

**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 19, 2005**

Members and Alternates Present

Nat Bottigheimer, MDOT  
Rick Canizales, Prince William County  
Skip Coburn, DC Council  
Lyn Erickson, MDOT – OPCP  
Andrew Fellows, City of College Park  
Ludwig Gaines, Alexandria  
John Giannetti, Maryland Senate  
Brian A. Glenn, FTA  
Edgar Gonzalez, Montgomery County Executive Branch  
J. Rick Gordon, Prince George’s County  
Charles Graves III, DC Officer of Planning  
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Sandra Jackson, FHWA  
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council  
Julia Koster, NCPC  
Debbie Lipman, WMATA  
Michelle Martin, MDOT  
Phil Mendelson, D.C. Council  
Carol Petzold, Maryland House  
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park  
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT  
Rick Rybeck, DDOT  
Art Smith, Loudoun County  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT-NOVA  
Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax  
Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park  
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County Board

---

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Gerald Miller	COG/DTP
Jim Hogan	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Jill Locantore	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Michael Farrell	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam	COG/DTP
Mark Moran	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Dusan Vuksan	COG/DTP
Jeffrey King	COG/DEP
David Robertston	COG/EO
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Theresa Defore	VDOT
Jeremy Miller	MDOT
Takumi Yamamoto	FHWA
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Bill Orleans	Prince George's ACT
Allen Muchnick	TPB CAC
Dennis Jaffe	TPB/CAC
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Bob Chase	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Bob Grow	Greater Board of Trade
Stewart Schwartz	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Jim Maslanka	City of Alexandria
Unwanna B. Dabney	FHWA – VA Division
Gary Groat	FLUOR
Deborah R. Burns	FTA
Lee Schoenecker	TPB/CAC
Paul Armstrong	Charles County
Jason Groth	Charles County
Mark Miller	WMATA
Mike Lake	Fairfax County, DOT
John Contestabile	MDOT
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Jeff Price	Arlington DOT

## 1. Public Comment

Bob Grow, Greater Washington Board of Trade, said his organization was very glad to see the CapCom project included in the CLRP and TIP. He also spoke in support of the Intercounty Connector, HOT lanes on the Beltway, rail to Tysons and Dulles, the Anacostia Demonstration Rail project, the Bi-County Transitway, the Wilson Bridge Project HOV transit improvements, the Techway study, and the University of Maryland Connector study. He called attention to the need to meet Metro's funding needs. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Kenneth Todd spoke about the drawbacks to traffic signal coordination, which he said invites drivers to break the law and reduces overall network capacity.

Tom Whitley said it is heartening to see the TPB's growing interest in pedestrians, cyclists and in people with disabilities. He said that policy makers should enact laws to require that vehicle lights come on automatically when cars are started and that traffic signals are loudly audible and brightly visible to drivers. He urged new standards to make stop signs more visible. He thanked VDOT for recently completing the second lane exit from 495 to the Dulles Toll Road. He urged full funding for WMATA. He said that funding the Techway, river crossing or the Intercounty Connector must be subordinated to solutions that he said are already in place. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Bud Keith said that Metro facilities continue to be inadequate for people with disabilities. He said he was very happy that the Access for All Advisory Committee has finally made the needs of people with disabilities an active part of the planning process. He said that last year's Disability Awareness Day brought about a real understanding of the needs of people with disabilities.

Andrea Arnold, testifying on behalf of the Solutions Not Sprawl Campaign of the Montgomery Countryside Alliance, said these organizations are adamantly opposed to the Techway bridge crossing and urges the TPB to remove the study from the TIP. She said there is virtually no support for a Techway crossing, which she said would destroy Montgomery County's rural character. She said a bridge is unnecessary. Copies of her remarks were distributed for the record.

Allen Muchnick, speaking as a resident of Arlington County, said the proposed HOT lanes on the Capital Beltway in Virginia and the Intercounty Connector in Maryland are prime examples of over-built, inadequately managed super-highway proposals that lack significant public transportation and non-motorized transportation components. He said that VDOT has agreed to a private sector proposal to expand a large portion of the Capital Beltway and has failed to initiate a supplemental draft environmental impact study or seriously evaluate a ten-lane Beltway alternative with the same four HOT lanes that would cost less to build, be safer for drivers, generate more toll

---

revenue, induce less traffic and sprawl. He said the project lacks an adequate transit component and provides no improvements for bicycling and walking along and across this major regional corridor.

Bobby Coward, Direct Action, said that paratransit services for people with disabilities are abysmal. He said he was seeking assistance in working with the D.C. Cab Commission to launch an initiative to start up a taxicab company that would provide accessible vehicles for people with disabilities.

Bob Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, spoke in support of the Intercounty Connector and a new Potomac River Crossing. He cited a recent poll by his organization in support of these projects. He said the survey also found a large majority of respondents believe regional projects should take precedence over local projects and parochial concerns. He said the package of improvements and studies in the CLRP warrants and should receive the TPB's unanimous support. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Chairman Mendelson asked if the survey's indication that regional projects should take precedence over local projects means that each of the jurisdictions should forego repairing local or residential streets.

Mr. Chase said he understood that the sentiment was that people believe that we ought to think more as a region. He said he did not believe that people believed that money should be diverted from maintenance for local roads.

Roger Dietrich, the Sierra Club, spoke in opposition to the Beltway HOT lane project. He said that earlier proposals to widen the Beltway had not moved forward because of public opposition and the lack of funding. He said the HOT lane proposal was not included in the Beltway Environmental Impact Statement because VDOT was claiming that the project is a variation of the 12-lane option. He said there were numerous continuing questions about the project, including its financial viability. He said that if the TPB is going to allow inclusion of a new and different option for the Beltway, one that has very little public input, then there are other options that ought to be studied in parallel such as other tolling schemes and a transit and land use option.

Stewart Schwartz, Coalition for Smarter Growth, said his organization had submitted comments supporting the removal of the Intercounty Connector from the TIP, the Techway from the TIP and CLRP, and calling for a fair evaluation of beltway, transit and HOT alternatives before its inclusion in the TIP. He said the Techway study should be removed from the CLRP. He said the American Legion Bridge origin/destination study showed that a new Potomac crossing was not needed. He also noted that it would be extremely expensive and would not relieve congestion on the Beltway, while it would shift significant development to outer areas at the expense of the east side of the region. He said that just because a project was in the prior TIP should not prevent the Board from voting to take it out. He said he understood that VDOT officials had argued that because the project

---

funds are already obligated, the project could not be removed, which he said was not consistent with the law the TPB operates under. He said another process issue is the question of whether a project defined as a "proposed Draft Environmental Impact Study" qualifies for National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review or inclusion in the CLRP and TIP. He said this project should not qualify for NEPA review because the project actually ends at the Potomac River and has no independent utility. He said the Board should vote to remove it. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

## **2. Approval of the Minutes of September 21, 2005**

A motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded.

Ms. Smyth asked that her name be spelled correctly in the minutes.

Chairman Mendelson asked that the attendance be listed in alphabetical order in the minutes.

The motion was approved unanimously.

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

Referring to the mailout meeting highlights report, Mr. Mokhtari said the Technical Committee met on October 7. He said the committee reviewed the following items on the TPB's agenda:

- the air quality conformity assessment for the 2005 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP);
- an analysis of how well the CLRP and the TIP address the three priority areas in the project solicitation recommendation;
- the draft FY 2006-2011 TIP document;
- the draft 2005 CLRP;
- new TPB planning and program activities related to the "Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users" (SAFETEA-LU); and
- a status report on the fine particles conformity analysis for the CLRP and TIP.

Mr. Mokhtari said the Technical Committee recommended TPB approval of the 2005 CLRP, the FY 2006-2011 TIP, and the conformity assessment for those documents. In addition, he said that the committee reviewed four other items presented by staff, as listed in the highlight report.

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

---

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Jaffe said the CAC met on October 13 and passed two resolutions. The first provided comments on the analysis of the 2005 CLRP regarding the three priority areas laid out in the Solicitation Document. The second provided support for the proposed TIP amendment to provide funding for CapCom.

Mr. Jaffe said the committee began a discussion about the Metro funding legislation, which will be continued in future months. While the committee was appreciative of Congressman Davis' efforts on this issue, he said the committee is concerned about the legislation's potential restrictions on sources of local and state funding, as well as the bill's restrictions on the disposition of property near Metro stations.

Mr. Jaffe said that Ms. Locantore of the TPB staff briefed the committee on the effect of the CLRP on activity clusters and activity centers, which is the briefing under TPB Agenda Item 10. The committee included comments on this presentation in a resolution attached to the report. Mr. Jaffe emphasized that committee members were concerned that the use of activity clusters instead of activity centers overstated the progress identified in the analysis.

Mr. Jaffe said that Mr. Swanson of the TPB staff briefed the committee on upcoming public involvement improvements. He also noted that the CAC presentation on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study was used in a presentation by Mr. Kirby at a forum on transit-oriented development in Loudoun County sponsored by the Dulles Area Transportation Association (DATA). Jim Larsen, executive director of DATA, is a CAC member.

Finally, Mr. Jaffe called attention to the second resolution passed by the CAC, in support of the TIP amendment to provide funding for CapCom. Mr. Jaffe emphasized that the committee's concern that the Volpe study proceed collaboratively. He also said the committee urges that an expeditious effort be made to arrive at a sustainable funding mechanism for the program to assure its success in the future.

Mr. Zimmerman asked whether the committee was able to get into much detail regarding the use of activity clusters instead of activity centers in the analysis of the 2005 CLRP.

Mr. Jaffe said the committee had not gotten into this question in great detail, but he noted that members were concerned that the analysis might be distorted because the clusters are geographically larger than the centers.

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

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on October 7, and approved one resolution amending the FY 2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to modify funding for the widening of I-66 in Prince William County, a bridge replacement and

---

utility relocation on Route 28 in Prince William County, and a utility relocation on the widening of Virginia 608 in Fairfax County.

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

Chairman Mendelson asked Vice Chairman Knapp to work with staff to develop recommendations for the November meeting on what follow-up steps the TPB might take in response to the recent summit on WMATA funding.

Vice Chairman Knapp said he appreciated WMATA's efforts in organizing the summit. He said one of the key questions at this point is what needs to be done to move the funding commitments forward. He said he believed the TPB can help bring the right people together to address this question.

Chairman Mendelson presented Mr. Porter with an award for outstanding elected official from the national Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO). Chairman Mendelson said he had received the award on Ms. Porter's behalf at the AMPO conference in Denver. He described Ms. Porter's numerous contributions to the TPB. Ms. Porter thanked the TPB staff and the Access for All Committee for their support over the years.

## **7. Approval of Amendments to the FY2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Draft FY2006-2011 TIP That Are Exempt From the Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Fund a Regional Transportation Coordination Program**

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Sorenson said this item was an amendment to cover the inclusion of the authorized \$2 million for CapCom, which will coordinate transportation communications and information during regional incidents, that was included in the recent federal transportation reauthorization legislation. She said it included \$1.6 million in federal funds and \$400,000 in local match funds, provided in equal portions by the departments of transportation of Virginia, Maryland and D.C.

Ms. Sorenson moved approval of Resolution R4-2006 to approve the amendments.

The motion was seconded.

Chairman Mendelson asked what was included in the motion.

Mr. Kirby said it included two amendments. One would amend the existing approved Transportation Improvement Program for FY 2005-2010, so the funds can be made available right away. The second amendment would add the project to the draft FY 2006-2011 TIP.

---

Chairman Mendelson said that he has been very concerned, along with Mr. Snyder, about the implementation of CapCom. He said he was pleased that the project was being included in the TIP, which would allow it to move forward. However, he emphasized that he was disappointed at the level of funding. He noted that the TPB had at least twice adopted statements saying that transportation communication and coordination for regional incidents and emergencies is a priority issue. He noted that earlier in the year, the TPB had received briefings that the project needed roughly \$1.4 million for the first year, including start-up, and approximately \$1 million per year thereafter for operations. He said the amendment before the Board would provide approximately \$400,000 per year, which would be approximately 40 percent of the total need. He said the local match, which is a total of \$400,000 over five years, amounted to approximately \$27,000 per year for each DOT. He said this was not enough.

Chairman Mendelson asked for an amendment to the resolution that would ask the state departments of transportation to provide a report approximately every two months on their progress for getting this project implemented. He asked that this report include a timetable for when CapCom will be operational on a 24/7 basis.

Mr. Kirby said he has discussed the funding question with the state DOTs and with WMATA. He said they believe the current level of funding is enough to get CapCom started, although he said the project would not yet be operational on a 24/7 basis. He said staff could provide reports every couple of months on the project's implementation, including a timetable for when the project would be operational around the clock, seven days a week.

Mr. Bottigheimer expressed appreciation for the TPB's leadership on CapCom. He said the speed of the TPB in adding this project to the TIP was an indication of the high priority the DOTs place on this project. He said there are factors that must be considered in the development of CapCom. He said that MDOT was concerned that funding should be put into a regionwide approach that will be the most effective.

Chairman Mendelson said he appreciates MDOT's commitment to the project. But he noted that the development of the project has moved slowly. He said it is only because of the congressional funding and the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) funding that that the project was finally moving forward. He said the situation could be likened to the levees in New Orleans that were known to be inadequate for major emergencies.

Chairman Mendelson asked if there was objection to amending the resolution that would add the requirement for reports every two months regarding the progress on CapCom, as well as a timetable for when the project would be operational on a 24/7 basis.

Senator Giannetti said he was a big supporter of this effort. He emphasized that the project would have immense utility on a day-to-day basis, as well as being important for potential large-scale



---

emergencies.

The motion was passed unanimously.

### **8. Review of Comments Received and Acceptance of Recommended Responses for Inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Assessment, the 2005 Constrained Long-Range Plan, and the FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Referring to the handout item, Mr. Kirby said that the draft conformity, plan and TIP documents were released for a one-month, 30-day public comment period, which closed on October 15. Most public comments were received online through the TPB website. The online public comment format was developed at the suggestion of the Citizens Advisory Committee.

Mr. Kirby said that a total of 160 comments were received. He said that staff reviewed the comments, grouped them, and provided responses. Referring to the handout, he summarized each of the points in the memorandum containing recommended responses.

Mr. Knapp asked if the Techway study that is included in the CLRP is a feasibility study or a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Ms. Sorenson said the Techway study is a feasibility study not a DEIS.

Vice Chairman Knapp noted that the study was listed as a DEIS at one point in the documentation that was distributed. He asked if that reference should be corrected.

Ms. Sorenson said that would be fine.

Vice Chairman Knapp said he understood that funds had been obligated for the study, although there has not been much activity to date. He said he understood that some type of feasibility study had been done. He asked for a clarification of the status of the project.

Ms. Sorenson said an origin/destination study for the American Legion Bridge had been done. She said that study did not use the funding identified in the CLRP. She said the study indicated in the document was fully funded by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and that money is available to be spent.

Vice Chairman Knapp asked if there are plans to move ahead with that feasibility study.

Ms. Sorenson said there are no specific plans at this time. She said the study appears in the six-year plan each year so that it is clear that there are still some funds available in case VDOT is asked to move forward with the study.

---

Vice Chairman Knapp asked if any local jurisdictions have requested the study.

Ms. Sorenson said no.

Vice Chairman Knapp asked if this item is essentially a placeholder for \$400,000 for a study that could take place someday.

Ms. Sorenson said there may not be \$400,000 remaining in this item because it has been available over the last four years to do traffic studies or counts and data collection.

Vice Chairman Knapp noted that the staff response indicated that these are obligated funds and therefore the TPB does not have the ability to remove this from the TIP. He asked for a clarification on whether there might be a situation when the TPB would be allowed to pull the project or make a modification. Referring to a statement made by Stewart Schwartz in the public comment period, Vice Chairman Knapp asked for clarification regarding the TPB's authority in this situation. If a project is listed in a document released for public comment, he asked, but the TPB cannot do anything in response to comment, why should it be released for comment in the first place?

Mr. Kirby said the time to remove the project would have been when it first appeared. He said that at this point in the process, this project is like one that has been approved and is under construction. He said it would be reasonable, however, to ask for a status report on the project.

Vice Chairman Knapp said that a status report would be helpful. He noted that Congressman Wolf had initiated a study four or five years ago, but since that time there has been little interest in moving forward on this issue. He noted that the Montgomery County Council voted unanimously again last year just to reaffirm opposition to this.

Mr. Fellows asked when, from the staff's perspective, it would be reasonable to remove something from the TIP. He asked what would be criteria for a project's removal if that project is already in the TIP but nothing is happening with it and there is no local momentum for it and there is a desire to remove it.

Mr. Kirby said the best time to address it is when the project comes in the first time, as an initial proposal. Regarding this project, he said that at least three different activities have happened. One was an origin/destination study, which was funded separately and is now completed. A second was Frank Wolf's initiative, which was funded and initiated, but then was terminated before it was completed. The third was this VDOT study to look at what could be done just on the Virginia side of the river if a new bridge was not under consideration. He noted that the project description delineated the project as "up to the Potomac River, or the Maryland line." He suggested that VDOT might provide some clarification on this description.

---

Chairman Mendelson said that he assumed that the TPB could limit further spending even if a project has to remain in the plan.

Mr. Kirby said that is correct.

Mr. Zimmerman moved that the Board acknowledge receipt of the comments presented by the public and the responses proposed by staff, and include them as such in air quality conformity assessment 2005 CLRP and the FY 2006-2011 TIP.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Gonzalez.

Mr. Zimmerman said it is important to note that the Board is receiving the comments but is not necessarily taking a position on them specifically. He also noted that the Board has received the responses, which would be accepted for inclusion in the CLRP, TIP and associated conformity documents. He said the Board was not endorsing the staff responses.

Mr. Zimmerman asked that in the future the public comments document indicate the names of organizations that have submitted comments instead of the simply listing the names of individuals who have submitted comments on behalf of organizations.

Mr. Kirby said this change would be made in future documents.

Vice Chairman Knapp asked if the responses could be modified.

Mr. Kirby said the document was for the Board's review.

Vice Chairman Knapp asked that the document indicate that the Techway study is a dormant project, but that the board will receive an update as to the current status of this project and any future activity associated with it. This would be added to the response to Comment 1 in the public comments summary document.

Mr. Zimmerman suggested that this new language should indicate that this is addition is a Board direction. He said he did not want to get involved in editing the entire document, which he again emphasized is a staff document.

The motion was approved unanimously.

## **9. Approval of Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2005 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Referring to the mailout packet, Mr. Clifford said the summary report is contained in a technical

---

memorandum to the TPB, which was released for public comment in September. He said he briefed the board on the conformity results in September. He said the mailout package also contained a letter from the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC), recognizing that the CLRP meets the interim mobile emissions budgets recently approved by EPA. The MWAQC letter also urges state and local governments to maintain their commitments to Transportation Emission Reduction Measures (TERMs), and states that the 8-hour ozone standard is expected to be a much more difficult challenge. Lastly, Mr. Clifford said the mailout included a resolution approving the air quality conformity determination.

A motion was made to approve TPB Resolution R5-2005 to approve the air quality conformity determination for the 2005 CLRP and FY 2006-2001 TIP. The motion was seconded and was passed unanimously.

#### **10. Review of Priority Areas in the Solicitation Document for the 2005 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and Approval of the 2005 CLRP**

Referring to the handout presentation, Ms. Locantore briefed the Board on priority area number 3, which looked at how the projects in the CLRP support the regional core and the regional activity centers. She explained that activity centers and clusters have been defined for the region. The clusters are usually larger in area than the centers. She said that because the TPB's traffic analysis zones, which are used for travel forecasting, do not align well with the centers, this analysis presents travel impacts for the activity clusters.

In going through the presentation, Ms. Locantore described the location of current and planned rail stations relative to the activity clusters. She described the location of forecast growth in households and jobs between 2002 and 2030 relative to activity clusters, as well as commuting patterns relative to activity clusters.

To summarize the findings of the analysis, Ms. Locantore said:

- The number of activity clusters with rail stations is increasing.
- Households are becoming more concentrated in activity clusters.
- Jobs already are fairly concentrated in activity clusters and remain steady.
- The share of auto commute trips to activity clusters is decreasing, while transit use is very high in activity clusters, especially the core clusters.

Mr. Zimmerman asked about the benefit of this analysis for activity clusters.

Ms. Locantore said that the activity clusters, although larger in area than activity centers, still are a relatively small portion of the region. Activity centers are intended to be more walkable communities, where somebody could walk to transit, and the activity clusters, although larger,

---

could still have relatively good access to transit.

Mr. Zimmerman said the activity clusters are not all located near transit and some of them are quite large. For example, he noted that the activity clusters in eastern Loudoun County appeared to be quite close to the size of the city of Alexandria. He said he did not quite understand the rationale for the activity clusters, which he characterized as large inkblots covering extraordinary amounts of real estate. He said he did not see evidence to support the assertion that the activity clusters are in any way indications of a move toward more compact development, more walkable communities, reduced vehicle miles traveled or increased transit mode share.

Chairman Mendelson said that Mr. Zimmerman's comments appeared to be a criticism of staff. He said it would be more appropriate as a criticism of how the TPB is correlating land use and transportation.

Mr. Zimmerman said he was simply asking what information could be obtained from the analysis.

Chairman Mendelson said the purpose of the analysis was to include as part of the CLRP an analysis of how the projects in the CLRP correlate with land use. He said he agreed that the analysis showed that there is not as good a correlation as there should be. He said this was not a criticism of the staff or of the analysis. Rather it was a criticism of "ourselves." He said the issue of activity clusters being so large is an issue that was addressed at the outset of Ms. Locantore's presentation. He said he understood that the Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee is working with TPB staff so that the next time this analysis is done, it will use activity centers.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct. He said the Planning Directors developed the criteria to delineate the centers and the clusters. He said clusters were developed to include some neighborhood areas, including more jobs and housing, that made sense as a geographic area of concentration. However, he said that the comments made by Mr. Zimmerman and others have been taken to heart; the Planning Directors will be working with staff to develop an analysis using activity centers instead of clusters. He said that one benefit of using the centers would be that the mode share for transit would increase. He said the fact that the clusters showed such a high transit mode share, particularly in the central clusters, is quite impressive. This share could be expected to increase even more with the centers analysis.

Vice Chairman Hudgins asked what the main objective of the analysis was.

Mr. Kirby said the main objective was to look at how the region's transit investments relate to where land use concentrations are now and where they are going to be in the future.

Vice Chairman Hudgins said this analysis is useful to get a better understanding of how some places have developed in large activity centers and can still be linked to transit. She referred to the village centers in Reston. She said the number of people, jobs and retail that make up this larger

---

activity cluster provides a comprehensive geography that is useful.

Chairman Mendelson asked that Mr. Kirby prepare another presentation on this subject for a subsequent meeting.

A motion was made to approve TPB Resolution R6-2006 to approve the 2005 CLRP. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Gonzales noted that a document containing additional information had been handed out because some of the transit projects were left out in the mailout material. He noted that this additional information was included in the motion.

Mr. Kirby said that material had been handed out and had been included on the web.

Referring to Vice Chairman Hudgins' comments, Mr. Kirby said that the Planning Directors continue to believe that it is useful to look at both activity clusters and activity centers.

Chairman Mendelson said he was concerned about the time. He said he would like to discuss the priorities at a future meeting, including the issue of traffic signal prioritization.

Ms. Pourciau asked if the ongoing update of the activity centers was being done collaboratively with both transportation and land use planners.

Mr. Kirby said that the process was conducted collaboratively in conjunction with the development of the Cooperative Land Use Forecasts.

Ms. Pourciau said she found it interesting that a number of rail stations are not currently in activity centers or clusters.

Ms. Pourciau asked that the future presentation on the activity centers also present information on how the TPB's scenario study gets layered into the CLRP analysis. She said it was important to see how decision-making can influence the future of the land- use/transportation connection.

Ms. Pourciau said that she found it troubling that there is forecast to be a huge growth in population and jobs and the regional share of jobs and housing in the activity clusters remains about the same, and in the core clusters the regional share would decrease. She said this shows that while the region is not necessarily moving in the wrong direction, the region is not making any real progress either.

The motion was approved unanimously.

## **11. Approval of the FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

---

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said this item is a follow-on to the CLRP adoption. It implements the first six years in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Mr. Gonzalez moved approval of TPB Resolution R7-2006 to approve the FY 2006-2011 TIP. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Fellows said that College Park was not going to ask for the removal of the University of Maryland Connector, but College Park did wish to express its displeasure concerning its continued inclusion in the TIP, especially because they have had difficulty getting funding for the US-1 corridor project.

Vice Chairman Knapp asked that the document be revised to reflect the earlier discussion clarifying that the Techway study is a feasibility study, not a Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

The motion was passed unanimously.

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

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said this is a formal action by the Board to certify that it has taken the actions that are part of the federally mandated metropolitan transportation planning process.

A motion was made to approve TPB Resolution R8-2006 endorsing the appended Statement of Certification. The motion was seconded and was passed unanimously.

## **13. Report on Progress Made Towards Accessible Transportation Since Disability Awareness Day in 2004**

Ms. Porter reminded the Board that on October 20, 2004, the TPB conducted an event and a press conference on "Disability Awareness Day" to highlight the importance of accessible and dependable transportation for people with disabilities. TPB Board members and persons with disabilities traveled to the press conference in teams and reported on their travel experiences. Ms. Porter said the event was a success in raising awareness. Ms. Porter thanked Bud Keith and Bobby Coward for their comments during the public comment period.

Referring to a handout report in the form of a color brochure, Ms. Porter briefed the Board on the progress made towards accessible transportation since October 2004. She said that since last year there are more accessible buses and a new public announcement system is planned for the 39

---

Metrorail stations. She said the Access for All Advisory Committee is conducting a study of Metro Access, as was recommended in the committee's earlier report. She said that Metro Access has a new director and is working with a new contractor to operate the service. She said an inventory of regional bus stops, including ADA features, is underway.

Ms. Porter also noted some issues that were raised the previous year that have not yet been accomplished. She said that working wheel-chair lifts and securements on all buses are still needed. She said there needs to be better lighting and elevators on the Metro Rail system, as well as better coverage of stations with bumpy strips. She said that supporters of services for people with disabilities need to be more vigilant about how the new Metro Access contractor performs. She said there needs to be better pedestrian access to bus and rail stations. Referring to Mr. Coward's comments, she said there is still a lack of accessible cabs. She also said that everyone needs to keep working to change public attitudes towards people with disabilities. She said the Access for All Advisory Committee will continue to work to raise this awareness.

#### **14. Briefing on New TPB Planning and Programming Activities Related to the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act - A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU)**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said the Board had been provided with a memorandum responding to questions raised by Mr. Zimmerman the previous month. He suggested the Board members might review the memorandum and come back with questions next month.

Chairman Mendelson said he hoped there would more time at the next meeting to discuss reports that have not been given much time in recent months.

#### **15. Status Report on the Fine Particles (PM2.5) Conformity Analysis for the 2005 CLRP and FY 2006-2011 TIP**

Referring to a handout memorandum, Mr. Clifford said that PM2.5 conformity analysis is a new work area for the TPB staff. He said the memorandum described the technical approach that will be taken in the analysis, along the schedule for process. He said the first draft results will be taken to the TPB Technical Committee on November 4 and to the TPB on November 16. The Board will be asked to act in December. He reminded the Board that the schedule was designed to avoid a conformity lapse in April.

#### **16. Other Business and Adjournment**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:05 p.m.



