

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

777 North Capitol Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20002-4226
(202) 962-3200

**MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
January 16, 2008**

Members and Alternates Present

Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Robert Catlin, City of College Park
Colleen Clay, City of Takoma Park
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Tom Harrington, WMATA
Patrick Herrity, Fairfax County
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Charles Jenkins, Frederick County
Timothy Lovain, Alexandria City Council
Michael C. May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Emeka Moneme, DDOT
David Moss, Montgomery County
Eric Olson, Prince George's County
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
Rick Rybeck, DDOT
Reuben Snipper, Takoma Park
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Art Smith, Loudoun County
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT-NOVA
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
Lori Waters, Loudoun County
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Bill Wren, Manassas Park

Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby
Michael Clifford
Gerald Miller
Jim Hogan
Bob Griffiths
Nick Ramfos
Wendy Klancher
Debbie Leigh
Deborah Etheridge
Andrew Meese
Andrew Austin
Beth Newman
Darren Smith
Sarah Crawford
Monica Bansal
Melanie Wellman
Michael Eichler
Michael Farrell
Tim Canan
William Bacon
Jonathan Rogers
Paul DesJardin COG/HSPPS
Dave Robertson COG/EO
Naomi Friedman COG/EO
Jeff King COG/DEP
Steve Kania COG/OPA
Allen Muchnick Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation (ACST)
Bob Chase Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Bob Grow Greater Washington Board of Trade
Bill Orleans PG ACT
Alex Verzosa City of Fairfax
Jeff Cole Fluor
Bob Owolabi Fairfax County DOT
Anthony Foster PRTC
Jim Maslanka City of Alexandria
Monica Backmon Prince William County
Angelica Betts Prince William County
Tamara Ashby Arlington County
Kael Anderson NCPC

Tim Young	Transurban
Rob Kerns	Transurban
Gary Groat	Fluor
Jenn Aument	Transurban
John B. Townsend	AAA Mid-Atlantic
Sarah Vilms	ACST
Peter Harnick	Maywood Community Association
Matt Moskitis	NOVA Transportation Alliance
Al Francese	Centreville Citizens for Rail
Kwame Arhin	FHWA – MD
Tony Chinyere	Tri-County Council – Southern MD
Patrick Fleming	Maryland Transportation Authority
Stewart Schwartz	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Christian Deschauer	Fairfax County
Andrew Beacher	Loudoun/OTS

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Mr. Grow of the Greater Washington Board of Trade spoke in support of adopting the 2007 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2008-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), specifically referencing the importance of the I-95/I-395 HOT lanes project and the I-66 spot improvements project. He noted that one of the Board of Trade’s top transportation priorities is a regional system of HOT lanes. He said a benefit of the HOT lanes project would be that the revenue generated would be used for transit improvements within the transportation corridor. He said the I-66 spot improvements project would provide relief to traffic congestion and a more significant emergency evacuation route from D.C.

Ms. Vilms of the Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation (ACST) encouraged the TPB to consider three points before adopting a CLRP that contains the I-66 spot improvements: ensure that the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) complies with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA); study at least some of the alternatives to using the earmarked funding before construction begins on I-66; and increase the corridor vegetation along I-66. She noted five alternatives to the spot improvements: operate express bus routes on I-66; expand feeder bus services to Metrorail Stations; increase the capacity of Metrorail; improve the rail routing system at Rosslyn; and improve the bike path. She added that regardless of the changes made to I-66, the vegetative buffer must be significantly increased.

Mr. Muchnick of ACST said the organization continues to oppose VDOT’s I-66 spot improvements as unnecessary, unwarranted, and counterproductive. He urged that the Multimodal Study of the I-66 corridor be expedited and completed before any construction on I-66 is authorized. He said VDOT’s pursuit of a NEPA categorical exclusion is inappropriate and illegal. He asked the TPB to require VDOT to study and report on alternative uses of the federal

earmarks for I-66 widening, and report back to the TPB in several months, at which time the TPB should revisit the issue of whether the spot improvements project should remain in the CLRP and TIP. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Harnick of the Maywood Community Association urged the TPB to encourage the use of the I-66 earmarked funding for transit improvements for the corridor, rather than adding capacity for single occupancy vehicles. He said it is imperative to complete the Multimodal Study of the I-66 corridor before construction on the spot improvements begins. He noted that issues such as the price of oil and climate change should be included in the discussion. He expressed concerns about how the spot improvements might affect the future potential for adding a third rail to the Metrorail system, as well effects on the bicycle trail.

Mr. Chase of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance expressed support for the I-95/I-395 HOT lanes project and the I-66 spot improvements project, noting both would ease congestion along the respective corridors. He said the I-66 spot improvements would produce significant immediate benefits without precluding future upgrades. He added that the HOT lanes project would guarantee fast peak hour travel speeds on I-95/I-395 for car-poolers, transit riders, and single-occupancy vehicles. He said there is no reason for further delay, as both projects have undergone extensive study. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Schwartz of the Coalition for Smarter Growth spoke in opposition to the Intercounty Connector (ICC) and noted that cost estimates for the ICC have not been updated over the last couple of years to account for the increase in highway construction costs, which the Federal Highway Administration has said have increased 50 percent since 2005. He urged the TPB to delay the adoption of the CLRP and TIP until these project costs, and those of other large highway projects around the region, can be reviewed. He expressed concern that the TPB has not reevaluated the CLRP and TIP to reflect declining federal transportation revenues, the challenge of global warming and rising energy prices, and changing demographics with respect to the aging population. He also expressed opposition to the I-66 spot improvements, and questioned that the full range of alternatives to the I-95/I-395 HOT lanes has not been explored.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the December 19 Meeting

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to approve the minutes of the December 19, 2007 meeting of the TPB. Ms. Smyth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Mr. Rawlings said the Technical Committee met on January 4 and discussed eight items on the TPB Agenda, five relating to the adoption of the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP.

-
- Item 9: The Committee was updated on the draft conformity assessment for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP.
 - Items 10 and 11: TPB staff updated the Committee on the documentation for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP, noting the public comment period for these documents and the draft conformity assessment would close on January 12.
 - Item 12: The Committee was updated on the status of the signatories for the memorandum of understanding that identifies the responsibilities of the TPB, state DOT's, and public transit operators for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process.
 - Item 13: The Committee reviewed proposed TPB procedures distinguishing between administrative modifications and amendments to the CLRP and TIP, recommending that the TPB approve them.
 - Item 15: TPB staff briefed the Committee on the major projects proposed for inclusion in the 2008 CLRP and FY 2009-2014 TIP. The Committee was briefed on the draft scope of work for the air quality conformity assessment.
 - Item 16: TPB staff reviewed an outline and preliminary budget for the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY 2009.
 - Item 17: The Committee was briefed on the updated list of priority regional bicycle and pedestrian projects recommended for consideration in the FY 2009-2014 TIP, recommending that this list be presented to the TPB.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Mr. Martin, Vice-Chair of the 2007 Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), provided the report from the January 10 meeting, which focused on the 2007 CAC End-of-the-Year Report. He said the CAC spent much of the year reviewing the implementation of two sets of recommendations the CAC presented to the TPB: suggestions related to the CLRP and TIP development process and suggestions related to the TPB Scenario Study. He said the CAC is happy that many of its suggestions have been put into practice, and it is optimistic that implementation of the other suggestions will occur in the coming year.

Mr. Martin summarized several of the CAC recommendations on the CLRP and TIP development process, which were presented to the TPB in January of 2006. In response to the request of 2007 TPB Chair Cathy Hudgins to provide a recommendation on improving public input to the CLRP and TIP cycle, he said the CAC recommends that the TPB should conduct an initial public forum on project submissions every year at the beginning of the CLRP and TIP

cycle in early to mid-September. He said this timing would allow for stakeholders to understand and influence the project submission process. He added that the state DOT's and WMATA would be asked to describe information that characterizes the CLRP and TIP submissions, such as the significant projects proposed for submission and the process through which the projects have been identified and prioritized. He said that several other recommendations of the CAC include: the TPB should develop a regional priorities plan that accompanies the CLRP and is derived from the Scenario Study; that the TPB Scenario Study Task Force continue its work to identify new scenarios to study; and that the TPB make public comments more useful to decision-makers.

Mr. Martin reviewed the CAC's recommendations on the Scenario Study from February 2007. He noted that the CAC has discussed how those recommendations might be implemented and is hopeful that the Scenario Study Task Force will assist the TPB in linking the Scenario Study planning activities with better integrated regional actions. He said the CAC supports a value-pricing scenario that would focus on converting existing lanes to toll lanes and that a study of value priced lane scenarios is incomplete without analysis of at least one scenario consisting predominantly of toll lanes converted from existing lanes. He said the CAC was happy to see the Transportation/Land-Use Connections Program implemented and would like to see it expanded in the future. He added that the CAC is pleased with the outreach forums conducted across the region and was glad to see the feedback generated from these forums included with the CAC recommendations in a comprehensive report presented to the TPB in July 2007.

Mr. Martin noted that the TPB Participation Plan was adopted in December and that the CAC is very pleased with the result. He said it agrees that the TPB needs to look at creating realistic expectations for how the public can participate in the TPB process, and that activities need to be balanced between the limited number of people who are involved and the majority of the region's residents who are not terribly involved. He said the most daunting challenge for TPB public participation remains the question of how public input is processed, acknowledged, and incorporated in the decision-making process.

Chair Mendelson asked if the TPB was too late to incorporate some of the recommendations posed by the CAC for the 2008 CLRP and FY2009-2014 TIP.

Mr. Martin said it is not too late and that the principal recommendation is that the CAC and the public would receive a briefing on the CLRP/TIP development process. He said the October TIP forum did provide for discussion on the process for the upcoming TIP. He said that the CAC would like to have a forum scheduled for next September that would focus solely on understanding what projects would likely be included in the next CLRP and TIP.

Chair Mendelson asked if there are any other CAC recommendations regarding the CLRP that would still be timely.

Mr. Martin replied there were not.

Mr. Kirby said TPB staff is supportive of the CAC recommendations, particularly the September TIP forum, which will occur in the next CLRP/TIP cycle. He said the CAC comment on better processing of public comments and better explanations of how TIP projects are identified by the implementing agencies are things that could be improved upon in the 2008 CLRP and FY2009-2014 cycle.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on January 4 and acted on one amendment to the 2007 and 2008 TIPs to include a sidewalk project as requested by the Montgomery County Department of Public Works.

Mr. Kirby referenced the letters packet distributed at the meeting and noted a memorandum from him summarizing the congressionally mandated report, "The Report of the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission: Transportation for Tomorrow," released on January 15 by a committee that has the responsibility for making recommendations about the next authorization of the Surface Transportation bill by Congress, which is due October 1, 2009. He said the current six-year SAFETEA-LU authorization expires on September 30, 2009. He said the commission was chaired by the Secretary of Transportation, Mary Peters, and was made up of a number of representatives of the public and private sectors. The first recommendation of the commission is that the federal surface transportation program should not be reauthorized in its current form, and that greater focus should be devoted to defining federal priorities. He said the commission recommends the federal fuel tax be increased from 5 to 8 cents per year over the next five years to pay for transportation improvements. He said basic structural reforms include limiting the scope of programs eligible for federal assistance to programs having a true national interest. He said they proposed a congestion relief program, for which the Washington region would qualify. He noted that there were minority views of some of the commissioners that disagreed with the majority. He said one minority view is that the federal fuel tax increase is not a solution and another is that the commission report calls for an unnecessarily large federal role.

Mr. Kirby said the letters packet includes a memorandum listing the requests for technical assistance through the Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program for FY 2008. He said the TPB received 21 requests: 3 from the District, 14 from Maryland, and 4 from Virginia.

Mr. Kirby said TPB staff is seeking nominations for the Community Leadership Institute (CLI), and asked TPB members to review the memorandum and brochure discussing the program and potential participants. He asked the TPB members to submit nominations for community leaders in their jurisdictions whom they feel would benefit from this program.

Mr. Lovain clarified that the majority report of the Surface Transportation Commission calls for a 5 to 8 cent increase in the gas tax per year over five years, for a total of between 25 and 40 cents increase before indexing with inflation.

Mr. Rybeck asked when TPB members should have their nominations ready for the CLI.

Mr. Kirby said the nominations would be appreciated by the end of January.

Chair Mendelson reminded the TPB that when they receive a report of the Steering Committee that contains items acted upon by that Committee, the TPB is approving what the Committee does by consensus, unless there is an objection.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chair Mendelson said he reviewed remarks made by 2001 TPB Chair John Mason when preparing for today's meeting and noted that many of the same problems exist today that existed in 2001, including tension between transit and highways, with not enough funding for either. He said incident response is still an issue, as is congestion management, maintenance, and operations. He said that his hope for the 2008 TPB is that emergency response issues will finally move forward, increasing the region's capability of handling incident response. He said he hopes that this year will bring progress on dedicated funding for WMATA. He said he also hopes to see a better correlation between long-range planning and land-use objectives as the TPB develops the next CLRP.

Chair Mendelson acknowledged new members and alternates of the TPB: William Bronrott from the Maryland House of Delegate, Colleen Clay from the City of Takoma Park, Patrick Herrity from the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, Susan Hoffmann from the City of Rockville, Todd Turner, from the City of Bowie, Lori Waters from the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, and Patrick Wojahn from the City of College Park. Chair Mendelson suggested that TPB staff set up a brief orientation before the next TPB meeting for new members.

7. Approval of Appointments to the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for the Year 2008

Chair Mendelson referred to the memo from Mr. Kirby regarding the appointments to the CAC.

Mr. Kirby said there are 15 CAC members: five from the District of Columbia, five from Maryland, and five from Virginia. He said that six, two each from the three jurisdictions, are nominated by the current CAC; the remaining three from each of the jurisdictions are nominated by the TPB officers. He noted that for the first time, the TPB invited citizens to submit applications of interest for appointment to the CAC. He said that a number of the names being

forward by the TPB officers are from people who expressed interest by submitting an application.

Chair Mendelson asked if the alternates attend and are welcome to participate at CAC meetings.

Mr. Kirby said the CAC bylaws are silent regarding alternates, but that in the past, they have come to meetings and participated actively.

Chair Mendelson made a motion to appoint the 15 members and alternates listed in the staff memorandum to the CAC for 2008, with Larry Martin serving as Chair. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

8. Review of Comments Received and Acceptance of Recommended Responses for Inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Assessment, the 2007 CLRP, and the FY 2008-2013 TIP

Mr. Kirby referred to the memorandum summarizing the comments the TPB received during the public comment period from December 13, 2007 to January 12, 2008 for the air quality conformity assessment, the 2007 CLRP, and the FY 2008-2013 TIP. He said the memorandum provides responses to the comments and staff recommends the TPB accept the responses as part of the action on this item. He briefly reviewed the comments on the I-95/I-395 HOT lanes project and the I-66 spot improvements project. He said a large number of the comments identified what are considered to be the positive impacts of the I-95/I-395 HOT lanes project. He said a number of residents in Arlington oppose the I-66 spot improvements project and request that the TPB require VDOT to report in early 2008 on the results of the current spot improvements study. He said one comment asserted that people did not have enough time to review the materials because the public comment period occurred over the holidays. He said the TPB received several comments on the accuracy of the cost estimates for major projects in the CLRP, as well as the difficulty in analyzing the data in the TIP.

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to accept the recommended responses to comments received for inclusion in the air quality conformity assessment, the 2007 CLRP, and the FY 2008-2013 TIP. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Olson asked how critically TPB staff analyzed the cost estimates received from MDOT, specifically those related to the Intercounty Connector (ICC). He noted that construction costs, costs of materials, cost of fuel and other related expenses have risen in recent years and that there has not been a consistent increase in the cost estimates for the ICC.

Mr. Kirby responded that TPB staff requests that the implementing agencies consider escalating costs during every annual cycle because if the costs are not updated and kept current, this creates

a potential vulnerability of the CLRP. He added that TPB staff relies on the implementing agencies to keep costs up to date for each project.

Chair Mendelson asked Mr. Kirby to elaborate on the process of evaluating project costs.

Mr. Kirby said it is impossible for staff to check all the details of every project. He said staff lays out ground rules in terms of keeping costs up to date and keeping revenue projections up to date. He said staff works with the implementing agencies to ensure that the financial data truly reflect the project needs and revenue projections. He said this is particularly true for the TIP because the identified revenues must be commensurate with the costs for the projects moving forward to implementation.

Ms. Erickson noted that the MPO process is just part of the process to program federal and state funding for projects. She said that in Maryland, as part of both the State TIP and metropolitan TIP processes, MDOT uses the Consolidated Transportation Program and updates project costs four times a year and revenues twice a year. She said TPB staff has to rely on the implementing agencies to provide accurate numbers because of the sheer volume of projects. She added that both the implementing agencies and the TPB answer directly to the Federal Highway Administration, so there are many levels of scrutiny for each process.

Ms. Clay shared her frustration on the timing of the public comment period with the holiday season, noting that it has the effect of discouraging or inhibiting people's ability to participate in their government.

Mr. Olson said it is the TPB's responsibility to make sure that accurate numbers are reflected in all documentation. He noted information he has received from the public and media about construction costs and oil prices rising and asked for Mr. Kirby's professional opinion about these trends.

Mr. Kirby responded that MDOT recognizes that costs have risen. He said that the unit prices on pending projects need to reflect the increases in construction costs, as these projects have a construction duration over the next two to four years.

Mr. Olson reiterated his concern that the numbers are not accurate for the ICC.

The motion passed, with Mr. Olson and Mr. Zimmerman dissenting.

9. Approval of Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP

Mr. Clifford said TPB staff has continued quality assurance checks throughout the process and there are no changes of any consequence in the material presented today. He said the public

comment period generated one comment, and highlighted the letter received from the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee, which noted the finding of adherence to all the emissions requirements and recommended continued maintenance of commitments to the Transportation Emission Reduction Measures (TERMs).

Ms. Waters made a motion to adopt Resolution R10-2008. The motion was seconded by Ms. Erickson and passed.

10. Approval of the 2007 CLRP

Mr. Kirby said the significant new projects to be added to the CLRP include the U.S. 340 and U.S. 17 interchange, the I-66 spot improvements, the I-95/I-395 HOT lanes, and the Potomac Yard Transitway. He added that the HOT lanes project only extends 36 miles to Garrisonville Road and does not go all the way to Fredericksburg.

Ms. Waters made a motion to adopt Resolution R11-2008 approving the 2007 CLRP. Ms. Erickson seconded the motion.

Mr. Lovain noted the controversy surrounding the I-95/I-395 HOT lanes project and that he is convinced that if it is properly implemented, it is a worthwhile project. He said it has the potential to increase transit usage, increase carpooling, and improve throughput on the general purpose lanes. He noted that Alexandria would like to see greater transit improvements at the Seminary Road interchange, and that he will continue to work with VDOT to that end. He said he supports the Potomac Yard Transitway.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the TPB is still waiting on traffic counts, the incident management plan, and the congestion management plan for the I-95/I-395 HOT lanes project and asked if that information would be forthcoming.

Ms. Sorenson said that it would.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if VDOT was still pursuing a bus lane specifically with regard to E Street.

Ms. Sorenson said yes.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the success of the HOT lanes project would hinge on correct implementation. He added that he does not believe it makes sense to end the facility at the 14th Street Bridge. He said if the project is to be completed successfully, it would need to extend across the Potomac River before terminating, noting that this is particularly important for the viability of the transit service. While he acknowledged the 14th Street Bridge Study, he said there needs to be a plan to implement the 14th Street Bridge connection before the HOT lane facility is

complete. He noted the differences between the I-95/I-395 HOT lanes project and the HOT lanes facility planned for the Capital Beltway, pointing out that the Beltway project creates new capacity through an arrangement with a private party to operate, whereas the I-95/I-395 project converts an existing facility that was built using taxpayer money and changes its use.

Mr. Moneme said the HOT lanes concept is an important experiment about to be applied in the Washington region. He noted the effectiveness of this concept around the nation. He added that the region needs to be prepared to have alternative options for funding transportation improvements other than through the Federal Highway program, because the application of federal funding may shift in the near future. He said the HOT lanes concept is a way to test new funding strategies for transportation improvements. He added that DDOT will continue to work closely with VDOT on the specific issues related to the 14th Street Bridge.

Ms. Smyth asked for clarification on the report Mr. Kirby referenced, assuming it to be the I-66 Multimodal Study.

Mr. Kirby clarified that the report to which he spoke referred to the I-66 spot improvements.

Ms. Sorenson confirmed this and added that the I-66 Multimodal Study just began on January 14 and will focus on transit in the I-66, U.S. 50, and U.S. 29 corridors.

Ms. Smyth asked when the results would be available.

Ms. Sorenson said that the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VDRPT) just started the study and that it would be complete in about a year.

Ms. Smyth noted that the Multimodal Study was a crucial part of a lot of members' decision to go along with the I-66 spot improvements. She said she is concerned about the status of the Multimodal Study, realizing that it is a complex study, but noting that she would like to see it in the near future.

Ms. Sorenson said that when VDOT provides the status report on the spot improvements in the spring, she will also provide information on the Multimodal Study.

Ms. Smyth asked if DRPT has a scope for the study.

Ms. Sorenson said she does not have that information.

Mr. May said that the Prince William County Board of Supervisors unanimously opposed the HOT lanes project and that he cannot support items 11 and 12 on the TPB agenda. He noted that the County Board is appreciative of the efforts made by the private partner.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the connection should not be lost between the I-66 multimodal study and the VDOT construction projects on the facility. He asked if VDOT would be willing to make modifications to the project if the study proposes alternative recommendations.

Ms. Sorenson said that the results of the study will be integrated into VDOT's plans for I-66.

Mr. Zimmerman asked Ms. Sorenson to comment on the availability of the engineering design drawings for the spot improvements, noting that VDOT previously stated the drawings would be shared with the TPB, the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority, and local jurisdictions to demonstrate that the planned extension of Metrorail to Tysons Corner or a third Metrorail track would not be precluded, and that the adjacent parkland and Custis Trail would be maintained.

Ms. Sorenson said the drawings would be available within two to three months.

Mr. Zimmerman asked when VDOT staff would be meeting with Arlington County staff regarding alternatives 2a, 2b, and 2c for the Washington Boulevard Ramp.

Ms. Sorenson said this meeting should occur in the next month or two.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the noise wall analysis along I-66 had been completed and if locations have been identified for remediation.

Ms. Sorenson said the analysis is currently underway and that the results would be available in time for the spring public meeting.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if VDOT has reviewed the cost effectiveness of the segment between Spout Run and Glebe Road.

Ms. Sorenson said the segment is time-effective, but said the cost-effectiveness is still under review and information would be available at the spring public meeting.

Mr. Zimmerman said the speakers during the public comment period highlighted important issues with the spot improvements, namely that alternatives had not been considered to determine how to most efficiently move people through the I-66 corridor. He said that this continues to be a project that is essentially funding in search of something to do, as opposed to a well conceived way of moving a large number of people in a corridor that does have a lot of activity and clearly does need work, but for which the analysis really has not been completed in the thorough way that it should.

Ms. Snyder supported the concerns of Ms. Smyth and Mr. Zimmerman, and added that a formal risk assessment for both the I-66 spot improvements project and the I-95/I-395 HOT lanes project have yet to be completed, leaving a question of safety of the project. He added that VDOT has committed to providing the risk assessment when completed.

Ms. Sorenson said that the assessment will be provided.

Ms. Waters said that residents of Loudoun County have to drive I-66 to reach Washington, D.C. She supports a multimodal study, but noted the reality that people will still use their cars. She said the spot improvements are a temporary measure and I-66 needs an overall solution, recognizing that road improvements must be considered so that people have options.

Mr. Olson said that the Prince George's County Council continues to oppose the ICC and he will be voting against the measure.

Mr. Jenkins echoed Ms. Waters comments.

Mr. Lovain expressed his disappointment that VDRPT was not in attendance. He said Ms. Sorenson did her best at answering questions that would have been more appropriately directed at VDRPT.

The motion passed with four members opposed.

11. Approval of the FY 2008-2013 TIP

Mr. Kirby said the FY 2008-2013 TIP is the six-year program that accompanies the CLRP. He noted an amendment to the TIP distributed at the meeting, which was a missing page due to a problem in the production of the document.

Chair Mendelson confirmed that the TIP is a subset of the CLRP.

A motion was made to adopt Resolution 12-2008. The motion passed with some members opposed.

12. Approval of Execution of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Between the TPB, the State DOTs and the Public Transportation Operators on Metropolitan Transportation Planning Responsibilities for the National Capital Region

Mr. Miller said the TPB was briefed on this MOU in December. He said the TPB has received signatures from all of the organizations and requests that the TPB authorize Chair Mendelson to sign the MOU describing the TPB's planning responsibilities.

Chair Mendelson said he was inclined to treat the item as a unanimous consent, unless there was any objection. He said that hearing no objection, it is understood that he is authorized to sign the MOU.

13. Approval of TPB Procedures for Processing Revisions to the CLRP and TIP

Mr. Miller said the TPB was briefed on the draft procedures in December. He said the procedures clarify administrative amendments and revisions to the CLRP and TIP.

Ms. Smyth made a motion to adopt Resolution R13-2008. Ms. Waters seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Snyder asked for unanimous consent to request that staff develop a flowchart showing how decisions are made so the public can better understand and be able to have input earlier in the project development process. He also asked that the TPB have an opportunity to review some cross-cutting issues before the next CLRP cycle begins. He said he would like to discuss costing issues, climate change issues, and the like, so that the TPB may better advise the public on how to more effectively participate.

Mr. Kirby said the flowchart would be available for the next TPB meeting.

Ms. Tregoning asked that in addition to the flowchart, would staff prepare a pie chart that shows how the funding is distributed among bicycle, pedestrian, and road projects, as well as how this information has changed over time. She said this would help in understanding if transportation improvements are adapting to other changing circumstances.

Chair Mendelson said that if there is no objection, staff will prepare both a flowchart and a pie chart.

Mr. Kirby said staff would review the figures for the past five years.

14. Certification of the Urban Transportation Planning Process for the National Capital Region

Mr. Kirby said the certification is required by the federal government every time the TPB completes the CLRP update process. He said the attachment to the resolution includes staff comments on each of the regulatory requirements.

A motion was made to adopt Resolution R14-2008. Ms. Winter seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

15. Release for Public Comment of Project Submissions and Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2008 CLRP and FY 2009-2014 TIP

Mr. Kirby said the documents for this item codify the project submissions the TPB has received from the implementing agencies. He said the critical step in the 2008 CLRP process will be approving the projects in February to go through the air quality analysis. He said it is important to ensure that the projects meet all federal requirements, most notably the financial requirement of adequate funding availability. Mr. Kirby said the TPB is asked to release the project submissions and draft scope of work for a public comment period that will end February 15. He said this time will also allow staff to review the finer details of the project submissions.

Mr. Kirby reviewed the significant additions and changes to the CLRP. He said the criterion used to define significance is a change to a major interstate, principal arterial, or other limited access parkway or roadway, or a major transit project. He noted that the table in the packet shows every project the TPB received. He added that some of the changes are to the I-95/I-395 HOT lanes project that was just approved by the TPB.

Chair Mendelson asked that if one of the projects should change substantially during or after the public comment period, the project could not be included in the air quality conformity analysis.

Mr. Kirby responded that minor changes and corrections are permissible, but that if something significant changes, the TPB would be obliged to extend the public comment period. He noted that this happened last year.

Chair Mendelson confirmed that the public comment period was to notify the public of the project submissions before the air quality conformity analysis begins.

Mr. Kirby confirmed this and added that the decision by the TPB in February to include projects in the air quality conformity analysis reflects a key decision point in the CLRP process.

Ms. Smyth asked how to let TPB staff know of errors in the project submissions.

Mr. Kirby said to identify any errors immediately.

Ms. Smyth said a project widening Hunter Mill Road from Vail Road to Chain Bridge Road was eliminated in the Fairfax County transportation plan and should not be included.

Ms. Hudgins also made a correction on page 35 which was noted by staff.

Chair Mendelson said that the TPB is authorizing that the project submissions for the 2008 CLRP be released for public comment with the changes noted.

16. Review of Outline and Preliminary Budget for FY 2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Kirby said the purpose of Item 16 is to review an outline of the UPWP, and that the TPB would be briefed on the full draft document in February and asked to adopt the UPWP in March.

Ms. Smyth noted that Fairfax County staff raised a question about the draft UPWP concerning the presence of TPB staff at the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority meetings.

Mr. Kirby said TPB staff will attend those meetings as needed.

Chair Mendelson said the full briefing on this item would be reserved for the February TPB meeting.

17. Review of Priority Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

This item was deferred to the February TPB meeting.

18. Other Business

There was no other business.

19. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.