

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 23, 2013**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Bob Brown, Loudoun County
Ron Burns, Frederick County
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Lou Farber for Vic Weissberg, Prince George's County
Seth Grimes, City of Takoma Park
Rene'e Hamilton, VDOT
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Shyam Kannan, WMATA
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick
Tim Lovain, City of Alexandria
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Bridget D. Newton, City of Rockville
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
Jonathan Way, Manassas City
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Scott York, Loudoun County
Sam Zimbabwe, DDOT
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	
Gerald Miller	
Robert Griffiths	
Andrew Meese	
Jane Posey	
Andrew Austin	
Michael Farrell	
Deborah Kerson Bilek	
Sarah Crawford	
Ben Hampton	
Dan Sonenklar	
Jonathan Rogers	
Karin Foster	
Debbie Leigh	
Chuck Bean	COG/EO
Nicole Hange	COG/EO
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Lewis Miller	COG/OPA
Bill Orleans	HACK
Randy Carroll	MDE
Judi Gold	Councilmember Bowser's Office
Tina Slater	CAC Chair
Allen Muchnick	Virginia Bicycling Federation
Mike Lake	Fairfax County DOT
Anthony Foster	DDOT
Stewart Schwartz	CSG
Patrick Durany	Prince William County
Jamie Coughlin	WMAL
Steve Kral	WMATA
Tim Davis	City of Frederick
Tom Fahrney	VDOT
Nick Alexandrow	PRTC
Christine Green	Greater Washington Region Safe Routes to School Network
Marti Reinfeld	City of Alexandria
Alexis Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Wendy Duren	Arlington County Commuter Services
John B. Townsend II	AAA Mid-Atlantic
Rahul Trivedi	VDOT

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Mr. Chase, representing the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, endorsed the inclusion of

several projects in the update to the 2013 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP, including: the new Dulles Airport connector road, the Manassas Bypass, the U.S. 1 widening at Prince William County, the new Dulles Toll Road ramps, Route 7 widening, I-495 express lane extensions, new Beltway and Dulles Corridor ramps, and the new I-395 southbound lane. He emphasized the importance of the Dulles Connector roadway and the Route 28 Manassas bypass as facilities that enhance both regional and statewide travel choices. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Mr. Muchnick, representing the Virginia Bicycling Federation, spoke about the proposed amendment to the FY 2013-2018 TIP to include funding for improvements to US Route 1 near Fort Belvoir in Fairfax County. He commented that the project illustrates shortcomings with the TPB's Complete Streets Policy. He advocated that the project adequately accommodate experienced long distance bicyclists who prefer to travel on the roadway, which he said would be better designed and maintained, and arguably safer, than the shared-use path which would otherwise be included as part of this project. He asked the TPB to require FHWA to provide continuous four-foot bike lanes in each direction as a condition for adding this project to the TIP. His comments, along with a proposed amendment to the draft resolution TPB R5-2013, were distributed for the record.

Mr. Schwartz, representing the Coalition for Smarter Growth, asked the TPB to support Mr. Muchnick's request, and advocated that the Route 1 corridor provide additional bicycle capacity. He called attention to the draft final report "What do People Think About Congestion Pricing? A Deliberative Dialogue with Residents of Metropolitan Washington," and emphasized the strong support for having better and more alternatives to driving, particularly transit and bike-ped facilities. He said the report represents a strong endorsement of the goals relating to land-use and transportation investment. He addressed Mr. Chase's comments, stating that the focus of these projects should be on more compact, walkable communities. He added that providing for a new potentially tolled facility does not make sense in this fiscal era. He concluded by denouncing the Virginia Governor's transportation bill, and said that providing more funding by maintaining the gas tax makes the most sense for Virginia.

Mr. Shefer, representing the Washington Airports Task Force, endorsed VDOT's request to study two options for connecting the Tri-County Parkway to the Dulles Loop in the next air quality analysis, citing a connection need that is urgent and has been neglected for over a decade.

Mr. Townsend, representing AAA, urged the TPB to support all of the projects for inclusion in the 2013 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the December 19 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the December 19 TPB meeting, which was seconded and passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Ms. Erickson said that the Technical Committee met on January 11 and discussed several items on the TPB agenda, including: the draft final report “What do People Think About Congestion Pricing? A Deliberative Dialogue with Residents of Metropolitan Washington,” the project submissions for the air quality conformity assessment for the 2013 CLRP and FY2013-2018 TIP, the new Unified Planning Work Program, which she said would be up for approval in March, and a review of the activities of the Bus on Shoulder Task Force. She added that some items were presented for information and discussion, including: further details on a request to examine a possible TPB adoption of a regional green streets policy or other ways to include or address green streets principles in our process, a presentation on the performance of the 2012 CLRP, and status updates on the Street Smart Campaign, the Regional Transportation Data Clearinghouse, and a draft version of a user-friendly TIP guide and summary document.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Ms. Slater provided highlights of the end-of-year summary report for the 2012 CAC. She spoke about the CAC’s continued interest in the regional Transportation Priorities Plan, and emphasized concerns regarding the direction that the plan is taking, particularly regarding the level of inclusiveness in the planning process. She said that the CAC had hoped that the priorities plan would engage TPB stakeholders and leaders in a dialogue about the region’s future, but that the CAC has not witnessed this occurring thus far. She mentioned a CAC resolution, which was passed in April, calling on the TPB either to reestablish the Priority Plan Scoping Task Force or to establish a new group that would provide regular input into the process. She acknowledged that some work sessions on the priorities plan would be held to solicit input prior to future TPB meetings, and said that the CAC looked forward to attending these meetings, but also expressed disappointment that the overall public involvement strategy now has a strong focus on public opinion research, rather than broader collaboration among a variety of constituencies. She added that the CAC had hoped that the priorities plan would identify priority projects, but that the CAC now understands that it will identify general strategies instead. She also expressed concerns that the amount of quantitative analysis that had initially been intended as part of the plan seems to have been reduced or eliminated. She reinforced that the CAC is a group with transportation knowledge that could contribute towards the priorities plan, and asked the TPB for special consideration to solicit the CAC’s involvement on the plan in 2013.

Ms. Slater addressed the TPB’s Regional Complete Streets Policy, and provided a brief history of the CAC’s involvement in establishing it. She mentioned that the regional bike and pedestrian project database has not yet been updated, even though the policy required this to be completed within 120 days of the policy’s creation. She added that the policy requires a regional information clearinghouse, acknowledged the progress of this website, and added that the CAC would like for each TIP project submission form to have a link where a web page could be referenced or a project manager could be contacted.

Ms. Slater advocated for a strong regional approach for the new Transportation Alternatives

Program under MAP-21, and urged the TPB to use regional criteria when selecting projects to be funded under this program. She also mentioned the CAC's success in becoming more directly involved with the Street Smart Campaign. She endorsed the TPB Information Hub and praised the TPB Weekly Report. She also suggested that the timing of the next TIP forum be conducted at a early stage in the TIP development process than it is under current practice. She concluded by mentioning that the CAC is celebrating 20 years as a citizen's advisory committee, and is planning a party to honor this milestone and all participants of the CAC on February 13.

Ms. Tregoning said she was distressed to hear Ms. Slater's views on the regional transportation priorities plan, and acknowledged the specific suggestions made about how the CAC could be more directly involved. She asked if Mr. Kirby wanted to address the CAC's concerns, and if the TPB could receive an update at its next meeting regarding some of the issues raised by the CAC.

Chair York thanked Ms. Tregoning and said that he would follow up with Ms. Slater, the future CAC chair, and Mr. Kirby on a conference call to discuss the CAC's concerns with the intent of bringing information back to the TPB at a future point.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said that the Steering Committee met on January 11, and took one action to amend the TIP to modify funding for the I-66/US 15 interchange reconstruction project, to include funding for a study to evaluate and develop a rating system for significant transportation projects in Northern Virginia, and for the Eisenhower Avenue project.

Mr. Kirby distributed a packet of letters sent/received and summarized a letter transmitted under Chairman Turner's signature to the governors, mayor, and state legislators that represent the region concerning funding for transportation. He also pointed out information on approaches for raising transportation revenues. He mentioned that the forecasts by the U.S. Department of Energy issued in January show that although gasoline consumption is forecast to decline, it is expected to be 78 percent of current levels by 2040, which indicates continuing significant use of gasoline. He added that the Department of Energy also forecasts that alternative fuels would increase from about 0.3 percent of today's total to about 6 percent by 2040. Finally, he mentioned that TPB staff were very active in the Annual Transportation Research Board Meeting which was held in Washington in January, and summarized a memorandum with a list of staff participation in the meeting.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for clarification about information that was provided on states that index their gas taxes.

Mr. Kirby said the data in question is intended to show the change in the rate from the year 2000 to 2010 because of the indexing implemented by certain states.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the information presented is intended to convey that only seven states have indexed their gasoline tax.

Mr. Kirby replied in affirmation.

Mr. Zimmerman recollected that, years ago, only one state in the country – Ohio – had indexed its gas tax. He said he did not see Ohio listed among the seven states.

Mr. Kirby said he would check into this.

Mr. Zimmerman thanked Mr. Kirby and asked about the assumption in gasoline price relative to the forecasted information on usage that Mr. Kirby provided earlier.

Mr. Kirby replied that the forecast on gasoline use was developed by the US Department of Energy, and is therefore national – not regional – in scope. He said he did not know about assumptions regarding price, and added that key elements are the assumptions about penetration of alternative fuels and how CAFE standards are factored in to the analysis.

Mr. Zimmerman said that price variability could introduce a large variation to these forecast assumptions, and that price of fuel could have a dramatic impact on actual vehicle miles traveled. He mentioned a TRB presentation that he attended the previous week that modeled the Baltimore-Washington area and ran different scenarios using both changes in fuel prices and assumptions about technology. He said that the presentation showed that variation on the assumption of price has a large impact on vehicle miles traveled and on land-use patterns.

Mr. Kannan, responding to Mr. Zimmerman, said that, according to the US Energy Information Administration, the price assumption between 2012 and 2035 is expected to be a 1.6 percent increase in liquefied gas for vehicles.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for confirmation that this percent increase is low.

Mr. Kannan replied that this price increase is low.

6. Chair's Remarks

Chair York thanked Mr. Turner and presented him with a plaque in recognition for his service and commitment as TPB Chair in 2012.

Mr. Turner, in turn, thanked the members of the TPB, and highlighted the accomplishments of the TPB over the past year, including: making progress on the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, adopting the Regional Complete Streets Policy, hosting two installments of the Community Leadership Institute, starting the Bus-on-Shoulder Task Force, including new areas in Prince George's County and in Loudoun County as part of the annual Street Smart Campaign, providing opportunities for member jurisdictions to highlight and share transportation project or activities with each other, and working with the COG Board of Directors to emphasize the importance of transportation in the region through the COG Economy Forward efforts. He thanked Ms. Slater for her leadership as Chair of the CAC in 2012, and remarked that the new federal surface

transportation authorizing legislation, MAP-21 was also established in 2012. He mentioned the letter that was transmitted by the TPB to state legislators to continue the conversation about transportation funding. He thanked the TPB for the opportunity to serve as chair, and wished Chair York well in his endeavors as TPB Chair in 2013. Finally, he recognized TPB staff for their efforts in supporting the work of the TPB.

Mr. Turner recognized Ms. Slater for her service as 2012 Chair of the CAC by presenting her with a plaque that acknowledged her leadership. He also recognized Mr. Rawlings for his service as 2012 Chair of the TPB Technical Committee by presenting him with a plaque that acknowledged his leadership.

ACTION ITEMS

7. Approval of Funding and Transmittal Letter for TPB's 2013 Membership in the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations

Chair York stated that staff is recommending that the TPB allocate \$25,000 out of the UPWP for TPB's membership in the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO).

Mr. Kirby added that the TPB has been a member of AMPO for at least 15 years, and has received great value from this membership.

A motion was made and seconded to approve funding from the FY 2013 UPWP, along with an associated transmittal letter, for the TPBs 2013 membership in AMPO. The motion passed unanimously.

8. Approval of Appointments to the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for the Year 2013

Mr. Swanson summarized the process for appointing members to the CAC, and said that the 15-member body is comprised of five members each from the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. Referring to a list that was circulated at the meeting, he presented the names of the nominees for the 2013 CAC, which include Steven Still, Allen Muchnick, Jeffrey Parnes, Lorena Rios, Mark Skiles and alternates Tom Burrell, Jamie Nham, and Andrea Hamre from Virginia; Neha Bhatt, Veronica Davis, Patrick Gough, Tracy Hadden Loh, Emily Oaksford, and alternates Larry Martin, Anita Hairston, Rosemarie Savio from the District of Columbia; and Justin Clarke, Cherian Eapen, John Epps, Tina Slater, Emmet Tydings, and alternates Ronald Hartman, Jeffrey Slavin, Jarrett Stoltzfus from Maryland. He added that it is the prerogative of the Chair of the TPB to name the Chair of the CAC.

Mr. Turner motion was made to appoint the fifteen members and alternates to the 2013 CAC. Mr. Wojahn seconded the motion.

Mr. Erenrich observed that several of the nominees are also transportation professionals or have jobs that relate to the work of the TPB. He asked if this is intended to illustrate an evolution in the direction of the CAC. He also asked if the appointed members are under any specific mandates to sign an ethics statement on potential confidentiality or conflicts of interest.

Mr. Swanson replied that such a mandate has not been required in the past, but that staff have spoken with members individually on issues of this nature as they arise.

Mr. Erenrich acknowledged that all members of the TPB are subject to different ethics requirements.

Chair York, acknowledging that he made the recommendations for the Virginia members, responded that he reviewed all of the applications he received before making his final decision. He added that he would hope that individuals would recuse themselves from participation on CAC matters if concerns regarding ethics were to arise. He added that all the recommendations reflect citizens who are affected by good or bad transportation, regardless of their professional affiliations.

Mr. Wojahn said that in making his selections from Maryland, he aimed to reflect a diversity of backgrounds and perspectives, as well as experience. He added that the decision was difficult because there were many qualified applicants.

Mr. Roberts expressed concern about the potential for a conflict of interest. He added that a citizen advisory committee should be comprised of regular citizens that are interested in the transportation network, but not necessarily transportation professionals.

Chair York called for a vote on the motion, which passed. He nominated Steven Still from Virginia to serve as Chair of the CAC for 2013.

9. Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2013-2018 TIP that is Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirement to include Funding for Improvements to US Route 1 near Fort Belvoir in Fairfax County

Mr. Austin provided a brief summary of the proposed project, noting that the TPB was briefed in December on the request to add \$180 million in Office of Economic Adjustment Defense Access Roads funds to the project to widen 3.4 miles of US Route 1 from the southern boundary of Fort Belvoir to just north of the Mount Vernon Highway. He said the project is included in the air quality conformity analysis of the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP. He said the comments received by the TPB on the project, as well as a response from Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division were included in the mailout. He said Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division is committed to working with all parties to maximize the use of the roadway for all modes. He said the project will be constructed as a design-build, and the travel lane widths and bike lane widths will be considered when the initial designs have been presented to FHWA and VDOT.

Ms. Jackson made a motion to approve Resolution R5-2013 to amend the FY 2013-2018 TIP. She reiterated that lane widths will be considered when the project enters the design phase.

Ms. Smyth seconded the motion.

Ms. Hudgins spoke to the concerns regarding the lane width and asked Ms. Jackson to describe the current process and how it would be possible to include four-foot wide bike lanes in the project.

Ms. Jackson asked a representative from VDOT to provide that information.

Mr. Farney, VDOT project manager, explained that VDOT is managing the project since it will maintain the finished product. He said there are a lot of constraints on the project: it goes through a historic district, it goes through Fort Belvoir, and VDOT is attempting to maintain a transit corridor in the median. He said there are safety considerations that further complicate the design of the roadway related to the inclusion of four-foot bike lanes. He said that bike lanes would be evaluated thoroughly during the design phase of the project.

Ms. Hudgins said the project is very important to Fairfax County and stated that it is the desire of the County that transportation projects be multimodal and meet a diversity of transportation needs. She asked for an amendment to the motion, that in consideration for the design, it would be a preference that the widening occur in order to include a bike lane.

Chair York said he considered this a friendly amendment.

Ms. Jackson said it can be considered and reminded the Board that this action is merely to attach funding to the project.

Ms. Hudgins said she realizes the nature of the action and noted the qualifier. She said she wanted to include the consideration for bike lanes at this point because as the process moves forward, she would like to ensure that the funding is used in the best possible spirit.

Mr. Roberts asked if accommodations would be made for pedestrians.

Mr. Farney said two ten-foot trails are planned on both sides of Route 1.

Mr. Roberts asked whether those would be available and desirable to bicyclists.

Mr. Farney said bicycles may use the trails, but that some bicyclists prefer to use the roadway. He said the trails are predominantly parallel to the roadway, but there may be some instances where the trails have to meander a bit to avoid some constraint.

Mr. Roberts asked if the bike lanes would be striped, or if they would be part of a wider outside lane.

Mr. Farney said both options would be considered during design.

Mr. Roberts said the TPB needs to make sure that projects are planned properly before funding is attached to them. He said he would prefer to know more about the design and the rationale behind the design before authorizing funds.

Mr. Farney said that VDOT holds design and location hearings on all projects that are open to the public.

Chair York called for a vote. The motion as amended passed unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

10. Briefing on the Draft Final Report: “What Do People Think About Congestion Pricing? A Deliberative Dialogue with Residents of Metropolitan Washington”

Mr. Swanson of TPB staff presented the findings of the recent study on the public acceptability of congestion pricing, which was funded with a grant under the Federal Highway Administration’s Value Pricing Pilot Program. He explained that the study engaged residents from around the region in a series of five “deliberative forums” to talk about the possibility of using congestion pricing to address some of the region’s biggest transportation problems, namely growing congestion and increasing funding shortfalls. He said that the TPB partnered with the Brookings Institution and the non-profit public engagement organization *AmericaSpeaks* to conduct the forums, and he said the study was intended to complement more than a decade of technical work at the TPB regarding congestion pricing by exploring what many see as one of the main obstacles to implementing such a scheme: public opposition.

Mr. Swanson reported that the study engaged more than 300 paid participants at five forums held throughout the region – two in Maryland, two in Virginia, and one in the District of Columbia. He said the participants were broadly representative of the region’s population. During the forums, he said, participants engaged in small-group discussions with fellow residents about three different congestion pricing proposals, that participants’ comments were recorded on laptop computers and fed to a “theme team” that synthesized the main conversation points in real-time, and that participants recorded their opinions via electronic keypad voting throughout the course of the four-and-a-half hour forums. He explained that participants were briefed on the transportation problems currently facing the region – including congestion and the extent of funding shortfalls, and how those were expected to worsen in the future – and three congestion pricing scenarios that could at least partially address those growing challenges: 1) priced lanes on all major highways in the region; 2) pricing on all streets and roads using in-vehicle GPS systems to calculate total fees owed; and 3) priced zones in central business districts like downtown Washington or Tysons Corner.

The findings, Mr. Swanson reported, were separated into four main categories: how people saw the region’s transportation problems; their reactions to each of the three scenarios; the factors

that were most important to people; and how people's opinions changed over the course of the forums.

Mr. Swanson said that congestion resonated more as a critical problem than funding shortfalls did and that people spoke about congestion in much more personal terms than they did funding. He said people were generally unaware that gas taxes at the federal level and in Maryland and Virginia haven't been raised in 20 years and aren't indexed to inflation, and he said that close to 40 percent of participants lacked confidence in the government to make transportation improvements even if it had more money.

Regarding the three scenarios, Mr. Swanson said that the first scenario – priced lanes on all major highways – garnered 60 percent support, more than either of the other scenarios. He said people were cautiously open to it because it provided an option not to be tolled and presented an opportunity for high-quality transit service on the tolled lanes, which would be free-flowing at all times due to tolling that would vary based on demand. The second scenario – the GPS-based mileage fee – provoked negative reactions, Mr. Swanson reported. Participants cited major concerns about privacy and government overreach as well as a level of complication that would both add new burdens to their daily lives and make the scenario impossible to implement and enforce. They also expressed a significant degree of skepticism about eliminating the gas tax in favor of such a mileage fee, he said, which had been presented as a “selling point” for the scenario. Finally, the third scenario – priced zones – garnered more support than opposition because it seemed logical and straightforward, but many participants didn't see it as a true regional solution. Overall, participants expressed doubt that any congestion pricing could actually work since most people drive because they have to, not because they want to. They said that pricing drivers who have no other option but to drive would amount to gouging.

Of the key factors that participants talked about during the forums, Mr. Swanson said that “choice” was the most important: people wanted opportunities to avoid paying new charges, whether in the form of non-tolled lanes or alternatives like transit. He said privacy was also an important factor, as was how revenues would be used. He said that people wanted additional transparency and accountability before they would be willing to support new revenue-raising schemes, and he said that fairness was not an especially important factor for people.

At the end of the forums, Mr. Swanson said, more people saw funding shortfalls as a critical problem facing the region than did at the beginning of the forums. And support for raising gas taxes nearly tripled after people learned that in most cases gas taxes haven't gone up in 20 years or more and aren't indexed to inflation, and after they considered congestion pricing alternatives.

Overall, the findings point to a need to define for the public what they stand to gain from any congestion pricing proposal, especially because they doubt the effectiveness of congestion pricing in actually reducing congestion, Mr. Swanson said. People want more control in their lives, not less, and more options, not fewer. Fairness wasn't as much of a concern as lack of confidence in the public sector was, and people favor more familiar solutions like raising gas taxes over more complicated ones like pricing. Finally, people want to know that congestion pricing is part of a wider strategic vision – that it isn't the only “solution” planners and decision-

makers are considering.

Mr. Swanson turned the floor over to Alice Rivlin, of the Brookings Institution, who offered her thoughts on the study and its findings. She told Board members that she learned a lot from the report, not only about people's attitudes about congestion pricing but about using deliberative forums to learn about people's attitudes. The two most startling findings, she said, were the depth of the public's skepticism about the government's ability to solve transportation problems and the public's concerns about privacy in light of all the ways the public has already surrendered its privacy in the era of mobile phones. She called for more exploration of public attitudes toward pricing so that leaders can develop proposals the public would actually support.

Chair York thanked Mr. Swanson and Ms. Rivlin for their presentations. He said that the report's conclusion echoes that of many local officials: that raising gas taxes is the easiest and surest way to increase funding for transportation in the short-term.

Chair York then opened the floor to questions and comments from Board members.

Mr. Zimmerman echoed Chair York's comments regarding the need to raise the gas tax in Virginia rather than eliminating it, as has been proposed by the Governor. He then asked Mr. Swanson about the wording of the poll question asked of participants regarding their level of confidence in the government. He said that how one asks the question can significantly affect the responses to the question. He expressed concern that because the question asked, "If the *government* had more money," that people reacted negatively to the question because they have been "indoctrinated" to dislike anything related to the "government." He also said that there appeared to him to be an "overwhelming understanding" on the part of the public that insufficient funding is a major problem facing the region.

Mr. Snyder raised two points. The first was that some of the report's findings are different than what the Board had expected when it authorized this study under his chairmanship two years ago, especially the acceptance of raising gas taxes after people learned more about the tax, its current level, and that it hasn't been raised in 20 years. His second point was the study demonstrates that people want to see the government take care of "first things first," like better management and operations of existing roads and transit, before their trust in government will be restored.

Mr. Zimbabwe said he thought it was really important to emphasize to people what tangible benefits they might see as a result of a particular scheme. He said he wasn't surprised that the first scenario – priced lanes on all major highways – got the most support, since it was the only scenario that laid out specific outcomes, in the form of a network of bus rapid transit, that people would see as a result of the new pricing scheme. He suggested conducting a similar follow-up exercise in which the tangible benefits of the different scenarios was made more specific.

Ms. Rivlin affirmed Mr. Zimbabwe's point, saying that it's very important for people to see what they might get out of paying more to use roads.

Mr. Swanson said that the replacement of the gas tax in the second scenario was intended to be the “tangible benefit” for drivers, but that participants weren’t very interested in eliminating gas taxes.

Mr. Elrich emphasized the need for alternatives in any pricing scheme, since pricing only works if people have other routes or modes to use, or can travel at other times, in order to reduce demand at peak times on heavily-traveled routes. He said the region needs to do more to provide such alternatives if congestion pricing is ever to be a real option, and he said public agencies need to do a better job of being accountable for how they use people’s money. As an example, he questioned why toll roads like the 495 Express Lanes on the Capital Beltway in Virginia have been turned over to private companies if there is money to be made by running them. He also recommended discussing parking policy as an alternative to pricing proposals as a way to achieve congestion-reduction outcomes.

Chair York thanked Board members for their comments.

11. Briefing on Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2013 CLRP and the FY 2013-2018 TIP

Mr. Austin provided a summary of the call for projects for the 2103 update to the CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP. He said TPB staff compiled the project information and released it for public comment on January 17. He then provided a presentation on the regionally significant additions and changes to the documents. He said there are two project groupings in the District of Columbia, ten new projects or changes to existing projects and one new study in Virginia, and no new significant projects in Maryland. He reviewed the details for these projects.

Chair York noted that as Mr. Austin was reviewing the two options for access to Dulles International Airport, he incorrectly referred to North Star Boulevard, or Belmont Ridge Road realigned, as the “Tri-County Connector.”

Mr. Austin said he would work with VDOT to correctly identify that facility (VA 606). He continued to summarize the schedule of the CLRP and TIP updates. He said the public comment period will close on February 16. He said the TPB will be asked to approve the project inputs for the air quality conformity analysis at the February 20 TPB meeting. He said staff will conduct modeling work and release the draft 2013 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP on June 13 for a 30-day public comment period. He said the TPB will be briefed on the draft at its June 19 meeting and asked to approve the CLRP, TIP amendments, and air quality conformity assessment at the July 17 meeting.

Mr. Zimmerman asked why projects four and five do not have cost information.

Mr. Austin said staff does not yet have that information from VDOT and will work with VDOT representatives to determine the changes in the project cost.

Mr. Zimmerman confirmed that the TPB will be informed of the costs for those projects before being asked to approve the documents.

Mr. Austin said that is correct.

12. Briefing on Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2013 CLRP and the FY 2013-2018 TIP

Ms. Posey reviewed a memorandum containing the draft scope of work for the air quality conformity assessment, and highlighted several items, including a summary of the technical approach. She said that this year, staff will use a new round of cooperative forecasts, Round 8.2, as well as the new MOVES 2010a model for the emissions analysis. She said staff has been working with the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) on the fine particles maintenance SIP. She said the budgets are out for public comment and that if they are approved before the TPB finished the CLRP and TIP update cycle, staff will be required to adhere to those budgets. She said staff is prepared to move forward with either outcome. She summarized the years of analysis for the assessment and noted that the schedule is the same as Mr. Austin provided in the previous item.

Mr. Kannan said he reviewed the technical document that accompanied the memorandum and he is concerned that if the regional transit mode share is fixed over time and is a significant driver of air quality emissions standards, the analysis is not benefitted by any of the scenarios which should be taken into account regarding changes in the transit mode share. He asked how staff would be able to provide a more refined model that takes into account scenario sensitivity.

Ms. Posey confirmed that Mr. Kannan was referring to the conformity analysis previously completed. She explained that mode share related to this process is an output of all the transit inputs for future projects and the current transit and highway system. She said that, once the outputs are run through the travel demand model, the analysis shows the transit trips associated with the region's land use, which provides mode share estimates into the future.

Mr. Kannan said he believes the mode share estimates are incorrect. He said that if mode share is an output, he questions the validity of the analysis because the analysis assumes estimates that do not reflect what is actually occurring on the ground.

Mr. Kirby said the model has been validated against current counts and it is currently being validated against 2012, so it does reflect all of the information in question. He said a 24 percent mode share, constant through time, does involve a 28 percent increase in transit ridership, which is substantial given the rail capacity in the CLRP.

Mr. Kannan said he recognizes that, but is suggesting that if an acceleration of mode share is observed, the TPB owes it to itself to conduct sensitivity testing and show a scenario where the accelerated trend continues, rather than remaining at the present level.

Ms. Posey said this process includes a transit constraint out into the future. She added that the TPB does not conduct scenarios related to mode share for this process, as this is a specific air quality conformity process that is designed to meet federal requirements.

13. Review of Outline and Preliminary Budget for the FY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

This item was deferred to the February TPB agenda.

14. Update on TPB Bus on Shoulder Task Force Meeting

This item was deferred to the February TPB agenda.

15. Other Business

Mr. Mendelson asked that the TPB receive presentations on three items over the course of the next several meetings: an update on MATOC, a presentation on synchronization of traffic signals in the region, and a report on the Next Bus technology that WMATA has discontinued.

Chair York said those items would be added on the next several agendas.

Mr. Kannan clarified that Next Bus is not a technology that is provided by WMATA. He said it is a third party application that uses Metro-provided data. He said any third party application provider is welcome to use the data and provide the service. He said that particular provider has legal issues that are not within WMATA's control.

Mr. Mendelson said he did not intend to open the issue now, and modified his request to get a general report on Next Bus and other technologies and efforts on how WMATA is encouraging bus ridership.

Mr. Kannan said WMATA can certainly provide that information.

Chair York said that item will be put on the February agenda and the other two items will either be heard in February or March.

Mr. Turner referred to the action the TPB took in December to send letters to Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. He said there is some movement in Maryland on advocating the tenets of that letter.

16. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:03 p.m.