

**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**  
**October 18, 2006**

Members and Alternates Present

Hilda M. Barg, Prince William County  
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA  
Lyn Erickson, MDOT  
Andrew M. Fellows, City of College Park  
Brian Glenn, Federal Transit Administration  
Edgar Gonzalez, Montgomery County Executive Branch  
Charles Graves, DC Office of Planning  
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Sandra Jackson, FHWA  
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council  
Julia Koster, NCPC  
Timothy Lovain, City of Alexandria  
Michael Lyles, City of Bowie  
David Moss, Montgomery County  
Carol Petzold, Maryland House of Delegates  
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park  
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT  
C. Paul Smith, City of Frederick  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County  
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT  
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate  
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County  
Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax  
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force  
Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park  
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board

---

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Gerald Miller	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Jim Hogan	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
Ron Milone	COG/DTP
Robert Snead	COG/DTP
Erin Morrow	COG/DTP
Don McAuslan	COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Dusan Vuksan	COG/DTP
Naomi Friedman	COG/EO
Chinyere Uzoukwu	COG/HSPPS
Heather Mueller	COG/OPA
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Emmet Tydings	DC Citizen
Ian Beam	MDOT
Randy Carroll	MDE
Sharmila Samarasinghe	Department of Rail & Public Transportation – Virginia
Unwana B. Dabney	FHWA – VA Division
Harry Sanders	Action Committee for Transit
Allen Greenberg	Citizen
Bob Grow	Greater Washington Board of Trade
Roger Diedrich	Citizen
Bob Chase	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Tamara Ashby	Arlington County
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Mark Rawlings	DDOT

---

Deborah Burns	FTA/Washington Metro Office
Patty Nicoson	Dulles Corridor Rail Association
Karen Redmond	Citizen
Tony Chinyere	Tri-County Council, Southern Maryland
Bill Orleans	PG ACT
Lee Schoenecker	COG CAC
Mary Ellen Earley	Citizen
R.J. Eldridge	Land Design, Inc.
Harriet Dietz	Land Design
Tom Biesiadny	Fairfax County DOT

## 1. Public Comment

Bob Grow, Greater Washington Board of Trade, thanked supporters of the Intercounty Connector and other projects for the inclusion of those projects in the Constrained Long-Range Plan. He suggested the TPB should conduct a study to look at the opportunities for developing transit-oriented development (TOD) around Metro stations and commuter rail stations. He also said his organization would appreciate the advocacy of the TPB members in Richmond and Annapolis, D.C., and at the federal level, to help us secure additional funding for transportation, including funding for Metro as proposed under Congressman Davis' legislation.

Allen Greenberg called attention to the Citizens Advisory Committee's resolution in support of the Transportation/Land-Use Connection (TLC) program that would be considered under agenda item 14. While supporting the proposed program, the CAC resolution also called for TPB to take additional concurrent steps in furtherance of the resolution's objective. He suggested such steps might include establishing a new competitive program that would award small innovative planning grants. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Harry Sanders, Action Committee for Transit, said it was important to continue to drill down into the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study to identify the transit projects that produce the largest benefits. He also expressed concern that the study did not have a clear connection to the development of the Constrained Long-Range Plan. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Roger Diedrich, speaking for the Virginia Chapter of the Sierra Club, spoke in support of the comments of Harry Sanders. He said the Sierra Club did not support taking money away from the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study as proposed under Item 14. He said more analysis and information was needed, and the study should not be impeded. He spoke against examination of a regional network of toll lanes because it would not be true congestion pricing since the revenue from the tolls would be used for highway expansion, not for congestion relief. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

---

Bob Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, said the TPB has spent nearly six years and millions of dollars satisfying intellectual curiosities by testing land use scenarios and several billion dollars of transit investments, while refusing to test new highways and bridge corridors despite the fact that highways move an overwhelming majority of all vehicular trips. He expressed concern that the CLRP has always appeared to be more a collection of lists than a plan. He called upon the Board to identify a selected handful of important priority projects that are needed to improve transportation and reduce congestion. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

## **2. Approval of the Minutes of September 20, 2006**

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

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

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Canizales said the Technical Committee met on October 6, and reviewed the following items:

- A briefing on the performance of the 2006 CLRP, including expected land use changes, the financial picture, and the highway and transit travel and congestion growth around the region.
- A briefing on the air quality conformity assessment of the CLRP and TIP.
- A briefing on the draft CLRP and TIP documents, including an emphasis on the Web-based presentation of the plan.
- A review of some minor technical corrections to portions of the draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The committee recommended that these be corrected and moved forward with the TIP.
- A briefing on the technical documentation for Phase 1 of the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study.
- A briefing on the proposed pilot program to promote the coordination between land use and transportation planning. The committee recommended that this pilot program be advanced for approval as an action item at the TPB's October meeting.
- A discussion of recent resolutions of the Frederick Area Metropolitan Planning Organization with respect to the allocation of Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula funds in the Washington urbanized area. The committee decided to discuss this issue further before bringing it to the TPB.

## **4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee**

---

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Tydings said the CAC met on October 12. He said the committee was briefed on the CLRP. He noted that the new web-based information reflected many of the recommendations that the CAC made in January. He thanked the staff for these improvements.

Mr. Tydings said the CAC passed a resolution in strong support of the new Transportation/Land-Use Connection (TLC) program, although the resolution also called upon the TPB to develop a more aggressive program along these lines in the future. He read portions of the resolution, which was attached to the CAC report.

Chairman Knapp thanked the CAC for the resolution and the substantive feedback it provided.

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

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on October 6 and approved two resolutions that amended the FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program. The first amendment was preliminary engineering for widening of Route 7 between the Reston Parkway and Tichor Road and for widening the Leesburg Bypass. The other amendment approved the acquisition of a new bus and paratransit vehicle by the City of Gaithersburg, which was funded by a federal earmark.

Referring to the "Letters Sent/Received" packet, Mr. Kirby called attention to a letter from Pierce Homer, the Secretary of Transportation in Virginia, on behalf of the Governor of Virginia, in response to Chairman Knapp's letter sent in August which explored interest in the Transportation/Land-Use Connection (TLC) program. He said the letter was fairly positive, commending the TPB for this effort, and encouraging the Board to move forward.

Mr. Kirby also called attention to a letter that the TPB sent to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as comment to the docket regarding the eligibility of high-occupancy toll lanes for incorporation in the federal transit formula. The TPB position is that all high-occupancy toll facilities that are variably priced and permit unimpeded transit service should be eligible for inclusion in the federal transit formula.

Mr. Bottigheimer asked about the background for this letter.

Mr. Kirby said that last year during the development of principles for the TPB's Value Pricing Task Force, the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA) expressed concern about the future status of fixed guideway bus miles in the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula that earn FTA funding by virtue of being included in the formula. WMATA asked whether those formula funds would continue to be available if the facility were converted to a high occupancy/toll lane facility. He said the TPB sent a letter to the FTA requesting a clarification of their position on that question. He said FTA issued a policy statement in the Federal Register of September 7, 2006, that makes clear that converting existing HOV facilities

---

to HOT lanes would remain eligible, as long as a high level of service is maintained for transit. But in the same regulation FTA excluded non-HOV facilities converted directly to HOT facilities, and they also excluded facilities constructed as new HOT lanes. He said that this aspect of the policy would restrict the Beltway lanes or the Intercounty Connector from receiving the formula funds, even if high-quality bus services are run on those facilities. In a response to this FTA policy proposal, the TPB provided a comment for the docket expressing the position that all high-occupancy toll facilities that are variably priced and permit unimpeded transit service should be eligible for inclusion in the federal transit formula.

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

Chairman Knapp thanked the staff for the completion of Phase I of the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Scenario Study and for the new citizen-friendly CLRP information.

## **7. Briefing on the 2006 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP)**

Referring to the mailout material and handout presentation, Mr. Kirby briefed the Board on the 2006 CLRP. He said this was an informational item preceding Item 8, which would be an action item seeking the Board's approval of the 2006 Constrained Long Range Plan coming up under Item 10. Mr. Kirby called attention to the brochure called "What's in the Plan for 2030?" He briefly described the new projects that were included this year, and he provided information on plan performance, including expected land use changes, funding, and the highway and transit travel growth and congestion around the region.

Mr. Zimmerman asked how incident management fits into the CLRP.

Mr. Kirby explained that the regional transportation coordination program, which was formerly referred to as CapCom, has been funded in the CLRP and TIP and will coordinate information and system management during incidents.

Mr. Kirby described the 2006 financial analysis for the plan, emphasizing that state/District of Columbia revenues form a smaller portion of total revenues compared to 2003 projections. In contrast, tolls and local revenues will form a much larger percentage of total revenues than was anticipated in the past. He also emphasized that while anticipated revenues have gone up since 2003, rising construction costs have also increased significantly.

Mr. Fellows asked to what degree the "toll revenues" portion of the funding pie chart reflected a privatization of roadways.

Mr. Kirby said that toll projects are being done a little differently in different parts of the region

---

and it is still a an evolving issue as to what the exact public/private role will be.

Ms. Pourciau noted that is difficult to identify anticipate private revenue with a high level of precision.

Mr. Zimmerman asked whether all District of Columbia revenues were included in the “State/DC” portion of the pie chart.

Mr. Kirby said that yes, the District of Columbia revenues were included in that figure.

Mr. Zimmerman said the growth in local and toll revenues was the most significant information in the presentation. He said that local governments are being expected to carry an increasing burden. He also emphasized that the Metro Matters funding represented a commitment from the WMATA jurisdictions to provide short-term funding for rail cars that were urgently needed. He emphasized, however, that major funding shortfalls would again emerge in the near future.

Referring to the scenario study, Mr. Staton said the results seem to be focusing on a desire for people to live in a certain way or live in a certain area. For example, he noted that Mr. Kirby had indicated that if more jobs would be concentrated in activity centers, then transit ridership would increase. But he said it was important to ask whether the goal should be to increase transit ridership or reduce congestion. He noted that at a certain point, transit capacity is going to be overwhelmed. He said he looked forward to the discussion of the scenario study.

Mr. Kirby noted that the scenario study is also looking at toll lanes, not just transit.

Mr. Gonzales said he wanted to echo Mr. Zimmerman's observations about the increased share of local funding as opposed to the state. He also said the congestion figures actually underestimated the immensity of the problem because in the future peak period congestion will last a much longer portion of the day.

## **8. Review of Comments Received and Acceptance of Recommended Responses for Inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Assessment, the 2006 CLRP, and the FY 2007-2012 TIP**

Mr. Kirby referenced a memorandum distributed at the meeting that listed the comments received via the TPB Web site, and said that two individuals had submitted two comments each. He read the questions, which focused on issues of additional river crossings, transit mode priority and ridership, and bicycle and pedestrian facility provision. He described the recommended response to each question, and pointed out how the plan documents address the concerns expressed in the comments.

---

Ms. Ticer moved to accept the recommended responses to comments received for inclusion in the air quality conformity assessment, the 2006 CLRP, and the FY 2007-2012 TIP. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

### **9. Approval of Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2006 CLRP and FY 2007-2012 TIP**

Mr. Clifford said that the resolution before the Board finds the 2006 CLRP and FY 2007-2012 TIP to be in conformity with the requirements of the Clean Air Act as amended in 1990. He said that the mailout included a letter from Chairman Mendelson of the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) and a memorandum with the summary results of and comments on the conformity assessment. He summarized the memorandum, including a timeline of the work activities involved and their relationship to federal requirements. He noted sections on the travel modeling process and emissions factor development, and referenced charts showing downward trends in the levels of volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, and particulate matter. He said that these primary emissions tests provide the basis for a determination of conformity by the TPB. He said that the letter from MWAQC notes that new emissions budgets will be in effect for next year's analysis, including a new 8-hour ozone standard currently under development, and urges state and local governments to maintain their commitments to emissions reduction measures.

Ms. Petzold moved to adopt Resolution R7-2007 finding that the 2006 CLRP and FY 2007-2012 TIP conform with the requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

### **10. Approval of the 2006 CLRP**

Mr. Kirby said that the resolution before the board would approve the CLRP for this year. He noted that a memorandum attached to the resolution in the mailout described the significant project additions and changes in this year's plan, which were also described under Item 7. He also noted that information about all the projects in the plan is available on the Web.

Mr. Kirby said that one plan performance measure that is moving in the right direction is the steady decline in mobile emissions, primarily as a result of improvements to fuels and vehicles. He said that technological advances, including modern diesel engines, are leading to significant reductions in particulate matter and nitrogen oxides, reductions that more than offset the growth in vehicle miles of travel and congestion.

Ms. Pourciau moved to adopt Resolution R8-2007 approving the 2006 CLRP. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.



---

## **11. Approval of the FY 2007-2012 TIP**

Mr. Kirby explained that the TIP implements the first six years of the 25-year plan and contains detailed programmatic information about all the included projects. He said that instead of distributing paper copies of the entire document to the Board, the document was made available on the Web and only a few hard copies were produced to save costs.

Mr. Graves moved to adopt Resolution R9-2007 approving the FY 2007-2012 TIP. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

## **12. Certification of the Urban Transportation Planning Process for the National Capital Region**

Mr. Kirby explained the annual self-certification process in which the TPB and the implementing agencies certify that the regional planning process culminating in the approval of the CLRP and TIP has been conducted in accordance with all of the federal planning requirements. He described the contents of the certification document that was included in the mailout and noted that the process is important because 80 percent of the TPB's funding comes from the federal government, with state and local matches of 10 percent each. He asked the Board to adopt Resolution R10-2007 which endorses the Statement of Certification.

Chairman Knapp asked if the document essentially says that the TPB has done everything it is supposed to do.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct and noted that Ms. Jackson of the Federal Highway Administration would bring any problems with the certification to the attention of the Board.

Mr. Wren moved to adopt Resolution R10-2007 endorsing the Statement of Certification. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

## **13. Briefing on Documentation of Phase I of the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Scenario Study**

Chairman Knapp said that Item 13 had been included on the agenda at the request of TPB members who had wanted further discussion on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Scenario Study.

Mr. Kirby referred to a brochure that was distributed at the meeting. He then briefed the TPB on

---

documentation of the five alternative transportation and land use scenarios included in the study, and on proposed scenario analysis and related outreach activities to be conducted in the coming year. He said that the brochure combines material on the study from the past two issues of the Region magazine, and describes regional land use and transportation projections along with the five study scenarios. He noted that initial results of an additional scenario analyzing a regional system of variably priced lanes would likely be presented to the TPB in November or December.

Mr. Kirby said that the next step upon completion of the variably priced lanes scenario would be to develop one or more composite scenarios that combine features of the individual scenarios. He said that all of the scenarios reduce vehicle miles of travel and peak-period congestion, and that all but the “Jobs Out” scenario increase overall transit use in the region. He noted that the impacts of the scenarios could be much more dramatic in specific locations. He said that efforts in the coming months would focus on discussion of how key findings of the analysis could best be put into practice, along with more public outreach to share the story with the region and help build public support for the most promising strategies identified by the study.

Mr. Kirby said that a lengthy technical report had been produced, a few copies of which were distributed at the meeting. He said that citizen representatives have asked TPB staff to continue to drill deeper into the analysis to see where transit investments would have the highest payoff. He said that this could be accomplished without much new analysis and that TPB staff would be continuing such work this year. He said that he wanted to make that point in advance of the discussion in Item 14 about moving some funding from the FY 07 budget for the scenario study into a regional implementation program.

Chairman Knapp said that although the individual scenarios could be debated at length, the single largest message from all of the scenarios is that in any part of the region, putting jobs and households closer together, encouraging mixed-use development around transit, and providing more transit to support regional activity centers can help improve the region’s outlook as far as congestion. He said that these principles could be put into effect throughout the region, and the study at least begins to provide information to spur conversations in different parts of the region. He thanked Mr. Kirby and TPB staff for their efforts in completing this phase of the study.

Mr. Zimmerman said that Chairman Knapp had summarized the study well and applauded the effort in completing the study. He said he thought it would be useful in promoting regional discussion. He asked if additional households included in certain scenarios are assumed to be in particular places, namely, concentrated in or around regional activity centers.

Mr. Kirby said that the scenarios do place the households in specific places and attempt to focus the growth in and near regional activity centers.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if it was accurate to say that where exactly the households are placed has a big impact on the degree of positive results achieved, and that fully understanding the impacts

---

of households in specific locations would require a finer level of analysis than is represented by the scenario study.

Mr. Kirby said that such a statement would be correct, and noted that the region's planning directors had assisted in placing the households for the purpose of the study in a somewhat realistic manner, not completely constrained by existing zoning and opportunities.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the scenario study as a first approximation constitutes a good start to looking at the linkage between transportation and land use. He said that moving forward with implementation steps would likely entail looking in more detail at the neighborhood level and the boundaries that dictate the current assumptions, like existing land use plans. He said that on a policy level it will be important to look at how sensitive the outcomes are to changes in those assumptions and boundaries at the local level. He said he would predict that making certain changes in specific places to shift household development will result in an even greater impact than what is reflected in the study. He noted that at the same time, changes at that level could move in the wrong direction and lead to significantly less positive results. He said that it will be important to look at that level of detail and move beyond the boundaries that are taken to be a given.

Mr. Zimmerman said that he wanted to point out in response to Mr. Staton's earlier comments that the distribution of metropolitan growth as shown on page 15 of the Item 7 presentation is based on assumptions of existing land use plans and current trends, but is not necessarily an indication of what people want. He said that it doesn't mean that people have already chosen to live in particular places in 2030, because those choices have yet to be made. He compared the situation to the rapid spread of Thai cuisine around the country, saying that it was not because people previously did not like Thai food and all of a sudden changed their minds, but rather that they had simply not been introduced to it or had it available to them before.

Mr. Zimmerman said that a problem with applying market analysis to land use is that the current condition was not generated by a perfectly free market but instead resulted from a combination of government regulations and policies at various levels. He said that the choices made by policy makers ultimately govern the choices that consumers have when they consider where to live. He said that current trends reflect a strong demand for housing near transit and in areas that allow for less auto travel, and that planners are faced with the challenge of meeting that demand, which would in turn help the region deal with congestion and address growing issues of energy consumption and global warming. He said that all of these factors call for the region's leaders to make policy choices that will generate a different scenario for the region that will be an improvement over the default condition for both the region and the world.

Mr. Staton asked if TPB staff had picked a winning scenario among the five that were discussed in the presentation.

Mr. Kirby said that the five scenarios provide a spectrum of options, and that the hope is to move

---

toward a composite scenario that would combine elements of each of the five.

Mr. Staton said that he was struggling with the idea that a final scenario to follow had not been chosen, but that the next item on the agenda would move money away from the budget for the scenario study to a plan that looks to implement the “Households In” and “Transit-Oriented Development” scenarios, even though it is not certain to be the best course of action.

Mr. Kirby said that rather than promoting one or two specific scenarios, the implementation plan says that there are a few general lessons from the study and common threads among all the scenarios that point to some general strategies that should be promoted. He said one such strategy is moving jobs and housing closer together, which could be accomplished in a variety of ways, including moving jobs out, households in, or shifting development from the west side of the region to the east, all of which result in a reduction in vehicle-miles traveled.

Mr. Staton said that he agreed with the idea of getting people closer to jobs, and that he has noticed that people tend to choose where they want to live based on quality of life issues and then try to figure out how to get to their jobs. He said that he has heard many Loudoun County residents who have moved from the region’s inner jurisdictions say at public hearings that their commutes back into jobs in the inner jurisdictions are becoming unbearable. He said that Loudoun County is not really trying to encourage more residential growth because of its consequences on public infrastructure like schools.

Mr. Staton said that he wants to look not just at which scenarios might yield the best results, but also look at which are the most feasible. He said he thinks that it is much more realistic to create more commercial infrastructure and jobs in outer jurisdictions than to try to force more residential development into inner jurisdictions. He said that the money considered for reallocation in Item 14 would be better spent working on a composite scenario.

Ms. Pourciau said that the analysis has shown that there is not a single strategy for improving the region, but rather many different options of how to proceed. She said that the scenario study process is reminiscent of the development of the District of Columbia’s first long-range transportation vision plan. She said that in that planning process, there was resistance to picking a single scenario with which to proceed, and that since that time improvements have been made that have incorporated many pieces of the different scenarios considered, and the result has nonetheless been very positive. She said that she supported the idea of beginning to invest in steps that move toward the plans and test how resources can be used to encourage change.

Ms. Smyth said that she has learned through her experience with the MetroWest development that there are many different opinions about transit-oriented development. She said that developers understand the need for density but do not consider details like design, connectivity to transit, and open space that actually make it work. She said that visualization and public outreach are crucial to making transit-oriented development work because of the complexity of the planning process, especially from the perspective of the public. She said she supported the

---

recommendation to commit \$250,000 to efforts to help local jurisdictions with things like public outreach and visualization, and wished that the amount were greater.

Mr. Weissberg said that he would like some elaboration and assurance that despite the shift of resources considered in Item 14, the scenario study could still include drilling down to identify the best transit options.

Mr. Fellows suggested that the TPB should try to facilitate jurisdictional discussions of the study and look at the regional scenarios with a view toward how intra-jurisdictional implementation steps could maximize benefits. He said that such information would be useful for the TPB to get back. He asked if there was a plan for facilitating this kind of discussion.

Mr. Kirby said that there are several outreach presentations pertaining to the scenario study scheduled for the coming months, and that TPB staff would be happy to give a tailored presentation to a particular jurisdiction, as has been done with past presentations. He said that audiences typically want to relate the presentation to their local situation, and that tailoring it locally has led to good response and good dialogue.

#### **14. Approval of Pilot Program for Strengthening the Linkages between Transportation and Land Use Planning**

Mr. Kirby gave a PowerPoint presentation that reviewed discussion of the item at previous TPB meetings, and explained that Resolution R11-2007 before the Board would amend the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to facilitate creation of a pilot program called the Transportation/Land Use Connection (TLC) Program. He said that the presentation summarized a memorandum included in the mailout packet and reviewed by the TPB Technical Committee, Steering Committee, and Citizens Advisory Committee, as well as the Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee. He said that these committees were generally supportive, and that at its October meeting the Steering Committee recommended that a proposal to begin a pilot program be brought before the Board as an action item at the October meeting of the TPB. He noted that MPOs are being called upon by local officials as well as federal guidance to help improve transportation/land use linkages, and summarized the value that could potentially be added by a regional initiative.

Mr. Kirby outlined the program proposal, including the implementation of a regional clearinghouse to document local and state experiences with land use and transportation coordination and the offer of short-term technical assistance to local jurisdictions to support their coordination activities. He detailed a start-up budget and proposed an implementation timeline for the pilot program. He said that the funds would be shifted from composite scenario planning activities in the budget for the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Scenario Study, and that the development of one or more composite scenarios would be delayed until FY 2008. He also

---

referred to letters, included in the mailout packet, that were received from the state administrations in response to a communication from Chairman Knapp regarding possible funding sources for the pilot program.

Mr. Graves said that Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee, which he currently chairs, would like to see a more extensive grant program implemented, but that the proposed pilot program is a good compromise given the fiscal realities. He said that the grant program implemented by the Atlanta Regional Commission, with which he is familiar, has been very popular and successful, and that he hoped this region could eventually move toward a program of similar magnitude and with similar funding levels.

Mr. Zimmerman said he agreed with Mr. Graves that the region should be moving toward implementing a more aggressive program, and that he had mixed feelings about the resolution as it takes money from another important planning activity. He said that the amount of money available for long-term thinking about transportation spending is small in relation to overall transportation budgets, and that this fact is indicative of poor priorities. He said that he is encouraged, however, that the resolution represents a step forward in putting the results of the scenario analysis into effect, and commended Chairman Knapp for his effort in promoting implementation ideas. He said he hoped the TPB could speed up the pace of implementation efforts in the future.

Mr. Zimmerman moved to adopt Resolution R11-2007, to amend the FY 2007 UPWP to reprogram funding from the RMAS work activity to implement the Transportation/Land Use Connection (TLC) pilot program from January 1 through June 30, 2007.

Ms. Petzold seconded the motion and said that she had intended to make the motion.

Chairman Knapp thanked TPB staff for their efforts in developing the proposal. He said he hoped that the program could move along quickly, and yield results and experiences that can be used to justify additional resources and provide more real-world information to local jurisdictions to inform further action.

Mr. Staton said that he could not support the motion because it removes funding from efforts aimed at answering key questions, and seeks to implement solutions before the answers are known. He said that concentrating development around transit stations in inner jurisdictions such as Fairfax and Arlington Counties has resulted in a trend of families with children moving to outer jurisdictions such as Loudoun and Prince William Counties. He said that the TPB should not be trying to achieve a particular solution without determining that it will actually solve the problem rather than perpetuating existing trends.

The motion was passed. Mr. Staton cast a dissenting vote.

---

**15. Other Business**

There was no other business.

**16. Adjournment**

Chairman Knapp adjourned the meeting at 2:06pm.