

**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 15, 2008**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County  
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County  
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA  
Robert Catlin, City of College Park  
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County  
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT  
Lyn Erickson, MDOT  
Jason Groth, Charles County  
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Sandra Jackson, FHWA  
Charles Jenkins, Frederick County  
Julia Koster, NCPC  
Timothy Lovain, Alexandria City Council  
Phil Mendelson, DC Council  
Colleen Mitchell, DC Office of Planning  
Mark Rawlings, DDOT  
Rick Rybeck, DDOT  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park  
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT  
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate  
Margaret Vanderhye, Virginia House of Delegates  
Lori Waters, Loudoun County Board of Supervisors  
Jonathan Way, City of Manassas  
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County  
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force  
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park  
Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park  
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

---

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	
Michael Clifford	
Jim Hogan	
Bob Griffiths	
Andrew Meese	
Michael Farrell	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Andrew Austin	
Michael Eichler	
Sarah Crawford	
Monica Bansal	
Darren Smith	
Rex Hodgson	
Tim Canan	
Mark Moran	
Dusan Vuksan	
Greg Goodwin	COG/HSPPS
Bill Orleans	PG ACT
Bob Owolabi	Fairfax County DOT
Tom Biesiadny	Fairfax County DOT
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Matt Moskitis	NVTA
Anthony Foster	PRTC
L'Kiesha Markley	SHA
Harry Sanders	Purple Line NOW
Kimani Choi	MDOT
Angelica Betts	PWC/BOCS Aide
Al Francese	Centreville Citizens for Rail
Mike Hackett	MWAA

---

## **1. Public Comment**

No comments were made during the public comment period.

## **2. Approval of the Minutes of September 17, 2008**

Ms. Smyth moved to approve the minutes and Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

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

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Rawlings said the Technical Committee met on October 3. The following items were reviewed for inclusion in the TPB agenda:

- Under TPB Agenda Item 7, the committee was briefed on the call for projects document for the 2009 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as well as the schedule for the air quality conformity assessment and a briefing on the revisions to the CMP documentation portion of the CLRP project description form. The Technical Committee recommended that the TPB approve this document.
- Under TPB Agenda Item 8, the committee was briefed on the status of the Transportation/Land Use Connections Program and the proposed changes to the TLC project application and selection process for the FY 2009 program year. The committee provided comments on the proposed changes, and recommended that the TPB release the call for TLC project applications for FY 2009, with an application deadline of December 19.
- Under TPB Agenda Item 10, the committee was briefed on the projects in the draft 2008 CLRP, the amendments to the FY 2009-2014 TIP with NVTA-funded projects delayed or removed, and the associated air quality conformity assessment. The committee recommended that the draft plan, the TIP, and the conformity assessment be released for public comment at the TPB's Citizens Advisory Committee meeting that was held on October 9.
- Under TPB Agenda Item 11, the committee was briefed on the Street Smart pedestrian and bicycle safety campaign.
- Under TPB Agenda Item 12, staff briefed the committee on the California measure SB375, which would require that transportation plans developed by Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in California include strategies designed to achieve certain goals for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light trucks.
- Under TPB Agenda Item 13, the committee was updated on the development of the "CLRP Aspirations" and "What Would It Take" scenarios.

---

The Technical Committee also reviewed two items not on the TPB agenda:

- The survey methodology and the quantity and quality of the travel data which was recently obtained from approximately 11,500 randomly selected households.
- An updated list of priority regional bicycle and pedestrian projects recommended for consideration in the FY 2010-2015 TIP by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee of the TPB Technical Committee.

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

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Martin spoke about the CAC meeting on October 9. He said the committee received briefings on the list of priority bicycle and pedestrian projects developed by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee. He said the CAC members voted to endorse the list and the committee called upon the TPB to work to get those projects included in the next TIP. Mr. Martin said the CAC also received an update on the Street Smart program. He said the CAC supports the program, but also encourages the TPB to work more closely to tie the program to concrete results in terms of improved pedestrian and bicycle safety.

Mr. Martin said the CAC received a briefing by staff on policy principles related to reauthorization of the federal transportation legislation. The committee extensively discussed the upcoming legislation.

Mr. Martin said that the committee also discussed the possibility of holding CAC meetings outside the COG offices, which was requested by some members of the CAC as well as by TPB Vice Chairman Jenkins. He said that the committee discussed the difficulty in finding suitable, transit-accessible locations in outer jurisdictions, but discussed possibilities for remote participation, such as teleconferencing or video-conferencing. More broadly, the committee talked about how to best fulfill the dual roles of the CAC of providing input on complex process issues at the TPB and also looking to engage the public in broader involvement in regional discussions. He said this issue will be discussed further at the CAC's November meeting. Finally, Mr. Martin announced that staff has begun to accept applications for the 2009 CAC.

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

Referring to the mailout packet, Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on October 3 and approved two resolutions. One was an amendment to the FY 2009-14 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to include funding for preserving one bridge in Frederick County and two bridges in Prince George's County, as requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation. The second was an amendment to the TPB's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to change the narrative under the bicycle and pedestrian task to recognize that we are developing a GIS system update to enhance regional bicycle route-finding in the region.

---

Chairman Mendelson reminded the members that these amendments approved by the Steering Committee were essentially being approved by the TPB by unanimous consent.

Referring to the letters packet, Mr. Kirby called attention to a letter from Christopher Zimmerman in his role as chairman of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority expressing appreciation for the TPB staff's support of the NVTA's activities.

Mr. Kirby also called attention to the final versions of two actions the Board took in September: 1) A letter to Chairman Knapp of the COG Board, providing comments on the report of the COG Climate Change Steering Committee. 2) The final version of the resolution on policy principles for the new federal transportation authorization cycle, as approved by the Board last month.

Finally, Mr. Kirby called attention to press releases and a copy of the bill that Congress passed, HR2095, authorizing capital and preventive maintenance funding for WMATA.

Mr. Kirby brought an additional item to the Board's attention: the solicitation notice from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for new grants under its value-pricing pilot program. Mr. Kirby said the solicitation documents indicate that FHWA is putting more of its resources into advanced planning to try to get some value projects moving forward. He noted that the deadline for the grant was November 7, which necessitated Board approval at the October TPB meeting. Referring to his memorandum, Mr. Kirby said the grant application would request federal support for continuation of scenario study analysis that had already been started under a previous federal grant. He said the application would ask for a \$400,000.00 grant for a one-year period. A 20-percent match would be required, which would be provided from COG local dues funding.

Ms. Ticer moved to approve the grant application, and Ms. Smyth seconded the motion.

Ms. Waters asked where the 20-percent match would come from.

Mr. Kirby said it would come from COG funds. He said a reserve fund is maintained for purposes like this.

Ms. Waters suggested that in this time of tightening budgets it might not be a good decision to use the reserve funds for this purpose. She noted that new funding for the TLC program would be discussed later on the agenda. She suggested that perhaps the matching funds should be taken from the TLC program instead of from the reserve.

Mr. Kirby said that if the Board is not interested in this grant, then the application should be put aside. He recommended that funding should not be taken from the TLC program, which he said is highly successful and should be considered a higher priority. He noted that the COG Board would have to be consulted regarding the match.

Ms. Waters said that if Mr. Kirby believed this grant was not a high enough priority, then it should be passed by. But if it is a priority, then the money should be shifted around and the

---

reserve should not be touched.

Mr. Kirby said he believed the grant program was an opportunity rather than a priority. He said he believed the main question was whether it would be worth committing reserve money from COG to leverage this additional federal funding.

Mr. Jenkins asked if there was any reason that VDOT could not provide the 20 percent match.

Mr. Kirby noted that the project would be a regional study and would not be limited to Virginia. He said that VDOT would be the agency to submit the grant only because a state must formally submit the application.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the 20-percent match for a grant of \$400,000 would be \$80,000.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for a clarification of who the applicant would be.

Mr. Kirby said that VDOT would be the applicant on behalf of the TPB.

Mr. Zimmerman asked why it would be VDOT and not MDOT or DDOT.

Mr. Kirby said that VDOT performed this role for the last grant received under this program and it would be easier to continue that relationship. He noted that DDOT was submitting their own application under this program.

Mr. Zimmerman said he was seeking clarification as to whether VDOT is just serving as a conduit for funding or if the project would actually involve Virginia more than the District and Maryland.

Mr. Kirby said that VDOT is simply a conduit.

Mr. Zimmerman said this provided an answer as to why Virginia should not be asked to put up the match. He said Ms. Waters' concerns about dipping into the reserve were valid. He said he did not support taking money from the TLC Program for this grant proposal, but he noted that was not the only choice that would be available.

Mr. Rybeck asked how large the reserve fund is.

Mr. Kirby said he did not know the exact amount. But he noted that the question of using the reserve fund would be a decision for the COG Board not for the TPB. He said the TPB's role was to determine whether or not to pursue the grant itself.

Mr. Rybeck said that if this is an opportunity to advance an important policy option for the region, then it could be penny-wise and pound-foolish to forgo the opportunity. He encouraged

---

the TPB to support this activity and then allow the COG Board to determine whether the reserve funds are sufficient to allow this to go forward. He noted that the District's application for this program would not be in competition with the TPB application because they fit into different categories.

Ms. Koster asked what the study would do for the region strategically. For example, she asked if it would make the region more competitive for future federal funding.

Mr. Kirby said it would enhance the TPB's ongoing scenario study. That enhancement might lead to a better sense of where priority projects are and lead to projects moving forward into the plan. However, he said there would be no guarantee that such a direct connection would occur.

Mr. Weissberg asked whether this grant would have the effect of advancing the value pricing scenario ahead of other scenarios in TPB scenario study activities, which he said would be a concern.

Mr. Kirby said this concern was raised at the morning meeting of the TPB Scenario Study Task Force. He said that this project would focus additional resources and interest on value pricing strategies, which is the topic that the FHWA would be funding. However, he said that the scenario study is already fairly thoroughly investigating those strategies, so it would not necessarily be a new focus for the scenario work.

Chairman Mendelson said he did not want the TPB to be penny-wise and pound-foolish on this question. He noted that a significant amount of federal funding could be leveraged with these matching funds. He said that concerns about the reserve fund might be a legitimate issue, but it was a decision for the COG Board of Directors, not the TPB. He said he believed the balance in the reserve fund is in the millions of dollars. He said the COG Board could not even consider using the reserve for this grant if the TPB does not ask for it to be considered.

Chairman Mendelson said he wanted to put off this item until the end of the agenda in the hopes that Mr. Robertson or someone from the COG Executive Director's office can speak about the reserve funds.

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

Chairman Mendelson chose not to make remarks at this time.

## **7. Approval of the Final Call for Projects Document for the 2009 Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

---

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Austin said this item was the annual kickoff for the CLRP and TIP update process. He highlighted the update schedule on page 9, noting that the update information for CLRP and TIP projects is due on December 5. In April the final project information for the TIP and CLRP will be due. Final approval is scheduled for July. He noted that this action will initiate the process for next year's TIP and CLRP, even though the TPB has not yet completed the current year's CLRP and TIP.

Treating the item as a unanimous consent item, Chairman Mendelson asked if there were any objections. There were no objections. The Call for Projects document was approved.

### **8. Briefing on the Status of the Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program and Approval for Release of the Call for Project Applications and Revised Selection Process for FY 2009**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Smith briefed the Board on the Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program, including a description of its origins and its current structure, which includes a regional website clearinghouse and technical assistance projects for local jurisdictions. He said 21 technical assistance projects have been implemented to date in 15 different jurisdictions, which were listed in Appendix A of the memorandum included in the mailout packet. He noted that evaluations of the program have been very positive.

Mr. Smith described three key changes that have been proposed for the next round of the program. First, based upon recommendations by the TPB Scenario Study Task Force, the amount of funding committed in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY 2009 will be increased from \$120,000 last year to \$180,000. In addition, Maryland DOT has committed an additional \$80,000 from its technical assistance fund in the UPWP. Second, instead of \$20,000 for each project, a range of funding between \$10,000 and \$60,000 will be offered for technical assistance projects. Third, a selection process will be formalized using a panel of experts and criteria with a scoring system.

Mr. Smith also noted that the TLC Program will be developing regional toolkits to address key regional challenges. In addition, the Scenario Study Task Force has asked staff to identify specific transportation projects and implementation activities that are potentially needed to advance the recommendations that are coming out of these planning studies.

Mr. Smith finished by describing the proposed new application process, the new project selection process and the schedule for the new round of projects. He said the call for projects would be released within the next week with a mid-December deadline. The selection process would take place in January and February and the delivery of the technical assistance would begin in March 2009. He said the TPB was being asked to approve this call for projects for the 2009 technical assistance round, including the revised application form, the formalized project selection concept, criteria and scoring system, and the application and selection timeline.



---

Chairman Mendelson said he would treat this as a unanimous consent item. He asked for questions or objections.

Mr. Zimmerman moved approval of the TLC Program's call for projects and the revised project selection process for FY 2009.

Ms. Waters asked how the program is measuring success.

Mr. Smith said that an extensive evaluation of the pilot round was performed. He noted that it is difficult to measure success this early on, because these are planning studies that often require additional analysis, but in some instances actions are being taken, such as action taken by a city council or funding committed to small capital improvements. He said that no quantifiable method has been identified to measure success, but all the local jurisdictions' responses to the program have been positive. He said that additional information about the evaluations could be provided.

Ms. Waters said that criteria for measuring success should be developed. She said that a key criterion would be whether a jurisdiction actually followed through. She noted that staff had indicated that a positive feature of the program was the fact that it allowed jurisdictions to receive planning assistance that they otherwise might not afford to do, but expressed concern that if jurisdictions do not have funding to perform a study, it might seem illogical for them to actually fund implementation activities. She suggested that the selection process should put a greater weight on project viability and that there should be more emphasis on the question of whether jurisdictions would be able to come up with a funding source for implementation activities based upon the technical assistance.

Mr. Smith noted that Appendix C of the memorandum referred to this point. He noted that it included a question about whether the project will yield clearly defined implementation priorities or next steps. He noted that the impetus for starting this program in the first place was to do projects that were not going to get done otherwise, to identify these kinds of projects as regional priorities and help the TPB as a regional body to encourage implementation of these projects.

Ms. Waters asked why there might be an objection to more specifically asking the question "Do you have funds to follow through with implementation?" in the application and giving the question of implementation greater weight in the criteria. She said she would like to offer this as an amendment if necessary.

Chairman Mendelson said that Ms. Waters would have to be more specific if she was actually moving an amendment.

Ms. Waters said she would like the application to include the question: "Do you have funding available to follow through with implementation of recommendations that may come out of this study? And if so, what are they?" On the weighted scoring, she suggested that the question of funding availability should have an additional 20 percent in addition to the 20 percent for project

---

viability.

Chairman Mendelson asked if there would be any objection to adding a question under Number 2 with language similar to the following: "Do you have funding available to follow through with the recommendations that come out of this project? Explain." The weighting would not change; this question would be addressed under Number 2, which he proposed should be 50 points.

Mr. Zimmerman objected. He noted that this discussion reflected a fundamental difference of opinion about what the TPB ought to be doing and therefore this should not be treated as a unanimous consent matter.

Chairman Mendelson agreed.

Mr. Zimmerman further noted that project viability was being misread. He said he believed the application form was actually asking whether the technical assistance project that was being proposed was viable, not whether implementation could be funded. He said Ms. Waters' question was a fair question, but it was not a fair question to ask on an application form. He said that a "smart person" would answer that question in the affirmative; a naive or honest person might say: "I don't know, I don't have that funding," and they would not get credit. He said that the real answer probably would not be known until the proposed study is actually performed.

Mr. Zimmerman said he believed this program is valuable because it provides a small amount of money for studies linking land use and transportation that might not be done and for communication that might not otherwise happen so that in the long run, decision makers will spend more wisely on projects costing many millions of dollars. He said the cost of the TLC program (\$355,000) contrasted with the total value of the CLRP, which is several billions of dollars per year, is a small investment. He said the TLC Program brings together different decision-makers and fosters local creativity. He said it was important for the TPB as a regional body to facilitate a process like this. He said the program has benefits beyond borders, which was the main reason he supported it. He said the program was intended to provide a sort of venture capital that hopefully will yield big returns in the long run.

Chairman Mendelson asked if there was a second to Mr. Zimmerman's motion to approve the TLC Program's call for projects and the revised project selection process for FY 2009.

The motion was seconded.

Ms. Smyth noted that some potentially valuable projects would not require implementation funding, such as the Fairfax County project "A Look Back at Rezoning Cases to Compare Projected and Actual Transportation Impacts." She said this is the type of analysis that should be encouraged. She said Fairfax County did not have the staff capability to do that study on its own.

Mr. Bottigheimer suggested that instead of asking the question "Do you have funding available," the application might ask "If this is a project requiring funding, what is your strategy for

---

obtaining funding for any recommendations that might emerge from the study."

Ms. Waters said she would agree to that friendly amendment.

Mr. Weissberg suggested that the question might be "If this is project requiring funding/implementation..."

Chairman Mendelson said that implementation was already covered under "b." However, he noted that staff may need to reword the amendment.

Hearing no objection to the revised wording, the amendment was accepted.

Chairman Mendelson repeated that the new question under "2", which would be reworded by staff, would read to the effect that "If this is a project that would require future funding, what is your strategy for obtaining funding to follow through with the recommendations that come out of this project?"

Ms. Vanderhye asked if the additional \$60,000 that would be available for TLC projects would be from within the TPB's budget.

Mr. Smith said it would be.

Ms. Vanderhye asked for an example of what would be included in a TLC toolkit.

Mr. Smith said staff was currently in the process of developing two toolkits. One will look at housing affordability and transportation affordability. The other will compile best practices for bicycle and pedestrian accommodation around transit stations. He said that Reconnecting America, which is the consultant providing overall assistance for the TLC Program, is helping with these toolkits.

Ms. Vanderhye asked if the first toolkit would address the problem that the price of housing near transit is increasing dramatically and yet the people who live near transit stations are the ones who most need it because they have limited income.

Mr. Smith said that this toolkit was designed to address that very challenge. He noted that participants in outreach forums on the scenario study repeatedly raised this concern.

Ms. Vanderhye said this issue is very important to address.

Chairman Mendelson asked if the source of funding for the TLC Program is federal.

Mr. Kirby said the funding comes from the TPB's Unified Planning Work Program, which is 80 percent federal, 10 percent state, 10 percent local.

Chairman Mendelson called for a vote to approve the release of the call for TLC project

---

applications, the revised selection process, and the application form as amended.

The motion was approved unanimously.

## **9. Briefing on a Proposed Metrobus Priority Corridor Network**

Mr. Hamre of WMATA briefed the Board on a proposal under consideration by the WMATA Board of Directors for a regional network of priority bus corridors aimed at improving services in the next five years for Metrobus riders.

Mr. Hamre said the Bus Priority Corridor Plan consists of a network of 24 corridors of high-ridership arterial services. These corridors were selected by evaluating the performance, ridership, and service levels of bus routes, the corridor land use, and the availability of jurisdictional support. The plan will roll out service improvements for three or four additional corridors per year, and should be complete by 2012. Strategies being investigated to provide priority to buses include running-way improvements and intelligent transportation systems and technologies. Running-way improvements could include dedicated bus lanes and queue-jump lanes. Technological strategies could include transit signal priority (TSP). Bus stop improvements, enhanced customer information and redesigned/improved bus services are also to be included along these corridors. Non-WMATA bus services along the selected corridors will also experience performance improvements. The plan also includes the purchase of new buses and the expansion of maintenance and storage facilities. The benefits of the plan include improved customer service, reliability, quality and performance. The plan will also expand the transit market, and help influence development patterns in the region.

Mr. Hamre said the total capital cost of the priority corridor network is projected to be around \$325 million, with approximately half implemented in the Metrobus budget and the remainder being actions that are the responsibility of state and local DOTs.

Mr. Hamre said that in order for this plan to be successful, the TPB and jurisdictions throughout the region will need to pursue policies that would assist WMATA in providing running-way improvements and technological strategies to support bus transit services. He described these policies, which were included in the handout memo.

Mr. Bottigheimer said this presentation was given to the WMATA Board of Directors in May. He said a revised version was scheduled to be presented to the WMATA Board on October 16. He said that WMATA staff would welcome the chance to make this presentation to elected officials and other bodies. He added that a WMATA goal is for other transportation agencies, particularly those that own roads, to begin thinking like transit operators.

Noting the budget problems facing many jurisdictions, Mr. Lovain asked that WMATA involve the local jurisdictions, not just in implementing but helping to fine-tune or develop the plan. Regarding prioritization, he said that some jurisdictions may have other projects that need

---

WMATA's collaboration. As an example, he noted the Kingstown to Pentagon bus that is supposed to be funded as a result of the HOV/HOT lane project.

Mr. Hamre agreed. He said it was important to be strategically prepared for when financial conditions improve. He also noted that given the current economic conditions, it is important to make sure that Metrobus assets are being used to maximum efficiency. Regarding the Kingstown-Pentagon route, he said that corridor has been placed on the "emerging corridor" list. He said WMATA was prepared to work out the details for that project so that it will be ready to be implemented when the funding becomes available and the timing is appropriate.

Ms. Hudgins noted the importance of using services that are already in place or extending the bus system to its fullest capacity to serve the largest part of the community. She said that too much of the region's transit discussion has been around rail, which has its limitations as to how far out it can reach and how much ridership it can bear. She said the bus priority corridor network would help integrate rail and bus services as a complete transit system.

Mr. Elrich said his office has identified approximately 100 miles of road in Montgomery County where he believes bus rapid transit (BRT) could be appropriate. He said this BRT project would match up well with the WMATA priority corridors. He said he was interested in developing a genuine BRT network. He said it was important to get the private sector included in this effort. He said that jurisdictions need to seriously consider putting parking restrictions around places like Metro Policy Areas and Central Business Districts if the region is going to meet CO2 reduction goals that would call for a very large increase in transit ridership.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the table attached to the report included current ridership numbers for the 24 corridors.

Mr Hamre said that yes, those ridership numbers were current.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if it was correct that the corridors at the top of the list had already received enhancements that WMATA staff was proposing to apply to the other priority corridors.

Mr. Hamre said that was correct.

Mr. Zimmerman said these numbers were an indication of why this project should be taken seriously. He said the potential for ridership growth in the corridors at the bottom of the list has already been demonstrated by the growth that has been achieved in the corridors at the top of the list.

Mr. Hamre noted that since enhancements on the Columbia Pike corridor in Arlington, ridership has actually increased almost 50 percent since 2003, if the coordinated Arlington transit is considered as well as the coordinated Metrobus services.

Mr. Zimmerman said that it was important to note that these enhancements will affect local bus

---

services in addition to Metrobus. He emphasized that the program presented by Mr. Hamre represents an opportunity to more efficiently use the assets, both buses and roads, in which the region has invested so much. He described the example of the Columbia Pike improvements, which involved extensive coordination between WMATA and the local bus service to restructure bus lines that had been in place for many years, but were not operating efficiently. He said it would be a mistake to look at the priority corridors network only in terms of the money it will cost. He said in many cases it might actually save money. He said the TPB can play an important role in bringing together the various jurisdictions and agencies that control the roads to work in a coordinated fashion focusing on the goal of moving people, not just vehicles.

#### **10. Briefing on the Draft 2008 CLRP, Amendments to the FY 2009-2014 TIP and Associated Air Quality Conformity Assessment**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said this item reported on the release for public comment of the conformity determination for the 2008 CLRP and the FY 2009-2014 TIP. He said the Board would be asked to approve this at the November meeting. He said the origin of this item goes back to the February 20 meeting, when the Board approved a set of project inputs for this CLRP and TIP. Final approval of the CLRP and TIP was scheduled for July. However, because of the Virginia Supreme Court decision taking away the funding for the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA), the Board approved a FY 2009-2014 TIP in July which excluded projects approved by the TPB in February that were either dependent on NVTA funding or required a new air quality conformity determination. A new air quality conformity analysis has been conducted for the 2008 CLRP and the amended FY 2009-2014 TIP with the NVTA-funded projects delayed or removed, but with all other projects approved by the TPB in February included. Mr. Kirby briefly listed the significant projects to be included in the 2008 CLRP and FY 2009-2014 TIP amendments.

#### **11. Update on the Regional “Street Smart” Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign**

Mr. Farrell gave a PowerPoint presentation that was distributed at the meeting. He summarized overall regional statistics of bicycle and pedestrian safety, and said that the statistics demonstrate the need for the Street Smart program. He reviewed the Street Smart campaign from FY 2008, describing the program budget, advertising content, press events, and coordination with law enforcement, including a pedestrian enforcement workshop held at COG in February 2008 attended by more than 50 police officers. He noted that the budget for the program in FY 2008 represented a significant increase from the previous year’s budget, which allowed for campaigns to be conducted in both November 2007 and March 2008. He also said that concurrent law enforcement increases the effectiveness of the advertising, and the advertising assists police in enforcing the law. He summarized the evaluation of the campaigns, presenting survey results on recognition of campaign messages and perceived changes in motorist, cyclist, and pedestrian

---

behavior. He said that the survey results indicate some short and long-term impact on behavior, and the ability of the program to leverage free media and advertising makes it a good value.

Mr. Farrell described the current funding commitments by state and local agencies for FY 2009, which total \$500,000, and noted that DDOT had given assurances that it would again be contributing \$200,000 to the campaign, adding to that total. He said that the total includes \$121,000 in pledges by local TPB member governments, and that each jurisdiction had again been called upon to pledge five cents per capita.

Mr. Zimmerman asked why the District of Columbia did not appear on the list of local jurisdictions asked to pledge five cents per capita.

Mr. Farrell noted that DDOT has expressed the intent to contribute \$200,000 as it has in the past, and said that the District of Columbia has never been asked to pledge funds as a local jurisdiction.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the issue of how to treat the District of Columbia in terms of the funding request has been raised at the TPB in the past.

Mr. Farrell, continuing his presentation, summarized the historical contributions to the Street Smart program. He said that the funding contributions are expected to be large enough this year that there can again be both fall and spring campaigns. He said that a kickoff event had tentatively been scheduled for November 13, 2008, at a location in Montgomery County. He said that there will also likely be another pedestrian enforcement workshop in February 2009. Chairman Mendelson asked Mr. Rybeck to comment in response to Mr. Zimmerman's earlier question about funding for the program by DDOT and the District of Columbia generally.

Mr. Rybeck said that the District of Columbia's FY 2009 budget was awaiting approval by Congress. He noted that the suggested contribution for local governments would amount to around \$30,000 for the District of Columbia, and that the historical contribution of \$200,000 by DDOT has represented 25% or more of the budget for the Street Smart program. He said that the District of Columbia is probably contributing more than its fair share in support of the program.

Ms. Waters suggested that judges should also be included in pedestrian law enforcement seminars, because enforcement of speed limits in local jurisdictions has been hampered by the fact that judges are not consistently upholding speeding tickets unless the measured speed exceeded the posted speed by more than 10 miles-per-hour. She said that given the significance of only a ten mile-per-hour difference in the impact of automobile-pedestrian collisions, the enforcement of posted speed limits is crucial.

Mr. Jenkins noted that pedestrian and bicyclist fatality and injury statistics seem to have remained fairly constant over the life of the program, despite the resources historically committed to it, and suggested that the program might not be worth the investment in tough budgetary times. He said that he therefore would not be recommending that his jurisdiction

---

contribute to funding the program.

Mr. Zimmerman, responding to Mr. Rybeck's earlier comments, noted that the District of Columbia is both a local and state government. He said that while he is not asserting that the District has or has not contributed its fair share to the program, he thinks the District should be included in the request for contributions by local governments. He said that if the District is only handing over federal money via DDOT, and not making any commitment of local funds, then that would be problematic. He said that while he is not certain that has been true in recent years, it was the case in some past years.

Mr. Zimmerman said that if the program is worth doing, then each jurisdiction needs to contribute a proportional amount, totaling enough that the program can have a significant impact. He said that while Mr. Jenkins raises a good question of whether the program is worth doing, he disagrees with the assertion that the program has been well funded. He said that not enough money has been put into the program to actually have the desired effect, especially as seen in relation to other public awareness campaigns. He said that it is difficult to gauge the effect of the program from year-to-year fatality statistics, and that information about behavior immediately before and after the campaign could better indicate how well the program is working.

Ms. Hudgins said that the program is important not only due to the effect of the media campaign, but also because of the effect of ancillary programs by police departments during the course of the year that help raise awareness. She said that while it is important to figure out how best to measure the effect of the program, it provides a level of awareness and attention that is needed and is a good value.

### *Supplement to Item 5*

Chair Mendelson asked if the COG Executive Director, Mr. Robertson, had arrived at the meeting and could comment on the availability and source of COG funds to supply a match for the possible FHWA grant for further value pricing study.

Ms. Ticer said that consulting with Mr. Robertson was not really necessary because it would ultimately be the COG Board's decision to supply those funds, if the TPB decides that it wants to submit the grant application.

Mr. Kirby informed Chair Mendelson that Mr. Robertson was still not present at the meeting.

Chair Mendelson returned the tabled motion from earlier discussion in Item 5, and moved forward with a vote to approve an application for a \$400,000 grant from FHWA for further value pricing study, with a 20 percent match from COG reserves pending approval by the COG Board of Directors.



---

The motion was passed by voice vote, with two dissenting votes.

**12. Briefing on California Measure SB375 Linking Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reductions to Metropolitan Transportation Planning**

This item was postponed until the November 19 TPB meeting.

**13. Update on the Development of the “CLRP Aspirations” and “What Would It Take?” Scenarios**

This item was postponed until the November 19 TPB meeting.

**14. Other Business**

There was no other business.

**15. Adjournment**

Chair Mendelson adjourned the meeting at 1:57 pm.