

## REPORT

### TPB Citizens Advisory Committee December 15, 2004 Dennis Jaffe, CAC Chair

The CAC held two outreach meetings on December 7 and 8, along with its regular monthly meeting on December 9.

#### **Outreach Meetings: “What if the Washington Region Grew Differently?” *December 7 and 8***

This month, the CAC began a series of outreach meetings based on the scenarios and findings of the TPB’s Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. The committee plans to continue these meetings into 2005.

Two meetings were held on consecutive days:

- Tuesday, December 7, 12:00–1:30 pm, Fair Lakes, Virginia.
- Wednesday, December 8, 7:30-9:00 pm, Gaithersburg, Maryland.

#### ***Format and Organization of Outreach Meetings***

Both meetings began with a 20-minute briefing, which was developed by TPB staff and presented by staff member John Swanson. The presentation was designed to be a non-technical overview of land use and transportation challenges that the region faces, and is intended to spark discussion about whether or not various scenarios can be expected to begin addressing these challenges.

The format and attendance for each meeting was different and provided an interesting contrast. The Fair Lakes meeting, which was organized by CAC member Bob Chase, was essentially an informal lunchtime gathering of business professionals, including a large number of developers. The Gaithersburg meeting was moderated by TPB Vice Chair Michael Knapp and was broadly publicized. Participants included many familiar faces from regional and local planning activities.

In recent years, committee members have expressed the desire to host different types of outreach, and these two meetings provide potential models for future forums.

#### ***Feedback***

Many of the key issues underlying the study seemed to resonate with participants. In particular, the jobs/housing imbalance and the need for higher densities around transit were two topics that elicited extensive discussion.

However, based on the feedback received, CAC members suggested that the presentation needs to be somewhat simplified before it is taken out again. A couple key points are worth reexamining as part of the process of refining the presentation:

- ***People are interested in local impacts.*** Participants said they want to know what the land use densities examined in the study would actually mean in tangible ways. Can we show illustrative pictures of higher density developments in activity centers? Can we provide focused analysis of how the study's scenarios might affect specific locations—such as Tysons Corner? These kinds of questions will be considered for future refinements to the presentation. A CAC member suggested the COG Planning Directors Technical Committee might provide input on how to illustrate the densities proposed under various scenarios.
- ***How will/can the study be used?*** This question came up a number of times in different direct and indirect ways: Participants asked how the study results will feed into the TPB's official planning process. Others asked how this study of alternative scenarios is different from the "Getting There" public involvement process in mid-90s. (Some citizens still have negative feelings about that experience.) Others asked if, as a follow-on step, the TPB will consider whether aspects of the scenarios should be implemented. The posing of these question highlighted the need to further delineate answers as to the purpose of the study.

In some cases, participants will provide their own ideas about how the study should be used. For example, some participants suggested it can help convince elected officials that the region is not building enough housing or that higher densities near transit is a good idea.

At the beginning of next year, the CAC will determine how many additional meetings will be held in this series. Based on all the feedback received at all the meetings, the CAC will develop a report for the TPB. At least one CAC member has suggested the committee should not schedule too many more of these forums before the transportation scenarios are added to the study.

### **CAC Monthly Meeting, December 9**

In addition to discussing the outreach meetings, described above, the CAC discussed a number of other issues at its regular monthly meeting on Thursday, December 9.

#### ***Travel Characteristics of Minority and Disabled People***

Wendy Klancher of the TPB staff briefed the committee on an analysis of 2000 Census data that looked at how minority communities and disabled people use the region's transportation system. Ms. Klancher will present this analysis to the TPB on December 15.

CAC member questions and comments included the following:

- ***What is the purpose of this analysis? Is it intended to meet a federal requirement?*** Ms. Klancher replied that the Access for All Advisory Committee requested the analysis. She said that, in part, this analysis is designed to meet federal environmental justice requirements.
- ***The Census data is already old.*** A member noted that housing values, among other things, have changed dramatically in that past few years, which will affect the travel patterns recorded by the Census.
- ***How does this Census analysis relate to the TPB's "Accessibility Analysis"?*** Ms. Klancher said the Census analysis simply looked at travel behaviors of minority communities and disabled persons for 2000. It does not provide a comparative analysis. She explained that the TPB's Accessibility Analysis specifically looks at the TPB's Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and assesses how accessibility to jobs will increase or decrease for various parts of the region under the plan. She said that a new accessibility analysis for the 2004 CLRP is now being conducted.

Regarding the Accessibility Analysis, a participant said that it is important to remember that when comparing the present with the future, current levels of accessibility should be taken into account. He said that current conditions could be so bad that an "improvement" might still leave some communities with poor accessibility to jobs.

### ***2005 Solicitation Document***

Ms. Klancher briefly described the 2005 Solicitation Document, which lays out the process for transportation agencies to use when submitting projects for inclusion in the next round of CLRP amendments. She drew attention to an analysis provided in the document describing how the current CLRP—the 2004 plan as amended in November—would perform when measured against some goals and objectives stated in the TPB Vision.

Ms. Klancher noted that CAC members earlier this year had requested that staff provide decision makers and the public with more analysis during earlier stages of the CLRP development process. She said that the analysis in the Solicitation Document was an attempt to provide that kind of information.

The CAC members welcomed this analysis. As a further suggestion, a member said it would be helpful not just to see an analysis of the past year's CLRP, but also to see analysis of how the proposed CLRP, including proposed amendments, would perform.

### ***End-of-Year Report***

The committee reviewed the end-of-year report, which will be distributed separately.

### ***Other Business and Future Agenda Items***

***Emergency Preparedness.*** CAC Chair Dennis Jaffe and others expressed continuing concern that emergency management agencies would not be included on the “enhanced CapWIN” (Capital Wireless Integrated Network) agency that will be designated to oversee regional coordination and communication for transportation incidents. The committee agreed to seek clarification of how this coordinating function will be established and which agencies will be included. Mr. Kirby said the CAC should be provided with a list of representatives on CapWIN, as well as on the Emergency Preparedness Council.

***Proposal to Change CAC Appointment Process.*** Bob Chase suggested that the TPB’s Public Involvement Process should be amended to make all 15 members of the CAC appointed directly by the TPB. Under the current system, six members are elected by the previous year’s CAC. Mr. Chase said a fully appointed CAC would increase credibility and improve representativeness. The committee agreed to bring this issue back at a future meeting for full discussion.

***Can the CAC Promote the TPB’s Use of Public Comment?*** A CAC member said that despite the improvements this year in the COG/TPB website, the TPB did not pay substantial attention to public comments during the CLRP decision making process. He suggested that at a future meeting the CAC should discuss possible ways to increase the attention the TPB gives to public comment.

***Metro Funding/Accountability.*** CAC members in future meetings will examine recent efforts to increase funding and improve accountability for Metro.

**ATTENDANCE**  
**CAC Meeting, December 9, 2004**

**Members in Attendance**

1. Dennis Jaffe, Chair, DC
2. Steve Caflisch, MD
3. Steve Cerny, VA
4. Bob Chase, VA
5. Don Edwards, DC
6. Harold Foster, DC
7. Allen Muchnick, Vice Chair, VA
8. Lee Schoenecker, DC
9. Stewart Schwartz, VA
10. Emmet Tydings, Vice Chair, MD
11. Merle Van Horne, DC

**Members Not in Attendance**

1. Ephrem Asebe, MD
2. Nathaniel Bryant, MD
3. Mark Friis, MD
4. Michael Lajuene, VA

**Staff/Others**

Ron Kirby, COG/DTP  
Wendy Klancher, COG/DTP  
John Swanson, COG/DTP  
Julie Rusczyk, VDOT  
Harry Sanders  
Alexander Radichevich

**CAC ATTENDANCE AT OUTREACH MEETINGS**

**December 7, Fair Lakes, Virginia**

Bob Chase, VA  
Mark Friis, MD  
Lee Schoenecker, DC  
Stewart Schwartz, VA

**December 8, Gaithersburg, Maryland**

Mark Friis, MD  
Lee Schoenecker, DC  
Stewart Schwartz, VA  
Emmet Tydings, MD