

## **REPORT**

### **TPB Citizens Advisory Committee**

**May 21, 2008**

**Larry Martin, CAC Chairman**

The normal business meeting of the CAC on May 15 was shortened to one hour to accommodate the Public Forum on the Washington Metropolitan Region's Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which was held immediately following. The CAC agenda focused on discussion of Committee priorities for the remainder of 2008, in particular activities related to the TPB Bus Subcommittee and the TPB Scenario Study Task Force.

#### **Discussion of Ongoing CAC Business and Interests – 2008 Priorities**

Mr. Martin led a discussion of ongoing Committee activities and interests, expressing a desire to focus the efforts of the CAC on a handful of pursuits in order to make a substantive contribution to the work of the TPB in 2008. He summarized the items discussed by the Committee so far this year, and invited members to comment on how the CAC could most effectively pursue those items, as well as contribute additional items meriting attention. These included:

- Providing input and advice to the current phase of the TPB Regional Mobility and Accessibility Scenario Study – the development of two new scenarios for study and exploration of possibilities for incorporating scenario findings into the process of prioritizing transportation projects at the regional level;
- Working with the TPB Bus Subcommittee to determining priorities for improvement/expansion of the regional network of bus service;
- Discussing/promoting regional strategies for reducing the energy needs of the transportation sector along with the harmful byproducts of energy consumption;
- Examining changes to the process of developing the region's CLRP in order to tie the plan more closely to the TPB Vision, through the use of regional criteria or a regional unconstrained plan.

Additional items suggested by CAC members as potential priorities for the Committee included:

- Promoting a regional approach to dealing with the transportation-related implications of the land use changes proposed under the latest round of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC);
- Developing regional priorities for expansion of intra- and inter-city rail service, possibly through formation of a CAC Rail Subcommittee, and promoting of inclusion of these priorities in regional plans;
- Learning more about and promoting regional coordination for emergency management, including preparations for evacuation if necessary;

- Proposing adoption by the TPB of a region-wide “Complete Streets” policy that would commit the region’s jurisdictions and implementing agencies to multi-modal accommodation on new or reconstructed streets.

Discussion focused on ways in which to move these priorities forward, including the possibility of using the activities of the TPB Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee as a model, in that the CAC could similarly develop lists of priority projects to forward on to the TPB for consideration. Committee members also suggested that the CAC invite guests (from inside and outside TPB staff) that could speak to certain topics such as emergency management coordination and specific transit alternatives such as monorail.

In addition, members discussed how the Committee can best work through the Scenario Study process to pursue the above priorities, whether it is to advance a particular kind of transit service like monorail or address a specific regional challenge like BRAC. CAC members emphasized that the two new scenarios, the CLRP Aspirations Scenario and the “What Would It Take?” Scenario, should be closely linked so that different indicators like CO2 emissions, vehicle miles of travel (VMT), and lane miles of congestion are not analyzed in isolation. The CAC chair will work with other members to develop a recommendation elaborating that point to submit to the next meeting of the TPB Scenario Study Task Force.

### **Other CAC Business**

- John Swanson of TPB staff reported that the fourth TPB Community Leadership Institute was held on April 17 and 19, and was attended by two new members of the CAC, one of whom shared his impressions.
- Mr. Swanson also briefly discussed the development of a Participation Program for FY 2009, which staff hopes to complete in the next several weeks, and invited input from the CAC on a preliminary list of public involvement activities to include in the Program. Due to time constraints, further discussion on this item was postponed to the June CAC meeting.
- Carroll George, a guest at the CAC meeting, presented the Committee with information on an alternative technique for handling highway merge lanes, and asked the Committee to consider taking up advocacy of the issue before the TPB.
- Ron Kirby, Director of Transportation Planning, provided an overview of items on the May 21 TPB Agenda.

## **Public Forum on the Washington Region's Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Kirby provided an overview of the purpose of the Public Forum on the TIP, which is to provide information to the public about how the TIP is developed and to comply with federal requirements for including the public in the TIP process. In a PowerPoint presentation, Andrew Austin of TPB staff described the features of the TIP for the Washington Region, the federal requirements detailing the development of the TIP, financial summaries of transportation funding for the state departments of transportation and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), and the schedule for approval of the TIP.

Representatives from the District of Columbia Department of Transportation (DDOT), the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT), the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), and WMATA described how projects are developed, prioritized and funded within their jurisdictions. The agency staff discussed the different sources of revenue for their planning and projects, as well as the process for approving a project for construction. They also discussed opportunities for the public to be involved in the project development process.

Questions from the public about TIP procedures included the following:

- Attendees asked several clarification questions regarding the funding amounts and breakdown of funding by year, type, and transportation mode as shown in several slides.
  - One participant asked about the drop-off in overall funding and specifically funding for right-of-way acquisition beyond the first two years of the TIP. Agency staff responded that the TIP inevitably reflects greater funding amounts in the nearest years because less is known about specific obligations in the out years. Regarding the ROW acquisition portion, they said that it is unusual to see such funding in out years because DOTs are not allowed to acquire ROW for projects until the project is very near construction.
  - Another question regarded the perception that the spending is dominated by one or two major projects, with little money left over for other projects. In the case of Maryland, the pie chart showing the funding breakdown by mode is heavily tilted toward highways due largely to the influence of the Intercountry Connector, while the Virginia chart is tilted toward transit because of the Dulles Rail project. Agency representatives replied that the TIP is just a snapshot in time, and that the mode breakdown fluctuates drastically from year to year based on the major projects slated for construction in the near future.
- A Maryland resident asked for clarification on the relationship between the TIP and the Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP), particularly regarding two major projects in Maryland. He noted that funding for initial

phases of both the Corridor Cities Transitway and the Purple Line are present in the TIP, but only the Corridor Cities Transitway is shown in the CLRP as fully funded beyond the six-year TIP period. He asked if this was a reflection of the relative priority of these projects in the eyes of the state administration. The Maryland DOT representative replied that the difference is likely only indicative of how far along the projects are in planning stages.

- A resident of the District of Columbia asked for clarification on funding sources for the 11<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge project, as the funding sources reflected in the TIP differed from information he had gathered from District Council meetings. The DDOT representative said that DDOT would provide further details to the questioner in response to his previous written request.
- Another participant asked about how Metropolitan Planning Organizations such as the TPB, as regional entities, fit into the process of prioritizing State and District projects. In particular, he asked how regional goals and priorities are represented in the selection process at the state level, and where in the process that might occur. Agency representatives responded by noting the participation by representatives of the implementing agencies (the DOTs and WMATA) on the TPB leading to “consensus” on priorities; and explained that the project submission process for the TIP requires the implementing agencies to describe how each project is consistent with the regional vision and goals.

## **ATTENDANCE**

### **CAC Meeting, May 15, 2008**

#### **Members in Attendance**

1. Larry Martin, DC, Chair
2. Harold Foster, DC
3. Bill Klenke, MD
4. Grace Malakoff, DC
5. Allen Muchnick, VA
6. Todd Reitzel, MD
7. Lynn Shanton, MD
8. Emmet Tydings, MD
9. Shirley Williams, DC

#### **Alternates in Attendance**

Bernard Hill, DC  
Gail Parker, VA

#### **Members Not in Attendance**

1. Farrell Keough, MD
2. Jim Larsen, VA
3. Daniel Malouff, VA
4. Robin Marlin, DC
5. Suresh Narasimhan, VA
6. Daphne Sahlin, VA

#### **Staff/Others**

Ron Kirby, COG/TPB  
Sarah Crawford, COG/TPB  
Darren Smith, COG/TPB  
John Swanson, COG/TPB  
Carroll George