

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 15, 2009**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Bill Bronrott, Maryland House
Kerry Donley, Alexandria City Council
Dan Drummond, City of Fairfax
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Brian Glenn, FTA
Jason Groth, Charles County
Don Halligan, MDOT
Tom Harrington, WMATA
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Charles Jenkins, Frederick County
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Julia Koster, NCPC
Michael C. May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Rick Rybeck, DDOT
Paul Smith, City of Frederick
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning

Todd Turner, City of Bowie
Margaret Vanderhuy, Virginia House of Delegates
Jonathan Way, City of Manassas
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Bill Wren, Manassas Park
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby
Michael Clifford
Gerald Miller
Robert Griffiths
Nicholas Ramfos
Andrew Meese
Debbie Leigh
Deborah Etheridge
Andrew Austin
Tim Canan
Daivamani Sivasailam
Andrew Meese
Wenjing Pu
Michael Farrell
Michael Eichler
Monica Bansal
Wendy Klancher
Beth Newman
Darren Smith
John Swanson
Dave Robertson COG/EO
Jeff King COG/DEP
Lewis Miller COG/OPA
Bill Orleans PG ACT
Betsy Massie PRTC
Alex Verzosa City of Fairfax
Tom Biesiadny Fairfax County DOT
Stephen Flippin CSX Director of Federal Affairs
Christine Hoeffner Virginia Railway Express
David Aubrey DRPT
Greg McFarland NVTC
Alyssa Brown PWC BOCS
Joseph Madison Maryland Transit
Sean Kennedy WMATA

Douglas Stewart
Eric Gilliland
Charlie Scott

Fairfax Advocate for Better Bicycling
Washington Area Bicyclists Association
WMATA

1. Public Comment

Eric Gilliland, Director of the Washington Area Bicyclists Association (WABA), expressed WABA's support for the region's TIGER grant application to create a regional rapid bus system and expressed a desire that the project should include shared bicycle and bus lanes. He also supported the bike-sharing component of the proposal and encouraged other jurisdictions to consider bike sharing. Finally, he expressed dissatisfaction with the amount of funding for bicycle and pedestrian programs in the draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Douglas Stewart, Fairfax Advocates for Better Bicycling, also spoke in support of the TIGER grant application. He said his organization would like to see the bike-sharing component of the proposal extended to Fairfax County.

Bob Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, noted a continuing deterioration of travel conditions in the ten years since the TPB Vision was approved. He said the Vision Statement's Year 2000 Action Agenda remains largely unacted upon, including adoption and funding of specific regional priorities and adequately maintaining the region's transit systems. He said the priority bus proposal has great merit, but he questioned the use of federal stimulus funds for bike sharing. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

2. Approval of the Minutes from the June 17, 2009 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 handout summary, Mr. Erenrich noted some key items on the TPB's agenda, which the Technical Committee had reviewed, including the 2009 CLRP, FY2010-2015 TIP and air quality assessment, the TLC Program's technical assistance projects, and the National Gateway Freight Rail Initiative.

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Referring the handout report, Mr. Keough said the CAC met the previous Thursday and discussed a variety of issues related to the update in FY2010 of the long-range plan. The committee discussed a number of issues related to public involvement, which were detailed in the CAC report. The committee also discussed the development of a new document that will strongly encourage the TPB to use the upcoming plan update cycle as an opportunity to develop a regional priorities plan that will use the TPB's scenarios as its basis. He noted that the CAC since 2005 has been calling for the development of a regional plan that will not be constrained by funding and will reflect regional consensus about unfunded priority projects for the region. He said the committee believes that this year is the time to act on that recommendation. He said the CAC will hold a special meeting in August to refine the committee's recommendations.

Ms. Vanderhye asked how the development of a regional priorities plan would account for the fact that the TPB includes three sovereign jurisdictions whose funding streams are likely to remain separate.

Mr. Keough said these divisions are very real, but he also noted the importance of identifying regional priorities and putting aside, at least to some degree, parochial differences.

Mr. Erenrich asked that the CAC in September provide a briefing to the Technical Committee on its proposal. He also emphasized the importance of getting feedback from staff on the CAC proposal.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee did not act on any resolutions at its last meeting. He called attention to the letters packet, which included the letter to the region's congressional delegation that the TPB approved in June focusing on the shortfalls in the Highway Trust Fund. Mr. Kirby also called attention to a brief document that described the Obama administration's proposal for addressing the shortfall in the Highway Trust Fund in a "Stage 1 Reauthorization." This document says that the only way of dealing with this shortfall is to put general revenue, amounting to approximately \$20 billion, into the trust fund for this year and next year. It would include some interim reforms, but would not call for a substantial reformulation of the current transportation programs. He noted that some aspects of the administration document are quite consistent with the policy principles that the TPB approved last September, including the concept of a National Infrastructure Bank.

Mr. Kirby also called attention to an article from the Washington Post on the TPB's ridesharing program, which was very positive.

Mr. Rybeck requested an amendment to the agenda so that the TPB could amend the 2009 CLRP and the FY 2010-2015 TIP to include projects that are part of a grant application from DDOT for federal stimulus funding for a high-speed inter-city passenger rail proposal. He suggested the

items could be handled separately or could be considered as part of Items 9 and 10 on the TPB agenda.

Chairman Jenkins asked that this request be considered under Items 9 and 10.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Jenkins welcomed a new member, Alexandria City Councilmember Kerry Donley.

7. Review of Comments Received and Acceptance of Recommended Responses for Inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Assessment, the 2009 CLRP, and the FY 2010-2015 TIP

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said that only one written comment had been received, which was the comment made by Mr. Gilliland in Item 1 of the agenda. He said that the same comment had been made by members of the Citizens Advisory Committee at a meeting on June 11 when they were reviewing the TIP and noted that they did not see enough funding explicitly called out for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Referring to the handout memo responding to the comment, Mr. Kirby noted that the state departments of transportation have indicated that the TIP understates this funding partly because bicycle and pedestrian components that are included in larger highway projects are not broken out explicitly as projects. In other cases, bike/ped projects are funded locally. Mr. Kirby said the first step in addressing this comment would be to work with the implementing agencies to determine how much money is being devoted to these projects. He said that staff would try to get that information in time for the fall forum that will kick off the planning cycle for FY2010.

Mr. Zimmerman said that he understood that Mr. Kirby was saying that the TIP does include more bicycle projects than indicated, but that staff has no way of saying how much is dedicated to those projects. He said this was not a very satisfactory answer.

Mr. Kirby said it was the best answer he could give at the moment.

Mr. Zimmerman said that in taking action to approve the TIP, he would like to offer an amendment directing staff in the final document to show specifically what bicycle projects are included as well as the total level of funding for those projects.

Mr. Kirby said there would be a motion under Item 10 to approve the TIP, which would be the appropriate point to add such language.

Ms. Sorenson indicated that it would be easier to identify those projects that have bicycle components included than to establish a precise level of funding.

8. Approval of Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Posey briefed the Board on the summary report for the air quality conformity analysis of the 2009 CLRP and the FY2010-2015 TIP. She said that compared to last year, the forecasts showed a net increase in emissions, but the region will still meet the criteria necessary to adhere to the conformity regulations.

Ms. Posey said that during the public comment period, which ended on July 11, only one letter was received, which was from the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC). She said that letter indicated that MWAQC is pleased that the analysis finds adherence to the current emissions budgets as well as to the proposed budgets, although the letter also expressed concern that EPA has not yet approved the proposed budgets. MWAQC further noted the increase in emissions, especially in 2010, and encouraged the TPB to watch the trends that are causing that increase in emissions. MWAQC also strongly urged state and local governments to maintain their commitments to transportation emission reduction measures. Ms. Posey noted a TPB response in the mailout material indicating that the TPB appreciates MWAQC's concerns.

Ms. Posey said that the full report is approximately 400 pages and can be found on the COG/TPB website. She said that the Board is being asked to approve Resolution R1-2010, which finds that the 2009 CLRP and the FY2010-2015 TIP conform with the requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments.

A motion was made to approve the resolution. The motion was seconded and was passed unanimously.

9. Approval of the 2009 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP)

Referring the mailout material, Mr. Kirby noted the third paragraph of the explanatory memo that said that in contrast to previous years there are no significant new projects being added to this year's CLRP. With state and local budgets facing drastic shortfalls, most of the changes proposed will delay completion dates of existing projects and, in some cases, remove projects from the plan altogether.

Referring to the handout material, Mr. Rybeck said he wanted to move four amendments to the CLRP and TIP. He explained that under the federal stimulus program, the high-speed inter-city passenger rail program grant applications are due August 24. Unlike Maryland and Virginia, which have rail programs that are already in place, the District of Columbia has not heretofore had any rail programs. If the District were to receive these grants, there would be no existing programs to include these projects. Therefore, it was determined that CLRP and TIP amendments would be necessary. He noted that all of the projects are exempt from the

conformity requirements. Referring to the handout material, he described the four projects in detail.

Chairman Jenkins asked if the escalator replacement at Union Station had gone out for bids.

Mr. Rybeck said the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation has already contracted with a firm to create design specifications, but they have not gone out to bid because they are not funded.

Mr. Zimmerman asked whether a CLRP/TIP amendment was really necessary to replace escalators at a train station.

Mr. Rybeck said it was not clear if it was necessary, but this action was being requested to be sure all potential requirements were met. He noted that the federal application form had indicated that inclusion in the State Transportation Improvement Program – and therefore in the TPB's TIP and CLRP – was required.

Mr. Zimmerman said he supported these projects but he had concerns about getting into this level of detail at the TPB.

Mr. Erenrich asked who owns Union Station.

Mr. Rybeck said that Union Station is owned by the U.S. Department of Transportation, which leases it to the Union Station Redevelopment Corporation, which is a quasi-governmental organization.

Mr. Erenrich asked if these projects are included in a Union Station master plan.

Mr. Rybeck answered yes.

Chairman Jenkins asked if it would be more appropriate to accept these amendments as part of Item 10 versus Item 9.

Mr. Kirby said they should be included in both items.

Chairman Jenkins asked if there was objection to any of these projects being included in the CLRP under this item.

Mr. Donley said he understood the use of federal transportation funding for escalators, but he was concerned about the use of these funds for bathrooms. He expressed doubt that the quality of bathrooms would influence travel decisions.

Mr. Rybeck said that current state of the bathrooms at Union Station was a deterrent to train patronage. He said that studies have shown that intercity train ridership is contingent upon the level of convenience and comfort that passengers perceive. As an example, he noted that in the late 1970s, the main building of Union Station was closed and Amtrak passengers were forced to walk around the building to get their trains. While the level of service remained the same, ridership fell, which was at least in part due to the reduced level of convenience. He said that when passengers encounter inconveniences on a regular basis, such as poorly maintained bathrooms, it does affect their travel choices. He also emphasized that station enhancements, including bathroom improvements, are eligible costs under the federal criteria.

Mr. Rybeck moved Resolution R2-2010 to approve the 2009 CLRP. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Rybeck moved an amendment to the motion to include the four amendments, which he presented, to the 2009 CLRP. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

The motion to approve Resolution R2-2010, as amended, was approved unanimously.

10. Approval of the FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Referring to the mailout and handout material, Mr. Kirby noted that the TIP is a thick document that is not particularly user-friendly. He said that staff would be making attempts in the next cycle to provide more citizen-friendly information on the TIP.

He noted that based on discussion during previous items, the approval of this document would also include amendments offered by Mr. Rybeck. He also noted Mr. Zimmerman's request that the TIP document should include more comprehensive lists of bicycle/pedestrian projects, although he suggested that, per Ms. Sorenson's recommendation, this improved information would identify projects, but not necessarily funding levels.

A motion was made to adopt Resolution R3-2010, to approve the TIP. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Rybeck moved an amendment to the motion to include the four projects included earlier in the CLRP. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

Mr. Zimmerman expressed concerns about Mr. Kirby's suggestion that lists of bicycle projects be included but not costs. He moved that the motion be amended to direct staff to include a separate analysis and description of bicycle projects with funding levels where possible. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

The main motion, to adopt Resolution R3-2010 as amended, was approved unanimously.

11. Certification of the Urban Transportation Planning Process for the National Capital Region

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said that this item is a federal regulatory requirement for the TPB in its role as a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). He briefly described the TPB's federal responsibilities, which were highlighted in the draft resolution. He said the Board was being asked to approve the resolution and subsequently, the TPB chairman and representatives of the three state departments of transportation would be asked to sign it.

Mr. Zimmerman said he saw no communication objecting to any aspect of this certification.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct.

Mr. Zimmerman said this item was an example of federal red tape that could be greatly streamlined. He said the TPB goes through this process every year and he finds it to be a waste of time. But he acknowledged that it was a requirement, so he moved approval of Resolution R4-2010 endorsing the appended statement and certification. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

12. Approval of the Technical Assistance Recipients under the FY2010 Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Swanson briefed the Board on the TLC Program. He described the origins and structure of the program. He noted that the TLC selection panel had recommended that seven projects receive funding under the FY2010 TLC Technical Assistance Program. He briefly described each of the recommended projects. He thanked the selection panel, chaired by Ms. Koster, for their assistance and guidance.

Ms. Koster thanked the TPB staff for their work on this program, which she said is important and innovative. She said the selection panel would like to explore ways in which dialogue among technical assistance recipients can be encouraged. She said one suggestion would be to hold an event among recipients. She also noted that the panel hopes that in the future the TPB might look at ways to encourage more cross-jurisdictional applications.

Mr. Turner said he understood that an additional \$100,000 for Maryland projects would be approved at a future date. He asked for more information about that process.

Mr. Swanson said an additional application process was conducted for that additional funding and the deadline was the previous Friday.

Mr. Bronrott asked how far west the Purple Line study would extend. Specifically, he was interested in whether the entire area of Langley Park, including the portions in Montgomery

County, would be included. He said it would be important to consider Langley Park in a holistic manner.

Mr. Weissberg said that he understood that the entire area of Langley Park would be considered as part of the Purple Line project.

Mr. May moved approval of the projects. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ticer and was passed unanimously.

13. Approval of Submission of a Regional Priority Bus Application for Funding under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Competitive Grant Program of ARRA

Ms. Tregoning said that the Scenario Study Task Force had been directed by Chairman Jenkins and Mr. Mendelson, the previous TPB chair, to determine how the region might develop a proposal for federal stimulus funding for a package of transportation investments that would be “game-changing.” She said that TPB staff would be giving the Board a briefing on a package of projects that would form the basis for a federal TIGER grant proposal. She said this proposal was due before the TPB reconvenes in September. She said that the presentation would reflect a set of projects totaling the maximum extent of possible projects. She said the final proposal could be no larger than \$300 million, and preferably, it would be between \$200 million and \$250 million. She noted that the TPB and the Federal Transit Administration sponsored a conference on June 24 on priority bus transit, and at the conference, some senior officials from the Department of Transportation provided some guidance regarding the proposal.

Mr. Kirby asked Ms. Bansal to make the presentation, noting that a few adjustments had been made in it following the morning meeting of the Scenario Study Task Force. He also reiterated Ms. Tregoning’s point that the task force needs to narrow down the proposal in size.

Referring to the memorandum in the mailout packets, Ms. Bansal briefed the Board on the TIGER grant proposal. She noted that priority bus treatments offer a way to improve existing bus service running on existing infrastructure. She said the federal stimulus act provided an opportunity to plan a regional system. She said the stimulus act provides a small amount nationally -- \$1.5 billion -- in competitive grants for capital projects that can deliver long-term outcomes, such as long-term economic benefit, livability benefits, environmental sustainability, safety, and a general state of good repair. She said the projects are expected to be completed by 2012. She said the package is envisioned as a first step toward a regional priority bus network in the future.

Ms. Bansal reviewed the schedule for submitting the proposal. She noted that it is due on September 15 and the next TPB meeting is September 16, which means that there is no choice but to seek the TPB’s approval of the concept that has been developed before it has been

finalized. She said that on September 4, with the TPB's approval, the TPB Steering Committee will review and approve the content of the final TIGER grant application.

Ms. Bansal described each of the projects, including cost reductions in project components that had been agreed upon at the Scenario Task Force meeting that morning. She said the projects include priority bus corridors as well as projects that enable multimodal access to bus transit, including transit centers and a regional bike-sharing initiative. She said that additional projects or specific components may be taken out if it is determined that they cannot meet the tight deadline of 2012, or if they do not meet the other major grant criteria. However, she said that nothing new will be added at this point.

She said the package would leverage considerable funding from local, state and federal sources. She said this leveraged funding would be advantageous to the proposal. She also noted that the proposal included a significant number of partners, which would also serve to make it attractive.

Mr. Kirby said that there had been informal agreement that the TPB and COG would serve as lead applicant for the proposal, with the states, WMATA and other agencies being joint applicants. He said it would be funded through either the Federal Highway Administration or the Federal Transit Administration.

Mr. Kirby asked for the Board's support by endorsing Resolution R5-2010, which was included in the mailout packet. He said it would be amended with the updated information that Ms. Bansal had just presented. He said the next step would be to write the actual grant and bring it to the TPB Steering Committee on September 4. He said the Scenario Task Force members have been invited to participate in that meeting so that they have the opportunity to express their views about the final application. He said the TPB was being asked to authorize the Steering Committee to approve the content of the final application, since it will need to be submitted before the next Board meeting.

Mr. Drummond requested that the City of Fairfax be included in the regional bike-sharing program.

Ms. Bansal suggested Mr. Drummond contact Arlington County staff, which is taking the lead on the bike-sharing component.

Mr. Kirby said there was a suggestion at the task force meeting that morning to include National Harbor in the bike-sharing program as well.

Mr. Wojahn asked that College Park also be included in the bike-sharing program.

Mr. Erenrich asked that the proposal, instead of specifically referring to a pedestrian tunnel, refer to a pedestrian "connection." He said Montgomery County still has not eliminated the option for a bridge.

Mr. Way asked what level of commitment would be required from local and state agencies regarding their proposed matches and contributions to projects.

Mr. Kirby said that in it would be difficult to guarantee those funds, but he said the proposal should seek to ensure that the state and local funds will be reasonably anticipated to be available.

As an example, Ms. Tregoning noted that the District of Columbia has already committed to using formula ARRA funds and Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds to expand the bike-sharing program in the District of Columbia. This would count toward the state/local match for that project.

Mr. Donley asked if additional operating costs were included in the cost estimates.

Mr. Kirby said that the main thrust of this project is to provide for efficient movement of existing buses through priority right-of-way. He said that approach would be intended to get more efficiency out of the existing levels of funding for operations. He said TIGER funds are for capital investments and the proposal would not ask for additional operating funds.

Mr. Zimmerman said that this proposal is intended to be part of a regional concept in which, in the future, government would need to put more resources into public transportation, including additional operating funds. However, he said that one of the attractions of this ARRA proposal would be that it has the potential to actually lower operating expenses. He noted an example regarding Los Angeles' Metro Rapid Bus System in which priority bus treatments enabled the transit agency to greatly increase the number of passengers with the same buses.

Chairman Jenkins asked for an explanation regarding the cost of the bicycle-sharing program, which was a total of \$10 million for 1600 bicycles, which averaged out to \$6,250 per bicycle.

Mr. Rybeck said the cost for the program included bicycle stations, program operations and other infrastructure.

Mr. Bronrott asked if consideration was given to enhancing bus service between Montgomery County and Tysons Corner.

Mr. Kirby noted that this is a first stage of a much more ambitious plan for express bus service throughout the region. He said this proposal is largely confined to existing transit right-of-way and services because these need to be projects that can be implemented by 2012.

A motion was made to approve Resolution R5-2010. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

14. Briefing on Integrating Freight into the 2010 Update of the CLRP, and Approval of Response to a Request by CSX Transportation for TPB Support for its National Gateway Rail Freight Initiative

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said that this item would include an overview presentation on Freight by Ms Foster of the TPB staff. It would also include information about a request by CSX Transportation for the TPB to provide a statement of support for their National Gateway Rail Freight Initiative. He said there are 13 components in the Gateway project that are in the Washington region; the most significant of these is the Virginia Avenue Tunnel in the District. He said the governors of Maryland and Virginia have written letters of support, which were included in the mailout packet. He said that because the time remaining at the meeting was limited, the Board might decide to make a decision on a statement of endorsement at the next TPB meeting in September.

Mr. Weissberg, chair of the TPB Subcommittee on Freight, provided background on the history of the Freight Subcommittee, including preliminary analysis, hiring staff and formation of the subcommittee in April 2008. He commented on the importance of freight.

Referring to the handout, Ms. Foster gave a brief update on the TPB's freight program and efforts to integrate freight into the TPB's planning activities. She provided some analysis about freight movement, noting that most freight travel in the region is through-movement. She described activities of the Freight Subcommittee, including a recent stakeholder survey. She said the subcommittee's next steps are to enhance the freight section of the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and to work towards developing a detailed National Capital Region Freight Plan.

Mr. Flippin from CSX introduced the National Gateway project of CSX, which he said was presented to the TPB Technical Committee earlier in July. He said that the TPB's mailout packet includes a draft endorsement letter from the TPB on behalf of this project. He described key aspects of the project. He said the objective of the project is to create a double-stacked network along key corridors to improve the flow of freight between the mid-Atlantic and the Midwest. He said the total cost of projects in the National Capital Region is \$150 million. The total over the six states affected by the project is \$724 million. CSX is seeking \$181 million in federal funding and \$181 million in state funding; CSX would be providing \$362 million.

Ms. Ticer asked if there was already a hazardous material plan for the region.

Mr. Flippin said that since 2001 CSX has had a voluntary agreement with D.C. regarding hazardous materials. He said they are required by federal law as a common carrier to price and carry hazardous materials.

Ms. Koster said that the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) has some concerns regarding the Virginia Avenue Tunnel. She said NCPC would like a better understanding of how this will affect passenger and commuter rail, particularly as growth occurs. On a larger scale, she

said NCPC has conducted studies looking at the issue of freight moving through the nation's capital, not only from a security issue but also in terms of an urban design. She said NCPC was concerned that the specific improvements proposed for the District to some extent might preclude a long-term evaluation of whether or not the nation's capital should be the center of a busy and growing freight corridor. She suggested the endorsement letter should be delayed until the September meeting.

Mr. Flippin said he appreciated the input from NCPC. However, he noted that freight movement was already happening, and therefore the challenge was to determine how to best manage it. He described the origins and purpose of the National Gateway Project. He spoke about the environmental and safety benefits of the project, in addition to savings in highway maintenance costs. He noted that the project is something that can be achieved relatively quickly.

Chairman Jenkins interrupted Mr. Flippin, noting this item would have to be delayed until the September meeting. Among other things, he noted that the District of Columbia had not yet determined its position on the project.

Mr. Donley asked if CSX was seeking an endorsement of the federal grant application for \$150 million for projects in the National Capital Region.

Mr. Flippin said that was correct. He said they were seeking endorsements from states and MPOs.

Mr. Donley asked what would be the source of the federal funding.

Mr. Flippin said that originally, CSX was intending to look toward the authorization bill as a source of funding, but since the TIGER grants were announced, it has decided to seek those funds.

Mr. Donley noted that it did not seem to make sense for the TPB to endorse a project seeking TIGER funds, when the Board had just preliminarily approved its own grant application for TIGER grant funding under Item 13. He noted that the CSX project would be in direct competition with the TPB application.

Mr. Flippin said that Mr. Donley's point was fair, but he said the CSX proposal would complement the TPB's regional goals. He again spoke about the benefits of the CSX proposal.

Mr. Donley said he understood that the region will get a maximum of \$300 million, so it would not seem to make sense for the TPB to support the CSX project.

Mr. Flippin said that other states have indicated that it is important not to put "all their eggs in one basket."

Chairman Jenkins said he would like to see more information about how this project would help with passenger rail. He noted that this project seemed to a potential bonanza for CSX in which half the project cost would be paid by others.

Mr. Donley asked that the item be deferred until the next meeting. He said the chairman's comments were quite pertinent and it was important to get more information.

Mr. Erenrich noted a distinction between general support for the National Gateway Project and support for this particular funding request. He noted that governors' letters that he had read were for reauthorization, not for TIGER grant funding. Also, he said that as a regional body, the TPB should make sure the project is consistent with the TPB's freight policies. He agreed that this item should be deferred until September.

Chairman Jenkins noted that funding for the projects included in the CSX package would come at the expense of other transportation projects in the state. He said he would like to know that the benefits of this project would not simply be to serve CSX.

Mr. Kirby said this item could be included on the September agenda. He said the item could provide answers to the questions raised.

15. Update on Analysis Results for the "What Would It Take" Scenario

Referring to the handout presentation, Mr. Kirby said the TPB's "What Would It Take?" Scenario is looking at what actions would be needed to achieve the transportation goals laid out in the 2008 report of COG's Climate Change Steering Committee. He said that staff has recalculated the baseline for that scenario to reflect the new CAFE standards approved by the Obama Administration. He suggested that members who are interested in this issue should read the handout material. He noted that this issue will likely be a subject of discussion when the first meeting of COG's new Climate Change Committee later in July.

16. Adjournment

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.