

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
January 20, 2010**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Melissa Barlow, FTA
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Kerry Donley, City of Alexandria
Dan Drummond, City of Fairfax
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Julia Koster, NCPC
Michael C. May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Colleen Mitchell, DC Office of Planning
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
Karina Ricks, DDOT
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Morteza Salehi, VDOT
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
John Thomas, Frederick County
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office Of Planning

Todd Turner, City of Bowie
Jonathan Way, Manassas City
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Gerald Miller	COG/DTP
Nicholas Ramfos	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
Tim Canan	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Deborah Etheridge	COG/DTP
Andrew Austin	COG/DTP
Rex Hodgson	COG/DTP
Darren Smith	COG/DTP
Karin Foster	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Beth Newman	COG/DTP
Monica Bansal	COG/DTP
Deborah Bilek	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Michael Eichler	COG/DTP
Dusan Vuksan	COG/DTP
Ron Milone	COG/DTP
Feng Xie	COG/DTP
Paul DesJardin	COG/DCPS
Alicia Lewis	COG/DCPS
John Mataya	COG/DCPS
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Lewis Miller	COG/OPA
Bill Orleans	Prince George's ACT
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Bob Owolabi	Fairfax County DOT
Randy Carroll	MDE
Kate Davidoff	COG
Ashley Halsey	Washington Post
Rod Burfield	Cape Jones Consulting
Andrew Wexler	Montgomery County Resident
Betsy Massie	PRTC

Tim Stevens
Stewart Schwartz

Falls Church ESC
CSG

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Chairman Snyder called for a moment of silence at the beginning of the meeting to reflect on the welfare of the people of Haiti and the safety and success of response personnel in the aftermath of the Haiti earthquake.

Mr. Stewart Schwartz, Executive Director of the Coalition for Smarter Growth, said that as a representative of the Transit First Coalition of transit advocacy groups, he wanted to present a set of core principles regarding transit investment in the region. These included prioritization of maintenance and operations of transit on par with roads, no cuts in transit service, additional focus on priority bus corridors, and additional public involvement, transparency, and accountability. He said the group advocated additional support of Metro's long-term capital funding needs and had collected more than 1,200 signatures on a petition to that effect. Speaking on behalf of the Coalition for Smarter Growth, Mr. Schwartz said that it supported the Norfolk Southern Corridor Crescent Initiative as it does the CSX National Gateway Initiative. He also commended TPB staff for its work on the TPB Scenario Study, but suggested that more could be done with land-use changes and enhancements to the regional Travel Demand Model to better reflect non-auto trips.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the December 16 Meeting

Mr. Donley moved to approve the minutes of the December 16, 2009 TPB meeting, and Vice Chairman Turner seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Mr. Verzosa introduced himself to the Board as the new chair of the TPB Technical Committee. He said that the Committee met on January 8 and discussed five of the items on the TPB's agenda, including Item 9 regarding the Norfolk Southern Crescent Corridor Intermodal Freight Project, Item 10 regarding new FTA grant possibilities through the Livability Bus and Urban Circulator Programs, Item 11 regarding the "CLRP Aspirations" Scenario, Item 12 regarding the "What Would It Take?" Scenario, and Item 13 regarding the outline for the FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Program.

Mr. Verzosa said that the Committee also was presented two items for information and discussion, including a briefing on the latest coordination and technical review activities of the Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulation (MOVES) Model Task Force and a briefing on the

establishment of the Virginia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (VAMPO). He said that an update on the status of activities to implement Version 2.3 of the TPB Travel Demand Model was deferred until February.

Chairman Snyder thanked Mr. Verzosa for serving as the chair of the Committee for the coming year.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Mr. Keough noted that as outgoing CAC 2009 chair this would be his last report to the Board. He said that the CAC met on January 14, and that the meeting featured a panel of speakers that discussed with the Committee the transportation needs and impacts of the facilities affected by the latest round of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC). He said that there were speakers representing MDOT, VDOT, and the U.S. Department of Defense. He said that committee members were struck by how many of the needed transportation investments are still un- or under-funded.

Mr. Keough also summarized the CAC End-of-Year Report for 2009 that was circulated to the TPB. He noted that the CAC in 2006 called upon the TPB to develop a regional transportation priorities plan that would identify both funded and unfunded priority projects of regional significance, and said that in 2009 the CAC had decided to try to carry that proposal forward. He said that in October the CAC issued a set of recommendations on how the TPB could move forward with development of an enhanced regional plan, including developing regional consensus on the plan through a high-level forum of decision-makers and citizens. He said that while the CAC is disappointed that the TPB did not fully commit to the development of a regional priorities plan in response to the recommendations, the Committee believes that the Board's response represents a significant step forward in planning for a regional forum on the issue and inviting the CAC to appoint two members to the working group that will develop the forum.

Mr. Keough said that the development of the TIGER grant application in 2009 demonstrated that TPB member jurisdictions can work together effectively on regional plans, and that there is a growing appetite for this kind of regional planning. He said that by developing and articulating regional priorities in an enhanced transportation plan, the TPB could clearly demonstrate that it is ready for new responsibilities and opportunities that may come through federal legislation.

Mr. Keough said that in 2009 the CAC held two meetings outside the COG offices, in Frederick and Alexandria, to develop a greater appreciation for the challenges faced in various jurisdictions, and two meetings focused on the CLRP and TIP. He said that the CAC expressed concerns to the TPB about the lack of information about spending by mode in the TIP, particularly about spending on bicycle and pedestrian projects. He said the Committee is primarily concerned that information in the TIP be accessible to the public.

Mr. Keough said he was honored to serve as the CAC chair for 2009 and appreciated the contributions of all the members, representing their jurisdictions as well as different perspectives on transportation solutions. He said that the coming year should provide more opportunities for the CAC to engage the public and promote workable transportation solutions. He said that when money is short, as it is now, it is time to plan.

Chairman Snyder thanked Mr. Keough and the other members of the CAC for their service.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said that the Steering Committee met on January 8th and acted on one amendment to the FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to put more resources into the priority corridor network studies being conducted by WMATA. He said that the Committee also approved three amendments to the FY 2010-2015 TIP: one to include a Maryland Route 355 corridor crossing project study, additional funding for bridge replacement projects in Prince George's County, and additional funding for a preventive maintenance project in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Kirby said that the letters packet in the TPB mailout included a letter transmitted to the Office of the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation in response to questions regarding the TPB's TIGER grant application submitted in September. He said that he interpreted the questions as good news in that they indicated interest in the application. He said the packet also included an announcement of EPA strengthening of ozone standards that will require updates to regional air quality plans and potentially additional reductions over time in the transportation sector. He also noted that EPA had released a new mobile emissions model called "MOVES" that is a finer-grained method for calculating emissions and in some respects produces higher emissions figures. He said that the packet also contained a letter from FHWA and FTA announcing their certification review of the transportation planning process for the Washington region to occur on April 19-20. He said that they would present preliminary observations on the region's planning process to the TPB at the April 21 meeting. He said the final letter in the packet was from Mr. Tennyson, a former employee with Arlington County, with comments expressing a preference for light rail instead of the priority bus plans being analyzed by the TPB.

Mr. Bottigheimer commended TPB staff for the quality of the response letter to U.S. DOT regarding the TIGER grant application, particularly the information on pages 6 and 7 listing time savings expected from each improvement.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Snyder expressed appreciation for the opportunity to chair the TPB and for the work of TPB and jurisdiction staff. He emphasized the importance of transportation services and

infrastructure to the safety, security, health, prosperity, and well-being of the region's citizens. He said that current economic difficulties make it imperative that the TPB focus on those improvements, structures, and practices that maximize the capacity of existing systems to serve more people and move more freight in a more safe and reliable manner. He said that the Board also needs to continue to plan and build for the future by completing projects and through ongoing visioning efforts. He said that the National Capital Region has the expertise and the obligation to influence national debate on transportation policy. He noted the 1998 TPB Vision included a call for better systems management. He said that there have been major improvements in that area in recent years, through programs such as the Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Committee, and the MATOC Program.

Chairman Snyder said that a second major area on which the Board should focus in the coming year is the growing demand for regional coordination. He said that the TIGER grant application provides a good example of the regional coordination that is possible, as well as the regional bus stop project proposal on today's agenda.

Chairman Snyder said he thought that the TPB would have a very productive year and that the Board is up to the challenges it faces.

7. Approval of Amendment to the FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Include Statewide American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Funding for two Projects: the Reconstruction and Paving of I-66 between the Capital Beltway and US 50, and the Fairfax County Parkway and Fair Lakes Parkway Interchange, as requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)

Chairman Snyder introduced Morteza Salehi, the Northern Virginia District Administrator for VDOT, who was in attendance at the meeting.

Ms. Sorenson described the two projects included in the amendment, and said that the I-66 project is exempt from regional air quality conformity analysis, and the parkway project was included in an earlier round of conformity analysis that was subsequently approved. She said that the amendment would obligate \$70 million in statewide ARRA funds for the I-66 project and \$11.659 million for the parkway project.

Ms. Sorenson moved to approve Resolution R14-2010 to amend the FY 2010-2015 TIP to include ARRA funding for the reconstruction and paving of I-66 between the Capital Beltway and US 50 and the Fairfax County Parkway and Fair Lakes Parkway Interchange.

Ms. Erickson seconded the motion.

Ms. Smyth noted that the project was in her district of Fairfax County which currently experienced severe congestion, and asked if the I-66 reconstruction work would be taking place at night to keep from further exacerbating the peak-period conditions.

Mr. Salehi said that VDOT recognizes the challenges of maintaining traffic flow during construction along I-66. He said that the detailed maintenance-of-traffic plan has not yet been developed, but maintaining reasonable available capacity along the corridor is a requirement for the project.

Mr. Drummond noted that the project corridor also runs through the City of Fairfax, and that the City has experienced cut-through traffic during past construction projects on I-66. He encouraged VDOT to be cognizant of the effects of the project on the region's drivers and to work with City of Fairfax and Fairfax County staff directly to assure citizens that progress is being made on the vital project but that their daily needs are also being considered during construction.

Mr. Salehi thanked Mr. Drummond for his comments and said that VDOT would work with the city and the county.

The motion passed unanimously.

8. Approval of Appointments to the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for the Year 2010

Chairman Snyder noted that TPB members were receiving a handout with the slate of proposed CAC members with their bios attached. He explained that six of the CAC members are nominated by the CAC, nine are nominated by the TPB Officers, and the chair is nominated by the TPB Chair.

Vice Chair Bowser moved to approve the appointment of the CAC members and alternates and the chair of the CAC for 2010, as listed in the circulated memorandum.

Vice Chair Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

9. Approval of TPB Letter of Support for the Norfolk Southern Crescent Corridor Intermodal Freight Project

Mr. Kirby explained that action on this item was deferred from the December meeting at the request of MDOT, and that MDOT had proposed modifications to the letter of support for the Crescent Corridor project following discussions with Norfolk Southern. He noted that these modifications were shown in bold in the letter included in the mailout packet. He said that an

additional change was made at the Technical Committee and not shown in bold. The phrase “and allow for current and future passenger rail expansions” was added at the end of the second bullet on the second page. He said this bullet, referring to coordination between freight and passenger rail systems, was strengthened to refer specifically to expansion of passenger rail service in the near- and long-term.

Mr. Kirby asked Ms. Erickson to describe the changes proposed by MDOT.

Ms. Erickson described the changes, including various additions and substitutions of language in the letter, clarifying the TPB position on related TIGER grant applications, requesting that additional parties be included in project coordination, and specifying concerns related to increased truck traffic in the vicinity of Norfolk Southern intermodal facilities. She said that MDOT would vote to support approval of the letter if unchanged from the current draft. She noted that MDOT had also consulted on the changes with the Hagerstown MPO, which had also provided a letter in support of the TIGER application.

Ms. Erickson also suggested substituting in the new Virginia Transportation Secretary as a CC on the letter, and correcting a typo in another of the recipient names.

Ms. Erickson moved that the letter as written, with the two minor modifications to the addressee list, be approved and submitted to Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood.

Mr. Erenrich seconded the motion.

Mr. Turner asked whether the TIGER application associated with the Crescent Corridor project would be in competition with the TPB’s TIGER application.

Mr. Kirby said that it would, and that therefore the letter explains that the TPB’s endorsement of the Crescent Corridor project does not extend to the TIGER application, as was similarly stated in the TPB letter of support for the CSX National Gateway Initiative.

Mr. Donley asked for clarification on what the first bullet on page two of the letter was actually requesting in terms of addressing local impacts by Norfolk Southern.

Mr. Kirby said that the letter does not speak specifically to how the local impacts should be addressed or with which funds, but requests as part of the TPB’s endorsement that local impacts be addressed. He said that the original language was similar to that used in the TPB letter of support for the CSX National Gateway Initiative, but had been strengthened somewhat by the MDOT changes to add the phrase “addressed to the satisfaction of these entities” and refer specifically to the prospect of increased truck traffic in the vicinity of intermodal terminals.

Mr. Donley said that his concern was that the language not imply that the railroad would have to use project funds obtained from the federal government to make accommodations such as grade-

separated crossings, which the railroads traditionally view as the responsibility of the state and local governments. He said that the message conveyed to the railroad should simply be the expectation that they will work with state and local interests on these issues.

Mr. Kirby said that the letter expresses the expectation that the local impacts would be addressed in the course of project implementation, so to the extent that addressing these impacts requires funding, the hope is that the railroad would use some of its available resources to do so.

Mr. Drummond asked for clarification of the second bullet on page two, to determine if it calls for local entities to actually formally approve certain elements of the railroad's plans, and if that would lead to delays in project implementation. He said this would represent a significant shift in intent from the original language proposed for the letter.

Mr. Kirby said that the letter urges close coordination with "all affected parties in neighboring jurisdictions," and that while the TPB can express this expectation it can't actually require it. He said that Norfolk Southern will presumably use the letter as a supporting document for funding applications, and that the expectation of coordination with state and local entities will at least be clear in the letter.

Ms. Erickson agreed with Mr. Kirby and said that the intent of the MDOT changes in that regard were to make the expectation of cooperation clear in the letter, but that all the letter could really do is urge such cooperation.

The motion to approve the letter was passed unanimously.

10. Endorsement of Grant Applications for the New Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Discretionary Programs

Mr. Kirby noted that the TPB was briefed at its December 16 meeting on two new FTA discretionary programs that had been announced on December 8 and carried a due date for grant applications of February 8. He said the two programs are called the Livability Bus Program and the Urban Circulator Program. He said that the FTA had taken unspent money under these program categories from the last fiscal year and offered a new solicitation with additional criteria; they do not represent brand-new programs. He said the Urban Circulator program seems to show an interest on the part of the Administration in smaller-scale fixed-guideway projects, and fits with recently announced changes in the evaluation criteria for the New Starts program that will put more emphasis on factors other than cost per rider, such as community development benefits. He said that these are indicators of an overall policy shift at FTA, creating new opportunities for projects that can be responsive to the new priorities and criteria.

Mr. Kirby noted that TPB staff had suggested at the December 16 TPB meeting that the TPB could potentially coordinate an application under the Livability Bus Program to improve the

accessibility of bus stops in the region. He said that staff has already done a lot of work on bus stop accessibility with the TPB Access for All Advisory Committee. He said that the application must come from the region's "designated recipient" for FTA funds, which in this case is WMATA, and that WMATA has done an extensive inventory on bus stop needs in the region. He said that because of this work and the work that many local governments have been doing, staff thought the region might be in a good position to quickly put together a regional application. He said that the TPB agreed at the December 16 meeting to have staff further explore the interest among WMATA and the local jurisdictions to put forward an application, and staff subsequently sent a submission form to each jurisdiction with the project criteria. He introduced TPB staff member Wendy Klancher to summarize the responses.

Ms. Klancher noted that in order to participate in the grant application, interested TPB jurisdictions needed to come up with a required 20 percent match for the submitted projects. She recognized TPB staff members Deb Bilek, Monica Bansal, and Rex Hodgson for their work on developing information on how project criteria apply to the region and compiling the application, along with Sean Kennedy and Kristin Haldeman of WMATA.

Ms. Klancher, referring to a PowerPoint presentation, described a series of maps that showed concentrations in the region of no vehicle availability, older adults, persons with disabilities, and middle-to-low income households, along with a map showing the region's approximately 20,000 bus stops. She said that WMATA staff identified stops that are functionally inaccessible and those in areas with high utilization of Metro Access. She showed several before-and-after photos of bus stop improvements made in various jurisdictions in the region to demonstrate the kinds of improvements that would be encompassed in the proposal. She noted that sometimes small changes can make a big difference to accommodate people in wheelchairs and a variety of other users. She also noted that the AFA Committee has placed an emphasis on better information at bus stops.

Ms. Klancher summarized the project submissions from jurisdictions including Arlington County, the District of Columbia, the City of Greenbelt, Montgomery County, Prince George's County, and Prince William County, including bus stop improvements such as shelters, lighting, sidewalks, and curb access; bus bay improvements; and real-time bus information projects. She thanked jurisdiction staff for their work on the submissions and said the total federal request is about \$12 million not including local matches. She said that with TPB approval, WMATA and TPB staff will compile a final application that will be submitted to FTA on February 8. She said that staff had learned of the possibility that the deadline would actually be changed to February 10. She said that WMATA would administer the grant and would be passing the money through to the local jurisdictions to make the actual improvements, since they own the bus stops and have their own design standards.

Mr. Bottigheimer commended TPB staff for its leadership in working with the local jurisdictions and developing the application. He said that while transit operators bear a certain responsibility in providing excellent bus services, there are many things that local jurisdictions can do to

improve service, and this application illustrates many of them that will improve stops, get customers better information, and improve safety and accessibility. He said that the proposal again demonstrates the value of regional planning in being prepared to put together an application for this program in a short period of time.

Ms. Tregoning commended TPB and jurisdictional staff for their efforts on the proposal and also said that it is a good example of how well the region can work together given the opportunity. She asked if the TPB could build some flexibility into the resolution approving the submission to allow for some additional projects to be included. She said that the District of Columbia may want to try to add another Metrobus facility that would fully meet the application criteria, but had not yet been able to put together the submission.

Chairman Snyder asked Mr. Kirby to clarify the process going forward and options for changes to the application.

Mr. Kirby said that the TPB could authorize the TPB Steering Committee to make minor changes to the application at its meeting on February 5. He said that even with that possibility, however, staff would need to receive any additions or changes by January 27 in order have time to work with WMATA staff and integrate the changes into the application. He said that if staff is able to put in the time to make the application responsive to the program criteria it would have a better chance of getting at least partially funded.

Vice Chair Bowser thanked staff for putting together the application to this point and said she was delighted with the spirit of cooperation among the jurisdictions. She said that she noted a disparity in dollar amounts requested among the jurisdictions, and wondered if the FTA will review allocations for each jurisdiction or just award a lump sum to be spread out evenly among the projects in the event that the full amount is not funded. She asked if the application would be ranking priorities among the projects in anticipation of that.

Ms. Klancher said that the variation among the amounts submitted by each jurisdiction was mainly due to their ability to come up with the required local match. She said that the FTA has encouraged applicants to make projects scalable, and that while the application does not rank or prioritize the projects, it does present each as a line item so that the FTA will be able to pick and choose if needed. She said this would be similar to how the TIGER grant application was done.

Vice Chair Bowser asked to clarify if that meant that the FTA would be choosing which projects to fund at which levels rather than the TPB or WMATA.

Ms. Klancher said that the FTA could choose the projects or give discretion to the region on scaling the application.

Vice Chair Turner asked if WMATA was submitting its own application.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that this is the only application that WMATA had been working to develop.

Vice Chair Turner asked how the jurisdictions such as his, who don't actually own the bus stops because the County owns them, could participate in the application process or submit projects for inclusion.

Mr. Weissberg said that in the case of the City of Bowie, Prince George's County had not included Bowie projects because the target area for the County's submissions was inside the Beltway given the demographic factors. He said that the County has an existing contract for county-wide bus stop improvements, however, and that obtaining funding through this grant could enable the County to broaden the reach of the existing contract to include more stops than is currently the case.

Ms. Klancher said that the City of Bowie would need to coordinate with Prince George's County regarding the match if they wished to submit bus stops or projects for the application. She noted that any local jurisdiction can submit applications for the Urban Circulator Program through FTA, not just WMATA as the area's designated recipient of FTA funds.

Ms. Ricks commended staff for its work on the application, and noted that \$4 million in stimulus funds that DDOT had prioritized for sidewalk improvements near bus stops could potentially be used as additional local match money for the region.

Ms. Klancher said that because the funding Ms. Ricks mentioned came from the U.S. DOT it could not be used as a local match.

Ms. Ricks said that perhaps it could just be mentioned in the application as a demonstration of local commitment to the effort.

Chairman Snyder asked if the Board could endorse the grant application as it currently stands and then authorize the Steering Committee to approve additions or changes submitted to TPB staff by January 27, and then submit the final application on behalf of the TPB.

Mr. Kirby said that such a motion by the Board would suffice, but should note that the final application will be submitted by WMATA, with the TPB's endorsement.

Mr. Zimmerman moved to authorize the TPB Steering Committee to give final endorsement to an application to be submitted by WMATA for the FTA Livability Bus Grant Program, and to set January 27 as the deadline for any additional submissions for or changes to the application.

Mr. Donley seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

11. Briefing on Draft Results for the “CLRP Aspirations” Scenario

Mr. Eichler of TPB staff, referring to a PowerPoint presentation and a memorandum included in the mailout packet, briefly described the background of the development of the scenario, and said that it was designed to look at how the region could grow differently and what the results of such a different growth pattern would look like. He summarized the three major components of the scenario as a land use component that concentrates jobs and households closer to each other and to transit stations, a transportation component that looks at pricing new and existing road capacity to relieve regional congestion and generate revenue, and an additional transportation component that supports the previous two by implementing a comprehensive network of high-quality bus rapid transit operating on priced lanes and providing connections between the region’s activity centers.

Mr. Eichler said that staff worked with local planning directors throughout the region to arrive at a set of land-use shifts determined to be “within reach” and looked at ways in which revenues from transportation components could pay for all of the improvements. He described the mechanics of the land use shifts, which included moving 70,000 additional households and 22,000 additional jobs into the region while relocating 200,000 households and 240,000 jobs within the region, using target densities for seven types of receiving zones. He said the shifts represented 8.2% of the region’s total households in 2030 and 5.6% of the total jobs.

Mr. Eichler displayed a series of maps and graphics showing the region’s existing transportation infrastructure, along with performance indicators and its relation to the region’s activity centers, as well as the transportation components included in the scenario. He said that the scenario complements a priced network of road capacity with a layer of bus rapid transit that would operate on those toll lanes as a quasi-dedicated right-of-way. He said that bus stations could be located just off of freeways with dedicated ramps or bus lanes, so that they could spur economic development in a way that stations within the freeway corridor could not. He said that the TIGER grant application approved by the TPB could be viewed as a first step toward the regional network envisioned in the scenario. He noted that the bus service was modeled with a level of service similar to that of light rail, with buses operating on freeway lanes coded at 45 miles per hour and those on priority corridor arterials at 15 miles per hour. He said the bus service would be complemented within certain activity centers by circulator services. He said that overall the scenario would create a 1,615-lane-mile regional priced lane network, 650 of which would be new and the rest converted existing lanes, HOV lanes, or lanes already included in the CLRP. He said it also creates a 500-mile transit network with 138 BRT stations and an additional 140 miles of circulator service.

Mr. Eichler summarized the results that were produced when the scenario was run using the TPB Regional Travel Demand Model, noting that regional vehicle miles of travel (VMT) increase slightly in the scenario in comparison with what would be expected in 2030 under the baseline 2008 CLRP, but that VMT per capita decreases. He said that measures of congestion such as average speeds and hours of delay move in the desired direction, while transit and

bicycle/pedestrian trips increase. He also gave some results related to expected tolls on the priced lane network.

Mr. Eichler said that staff had done a preliminary sketch estimate of costs and revenues under the scenario that indicates the scenario could roughly break even, though he noted that some costs and revenues associated with the scenario are yet to be investigated. He said that staff would be doing some sensitivity analyses using the scenario to see how changes in the network could affect the regional indicators, particularly to look at converting more existing general purpose lanes into toll and bus lanes rather than building new capacity for that purpose. He said staff would also be assessing the greenhouse gas emissions impacts of the scenario, and said that although overall VMT still increases in the scenario, that may be offset by reductions in congestion.

Mr. Zimmerman asked about the estimated cost of implementing the network of variably priced lanes envisioned in the scenario.

Mr. Eichler said that the estimated costs is approximately \$50 billion.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the scenario was characterized as adding 5,640 daily transit hours, and asked what that number meant relative to existing transit service.

Mr. Eichler said that staff had not determined the actual number of existing regional transit service hours for the sake of comparison.

Mr. Zimmerman said he was interested only in the order of magnitude, and asked if Mr. Bottigheimer might perhaps know the answer to the question. He said that it would be nice to know if the scenario is contemplating a five percent increase in transit service or a 50 percent increase.

Mr. Eichler said that he would guess the scenario would represent a one-to-five percent increase.

Mr. Bottigheimer said he would try to come up with an estimate in a few minutes.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the results from the scenario analysis indicated that the scenario would increase total regional VMT relative to the baseline 2008 CLRP.

Mr. Eichler said that the scenario does result in a small increase in total VMT relative to the 2008 CLRP, and noted that scenario adds 650 new lane miles to the region, but that those lane miles would be priced. He said the scenario significantly increases mobility relative to the 2008 CLRP.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the increase due to the new lane miles would be in “drivable mobility.” He said that the increase in VMT is an important result, and suggests that the scenario should be

compared to another scenario that does not require a large investment in new capacity for single-occupant vehicles. He said that in anticipation of limited capital funds, it would make more sense to work with existing infrastructure, to make it more efficient and use it to expand transit service, rather than look at lots of new road capacity. He said such a scenario could improve mobility in the region without increasing VMT, and urged staff to explore these alternatives.

Ms. Tregoning said that she supported Mr. Zimmerman's comments and noted that similar comments had been made during the Scenario Study Task Force meeting. She said that Task Force members had encouraged exploration of a scenario that would add no new road capacity, but would design a BRT network that would use existing rights-of-way, perhaps using WMATA's priority bus network as a starting point. She said that while the Task Force appreciates the work that has been done, it is not enthused with an outcome that increases VMT even with considerable expenditure. She said the Task Force also encouraged staff to use data from the Regional Household Travel Survey to provide more information on bicycle and pedestrian trips as well as non-commute trips. She noted that the Scenario Study Task Force would be meeting again in about two weeks to further explore the analysis and make specific suggestions to TPB staff on how to proceed, and invited all interested Board members to attend.

Mr. Elrich said that it would be more useful, given the scenario outcomes, to explore development of systems that are not reliant upon use of the Capital Beltway, I-270, and I-95 as corridors for the BRT network but rather use corridors that are interior to the inner counties and other jurisdictions. He noted that Montgomery County is looking at a proposal to develop an internal BRT system focused on the major arterials, not on the freeways. He said that without additional parking facilities near the freeways, the system would not have much efficacy in attracting and moving riders.

Mr. Elrich suggested that changing parking policy in the region to discourage parking in central business districts and job centers could have more of an impact on travel behaviors, especially when paired with a robust BRT system that connects these locations with residential areas. He said that jurisdictions should not be building garages with public funds and then trying to incentivize people not to use them. He said that the region needs uniform parking policies so that jurisdictions do not end up in competition with each other for development based on parking policy and do not end up needing to build as many roads.

Mr. Elrich also noted that while the scenario supposedly contemplates land-use shifts within jurisdictions, in his experience it may not be realistic to assume that jurisdictions could both up-zone areas where growth is desired and also down-zone the areas in which growth is not desired.

Mr. Kirby noted that the scenario includes a lot of rapid bus service on arterials, and that the routes contemplated along the freeways would include stations that are just off the freeway at the edge of mixed-use developments such as in Shirlington. He said that the intent of that network is to incentivize that kind of development and not to involve a lot of new parking lots that would serve drivers. He also said that regarding the land-use shifts included in the scenario, TPB staff

had worked with local planning directors to set parameters for the shifts, but that different assumptions could be explored through sensitivity analysis.

Mr. Eichler noted that Mr. Bottigheimer had informed him that the additional transit service outlined in the scenario would amount to an approximately 25-percent increase over existing service in the region.

12. Briefing on Draft Results for the “What Would It Take?” Greenhouse Gas Reduction Scenario

Ms. Bansal of TPB staff, referring to a PowerPoint presentation and a memorandum included in the mailout packet, briefly described the background of the development of the scenario, and said that it was designed to build off of regional climate action momentum. She noted that the COG Climate Change Report was issued in November 2008 and set regional goals for climate change mitigation, including a 2012 goal of reducing emissions back to 2005 levels, a 2020 goal of 20 percent below 2005 levels, and a 2050 goal of 80 percent below 2005 levels. She said that an interim goal of a 40 percent reduction below 2005 levels by 2030 was used for the scenario, which asked what it would take for the transportation sector to meet that goal. She said a primary goal of the activity was to analyze various strategies for cost-effectiveness and feasibility in order to assist local governments in adopting constructive policies.

Ms. Bansal presented a series of graphs and other illustrations showing the regional baseline and the effects on the baseline of various interventions including federal fuel efficiency (CAFE) standards, federal energy policies that encourage alternative fuels, as well as state, regional, and local interventions. She said that the interventions fall into three categories: those dealing with the composition of the vehicle fleet, those dealing with the fuel used by vehicles, and those dealing with how the fleet is used. She presented information about existing conditions in those three categories and the effects of interventions in each. She noted that the third category included initiatives to reduce vehicle use for trips under three miles, which could be potentially be made by other modes, and also efforts to reduce congestion, which itself increases emissions.

Ms. Bansal described different long- and short-term actions that could be taken by federal, state, and local governments, or as regional initiatives, and summarized the cost-effectiveness of each. She said that in addition to implementation of recent federal fuel efficiency standards, a variety of short-term strategies would be necessary in order to meet the 2012 goal of returning to 2005 emissions levels. She said that it would also be necessary to begin implementing long-term strategies as soon as possible in order to ramp up toward the long-term goals.

Ms. Bansal said that looking just at the cost effectiveness in terms of carbon emissions reductions of the various strategies may be short-sighted in that many strategies have benefits beyond emissions reduction. She said that a next step of the effort could be to do a

comprehensive cost-benefit analysis of various strategies, citing the cost-benefit analysis done for bike sharing completed for the TIGER grant application as an example.

She concluded by saying that the emissions reduction goals are very difficult to meet, and that the analysis indicates that a combination of interventions at various levels will be necessary to meet the goals. She presented a list of nine different strategies that can be done by local governments in the short term to move toward meeting the goals.

Mr. Way noted that the graph on slide 16 seemed to show that no transportation-related intervention could be done at a cost of less than \$50 per ton of carbon dioxide.

Ms. Bansal said that there are a few interventions listed that cost less than \$50 per ton, including changes in driver insurance structure.

Mr. Way said that it is still apparent that most transportation-related interventions would cost at least \$50 a ton, which for example would represent a 40 percent increase in the wholesale rate of electricity. He noted that the COG Climate Change Report cites 3.2 billion tons a year of nationwide greenhouse gas reduction interventions, none of which cost more than \$50 a ton. He said that it was difficult to reconcile going forward with any of the transportation-related interventions given that they do not seem to be at all cost-effective relative to other sectors.

Ms. Bansal said that if the interventions were done only for the purpose of greenhouse gas emissions reduction, they may not be worth doing, but that virtually all of the strategies have other benefits that should be taken into account.

Mr. Kirby said that work would continue on the “What Would It Take?” analysis, and that in particular staff would look at incorporating land-use and transportation components from the “CLRP Aspirations” scenario. He said that a focus would also be on cost-benefit analysis that takes into account other benefits of various interventions. He said that including greenhouse gas reduction benefits in the cost-benefit analysis of other programs could better demonstrate their value.

Ms. Sorenson asked that TPB staff circulate more detailed information about the construction and analysis of both scenarios, and encouraged consultation with the TPB Technical Committee regarding additional points of interest for the analysis. She said that TPB members may not be comfortable supporting the analysis or the recommended interventions without more information about the underlying assumptions and data.

13. Briefing on Outline and Preliminary Budget for the FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Kirby said that the process of developing the FY 2011 UPWP had begun, and a full draft would be brought to the TPB at its February 17 meeting, with a final version for approval in

March. He said that the UPWP would then have to receive federal approval before becoming effective on July 1st. He said that staff is assuming a funding level similar to the FY 2010 level, which would be contingent on federal action on transportation authorization. He said that if Congress continued to extend the transportation authorization at less-than-full funding levels, it would lead to a reduced level in the UPWP, but that for now the assumption is a funding level similar to FY 2010.

Mr. Kirby said that the FY 2011 UPWP structurally would be very similar to the FY 2010 UPWP, including a focus on activities such as the scenario studies, MATOC, and basic work program support.

Mr. Bottigheimer noted that the bus planning element currently listed in the draft work plan is funded at a level of \$100,000. He said that he was hoping to see that element expanded, perhaps to \$250,000, to reflect the impact that work has had over the past year and better position the TPB for future funding opportunities.

Mr. Kirby said that the question of the funding level for the bus planning element could be taken up at the February 17 TPB meeting.

14. Other Business

There was no other business.

15. Adjournment

Chairman Snyder adjourned the meeting at 1:58 pm.