

REPORT

TPB Citizens Advisory Committee

June 18, 2008

Larry Martin, CAC Chairman

The normal business meeting of the CAC on June 12 focused on discussion of the May 15 Public Forum on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), a staff update on the TPB's Scenario Study, and discussion on the TPB's Participation Program for FY 2009.

Debriefing on the May 15 Public Forum on the TIP

Andrew Austin of TPB staff held a dialogue with the CAC to discuss ways to improve future TIP forums. He said that TPB staff made changes to the format of the May 15 TIP Forum based on lessons learned at the October 11, 2007, forum. He said staff plans to develop a new format for the TIP forums that will provide two opportunities for public comment. The September TIP Forum will serve a different function than the May 15 TIP Forum because it will be held at the beginning of the TIP cycle. He said that holding the forum at this point in the TIP cycle will give the public a better opportunity to weigh in on project selection before the agencies submit their projects to the TPB for air quality conformity analysis for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP. He added that the TPB will subsequently hold a second TIP forum in Spring 2009 that will coincide with the public comment period for the FY 2010-2015 TIP to give the public an opportunity to review the TIP and ask questions.

The CAC had a number of comments and suggested improvements for future TIP forums:

- Members expressed surprise at the low turnout for the event and suggested opportunities to advertise the TIP forum.
- The CAC asked if staff could improve the packaging/marketing of the TIP so that it is easier for the general public to relate to the immense amount of information conveyed in the document, and easier to attract media attention so that the information can be more widely disseminated. Mr. Austin said plans were in the works to improve the marketing of the TIP as an implementation tool.
- A member noted that the TIP contains mostly road projects and objected to the absence of adequate rail projects in the TIP.
- A member expressed concern that a project that is still in the TIP has been taken out of the D.C. Comprehensive Plan. She suggested the TPB might establish a process to cross-check the TIP with local transportation and comprehensive plans.

The CAC approved a motion recommending that the TPB require implementing agencies to submit evidence that projects submitted for the TIP are consistent with state or local

transportation plans and/or local land use plans. The CAC agreed that it should be incumbent upon the submitting agency to demonstrate this consistency.

The FY 2009-2014 TIP was released for the official 30-day public comment period at the CAC meeting.

Update on the TPB's Scenario Study

Monica Bansal of TPB staff presented to the Committee an update on the activities of the TPB Scenario Study Task Force, including further details about the process of developing and analyzing two new scenarios. She described the "CLRP Aspirations" scenario as designed to provide input to the development of the 2010 CLRP through the identification of land use strategies and transportation projects that should be regional priorities based on their performance in scenario analysis. This scenario would not simply include a wish list of projects but would explore land use shifts and transportation projects that are "within reason" in terms of economic and political feasibility, building off of previous scenario work.

Ms. Bansal also detailed the second scenario activity, the "What Would It Take?" scenario. She described it as an exercise that will work backward from a goal, namely, a CO₂ mobile-source emissions reduction goal, and see what interventions would be necessary to meet that goal in the region. Possibilities to be explored include increasing vehicle fuel efficiency, decreasing the carbon intensity of vehicle fuels, and reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT). This scenario exercise would look at what combinations of interventions would reach the goal and which among those combinations are the most feasible and cost-effective.

CAC members asked about the timeline for the next stages of the Scenario Study, questioning why the planned public input phase would occur after development and analysis of the scenarios rather than before or during. Ms. Bansal and Mr. Kirby noted that the Scenario Study is just coming out of a phase of extensive public involvement regarding the initial five scenarios, and feedback from that outreach will inform the development and analysis of the new scenarios. The later phase of public input would be focused on presenting the new scenarios and results, and getting feedback on those.

In addition, Committee members asked about how results from trying different combinations of interventions in the "What Would It Take?" scenario exercise could be communicated effectively, and if those results would still include traditional transportation indicators of VMT and congestion as well as CO₂ emissions. The Committee reviewed and approved unanimously a draft recommendation proposed by Mr. Martin that would press the Task Force and staff to ensure that such indicators are analyzed. While Mr. Kirby said that the intent has been to make sure the analysis yields such results, CAC members indicated that this had not been made clear during the Task Force's discussions. Mr. Kirby and Ms. Bansal said that they would do more to better elucidate the intent of the exercise and appreciated the CAC recommendation.

Discussion Regarding the TPB's Participation Program for FY 2009

John Swanson of TPB staff reviewed the proposed Participation Program for FY 2009. He said that the TPB's Participation Plan recommends that staff develop an annual Participation Program. He said the program is an internal document that provides an outline for staff activities for FY 2009, and is structured in the same manner as the Participation Plan. He asked if the CAC had any comments or suggestions for staff activities.

Generally, the CAC looked favorably on the proposed FY 2009 Participation Program and had the following comments:

- Members suggested that staff develop a "Frequently Asked Questions" (FAQs) page on the website that would provide answers to simple, often-asked questions, or direct the public to sites and agencies that could answer common questions.
- A member said there should be greater emphasis placed on developing strategies to support the progression of the three segments of the population identified in the TPB's Participation Plan: the interested, informed, and involved publics. This effort would assist interested members of the public to become more informed and the informed public to become more involved.

Other CAC Business

- Mr. Swanson of TPB staff reported that an intern will be starting on June 16 to assist public involvement staff for the summer. He said staff is currently managing 11 projects for the Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program, and will brief the CAC in the future about the progress of this program.
- Ron Kirby, Director of Transportation Planning, provided an overview of items on the June 18 TPB Agenda, and addressed some CAC members' questions regarding Item 8 – Approval of Projects for Funding Under the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom Programs of the Federal Transit Administration. Members also welcomed learning more about the Cost-Benefit Analysis framework for assessing transit investment that is the subject of Item 10.

ATTENDANCE
CAC Meeting, June 12, 2008

Members in Attendance

1. Larry Martin, DC, Chair
2. Harold Foster, DC
3. Bill Klenke, MD
4. Grace Malakoff, DC
5. Dan Malouff, VA
6. Robin Marlin, DC
7. Todd Reitzel, 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. Allen Muchnick, VA
4. Suresh Narasimhan, VA
5. Daphne Sahlin, VA
6. Lynn Shanton, MD

Staff/Others

Ron Kirby, COG/TPB
Andrew Austin, COG/TPB
Monica Bansal, COG/TPB
Sarah Crawford, COG/TPB
Darren Smith, COG/TPB
John Swanson, COG/TPB
Bill Orleans

**Resolution of the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Transportation Planning Board:
CLRP Consistency with State and Local Planning Efforts**

The CAC expresses concern that projects submitted for inclusion in the CLRP may not always be consistent with current state or local transportation plans and/or local land-use plans.

Specifically, the CAC:

1. Recommends that the TPB ask the implementing agencies to clearly explain at the time of project submission how a project is consistent with state or local transportation plans and/or local land-use plans.
2. Believes that it should be incumbent on the implementing agency to demonstrate this consistency through specific references to relevant state and local plans.

Approved by the CAC by unanimous vote, June 12, 2008

**Resolution of the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Transportation Planning
Board's Scenario Study Task Force:
Supporting the Analysis of Transportation Indicators for the "What Would It
Take?" Scenario**

The CAC expressed concern that results from the analysis of the "What Would It Take?" Scenario would focus exclusively on CO₂ emissions and not include traditional transportation indicators.

Specifically, the CAC:

1. Recommends that the results from trying different combinations of interventions in the "What Would It Take?" Scenario include traditional transportation indicators of VMT and congestion in addition to the CO₂ emissions.

Approved by the CAC by unanimous vote, June 12, 2008