

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
November 18, 2009**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Melissa Barlow, FTA
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Bill Bronrott, Maryland House
Colleen Clay, City of Takoma Park
Kerry Donley, City of Alexandria
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jason Groth, Charles County
Tom Harrington, WMATA
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Charles Jenkins, Frederick County
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
Karina Ricks, DC Office of Planning
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Paul Smith, City of Frederick
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd Turner, City of Bowie
Jonathan Way, City of Manassas
Lori Waters, Loudoun County Board of Supervisors
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	
Michael Clifford	
Gerald Miller	
Bob Griffiths	
Nicholas Ramfos	
Andrew Meese	
Tim Canan	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Andrew Austin	
Deb Bilek	
Erin Morrow	
Karin Foster	
Michael Farrell	
Wendy Klancher	
Beth Newman	
Monica Bansal	
John Swanson	
Darren Smith	
Karin Foster	
Wenjing Pu	
Mark Moran	
Dave Robertson	COG/EO
Paul DesJardin	COG/DCPS
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Lewis Miller	COG/OPA
Bill Orleans	PG ACT
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Tom Biesiadny	Fairfax County DOT
Bob Chase	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Jim Maslanka	City of Alexandria
Russell Anderson	MD/SHA
Rick Kiegel	MTA
Ernie Baisden	MTA
Sarah Fowler	MD/SHA
Mulowa K. Kajoba	MD/SHA
Felicia Alexander	MD/SHA
Tina Slater	Action Committee for Transit
Judith F. Davis, Mayor	City of Greenbelt
Lon Anderson	AAA Mid Atlantic
Martha M. Meade	AAA Mid Atlantic
John B. Townsend	AAA Mid Atlantic
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Douglas Stewart	Private Citizen – Fairfax City
Phillip Ellis	Sierra Club
Alyssa Brown	Prince William County

Mike Brown	PB
Tom Whitley	Citizen
Dan Malouff	Loudoun County
Buddy Ey	MATOC

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Mr. Keough, speaking for himself rather than as CAC Chairman, provided positive feedback on the Greater Washington 2050 Report. He also spoke on the TPB's grant proposal: Public Acceptability of Regional Road Use Pricing. He said the TPB should include broad perspectives on the issue of road pricing should it be awarded the grant. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Anderson of AAA Mid-Atlantic spoke on the Greater Washington 2050 Report and noted that the report was lacking in transportation vision for the region. He said that fixing transportation in the region involves improving the road system.

Mr. Chase of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance spoke on the Greater Washington 2050 Report and expressed concern that the report's transportation focus is only on transit, bicycles, sidewalks, and land-use. He said it does not take into account the daily trips people take in vehicles. Copies of his remarks were distributed.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the October 21 Meeting

Mr. Donley made a motion to approve the minutes of the October 21, 2009, TPB meeting. Mrs. Smyth seconded this motion, which passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Mr. Erenrich said the TPB Technical Committee met on November 6, 2009, and discussed six items on the TPB agenda:

- Item 9: He said the committee agreed with the need to revise the schedule for the 2010 Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) to accommodate the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) revenue forecasts.
- Item 10: The committee was briefed on the Greater Washington 2050 Report.
- Item 11: The committee was briefed on the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) recommendations and provided feedback to staff on the proposed TPB response.
- Item 12: Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) staff briefed the committee on the I-270/US-15 Multimodal Corridor Study.

-
- Item 13: The committee was briefed on the recent activities of the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program.
 - Item 14: TPB staff briefed the committee on an amendment to the 2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Mr. Keough said the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) believed it would be useful to study public attitudes about road pricing to help elected officials make educated decisions on the topic. He noted that the CAC was concerned about political bias in the proposal should the think tank involvement be limited to the Brookings Institution.

Mr. Keough said the CAC received a briefing on the Greater Washington 2050 Report and felt the report represents progress in reaching a unified vision for the region. He said the CAC is interested in how the Greater Washington 2050 effort relates to TPB planning efforts, including the CLRP, the Scenario Study, and regional emergency preparedness. He said the CAC offered suggestions on how to make the report more accessible and user-friendly. He said the CAC called for transportation targets to be more quantifiable, and suggested an idea to develop a scoring system by which policies and projects would be evaluated against the regional vision and goals.

Mr. Keough said two members of the CAC attended the TPB's Community Leadership Institute in October. He said the next two CAC meetings will address special topics: the December meeting will be held in Alexandria and feature speakers on the federal transportation policy picture and high speed rail initiatives; the January 2010 meeting will focus on issues related to the transportation impacts of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) decision.

Mr. Keough reviewed the CAC recommendations before the TPB that would be discussed under Item 11. He restated the CAC recommendations, and summarized the TPB staff memo that responds to the CAC proposal. He expressed the CAC's disappointment with this staff response memo, citing that the proposals fall short of committing to developing a regional enhanced long-range plan. Mr. Keough said that while many in the CAC membership felt that the staff response represented a step in the right direction, it may become yet another missed opportunity.

Chairman Jenkins invited Mr. Keough to continue his remarks later in the meeting, when the CAC recommendations would be addressed formally under Item 11.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said that the Steering Committee met on November 6th. Referring to the mailout, he said that the Steering Committee took three actions on the fiscal year 2010-2015 TIP, all of

which were associated with moving funding allocations from one source to another. There were no impacts on air quality conformity.

He reviewed several letters from a letters packet that was distributed. These letters included:

- A commitment letter from John Catoe , General Manager of WMATA, for \$150,000 to the Streetsmart Pedestrian Bicycle Safety Campaign.
- An invitation to Mr. Kirby to attend a symposium called “Moving Maryland” that will include discussions about the relationships between land use, growth, VMT, congestion, and greenhouse gas emissions.
- An announcement noting the formation of the Northern Virginia Streetcar Coalition.
- An explanation of the Columbia Pike Transit Initiative, which is a light rail project being developed in Arlington.
- An announcement that the TPB will receive the Rosa Parks Diversity Leadership Award from the DC Chapter of WTS. The TPB is being recognized for a number of activities, including wheelchair accessible taxi services, work on Metro Access, reaching out to the Hispanic community in pedestrian safety programs, and the Community Leadership Institute.

Mr. Kirby concluded by showing a few slides of a demonstration that was held at COG for the wheelchair accessible taxicabs that are being purchased under a New Freedom FTA grant. He spoke about the program, noting that these are the first wheelchair accessible taxicabs in DC, and that the initial fleet includes 20 cabs to be operated by two private taxi companies – Yellow Cab and Royal Cab. He also said service is expected to begin in January 2010. He pointed out that DC Councilmember and TPB Second Vice Chair Muriel Bowser was at the event.

6. Chairman’s Remarks

Chairman Jenkins recognized Alderman Paul Smith with the City of Frederick by presenting a certificate of recognition and appreciation for his distinguished service as a member of the TPB from 2006 to 2009.

Mr. Smith noted that he represented the smallest entity of the TPB, and thanked the TPB.

Chairman Jenkins recognized six participants who completed the Community Leadership Institute (CLI), which was held on October 29th and 31st. He asked Ms. Tina Slater, one of the participants, to speak about her experiences with the CLI.

Ms. Slater said that the CLI resources were excellent, and that staff was very knowledgeable and supportive. She said the structure of the two-day seminar was interesting, and included PowerPoint seminars and role-playing exercises. She said that, as a result of her participation with the CLI, she is more aware of how the different counties and municipalities are involved in

making transportation-related decisions. She also noted that her experiences in CLI reminded her of her real-life experiences in her advocacy work for the Purple Line. She thanked the TPB.

Chairman Jenkins distributed certificates of completion to the CLI participants.

7. Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which is Exempt From the Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Reduce Funding for the Intermodal Transportation Center at Union Station as Requested by the District Department of Transportation (DDOT)

Ms. Ricks said that the amendment proposed by DDOT is to reduce funding amounts in FY 2010, 2011, and 2012 for the Union Station Intermodal Transportation Center. She said the reason behind the amendment is to maintain fiscal constraint in the proposed TIP in order to gain FTA and FHWA approval. She moved to adopt resolution R11-2010. The resolution was seconded by Ms. Tregoning, and approved unanimously.

8. Appointment of Nominating Committee for Year 2010 TPB Officers

Chairman Jenkins appointed former TPB Chair Cathy Hudgins, former TPB Chair Phil Mendelson, and Maryland Delegate Bill Bronrott to serve on the TPB Nominating Committee, with Ms. Hudgins as Chair. He said that they will bring nominations in December for TPB leadership in 2010.

9. Approval of Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2010 Update of the Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Austin of COG staff noted that there were two significant changes to the call for projects document since the TPB was briefed on it at its October 21 meeting. He said that the schedule has essentially been shifted by two months into the future to accommodate some implementing agencies that needed more time to complete programming activities. He said this would push the deadline for project inputs to March 2010, and the scheduled adoption of the CLRP to October 20, 2010.

Mr. Austin said that the second change was in response to concerns raised by TPB members at the October 21 meeting, and appears on page 14 of the document in a new section titled “Evolving Policy Context and Direction for the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP.” He said that staff had included new language about the shifting funding picture and opportunities such as stimulus funds and the federal Partnership for Sustainable Communities, as well as transportation-related goals referenced in other TPB and COG activities such as the TPB

Scenario Study, the Climate Change Report, and the Greater Washington 2050 Report. He said that submitting agencies are encouraged to consider this context in programming projects and describing their regional benefits.

Ms. Tregoning said that she appreciated the effort to strengthen the context considerations section of the document, but thought that it should not be weakened with any qualifiers. She said that the TPB has positioned itself well to respond to changing priorities and circumstances, and should be ready for further opportunities that may come from the federal level at any time.

Ms. Tregoning moved to amend the call for projects document by replacing the last sentence on page 14 with the following text: "This evolving federal and regional policy context and direction shall be considered in the development of the 2010 plan and the fiscal year 2011-2016 TIP, in addition to the specific goals of the Greater Washington 2050 Region Forward Report as adopted by the COG Board and the COG Climate Report, VMT-Reducing Strategies of the RMAS, and the need to address the East-West Divide." Mr. Elrich seconded the motion.

Mr. Kirby noted that many of the policy developments mentioned by Ms. Tregoning were still evolving and may be moving targets as the 2010 CLRP is developed, but that they are far enough along that their general shape is clear, and agencies submitting projects for the 2010 CLRP should be able to take them into account.

Ms. Waters said that in many of the regional policy discussions there is not only an issue of an East-West divide but also a divide between inner jurisdictions and outer jurisdictions. She said she wanted to ensure that Ms. Tregoning's amendment would not affect recognition of the differences that may exist in priorities between the inner and outer jurisdictions.

Ms. Tregoning said that her amendment would not affect the ability of every part of the region to put forward projects that would meet regional goals. She said that the East-West language refers to a long-articulated recognition of imbalances in poverty, unemployment, and growth between the two sides of the region.

Mr. Weissberg noted that the phrase commonly used to describe efforts to address East-West imbalances has been "The Region Undivided."

Ms. Waters said she wanted to make sure that the language proposed would not be interpreted in a way that would penalize outer jurisdictions, especially given that many of the goals and strategies mentioned in the Greater Washington 2050 report to be addressed in the next item are inner-jurisdiction-centric.

Ms. Tregoning said that every jurisdiction in the region would continue to be able to successfully advance projects under the language she proposed, and that while her intent is to change some aspects of how CLRP development occurs, that would not leave out any jurisdiction or take away opportunities to get funds for their projects.

Ms. Sorenson said she was concerned about agreeing to be informed by products, such as the Greater Washington 2050 report and the current phase of the TPB Scenario Study, which are not yet complete. She said that the original language in the document struck the appropriate balance of giving the opportunity to consider the ongoing work and continue to comment on it going forward.

Ms. Tregoning said that she appreciated the concern about the incompleteness of some of the products, and for that reason had constructed her proposed amendment language to include phrases like “as adopted by the COG Board” in reference to the Greater Washington 2050 report. She said that once such a document becomes official policy as adopted by the elected leaders of the region, it should be fair game to have it inform the CLRP development process.

Mr. Zimmerman said that waiting for all the related policy initiatives to be complete could lead to complete inactivity, and that the ability to work concurrently with related efforts can often be the only way to move forward.

Ms. Backmon said that she shared Ms. Waters’s concern about the effect of various external policy documents, particularly the Greater Washington 2050 report, on outer jurisdictions. She said that Prince William County is concerned that some of the targets in the report are viewed as unattainable for jurisdictions outside the Beltway.

The amendment proposed by Ms. Tregoning was passed by a majority vote, taken by voice.

The final call for projects document for the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP for distribution to state, regional, and local agencies, was passed as amended by a unanimous vote.

10. Briefing on Draft Greater Washington 2050 Report and Approval of TPB Comments on the Report

Mr. Robertson, referring to a PowerPoint presentation, described the process for development of the Greater Washington 2050 draft report and summarized the content of the report. He said that the Greater Washington 2050 Coalition welcomed the TPB’s interest in its activities, and invited comment on the draft report. He noted that TPB members had several options to comment including through the TPB, through their governing boards and councils, and individually. He said that many other metropolitan regions have been engaged in similar efforts, and noted that the Coalition had representatives from many different sectors and had provided many opportunities for input during related outreach.

Mr. Robertson said that the initiative has been shaped by the evolution of long-range planning in the region, which has included milestones such as introduction of the regional activity center concept and maps, development of the TPB vision, and recent completion of the COG climate

change report. He said that while all such regional, long-range planning activities are difficult, the Coalition recognized a need to take on additional regional challenges with hope and confidence in what the future may hold.

Mr. Robertson referred to various contextual factors that will influence the region including demographic, economic, and political trends. He said that the hope of the Coalition was to build on previous work but also do some big-picture thinking that could open up new possibilities and take into account unanticipated factors and trends such as technology, energy prices, and workforce participation. He noted that a public survey conducted by the coalition indicated a desire for better regional coordination and emphasized the need to recognize the inter-connectedness of various issues, like transportation and housing.

Mr. Robertson said that the draft report dealt with four concepts that seem to resonate in the region: sustainability, livability, accessibility, and prosperity; and is organized into four sections dealing in turn with goals, targets, indicators, and a regional compact. He emphasized that the compact is voluntary for the region's jurisdictions, but that the intent is to lay out some aspirational goals that all can agree on and work toward. He briefly described the goals and measures, particularly those related to transportation, and noted how the report recognizes their inter-connectedness.

Mr. Robertson said the Coalition's hope was for each COG jurisdiction to agree to the compact that pulls together the various goals, and strategize on how to meet them. He said that the Coalition would be creating a toolbox designed to help jurisdictions in learning about best practices and sharing information. He encouraged additional comments on the draft and said the process would continue to be transparent, interactive, and participatory. He said that comments are due by November 30 and that the Coalition would be meeting again on December 11 to consider the comments, after which the revised report would be considered by the COG Board.

Ms. Hudgins apologized that a delay had prevented her from being able to introduce the item. She reemphasized the voluntary nature of the initiative and said that it provided an opportunity for greater synergy between jurisdictions. She noted that other stakeholders such as civic and homeowner associations, business communities, and other interest groups will be critical to implementing the goals contained in the report. She thanked COG staff for its work on the effort.

Chairman Jenkins sought clarification on the action before the TPB.

Mr. Robertson said that the action before the TPB is a letter commenting on the draft report on behalf of the TPB as a collective body. He said that the draft report was also sent all of the region's governing boards and councils requesting comments individually from them. He said that the comments are due by November 30.

Ms. Waters said that she had some passages of text that she wanted to offer as additions to the draft letter, with the first being: “In addition to expanding transit and walkability options, roads are an essential component of a functional regional transportation system. Additional capacity will be needed to accommodate the region’s growth and economic vibrancy.” Ms. Waters moved to add this passage of text to the comment letter. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Zimmerman observed that the proposed new text seemed only to address the idea of new capacity, while one of the concerns of many in the region is that the existing network for vehicular and other transportation is, in many places, in need of repair, including some areas that carry heavy loads of traffic in multiple directions.

Ms. Waters asked if Mr. Zimmerman would like her to add the phrase “additional capacity and maintenance will be needed” to the new passage she proposed.

Mr. Zimmerman said he would be more comfortable with language that talks about the need to maintain our existing infrastructure.

Vice Chairman Snyder suggested that the new passage say “increased support for maintenance, management, and operations.”

Ms. Waters agreed to Vice Chairman Snyder’s proposed change.

Ms. Tregoning expressed a concern that the proposed statements are almost antithetical to the spirit of the report. She said that in some jurisdictions, new road capacity is definitely not the answer. She said that the report doesn’t currently say the opposite – that we shouldn’t be building any new road capacity – and she asked why the new statement should be included.

Mr. Bottigheimer asked for clarification from Vice Chairman Snyder and Mr. Zimmerman as to whether they were including the idea of getting more capacity out of existing infrastructure.

Vice Chairman Snyder replied in the affirmative, and said that his intent was to include all modes. He said that the region needs more capacity and to better maintain and operate existing infrastructure.

Mr. Smith said that in Frederick County, roads that were some of the first Interstates in the country were great 50 years ago, but now definitely need more capacity. He said that it is important to acknowledge in the letter that at least in some places, there clearly is a need for more capacity.

Mr. Way said that the western part of the region will be considerably dependent upon roads, as was noted in the testimony of the American Automobile Association and the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance during the earlier public comment item. He said that the Greater Washington 2050 report, as it is currently drafted, is somewhat devoid of reference to

transportation. He said that Ms. Waters's proposal will push the authors to address the subject, however it may finally be resolved.

Chairman Jenkins called for a vote on Ms. Waters's additional text passage as amended by Vice Chairman Snyder: "In addition to expanding transit and walkability options, roads are an essential component of a functional regional transportation system. Increased capacity and additional support for maintenance, management, and operations is needed to accommodate the region's growth and economic vibrancy."

The motion passed by a majority vote, taken by voice.

Ms. Waters proposed a second additional text passage to be included in the letter, as follows: "Recognize and respect the geographic diversity of the region, which offers residences and businesses opportunities for rural, suburban, and urban locational choices. Establishing metrics, trends, and targets should be realistic and reflective of our geographic diversity."

Mr. Bronrott expressed concern that the region will be splintered if it is accepted that the bedroom communities around the rim of the region should continue to grow in the old, auto-dependent way, when, as was stated earlier in the meeting, transit-oriented growth and town centers are compatible for all the concentric circles of the region.

Ms. Waters replied that in some of the targets listed in the report, specific numbers are used, and that it may be easier for D.C., for instance, to attain certain targets that are specific numbers than it would be for Loudoun County. She said she wanted recognition that if an indicator shows progress in the right direction that should represent sufficient progress, since different jurisdictions will not be able to reach the same target at the same speed. She said that every jurisdiction is implementing mixed-use development and other strategies that make progress toward the goals.

Ms. Ricks said she didn't know that there was reason to believe that the document doesn't recognize the differences between the different jurisdictions. She said that the District of Columbia, for example, will contribute very little to the 450,000 acres of agricultural land to be preserved. She said that on the other hand, achieving the goals for reduction of pedestrian and bicycle fatalities is a serious challenge for the District, which has a far greater exposure rate than some of the more rural jurisdictions. She said she thought that the primary objective of the Greater Washington 2050 initiative was to create a regional vision that gives all of the jurisdictions some responsibility for achieving overall regional goals.

Chairman Jenkins called for a vote on the second passage of text proposed by Ms. Waters, to read as follows: "Recognize and respect the geographic diversity of the region, which offers residents and businesses opportunities for rural, suburban, and urban locational choices. Establishing metrics, trends, and targets should be realistic and reflective of our geographic diversity."

The motion passed by a majority vote, taken by voice.

Ms. Waters proposed a third amendment to the document, saying that she thought it needed to have text that conveys a desire to promote or recognize the value of the region's airports in moving passengers and cargo.

Mr. Robertson noted that the Coalition had looked at aviation and freight movement, but that Ms. Waters had potentially identified a topic that may warrant greater attention in the report.

Ms. Waters moved to add an additional passage of text to the letter, as follows: "Promote accessibility of passengers and cargo to the region's airports." Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Way suggested that the bullet point in the letter dealing with targets and indicators be split into two parts, saying that the second half was buried by the first half, with the second half reading: "Directions and priorities rather than hard numerical targets, incentives rather than disincentives, and expanded benefit/cost analysis that can capture a full array of benefits and costs associated with alternative policies." He said that this latter point was more important than all eight of the other bullet points combined, and deserved to be highlighted as a particular recommendation of the TPB to the Coalition.

Mr. Way moved to amend the text of the letter as he described. Ms. Waters seconded the motion.

Ms. Tregoning said that numeric targets are necessary. She said she agreed that perhaps they should be better informed by analysis, but she did not agree with the notion that the Coalition should not set targets for the transportation sector, especially since they have been adopted for other sectors.

Ms. Tregoning proposed an amendment to Mr. Way's motion that would remove the first clause of the text in question: "Directions and priorities rather than hard numerical targets." Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion.

Mr. Zimmerman said that he also was not comfortable with the clause "incentives rather than disincentives," which was not addressed in Ms. Tregoning's motion. He said that since the region faces large challenges, it will need tools that may involve both incentives and disincentives. He said that hard numeric targets ultimately will probably be needed for some indicators, similar to those currently imposed for air quality and likely to be extended to deal with greenhouse gas emissions, and that the TPB runs the risk of not sounding serious if the letter qualifies things so much.

Ms. Tregoning said she assented to Mr. Zimmerman's suggestion to also remove the phrase "incentives rather than disincentives," and begin the bullet at "Expanded benefit cost/analysis."

Mr. Kirby noted that the TPB letter was designed to follow the bulleted questions in the letter sent to the TPB by Mr. Robertson. He said the bullet under discussion was designed to respond to a request concerning the experience in other places with regard to indicators and targets by reporting on an international scan that was just completed.

Mr. Zimmerman acknowledged that the TPB was responding to a letter with specific questions, but that he would prefer to give a simple affirmative answer to the question, "Will the proposed targets and indicators help track progress in meeting goals?" He said he had not seen the scan to which Mr. Kirby referred, but that rather than trying to wordsmith Mr. Kirby's language the TPB should just simply decide if the answer to that question should be yes or no, or even maybe.

Mr. Kirby said that the phrase "directions and priorities rather than hard numerical targets" reflects experience that if the focus is on directions, it is possible to get a lot more consensus and support behind actions than if hard numbers are set.

Mr. Erenrich said that when the Technical Committee discussed this topic, it was concerned about some of the hard numbers and goals. He said that what came out of the discussion was the need for more analysis of what the baseline is, and to regularly update it. He said the numbers that are in the report, although they are recognized as stretch goals, may not be realistic. He said that they are suggestions, and there needs to be monitoring of whether or not they are the right numbers as time goes on. He said that the TPB's role should be to do such analysis and tracking.

Mr. Way stated that the bullet under discussion should not just be a report on a report, but that it should be a directive from the TPB as to what the Board thinks should be done for the study, and using expanded cost/benefit analysis is an integral part of what the TPB should be recommending.

Chairman Jenkins repeated that the amendment to Mr. Way's motion was to begin the second part of the bullet in question with "Expanded benefit/cost analysis that can capture a full array of benefits and costs associated with alternative policies."

The motion failed by a majority vote, taken by voice.

Chairman Jenkins repeated that Mr. Way's motion, absent amendment, was to split the bullet dealing with targets and indicators into two parts, with the second part reading "Directions and priorities rather than hard numerical targets, incentives rather than disincentives, and expanded benefit/cost analysis that can capture a full array of benefits and costs associated with alternative policies."

The motion passed by a majority vote, taken by voice.

A motion to adopt the letter as amended was seconded and passed unanimously.

11. Approval of Response to the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee's (CAC) Recommendations to Develop a Long-Range Regional Transportation Priority Plan

Referring to the mailout packet, Mr. Kirby described his memo containing a response to the CAC recommendations. He said the response had been discussed extensively at the CAC meeting and at the Technical Committee meeting.

Mr. Kirby said that the CAC had requested two specific actions. First, the TPB should host a regional forum of planners, elected and high-ranking appointed officials, and citizens to achieve regional agreement on the need to develop a long-range regional transportation priority plan. Second, a work plan should be developed to create a long-range regional transportation priority plan. He said that staff is proposing to hold a regional forum in the spring to discuss regional transportation priorities. At this forum, staff would provide information on 1) the region's Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP), 2) the large number of transportation projects and priorities under development in the Washington Region, 3) the TPB scenario analysis, and 4) public outreach. Mr. Kirby's memo noted that "Based on the outcome of the regional forum in the spring of 2010, the TPB will develop a revised work plan that addresses the CAC's recommendations by explicitly integrating the processes of project development and prioritization, outreach and scenario analysis."

At the request of Chairman Jenkins, Mr. Keough resumed his comments from Item 4. He noted that despite the fact that the CAC includes a diverse array of positions and ideologies, the committee is united behind the belief that a regional transportation priority plan is needed. He said the committee believes the best way to integrate the scenario planning activities with the CLRP would be to develop the enhanced long-range regional plan based on scenario findings. He expressed a concern that the steps outlined in the TPB staff memo will simply lead to a collection of projects with no regional perspective. He said the CAC understands that the staff response does not preclude the eventual development of an enhanced long-range regional plan but he noted that the TPB does not need to wait because it has the authority to move forward with the CAC's proposal. He said the CAC understands that the transportation project development process in this region is a combination of bottom-up and top-down activities, but he emphasized that the CAC proposal will make the top-down part more robust so that the regional perspective is better reflected in the CLRP, and so that the TPB is better able to convey to the public a regional message on transportation.

Mr. Erenrich noted that the CAC recommendations had been discussed by the Technical Committee. He said that committee members expressed the feeling that there are a lot of planning activities currently underway, but the whole picture is not understood by the public.

He said it would be useful to conduct a forum in the spring to educate the public about all the processes that are taking place.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that this discussion about the need to get citizens to understand various independent planning processes is deferential to the way things have been done for a long time, and is not the essence of what the CAC is asking for. He said the big-picture question is whether the TPB should take an independent view, using criteria independent from the goals that all of the independent processes have. He said that many people seem to be uncomfortable with that big-picture question, but he understood that was what the CAC was asking for.

Mr. Keough noted that the CAC's recommendations had specified that state sovereignty would not be undermined by the committee's proposal. He said the CAC is looking for a regional perspective, which is reason for the TPB's creation in the first place.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that he believed it was a good thing that the CAC was acknowledging the need to enhance the TPB process. He said he wanted to press to go as far as possible towards what the CAC is recommending.

Chairman Jenkins asked if Mr. Bottigheimer was in support of the CAC recommendations.

Mr. Bottigheimer said yes.

Ms. Tregoning said she agreed with Mr. Bottigheimer. She said that currently there is not a forum for coming together around a robust set of transportation priorities, unless it is created on an ad hoc basis as it was for the TIGER grant application. She noted that a more collaborative ongoing regional planning process might be something as simple as looking at independent plans to implement activities like streetcars or light rail, and actually sitting down together and see how the region might be able to enhance these various activities by doing more of this planning together. She said that the creation of a more permanent system to perform this type of long-range planning was not necessarily addressed in the TPB response to the CAC, but she said she believed it is part of what the CAC is asking the TPB to do.

Mr. Kirby said the goal of the forum is to provide an opportunity to reach that conclusion. He said that the forum would include a much larger group than just the CAC. He noted that the CAC itself had acknowledged the need to get a much larger set of stakeholders to buy into the concept. He said the TIGER experience demonstrated that when the opportunity presents itself, the region can come together successfully. He said that he had attended a national meeting of MPOs recently and it appeared that other metropolitan areas did not put together a regional package like the TPB's TIGER grant. He said the TPB was well-positioned to do that again if other opportunities present themselves. However, he said that to anticipate all of those opportunities ahead of time is a bit of a challenge.

Mr. Keough said that the forum itself is not the ultimate answer to what the CAC had requested. He emphasized that the CAC had recommended a new process to develop a long-term enhanced regional plan. He also noted that if the TPB would develop a long-range priorities plan in advance of funding opportunities, it would provide adequate time to examine a variety of options.

Chairman Jenkins said he applauded the CAC's activism. He said that several years ago he had asked MDOT Secretary Porcari whether the state had considered creating a master list of priorities, and the Secretary had answered "no," which Chairman Jenkins found to be a source of concern. Chairman Jenkins said he understood that the creation of such a master list was essentially what the CAC was asking for at the regional level, and he said he shared the CAC's sentiment in this regard. But he said he also understood the realities of "turning around a train that is moving." He said he believed the first step in addressing this challenge is to hold the forum in the spring.

Ms. Waters made a motion to authorize staff to move forward with planning the spring forum. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Keough expressed a concern that the forum could be easily derailed if the TPB does not more explicitly identify the direction it would like to take. He said the CAC was hoping for more substantial action on the part of the TPB.

Chairman Jenkins said that uncertainty regarding the outcome of the forum reflects the nature of representative democracy. He said he thought the forum would be the right first step.

Chairman Jenkins reiterated that the motion before the Board was to direct TPB staff to initiate planning for a forum to be held in the spring of 2010 to discuss the issues that have been brought forth by the CAC.

The motion was approved unanimously.

12. Briefing on I-270/US 15 Multi-Modal Corridor Study

This item was deferred to the December 16 meeting.

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

This item was deferred to the December 16 meeting.

14. Briefing on an Amendment to the FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Revise the Budget and Certain Work Tasks

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby asked that Board members take a look at the proposed amendment to the TPB work program, which would be presented for Board approval in December. He said that amendment was for additional funding and work activities, and that because of federal budget uncertainties, the availability of this funding had not been confirmed earlier in the year when the work program was adopted.

15. Other Business

There was no other business.

16. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.