

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
July 16, 2008**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Robert Catlin, City of College Park
Dan Drummond, City of Fairfax
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County
Brian A. Glenn, FTA
Colleen Clay, City of Takoma Park
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jennie Forehand, Maryland Senate
Jason Groth, Charles County
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County
Julia Koster, NCPC
Timothy Lovain, Alexandria City Council
Dan Maller, City of Falls Church
Henry Marraffa, City of Gaithersburg
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Colleen Mitchell, DC Office of Planning
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
Rick Rybeck, DDOT
C. Paul Smith, City of Frederick
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
Margaret Vanderhye, Virginia House of Delegates
Lori Waters, Loudoun County

Jonathan Way, City of Manassas
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby
Michael Clifford
Jim Hogan
Nick Ramfos
Bob Griffiths
Debbie Leigh
Deborah Etheridge
Andrew Austin
Mark Moran
Michael Eichler
Beth Newman
Monica Bansal
Darren Smith
Sarah Crawford
Erin Morrow
Tim Canan
Lewis C. Miller
Matt Johnson
Dave Robertson COG/EO
Joan Rohlf COG/DEP
Jeff King COG/DEP
Bill Orleans PG ACT
Bob Owolabi Fairfax County DOT
Betsy Massie PRTC
Clayton L. Ashby WMATA
Andrew Wexler Mongtomery County Resident
Allyson Wilson Reporter – WTTG
Tom Biesiadny Fairfax County DOT
Jim Maslanka Alexandria
John B. Townsend AAA Mid-Atlantic
Ritch Viola Arlington DOT
Alex Verzosa City of Fairfax
Ben Newell Reporter, Washington Times
Harry Sanders Purple Line NOW
Taryn Luntz Examiner

Shirley C. Williams
Tom Skancke

FEMA/DHS
NSTPRSC

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

There were no speakers for public comment.

2. Approval of Minutes of the June 18 Meeting

Mr. Knapp made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 18, 2008, TPB Meeting. Ms. Hudgins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Mr. Rawlings said the Technical Committee met on June 27 and reviewed four items for inclusion on the TPB's July agenda:

- Items 8, 9, 10, and 11: The Committee was briefed on the Air Quality Conformity Analysis for two versions of the 2008 Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): with and without the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) funded projects. The Committee recommended that the TPB act on these documents at the July TPB meeting.
- Item 12: The Committee received a briefing on the major changes to the current Federal Surface Transportation Programs proposed in the report by the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission that was established in SAFETEA-LU.
- Item 13: Staff briefed the Committee on current initiatives for the reauthorization of the Federal Surface Transportation program.
- Item 14: The committee received a briefing on the status of the development of the CLRP Aspirations and "What Would It Take?" scenarios. The committee was also briefed on the transportation strategies included in the draft report of the COG Climate Change Steering Committee, and recommended that staff develop comments on the transportation recommendations included in this report.

Mr. Rawlings said the committee also reviewed and discussed three information items:

- WMATA staff briefed the committee on the proposed regional network of priority Metro Bus corridors under consideration by the Metro Board.
- TPB staff briefed the committee on the final version of the 2008 Congestion Management Process Technical Report.

-
- The committee received a briefing on recent transportation safety activities.

Chairman Mendelson confirmed that staff will prepare comments on the COG Climate Change draft report and submit a memorandum for review by the Technical Committee. Mr. Rawlings said the Technical Committee will review staff comments in September and the TPB will be briefed on the comments at the September 17 meeting.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

Mr. Martin noted that the TPB recently published an updated version of “The Citizen’s Guide on Transportation Decision-Making,” and recommended that TPB members take copies of it to display in their jurisdictions for interested members of the public.

Mr. Martin said the CAC met last Thursday for the fifth time this calendar year, and received a briefing on how the military Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) changes made by Congress will affect jobs and traffic congestion in the region. He said BRAC will impact the transportation network, resulting in a decrease in transit trips and increase in vehicle miles traveled (VMT). He said the CAC expressed concern that jobs are moving away from areas well-served by the region’s transit system, which will negatively affect VMT and air pollution.

Mr. Martin said the CAC also received a briefing on the unconstrained planning activities conducted at other Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) around the country. He said TPB staff interviewed staff at ten MPOs and they all reported favorably on unconstrained planning as part of the long-range planning process. He said most MPOs use unconstrained plans to further policy goals, as staging documents where projects can be listed until sufficient funding is identified, and as a way to create dialogue around regional transportation priorities. He said the CAC believes planning that looks beyond financial constraint and towards creating a project-specific vision for the region would lead to a useful dialogue within the region. He said the CAC will finalize a short report to the TPB on this topic and submit it for the September meeting.

Mr. Martin said the CAC also discussed CAC priorities for the remainder of the calendar year. He said the CAC looks forward to rounding out the year by developing recommendations to the TPB on unconstrained planning, the TPB scenario study, and a strategy for operationalizing the TPB Vision as strategic goals to help optimize outcomes from the scenario study. He said that due to the Public Forum on the TIP that is scheduled for the September 11 CAC meeting, the CAC will meet informally in August and September to shape these recommendations.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on June 27 and approved two amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), as detailed in the mailout packet.

Mr. Kirby said the mailout packet also included a letter from Mr. Lovain reporting on a meeting with the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) on the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom action the TPB took at its June 18 meeting. Mr. Lovain said DDOT and TPB staff discussed the funding levels of the connector bus service project the TPB approved for DDOT and decided that there were no grounds for reopening the matter and reconvening the selection committee.

Mr. Kirby provided a brief update on the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program, which is moving towards final implementation by July 2009, noting a schedule attached to the memorandum in the packet for Item 5.

Ms. Sorenson spoke on behalf of VDOT regarding a letter included in the mailout packet requesting a TIP amendment that would provide additional funding to the Route 27 interchange in Arlington County. She made a motion to approve Resolution TPB R5-2009. Ms. Erickson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Kirby noted several items discussed at the COG Board meeting on July 9: regional commercial construction growth; the report of the COG Climate Change Steering Committee, which will be discussed at the staff level at the September meeting of the TPB Technical Committee; and a press release on the proposed rulemaking concerning the regulation of greenhouse gas emissions. He noted that the last item in the letters packet includes a resume for Mr. Tom Skancke, who is substituting for Mr. Paul Weyrich under Item 12.

Chairman Mendelson asked for clarification on the MATOC Program schedule, specifically referring to the six-month timeframe for the operation of proof of concept system.

Mr. Kirby said the proof of concept will be close to the final operation for the program, but that it is intended to be a trial run of the program to ensure it functions properly. He said six months are budgeted in the schedule to work out any weaknesses in the program before it is announced as a fully operational system.

Chairman Mendelson asked if the issue is with the software or the coordination.

Mr. Kirby replied that the testing involved developing operating procedures for all of the operators that sit in the command centers in Virginia, Maryland, the District, and WMATA. He said the operators need to be trained and the real-time coordination capabilities will need to be tested.

Chairman Mendelson asked if it would be possible to tighten the schedule.

Mr. Kirby said that those in charge of the operating centers feel the amount of time built into the schedule is necessary to train all operators.

Chairman Mendelson asked if the TPB will be briefed again at its September meeting.

Mr. Kirby said he could ask Mr. Stieg, Chairman of the MATOC Task Force, to brief the TPB in September.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Mendelson noted several changes in membership on the TPB. He said Mr. Donald Halligan will serve as the representative from the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) and Mr. Dan Drummond will serve as the representative from the City of Fairfax. He said new alternates include Mr. Dan Maller from the City of Falls Church and Ms. Monica Backmon from Prince William County.

7. Review of Comments Received and Acceptance of Recommended Responses for Inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Assessment, the 2008 CLRP and the FY 2009-2014 TIP with Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) Funded Projects

Mr. Kirby reviewed the staff recommendations contained in the memorandum for Item 7 distributed at the meeting. He said the NVTA funding was not restored by the Virginia General Assembly, meaning that the TPB cannot act on agenda Items 8, 9, and 10, which would have approved the air quality conformity assessment, the 2008 CLRP, and the FY 2009-2014 TIP that contained the NVTA projects. He said that the TPB will have to use the established contingency course of action that the TPB approved in April, which is represented under Item 11 and involves approving a TIP that excludes the NVTA projects. He said the contingency course of action relies on the conformity determination that the TPB approved for the 2007 CLRP and will amend the current TIP of record with projects that do not affect air quality conformity. He said TPB staff will move forward with a new analysis of the air quality implications of the 2008 CLRP without the NVTA projects. He said the TPB will receive the results for review at the October TPB meeting and take action in November.

Mr. Kirby reviewed a memorandum summarizing the comments received and staff responses provided during the 30-day public comment period. He said both versions of the CLRP and TIP were released on June 12 at the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting and the public comment period closed on July 12.

Ms. Vanderhye said it was a tragedy that not only was money not made available for the NVTA projects, but also that match money was not allocated to Metro, VRE, and capital projects that have federal funding. She said she intends to keep working towards increasing funding for transportation projects. She said that transportation investment is not about congestion for a few people getting to work, but that it is about commerce and the basic economic vitality of the entire Commonwealth, of which the region is a huge part. She said she hopes bodies such as the TPB continue to place pressure on the Virginia General Assembly to allocate money to fix transportation problems to clean the air, move people within and through the region, and move commerce.

Ms. Hudgins agreed that losing the NVTA funding and not matching the funding for Metro would have serious economic impacts on the region. She added that not only is Metro vital to the economics of the region, but the human and social demand for the service was evidenced by the highest Metro ridership in history on July 14.

Mr. Drummond also noted the impact the loss of NVTA funding will have on the region and the Commonwealth and added that the greatest impact will be felt by the constituents, who will have to continue to find ways to navigate an increasingly congested transportation system.

Chairman Mendelson said the TPB will accept the recommended responses to the comments received for inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2008 CLRP and the FY 2009-2014 TIP by unanimous consent.

Items 8, 9, and 10 were not acted upon by the TPB because the NVTA funding was not restored by the Virginia General Assembly.

11. Approval of the FY 2009-2014 TIP without NVTA Funded Projects

Mr. Kirby said the TPB is asked to approve the FY 2009-2014 TIP that was released for public comment on June 12 with the recognition that the NVTA projects on page V-1 will not be included in the approved document.

Mr. Knapp made a motion to approve Resolution TPB R4-2009. Ms. Waters seconded the motion.

Chairman Mendelson circulated a memorandum he drafted requesting a change to the District of Columbia Klingle Road project. He amended the third line of the first paragraph of the memorandum from “to a local property access road with a hike and bike trail,” to read “repurpose Klingle Road and a portion no longer used by motor vehicles.”

Mr. Kirby said the item at hand is in the current TIP document, which is supplemented by Chairman Mendelson's memorandum. He noted that the page distributed to the TPB has the Klingle Road amendment on one side and page V-1 of the NVTAs that will not go forward on the reverse side.

Chairman Mendelson said he would treat the Klingle Road amendment as a unanimous consent change to the motion at hand.

Mr. Rybeck said DDOT recognized the action of the District of Columbia Council on the proposed change to Klingle Road and noted that the changes will require the approval of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the National Park Service (NPS) before they can be implemented.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that some of the NVTAs that will not be included in the TIP and do not have federal or state funding allocated to them may in turn be funded through local financing efforts. He asked that if local funding is identified for these projects in the short term, would they be included in the current or future version of the TIP. He asked additionally if the steps necessary to include a funded project in the TIP would delay some of the projects.

Mr. Kirby said the reason for approving a TIP without NVTAs funded projects today is that the three states need to process a TIP to get funding allocated for the beginning of the federal fiscal year, October 1. He added that the second part of the contingency course of action is to perform an air quality analysis on the amended TIP and return with the 2008 CLTP and TIP in the fall. He said there would be an opportunity at that time to make changes to the funding for these projects. He said that if additional funding sources are identified, those sources could be incorporated into the action the TPB is scheduled to take in November.

Mr. Zimmerman clarified that if a local jurisdiction takes action on funding a project in the next month or two, they would not be penalized by having to wait until November for the TPB to approve the funding for their project.

Mr. Kirby said amendments to the TIP that involve moving funding from one source to another can be performed at any time. He added that the only reason a project would have to wait until November is if it affects the air quality conformity analysis.

Mr. Zimmerman confirmed that if the TPB approves today moving a project from 2014 to 2016 due to lack of funding, and the local jurisdiction establishes another source of funding in the next month, it won't be a problem to make that change to the TIP.

Mr. Kirby said that would not be a problem.

INFORMATION ITEMS

12. Briefing on “Transportation for Tomorrow: Report of the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission

Chairman Mendelson noted that this item is useful for the TPB’s understanding of transportation issues and funding as discussions begin for reauthorization of federal transportation legislation. Mr. Tom Skancke spoke in place of Mr. Paul Weyrich as a former commissioner on the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission. He said that the TPB meeting provided a good context for his presentation, as the Board’s agenda had highlighted the bureaucratic hurdles for implementing transportation projects, and his drive to the meeting had highlighted the congestion challenges facing the region and the country.

Mr. Skancke briefed the TPB on the activities of the Study Commission and the report it submitted to Congress in January 2008 after 22 months of work. He spoke from a PowerPoint presentation that was distributed at the meeting. He said that the 12-member commission was appointed by the President and Congressional leaders, and was made up of members representing federal, state and local governments; metropolitan planning organizations; transportation-related industries; and public interest organizations. He said it focused in particular on short- and long-term alternatives to replace or supplement the fuel tax as the principal revenue source to support the Highway Trust Fund over the next 30 years.

Mr. Skancke said that the Study Commission found an urgent need for improvements in the way transportation projects are funded and implemented, because the global competitiveness of the United States economy is threatened by increased congestion and the deterioration of transportation infrastructure. He said the Study Commission estimated that it will take \$225 billion per year for the next 50 years to meet transportation needs in all modes, yet the Highway Trust Fund is projected to be in deficit as soon as next year. He said this showed that financing mechanisms for transportation infrastructure have not kept up with the demand for capacity.

Mr. Skancke said that the Study Commission’s report, titled “Transportation for Tomorrow,” proposes a revamped federal system that would reduce the number of federal surface transportation programs from 108 currently to 10. He said that the report advocates a reduction in project delivery time through streamlined regulatory processes, a shift to a more “performance-based” system, and an increased focus on safety and the movement of freight. He said the report also calls for a significant increase in the fuel tax over the next several years. He noted that Transportation Secretary Mary Peters along with two other commissioners declined to sign the final report and instead submitted a minority report that did not call for an increase in the fuel tax.

Mr. Skancke said that the federal transportation program has lost credibility and the system is overwrought with regulation and red tape. He encouraged TPB members to hold their national elected officials accountable to reform our transportation infrastructure program because

business-as-usual is not acceptable. He said that members of the Study Commission had raised money from the private sector to fund travel by commission members around the country to present the information and encourage public officials to advocate for reform of the federal program.

Mr. Smith asked if the Study Commission had addressed the argument that because of projected oil shortages money should be spent on alternative transportation modes rather than on improvements to the highway system.

Mr. Skancke said that although issues of energy independence, greenhouse gas emissions, and pedestrian mobility were not part of the Study Commission's initial scope, they did end up considering these topics. He said that the report makes pretty strong recommendations advocating exploration of and investment in alternative fuel technologies.

Mr. Marraffa noted that he had just attended a board meeting of the National League of Cities where transportation was a key topic of discussion. He said that the League is planning to set a date on which member cities nationwide will be asked to ratify a League policy on a specific issue, and that issue will likely be related to transportation. He said he would like to work with Mr. Skancke and perhaps get the Study Commission involved in the effort.

Mr. Skancke said that he or his colleagues would gladly assist in the initiative by the National League of Cities. He said that advocating for streamlining of transportation project delivery could be an especially important role for the League.

Ms. Forehand said that she would be attending the upcoming meeting of the National Conference of State Legislatures, and that she had not seen anything about the federal transportation reauthorization on the agenda. She asked if Mr. Skancke was aware of the meeting and if anyone from the Study Committee would be attending.

Mr. Skancke said he was not aware of it but that it would be a good event for someone from the Study Commission to attend. He asked Ms. Forehand to speak with him after the TPB meeting to discuss the event.

Ms. Waters asked Mr. Skancke to further explain why the Highway Trust Fund is diminishing and expected to be in deficit next year.

Mr. Skancke said that there are several reasons for the erosion of the Highway Trust Fund, including the decrease in the buying power of gas tax revenue due to inflation, and the recent downturn in driving due to high gas prices has meant even less revenue coming in. He said that the Trust Fund has also been over-allocated.

Chairman Mendelson noted that improved fuel efficiency of vehicles also has led to less fuel being purchased and therefore less revenue from the gas tax.

Ms. Waters said it was important to mention, as was noted in the Study Commission's report, that the Highway Trust Fund had also been raided in the past for other government purposes.

Mr. Skancke said that some states have constitutional prohibitions against using money from the Highway Trust Fund for other purposes, but that many states do not. He noted that in California the legislature borrows money from its Highway Trust Fund revenue each year to balance its budget.

Ms. Waters said that something should be done to make sure that Highway Trust Fund revenue is locked away and not available for diversion to other purposes.

Mr. Skancke agreed with Ms. Waters and said that the recent failure by Congress to resolve the impending Highway Trust Fund deficit is evidence that not enough people in the federal government recognize the magnitude of the problem.

Mr. Weissberg praised the Study Commission for its thoughtful approach to the difficult issues considered in the report. He asked if Mr. Skancke could elaborate on how a transition to a substantially different federal transportation program might take place in a short amount of time.

Mr. Skancke said the Study Commission had spent a lot of time considering how a transition period would work, especially in terms of a shift to different funding mechanisms. He said that the commission determined that it would probably take 10 to 15 years to transition into a new funding and programmatic system. He said that discussions of alternative revenue-generation methods such as taxing vehicle miles of travel (VMT) rather than fuel have raised privacy concerns, but that provisions can be made to make sure that sensitive information is purged from databases after a very short period of time.

Mr. Skancke said that transition to new systems would nonetheless be difficult because there are many entrenched interests. He said that the Study Commission's report includes specific recommendations to Congress regarding transition steps and looks to achieve a level of comfort with change.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what the current federal gas tax rate is.

Mr. Skancke said that he thought it is either 18.4 or 18.6 cents per gallon.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that given current gas prices of more than four dollars per gallon, the federal tax represents less than five percent of the current cost of a gallon of gasoline, but that in the 1950s the gas tax was about 25 percent of the cost. He said that while increased fuel efficiency in cars has had some effect on declining revenues, the largest effect has been from the fact that the gas tax is a unit tax that does not keep up with inflation.

Mr. Zimmerman said that he did not understand why the Study Commission had recommended a federal tax on transit trips as a way to fund transit investments. He said that it would seem to discourage travel behavior that is desired, and fails to take into account the broader community benefits of increased transit use that justify subsidizing that behavior. He said that if needed transit investments could be funded just by making riders pay more, every transit agency would already be doing that.

Mr. Skancke said that the Study Commission had debated Mr. Zimmerman's question but ultimately determined that all transportation users need to pay more, across all modes, though the distribution of that burden will be a difficult challenge for Congress.

Mr. Knapp said he appreciated the Study Commission's work. He asked if the commission had recognized the disconnect between the federal policy makers and the people at the state and local levels more closely involved with implementation and more attuned to the challenges, and if they had looked at any models for action at the local and state levels that would either encourage federal action or obviate the need to wait for it.

Mr. Skancke said that while the Study Commission had not developed a specific plan of how to change the opinions of federal lawmakers, they were reaching out to local and state officials with presentations like his own to encourage groups like the TPB to support all or portions of the commission's report. He said that such endorsements would carry more weight with members of Congress than the report on its own.

Mr. Knapp said that the fact that individual members of Congress can tie up funding for important projects has frustrated state and local officials, and that there is clearly a need for a different system or strategy to fund and implement projects.

Mr. Skancke said that the solution is to fund the system to a level at which projects do not have to compete with each other nationwide, but at which any project which is determined to be necessary is funded and implemented.

Mr. Turner asked what the next step would be for the TPB in relation to the reauthorization discussion. He suggested that the Board should take a position on the elements on which consensus can be reached, and bring those issues forward to the region's Congressional delegation.

Chairman Mendelson suggested that the TPB ask staff to draft a resolution that the Board could consider at its next meeting.

Mr. Kirby said that staff could bring a draft to the TPB at its September 17 meeting, and said that the intent of having Mr. Skancke's presentation on the agenda was to start the discussion and enable the Board to begin considering what points it wishes to support. He said that the next three to six months would be the appropriate timeframe for the TPB to take action, as

Congressional hearings on the issues have already begun and many groups are starting to draft positions.

Chairman Mendelson thanked Mr. Skancke for his presentation and asked Mr. Kirby to present a draft resolution at the September 17 TPB meeting.

13. Review of Current Study and Legislative Proposals for the Reauthorization of the Federal Surface Transportation Act

Mr. Kirby summarized a PowerPoint presentation that was distributed at the meeting, briefly describing different proposals currently before Congress regarding reauthorization. He noted that the proposals were all described in a memorandum included in the mailout packet. He described the interim report by the National Surface Transportation Infrastructure Financing Commission, joint hearings between transportation and budget committees on the idea of a national infrastructure bank for major investments, and the Lieberman-Warner climate change legislation. He also noted that he had given testimony at a Congressional hearing on reauthorization issues in April.

Mr. Kirby also described the formation of a new Metropolitan Mobility Caucus in Congress, led by Representatives Ellen Tauscher and Tom Petri. He said that three representatives from the Washington Region had joined the caucus: Eleanor Holmes Norton of the District of Columbia, Jim Moran of Virginia, and Chris Van Hollen from Maryland. He said that this caucus is developing advocacy positions on issues of urban infrastructure, congestion, air pollution, and economic development, with an emphasis on inter-governmental partnerships, greater use of transit and inter-city passenger rail, and performance standards for metropolitan mobility. He said it could be a good audience for the TPB's views on the policy issues.

Mr. Kirby highlighted some common themes from the various reauthorization initiatives, including greater investment in transportation, a desire not to reauthorize the program in its current form, streamlining and simplification of the project delivery process, greater use of cost-benefit analysis for investment decisions, and greater focus on system maintenance. He said that another common theme is a desire to use technological innovations that enable new pricing strategies, including congestion pricing. He said that the TPB could build its own positions around those common themes, and focus on some elements that are of particular interest to the Board.

Mr. Zimmerman said that he noticed that in the list of shortcomings of the current federal program provided in the memo, there was no mention of the structure of funding for transit projects relative to highways. He said that with highways, there is a formula for distribution of funds to the states, but for transit projects, jurisdictions have to go the federal government asking for money for each new project. He said that this discourages investment in transit, and that at

the very least the reauthorization of the federal program should makes these processes more similar to each other so that the resulting investment is more comparable.

Mr. Kirby said that this point is included in the desire to base investment decisions on rigorous analysis of costs and benefits that would be mode-neutral and not separated by mode.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the TPB may need to be more explicit about that issue in order to get the point across to federal policymakers and encourage significant changes to the process.

14. Update on the Development of the “CLRP Aspirations” and “What Would It Take?” Scenarios

Mr. Kirby said that no action was required on this item, and in the interest of time the item could be postponed and staff would update the Board on the Scenario Study at the September 17 TPB meeting.

Hard copies of the PowerPoint presentation for the item were made available at the meeting.

15. Other Business

There was no other business.

16. Adjournment

Chairman Mendelson adjourned the meeting at 2:01 pm.