

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
December 17, 2008**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
William Bronrott, Maryland House of Delegates
Robert Catlin, City of College Park
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Brian A. Glenn, FTA
Tom Harrington, WMATA
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Charles Jenkins, Frederick County
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council
Timothy Lovain, Alexandria City Council
Michael May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
Rick Rybeck, DDOT
C. Paul Smith, City of Frederick
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd Turner, City of Bowie
Jonathan Way, City of Manassas
Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	
Michael Clifford	
Gerald Miller	
Robert Griffiths	
Andrew Meese	
Michael Farrell	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Andrew Austin	
Michael Eichler	
Monica Bansal	
Sarah Crawford	
Darren Smith	
Beth Newman	
Rex Hodgson	
Dusan Vuksan	
Mark Moran	
Karin Foster	
Tim Canan	
Robert Snead	
Daivamani Sivasailam	
Feng Xie	
Joan Rohlf	COG/DEP
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Bill Orleans	PG ACT
Tom Biesiadny	Fairfax County DOT
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Shirley C. Williams	FEMA
Dan Emerine	DC Office of Planning
Art Rodgers	DC Office of Planning
Eugene W. Grant	Seat Pleasant: A City of Excellence
Walter Lee James, Jr.	Town of Bladensburg
Trish Hendren	WMATA
Yvonne Dawson	WMATA
Bob Chase	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Sarah Kline	WMATA
Kathy Porter	Community Leadership Institute
Patricia Haddon	Calvert County
Greg McFarland	NVTC

Dan Malouff	Arlington
Angelica Betts	PWC/BOCS Aide
Randy Carroll	MDE
Otto Clemente	Fairfax County DOT
Mike Hackett	MWAA
Sean Kennedy	WMATA
Erik Dahlerg	WMATA

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Bob Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Authority, said the potential federal transportation stimulus package would be a great opportunity for the region. He said it would be very important to select projects according to performance-based criteria in order to build public trust. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the November 19, 2008 Meeting

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to approve the minutes. Ms. Smyth seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Referring to the handout summary, Mr. Rawlings said the Technical Committee met on December 5. A number of items were reviewed for inclusion on the TPB's December agenda:

- Related to TPB agenda item 11, the Technical Committee was briefed on the potential applicability of the California measure, SB375, and other alternative approaches for linking greenhouse gas emission reductions to metropolitan transportation planning in the Washington region.
- Related to TPB agenda item 12, the committee was briefed on the status and development of the land- use and transportation components of the two scenarios under development for the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study.
- Related to TPB agenda item 8, the committee was briefed on the schedule and draft scope of work for the conformity assessment of the 2009 CLRP and FY2010-2015 TIP. The committee also discussed the possibility of a delay in submitting project inputs for the assessment because of current funding uncertainties at the state and local levels.
- Related to TPB agenda item 10, the committee was briefed on WMATA's 2011 to 2020 Capital Needs Inventory, the available capital funding levels, and need for a regional funding strategy, and the next steps for prioritizing the capital needs.
- Related to TPB agenda item 9, the committee was briefed on a list recommended by the

Regional Bus Subcommittee of high-priority bus projects of regional significance.

The Technical Committee also discussed a final draft of the FY2009-2014 TIP brochure.

Two items were deferred until the January meeting: a briefing on the FY2009 models development consultant task order research and a briefing on the 2007 Washington-Baltimore Regional Air Passenger Survey.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Martin said the CAC spent the majority of its December meeting discussing the two new scenarios under development: the CLPR Aspirations Scenario and the “What Would It Take?” Scenario. Among many questions, the committee discussed how the results of both scenarios will feed into each other and into the CLRP, as called for in the CAC's recent recommendations to the TPB Scenario Study Task Force.

Mr. Martin said the committee also discussed technologies to allow for remote participation at CAC meetings. The committee also selected six individuals to serve on the 2009 CAC: Harold Foster and Shirley Williams (District of Columbia); Bill Klenke and Emmett Tydings (Maryland); and Allen Munchnik and Gail Parker (Virginia).

Regarding the land-use shifts under examination in the scenario study, Mr. Way asked if there was any expectation that such standards would become binding on member jurisdictions.

Mr. Kirby said the analysis was not intended to be binding. The scenarios were simply intended to provide information about the effects of potential changes. However, he noted that the scenarios were being developed with the participation of planning directors from all the member jurisdictions, and thus were not necessarily unrealistic.

Chairman Mendelson emphasized that the work of the TPB staff is intended to inform the TPB members as planning officials in their own jurisdictions.

Chairman Mendelson presented Mr. Rawlings and Mr. Martin with plaques in recognition of their service as chairmen of the Technical Committee and CAC, respectively.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Referring to the handout and mailout material, Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee on December 5 amended the FY2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to include project funding for a transit center in the City of Alexandria.

Mr. Kirby said the letters packet included a letter from EPA Regional Administrator Donald Welsh to Governor O'Malley of Maryland regarding the designation of non-attainment areas for the new PM2.5 fine particle standard, established in 2006. He said that EPA on September 2 had preliminarily indicated they would designate the Baltimore metropolitan area as non-attainment and the Washington metropolitan area as in attainment for this standard. During public comment, the argument was made that Baltimore's particulate problem is influenced by pollution that blows north from the Washington area. Therefore, EPA is now proposing to add Montgomery County and Prince George's County to the Baltimore non-attainment area for the purposes of PM2.5. This proposal raises a number of complicated questions, which have been discussed extensively at the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC). TPB Vice Chairman Snyder, who chairs MWAQC, has prepared a letter to TPB Chairman Mendelson regarding this situation, which was distributed to the TPB.

Vice Chairman Snyder further explained the situation regarding the conformity designation for PM2.5. He said that MWAQC will meet on January 28 to review and finalize the response on this very important issue. He said the TPB may meet on that date as well. He said the COG board would join in that response.

Mr. Kirby said staff planned to develop a joint letter to EPA from MWAQC, the TPB and COG that would be submitted by February 3. Because of Inauguration activities, he proposed that the TPB meeting be held on January 28 instead of the 21st. MWAQC meets from noon to 2:00 p.m., so the TPB could hold its meeting from 10:00 a.m. to noon.

Hearing no objections, Chairman Mendelson announced that the date of the TPB's next meeting would be on January 28, from 10 a.m. until noon.

Ms. Tregoning asked why Prince George's and Montgomery counties, but not the rest of the region, would be included in Baltimore's PM2.5 designation.

Mr. Kirby noted that the proposal to include those two counties originated with EPA. He said it would make planning for the two metropolitan regions very complicated. He said that currently each region sets its own standards and develops separate air quality plans to independently meet the federal requirements.

Mr. Knapp agreed with the plan to coordinate the response of the three bodies at COG. He also said it was important to reach out to officials in Baltimore, including those at the state and Congressional levels.

Mr. Turner said that Montgomery and Prince George's counties should also write their own letters.

Hearing no objection, Chairman Mendelson asked that staff develop a letter for the TPB, MWAQC and COG. In addition, staff will work with the TPB's Baltimore counterparts, send

copies of the letters to the congressional delegation, and make sure the Prince George's and Montgomery County officials are kept informed.

Mr. Kirby clarified that the TPB and other bodies at COG would be asked to approve the letter regarding the PM2.5 designation at the January 28 meeting.

Mr. Kirby called attention to a letter to Councilmember Knapp suggesting that bus rapid transit (BRT) and monorail would be good options for the Purple Line.

Mr. Kirby called attention to a report on the most recent session of the TPB's Community Leadership Institute (CLI), which was conducted on November 19 and 22. The participants at this session were elected officials.

Mr. James, mayor of Bladensburg, spoke about being a participant in the CLI. He said it gave him a better understanding of the activities of the TPB and also opened the eyes of participants to the common challenges that we share as a region. He commended staff for the workshop and asked that it be continued in the future.

Chairman Mendelson presented certificates to four participants of the CLI.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Mendelson made his final remarks as 2008 chairman. He reviewed some continuing disappointments in making progress on a number of key issues. For example, he noted that basic maintenance and operations funding continues to be short. He noted the continuing tension between highway and transit funding. He pointed out that the Federal Highway Trust Fund is woefully underfunded and he said that the forthcoming federal reauthorization is extremely important.

Chairman Mendelson said that there is confusion about transportation priority-setting. For example, he commented on a recent proposal for developing a high-speed rail line between Washington and New York that would require a separate line. He said that two obstacles to such a line would be the tunnels in Washington and Baltimore. In light of the billions of dollars such a project would cost, he said it would be important to have a fundamental discussion about whether that project is in fact the right priority. He said that TPB does a good job of updating the Constrained Long-Range Plan every year, but he questioned whether the Board was in fact playing a leadership role in prioritizing projects as it should.

He continued and reviewed some successes from 2008 including implementation of MATOC, passage of the federal legislation to provide dedicated funding for Metro and the completion of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge.

He said that as a board member of the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations, he has observed the operations and roles of different MPOs around the country, including their different relationships with state DOTs. He pointed out that MPOs have the ability to say no to projects and to be much more directive. He concluded by expressing hope that through reauthorization MPOs would obtain more control over funding decisions.

Mr. Snyder moved the TPB express its appreciation for Mr. Mendelson's great service as chairman. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Knapp commended Chairman Mendelson for his service on TPB, where he has been chairman three times, and on the COG board and the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee, both of which he has chaired. He thanked him for his long-standing service to the region.

ACTION ITEMS

7. Report of the Nominating Committee for Year 2009 TPB Officers

Mr. Knapp said the Nominating Committee recommended Muriel Bowser, representing the District of Columbia, to serve as the second vice chair; David Snyder from Falls Church, representing Virginia, as the first vice chair; and Charles Jenkins from the County of Frederick to serve as the chair for the upcoming year.

There were no other nominations.

Mr. Knapp moved approval of the nominations of the Nominating Committee. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

Vice Chairman Jenkins noted that Chairman Mendelson's long service to the Board was a reflection of his effectiveness in serving his constituents. He presented Chairman Mendelson with a plaque commemorating his service to the region as TPB chairman.

INFORMATION ITEMS

8. Briefing on Draft Scope of Work for Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2009 Financially Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Posey explained the scope of work including the technical assumptions and the bases for the conformity analyses for ozone and particulates. She noted

some changes since the last conformity analysis, including new land-use forecasts and vehicle registration data. She noted the analysis forecast years are 2010, 2020, and 2030.

Ms. Posey called attention to two policy assumptions in the scope which staff believed merit attention: 1) In the analysis, as proposed in the scope, all of the HOV facilities would be converted to HOV3-plus in 2010, and 2) a transit constraint in the model for 2010 will constrain all the transit trips at the 2010 level that go to and through the core. This constraint includes the District of Columbia and also the part of Arlington that includes the Pentagon. The constraint would affect the 2020 and 2030 analysis years. She said that staff is looking for some guidance from WMATA and the state DOTs on these issues.

She described the schedule for the conformity analysis, and said that staff plans to finish the analysis in June, with final approval scheduled for July.

Referring to the assumption that all HOV lanes will become HOV3-plus, Ms. Smyth said she understood that I-66 would remain HOV-2.

Ms. Sorenson said that before the next meeting, VDOT will comment on this question and other aspects of the conformity scope.

Vice Chairman Jenkins said he had not seen a proposal to increase HOV requirements on I-270. He asked why the conformity analysis would make such an assumption.

Ms. Posey said this assumption has been in place for years. She said the Technical Committee recommended it as a way to alleviate congestion when HOV-2 facilities became too crowded. She commented that in the past, VDOT reviewed traffic volumes on I-66 every year to determine when congestion might be bad enough to convert the facility back to HOV-3.

Vice Chairman Jenkins said that analysis of HOV-2 instead of HOV-3 could be a better reflection of the actual need, especially if there are no plans to change the facilities to HOV-3.

Ms. Tregoning asked if the new Household Travel Survey data will be used for this analysis.

Mr. Kirby said the new Household Travel Survey data will not be ready for this analysis, but will inform the next travel demand model update for the 2010 CLRP. He said that data from the survey will be presented at the January, February, and March TPB meetings. He mentioned again that updated vehicle registration data will be used.

Mr. Kirby noted two major on-going activities that could affect the schedule for project inputs and the completion of the analysis: 1) the reduction in transportation project funding at the state level, which is expected to cause project reductions and delays, and 2) the federal stimulus package currently under development, which would provide a substantial amount of federal

money for transportation projects. He said these two initiatives could cause delays in the completion of this analysis.

Referring to the funding cuts and potential federal funding increase, Mr. Snyder said he was concerned that this region should speak as a region in terms of setting priorities and giving guidance as to how this money ought best be spent for the benefit of the people in the region.

Mr. Kirby said the stimulus package is supposedly going to be on the new president's desk on January 20, so a letter would probably need to be sent before then.

Chairman Mendelson asked if Mr. Snyder was suggesting the Technical Committee work on this.

Mr. Snyder said the Technical Committee and the Steering Committee should pursue it.

Mr. Kirby said it will be very hard to be specific, but there may be some broad criteria that the TPB could advance that would be helpful to narrow the field down in terms of the kinds of projects that will receive funding.

Chairman Mendelson said he was concerned about the process for developing such a letter.

Mr. Kirby said that if the Board intends to submit such comments, it would be best for the Board to give staff guidance at the meeting today and keep this guidance at a fairly general level. He said it would be very difficult to get the Technical Committee to prioritize projects and he emphasized the shortness of the timeframe.

Mr. Lovain said it may be more important to address the TPB's concerns to the Departments of Transportation of Virginia and Maryland and D.C., because he said it was likely the stimulus funds would be sent to the DOTs as block grants. He said he understood that WMATA would probably also receive a type of block grant. He said he did not think Congress will go into great detail about priorities, but those decisions will be made by the state DOTs and by the designated transit recipients.

Chairman Mendelson said it still might be worth articulating broad criteria as soon as possible to Congress. He said that such a statement could be useful elsewhere. He asked Mr. Snyder to try to develop some criteria.

Mr. Snyder suggested that a statement be prepared for the meeting on January 28 because the Board would need a chance to review it. He suggested that Mr. Kirby should prepare a submission for the Board's review prior to that meeting.

Ms. Erickson said that all the DOTs are undergoing cuts right now, and when the stimulus package emerges, most agencies will be looking first at what has been cut. She noted that

everything that has been cut has already been through an extensive prioritization process. She said it might be more worthwhile to focus the letter on the funding split or how the funding formulas will be established.

Mr. Lovain said that one potentially critical issue to address is whether the states should share the funds with the metropolitan regions. He said that normally, under the Surface Transportation Program, 35 percent of the funds are sub-allocated to the metropolitan regions, but that rule would probably be waived. However, he noted that advocacy groups for metropolitan areas are expressing concern about such a possible waiver. He said the TPB might want to comment on this question, which he said would be the most important thing for the Board to do at this point.

Ms. Tregoning suggested that it might be best for the chairman to designate an executive committee to enable the TPB to have a more rapid response to these kinds of situations.

Ms. Tregoning also noted that this discussion reflects a “chicken and egg” pattern at the TPB. Because the CLRP is constrained, there is inadequate consideration given to unfunded projects. She said the region, acting as a coordinated voice through the TPB, is not really prepared to put unfunded regional priority projects on the table. She emphasized that she was talking about the need for a focused list of priority projects, not just a consolidated list of all the projects that individual jurisdictions have been unable to fund. She suggested that an existing or new committee should be designated to address this need.

Chairman Mendelson asked Mr. Snyder, Mr. Lovain and Ms. Tregoning to caucus in order to come up with a recommendation by the end of the meeting.

9. Review of Priority Near-Term Bus Projects Recommended by the TPB Regional Bus Subcommittee

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Yaffe said the TPB Regional Bus Subcommittee developed these recommendations to include regionally significant high-priority measures designed to improve access to bus transit and to improve the circulation of buses while in operation. He explained that his presentation focused on short-term needs as opposed to the mid- and long-term WMATA proposals that would be addressed under Item 10.

Mr. Yaffe described the criteria for determining “regional significance.” He described each of the recommendations based upon regional criteria. He also discussed other sets of endorsed projects, such as emerging corridors, storage and maintenance facilities, and marketing and customer information, and HOT lane enhancements.

Chairman Mendelson asked for information about marketing and customer information.

Mr. Yaffe said these programs vary by area. For example, Arlington's marketing is quite extensive.

Chairman Mendelson asked if there are any initiatives or campaigns to educate non-bus riders.

Mr. Yaffe said that marketing to non-bus riders is always something they are working on. He said the recent gasoline price increases persuaded many people to try transit, and even though prices have gone down, much of the new ridership has been maintained.

Mr. Zimmerman said that bus services across the region have shown large increases in ridership; Metrobus ridership has grown more than Metrorail. He emphasized the concerns that riders and potential riders have about buses getting stuck in traffic. He noted that other metropolitan areas around the country and around the world have been much more aggressive in reserving lanes for buses. He asked whether the issue of dedicated bus lanes was a focus of discussion.

Mr. Yaffe noted that several studies for unique bus lanes have been performed for Columbia Pike and Crystal City. He also noted the importance of technologies that inform riders when buses are coming. He described a new system in Arlington that provides such information.

Returning to the issue of dedicated bus lanes, Mr. Zimmerman said such lanes have been studied a lot in the region, but they are not being implemented. He said that such lanes are probably the single most important feature to attract more people to ride buses. He said there is tremendous reluctance to take away lanes from car use, but he said this was based on a misunderstanding because the increase in bus ridership will mean less vehicles on the road and less congestion. He said that making progress on this issue would require leaders at the TPB and other agencies to assign some road capacity to transit vehicles.

10. Briefing on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) Capital Improvement Needs

Referring to the handout material, Mr. Harrington said the purpose of his presentation was to present a comprehensive review of Metro's capital needs over the next ten years. He said this identification of needs will form the basis for WMATA's next capital funding strategy. He said the capital needs inventory covers ten years, from 2011 to 2020, and is not constrained by funding availability. He said it is based on life cycle replacements, assessments of current conditions, and future demand for the system. System expansion projects are not in the inventory. He said a number of factors are driving costs, including rail car replacement, information technology and MetroAccess. He said that when all the needs are added up for the 2011 to 2020 time period, the costs are more than \$11 billion. This is roughly double WMATA's current annual capital spending.

Mr. Harrington addressed the challenge of core capacity. He said that the expansion of the fleet to provide all 8-car trains in the peak would extend the capacity of the core for five to ten years. However, he noted that if the system continues to add new facilities, the capacity of the core to handle new riders must also be expanded in order to maintain the system's transit share. In conclusion, he said that WMATA is currently in the process of working with its partners to prioritize needs and identify funding sources.

Mr. Zimmerman made some points regarding Mr. Harrington's presentation. He noted that the statement for slide 13 that the deployment of 8-car trains would likely handle system capacity needs through 2025 assumes relatively modest growth, which may not be realistic. He further noted that the baseline for slide 12 assumed that capacity at present is adequate (as indicated by green and yellow on the slide), which was a questionable assumption. For slide 10, he said he believed the Metrorail forecast was perhaps modest, but more importantly the Metrobus forecast was extremely underestimated. Finally, on slide 7 he noted that capital needs were identified to be more than \$11 billion, but that is about twice the amount that has normally been provided. He noted that the recent federal bill providing funding for Metro would only provide \$1.5 billion, which would still leave a very large shortfall.

Mr. Erenrich asked for Mr. Harrington's recommendation regarding the Metrorail ridership constraint in the TPB's Constrained Long-Range Plan, which currently has a cap on ridership growth in the core area after 2010.

Mr. Harrington said the current capacity constraint was established several years ago when the system was mostly running six- and four-car trains. Since the implementation of the Metro Matters agreement, the 2010 constraint is probably too severe. He said that WMATA would be making a recommendation on this question during the public comment period.

Mr. Elrich said the presentation's projections of transit ridership were disappointing. He said that policies need to be implemented to take more people off the roads.

11. Briefing on Alternative Approaches for Linking Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions to Metropolitan Transportation Planning

Referring to the mailout memorandum and the handout briefing paper, Mr. Kirby said this item was a followup to a presentation in November on California's SB375 legislation. He said that on November 12, the COG Board approved the National Capital Region Climate Change Report, which set significant greenhouse gas reduction goals for this region based on national and international goals. Specifically with regard to transportation, the report recommended collaboration with the TPB to evaluate a process that might follow the current transportation air quality planning process and adapt it to greenhouse gas emissions. The report also recommended that the TPB should consult with other regions for other approaches, including California's SB375 legislation. He briefly described the origin and implementation of that legislation.

Mr. Kirby noted three possibilities for the TPB to pursue in its climate change planning activities: 1) continue to pursue the "What Would It Take?" scenario, which is identifying necessary steps to achieve CO2 reduction targets; 2) pursue a target-setting approach similar to California's SB375 legislation; and 3) further investigate and potentially promote implementation of the recommendations of the climate change commissions at the state level.

Mr. Way suggested that in the item number 2 on page 12 of the handout, the word "possibility" should be changed to "desirability." He said the California initiative currently is unproven, invasive, and dominated by state control. He said it also might be very expensive. He said the TPB needs to assess the merits of such a process, rather than the mechanics of implementation.

Chairman Mendelson asked Mr. Bronrott if he had anything to add regarding the State of Maryland in response to Mr. Kirby's proposal.

Mr. Bronrott said he was not prepared to talk about the numerous proposals that have been discussed in Maryland. He said he could like to revisit this question at a future meeting.

Mr. Kirby said there are some greenhouse gas reduction actions that can be taken that are not too difficult to implement and would be cost-effective. However, there are some other measures that states might be less willing to implement, absent national legislation, because they might put the states at a competitive disadvantage.

Mr. Bronrott noted some examples illustrating Mr. Kirby's point, including clean car legislation, which has been adopted in Maryland, but not in Virginia.

Responding to Mr. Way's comment, Mr. Kirby clarified that he was not advocating the SB375 approach. He said that changing the word "possibility" to "desirability" in the text would be a good change.

Chairman Mendelson said the options presented by Mr. Kirby did not seem to be mutually exclusive. He said it seemed that they all could be pursued.

He said that this item is concluded and acknowledge Ms. Snyder regarding the letter discussed under Item 8.

8. Briefing on Draft Scope of Work for Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2009 Financially Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) *(continued)*

After caucusing with a small group during the meeting, Vice Chairman Snyder returned to the Board with recommendations for how to communicate the TPB's priorities to Congress

regarding the proposed federal stimulus package. He said the recommendations were being made in the form of a motion:

- The chairman of the TPB be directed to send a letter to the Congressional Delegation and state leadership that: "The transportation stimulus package must reflect fair and equitable distribution to metropolitan areas. At a minimum, the distribution should reflect the Surface Transportation Program (STP) percentage allocated to metropolitan areas of 35 percent. This recognizes the great economic contribution of metropolitan areas in the U.S."
- That the Steering Committee be directed to report back to this board, on January 28, proposed criteria for prioritizing stimulus-related transportation projects and, secondly, the best structure and process for TPB to exert the maximum influence in stimulus-related transportation funding.
- That the Scenario Task Force be directed to report back to TPB on January 28 with a proposed prioritized list of new major regional transportation projects to be considered, circumstances permitting.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Lovain emphasized that the letter should state that 35 percent of the Surface Transportation Program is currently sub-allocated to metropolitan regions. This suballocation is currently being debated in Congress and he said it was very appropriate for the TPB to support the efforts of the National League of Cities, the Conference of Mayors and other organizations to ensure that the metropolitan regions receive an equitable share.

Mr. Erenrich said the motion seemed to be highway oriented. He noted that \$100 million in transit funding could be allocated to the region, and he hoped that not all of this funding would be going to WMATA, but would also include the local transit operators.

Ms. Tregoning said the motion was intended to be mode neutral. She expressed concern about mentioning any one mode, which might be construed to be disadvantaging other modes.

Vice Chairman Jenkins said he was part of the caucus that put together the language, and he confirmed that it was intended to be mode neutral.

Mr. Lovain noted the significance of the last point, in which the Scenario Study Task Force would identify priorities. He said it would move the TPB into a planning activity in which it would look beyond constrained financing and think about projects of regional significance.

The motion was approved unanimously.

12. Briefing on the Development of the “What Would It Take?” and “CLRP Aspirations” Scenarios

Referring to the handout material, Ms. Bansal described recent development activities on the scenarios. She said the “What Would It Take?” scenario looks at potential actions in the transportation sector to meet the COG Climate Change Committee’s CO₂ reduction goals. The “CLRP Aspirations” scenario seeks to build an aspirational vision for transportation and land use in the future and is expected to serve as an unconstrained long-range plan.

Mr. Eichler described the transportation components of the scenarios. He said the scenarios would use a combination of tolled new lanes as well as tolled existing highway facilities and that the toll revenue will help support not only this network but also pay for transit operations. In addition, the scenarios would include selected transit projects that were identified in earlier versions of the scenario study.

Chairman Mendelson asked that the first slide from the presentation be copied and distributed to the members in the January packet. He asked that it be blown up in size.

Mr. Eichler noted that it was included in the handout, but a larger version could be provided.

Mr. Rybeck asked how land use proposals would fit into the study’s cost/benefit analysis.

Ms. Bansal said that every strategy under investigation, including all the strategies from the COG climate change report which includes many land use strategies, will be analyzed.

Mr. Rybeck noted that there might be some strategies that have multiple benefits in addition to just the CO₂ reductions.

Mr. Kirby noted that the Board received a briefing in the summer from David Lewis on cost/benefit analysis, which provided a comprehensive approach to capturing land development benefits from transit, as well as other benefits. He said the TPB study would be taking that approach.

Mr. Bronrott said that BWI Airport should not be forgotten in the analysis.

Mr. Eichler showed Mr. Bronrott the slide where BWI is included.

Mr. Bronrott also asked if transit to Annapolis would be included.

Mr. Eichler said that the scenario study had included a transit line along U.S. 50 from the Beltway to Westfield, which was almost to Annapolis.

13. Other Business

There was no other business.

14. Adjourn

Chairman Mendelson adjourned the meeting at 2:12 p.m.