the Telework TERM funds to market and advertise its Telework Virginia program, but staff does not support the request to reduce the funding for the Employer Outreach TERM, which severed the contractual relationship between COG/TPB and the Northern Virginia jurisdictions for this TERM.

Mr. Ramfos described substantive changes in the draft CCWP that had been made based on comments received from VDOT and MDOT:

- On page 8, short descriptions have been added to each of the charts for the Commuter Connections committee groups based on information from the Commuter Connections strategic plan.
- On pages 9 and 10, the funding amounts were reduced to reflect VDOT's reduced commitment for both the Employer Outreach and Telework TERMS.
- On pages 30 and 31, several regional components associated with the Employer Outreach TERM have now been shifted to jurisdictional components.
- On page 33, Tasks A and B, local agency funding and support and D.C. and Maryland program administration tasks were changed to reflect the change to the Employer Outreach TERM.

Chairman Jenkins said that VDOT's action was penny-wise and pound-foolish. He said he could understand if these were simply budget cuts. However, he said that these actions would simply splinter money away from the regional organization, which would diminish the regional effectiveness of this particular component of the Commuter Connections program. He said he was disappointed that VDOT has taken this route.

Resolution R-18-2009 was moved, seconded, and approved unanimously.

## **11. Approval of Amendments to the FY 2010-2014 TIP to Include Projects under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act**

---

Referring to the distributed material, Mr. Kirby said this is part of a continuing series of actions to incorporate the federal stimulus funding into the TIP. He said the TPB has received requests from each of the implementing agencies: Maryland, Virginia and the District Departments of Transportation, WMATA, and the Eastern Federal Lands Division of the Federal Highway Administration.

Mr. Kirby said the mailout packet included resolutions for the Virginia Department of Transportation, the District Department of Transportation and the Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division of the Federal Highway Administration. Mr. Kirby asked each of the submitting agencies to comment on their requests to amend the TIP.

Ms. Sorenson of VDOT said she had no comments.

Mr. Bottigheimer of WMATA said he understood that no resolution had been included for the revisions submitted by WMATA.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct. He said that he had received something from WMATA that morning.

Mr. Bottigheimer apologized for the late submission. He asked if there was a way for moving forward with the WMATA projects at the meeting so that WMATA might move forward on its grant application this month.

Mr. Kirby said that the information received from WMATA had been distributed to the Board with a blue cover sheet. He suggested that the WMATA issue could be taken up after the other three resolutions had been addressed.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for a clarification regarding how these amendments were being addressed.

Mr. Kirby explained that they would be handled separately. The TPB would vote on each of the three resolutions that had been distributed. Following those three actions, the Board would consider the WMATA request.

A motion was made to approve TPB Resolution R19-2009 regarding the VDOT projects. The motion was seconded and was passed unanimously.

Mr. Klein of DDOT apologized for the last-minute changes.

Mr. Zimmerman said he was very interested in the kinds of projects that DDOT had submitted. He said it represented a real mix of improvements to existing infrastructure that will benefit transit, pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles. He said it appeared to be a balanced approach and he

---

commended DDOT. He said he hoped this was the approach that the region overall would be taking with these funds. He noted that two weeks ago in Arlington concrete started falling from a bridge on a VDOT highway onto Route 50 below. Luckily, no one was injured. He said that Arlington has been seeking repair to that bridge for at least a decade, and during that time, the price of the repair has increased from approximately \$4.5 million to approximately \$18 million. He said this kind of small project is extremely important, but it has again been pushed back as a priority to 2014. Another bridge, which 20 years ago was ranked third worst in the state, has also been pushed back. On a third intersection bridge project at Courthouse Road and Route 50, construction was begun last year but it has been halted and is awaiting completion. He said the only place VDOT is anxious to spend money is the project on I-66, which his county does not want. He said he hoped that some way would be found to address truly important concerns such as the bridge projects.

Mr. Zimmerman also said the bike-sharing package requested by DDOT is of great interest. He noted that Arlington is pursuing a similar program and he expressed hope that in the future such programs could be coordinated across jurisdictional borders. He said he was disappointed that a regional bike-sharing program was not being pursued. He said he was pleased to support the resolution related to DDOT's projects.

A motion was made to approve TPB Resolution R20-2009 related to DDOT's requests. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

Mr. Steve Souder, speaking on behalf of the Eastern Federal Lands Division of the Federal Highway Administration, briefed the Board on its project submission. He gave some brief background on his agency, which operates under guidance that requires consistency with state and MPO processes.

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to approve TPB Resolution R21-2009. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

Referring to the handout material with the blue cover sheet, Mr. Bottigheimer said that the previous month, WMATA submitted TIP amendments in an amount of \$230 million, reflecting the totality of the formula funds that were allocated to the Washington region. He said that WMATA has revised down the total of anticipated funding that it would receive to \$201.8 million. In addition, WMATA has made six revisions, three deletions, and two small additions to the projects in the original TIP amendment.

Ms. Hudgins asked for further clarification of the WMATA list. She said she was particularly interested in the MetroAccess funds.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that the table on the second page of the handout showed what was submitted last month and what has been revised for this month. He said there was a reduction of

---

\$5 million in the MetroAccess fleet items, to accommodate the WMATA reduction and some of the additional items.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the table that had been distributed was consistent with actions taken by the WMATA board. Specifically, he asked if the priorities on list that had been provided by the General Manager to the WMATA board were consistent with what was now being presented.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that in aggregate, the lists were consistent. On a project-by-project basis, he said he believed there had been some deviations. He asked if other WMATA staff could provide further information.

Mr. Erenrich asked why this item was being presented to the TPB at this time, given the fact that WMATA board has not acted on the issue of preventive maintenance.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that action by the TPB would permit WMATA to submit grants to the FTA during this month and move forward quickly.

In response to Mr. Zimmerman's question, Mr. Bottigheimer said that he understood that the list the WMATA board saw the previous week was a total of \$230 million, as opposed to the lower level.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the WMATA board was made aware the previous week that the final list might be smaller than \$230 million. He said he had two questions: 1) Is the prioritization represented on the handout consistent with the authority that the WMATA board gave the General Manager; and 2) Is there a compelling reason that this action needed to proceed at the TPB's March meeting, given the fact that the WMATA board has already approved a list that is funded at a higher level, and the projects that are ultimately funded would be a subset of the larger list?

Mr. Bottigheimer said that there are projects that were not included on the earlier list that they would like to move forward on, such as the financial system integration.

Given the information that there were items on the list that the WMATA board had not signed off on, Mr. Zimmerman said he believed this item should wait until the WMATA board has had a chance to vet it.

Ms. Waters suggested that the items that were approved last month might proceed, and the new items might be deferred until next month.

Mr. Bottigheimer confirmed that for those items that the TPB approved in February, the grant process could move forward. He confirmed that there were two additions, which the TPB had not seen, that would require additional approval.

---

Ms. Waters moved that the two additions be deferred until next month.

After some discussion, it was confirmed that no action was needed because, except for the two additional projects which would be on the April TPB agenda, the TPB had already approved the projects on the list that would be moving forward.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **12. Status report on the traffic signal optimization in the Washington Region**

Referring to the mailout memorandum and the handout presentation, Mr. Jones said that he was providing a status report on traffic signal optimization, as requested by the TPB in January. He explained that optimization is considered a high priority for the TPB's Constrained Long-Range Plan and is considered a Transportation Emissions Reduction Measure (TERM). He gave a brief definition of traffic signal optimization. He said a recent survey of traffic signals found there are 5,400 traffic signals in the region, and 80 percent of them have been optimized or adjusted. He said that 56 percent were adjusted by computer simulation or using computer-based tools and 24 percent were adjusted by other means. In 2005, 68 percent of signals were considered optimized. He said that agencies would continue their coordination efforts to increase the rate of traffic signal optimization.

Vice Chairman Snyder thanked Mr. Jones. He said he had been working on this regional coordination effort since it began and he was pleased with its progress. However, he noted that as he drives around the region, he finds it hard to believe that traffic signals have reached a level of 80-percent optimization. He said the Board should continue to monitor this issue.

### **13. Briefing on Additional Findings from the 2007/2008 Regional Household Travel Survey**

Referring to the handout material, Mr. Griffiths provided additional information on the TPB on findings from the TPB's Household Travel Survey. His briefing included information on daily commuting patterns and changes in mode share. In his summary findings, Mr. Griffiths noted that the biggest increase in transit commuting is in areas outside the Beltway; carpooling and auto passenger trips have declined in all areas except Charles County and Southern Maryland; and there has been a significant increase in walk and bike commuting trips in Arlington and Alexandria.

Chairman Jenkins thanked Mr. Griffiths for the information, which he said was very useful.



---

#### **14. Update on the March 18 Scenario Task Force Meeting and the Development of a Regional BRT Project**

Ms. Tregoning said the attendance at the Task Force meeting has been good since the task force began working on a project looking at rapid transit options. She commended the TPB staff for putting together a very useful “straw man” transit proposal. She said she hoped the task force would be ready to present something to the TPB in June.

Mr. Bottigheimer seconded Ms. Tregoning’s comments regarding the TPB staff. He said they are doing a tremendous job.

#### **15. Other Business and Adjournment**

There being no additional comments, the meeting was adjourned at 1:59 p.m.