

**METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
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 21, 2010**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Melissa Barlow, FTA
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Colleen Clay, City of Takoma Park
Barbara Comstock, Virginia House
Kerry Donley, City of Alexandria
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Emad Elshafei, City of Rockville
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jason Groth, Charles County
Tom Harrington, WMATA
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Julia Koster, NCPC
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick
Michael C. May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Eric Olson, Prince George's County
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
Karina Ricks, DDOT
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Patricia S. Ticer, Virginia Senate
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd Turner, City of Bowie

Jonathan Way, Manassas City
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Robbert Werth, Private Providers Task Force
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby
Gerald Miller
Bob Griffiths
Andrew Meese
Tim Canan
John Swanson
Andrew Austin
Beth Newman
Deborah Bilek
Sarah Crawford
Monica Bansal
Debbie Leigh
Deborah Etheridge
Michael Farrell
Darren Smith
Rex Hodgson
Gareth James
Eric Randall
Karin Foster
Rahath Sultana
Danielle Peak
Ryan Hand COG Intern
Lewis Miller COG/OPA
Paul DesJardin COG/Community Planning & Services
Randy Carroll MDE
Bill Orleans HACK
Maureen Budetti TPB CAC Chair
Greg McFarland NVTC
Betsy Massie PRTC
Andrew Bielak Maryland DOT
Judi Gold CM Bowser
Brandi Law Greehan, Jones, Pandak & Straw
Phillip Ellis Sierra Club
Jim Maslanka Alexandria
Michael Owino Central MD

Trevor Coscio	Central MD
Noelle Dominguez	Fairfax County
Tom Biesiadny	Fairfax County DOT
Von Pelot	Red Top Cab
Brian Hughes	DC
Alyssa Brown	PWC Board of Supervisors
Maria Staunton	AMPO
Alex Block	DC Office of Planning
Dan Malouff	Arlington County

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Chairman Snyder called the meeting to order, and requested that speakers adhere to a 3-minute timeframe when offering public comments

Ms. Parker, on behalf of the Independent Greens of Virginia, spoke in support of the 2010 National Capital Region Freight Plan (Item 8). She exhibited a stack of petitions collected across Virginia between 2006 and 2008, totaling 40,000 signatures. She said these signatures represent support for more trains and less traffic. She emphasized that rail saves lives, that 40,000 Americans are killed on roadways every year, and that 330,000 Americans are injured in automobile accidents on roads every year. She said that rail can help cut dependency on foreign oil and can help provide access to cleaner air and water. She urged the TPB to approve the Freight Rail Plan and initiate action to incorporate its rail projects into the CLRP.

Mr. Chase, on behalf of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, addressed two issues relating to the Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities: (1) the recommendation for a task force to determine if a Regional Transportation Priorities plan is feasible, and (2) the suggestion that an inventory of priority projects be limited to those in currently approved plans. He said that it is feasible to develop priorities that include projects not currently under consideration. He stated that if the TPB can allocate time and resources to studying land use scenarios that are not feasible or achievable, it could develop a priority plan that considers new options, such as multimodal regional parkways and Potomac River bridge crossings. He said the same is true of building consensus around regional funding solutions, and that a regional priority plan should not be limited to projects that are already approved. He cited the Greater Washington 2050 survey, which indicates that area residents view transportation as a primary challenge for the region, and stated that the region's major hurdle in meeting this challenge is lack of political will to take a regional approach to transportation planning. He said that the Alliance believes that the TPB has a responsibility to create a path to a more mobile future, and suggested looking to Hampton Roads, Virginia as an example of another Metropolitan Planning Organization setting transportation priorities. He urged the TPB to identify and advance the region's most important transportation priorities. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the June 16 Meeting

Vice Chairman Turner moved to approve the minutes from the June 16 TPB meeting. Ms. Ticer seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Mr. Verzosa said that the Technical Committee met on July 9, and highlighted six items that were reviewed for inclusion in the TPB agenda. The first item reviewed was the Car Free Day event, which falls during the “Try Transit Week” that is sponsored by the American Public Transportation Association. The second item reviewed was the National Capital Region Freight Plan, which the Technical Committee endorsed. The third item reviewed was the slate of projects recommended for TPB funding under the TLC program by the expert review panel. The fourth item reviewed was the development of the COG application for funding under the HUD Sustainable Communities planning grant program. He noted that this is the first grant of its kind that integrates housing, transportation, environmental impact, and economic development. The fifth item reviewed was the identified Next Steps resulting from the Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities, which was held on May 26. He noted the Technical Committee recommendation that if another similar forum is held, it should be a scaled-down version that occurs over the course of a half-day at the COG offices. The final item reviewed was the survey on the State of the Commute for the National Capital Region, which he said included some interesting results on telework and transit use.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Ms. Budetti said that the CAC had a very productive and lively meeting on June 15. She emphasized that this year’s CAC has a committed membership and has received strong attendance at meetings. She said that the last CAC meeting hosted two officers from the WMATA Riders Advisory Council (RAC), who shared the structure of their committee, the history, its purpose, and what they have been considering lately, including the committee’s concern about the lack of citizen and rider representation on the Board of Trade/COG Task Force that is addressing WMATA governance issues. She said that this concern is also of interest to the CAC, and noted that some CAC members planned to attend the upcoming RAC Subcommittee meeting on this topic. She also expressed excitement about meeting RAC officers and gaining a broader understanding of what RAC does. She expressed a hope that the CAC can work with RAC on future issues relating to long-term planning and the fiscal health of WMATA.

Ms. Budetti said that the CAC discussed the staff proposal for the follow-up to the May 26 Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities, and noted that further discussion on this item would occur later in the TPB meeting. She thanked the TPB for its responsiveness to follow-up issues relating to the Conversation. She mentioned that the CAC is excited about the HUD Sustainable Communities grant application, and noted that this effort is consistent with the

kind of things that the CAC is trying to do to bring different sectors together and take a regional approach to sustainability in transportation and other areas that relate to it. She mentioned that the CAC would be pleased to host a follow-up meeting to the May 26 Conversation, which could be held in November. She also expressed the CAC's concern about the timing of the follow-up to the Conversation. She stated that the CAC passed a resolution requesting that the TPB place on its September agenda an item that would allow for further discussion of this topic, as well as the creation of a TPB task force to look at the feasibility and desirability of doing a regional transportation priorities plan.

Ms. Budetti said that the CAC also received a report on the update to the region's bicycle and pedestrian plan, and that the CAC took some administrative actions to elect the CAC vice chairs, noting that the new vice chairs for the CAC are Tina Slater from Maryland and Zach Dobelbower from the District. She also welcomed Kelby Funn as a new CAC nominee from Maryland to replace a member who resigned.

Vice Chairman Turner thanked Ms. Budetti for her report, and moved the nomination of Mr. Funn of Bowie to fill the Maryland vacancy on the Citizens Advisory Committee. Vice Chair Bowser seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said that the Steering Committee met on July 9, and acted on three resolutions. Referring to the mailout packet, he provided a summary of these actions. The first action was to add funding to the FY 2010-2015 TIP for the TPB bus priorities grant received under the TIGER program. The second action was to modify funding amounts for projects funded under the stimulus program for the District. The third action was a TIP amendment regarding the Crystal City Potomac Yards Transitway in Arlington County, and the I-66 multimodal transportation environmental study in Fairfax and Prince William Counties.

Mr. Kirby provided a summary of the letters packet, which included the following items: (1) a memorandum from COG Executive Director David Robertson, concerning the selection of the law firm of Greehan, Taves, Pandak & Stoner and specifically of Ms. Sharon Pandak to provide legal support to COG after the retirement of COG's General Counsel, Lee Ruck; (2) the final version of the letter the Board approved last month to Mr. Smith of the Martz Group, concerning its request for transit funding for the Martz Commuter Bus Service; (3) a copy of a letter to Bob Chase of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance from Arlington County Board Chair Jay Fisette, concerning the I-95/395 HOT lanes project; (4) a copy of a resolution passed by the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission regarding that project and expressing its views to the Commonwealth on the next steps forward; and (5) a letter of commitment from the City of Alexandria to the TPB Street Smart Safety Campaign.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Snyder had no remarks.

ACTION ITEMS

7. Approval of Regional Car Free Day Proclamation

Mr. Kirby said that Car Free Day events would be held on Wednesday, September 22, and introduced Mr. Ramfos to discuss the events in further detail.

Mr. Ramfos provided a briefing on the Car Free Day event. Referring to a slideshow, he said this event first occurred in Europe in the mid-1990s, and went global in 2000. He noted that the event corresponds with Europe's International Mobility Week, and that Car Free Day is now an international event celebrated in 15 cities across 40 countries. He said that participation in Car Free Day was recognized by the District of Columbia in 2007, and a regional rollout occurred in 2008 with TPB's support through Commuter Connections. Car Free Day is now an annual regional event that invites citizens to try alternative forms of transportation, such as transit, bicycling, or walking. He emphasized that Car Free Day is also a way to promote "car-light" travel patterns, and extends to commuters as well as anyone who may be planning a trip for that day, including senior citizens and students.

Mr. Ramfos provided some photos from past Car Free events, and mentioned that this event receives a lot of media coverage. He pointed out the website, www.carfreemetrodc.com, and noted that last year, 6,200 pledges were received through the website to participate. He discussed promotion for the event, which includes posters to be distributed at employer sites and other outlets, as well as partnerships with transit agencies such as buses in Montgomery County, Frederick County, Prince George's County, and the District Circulator, to provide advertisement space. He noted that other partners include the General Services Administration, which will offer free telework days at specific centers throughout the region. Car Free Day is also on Facebook and Twitter, and was advertised in the employer newsletter that has gone out to 6,000 employers throughout the region.

Mr. Ramfos said that there is a goal for gaining 10,000 pledges for participation for this year, and referred to a proclamation in the mailout packet for TPB approval. He also mentioned that each TPB member should have received a Car Free Day button, and requested that members wear the button over the coming weeks to promote the event. As part of the media pitch, he said that it would be great to have a few volunteers from the Board to pledge to go car-free or car-light, and that anyone from the Board could contact him to volunteer.

Vice Chair Bowser asked if there were any efforts to engage groups who traditionally think that they cannot do without their car, such as senior citizens.

Mr. Ramfos replied that the Steering Committee is looking to partner with other organizations and to businesses for this purpose. He invited anyone to approach him with additional ideas for partnerships.

Mr. Snyder said that a citizen suggested that the TPB send a note to the region's Congressional delegation and to the federal executive office about this effort. He suggested that this method of pushing out information might add promotional benefit.

Mr. Roberts said that the City of Greenbelt is considering a No Car Day that might be a monthly event. He said that a citizen has come forward who would like to promote this idea within the city, which could be a good complement to Car Free Day.

Mr. Ramfos added that he would like to encourage everyone to adopt a similar proclamation as a way to help get the word out. He said that he could provide anyone with additional information to send to constituents in order to get them acclimated to the event, and to pledge to participate.

Mr. Donley moved to approve the Car Free Day 2010 Proclamation. Ms. Ticer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Ramfos noted that a large version of the proclamation was available for Chairman Snyder to sign at the conclusion of the meeting. He said this would also provide an opportunity to take some photographs.

8. Approval of the National Capital Freight Plan 2010

Mr. Kirby introduced Mr. Weissberg, Chairman of the TPB Freight Planning Subcommittee and Karin Foster of the TPB staff. He said this marked the first time that the TPB has assembled an integrated report on freight for the National Capital Region.

Mr. Weissberg noted that this plan has been in development over the last year, and has been reviewed several times by the Freight Subcommittee, and by the Technical Committee. He noted that the plan looks at how to integrate freight into the larger regional transportation network.

Ms. Foster provided an overview of the Regional Freight Plan. Referring to a PowerPoint presentation, she said that this plan links to Policy Goal 2 of the TPB Vision, which states that the TPB wants an "interconnected transportation system that promotes strong and growing economy" and "efficient and safe movement of people, goods, and information." She added that Policy Goal 8 of the TPB Vision speaks directly to a freight plan with a strategy to "develop a regional plan for freight movement." She provided a history of the Freight Subcommittee, and discussed the role of freight as it parallels growth in the economy. She also described freight movement by tonnage in the Washington region.

Ms. Foster said the Freight Plan follows up on the SAFETEA-LU legislation that recognized

freight for the first time and provided guidelines to MPOs for freight planning. She said the plan is a first step to integrate freight into a comprehensive transportation paradigm and incorporate freight into the growing livability and sustainability discussion. She noted that trucks carry 76% of goods throughout the region, and that data forecasts show that heavy truck and medium truck volumes will increase by 38 and 47 percent, respectively. She added that a major issue for truck movement is congestion, which diminishes productivity and increases costs of operation.

Ms. Foster said that freight rail is also a major topic in the Freight Plan, and specifically mentioned the CSX National Gateway and the Norfolk Southern Crescent Corridor as significant projects affecting the region. She noted the interaction between freight and passenger rail, citing VRE, MARC, and Amtrak use of freight railways. She said that the Freight plan also addresses air cargo, which is expected to grow nearly 500 percent in tonnage by 2030. She also mentioned maritime movement in the region, noting that approximately 1 million tons of goods, worth \$69 million, are moved annually by water through barge movements.

Ms. Foster summarized some elements of the relationship between freight and the environment, including the importance of land use and zoning decisions, and emphasized that modifying the truck fleet and its use has great potential to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. She highlighted the benefits of planned major rail projects in the region, including potential reductions in vehicle miles traveled that would result from the CSX National Gateway and the Norfolk Southern Crescent Corridor projects. She mentioned that another initiative of the Freight Plan is the freight database, which represents a compilation of projects beneficial to freight movement in the region. She said there are 41 rail projects and 61 highway projects in the database, all of which were drawn from existing documents, such as the 2009 CLRP, the Maryland Freight Plan, the Maryland Rail Plan, and the region's railroad companies. She said this database is a source for the Freight Subcommittee to prioritize in the future and come up with a list of top projects.

Ms. Foster highlighted the final recommendations of the plan, which include: (1) to continue to enhance the program, (2) to regularly update the TPB on freight-related developments, (3) to continue special outreach to the freight community, (4) to work on jurisdictional-level freight profiles, (5) to explore new freight data opportunities, (6) to work on a freight forum in the future to raise awareness, and (7) to encourage more freight and passenger rail coordination.

Mr. Snipper asked if the set of projects includes a large, expensive project to shift rail freight away from the Capitol.

Ms. Foster clarified that the project alternatives described in the National Capital Planning Commission study on routing rail freight away from the Capitol are not included in the TPB Freight Plan.

Mr. Donley noted that item 7 on page 16 of the plan states, "The TPB Freight Program will encourage rail stakeholders to coordinate our rail planning and operational issues with TPB jurisdictions, passenger railroads, and the public." He expressed interest in hearing how the TPB is planning to improve coordination and how public safety will be protected. He acknowledged

impediments to local influence and control, citing significant preference under federal law for railroads and the interstate commerce clause, which limits a locality's ability to control land use and land-use applications on rail property. He pointed to an ethanol facility built by Norfolk Southern in his jurisdiction that is in close proximity to 6,500 dwellings, a public park and a public school, and therefore creates safety concerns. He requested that either staff report back or TPB hold a discussion about what localities can do either through COG or through local zoning to protect public safety. He emphasized the problematic nature of highly flammable and hazardous materials coming in close proximity to public facilities and dwelling units.

Ms. Tregoning mentioned previous discussions within the TPB about the conflict between passenger rail using freight lines and freight use. She said that ambitious projections about increased freight rail traffic could have a major impact on commuter rail service. She noted the plan's recommendation of better coordination, and stressed that projections for population growth will cause a greater demand for passenger rail.

Mr. Weissberg said that the representatives of freight railroads frequently attend and participate in conversations about freight and passenger rail interaction, through the Freight Subcommittee.

Ms. Tregoning asked for clarification about whether representatives from both freight and commuter rail providers participate in these conversations.

Mr. Weissberg confirmed that representatives of both regularly attend.

Mr. Wojahn said he would like to see more of an analysis of where gaps in freight service exist, and what steps can be undertaken to fill these gaps, with a specific aim of reducing reliance on truck transportation in the future.

Chairman Snyder, referring to page 16 of the report, suggested a change to the language at the end of number D(1) so that it reads: "..., with special emphasis on public safety, security, environmental, congestion-related, commuter rail and service gaps issues." He said this change would allow the TPB to better indicate some of its priority issues related to freight transportation.

Ms. Ticer seconded the motion.

Chairman Snyder said he would like to take things in the appropriate order.

Vice Chair Bowser moved to adopt Resolution R1-2011 to approve the National Capital Region Freight Plan. Vice Chairman Turner seconded the motion.

Ms. Ticer moved to amend the motion in accordance with Chairman Snyder's suggestion described above regarding language on page 16. The motion to amend was seconded and passed unanimously. The motion, as amended, to adopt Resolution R1-2011 passed unanimously.

Mr. Erenrich complimented TPB staff and specifically Ms. Foster for work on the first freight

plan adopted by the TPB.

Chairman Snyder also thanked TPB staff, and said that the Freight Plan is a significant accomplishment.

9. Approval of Technical Assistance Recipients under the FY 2011 Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program

Ms. Crawford provided a presentation on the proposed projects for the FY 2011 Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Technical Assistance Program and the proposed timeline for FY 2011 project completion. She noted that at the close of the FY 2010 round of the TLC Technical Assistance Program, the TPB has funded 39 technical assistance projects in 19 jurisdictions for a total of \$1,030,000.

Ms. Crawford said the TPB issued a call for projects for the FY 2011 round of TLC technical assistance on March 12, 2010, with a deadline of May 12, 2010. She said TPB staff conducted an application workshop on April 1, 2010. She said that for this application cycle, \$220,000 from the TPB's FY 2011 UPWP is available for technical assistance projects, and MDOT committed \$100,000 from its technical assistance account for projects in Maryland, with special emphasis on projects relating to transit-oriented development (TOD). She said the TPB received 13 applications: the District of Columbia submitted two applications; Maryland jurisdictions submitted nine applications; and Virginia jurisdictions submitted two applications. She said the TLC Selection Panel met on June 15, 2010, to review the project applications and develop a list of recommended projects for the FY 2011 round of TLC technical assistance. She said the panel selected eight projects and that MDOT staff supports the five projects that the selection panel recommended for funding in Maryland.

Ms. Crawford added that staff is reviewing an external assessment of the TLC Program conducted on the FY 2009 and FY 2010 rounds of technical assistance that was undertaken in spring 2010 and will be available later this calendar year.

Mr. Zimmerman moved to approve the recommended TLC technical assistance recipients under the FY 2011 TLC program. Mr. Olson seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Bowser asked staff to provide an indication as to why some applications were not selected for funding.

Ms. Crawford said that five applications were not selected in part due to limited funding. She added that the selection panel tried to fairly distribute the funding around the region, keeping in mind jurisdictions that have recently received funding. She said that TPB could provide to applying jurisdictions feedback on their applications based on the panel's review. She said in future application reviews, the selection panel would particularly be emphasizing clarity of scope and the theme of affordable housing. She provided a brief overview of why the District's Mount

Pleasant project was not selected. She said the selection panel was concerned that the scope of the project, limited only to wayfinding improvements as a means to spur economic development, would not yield significant benefits by itself and that the challenge of attracting foot traffic to the neighborhood required a more comprehensive approach.

Vice Chair Bowser said she was interested in details for all five unfunded applications.

Ms. Crawford said she would be happy to provide this information, but offered to speak with jurisdictions offline in the interest of time.

Vice Chair Bowser said it would be helpful as part of the presentation for the Board to have some idea of the context in which the selection panel was operating. She noted that the selection panel aims to achieve relatively even distribution of funding throughout the region and that she does not think the panel was successful. She said it would be interesting to know why certain projects were not advanced.

Ms. Crawford provided information for the four remaining unfunded projects. She said the selection panel did not recommend funding the City of Bowie project because the proposal was not entirely clear as to how the City planned to carry out the recommendations of the proposed traffic safety summit. She said that the panel felt the ferry concept proposed by Charles County was very interesting, but that it would be more compelling if the County partnered with Prince William County to submit a joint application on this topic. She said that for the project submitted by the City of Frederick, the selection panel did not understand how the scope outlined in the project would manage growth in the proposed project area. She said that the selection panel liked ideas included in the project submitted by the City of Takoma Park, but thought this project might be best completed as part of a local university charrette as it did not seem like an appropriate use of TLC funding. She added that TPB staff was available to work with jurisdictions during the two month solicitation period to review and help refine TLC applications, and will again be available for such consultation during future application cycles.

Ms. Krimm asked if part of the selection process includes providing feedback to jurisdictions whose applications are not funded.

Ms. Crawford said staff provides feedback to the jurisdictions following the action at the TPB meeting.

Vice Chair Bowser recommended that the TLC selection process might benefit from having TPB staff provide guidance as a best and final offer to the jurisdictions. She said that if there is something that the panelists do not understand, clarification could occur before project recommendations are made. She noted that some of the reasons projects were not funded might be answered by a phone call to the jurisdiction.

Ms. Krimm said she agreed with Vice Chair Bowser's suggestion for additional opportunities for clarification of project scopes before the panel makes its recommendations.

The motion to approve the recommended TLC technical assistance recipients under the FY 2011 TLC program passed unanimously.

Ms. Erickson of MDOT distributed a handout to the Board regarding a recent commitment of the O'Malley administration to increased transit ridership and the improvement of the connection between land-use and transportation. She said that in 2008, the Maryland General Assembly passed legislation designed to facilitate transit-oriented development (TOD) in Maryland. She said the legislation defines TOD to be a transportation purpose which authorizes MDOT to use departmental resources, including land, funds, and personnel to support designated TOD projects. She said that on June 18, 2010, Governor O'Malley named 14 Maryland transit stations as designated sites for TOD. She said seven of these stations are in the Washington region and that two, the Naylor Road Metro Station and the Twinbrook Metro Station, are the focus of two projects just approved by the TPB for inclusion in the FY 2011 TLC Technical Assistance Program.

10. Approval of TPB Participation in the Submission by COG of a Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Application to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

Mr. Roberston summarized for the TPB the parameters of the Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant program being administered by HUD in partnership with EPA and USDOT. He noted that the intent of the grant meshes well with recent activities of COG and the TPB to promote livable, sustainable communities and explore alternative scenarios for regional growth, as well as recent cross-jurisdictional and multi-sectoral collaboration for the Greater Washington 2050 and Region Forward efforts. He said that the grant program is designed to encourage regional, integrated approaches to the challenges of dealing with regional growth and maintaining regional vitality.

Mr. Robertson also explained that the involvement of the TPB is not only required in order to qualify for funding through the federal grant program, but is also crucial for putting forward an application that reflects an integrated approach and incorporates regional transportation goals, and for implementing the region's proposal should it be awarded funding.

Mr. Mataya gave a PowerPoint presentation describing the origins and requirements of the federal grant program and outlining the grant application as proposed by COG staff. He noted the August 23 deadline for the grant application and the requirement to form a regional consortium consisting of local jurisdictions, universities, and relevant non-profit organizations and led by a regional entity. He also described the match requirements for the grant, which can include in-kind services and other sources of federal funding committed to the effort. He explained how the proposal would be based on the findings of the COG Region Forward report and described the process for finalizing the application.

Mr. Mataya said that the federal inter-agency initiative is designed to provide incentives for regions to have current, integrated regional sustainability plans, and that even if applications are not selected for funding in this year's grant program, applicants will have preferred status in obtaining funds through related programs at all three agencies. He said that the program represents an opportunity for the region to leverage existing sustainability efforts and funding commitments into additional resources, and to focus on improving the region's communities and the competitiveness of the region as a whole. He said the approach to the proposal builds on Region Forward by focusing on regional equity and seeking to build complete communities and sustainable centers and corridors.

Mr. Robertson explained that the action before the TPB is to endorse the application and approve a commitment of a portion of the TPB UPWP toward the match of the potential federal grant, along with indicating the TPB's intent to participate in the implementation of the proposal should it be funded.

Vice Chairman Turner moved to adopt Resolution R2-2011 to approve TPB participation in the consortium for the COG submission of a Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Application to HUD by the due date of August 23.

Mr. Donley seconded the motion.

Mr. Donley asked for clarification on the match requirement for the grant, particularly when commitments by local governments would need to be made.

Mr. Robertson noted that the match can consist of in-kind resources, and that the total match amount required for the application as proposed would be \$1 million over three years, to which the COG Board has already committed \$100,000. He also noted that federal dollars could be included as a match, which is rare for federal grant programs. He said that COG does not anticipate asking member jurisdictions for any new money for the match.

Mr. Donley said he did not mean to suggest that new money from the local jurisdictions would not be an option, but that plenty of notice would need to be given to jurisdictions before any such request. He said that the program fits well with what has been discussed by COG and the TPB over the last several years and would take the region to the next step.

Mr. Way said that although what the application proposal outlines is just a plan, there are some aspects of it that are disconcerting. Referring to page 10 of the item handout, he noted that it calls for the plan to include "recommendations, including revisions in state statutes or local government charters or regulations that govern or control local government operations so that the regional plan can be enabled, financed, and implemented."

Mr. Way said that it would be a massive undertaking to try to redefine statutes that control local government authorities and operations such as taxation, zoning, and economic development, and that this would be highly controversial. He said it goes way beyond the voluntary suggestions

included in the Region Forward report, which contemplates only providing jurisdictions with the ability to make decisions consistent with the report recommendations if they so choose. He said this proposal, if implemented, would actually start to impose a super-regional authority.

Mr. Robertson noted that the HUD grant program requires as part of implementation that local plans and state enabling legislation be critically examined, but not that local or state authority be superseded. He said the goal is to “think regionally and act locally” by stitching together all the pieces and encouraging, but not compelling state and local action.

Mr. Way asked if that were the case, why the presentation included an implementation step of revising state statutes and local government charters.

Mr. Robertson said that was a step that states and localities could choose to take based on the regional sustainability plan but would not be required to do so.

Ms. Tregoning noted that she has been an active supporter of the Region Forward effort, but said that she wondered if the application commits to an effort that would require many more resources than would be obtained through the grant. She noted that it took at least two years to develop the Region Forward report, and that this proposal contemplates something much deeper and more extensive. She asked what the value added would be from COG and the TPB participating in the HUD program, aside from the vague promise of “preferred status” for future federal funding opportunities. She said that while she ultimately supported the application, she wasn’t sure that it would be worth the effort, and that as opposed to doing further planning, the region should focus on successful implementation of the recommendations in Region Forward.

Mr. Robertson said that at this stage, development of the application would involve fine-tuning the work program tasks and deliverables to make them realistic within a \$5 million budget. He acknowledged that there could be a sense of “planning fatigue” following the Region Forward effort, but said that participating in the HUD program would be helpful to implement what has already been done by accelerating the process and providing new tools and resources, particularly regarding cutting-edge technologies for scenario work and greater community outreach and engagement.

Mr. Robertson said that through this program and other policy changes, HUD, DOT, and EPA appear to be sending signals of possible directions for transportation policy and funding structure in the next authorization. He said that participating in this sustainability grant program could help position the region to be ahead of or ready for that evolving context. He said that the activities proposed could also help examine regional plans such as the CLRP and TIP, and develop new products and tools that help shape the decisions that get made every month at the TPB and in state and local jurisdictions.

Ms. Tregoning noted that the proposal calls for gathering data to reestablish regional baselines for further analysis of trends. She said that one of the region’s strong suits is in actually measuring a lot of important indicators and trends already. She said that the best outcome of the

process might be for the region to produce a highly rated application but not actually get funded through the program, as that would allow the region to proceed with implementation steps while still getting preferred status for future federal implementation funds.

Mr. Robertson said that would not quite be his definition of a success for this process.

Vice Chairman Turner noted that the combined COG and TPB actions committing to a funding match for the application would still leave a gap of \$750,000 for the match, and that he was concerned where that portion would come from.

Mr. Robertson said that the COG Board could only for the moment pledge money from its current budget, but that his intent is to recommend commitment of funds from the FY 2012 and 2013 work program and budget, and that the TPB could do the same. He said that the project partners including non-governmental organizations and universities would be contributing to the match as well through in-kind services, and he did not anticipate any problem in meeting the 20-percent match requirement.

Vice Chairman Turner asked what the actual deliverables would be to the federal agencies at the end of the three-year period should the region be selected for the program.

Mr. Robertson said that at the end of the three-year period the region would have a regional sustainability plan that will have resulted from an aggressive outreach and engagement campaign and a planning process that will have informed and will continue to inform decisions by the TPB along with local and state boards and councils. He said the region will also have additional tools and best practices information. He said that the process will allow for an expansion of stakeholders and provide tools to build public consensus.

Vice Chairman Turner said that he is supportive of moving forward with the application, but still would like to have a better understanding of where it gets the region at the end of the process.

Chairman Snyder asked Mr. Kirby what the transportation component of the proposal would entail.

Mr. Kirby said that there will be a transportation component to the sustainable communities plan that will be focused on the objectives of sustainability and livability. He said that he sees integration working in two directions – that the transportation system needs to be supportive of land use and environmental goals, but that land-use and environmental plans need to be transportation-efficient by making best use of existing and planned capacity. He said that addressing this two-way interaction will help address climate change, water quality, and the other issues noted in Region Forward. He said that participation in the grant program would be beneficial and urged approval of the resolution.

Chairman Snyder asked how this proposal relates to the discussion of developing a Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.

Mr. Kirby said that the two are related, and that TPB staff had recommended deferring action on forming a task force to discuss a priorities plan until after the HUD grant application was completed, so that there would be a better sense of what the TPB would be called upon to do as part of that process.

Chairman Snyder asked if the best description of the transportation component as currently understood is on page 7 of the item handout.

Mr. Kirby said that the information on page 7 reflects what has been requested by HUD in the Notice of Funding Availability, and is what the TPB could be expected to commit to. He said he did not anticipate any problem in being responsive to the tasks outlined.

Mr. Kirby said in response to Ms. Tregoning that one of the real strengths of this opportunity is to look at the baseline situation and then look at where the region would like to be and where the gaps are. He agreed that the region has done a lot already as far as creating sustainable, livable communities, and that would be present in the baseline, but that there are things the region could be doing better such as getting more affordable housing in mixed-use developments and getting a better regional distribution of such development. He said analysis of baseline data should allow for a focus of effort on the things that most need to be done in the region, as opposed to redoing the discussion that took place during development of Region Forward.

Chairman Snyder noted that the goals of greater safety and reduced travel times are not mentioned in the current proposal materials, and that they should be as they are fundamental to the region's transportation challenges.

Mr. Kirby said that staff would work those concepts into the application.

Mr. Erenrich said that there needs to be a general recognition in the application proposal that there are some instances in which new roadway capacity is needed in order to achieve regional goals such as the ones just mentioned by Chairman Snyder. He asked that the application include some indication that strategic roadway capacity increases may be necessary to achieve sustainable activity centers and corridors in some instances.

Chairman Snyder asked for consideration of Resolution R2-2010, with the stipulation of including discussion of safety, travel time reduction, and the need for strategic roadway capacity increases in some instances, in the transportation component of the grant application proposal.

The motion passed by a majority vote taken by voice. Mr. Way and Ms. Comstock asked to be referenced in the record as dissenting from the majority vote.

11. Approval of Next Steps for the “Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities”

Mr. Swanson spoke in reference to a handout for Item 11, which reviewed the five next steps derived from the May 26, 2010, event: “Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities.” He said the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) endorsed the next steps and asked the TPB to act on them and to develop a plan for how to respond to the next steps. He summarized the next steps and potential actions the TPB could take to accomplish these items. He said the first step is to form a task force to determine if a regional transportation priorities plan is feasible, the formation of which it is recommended that the TPB take up again in September. He said the second step is to develop an inventory of unfunded transportation priority projects, which staff recommends be brought back to the TPB in October. He said the third step is to investigate what other MPOs are doing, which will be brought back to the TPB in October. He said the fourth step is to increase public information about how decisions are made in the region, which will be brought back to the TPB in October. He said the fifth step is a recommendation to continue the conversation, and that staff recommends reconvening the group in November at COG.

Ms. Ricks noted that the event that occurred was called a conversation on setting regional transportation priorities, but she said that she doesn’t see anything in the follow-up items that gets the TPB in the direction of actually setting regional transportation priorities. She said it was a great event, a great conversation, and that there were a lot of rich recommendations that came out at the event that are not reflected in this memo. She said that the follow-up is a bit anemic over what would really happen to get the region to a place where the TPB would begin to set a structure to achieve the goal of setting regional transportation priorities.

Mr. Swanson said that is a point that the CAC reflected at its meeting and that the CAC wants the TPB to establish a task force to determine whether such a plan would be feasible.

Ms. Tregoning said that the idea that the TPB is looking at whether it’s feasible to set regional transportation priorities seems lame. She said she thinks it would be feasible to develop such a plan and said it should be easy to establish feasibility.

Mr. Kirby said he thinks a lot of what revolves around the feasibility of such a plan is what one means by “regional transportation priorities plan.” He said there are different perspectives on the definition. He said that reviewing project information, how projects are developed, how projects get into the CLRP, and what other MPOs are doing will be helpful in this conversation. He said that what staff is proposing is to compile that information over the summer and report back in September. He said there is no intention to dilute or delay progress on this matter, but to merely put together enough information on this topic so that the Board may have a more informed discussion.

Ms. Sorenson suggested that staff add VTrans2035, Virginia's Long-Range Multimodal Transportation Plan, to the list of transportation plans to review.

Ms. Ricks asked if this memorandum and outlined tasks would provide for a discussion in a richer context in October.

Mr. Kirby said that is correct.

Ms. Ricks asked why the TPB could not move forward with the information generated at the Conversation. She said she did not understand the significance of only laying out a handful of action items to pursue over the next three months.

Mr. Kirby said the next steps represent the five main points TPB staff gleaned from the discussion and are follow-up activities that came out of the discussion. He noted that there were different perspectives on the topic and the Conversation provided possibly the first opportunity for the different committees under the TPB to come together and talk with one another. He said the event brought people together in terms of understanding the regional process, but that with a couple months of compiling the information laid out in the next steps, the TPB will be able to move forward with something fairly specific. He said TPB staff is asking the TPB to approve the outlined tasks so that the group can reconvene in the fall with more information to develop a set of more specific next steps.

Vice Chairman Turner moved to approve the recommended next steps for follow-up to the “Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities.” Ms. Ticer seconded the motion.

Chairman Snyder said he thinks the wording under the first step should be amended. He did not think it would be necessary to consider whether a task force is needed, but more so that there is an interest in considering the issue related to this task force. He said the TPB does not need to talk about forming a task force, but should move ahead and look at the issues. He suggested rewording the step to include: “Consider issues relating to a regional transportation priorities plan and report back.”

Mr. Kirby said that some people are very eager to have the task force concept advanced and that he would not want to take that piece out. The next steps represent the best efforts of TPB staff to distill what occurred at the Conversation. He said the CAC, the initiator of the Conversation, is comfortable with the recommendations, so long as staff reports back at the September TPB meeting.

Ms. Tregoning suggested rephrasing task one to read: “To form a task force to determine the scope and the process for developing a regional transportation priorities plan.” She noted that this will address the shape of the process, rather than spending time answering a “yes/no” question on the feasibility of the plan.

A motion was made to amend the document as suggested by Ms. Tregoning. The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.

Chairman Snyder asked for a vote on the motion approving the proposed work plan as amended. This motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

12. Briefing on the Results of the 2010 State of the Commute Survey for the Metropolitan Washington Region

Mr. Kirby said Mr. Ramfos' presentation would touch on the key results of the survey, which demonstrates some significant changes in behavior since 2001. He said Commuter Connections has been conducting this survey every three years since 2001.

Mr. Ramfos said this is the fourth State of the Commute Survey conducted in the past nine years. He said it is a random telephone survey conducted with approximately 600 residents from each jurisdiction in the Washington DC non-attainment area. He reviewed the preliminary highlights of the survey results. He said the survey found that more commuters were switching from driving alone to other modes of transportation, such as transit, carpooling, biking, and walking. He said the survey found that 18 percent of those who switched did so to save money. He said that the survey found that 25 percent of regional commuters telecommute at least occasionally. He noted that teleworking has grown for all employer types in the region: private, nonprofit, federal, state, and local. He reviewed statistics about access to travel facilities, such as bus stops and HOV lanes. He said the survey reported that 25 percent of commuters said their commute was more difficult than a year ago. He said that finally, the survey showed that there has been an increase in awareness of regional commuting information and resources. He said the next steps of the project will be to review a draft technical report, for which a final draft will be released in 2011.

Chairman Snyder asked what the three takeaways are from this report.

Mr. Ramfos said that there is a dramatic increase in teleworking, that the federal government is stepping up its efforts to promote teleworking, and that there is a large increase in transit use in the region.

13. Other Business

Ms. Krimm asked to be on the record as requesting information at the next TPB meeting about the status of the Virginia contribution to the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program.

14. Adjournment

Chairman Snyder adjourned the meeting at 2:22 p.m.