

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 MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
September 21, 2005**

Members and Alternates Present

Phil Mendelson, D.C. Council
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT-NOVA
Edgar Gonzalez, Montgomery County Executive Branch
Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park
Wally Covington, Prince William County
Rick Canizales, Prince William County
Brian A. Glenn, FTA
Carol Petzold, Maryland House
David F. Snyder, City of Falls Church
Andrew Fellows, City of College Park
J. Rick Gordon, Prince George's County
Rick Rybeck, DDOT
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate
Mick Staton, Loudoun County
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT
Dick White, WMATA
Julia Koster, NCPC
Nat Bottigheimer, MDOT
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Skip Coburn, DC Council
Rick Canizales, Prince William County

Lyn Erickson, MDOT - OPCP

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Gerald Miller	COG/DTP
Jim Hogan	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Jill Locantore	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Michael Farrell	COG/DTP
Anant Choudhary	COG/DTP
Dusan Vuksan	COG/DTP
Dave Robertson	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Dennis Jaffe	TPB/CAC
Randy Carroll	MDE
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Bob Chase	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Jim Clarke	Action Committee for Transit
Michael Replogle	Environmental Defense
Harry Sanders	Action Committee for Transit
Ben Ross	Action Committee for Transit
Unwanna Bellinger Dabney	FHWA – VA Division
Bonnie Bick	Prince George's
Chris Carney	Sierra Club
Bob Grow	Greater Board of Trade
Stewart Schwartz	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Robin Lewis Marlin	Nominee to CAC – DC
Takumi Yamaroto	FHWA
Marcus Bowman	IAC

1. Public Comment

Bob Grow, Greater Washington Board of Trade, thanked the Council of Governments and TPB for their leadership on the Metro funding issue. He said the Board of Trade looks forward to the October 3 Metro Funding Summit. He said the Board of Trade supports the Intercounty Connector and the TIP amendments necessary to complete that project. Finally, he said the Board of Trade is a longstanding proponent of implementing the CapCom program to improve regional transportation coordination. He said that while he understood that the Virginia and Maryland departments of transportation were supportive of CapCom, the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) was in favor of additional study of the CapCom proposal. He urged all the key partners to move forward in implementing CapCom. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Ms. Pourciau said that contrary to Mr. Grow's statement, DDOT is in full support of CapCom.

Jim Clarke, Action Committee for Transit, referred to a letter to Chairman Mendelson that had been distributed. He said the letter was signed by Michael Ashe, President of the Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 689, and by James Allen, co-Chair of the Prince George's Action for Community Transportation. He said that while the signatories were very supportive of the concept behind the Metro funding bill introduced by Congressman Davis, they were very concerned about language in the bill requiring all payments made by the local signatory governments for Metro be derived from dedicated funding sources. He said that in Maryland, transit funding is the responsibility of the state and transit payments come out of the state transportation trust fund. He said the signatories of the letter do not support any requirement for dedicated funds from the Maryland transportation trust fund.

Bob Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, said he wanted to repeat his organization's longstanding recommendation that emergency preparedness efforts in the region should focus on increasing capacity at choke points on the regions' roads. He said the inadequacies of the region's transportation network have long been apparent, just as it now seems the inadequacies of New Orleans' levees was well-known for years. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Bonnie Bick, Campaign to Reinvest in the Heart of Oxon Hill, thanked the TPB's Citizens Advisory Committee for hosting a public forum the previous evening in Oxon Hill. The subject of the meeting was alternative transportation and land use scenarios, including the issue of the regional economic divide. She emphasized the importance of getting rail on the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, which she said would reduce the regional divide. She said she hoped that regional decision makers could reconsider their support of expensive road projects, and redirect that money to circumferential rail.

Chris Carney, speaking for the Maryland, Virginia and D.C. Chapters of the Sierra Club, said those groups support full funding for Metro, but they have two concerns regarding language in the Davis bill. He said their first concern was consistent with the comments made earlier by Mr. Clarke, i.e., they were concerned about language in the bill that appeared to require that funding by

jurisdictions for Metro must come from dedicated sources. He said local jurisdictions should be able to choose the mechanisms that allow them to best fully fund Metro. Second, with regard to any land use provisions in the bill and how they relate to the TPB Vision for the region, he urged the TPB to object to any intervention on local decision-making processes as a matter of principle.

Stewart Schwartz, Coalition for Smarter Growth, said the real lesson from Hurricane Katrina is that public money on infrastructures needs to be spent more wisely on growing smarter. He said that the Pentagon's plan for base realignments and closures was an unwise decision because it would increase sprawl and reduce opportunities for alternative transportation. Likewise, he expressed concerns regarding other federal land use decisions. He said Metrorail station areas need to be used more efficiently, including the Vienna station and at Tysons Corner, which will be on the new rail line to Dulles. He said the Intercounty Connector would shift jobs and housing toward the western side of the region, exacerbating both the regional economic divide and congestion. He said regional leaders in the Reality Check exercise supported development near transit, mixed-use walkable communities, affordable housing closer to jobs, and correcting the east/west divide.

Michael Replogle, Environmental Defense, said he wanted to associate himself with the comments by Stewart Schwartz. He said that Environmental Defense and Breakthrough Technologies Institute has just released a report looking at the high occupancy/toll (HOT) lanes in the Washington region. He said that if used correctly, HOT lanes could potentially generate 23,000 new transit trips in the region with a new system of bus rapid transit making use of the HOT lanes. But he said if used incorrectly, HOT lanes could simply help facilitate the movement of jobs and housing farther out from the center of the region. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the July 20, 2005 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Referring to the mailout report, Mr. Mokhtari said the Technical Committee met on Friday, September 9. The committee discussed the following items, which are also on the TPB agenda:

- The committee was briefed on the Federal Highway and Transit Administration certification review of the TPB transportation planning process.
- The committee was briefed on the Safe Accountable Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equality Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU).
- The committee was briefed on the growth in requests for Commuter Connection Program

Ridesharing Assistance in relation to the recent rise in gasoline prices.

- The committee reviewed the draft 2005 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) documents, and recommended that those documents be released for public comments on September 15.
- The committee reviewed the draft result of the air quality conformity assessment for the 2005 CLRP and the FY 2006-2011 TIP.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Jaffe said the Citizens Advisory Committee met on September 15. He said the committee is developing recommendations on improving information and analysis that is available for the CLRP and the TIP. He said the committee will be providing final recommendations to the TPB sometime this fall.

Mr. Jaffe said the committee is continuing its forums on the TPB's Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study, including the meeting the previous evening in Oxon Hill.

Mr. Jaffe said the committee met with the federal review team that was conducting the federal certification review, and provided comments, which were reflected in the committee's report.

Mr. Jaffe said that during the public comment period, he found comments regarding CapCom to be confusing. He expressed concern that the positions of the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) regarding CapCom have been inconsistent.

Ms. Pourciau said it is true that DDOT has had reservations about CapCom, but that has not prevented the project from moving forward. She said that at the October meeting, the TPB would be presented with a TIP amendment to approve funding for CapCom. She said that the Volpe Transportation Center was conducting a study to more clearly define the CapCom program. She said it was important to continue discussing how the program should best proceed.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Referring to the mailout and handout material, Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on September 9. In addition to reviewing the agenda for the TPB meeting, the Steering Committee approved an amendment to the FY 2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation. He said information about the amendment was included in the mailout packet. It modified funding for projects that are exempt from air quality conformity, including highway projects, traffic signal, traffic monitoring, pedestrian crossings, and two park and ride lot improvements.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Mendelson nominated Robin Marlin to be an alternate member for the Citizens Advisory Committee for the District of the Columbia. The motion was seconded.

Vice Chairman Knapp nominated Elvin Crespo to be a member for the Citizens Advisory Committee for Maryland.

Biographical information about Ms. Marlin and Mr. Crespo was handed out.

The motions were approved unanimously.

7. Endorsement of Efforts to Identify Dedicated Funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority

Referring to the handout presentation and the mailout material, Mr. White briefed the Board on recent efforts to seek dedicated funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA). He explained the nature and extent of the system's funding shortfall and the approval in 2004 of the Metro Matters funding package, which provided short-term relief. He described H.R. 3496, legislation recently introduced by U.S. Representative Tom Davis of Virginia that would authorize \$1.5 billion over 10 years in federal funds for capital funding only for WMATA. He noted that this proposed federal funding would be contingent on amending the WMATA Compact to provide for state/local dedicated funding, establishment of an inspector general to report to the WMATA Board, and the expansion of the WMATA Board to include two federal appointees.

Mr. White said a regional summit on October 3 would focus on how state and local governments can achieve consensus on the scope and source of funding that might be identified to respond to the federal legislation.

Chairman Mendelson asked for a clarification regarding the amount of funding the system needs. He said Mr. White had said that the Davis bill would essentially fund a continuation of the Metro Matters funding package, but Mr. White had also said that Metro Matters is \$2.9 billion short of what is needed.

Mr. White said there is a mismatch in the planning horizons of different analyses. He said the Davis bill is based on the funding needs identified in the Blue Ribbon panel report that was sponsored by COG, the Board of Trade and the Federal City Council.

Ms. Porter asked if the section beginning on page 4 of the bill, Section 18(d)(1) contained the

language regarding the requirements for the local/state match.

Mr. White said that section contains the definition of what would constitute a dedicated funding source.

Ms. Porter said that the way she read the legislation does not seem to require a match. Rather, it seemed that the language required that any funding provided by localities would need to be from a dedicated funding source.

Mr. White said the legislation says two things: The current level of subsidies need to meet this definition of a dedicated funding source, and the additional monies that would match the Davis bill would need to do the same thing.

Ms. Porter said she shared concerns raised during the public comment period that by specifying a dedicated funding source the bill could in fact restrict the monies that are provided in the future from what might be provided in the absence of this bill.

Mr. White said that was a good observation. He said that one of the purposes of the summit on October 3 should be to discuss these types of concerns and how the bill should be amended.

Ms. Porter said that she believed the TPB resolution should make clear that the TPB is not endorsing a limitation on the amount or the source of local funds that might be provided for WMATA.

Ms. Petzold said she agreed with Ms. Porter's comments. On another matter, she asked if Mr. White anticipated that the Congressional bill would have to be passed before state legislatures would take up the amendments to the Compact.

Mr. White said that it would be possible for either Congress or the state legislatures to act first. He said it was important that all participants begin to strategize on how to proceed. He said he believed that the earliest that the federal legislation could be concluded would be the next federal fiscal year. At the state/local level, he noted that actions could be divided into separate steps: a Compact amendment first followed by revenue actions.

Mr. Zimmerman said he wished to associate himself with the comments of Ms. Porter and Ms. Petzold. He said he had not previously understood that the language in the bill would actually require that all funds for Metro would need to be dedicated. He questioned whether this restriction was actually intended. He said it did not appear to make sense.

Mr. White assured Mr. Zimmerman that the restriction was intended. He said that WMATA staff had expressed serious concerns regarding this language to Mr. Davis' staff, but Mr. Davis had decided to leave the language in the bill, at least for the time being.

Mr. Zimmerman said that as a whole, the bill was more positive than questionable. He said he was very appreciative of Congressman Davis' efforts, but he said he expected there would be negotiation about some of the specific provisions in the legislation.

Ms. Pourciau asked if the WMATA Board had taken any type of action with regard to the legislation.

Mr. White said the WMATA Board had not yet taken action.

Vice Chairman Knapp asked what organization or institutional structure at the state and local level should be taking the lead in responding to the legislation.

Mr. White said that was a good question. He said that members of the WMATA board had begun meeting with appropriate representatives from the states to determine what group should take the lead in responding from the local and state level.

Vice Chairman Knapp asked if one of the objectives of the summit was to determine who will assume the leadership of this effort.

Mr. White said that was correct.

Chairman Mendelson moved TPB Resolution R3-2006. The motion was seconded by Mr. Zimmerman.

Ms. Porter offered an amendment with two parts:

- Under "Now therefore be it resolved," in the second bullet, lines 4 and 5, strike the remainder of the sentence beginning with the words "as called for..." Ms. Porter explained that this deletion would make it clear that the TPB is not endorsing the bill as it currently stands, although she emphasized that she appreciates Congressman Davis' work on this legislation.
- At the end of the second bullet, add a sentence: "We do not endorse any attempt to limit the sources of funds local jurisdictions may rely on to support WMATA."

The motion to amend the resolution was seconded.

Ms. Petzold suggested that the language introduced by Ms. Porter should be amended to remove the words "attempt to" so that it would read "We do not endorse any limit on the sources of funds."

Ms. Porter agreed to the language suggested by Ms. Petzold.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the Board should consider questions regarding the legislation related to the disposition of property by WMATA.

Ms. Porter said that those are things that make it very important that transit access for her constituents be continued.

Chairman Mendelson said that there was limited time to deal with this item.

Mr. Zimmerman said although he did not want to get specific, he simply wanted to suggest that the disposition of properties, regardless of any particular case, might not be something that Congress should be addressing. He said the notion of Congress determining how WMATA should dispose of specific properties might not be something consistent with the general positions of most Board members in terms of relationships between governments.

Chairman Mendelson advised that property issues should be dealt with in a separate resolution because the resolution currently before the Board dealt exclusively with the funding issue.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that all these issues were part of the same bill.

Ms. Smith said she was well acquainted with some of the property in Fairfax County referenced in the legislation. She said that it was important that the resolution before the Board only address the funding aspect of the legislation. She said it was important to be clear that the resolution was not endorsing any other parts of the bill.

Chairman Mendelson asked if Ms. Smith was comfortable with the resolution, with the amendment by Ms. Porter as amended by Ms. Petzold.

Ms. Smith said she was.

Mr. Covington asked if the resolution only applied to WMATA members.

Mr. Zimmerman said that it is clear in the legislation itself that the funding issue is directed solely at the WMATA Compact member jurisdictions. He also noted that the resolution was not an endorsement of a tax increase.

Vice Chairman Knapp proposed an amendment in the first sentence of the first bullet, following the words "emphasizes the criticality of identifying the additional funding," inserting the language, "and improved management oversight and cost-effective operation..."

There being no objection to the amendment, it was accepted.

The motion to approve the resolution, as amended, was approved unanimously.

8. Report on TPB Transportation Planning Process Certification Review

Ms. Jackson said the federal certification review team had finished a site visit in the last two days, so her remarks were very preliminary observations. She said federal law and regulation requires the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration every three years to jointly review the planning processes at Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), including the TPB. She thanked the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee and staff for their cooperation and assistance in this process. She commented that under SAFETEA-LU, the next review would be in 2009.

Mr. Brian Glenn from the Federal Transit Administration provided some preliminary observations:

- The federal team recognizes the high quality of public information publications such as the Citizens Guide and the Region magazine. He said they believe these documents help the stakeholders and the public understand the regional planning process better.
- The team noted the TPB's work through the Access for All Committee to include low-income, minority and disabled populations in the metropolitan planning process. They encouraged additional efforts to identify ways to enhance visibility of compliance with Title VI recommendations.
- The team acknowledged early efforts to bring freight considerations into some aspects of the planning process. The team encouraged expansion of these efforts, including outreach to the stakeholders.
- The team commended the active approach to improving the development of the transportation travel demand models and encourages further enhancement of data collection and quality.
- The team acknowledged the completion of the regional ITS architecture by the Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Committee as a crucial first step. They encouraged continuous follow-up efforts to ensure implementation.
- The team commended the TPB's innovative efforts in scenario planning to raise critical regional issues, such as the importance of regional jobs and housing balance.
- The team suggested improvements in the documentation and transparency of financial planning, including key assumptions in the CLRP and the TIP.
- The team would like to see improvement in the documentation and transparency of the project selection process, to build on the successful documentation in the Citizens Guide.
- The team would like to see specifically demonstrated how federal planning requirements are addressed at key points in the transportation planning process, including consideration of the federally required planning factors.
- The team would like to see a comprehensive description of a regional congestion

management system to demonstrate its application at critical stages of the metropolitan planning process.

- The team would like to see an evaluation of the effectiveness of regional public involvement efforts. Mr. Glenn noted that this was a recommendation in the 2002 Federal Certification.
- The team encouraged the resolution of the FTA's transit bus and commuter rail funding allocation issues involving the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO), WMATA, and the Potomac and Rappahanock Transportation Commission (PRTC).

Ms. Petzold asked if the recommendations would be provided in writing.

Ms. Jackson said they hoped the formal report would be completed within the next three to six months.

9. Briefing on Reauthorization of the Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century

Mr. Kirby said President Bush signed the new federal surface transportation reauthorization into law on August 10, almost two years after the previous one expired. He said the bill contained some good provisions, including increased federal funding for transportation in general and for planning in particular.

Referring to the handout presentation, Ms. Klancher briefed the Board on aspects of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). Her presentation included information on metropolitan planning provisions, pricing provisions, and funding for regional transportation coordination during incidents.

Mr. Zimmerman said he would like more specific information related to the new legislation. He said he would like to know how much additional funding would be coming to the TPB. He said he would like to know how much of that funding is designated for specific purposes and how much is discretionary. He said he would like more information on the requirements for MPO planning that will become effective July 1, 2007. Specifically, he said he would like more detail on the "required consultation with agencies," including agencies responsible for land use.

Under Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funding, Mr. Zimmerman said that eligibility is expanded, including diesel retrofit programs. He asked to what degree this may jeopardize current funding for transit vehicles. He said he was also interested in getting a clarification of the language stating that "states must give priority to cost-effective congestion mitigation activities."

Mr. Kirby said that priority is to be given to both "eligible diesel retrofits" and "cost-effective congestion mitigation activities." He said this means that diesel retrofits have been added into the

priority list, but not to the exclusion of other things that have been done in the past.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the pilot pricing program described on slide 20 was not very large. He suggested that this money may already be designated, but he said it should be looked into.

Mr. Zimmerman suggested that staff should examine the bill to determine where there might be opportunities for funding for the region or for the states and jurisdictions in the region.

Chairman Mendelson asked that this item be put on the agenda for next month.

Mr. Snyder asked that next month's agenda also include information on the CapCom earmark and how to proceed with using it.

Mr. Kirby said that staff would come back next month and be more specific about how that money can be put into action.

Ms. Jackson asked that staff work with the federal agencies to provide answers to the questions that have been raised.

Chairman Mendelson agreed that staff would work with the federal agencies to provide this information.

10. Briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2005 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Chairman Mendelson asked that this item be handled before the briefing on Commuter Connections, which was previously listed at Item 10.

Mr. Kirby said that the documents for this item were released with the mailout packet on September 15.

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Clifford briefed the Board on the draft air quality conformity determination for the 2005 Constrained Long Range Plan and the FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program. He explained the work activities in preparing the conformity analysis. He described the results, which he said provide a basis for a determination of conformity by the Board.

11. Status Report on Fine Particles (PM_{2.5}) Conformity Analysis for the 2005 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2006-2011 Transportation

Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Clifford said that on the issue of PM2.5, all regions around the country were beginning the process of determining how to conduct a conformity analysis because the non-attainment designation for PM2.5 was issued within the last year. He said TPB staff developed a work scope in July and has been working to implement that. In August EPA released some guidance on how to construct inventories for particulate matter. That guidance basically affirmed everything that was in the TPB's work scope, although it did provide different examples about the level of detail that might be appropriate for constructing an inventory.

Mr. Clifford said the inputs for conducting the analysis have not yet been finalized, so the PM2.5 analysis will not be performed until October or November. He said the TPB has until April to obtain federal approval for a conformity determination for PM2.5.

Chairman Mendelson said he was confused that this conformity determination would be performed after the CLRP and TIP are approved.

Mr. Clifford said that the conformity determinations for ozone and wintertime carbon monoxide, as discussed under the previous item, were scheduled for approval in conjunction with the CLRP and TIP approvals in October. However, he said the PM2.5 designation was a new requirement and the guidance on how to perform this conformity analysis was only released the previous week. He said that there is no State Implementation Plan (SIP) for PM2.5 in place yet, and therefore conformity must be demonstrated under interim guidance.

Chairman Mendelson asked what the conformity determination would be based upon. He noted that there is no SIP in place with emissions budgets for use in conformity.

Mr. Clifford said it would be based on reductions from a base year 2002 condition.

Chairman Mendelson asked what would happen if the conformity analysis for PM2.5 reveals a problem. He asked if the CLRP and TIP would have to be reopened.

Mr. Clifford said the TPB would have until April to obtain approval of conformity with respect to PM2.5. If that does not happen, the plan will lapse.

Chairman Mendelson asked if there is any reason to be concerned that problems might arise in this regard.

Mr. Kirby said that staff hoped there would not be problems. He said it appeared that the trend toward cleaner vehicles will bring particle emissions down. However, he noted that there is not as much turnover with diesel engines as with lighter vehicles, and with particulates being very much attributable to diesel engines there may not be quite the dramatic drop that is anticipated in

emissions from lighter vehicles. But nevertheless, staff believed the reductions would be sufficient.

Mr. Bottigheimer emphasized that the previously required conformity and PM2.5 conformity were two separate processes.

Ms. Ticer said she had always understood that particulate emissions were largely associated with power plants.

Mr. Kirby said that vehicles emit particulates, and therefore there is a conformity requirement within the mobile sector. He explained that the SIP for PM2.5 will include all sources of emissions, including power plants. The SIP will establish the amount of emissions from different sources and identify the most cost-effective strategies for reducing them.

Referring back to the previous item, Chairman Mendelson said it was not clear from the document that the conformity analysis has been completed and that the CLRP is in conformity.

Mr. Clifford said the analysis has been completed and the CLRP and TIP were found to be in conformity for ozone. He said the forecasted emissions were well within the mobile emissions budgets established in the SIP.

Mr. Gonzales said that the conformity finding under the previous item should be considered a cause for celebration, particularly because even though vehicle miles of travel (VMT) are expected increase, forecasted emissions are well within the mobile emissions budgets.

Mr. Kirby offered a qualification, noting that the forecasted emissions are meeting the one-hour standard, but there is no eight-hour SIP at this point. He noted that the eight-hour standard will have to be met in the future, and that standard is expected to be tighter.

Regarding the CLRP, Chairman Mendelson noted that he had raised three issues at the beginning of the year that he would like to see as priority areas for this year's CLRP. One of those priority areas was how the submissions for the CLRP and the TIP correlate with the regional activity centers.

Mr. Kirby said an analysis of this issue was being prepared and would be presented at the October meeting.

Chairman Mendelson noted that another priority area was traffic signal optimization.

Mr. Kirby said that staff has analyzed this question and would present that information at the October meeting.

Chairman Mendelson said that the third of his priorities for the CLRP was transportation coordination through CapCom. He asked if CapCom would be added to the CLRP.

Mr. Kirby said that although the federal funding had only recently been received, he believed that an action could be taken to add the funds to the CLRP and TIP in October.

Chairman Mendelson asked if that action would also require state/local funding to meet the 80:20 required federal match.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct. State/local funding would have to be included in the action.

12. Briefing on Recent Activities in the Commuter Connections Program

Mr. Kirby said he wanted to make a few points quickly. He said that as a result of the higher gasoline prices, Commuter Connections was receiving an increased number of applications to the ridesharing programs.

Referring to the handout presentation, Mr. Kirby called attention to statistics from a 2004 survey on the potential for teleworking. He said the survey found that the opportunities to increase teleworking were significant. He said the Commuter Connections telework program is relatively small, about \$160,000 a year. But a new private sector organization called Telework Exchange has recently begun work to promote telework through a very extensive advertising campaign.

Mr. Kirby said he wanted to let the TPB know that Commuter Connections is not designing these advertisements. But he said that the promotion of teleworking was a worthy goal, and this private sector effort would be expending considerably more money than the TPB could afford.

13. Other Business

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.