

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
June 16, 2010**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Melissa Barlow, FTA
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Robert Catlin, City of College Park
Barbara Comstock, Virginia House
Kerry Donley, City of Alexandria
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jason Groth, Charles County
Tom Harrington, WMATA
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick
Michael C. May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Glenn Orlin, Montgomery County
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
Karina Ricks, DDOT
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Patricia S. Ticer, Virginia Senate
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd Turner, City of Bowie
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby
Michael Clifford
Gerald Miller
Andrew Meese
Tim Canan
John Swanson
Andrew Austin
Wendy Klancher
Beth Newman
Deborah Bilek
Sarah Crawford
Monica Bansal
Erin Morrow
Debbie Leigh
Deborah Etheridge
Michael Farrell
Darren Smith
Rex Hodgson
Wenjing Pu
Gareth James
Eric Randall
Karin Foster
Joan Rohlfis
Lewis Miller
Ryan Hand
Randy Carroll
Bill Orleans
Maureen Budetti
Greg McFarland
Betsy Massie
Catherine Baker
Mike Hackett
Tom Biesiadny
Oveta Wiggins
David Awbrey
Jim Maslanka
Michael Zezeski

COG/DEP
COG/OPA
COG/CPS
MDE
Citizen
TPB-CAC Chair
NVTC
PRTC
PGMC – Quantico Growth Management Comm.
MWAA
Fairfax County DOT
Washington Post
DRPT
City of Alexandria
Maryland State Highway Administration

Chairman Snyder recognized Barbara J. Comstock, a new TPB member representing the Virginia House of Delegates.

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Bill Orleans said that the Greater Washington Board of Trade (GWBOT) had invited the Council of Governments to participate in a review of Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) governance. He said it is not clear if transit riders' advocates will be invited to participate in this review. He suggested that the TPB encourage that both COG and the Board of Trade include riders' advocates in this review.

2. Approval of Minutes of the May 19 Meeting

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 19 TPB meeting. Mr. Orlin seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Mr. Verzosa said the Technical Committee met on June 4 and discussed six items on the TPB agenda, including item 11, the MOITS Strategic Plan, and item 12, the Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities. He said the Committee discussed the summary report on the Conversation and decided to wait to comment on it until hearing the opinion of the Citizens Advisory Committee. He said the Committee will discuss this item again at its July meeting.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Ms. Budetti said most of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting on June 10 was spent discussing the Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities that was held on May 26. On behalf of the CAC, she thanked the members of TPB for their role in making sure the Conversation occurred and also for being responsive to CAC concerns. She said the members were generally pleased with the results of the Conversation, particularly that it offered an opportunity for a variety of stakeholders to gather and discuss regional transportation priorities.

Ms. Budetti said that the CAC wants to reiterate that it thinks the TPB should move forward in developing a long-range transportation priorities plan. She said the CAC unanimously voted to endorse the five potential next steps outlined in the summary report. She said that in addition, the CAC voted to request that the TPB act on these steps at its earliest opportunity.

Ms. Budetti said that at its meeting on June 10, the CAC also received a briefing on the potential development of a HUD Sustainable Communities Planning Grant application and had a

discussion on potential interaction with the WMATA Riders Advisory Council. She said the CAC will also take up at its July meeting the issue, noted by Mr. Orleans during public comment, of the involvement of transit riders' advocates in the GWBOT/COG review of WMATA governance.

Ms. Tregoning complimented Ms. Budetti on the presentation she gave at the Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities and thanked her for her leadership on this topic. She said Ms. Budetti helped the TPB move forward on this activity and also thanked Chairman Snyder for his involvement.

Chairman Snyder thanked Ms. Tregoning and noted that the TPB would speak more about this topic under item 12.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on June 4 and approved four resolutions. He said the first two resolutions were related to the expansion of the Commuter Connections Guaranteed Ride Home Program to the Baltimore metropolitan area and to St. Mary's County through funding provided by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT). He said the third resolution was an amendment to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to include funding for the administration of Northern Virginia "Mega Projects" and the Jones Point Park Reforestation Project. He said the final resolution was an amendment to the FY 2010 and FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Programs (UPWP) to modify the Regional Studies Work Activity to reflect the preparation of Project Grant Applications under new US DOT and HUD programs. He highlighted the two letters included in the mailout packet.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Snyder recognized TPB staff member Mike Clifford, who is retiring on June 30 after 38 years of service to the TPB. He said Mr. Clifford leads a team of 11 professionals in his capacity as systems planning applications director within the Department of Transportation Planning at COG. His team is responsible for applying the TPB travel demand forecasting process to support major planning studies throughout the region, and for conducting mobile emissions calculations for regional air quality plans and the TPB's air quality conformity requirements. He said that not the least of Mr. Clifford's accomplishments has been assuring that the TPB's air quality conformity requirements were met year after year, which has involved a number of policy and technical challenges. He added that on behalf of the TPB, he would like to thank Mr. Clifford for his long and dedicated service to transportation planning in the region and to wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

After a round of applause, Mr. Clifford mentioned a few things that have changed over his years

of service to the TPB. He noted how the data flows conducted as part of his work used to fit on a sheet of paper, while now it takes 50 to 60 pages to record all the computer programs his team executes in a single forecast year. He noted that at the start of his career, the TPB meeting would have been held in a “smoke-filled room,” a concept that seems so foreign now. He said one thing that has not changed is the productivity of the Board and its ability to act in a collegial and effective manner. He thanked the Board for their recognition of his service.

ACTION ITEMS

7. Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Update Project Information for FY 2011 in order to match the Proposed FY 2011 Capital Budget of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)

Mr. Kirby noted there is a slight change to the table that was included in the mailout and that the new table has been distributed to the Board.

Mr. Harrington said WMATA is putting forward an amendment to the FY 2010-2015 TIP to update project information in order to match the proposed FY 2011 capital budget of WMATA. He said this includes funding source information. He said the WMATA capital program is \$711.6 million.

Mr. Harrington made a motion to approve resolution R23-2010. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion.

Chairman Snyder asked Mr. Harrington to summarize the major takeaways for this item.

Mr. Harrington said that with the increased level of funding, the primary focus of the capital program is state of good repair for Metro. He said another noteworthy item is the kickoff of the Metrorail 7000 series rail car program, which will replace the 300 oldest rail cars of the 1000 series.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the replacement of the 1000 series cars will be the investment that most people will readily understand. He said WMATA has all of the internal details ready to go and that it is just a matter of final approval of the financing to place the order for the new rail cars, which will likely be in service several years later. He said that overall, this funding represents a significant investment in the system, but that this funding will only provide some of the necessary funding to maintain a state of good repair. He noted that WMATA is still short by at least \$3 billion over the next decade.

Chairman Snyder added that as a regular Metro rider, he is pleased to see this level of investment in the system and that he agrees with Mr. Zimmerman in that the region needs to find a more regular, higher level of investment if it is to maintain Metro as a world-class system.

The motion passed unanimously.

8. Approval of Projects for Funding Under the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom Programs of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

Ms. Bowser presented to the TPB the fourth round of JARC and New Freedom projects. She recognized the efforts of TPB staff Beth Newman and Wendy Klancher in working with the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force to not only prioritize what the Task Force thought was important for this round of funding, but to work with the selection committee in making these project recommendations. She said the ten project recommendations were developed by a five-member selection committee which was geographically balanced and included local and national representatives from transit and human services agencies, and private transit providers. She said the selection committee based the project recommendations on TPB-approved selection criteria, and she noted that, as chair of the selection committee, she convened two meetings to review the submissions.

Ms. Bowser said the TPB became the designated recipient of these two programs in 2006, after SAFETEA-LU increased human service transportation coordination requirements. She said the initiative is an opportunity to fund projects, but also to continue the TPB leadership role in addressing transportation needs of disadvantaged communities throughout the region. She said the TPB has approved 25 projects over the last three years. She said the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requires that the projects be matched, 50 percent for operating cost and 20 percent for capital cost. She said that since the economic downturn, there has been a decrease in the number of applications that the TPB has received and that the project amounts have been less. She said she speculated that is because local governments and agencies are finding it difficult to find matching funds.

Ms. Newman provided a PowerPoint presentation that described in greater detail the 25 projects that the TPB has funded to date. She said the current solicitation ran from February 2, 2010, to April 16, 2010, and that there was \$2.3 million in JARC funding and \$1.3 million in New Freedom money available. She said that approximately 1,800 organizations received a brochure announcing the solicitation and the TPB held four pre-application conferences: one in Maryland, one in Virginia, and two in the District of Columbia. She described the five priorities established by the Task Force and approved by the TPB in December 2009. She said that at the conclusion of the solicitation, the TPB received 11 applications. She provided details about the ten projects the selection committee recommended for funding. She said that approval of these ten projects would obligate \$1.4 million of the JARC money and \$528,000 of the New Freedom money, leaving \$944,000 of JARC and \$840,000 of New Freedom funding for the 2011 solicitation. She said that TPB staff will be initiating an evaluation of the 25 projects that have been funded to date to determine their impacts and to document lessons learned that can be applied in future solicitations and projects. She said the 2011 solicitation will occur in the same timeframe as the 2010 solicitation and that it will include carryover funding from FY 2009 and FY 2010, so there will be \$2.5 million in JARC funding and \$1.9 million in New Freedom funding available.

Mr. Donley noted that in light of the remaining money, one project was not funded. He asked staff to provide some information on why this project was not included in the recommendations from the selection committee.

Ms. Newman said the selection committee was concerned that the project is specifically for employees of the UPS facility in Laurel and that the shuttle would not be available to other people who may want to use it if they are going to the community college or the Greenbelt Metro station.

Ms. Bowser made a motion to approve Resolution R24-2010, which recommends approval of the ten projects described. The motion was seconded.

Chairman Snyder thanked Ms. Bowser, Ms. Newman and the entire Task Force for their efforts. He noted that the projects seem to be for smaller amounts than in years past and principally located in one jurisdiction. He said that for the next solicitation, he hopes that the TPB can place a greater emphasis on regional projects that have a lasting impact. He said he understands that the federal rules for this program are quite onerous and limiting and he suggested that since Congress is starting to discuss authorization, the TPB could let the regional congressional delegation know about its experiences administering the funding and recommend any potential changes to the program. He said the challenges are many, including a 50-percent matching requirement for operating assistance that potentially eliminates too many good programs, as well as the prohibition of the use of the funding for purchase of transit fares. He asked Mr. Kirby if he had any thoughts about how the TPB may proceed on looking at criteria that may be a bit more regional.

Mr. Kirby noted that the TPB has had three years of experience with the program and that there are some nice features to it, including the competitive project selection process, the requirement for a coordinated plan, stakeholder participation, and the leadership by the Board members. He said there are also some limitations, including the 50-percent match for operating assistance as opposed to 20 percent for capital projects, as well as the use of the funding for transit passes. He said the size of the program is also limited. He noted that because the program is administratively run through FTA, an agency that is mostly in the business of funding larger projects, the administrative requirements for this program tend to reflect FTA's larger mission and not necessarily these smaller and more focused programs. He said the TPB could suggest some options that could streamline the administrative requirements of the program, making it simpler for FTA, MPOs and the recipient agencies. He said he thinks it is appropriate for the TPB to speak from its experience and rely on the Task Force to provide some recommendations to the TPB.

Ms. Bowser said Chairman Snyder made excellent points for the Task Force to consider in the review of the projects and the recruitment of additional programs into this funding competition. She said it provides a challenge for all TPB members to go back their jurisdictions and make sure that the human service transportation providers are not only engaged in this funding

competition, but are engaged in the process throughout. She said she was unimpressed with the participation from her jurisdiction and made sure all parties knew about the Task Force meetings and funding opportunities. She said she is pleased to work with every member of the Board to make sure that the TPB can provide good recommendations to the congressional delegation that will be helpful in making this program attractive to the jurisdictions.

Chairman Snyder asked if there were any objections to proceeding as discussed. He noted no objection and said the TPB will proceed accordingly. He asked for a vote on the motion at hand. The motion passed unanimously.

9. Approval of Submission of a “TIGER II” Pre-Application for a Regional Bike Sharing Project

Mr. Kirby described the original TIGER grant program that was part of the federal stimulus legislation, citing the TPB’s award of nearly \$60 million in federal funding for bus priority projects. He provided an overview of a second TIGER program, called TIGER II, which makes \$600 million available, of which \$140 million is available for rural areas, \$35 million for planning activities, and over \$400 million for capital priority projects. Unlike TIGER I, which provided 100-percent federal funding, TIGER II requires a 20-percent local match. He noted the staff recommendation to the board in May to pursue an application for a bike-sharing program under TIGER II, saying that the regional bike-sharing program was a component of the TPB TIGER I grant application, but was not funded.

Ms. Bansal provided an overview of the TPB application for a regional bike-sharing program under the TIGER II program. Referring to a memo that was included in the mailout, she said that the proposal includes bike-sharing and access improvements. She explained how bike-sharing works, and said that the proposal calls for bikes to be placed at transit stations and at places of major activity. She noted the benefits of bike-sharing, such as providing affordable access to areas that may otherwise be too far away to walk, or have insufficient transit service. She explained that access improvements would be included in the proposal to make bike-sharing increasingly accessible through such things as safety and way-finding improvements. She said that this proposal is based on the TIGER I submission, and that the main objectives of the proposal include sustainability, livability, economic competitiveness, and regional impact. She also emphasized recent success with bike-sharing programs throughout the region since the TIGER I funding was announced, citing the D.C. and Arlington County bike-sharing systems that are already in place. She said that a bike-sharing system for the region would involve local ownership, and that a few initial partners have already committed to providing a local match and operating costs.

Ms. Bansal summarized the jurisdictional commitments so far, including a commitment from the District of Columbia to add 1,000 additional bikes to its already-established system, Arlington County’s commitment to adding 750 additional bikes to its already-planned 117-bike system, Fairfax County’s commitment to start a new system with 100 bikes, the City of Alexandria’s

commitment to add 150 bikes, Montgomery County's commitment to start with a 200-bike system, and the City of College Park's plan to include a bike-sharing system with a number of bikes that is still to be determined. She noted that other jurisdictions, such as Prince George's County and the City of Greenbelt, have expressed interest and are looking to identify matching funds. She said that based on this initial package, there is just above \$10 million worth of bike sharing components in the proposal, which is the minimum grant request amount for the TIGER II program. She noted that staff is trying to solicit additional matching contributions to sustain this program, based on the models of other bike sharing programs around the country.

Ms. Bansal reiterated that this package is not yet final, and additional partners could be added to the application through July 1. She provided a timeframe for next steps in preparing an application: on July 9, the TPB Steering Committee will review and approve the application; on July 14, the application will be presented to the COG Board for approval; and July 16 is the deadline to submit all pre-application material to DOT.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the proposal would build off existing programs that are currently underway.

Ms. Bansal clarified that the proposal would build off existing programs in the District of Columbia and the Capital Bike-Sharing Program in Arlington.

Mr. Zimmerman said the name for the Capital Bike-Sharing Program was recently determined. He also said that the numbers provided in the proposal appear confusing because some numbers refer to bikes that would be added to existing programs in certain jurisdictions, and other numbers refer to bikes that would be added to a regional program if the grant were funded. He requested clarification on the numbers.

Ms. Bansal clarified that 3,227 bikes cited in the memo include 1,000 bikes already planned for the District of Columbia. These 1,000 bikes are funded using federal resources, and therefore cannot be included in the proposal. She said the Arlington system is funded with private and local resources, rendering it useful as a match for the application. She clarified that 2,227 bikes will be included in the application.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for confirmation that these 2,227 bikes would be added to the existing ones, resulting in a system with about 3,200 bikes.

Ms. Bansal confirmed Mr. Zimmerman's statement.

Mr. Roberts asked if some of this funding would be used to construct bike lanes.

Ms. Bansal said this was a possible use of the funds, but that to date, none of the participating jurisdictions had made a commitment to include bike lanes in the proposal.

Mr. Roberts asked if there was a way to work with the State of Maryland to secure bike lanes on

State Road 193, also known as Greenbelt Road. He mentioned previous efforts for a neighborhood improvement plan that included bike lanes, landscaping, and pedestrian safety projects on this road that was not completed due to funding considerations. He said he would be more likely to marshal support from his colleagues for bike sharing if the State of Maryland could commit funds for bike lanes.

Ms. Erickson responded that the Maryland State Highway Association (SHA) is partnering on this proposal. She said SHA is working with Metro on station access improvements. She said that the short turnaround timeframe, combined with limited funding for a match, is causing MDOT to focus on what it has already funded in the program. She said the State could look into Mr. Roberts' request in the future.

Ms. Tregoning asked if the bike facilities that are under construction around the region are all federally funded, or if some are locally funded and could therefore be part of a match for this grant application.

Ms. Bansal said that some bike facility projects include federal funds and cannot be used as a match. She said that for other facility projects, jurisdictions may not want to undertake all of the requirements that accompany federal funding. She said that each jurisdiction is reviewing its improvement programs to see what might be included as a match, and that this process is ongoing.

Ms. Ricks mentioned that the District has an existing 100-bike sharing system, which is part of a 20-year bus shelter contract, and said that hoped that this would be included as part of a local match.

Chairman Snyder asked Mr. Kirby if additional jurisdictions could participate in the application.

Mr. Kirby said that TPB has reached out to all member jurisdictions to explain about the opportunity to join in this proposal. He clarified that the jurisdictions described in the memo represent those who have made a commitment so far. He said additional jurisdictions could be added to the package, but would need to make a commitment by July 1. He noted that the application submission deadline is July 16, and that staff has suggested that the Board empower the Steering Committee to sign off on the final application on July 9.

Chairman Snyder asked if a reminder could be sent to the jurisdictions.

Mr. Kirby said yes.

Chairman Snyder noted that the resolution before the board is not jurisdiction-specific, but that the background materials are. He clarified that with the additional reminder communication, the ultimate decision on the application would be made by the Steering Committee. He said that precedent has been set for this action with the TIGER I application, where a general resolution was passed by the board, and the Steering Committee was delegated the task of approving final

details of the submission. He asked Mr. Kirby to confirm that all this was correct.

Mr. Kirby confirmed the accuracy of the Chairman's remarks.

Mr. Zimmerman moved to adopt Resolution R25-2010, to approve the submission of a regional bike-sharing pre-application under the TIGER II program. The motion was seconded, and passed unanimously.

10. Approval of a TPB Response to a Request by Martz National Coach for Federal Assistance for Commuter Bus Service between Fredericksburg and Washington, DC

Mr. Kirby provided an overview of the history behind the letter for the board's approval. He said that in January, Martz National Coach, a private bus company that provides commuter service between Fredericksburg and the District, sent a letter to the TPB requesting support for Martz to take advantage of the fact that the Federal Transit Administration's (FTA) 5307 formula funds are based on reporting service mileage and passengers for service within the Washington metropolitan area. He said that Martz has recently been reporting their service mileage to FTA, which has resulted in increasing the region's total share of 5307 funds by approximately \$250,000 or more per year. He said that Martz is requesting that the TPB consider taking steps to program these funds toward its bus system in the form of capital improvements and/or related eligible expenses.

Mr. Kirby outlined a draft letter that responds to the Martz request, noting that the letter asks for additional information on some of the issues that are associated with an affirmative response to their request. The first point in the letter states that one of the existing transit recipients in the Washington region would have to assume responsibility for these funds because federal funds cannot go directly to a private bus operator, and that a 20-percent match is required. The existing transit recipient would also have to assume all of the federal certifications, including conformity requirements, and drug and alcohol testing. The letter asks if Martz has identified a recipient agency that is willing to pass the federal money along to them, and whether Martz will provide the requisite matching funds. The second point in the letter asks if Martz can provide further information on the administrative costs associated with accepting federal funding. The third point in the letter asks Martz for input on what kind of public benefit would be generated through this arrangement. The fourth point in the letter asks Martz to provide information on their mileage and contribution to the 5307 funding.

Mr. Kirby said the letter also describes a precedent that exists in the region through an arrangement between WMATA and PRTC. In general, 5307 funds go to WMATA initially, and additional arrangements exist through a split-letter to sub-allocate funding to VRE and MARC based on their contributions to the formula. PRTC receives a portion of 5307 funds for its bus service that operates outside the WMATA compact area. According to this precedent, Martz would not receive all of the money it generates, but instead would receive only the money associated with the mileage outside the WMATA compact area. The final comment in the letter

notes that the TPB is receptive to working with Martz, but notes that whatever action is taken with Martz may set a precedent for other private providers in the future.

Mr. Kirby added that, since the mailout, TPB staff learned that WMATA replied to a similar letter from Martz. A copy of WMATA's response was provided as a handout. He emphasized that WMATA is not interested in assuming responsibility for being a recipient on Martz's behalf. He also said that WMATA is uncomfortable with any action that would result in a reduction of its funding. He said that it would be good to send the TPB reply letter to Martz and see what the response may be. He anticipated that a response would return rather quickly, and that the board will have to decide how to proceed from there.

Mr. Zimmerman moved that the Board approve the letter as drafted. Ms. Ticer seconded the motion.

Ms. Tregoning asked for clarification on the wording of the fourth item in the letter, under the sentence that read: "For those bus agencies that are not members of the WMATA compact, only those federal 5307 formula funds earned outside the compact area are the subject of the split letter calculations; inside the compact area goes to WMATA."

Mr. Kirby clarified that the sentence should read: "The funds earned inside the compact area go to WMATA."

Mr. Zimmerman said that the sentence should read: "Those funds earned..."

Mr. Kirby agreed on the grammatical change.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for confirmation that the discussed revision would be inserted into the draft letter for clarification.

Mr. Kirby confirmed that this revision would be inserted in the final draft letter.

Chairman Snyder stated that the change would be incorporated into the motion without objection.

The motion passed unanimously.

11. Approval of the Strategic Plan for the Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Planning Program

Mr. Kirby noted that the TPB received an abbreviated presentation on the MOITS Planning Program at its May 19 meeting, when Chairman Snyder requested that TPB staff prepare a resolution to approve the MOITS Strategic Plan for consideration at the June 16 meeting, following a longer presentation on the topic.

Mr. Meese, referring to a memorandum in the mailout packet, and a PowerPoint presentation distributed at the meeting, described the MOITS Planning Program and summarized the proposed MOITS Strategic Plan. He thanked Chairman Snyder for his chairmanship of the MOITS Policy Task Force and participation on previous committees related to the topic. He noted that the core missions of the MOITS Technical Subcommittee are to advise the TPB on transportation management, operations, and technology, and to serve as a forum for information exchange. He said that the Subcommittee had initiated an effort to develop a strategic plan for guide future Subcommittee activities and provide a list of potential regional projects for future funding opportunities.

Mr. Meese described the proposed Strategic Plan as having been developed with consultant assistance and under advisement of the MOITS Technical Subcommittee, and was grounded in the 1998 TPB Vision. He said that the Plan works to achieve Vision goals by providing regional situational awareness, coordinating standard operating procedures, informing travelers, and integrating technical systems and processes. He said the Plan provides a set of best practices by which the region's state and local agencies can help support regional goals through technology and operations. He noted that the MOITS Subcommittee partners with the COG Emergency Transportation Committee, WMATA, and the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program, describing MOITS as a planning activity while MATOC is an action and implementation program.

Mr. Meese explained the benefits of the MOITS Planning Program, including improved safety, reduced delays, better availability and quality of information, and increased travel options. He went through the list of possible projects and strategic efforts developed as part of the Strategic Plan, noting that this list would be ready should funding opportunities arise. He said that the list includes projects to facilitate and improve data sharing, and initiate pilot projects that implement new technologies. He said the strategic efforts focus on the federally promoted concept of regional coordination in transportation systems management and operations.

Mr. Meese concluded by summarizing the core recommendations of the Strategic Plan, including further strengthening coordination between MOITS and partner programs, identifying additional needed projects and strategic efforts, encouraging best practices, strengthening understanding of performance measurement and benefit-cost analysis, and informing policy makers of the activities and recommendations of the Subcommittee.

Mr. Meese asked the TPB to consider adoption of Resolution R26-2010 to approve the MOITS Strategic Plan.

Chairman Snyder said that the MOITS Planning Program is aimed at day-to-day improvements to make the existing transportation system work better and to be better prepared to respond to unusual circumstances.

Vice Chairman Turner moved to adopt Resolution R26-2010 to approve the Strategic Plan for

the MOITS Planning Program. Mr. Mendelson seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

12. Report on “Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities”

Mr. Kirby said that the May 26 “Conversation” was successful in providing a forum for productive conversation between members of the TPB, the Technical Committee, the Citizens Advisory Committee, and the Access for All Advisory Committee. He noted that the mailout packet included four PowerPoint presentations delivered at the event, and that staff had taken and compiled notes on the conversations held at each of seven tables.

Mr. Swanson summarized the report developed on the event, including notes from the group discussions, common themes, and possible actions. He noted that the event arose from a recommendation by the CAC that the TPB develop a regional transportation priorities plan, and hold an event to discuss the development of such a plan. He said that the event had been structured as a sort of internal retreat for stakeholders of the TPB. He summarized the event program, including background presentations and structured small-group discussions, noting that the discussions pivoted off of the presentation by CAC Chair Ms. Budetti, who outlined frustrations with the current transportation process and presented some ideas for change.

Mr. Swanson summarized the discussion notes under each of the guiding questions from the conversation, including how participants understand the current process, reasons for change, and options for change. He identified areas of consensus and disagreement, including the question of whether it is appropriate or desirable for the TPB to play a greater role in defining and implementing regional transportation priorities. He said there was discussion about solving regional problems with regional solutions, emerging opportunities to obtain additional federal funding through regional cooperation, ways to provide better information to decision makers about the regional context and impacts, and ways to encourage public discussion about regional issues. He said there was also discussion about the potential pitfalls of a greater TPB role in project selection, including possible undermining of local decisions and authority.

Mr. Swanson said that the group discussions featured many creative ideas, and he described what different groups thought key elements of a regional priorities plan would be, including specific policies derived from the TPB Vision and/or the Region Forward report produced by Greater Washington 2050, an identification of both funded and unfunded priority projects, and some analysis component that places projects within a framework of regional performance measures. He said that there was discussion about the threshold of “regional significance” that should be used in deciding what projects should be included in such a plan. He said that discussion about what the plan should not be included making sure that it does not usurp state, subregional, or local authority for transportation funding and land use.

Mr. Swanson said discussion about a regional priorities plan included issues of how often it

should be updated, how it would fit within the current process, how public involvement would be incorporated, and what new tools might be necessary for analysis and outreach. He said many groups suggested establishing a task force or some way of institutionalizing discussion of regional transportation priorities. He said discussion of potential methodologies for developing a regional priorities plan included how to quantify benefits, how to identify needs and preferred solutions, how to incorporate a broad theme of sustainability, and how to include some funding constraint as a framing device. He noted that discussion did not really get bogged down in ideological disagreements about what the priorities themselves should be, but instead focused on the process for identifying and implementing them. He said that many participants emphasized that the current process needs to be explained better to the public and citizen advocates.

Mr. Swanson concluded by listing potential next steps that were identified in the notes from a number of groups, including forming a task force to look at developing a regional transportation priorities plan, developing a regional inventory of unfunded projects, investigating how other MPOs develop and implement regional transportation priorities, taking steps to increase public information about procedures and goals, and continuing the conversation at future events.

Chairman Snyder thanked the staff involved in putting on the event and all those who participated.

Ms. Ricks complimented the involved TPB staff on the event and said it represented the TPB playing an important role as a forum for regional discussion. She said that while people may be afraid of the phrase “regional priorities plan,” it is the only way as a region to frame and understand what the region requires to move forward. She said that the direction being taken in federal policy discussions is toward regional planning and prioritization, and that she hoped the discussion facilitated by the May 26 event would continue.

Mr. Orlin noted that there was agreement at his table that the CLRP technically cannot be anything more than it is as an accumulation of needs from state and local governments, because of the need for a strict financial constraint to satisfy federal requirements. He said that it is not quite as parochial as it may appear, as local and state governments have become accustomed to working together and making the process work. He said that one missing element is prioritization of projects that cross state lines, because there is no other forum besides WMATA and the TPB for that type of discussion. He suggested that the CLRP could continue with its current format but be supplemented by some kind of analysis by TPB staff to identify projects within the CLRP that have the highest priority. He said this would not have any formal significance, but could be used to press jurisdictions to implement projects of greatest benefit for the region. He said that there are examples of major projects such as planned streetcar projects that seem to lack cross-jurisdictional planning and coordination in some ways, noting in particular a lack of connection between the Purple Line and D.C. streetcar projects. He said the TPB could encourage outside-the-box thinking in that regard.

Ms. Krimm said she supported the suggested next steps of increasing public information about regional procedures and goals, and continuing the conversation. She encouraged the TPB to

especially make sure that information reaches the outer jurisdictions and that residents in those jurisdictions get an opportunity to participate in conversations about regional priority-setting.

Ms. Tregoning said she supported the first three next steps mentioned in the report, as well as looking at the potential to use the Region Forward report, which addresses transportation as closely related to climate change and economic competitiveness, as a starting point for identifying regional transportation priorities. She said that while it may be interesting to see what other MPOs are doing, she expects the Washington Region to continue to be a leader and not be limited to doing things that have already been done elsewhere. She agreed that federal transportation policy is moving in the direction of regional and sustainability-focused efforts, and the TPB can be in a much better position to compete for federal funds if it can be proactive in addressing these issues in advance of a specific funding opportunity.

Chairman Snyder suggested that discussion of next steps be put on the agenda for the July 21 TPB meeting, following consideration by the Technical Committee. He asked that TPB staff present some possible ways forward at the July 21 meeting, taking into consideration the notes from the May 26 event, the CAC recommendations, and input from the Technical Committee.

Mr. Kirby said that staff would organize the various materials into a set of steps to go forward, get feedback from both the Technical Committee and the CAC, and come to the July 21 TPB meeting with some recommendations.

13. Briefing on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program

Chairman Snyder said that he had gathered that several TPB members wanted some clarification as to what the MATOC Program is really accomplishing, and that while those close to it have an understanding of it, it may be helpful to get a good summary in simple terms.

Mr. Zezeski of the Maryland State Highway Administration, referring to a PowerPoint presentation, summarized the current status of the MATOC Program, including funding commitments, recent actions, and program benefits. He said that funding commitments for FY 2011 are up to around \$1,190,000, after a request of \$1.2 million to sustain the program. He summarized recent regional incidents in which MATOC played a response coordination role, as well as special events such as holidays and major construction activities. He noted that a benefit-cost analysis was recently completed, and that program benefits derive from coordination across jurisdictions and resulting improvements in traveler information. He said the result is reduction in delay, duration of incident impacts, and the emissions that result from incident-caused congestion, as well as improvements in safety.

Mr. Zezeski briefly described three incidents as examples of the type of regional incident included in the program scope and how MATOC responds to such incidents. He said that the benefit-cost analysis estimates that MATOC actions have resulted in a savings of \$12.9 million,

including a half-million-dollar benefit from reduction of greenhouse gases. He said that given the expectation that a \$1.2 million budget per year will sustain MATOC, that results in a benefit-cost ratio of about ten-to-one.

Mr. Mendelson asked about the status of the MATOC Facilitator position, which he recalled had been vacant as of April.

Mr. Zezeski said that a candidate had been selected and was in process of being hired, likely within the next two weeks.

Mr. Mendelson asked if that meant the facilitator would be starting before the July 4 holiday.

Mr. Zezeski said that the facilitator would be starting before July 4.

Mr. Mendelson asked as to the source of the \$400,000 committed by DDOT to the program for FY 2011.

Ms. Ricks said that she believed the source of funding to be Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds.

Mr. Mendelson said that the document included in the TPB mailout packet had indicated that DDOT had given an oral commitment but not yet sent a letter.

Ms. Ricks said that DDOT was still working through the logistics of how the formal commitment would be made and the funding transferred.

Mr. Mendelson asked about the status of VDOT's commitment.

Ms. Sorenson said that VDOT had not committed funds to the program.

Mr. Mendelson asked if there was a chance VDOT would be committing funding, noting that a lack of funding from VDOT made it more difficult for MDOT and DDOT to commit funding.

Ms. Sorenson said that VDOT had been waiting on the completion of the benefit-cost analysis of the MATOC program before deciding on a commitment of funds, but that the appropriate VDOT staff had not yet had time to review the analysis.

Mr. Mendelson asked if Ms. Sorenson would be able to provide more information on VDOT's funding commitment at the next report on the MATOC Program.

Ms. Sorenson said she hoped she would be able to provide more information at that time.

Mr. Mendelson asked if Mr. Zezeski could provide more detail about preparations for the July 4 holiday.

Mr. Zezeski said that the MATOC Operations Subcommittee had been meeting to discuss likely congestion spots and planned construction sites, and planning on how to be prepared for incidents and how best to get the word out to travelers.

Mr. Mendelson asked what MATOC had done to respond to the situation created when work on the Chain Bridge necessitated an unanticipated lane closure during rush hour.

Mr. Zezeski said that he did not know the specifics of the response to that incident.

Mr. Mendelson asked that Mr. Zezeski supply greater detail about responses to recent unplanned incidents when he next reports to the TPB.

Mr. Zezeski noted that there is a complete summary of the unplanned events that had occurred recently and what MATOC had done to respond to them that could be made available to the TPB. He noted that description of three unplanned incidents and the MATOC responses were included in the presentation.

Mr. Mendelson asked if the complete list with descriptions of unplanned incidents and responses could be supplied at the next MATOC presentation to the Board.

Mr. Zezeski said that he would be glad to provide that information at the next MATOC report.

Chairman Snyder thanked the agencies that have committed funding to the MATOC Program and said he would be interested in VDOT's reaction to the benefit-cost analysis. He said that there are few programs that have the payback of the MATOC Program for the region.

14. Other Business

There was no other business brought before the Board.

15. Adjournment

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting, and was passed unanimously. Chairman Snyder adjourned the meeting at 2:02 p.m.