

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 15, 2006

Members and Alternates Present

Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Wally Covington, Prince William County
Brian Glenn, Federal Transit Administration
Jason Groth, Charles County
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council
Timothy Lovain, City of Alexandria
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Sam Minnitte, MDOT
David Moss, Montgomery County
Carol Petzold, Maryland House of Delegates
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT-NOVA
C. Paul Smith, City of Frederick
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Mick Staton, Loudoun County
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby COG/DTP
Michael Clifford COG/DTP

Jim Hogan	COG/DTP
Robert Griffiths	COG/DTP
Nick Ramfos	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Deborah Etheridge	COG/DTP
Darren Smith	COG/DTP
Michael Eichler	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
Andrew Austin	COG/DTP
Michael Farrell	COG/DTP
Hailemariam Abai	COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam	COG/DTP
Dusan Vuksan	COG/DTP
Jane Posey	COG/DTP
Erin Morrow	COG/DTP
Beth Newman	COG/DTP
Brian Cassidy	COG/DTP
Anant Choudhary	COG/DTP
Paul DesJardin	COG/HSPPS
Naomi Friedman	COG/EO
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Lyn Erickson	MDOT
Ian Beam	MDOT
Randy Carroll	MDE
Sharmila Samarasinghe	Department of Rail & Public Transportation – Virginia
Unwanna B. Dabney	FHWA – VA Division
Tamara Ashby	Arlington County
Mark Rawlings	DDOT
Deborah Burns	FTA/Washington Metro Office
Tom Biesiadny	Fairfax County DOT
Steven M. Zellers	Booz Allen Hamilton
Jason Miller	Procopio & Associates, Inc.
Margaret Sacks	Powell Tate Public Affairs
Candice Rose	Arlington County
Nancy May	Community Leadership Institute
G. Stanley Doore	Community Leadership Institute
Carroll George	Citizen
Kathleen Walsh	Equal Rights Center
Steve Yaffe	WMATA

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Carroll George spoke to the TPB regarding the design of freeway merges used in the region. He referred to earlier merge reform proposals he submitted advocating for alternate-yield merge designs. He asserted that implementation of his proposals would result in safety improvements due to the reduction of the speed differential between merging vehicles, as well as reduction of congestion during emergency evacuations. He urged the TPB to spearhead merge reform in the region, in particular to use reconstruction of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge as an opportunity for a demonstration project. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record, and he distributed a related report to TPB members.

Kathleen Walsh, Disability Rights Program Manager at the Equal Rights Center, commented on efforts by WMATA to address complaints about the MetroAccess program. She said that WMATA has implemented some of the TPB's recommendations but that there are many more steps necessary to address structural problems with the paratransit program, including approval of a \$6 million expenditure to be voted on by the WMATA Board in December. She urged the TPB to continue to advocate for improvements to MetroAccess and for transparency and public involvement in the decision-making process, especially the reevaluation by WMATA of the MetroAccess eligibility requirements. Copies of her remarks were submitted for the record.

Ms. Hudgins thanked Ms. Walsh for her testimony and encouraged her to contact members of the WMATA Board directly.

2. Approval of Minutes of October 18, 2006 Meeting

Mr. Staton asked that the minutes be amended to reflect his presence at the October TPB meeting, as his name was omitted from the attendance list.

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

3. Report of Technical Committee

Mr. Kirby gave the report of the Technical Committee in the place of Mr. Canizales, the committee chairman, who could not attend the TPB meeting. Referring to the summary contained in the mailout packet, Mr. Kirby said that the Technical Committee met on November 3 and considered the following items on the TPB agenda:

- An update on implementation of the Transportation/Land Use Connections Pilot Program, including more details on timeline and procedures (Item 9).

-
- A briefing on the status of recommendations by the TPB Access for All Advisory Committee to improve MetroAccess service and on the first meeting of the TPB Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force (Item 10).
 - A briefing on the results of the 2006 Street Smart Campaign and committed funding and activities for the fifth campaign planned for April 2007, along with a strategy for obtaining additional resources, perhaps through private sponsorship (Item 12).
 - A review of the Call for Projects document which will start the 2007 cycle for update of the TIP and CLRP and will be presented for TPB approval at the December 20 TPB meeting (Item 13).

Mr. Kirby said that the Technical Committee also considered four additional items not on the November TPB agenda, including the following:

- A briefing by COG environmental staff on the development of the eight-hour ozone and PM 2.5 State Implementation Plans (SIPs), along with the development of new mobile budgets for 2010 and 2011, which would impact the TPB process and about which the TPB will receive a full briefing at its December meeting.
- A briefing on initial proposals to establish a bus subcommittee of the TPB Technical Committee, which will be detailed further at the December TPB meeting.
- An update on consideration of the request by the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) for a portion of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula funds, including plans for a meeting with the region's designated recipients of FTA formula funds to review the request and proposed alternative responses.
- A briefing on the first results of an analysis of a regional network of variably priced lanes as part of the TPB's Scenario Study.

Mr. Kirby also noted that a briefing to the Technical Committee on visualization techniques presented at a Transportation Research Board meeting was postponed to a future meeting.

There were no questions regarding the report of the Technical Committee.

4. Report of Citizens Advisory Committee

Mr. Darren Smith of TPB staff gave the report of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) in the place of Mr. Tydings, the committee chairman, who could not attend the TPB meeting. Mr. Smith said that Mr. Swanson had briefed the CAC on the recently held Community Leadership Institute, and talked about staff efforts to start a new phase of public outreach regarding the Scenario Study that would focus more on getting input from the public about the scenarios to inform the development of a composite scenario. He said that CAC members expressed a desire to establish how such a composite scenario or other forms of public input would inform the TPB's long-range planning process. CAC members also discussed how to make the outreach

presentation speak to local issues to spur discussion while still maintaining a regional perspective. He said that the CAC hopes to reach consensus on a few general recommendations to submit to the TPB regarding the future of the Scenario Study and related outreach.

Mr. Smith said that Mr. Kirby summarized the items on the agenda for the upcoming TPB agenda, including the Transportation/Land Use Connections Program, in which he said the CAC remains very interested. The CAC also heard a presentation by Steve Lee of Circle Point, the leader of the consultant team selected to perform an evaluation of the TPB's public involvement process. Mr. Lee described the evaluation process and the CAC gave several suggestions as to the focus of the team's research and the ultimate goals of the team's work.

Chairman Knapp asked what additional steps were necessary, including any involving the CAC, before a new edition of the Scenario Study outreach presentation would be ready for meetings around the region. He said that many members of the COG Board were interested in the presentation after receiving an update about the Scenario Study and outreach efforts at the last meeting of the COG Board. He said that it would be useful to provide a timeframe of when interested board members could arrange to have the presentation given in their jurisdictions.

Mr. Kirby said that further refinements to the presentation would be gradual and that TPB staff were prepared to give the presentation at any time depending on requests and interest. He noted that the CAC has helped organize some of the past outreach meetings.

5. Report of Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said that the TPB Steering Committee met on November 3 and approved two resolutions amending the FY 2006-2011 TIP and FY 2007-2012 TIP. Referring to the mailout packet, he said that the first amendment was requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), and dealt with funding management support for the Wilson Bridge, utility relocation and building demolition near I-95, pedestrian safety improvements along Route 236 in Fairfax County, three bridge replacement projects in Fairfax County, and two transit projects in Prince William County. He said the second amendment was requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT), and included designation of the Intercounty Connector between I-370 and I-395, with a connection to US 1, as part of the national highway system, which would make the facility eligible for that category of funding.

Referring to the "Letters Sent/Received" packet, Mr. Kirby called attention to a transmittal from Chairman Knapp to Phil Mendelson, the Chairman of the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee, on transportation emission reduction measures for use in the setting of mobile budgets. He said that the transmittal summarizes and quantifies demand reduction measures that are then subtracted from the mobile source inventory and provide a basis for setting mobile emissions budgets for 2008 and 2009, for the purpose of development of State Implementation

Plans (SIPs).

Mr. Kirby also mentioned the notification received of intent by Environmental Defense to commence a civil action related to completion of environmental requirements for the Intercounty Connector. He noted that attached to the notice in the mailout packet was a copy of relevant sections from the EPA's conformity rule and guidance regarding the pollutant in question, PM 2.5. He said that the essence of the legal challenge is the assertion that a localized quantitative analysis should have taken place as opposed to just a qualitative analysis. He said that the ruling by the EPA indicates that only qualitative analysis needs to be done for localized PM 2.5 requirements until the EPA develops better methodology for such analysis. He said that the information contained in the mailout had been shared with MDOT and FHWA, and the TPB would be kept apprised of any developments.

Mr. Kirby said that the "Letters Sent/Received" packet also contained information from MDOT regarding changes in the breakdown of how transportation projects in the region are funded, and that MDOT had pointed out that the breakdown is different when suballocated by state. He also drew attention to a document included in the packet regarding efforts in the U.S. Congress to earmark funding for Metro rehabilitation activities, and that consideration of a new version of the bill is likely during the "lame duck" session.

There were no questions regarding the report of the Steering Committee.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Knapp recognized those citizens who attended the second Community Leadership Institute conducted by the TPB on October 25 and 28. He noted that the Institute series is an effort to more actively engage interested residents in transportation activities at the regional level. He asked Mr. Swanson to report on the latest session and introduce a few attendees who were present at the TPB meeting.

Mr. Swanson mentioned that there were copies of the new Scenario Study brochure available at the TPB meeting, and also noted that Ms. Petzold and Chairman Knapp would be sponsoring an upcoming public outreach presentation related to the Scenario Study in Rockville on November 29.

Mr. Swanson described the Community Leadership Institute as a two-day workshop that provides information about regional transportation and land use challenges and about the transportation decision making process in the region. He said that this Institute was different from the one held in April, for which participants were nominated by the TPB. He said that in this case most of the 18 attendees were identified by the AARP and the workshop focused more on issues of importance to older adults. He thanked TPB Member David Snyder for giving the

opening presentation at the workshop. He invited three of the attendees who were present to talk about their experience at the workshop.

Candice Rose of Arlington County emphasized the interactive nature of the workshop as helpful in broadening the perspective of participants, and noted how much attendees got involved in thinking about and discussing the land use and transportation scenarios. She said that she thought the workshop could be used for outreach to many different citizen groups and suggested expanding the focus to include more discussion of transportation project financing.

Nancy May of Montgomery County said that she came to the Institute with quite a bit of knowledge about transportation issues in her county, but that the Institute provided the opportunity to look at transportation challenges from a broader perspective. She said that she was struck by the sheer number of deserving projects in the region and the difficulty in prioritizing and funding them. She said that her participation in the Institute had led her to get more involved in a transportation issue important to her local civic association.

Mr. Fellows asked to what extent the participants focused on land use elements such as building and neighborhood design to promote walkability and mobility as opposed to service-related transportation.

Ms. May said that the group touched on that issue, especially during small group work activities when participants discussed a variety of concerns and strategies related to individual projects or issues important to them individually.

G. Stanley Doore of Montgomery County said that the Institute was helpful in bringing together people and ideas from various jurisdictions in the region and gaining a better understanding of the TPB and regional transportation challenges. He said that he thought it was important to add a discussion of transportation technologies to the workshop program, such as elevated monorail technology and hybrid fuel/electric vehicles including conversion of conventional buses to clean diesel fuel.

Chairman Knapp presented certificates to the Institute participants in attendance: Ms. Rose, Ms. May, Mr. Doore, and Sue Whitman of the District of Columbia.

7. Appointment of Nominating Committee for Year 2007 TPB Officers

Chairman Knapp said that the task of identifying the TPB Officers for the next year is to be undertaken by a committee of the three immediately previous chairs, including Mr. Mendelson, Mr. Zimmerman, and Ms. Porter, and that Mr. Zimmerman will chair the committee. Chairman Knapp asked Mr. Kirby if the TPB needed to vote to approve the nominating committee.

Mr. Kirby said that the nominating committee is appointed by the current chair and did not require a TPB vote.

Chairman Knapp thanked the members of the nominating committee for agreeing to serve in that capacity and said he looked forward to hearing back from the committee at the December meeting.

8. Approval of Funding and Transmittal Letter for TPB's 2007 Membership in the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations.

Mr. Kirby said that the TPB is a founding member of the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) which represents and provides assistance to organizations like the TPB around the country. He noted that former TPB chairs have led the national organization and that Mr. Mendelson had just been elected to be the president of AMPO for the coming calendar year. He said that the TPB had received an invoice and transmittal letter, which were included in the mailout packet, stating the dues payment amount of \$19,750. He asked the Board to approve a letter from Chairman Knapp to AMPO transmitting the payment.

A motion to approve funding from the FY 2007 UPWP along with an associated transmittal letter for the TPB's 2007 membership in AMPO was moved and seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

9. Update on the Implementation of the Transportation/Land-Use Connection Pilot Program

Referring to the handout material, Mr. Kirby gave a PowerPoint briefing on the implementation of the Transportation/Land-Use Connection (TLC) program. He noted that the TPB in November had approved establishment of the pilot and had funded it at a level of \$250,000. He said the program will have two major functions – an information clearinghouse and provision of technical assistance. He described these functions. He said that staff was preliminarily planning to work with a national nonprofit organization that has a substantial grant from the Federal Transit Administration to do a national clearinghouse on this very same topic. He said a range of technical assistance activities may be provided, including public involvement facilitation, visualization techniques, design assistance, project scoping for a larger public participation planning effort on major projects and other challenges that may arise that are based on requests from jurisdictions.

He said that \$100,000 would be available in technical assistance for this pilot. Approximately \$20,000 would be available per project on a task order basis, which would mean five projects could be done during the remainder of this fiscal year, through the end of June 2007. Based on a

recommendation from the Technical Committee, staff was recommending that a deadline of January 31 be established for applications.

He said the applications would be circulated to all TPB members for comment. If any interjurisdictional or interagency issues are raised, then Board members would have an opportunity to comment on those before any decision was made to move forward. Assuming that more applications are received than can be funded, Mr. Kirby proposed that the TPB officers and staff review those proposals in terms of consistency with the TPB Vision and the strategies in the scenario study, geographic distribution, and any comments that are received from the TPB members. Based on this review, staff would bring a recommended slate of projects for assistance to the TPB for approval at the February 21 Board meeting. Staff would then identify appropriate consultant support for the proposals.

Mr. Kirby said staff would develop a brochure describing the program, which would be presented to the Technical Committee and TPB at their December meetings.

Regarding the continuation of the program into Fiscal Year 2008, Mr. Kirby proposed that a budget placeholder be put into the 2008 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) anticipating continuation of the program at least at the current level.

Mr. Minnitte asked whether it would be possible to move at this rapid pace and still be comfortable with the development of the program. He also asked whether the cap of \$20,000 would provide a total or just a portion of a project.

Mr. Kirby said the program is based on a similar program in Los Angeles, which focused on niche assistance, providing specialized assistance on a particular aspect of a project. He said the program is moving on a fast schedule.

Mr. Zimmerman said this is potentially a very useful program, but he noted that the program is providing so little money that he was concerned that it would be hard to do very much with it. He asked if it would be possible to require a match from the applying jurisdiction. He said he was concerned that staff and the TPB may find later that it is not as successful as they would have liked, and the simple reason for this may be that not enough money was allocated to it.

Ms. Sorenson asked if the applicants would only be TPB members. She noted that \$20,000 could be a significant amount of money for small towns.

Mr. Kirby said that staff expected requests to come primarily from local governments. He noted that the mayor of Greenbelt at the November COG Board meeting said that Greenbelt was intending to send in a request. He noted that the assistance under this program would not be provided in money, but in technical advice and assistance. He again emphasized that the assistance would likely be a component of a much larger effort.

Regarding the clearinghouse, Chairman Knapp said it would be helpful to get feedback from the planning directors. He said it was important to ensure that the clearinghouse is not simply an internal staff exercise, but really has an external focus to it. Regarding the review process for technical assistance, he said it would be valuable to get feedback on the applications from the Technical Committee. On the question of the placeholder budget item for the next fiscal year, he said it would be useful to revisit the amount of money that is allocated based on the types and number of applications received during this pilot period.

10. Status Report and Recommendations to Improve MetroAccess Service

Ms. Porter introduced this item, saying that the TPB had expressed concerns about these issues in the past. She said that earlier this year, the TPB approved the Access for All Advisory Committee's study of MetroAccess, which identified some concerns about the MetroAccess system. She also noted that earlier this year, there were a lot of negative news reports about problems with MetroAccess. In response to many of those concerns, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) formed an ad hoc MetroAccess Committee, which made a number of recommendations. Ms. Porter said she was a member of this ad hoc committee. She also noted that Wendy Klancher of the TPB staff headed up the Best Practices Subcommittee of the ad hoc committee. She said that the recommendations of the committee that had no additional cost were adopted by the WMATA Board in June. However, a number of recommendations are still outstanding because they do have costs associated with them. She said WMATA is investigating cost and other implications for implementing these recommendations. Meanwhile, she noted that while the issue is not currently as prominent in the news, MetroAccess riders continue to experience problems.

Ms. Porter noted that while some MetroAccess problems were linked to the changeover in contractors, many problems that were identified in the Access for All report were really related to longstanding structural problems with Metro Access.

Ms. Porter said this issue was being brought to the Board today to thank WMATA for the steps that have been taken and to also make it clear that a number of issues that the TPB has expressed concern about have not been addressed.

Referring to the mailout and handout materials, Ms. Klancher gave a PowerPoint briefing that listed and briefly described the recommendations that had been implemented and those that were still under consideration. In terms of next steps, Ms. Klancher said the Access for All Committee will continue to monitor and follow up on these issues, under the leadership of Vice Chairman Hudgins. She said an independent TPB review will be conducted in February or March, which was a recommendation from the Access for All MetroAccess study.

Chairman Knapp thanked Ms. Porter and Ms. Klancher for their efforts and leadership. He also thanked Vice Chairman Hudgins for agreeing to assume chairmanship of the Access for All

Advisory Committee. Finally, he thanked WMATA for their willingness to address these concerns.

Mr. Yaffe said WMATA staff expected to present a full proposal addressing the TPB recommendations to the WMATA Board in December.

11. Status Report on the Regional Value Pricing Study

Referring to the handout presentation, Mr. Kirby updated the Board on recent activities related to value pricing. His briefing included background on the TPB Value Pricing Task Force, which met that morning. He noted that Ms. Petzold who chaired the task force in recent years will not be returning to the Board in January. He thanked Ms. Petzold for her service.

Ms. Petzold said that the leadership of the TPB would be asked in January to appoint a new chair for the task force.

Mr. Kirby said that the Nominations Committee might make a recommendation for task force chair.

Chairman Knapp agreed to this approach for selecting a new task force chair.

Returning to the presentation, Mr. Kirby described current value pricing projects in the region. He also described the TPB's analysis efforts to date, including assisting the Virginia Department of Transportation in analyzing key corridors on the Beltway and I-95/I-395. He described the regional system of variably priced lanes that is being analyzed under the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. The steps in this analysis include developing and analyzing a "starting point" scenario; conducting sensitivity tests, including impacts of enhanced transit; identifying high-potential corridors for a first phase regional network, and identifying access and egress issues. He said that the findings to date include the following key issues:

- Toll levels will have to vary by segment, direction and time of day;
- Transit services will affect demand and toll levels, and need to be explicitly incorporated;
- A full network of VPLs has higher value than the sum of the individual segments (the "network effect"); and
- Access and egress issues need to be addressed.

Finally, Mr. Kirby noted that the TPB had received a grant from the Federal Highway Administration for \$300,000 that will allow the scenario developed under RMAS to be evaluated in greater detail and to include additional corridors, such as parkways. He said that next steps will include: incorporating DC bridges and other facilities into an expanded test network; additional sensitivity testing; microsimulation studies; and examination of land use impacts.

Chairman Knapp thanked Ms. Petzold for her service.

Mr. Zimmerman said this was a very good presentation. He noted that there is very little experience with modeling these types of scenarios, so there is a certain level of uncertainty that should not be forgotten. He noted a point Mr. Kirby had raised, which he said was counter-intuitive: Putting pricing on the system may actually increase the rate of flow and actually increase capacity. He said this situation was found in Stockholm, Sweden where a pricing scheme was tried on a test basis and was endorsed by the public after they experienced it. If a vote had occurred before the test, it probably would not have been approved. He speculated that something similar might happen in Washington, although he said it would probably be politically unfeasible.

Referring to slide 9, Mr. Zimmerman asked how the 14th Street Bridge was treated in the model, in terms of endpoints.

Mr. Kirby said the model assumes that the new lanes will stop well short of the 14th Street Bridge.

Mr. Zimmerman said that failing to extend the variably priced lanes across the bridge is apt to create quite a problem there, which is somewhat ironic because of the three spans on the bridge, one was built entirely for the purpose of carrying high occupancy vehicles. He said people should pay attention to that, because that is one of those areas that probably can be fixed.

Referring to slide 8, Mr. Zimmerman noted a point he found to be important in Mr. Kirby's presentation: If transit use is increased, it has a really beneficial effect for everyone. He asked, for purposes of the model, what "enhanced transit" means, i.e., what was actually changed in the scenario?

Mr. Kirby said that the inputs for "enhanced transit" were made up of two things: The bus service planned for 2030 was moved forward to 2010 and for the existing service all the headways were reduced to a maximum of 15 minutes. Mr. Kirby noted that a staff person who coded the analysis made the comment that the "enhanced transit" represented a very significant increase.

Mr. Lovain said he was concerned that private partners in the HOT lane project do not have any economic incentive to encourage enhanced transit.

While noting that this concern was not in the specific scope of the TPB study, Mr. Kirby did note that VDOT is currently working with a private consortium on two HOT lane facilities. He noted that increased transit could be seen as having a beneficial effect for private operators, in that, if the toll rates can come down but their revenues are not reduced, they might be pleased with that result.

Vice Chairman Pourciau said that the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) was working closely with VDOT on their pricing analysis, and concerns have been raised about a choke point at 14th Street Bridge. She said they have also been discussing improving connections to other destinations, such as a total reconstruction of the M Street corridor at the Southwest Waterfront, which then would reduce some of that capacity coming off the 14th Street connection.

12. Report on the Regional “Street Smart” Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign

Chairman Knapp noted that Montgomery County was not listed in the report on the Street Smart Campaign as having contributed to the program this year, but said that the payment had been approved and the county will be contributing at the recommended level of five cents per capita.

Mr. Farrell briefed the TPB on the results of the 2006 Street Smart campaign, the funding and proposed activities for 2007, and potential enhancements to the program for 2008, referring to a PowerPoint presentation that was distributed at the meeting. He summarized the Street Smart Campaign, describing the advertising methods used and target audiences, and noted that materials and advertisements are produced in English and Spanish. He said that the spring 2006 campaign was the fourth such campaign and that participation in the program by law enforcement was substantial.

Mr. Farrell said that the surveys from before and after the 2006 campaign reported improvements in driver and pedestrian behavior as well as increased awareness of the campaign themes. He showed charts with pedestrian and bicycle fatality numbers by year and by local jurisdiction.

Mr. Farrell said that the 2007 campaign would likely be held in April, coinciding with the start of the tourist season. He said that the campaign would be similar to last year’s but with more emphasis on the growing use of Internet advertising. He detailed the funding history of the program and the suggested contributions from each jurisdiction based on a level of five cents per capita. He said that the program would also be exploring opportunities for private sponsorship as an additional source of funding.

Mr. Farrell said that the request for 2008 funding would be sent out earlier to give jurisdictions more lead time, and that the current funding trend is not keeping pace with rising advertising costs, which limits the scope of the campaign. He mentioned a few desirable enhancements to the program for 2008, including the possibility of two waves of advertisements rather than just one as was recommended by the campaign’s design consultants. He said that there is significant support for the program and that a large portion of the campaign consists of free press coverage and public service announcements.

Ms. Hudgins said that she thought the program had grown and achieved a level of which the TPB should be proud. She emphasized that the program needs additional funding and that being able to do a campaign in the fall to coincide with the start of the school year could make the program much more effective. She noted that Fairfax County has been consistently supportive of the program and urged other jurisdictions to join in that support. She said that making the funding request earlier in the year is a good idea.

Ms. Petzold said that the fall is a much more crucial time for the campaign to take place not only because of the start of the school year but also because of the decreased amount of daylight.

Mr. Farrell said that the turnover of the federal fiscal year on October 1 presents administrative difficulties in coordinating contracts and funding for the program. He said that best alternative from an administrative point of view is to do a fall campaign in September, ending by the beginning of October, even though extending into October may be ideal from a programmatic standpoint.

Ms. Petzold asked if the campaign could be extended into October by delaying the play of the free public service announcements until then.

Mr. Farrell said that the campaigns tend to be most effective when all the advertisement and publicity is focused in a specific timeframe in order to create a measurable increase in awareness. He said that it would be difficult to separate free and paid components of the campaign, and reiterated that an October campaign presents administrative challenges.

Ms. Petzold said that she found it disappointing that government deadlines and procedures stand in the way of doing what is most reasonable.

Chairman Knapp said that TPB members were conversing among themselves and indicating that the administrative challenges should be dealt with if they are the only barriers to doing the campaign at the time when it would be most effective.

Mr. Zimmerman agreed with Chairman Knapp, and suggested that the spring campaign could be delayed and conducted instead in the fall. He said that he was most concerned about the level of funding, and that he thinks the program is only worth doing if it can be done at a level that ensures its effectiveness. He said that he feels even the suggested level of funding is at the low end of what is necessary to make the program worth doing. He said that a commitment to the program by all jurisdictions is required, and that he is disturbed that in past years Montgomery County's contribution was the same as Arlington County's though Montgomery County is four times larger. He noted that Fairfax County, along with Arlington County and the City of Alexandria, have been contributing at the suggested rate of five cents per capita.

Mr. Zimmerman said that he was willing to put up more money from Arlington County if all the other jurisdictions do so as well, but that he is not willing to keep securing funds from Arlington

County if a lot of the other jurisdictions do not think the program merits at least the suggested contribution. He said that he was only interested in moving forward with the program if everyone is on board. He also asked why there is not a suggested local contribution for the District of Columbia.

Mr. Kirby said that the District of Columbia is considered a state for this particular program.

Mr. Zimmerman said that both Virginia and Maryland are also putting up federal money for the program, and that the District of Columbia should be treated as both a state and a locality, as they wish to be in most cases. He reiterated that he would not be willing to put up a contribution from Arlington County unless the other jurisdictions contribute at a comparable amount so that there is enough funding to make the program effective.

Chairman Knapp said that he noted Mr. Zimmerman's concern and that while the point could be debated further, the meeting needed to move ahead in the interest of time.

Ms. Pourciau said that she supported the idea of doing the campaign twice a year, especially given that fatality numbers seem to have increased in the past year. She said that resources should be focused in areas where the most incidents and fatalities have occurred. She said that the District of Columbia would give more or as much as others based on what is deemed to be the appropriate formula. She said that efforts should be made to take advantage of low-cost opportunities that would at least keep word out about the issue.

13. Briefing on Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2007 Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2008-2013 Transportation Improvement Program

Ms. Klancher referred to the Draft Call for Projects included in the mailout packet, saying that this year's document is very similar to last year's, but does include some additional information and requirements needed to make the process SAFETEA-LU compliant. She said that the project submission process would be online this year, and that the submission forms would be asking for some additional information from implementing agencies about the projects to respond to SAFETEA-LU requirements. She said that this year's schedule for adoption of the plans would also be similar to last year, with a goal of adoption of the plans at the October 2007 TPB meeting.

There were no questions regarding Item 13.

14. Other Business

There was no other business.

15. Adjournment

Chairman Knapp adjourned the meeting at 2:01pm.