

**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 19, 2006**

Members and Alternates Present

Hilda M. Barg, Prince William County  
Rick Canizales, Prince William County  
Wally Covington, Prince William County  
Lyn Erickson, MDOT  
Andrew M. Fellows, City of College Park  
Jason Groth, Charles County  
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Sandra Jackson, FHWA  
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council  
Julia Koster, NCPC  
Deborah Lipman, WMATA  
Michael Lyles, City of Bowie  
David Moss, Montgomery County  
Edith Patterson, Charles County Commissioner  
Carol Petzold, Maryland House of Delegates  
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park  
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT  
Rick Rybeck, DDOT  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
David Snyder, City of Falls Church  
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT  
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT  
Mick Staton, Loudoun County  
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County  
Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax  
Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park  
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP

---

Gerald Miller	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Nick Ramfos	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Deborah Etheridge	COG/DTP
Michael Farrell	COG/DTP
Darren Smith	COG/DTP
Michael Eichler	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
Andrew Austin	COG/DTP
David Roberston	COG/EO
Chinyere Uzoukwu	COG/HSPPS
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Deborah Burns	FTA
Tomika Hughey	WMATA
John Wetmore	DC Citizen
Allen Greenberg	DC Citizen
Chris Carney	Sierra Club
Mary McCarthy	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Josh Cantor	George Mason University
Reena Matthews	Cambridge Systematics
Kiran Bhatt	K.T. Analytics, Inc./MD
Scott Peterson	FHWA
Anthony Foster	PRTC
Tom Biesiadny	Fairfax County DOT
Jim Maslanka	City of Alexandria
Charles Denney	Arlington County DOT
Tamara Ashby	Arlington County DOT
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Arlee Reno	Cambridge Systematics
Brenda Richardson	Women Like Us
Todd Lang	WBCM
Chuck Baell	Charles County
Michael Medici	Prince William County
Famarz Mokhtari	Prince George's M-NCPPC
Emmet Tydings	TPB Citizens Advisory Comm. Chairman

## 1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

---

John Wetmore spoke in support of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. He urged the TPB to make implementation a priority. He said that creating a network of bicycle and pedestrian facilities makes each facility more useful than if they were isolated. He said that removing barriers to pedestrians and bicyclists is an essential part of creating a unified network. Copies of his remarks and DVD on pedestrian safety were distributed for the record.

Allen Greenberg, former member of the Citizens Advisory Committee, spoke about agenda item 12. He said Chairman Knapp and TPB staff should be commended for beginning to consider establishing a transportation program to support regional goals. He said the region is doing an inadequate job of linking transportation and land use and therefore he urged the TPB to support “option one” in Mr. Kirby’s presentation, which would fund both planning and capital activities that strengthen linkages between transportation and land use. He indicated that attached to his remarks was a memorandum that he had written that describes some proposed policy objectives, including expanding the Commuter Connections program to offer incentives to employers to locate near transit and provide transit subsidies to their employees. He also described another concept, “traffic buster grants,” which are being created by the Oregon Environmental Council.

Chris Carney, speaking for the Maryland Chapter of the Sierra Club, asked that the TPB defer voting on the action item regarding the Billingsley Road widening in Charles County, which is also known as the Cross County Connector. He said that a representative from the Army Corps of Engineers had informed him that the 1996 report prepared by Charles County, while having the words “National Environmental Policy Act Report” (NEPA), as part or all of its title, was actually only a summary of data gathered at the request of the Corps, which in 1996 was preparing to do a genuine NEPA review, which was never completed because the project was shelved. He said the Corps is currently in the preliminary NEPA process and will soon be deciding whether they will conduct a full environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement. He said that because a review of the proposed highway required by NEPA has not been done, there is not yet an objective assessment of impacts that the Cross County Connector would have on the adjacent Mattawoman Creek. He spoke about the ecological importance of this creek and the impacts that the road would have on it. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Mary McCarthy, Coalition for Smarter Growth, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the Charles County Connector in the CLRP. She noted that the Coalition had forwarded to the Board’s attention a letter from VDOT documenting major traffic gridlock in the event that Loudoun County were to approve an additional 28,000 houses near Route 15, on top of 37,000 houses already approved to be built. She said that Fairfax County would bear the brunt of the commuting traffic generated by this development. She commended the TPB for a number of activities, but she expressed concern regarding the funding briefing under item 14, which is a follow-up to the 2004 Time to Act Report, because the primary focus in both Maryland and Virginia continues to be on funding without real reform in transportation and land use planning. She concluded by calling for a complete reevaluation of the regional CLRP to account for a world of high energy costs, the urgent need to reduce emissions contributing to global warming, and the need to protect far more land to save the Chesapeake Bay.

---

## **2. Approval of Minutes of June 21, 2006 Meeting**

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

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

Referring to the mailout report, Mr. Canizales said the Technical Committee met on July 7 and reviewed a number of items on the TPB agenda:

- Regarding Item 8, the committee was briefed on the final update on the draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, which was released for public comment on June 15. The committee recommended that TPB adopt the plan.
- Regarding Item 9, the committee was briefed on establishing the TPB Task Force to develop the Human Services Transportation Coordinated Plan and to establish a process to become the designated recipient for New Freedom and Job Access/Reverse Commute funds.
- Regarding Item 11, the committee was briefed on the TPB Access for All Advisory Committee's report on transportation and the concerns for low-income communities.
- Regarding Item 12, Mr. Kirby gave his presentation regarding potential approaches for strengthening the linkages between transportation and land use planning. The Technical Committee discussed the potential for a transportation/land use grant program, including looking at two major issues: identifying the funding and the importance of what the selection criteria would be to get these grants moving.
- Regarding Item 13, the committee was briefed on the key results of the draft analysis of the financial plan for the 2006 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP). This discussion was combined with a presentation on Agenda Item 14, which is a report on progress made since early 2000 in identifying resources to meet the region's currently unfunded transportation needs.

Mr. Canizales said the Technical Committee also discussed several issues not on the TPB agenda:

- A discussion of the proposed SAFETEA-LU transportation planning regulations that metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) must follow.
- A discussion on the status of the eight-hour ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP) and the transportation conformity requirements that the region must follow.
- An update on the status of project submissions for the draft FY 2007-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and CLRP, which are scheduled to be released in September of this year.
- An update on activities to respond to a proposal by the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) to the TPB for allocating and distributing annual FTA

---

formula funds that are apportioned to the Washington urbanized area within Stafford County.

Mr. Staton asked for more information on the Technical Committee's discussion regarding Agenda Item 12.

Mr. Canizales said the committee discussed different options for how the program might be structured. These options would be covered under Mr. Kirby's presentation. The Technical Committee also discussed how the program might be funded and how criteria for selected projects might be established. He noted that from Mr. Kirby's presentation, it seems that the criteria were likely to be based on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study and transit-oriented development around Metro stations.

Mr. Staton said he would like to talk about the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. He noted that two of the scenarios in the study were "houses-in" and "jobs-out." He said he still had not seen any information on the "jobs-out" scenario. He noted that this should be a public document.

Mr. Canizales said that preliminary information on all the scenarios had been released.

Chairman Knapp said those results were included in a presentation that was given earlier this year.

Mr. Kirby said the information was available on the TPB's website and was included in a presentation. He suggested the presentation might be brought back to the Board.

Chairman Knapp agreed with Mr. Kirby's suggestion. He said that Mr. Staton's questions were good. He noted that Mr. Kirby's presentation under Item 12 would begin to address some of Mr. Staton's questions.

Mr. Canizales said that part of Mr. Staton's concerns related to the funding and criteria for the potential new regional grant program and those issues have not yet been resolved or discussed fully.

Mr. Staton again emphasized that he does not have a copy of that report and he would like to see a copy of the results of the jobs-out scenario, as well as the houses-in scenario, and some of the assumptions that went into running those models. He said he was interested to see if there is an analysis of the feasibility of some of those scenarios.

Mr. Kirby said staff would get Mr. Staton a copy of the presentation showing all the comparative results.

Ms. Sorenson said that in addition to the presentation, she would like to see a full report on the study. She said the TPB needs to see the data in the full report before it moves forward.

---

Mr. Kirby said that the data have been developed, but have not been assembled. He said that a report could be made available by September.

Ms. Barg said she wanted to be sure all the information would be provided for the entire Board.

#### **4. Report of Citizen Advisory Committee**

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Tydings reported that the CAC met on July 13. Related to Item 11 on the TPB's agenda, the committee received a briefing on the Access for All Advisory Committee's report on the transportation concerns of low income populations. Among other things, the committee discussed the report's contention that more development is needed around Metro stations on the eastern side of the region. A CAC member noted that the Green Line trains are already packed to capacity during peak hours. She also expressed concern about the increased local traffic that would be generated by more development. In response, other members commented that an increase in jobs on the eastern side of the region, especially near the transit stations, could have a positive impact on congestion. Reflecting on the conversation, Mr. Tydings said that if the region is going to make the case that increased density is a good thing, then some people on the eastern side of the region need to be convinced of it. He added that there is a broad acknowledgement that the number of trains on the Green Line needs to be increased.

Regarding the AFA recommendations as a whole, Mr. Tydings noted that a CAC member asked whether the TPB actually does anything with recommendations like these. He expressed concern that recommendations may be simply put aside, with little or no follow-up. The committee believes this concern is something that TPB needs to look at on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Tydings said that TPB staff member Darren Smith briefed the CAC on the public involvement requirements of the new federal transportation reauthorization act, SAFETEA-LU, which among other things requires TPB to develop a participation plan. Mr. Smith told the committee that that staff is planning to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) to hire a consultant to conduct an evaluation of the region's current public involvement plans and activities. Such an evaluation was recommended in the certification review that the federal agencies conducted last year with the TPB. Staff asked for CAC comments on the RFP.

CAC members had a number of comments regarding Mr. Smith's presentation. First, the committee believes the evaluation of public involvement activities needs to thoroughly examine the feedback loop, asking the basic questions: Does citizens' input have an influence on decision making? Can this input be more effective? The committee also believes the evaluation of TPB public involvement must extensively consider the activities of the state DOTs and WMATA because so many actual transportation decisions are made at those levels. Finally, the committee believes the consultant evaluation of the TPB's public involvement should burrow into the question of how to use the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study more effectively as a vehicle

---

for input.

Finally, Mr. Tydings mentioned that the committee had a brief discussion on how the TPB can pursue the CAC's recommendation from last January that the TPB should develop a list or a plan of unfunded priority projects, which would provide a big picture context for understanding project selection for the CLRP. The committee believes the development of this unconstrained plan should start with the projects that have been identified for study in the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study and future scenarios that need to be determined. He said he would like the TPB and the CAC to use public outreach on the scenario study to help guide the development of this unconstrained plan. He said he believed the discussion under Item 12, which deals with the possibility of establishing a program to link transportation and land use, might provide the opportunity to discuss the need for development of an unconstrained plan that would identify priority unfunded needs.

Chairman Knapp thanked Mr. Tydings and said he wanted to continue to seek ways to find better mechanisms for citizen input and recommendations. He mentioned the Community Leadership Institute as a useful experience. He said it was important to reach out to citizens and not expect them to come to the TPB. He also said he looked forward to the discussion of unfunded needs under Item 12.

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

Referring to the mailout packet, Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on July 7 and acted on five resolutions. These included:

- A small rescission in planning funds due to the federal appropriations and associate funding reductions for a few projects.
- Approval, at the request of VDOT, of amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add statewide enhancement projects and to fund two segments of the Crystal City-Potomac Yard busway and the Columbia Pike Streetscape Project in Arlington and the US 1 Pedestrian Transit Access Improvement Project in Fairfax County.
- Approval of funding for the I-66 multimodal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) between the Beltway and US 15 at Haymarket.
- Approval of changes to the federal functional classification in Montgomery County in Maryland.
- Approval of an amendment to the funding plan for the Silver Spring Transit Center in Montgomery County.

Referring to the letters packet, Mr. Kirby drew attention to a transmittal letter from Chairman Knapp to Chairman Mendelson of the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) transmitting the mobile source emissions calculations that have been completed for the development of the air quality plan updates. He said those numbers will form the basis for the mobile emissions budgets that will be used in future conformity determinations.

---

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

Chairman Knapp noted that the agenda was very tight and wanted to keep the discussion moving.

Chairman Knapp asked Ms. Lipman of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) to provide an update on recent legislative actions regarding funding for Metro.

Ms. Lipman said that the previous Monday, the House of Representatives had passed H.R. 3694 to authorize \$1.5 billion for Metrorail capital expenditures over the next ten years. The funding was designated to come from offshore drilling receipts that are paid to the federal government. The approved bill includes the provisions that were in the committee reported bill requiring that the WMATA Compact be amended so that Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia create dedicated funding sources to match the federal funds, that WMATA establish an inspector general, and that there be added to the WMATA Board four federal members. She said the bill has now been referred to the Senate.

## **Action Items**

### **7. Approval of Inclusion of the Project to Realign and Widen a Segment of Billingsley Road in Charles County in the 2006 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2007-2012 TIP**

Mr. Groth introduced the delegation present from Charles County, including County Commissioner Edith Patterson and Acting Planning Director Chuck Baell. He said that the County did not know the project needed to be included in the CLRP and air quality conformity analysis because it was a new TPB member and the project is fully locally funded. He said that they were informed by the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) during the permitting process that the project did need to be included.

Mr. Groth said that issues raised about impacts to Mattawoman Creek and other environmental concerns would be addressed through the permitting process, and that the impact assessment completed for the project in 1997 was actually in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) at that time and investigated the impacts of the considered alternatives. He said the Corps has requested and been provided with additional information to bring the 1997 document up to current review standards.

Mr. Groth said that there would be additional opportunities for public comment on the revised NEPA document as well as the project as a whole. He said that the county sees the process of bringing the project before the TPB as one focused on the air quality issue and that other environmental impacts and mitigation requirements will be addressed as part of the permitting

---

process.

Ms. Patterson said that the project has the full support of the Charles County Board of Commissioners and has been part of the comprehensive plan since 1987. She said that it would help alleviate traffic and congestion in the County, and that four of seven phases of the project are already complete. She noted that the County has worked with environmental groups on the project and established task forces to protect the Mattawoman Creek. She encouraged the TPB to support the inclusion of the project.

Mr. Staton moved to adopt Resolution R1-2007 to include the project in the CLRP and TIP, and the motion was seconded.

Mr. Fellows referred to his question at the June TPB meeting concerning whether the TPB could be supplied with information about the project alternatives, and asked if that issue could be addressed.

Ms. Patterson said that for the final three phases of the project, unlike the first four, the consultants and engineers recommended a route that deviates from the existing road because the existing alignment is narrow, winding, and dangerous. She said that citizen concerns about the new alignment had been considered and some modifications were made accordingly to the final plan.

Mr. Baell said that the NEPA document prepared for the final three phases in 1997 essentially was an alternatives analysis, as had been encouraged by the Corps. He said it included a dozen or more alternatives, and that the Corps concurred with the ultimate selection. He said that following the Corps approval of the alternative and the completion of detailed design work by the county, the Corps has asked for additional information to update the original NEPA document during the present permitting process.

Mr. Fellows asked if he was correct in understanding that the Corps considered alternatives and had a related public process, and asked what written documentation of those alternatives was produced.

Mr. Baell said that Mr. Fellows was correct and that the NEPA document served as written documentation of the alternatives.

Mr. Fellows asked how information from the air quality analysis would be incorporated into the upcoming public hearing that was mentioned earlier.

Mr. Groth said that the air quality information would be included in the Corps' consideration of the permit.

Mr. Baell said that the air quality information would go into a supplement that they will be preparing for the 1997 NEPA document.

---

Mr. Fellows asked if that meant that the current activities are still part of the NEPA process.

Mr. Baell said yes, and noted that because the project is not federally funded, it is not governed by the NEPA 404 process, but at the encouragement of the Corps in the mid-'90s, the county chose to follow the NEPA process and parallel its requirements.

Mr. Fellows asked if there was a rough estimate of when the aforementioned public hearing would occur.

Mr. Baell said that the date of the meeting would be contingent upon action by the TPB, as the air quality information is needed to address comments by the Corps. He said that once those have been addressed, the meeting would likely take place later this fall.

Mr. Groth said that the Corps had estimated the public hearing would take place by the end of the year. He said that the public hearing cannot be held and the permit cannot be granted until the air quality conformity analysis for the project has been completed.

Mr. Zimmerman said he had thought the issue was if the NEPA review from ten years ago was still valid, but that now it seemed as if a true NEPA review was not actually done in the first place and the assertion is being made that it was not necessary because of the project being locally funded.

Mr. Baell said that Mr. Zimmerman had misunderstood his earlier statements, and clarified that he meant to convey that although the County was not obligated to go through the NEPA process, it had chosen in the mid-'90s to do so anyway and followed the Corps' NEPA guidelines at that time. He said that the current activities would supplement the previous document to meet the current requirements of the NEPA process.

Mr. Groth said that the supplement is currently 54 pages in length and addresses all of the requests by the Corps and the Maryland Department of the Environment for additional information.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the process followed by the County differs at all from what they would have to do if the project were receiving federal funding.

Mr. Baell said that he did not think there was any difference.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if Mr. Baell was thus asserting that the County is doing the equivalent of a full NEPA review.

Mr. Groth said that was correct, and said that in essence, the permitting process requires about the same level of documentation as would a full NEPA process.

Mr. Zimmerman said this made sense given the federal participation on the part of the Corps.

---

Mr. Zimmerman asked Mr. Kirby about the project submission occurring outside the normal cycle.

Mr. Kirby said that the timing was the only unusual aspect of the project. He said that after the Corps requested the air quality analysis, the County came forward to ask if the project could be incorporated into this year's process so that the public hearing could still take place by the end of the year. He said that the task of incorporating the project into this year's analysis was minor and would not delay the process.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if anything would be happening differently if the project had been submitted at the normal time.

Mr. Kirby said that there essentially would be no difference.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if that meant that things would happen in the same sequence even in cases where a full NEPA process is required.

Mr. Kirby said that was the normal procedure, and that in the last several years a number of projects had been included in the air quality analysis while their NEPA reviews were still underway.

Mr. Zimmerman said that although the TPB's primary environmental concern is with air quality, other environmental concerns had been raised about this project and the issue is whether or not those concerns were being addressed in the other reviews through which the project must pass. He asked Mr. Kirby what the TPB could say to people with those concerns.

Mr. Kirby said that these issues would be addressed through the process with the Corps, and that if the Corps is not satisfied they will not issue a permit and the project will not go forward.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if he was correct in understanding, then, that the key environmental control and protection of the creek rested with the Corps.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct.

Ms. Pourciau said that the District of Columbia takes the air quality analysis process very seriously. She pointed out that the states and the District are essentially the funders of the analysis process, and that delays could have financial implications. She said she understood the special circumstances in this case, but emphasized that the TPB was making a special exception that is not done lightly.

Chairman Knapp said he appreciated Ms. Pourciau's comments and noted that the TPB's discussion of the project now should help resolve any questions before the project moves forward and ensure that it does not have to be revisited later by the Board.

---

Mr. Groth said that the Charles County delegation appreciated that consideration.

The Board voted unanimously to pass the motion on the table, approving TPB Resolution 1-2007.

## **8. Approval of Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region**

Mr. Farrell gave a PowerPoint presentation that was distributed at the meeting and refers to the draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan that was included in the mailout packet. He explained various aspects of the plan and described examples of included projects. He said that it identifies the major bicycle and pedestrian projects that the region wishes to carry out by 2030, and that it is the first regional bicycle plan since 1995 and also the first ever regional pedestrian plan. He discussed the timeline of the plan's development and review, and gave figures describing the plan including the total number of projects and estimated cost.

Mr. Farrell noted that the context for approval of the plan reflects the evolving federal guidance on provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. He said that rather than being viewed as a discretionary extra, such accommodation is increasingly regarded as routine and necessary as part of a "complete street".

Mr. Farrell said that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee hoped that the plan would lead to awareness of changed bicycle and pedestrian policies, and advise the future programming of currently unfunded pedestrian and bicycle priority projects. He said that public access to an online project database would eventually be provided.

Mr. Kirby, referring to proposed additional language to the plan that was included in the mailout packet, said that the language was in response to suggestions from Arlington County officials concerning regional wayfinding and signage for bicyclists and pedestrians. He said that suggestions included paying more attention to signage and looking at best practices in the region, the rest of the country, and internationally.

Mr. Kirby said that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee recommended adding the language, which commits to compiling and reporting on best practices regarding wayfinding and signage by the end of the year. He said that the committee would also explore the creation of uniform guidelines for the region as a next step.

Mr. Zimmerman moved to approve the additional language as an amendment to the plan. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

Chairman Knapp thanked Mr. Farrell and Mr. Meese for their efforts in completing the plan.

Chairman Knapp asked if the online database would just show the static plan or if it would track

---

the status of projects so that people would know what facilities have been developed and which are still to come.

Mr. Farrell said that the database was capable of tracking project funding and completion status, but that the updates are dependent on jurisdictional staff for input. He said that the database would include contact information for jurisdictional staff and would indicate when a record was last updated.

Chairman Knapp encouraged Mr. Farrell to periodically check on how well project information is being kept up to date so that the online database continues to be a useful resource.

Ms. Sorenson asked if new projects that come along could be added to the database.

Mr. Farrell said that new records could be added, and that currently the database is password-protected so that only regional bicycle and pedestrian professionals can add or change information. He said that the subcommittee would explore in the coming months the possibility of opening that ability to the public.

Ms. Sorenson asked if additional projects could be provided to Mr. Farrell for inclusion in the database.

Mr. Farrell said that he would get the information in the database, but that he had taken it off-line for a period of time to freeze the information until the TPB had the opportunity to approve the plan as a static document. He said that the database is to serve as a living document while the plan is a snapshot of the current situation.

Ms. Pourciau noted that usually every year the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee presents the TPB with a list of a few priority projects it would like to challenge the Board to advance. She asked if the subcommittee could come back again with a clear priority list in addition to the plan.

Mr. Farrell said that a project prioritization was not part of this plan, and that a scale filter was used so that the projects included were of a certain significance, with the cutoffs being a minimum of \$300,000 in cost, three miles in path length, or a crucial connector. He said that the subcommittee is planning to come back to the TPB with a prioritized list in December, drawing upon the previous priority list as well as the new plan.

Ms. Porter said that she was pleased that the work of the Greenways Report committee of several years ago, which she chaired, had been incorporated into this report and built upon. She said that committee had been hopeful that the Greenways Report was not the end of the process, and that she thought this was a good next step.

Ms. Smyth moved to adopt Resolution R2-2007 approving the bicycle and pedestrian plan, and Ms. Porter seconded the motion. The Board unanimously approved the motion.

---

## **9. Establishment of a Task Force to Develop the Coordinated Plan for Human Service Transportation for the Region, and Approval of Steps for the TPB to Become the Designated Recipient for the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom Programs**

Referring to materials in the mailout packet and a PowerPoint presentation distributed at the meeting, Ms. Klancher gave a short briefing. She said the TPB was being asked to do two things: authorize the establishment of a Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force; and authorize the Chair to submit a formal request to the two governors and the mayor to have the TPB designated the recipient of Job Access/Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom funds for the Washington, D.C.-Maryland-Virginia urbanized area.

In her presentation, Ms. Klancher explained the context for these new responsibilities under the federal surface transportation reauthorization act, SAFETEA-LU. She said that SAFETEA-LU focuses on three FTA programs: 1) The Elderly and Disabled Individuals Program, which is a program that provides capital grants to nonprofits and is distributed to the states; 2) The Job Access Reverse Commute Program (JARC) which is meant to help low income workers get to jobs, a program that has been changed from an earmarked program to a formula program; and 3) The New Freedom Program, which is for transportation for persons with disabilities that goes above and beyond what the Americans with Disabilities Act requires.

Ms. Klancher showed a chart indicating that the region's funding amounts for JARC and New Freedom for federal Fiscal Year 2006 will be \$1.2 million for JARC and \$1.0 million for New Freedom. She said there is a 50-50 match requirement for operating projects and an 80-20 match requirement for capital programs. This translates into about \$2.4 million operating and \$1.5 million capital funds for JARC, and about \$2 million operating and \$1.25 million capital funds for New Freedom.

Ms. Klancher noted that at the June TPB meeting, Board members had questioned the use of ten percent of the funds for administration, planning, and technical assistance. She said that SAFETEA-LU allows the designated recipient to use up to that amount, and it is estimated that a 6.8% share will be needed for the first year to hire a full-time staff person to administer both programs. She said this figure would be reevaluated in subsequent years.

Ms. Klancher said that SAFETEA-LU requires the development of a coordinated plan from which projects to be funded must be derived. She said these projects also must be competitively selected. She noted that the FTA recommends that the designated recipient not also be a provider of services, to avoid conflicts of interest, and suggests that MPOs may be appropriate designees. She emphasized that no funds can be allocated until the designation process is complete, so there is a desire to move quickly.

Ms. Klancher said that an ad hoc committee of key stakeholders had met in the spring to discuss

---

the new requirements and the role of the TPB. She said this committee recommended that the TPB establish a task force to oversee the development of the coordinated plan, serve as the designated recipient for JARC and New Freedom, and conduct the competitive selection process for the urbanized area.

Ms. Klancher said that the TPB was being asked to establish this task force and appoint a Board member to chair it. She presented the proposed composition of the task force, including members representing public transit agencies, nonprofit providers, human service agencies, and disabled, elderly, and low-income advocacy groups, for a total of 34 members.

Ms. Klancher noted that WMATA had provided a letter of support for the proposal, and clarified that the resolution before the TPB would establish the task force and authorize the Chairman to submit a formal request regarding the designation of the TPB as recipient of the JARC and New Freedom funds.

Ms. Pourciau asked if the task force could work through the TPB Technical Committee and any Human Services Committee within the Council of Governments (COG) in order to make sure that human service providers are well represented.

Ms. Klancher said the proposed makeup of the task force would adequately represent human service agencies.

Ms. Pourciau clarified that her intent was to see if there was a way for any report by the task force to be vetted by a COG Human Services Committee to add an additional focus on human services as opposed to transportation.

Ms. Klancher said that the COG Human Services Committee had been briefed on the proposal and would continue to be involved. She said that this committee did not have many members with transportation knowledge, necessitating the formation of the separate task force, but that they would be kept informed of the task force's activities.

Ms. Hudgins moved to adopt Resolution R3-2007 to establish the task force to develop the coordinated plan for the region and to authorize the chairman to submit a formal request to the governors and mayor to designate the TPB as the recipient of the JARC and New Freedom funds. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **Information Items**

### **10. Presentation of Recipients of the 2006 Commuter Connections Employer Recognition Awards**

---

Mr. Ramfos explained that one of the missions of the Commuter Connections Program is to encourage local businesses to influence the commuting behavior of their employees. He said that the 9<sup>th</sup> Annual Employer Recognition Awards ceremony was held on June 28<sup>th</sup>, and that awards were presented to one employer in each of three categories: incentives, marketing, and telework. He said that a committee selects winners based on their ability to offer measurable commuter benefits that reduce fuel consumption and emissions.

Mr. Ramfos said that additional awards went to the employer services team from the jurisdiction that most successfully supported employers in the effort, and an organization that created a new program to foster employer-based action. He showed a video that highlighted this year's award winners.

Following the video, Mr. Ramfos introduced representatives from award-winning organizations that were present at the meeting, including Josh Kanter, Director of Parking and Transportation from the Fairfax campus of George Mason University, and Sandra Brucker, administrator of the Montgomery County Commuter Services Program. The TPB applauded the guests and the other award winners.

Chairman Knapp thanked Mr. Ramfos and said that it is important to maintain the program and publicize it to increase awareness of the employer activities being undertaken in the region.

## **11. Briefing on the TPB Access for All Advisory Committee's Report "Transportation Issues for Low-Income Populations: Findings and Recommendations"**

Ms. Porter said that the report was the third subcommittee report brought to the TPB by the Access for All Committee, following one on issues of language access and another on issues for persons with disabilities. She introduced Ms. Richardson to present the report. She noted that Ms. Richardson's participation with TPB efforts goes back to the workshop that led to the creation of the Access for All Committee, and that she was pleased Ms. Richardson has continued to be involved. She also referred to the rest of the committee membership and said that many people interested in various aspects of activities and transportation needs of low-income people served on the committee.

Ms. Richardson gave a PowerPoint presentation that was distributed at the meeting. She presented findings regarding the geographic distribution of poverty and rates of job growth in the region as well as access of low-income people to cars and dependency on transit and walking.

Ms. Richardson also presented recommendations contained in the subcommittee's report, including adoption of uniform standards for bus stops and prioritization of bus stop improvements in areas with high concentrations of poverty, identification of funding for bus service enhancements to serve low-income populations, and provision of better information about bus

---

service. She said that increased access by low-income populations to jobs and services would help create a sense of regional equity.

Ms. Richardson said that the subcommittee had looked at three pilot areas, Langley Park in Maryland, Anacostia/Congress Heights in the District of Columbia, and the Route 1 Corridor in Virginia. She said that the recommendations involving the pilot areas in particular called for prioritization of the worst bus stops to improve by 2010, improvement of pedestrian safety, and provision of multilingual information.

Ms. Porter referred to the CAC report given earlier in the meeting, which raised the issue of how the TPB acts upon recommendations contained in such reports, and said that the Access for All Committee will be trying to ensure that the TPB follows up to implement the recommendations.

Ms. Porter said that the report will also be used to inform human service transportation coordination planning and will be forwarded, with follow-up, to WMATA and local agencies in charge of bus service and stops. She said that the committee will continue to remind the TPB of the importance of bus service for the low-income population, and thanked Ms. Richardson for the work she did on the subcommittee.

Mr. Zimmerman said he applauded the work that was done and agreed with the recommendations and the importance of improving bus service. He said that bus service is typically poor and gets low priority because it is viewed as a safety net program serving low-income people, and is therefore frequently the first thing to get cut back and ignored in larger transportation planning discussions.

Mr. Zimmerman said that only recently has more attention been paid to bus service and ways to make it better, and especially to attract riders who would not normally think of the bus as an option. He said that the population dependent on bus service isn't particularly well served by it, and he believes that many of the things that would make bus service work better for the low-income population would make it work better for everyone, even though the focus should still be on priority areas like those identified in the report.

Mr. Zimmerman said that as more people are attracted to ride the bus as a result of improvements to bus service, the cumulative effect would be more interest in extending high-quality bus service as a choice for more residents of the region, including those who are more influential in the transportation decision-making process. He said that he wanted to point out that while improving bus service is important for low-income people, it is also important to the region for broader reasons, such as increasing use of public transit and dealing with problems such as air quality and congestion.

Ms. Pourciau thanked Ms. Richardson for her work on the subcommittee and noted that she previously served on the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee as a District of Columbia resident.

---

Ms. Pourciau said that she wished to strike from the report mention of two specific potential sources of funding from the District of Columbia, the Safe Routes to School and Great Streets programs, for improvements mentioned in the report. She said that designating these two sources for the activities mentioned is problematic, though it would still be acceptable to say that the District of Columbia generally should devote funding to those activities.

Ms. Pourciau also asked Chairman Knapp to direct TPB staff to look at creating a committee that would focus specifically on buses, modeled after the Bicycle and Pedestrian committee, which she said has helped the TPB prioritize projects in the TIP and CLRP through its work.

Chairman Knapp said the idea sounded reasonable.

Ms. Porter said that the idea was interesting and that some members of the Access for All Committee might be interested in being involved in a committee focused on bus transportation, as some members have made it a priority in their work on the Access for All Committee.

Ms. Hudgins said that the discussion emphasizes the role of human services, and that while she agrees with Ms. Pourciau in making sure that human services policy people are involved, she thinks it is critical that transportation planning activities remain with transportation-focused bodies and individuals. She said that Mr. Zimmerman's point about how bus service is important to everyone reinforces the notion that transportation planning discussion not be segregated into particular demographics of people.

## **12. Briefing on Approaches for Strengthening the Linkages Between Transportation and Land Use Planning in the Region**

Chairman Knapp said that the idea for putting the issue before the TPB was to provide a framework for discussion, and that there is no intent to rush to a vote on the matter. He said that he had hoped to take the feedback from the discussion in previous meetings and begin to identify the details of how such a program could and could not work, to more fully flesh out a proposal to bring back to the Board.

Chairman Knapp urged TPB members to study the presentation after the meeting and solicit feedback from the jurisdictions they represent, to facilitate a more extensive discussion on the topic at the September TPB meeting. He said that at the September meeting, a larger amount of time could be dedicated to the issue, and there would be additional information about the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study to consider as context. He said that today's discussion was aimed at making sure all the items necessary to consider and address had been raised before proceeding to the point of a major decision and reiterated that nothing had been scheduled for an imminent vote.

Mr. Kirby, referring to a PowerPoint presentation that was included in the mailout packet,

---

recapped the discussion that took place at the June TPB meeting. He summarized the three options for TPB action that had been presented at that meeting including Option 1 – administering a grant program to fund selected planning and capital activities that further regional goals, Option 2 – administering a smaller grant program to fund planning activities only, and Option 3 – identifying priority needs in the region and promoting particular projects and strategies using only funds out of the TPB’s Unified Planning Work Program. He said this last option would resemble the TPB’s prioritization and advocacy of certain bicycle and pedestrian projects, and the identification of crucial needs through the freeway surveillance program.

Mr. Kirby also discussed how a grant program such as that entailed in Options 1 and 2 had been implemented in other areas such as San Francisco, Atlanta, and Philadelphia, including details about how the programs are funded and how projects are selected.

Mr. Kirby presented a few examples of the types of projects funded by similar programs in the San Francisco, Atlanta, and Philadelphia areas, including grants for both small-scale capital improvements and planning activities.

Mr. Kirby suggested how such a program could be structured and administered in the Washington Region, based on how the experience in other regions could be applied to the unique circumstances in this area. He gave details about how a program might be funded, emphasizing that funds from each state would only go toward projects in that state. He also said that funds should not have to be taken away from what is already committed to other crucial transportation needs, and said that funding could perhaps be solicited from the governors of Maryland and Virginia and the mayor of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Kirby said that the TPB Vision goals and the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study could serve as a foundation for selection criteria, including a focus on facilitating mixed-use development in both existing and potential new activity centers, especially given the incorporation of more households in the Round 7.0a forecasts.

Mr. Kirby said that based on recent comments from the COG Board and the TPB Technical Committee, he proposed that TPB staff would do further analysis to identify not-yet-addressed challenges to implementation of TPB goals. He said this analysis would include an overview of the relevant activity going on in the region already. He said that an assessment could then be made of how specific priorities might be addressed through such a program.

Chairman Knapp asked if it was correct that the TPB would not be holding a meeting in August.

Mr. Kirby verified that there would be no TPB meeting in August.

Chairman Knapp asked if, given the time interval, TPB members could e-mail him and Mr. Kirby with any issues they think the presentation raises so that they could be collected and circulated back out. He said that this would allow them to tailor the presentation to be given at the September

---

TPB meeting to begin to address those issues and questions and advance the discussion.

Mr. Staton asked if slide number 20 discussing selection criteria such as facilitating the addition of more households in close proximity to activity centers was referring to the “Households In” scenario from the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study.

Mr. Kirby said that the point is related to two scenarios: “Households In” which would reallocate households already projected to be within the boundaries of the TPB region, and “More Households” which would bring in additional households from outside the region, from places like West Virginia and Pennsylvania where residential development would entail long commutes into the region.

Mr. Staton said that in Loudoun County, the sentiment is not to put more households in the activity center located near the Dulles Town Center, which is viewed as an employment center.

Mr. Kirby said that an additional scenario is the “Jobs Out” scenario, which should be a part of the discussion and would be included in the development of selection criteria for a possible grant program.

Mr. Staton said he appreciated that consideration. He said that his biggest concern was the possibility of the loss of funds like CMAQ and STP funding relied upon by outer jurisdictions to help fix roads. He said he was concerned that this money would be rededicated toward a project that would encourage certain land use patterns in pursuit of a goal that may not be feasible, such as bringing more households in to the region or shifting growth from the western side of the region to the eastern side.

Ms. Sorenson suggested that the further analysis of regional needs and current activity be brought back to the TPB as an information item before a framework for implementation of a grant program is developed further.

Mr. Kirby agreed with the suggestion.

Ms. Barg asked if there was an option to inventory projects currently occurring or planned and bring that information back to the board.

Mr. Kirby said that was the intention of the analysis he had described.

Ms. Barg asked where funds for such a program might come from if they were not to be taken from CMAQ and STP funds, and asked that more information be presented at the September TPB meeting related to how the two options to implement a grant program could be funded.

Mr. Zimmerman said that he was comfortable with what Mr. Kirby had presented. He suggested that a study from earlier in the year by Virginia Tech University might help inform the discussion

---

and address some of the questions. He said that the study highlights some of the opportunities to achieve land use goals based on the large number of new households and new structures generally that are projected to be built in the next 25 years.

Chairman Knapp urged the TPB members to send in additional questions to be considered in further refining a framework for discussion at the September TPB meeting.

Chairman Knapp acknowledged Mr. Snyder to speak regarding an item not on the meeting agenda.

Mr. Snyder said that in light of recent positive developments in Congress with respect to funding of Metro, the Board might want to consider sending a letter to Congressman Tom Davis and others involved expressing appreciation and urging Maryland and Virginia to do their part to commit funding and ensure that the federal money is not left on the table. He also suggested that the letter could provide a summary of the positive effects of transit in terms of moving people, responding to emergencies, and helping environmental quality.

### **13. Briefing on the Draft Financial Analysis for the 2006 Financially Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP)**

Mr. Reno, referring to a PowerPoint presentation distributed at the meeting, reported on the update of the financial analysis and its implications for the region. He said that the financial analysis is nearly complete, with a few local jurisdiction numbers still to be added in. He said that revenues and expenditures exceeded 2003 totals, but noted that the difference had been negated by inflation. He noted that the assumed revenues do not include the Davis bill to fund Metro's capital request.

Mr. Reno said a major finding of the analysis is that revenues expected to be available to operate and preserve the region's transportation system are adequate, though Metrorail capacity is still constrained after 2010 because of capital funding shortages.

### **14. Briefing on Draft Report: "An Update on the National Capital Region's Transportation Capital Funding Needs"**

Mr. Reno, still referring to the PowerPoint presentation distributed at the meeting, summarized transportation program and finance actions taken in the region since early 2004, including the Regional Transportation Coordination Program, improvements made and funding allocated for specific major projects in all three state-level jurisdictions, and the approval of MetroMatters capital funding. He said that federal revenues for the region have increased under the recent federal transportation reauthorization (SAFETEA-LU), but not dramatically.

Mr. Reno displayed a chart showing the Producer Price Index for street and highway construction

---

over a period of several years, noting that increases were fairly small and consistent up until the beginning of 2004 when a very rapid increase began. He noted that congestion continues to increase on both highways and transit systems.

Mr. Reno said that an array of possible solutions to funding needs is presented in the draft report that was included in the mailout packet. He noted that fuel taxes in the region are below the national average and that some states have acted to index all or a portion of their fuel taxes to inflation or other measures. He said that while tolling and other usage pricing can directly affect specific projects and are good opportunities, there are big needs for general resources for the existing system.

Mr. Reno highlighted other potential revenue sources, noting that some states authorize local option sales taxes for transportation, and some also utilize public-private partnerships. He also noted that Oregon is testing vehicle-miles traveled (VMT) fees paid at the gas pump, a technique that could disconnect reliance for transportation revenues on increasing fuel consumption.

## **15. Other Business**

There was no other business.

## **16. Adjournment**

Chairman Knapp adjourned the meeting at 2:08 pm.