

REPORT

TPB Citizens Advisory Committee September 15, 2004 Allen Muchnick, CAC Vice Chair

The TPB's Citizens Advisory Committee met on September 9. CAC Vice Chair Allen Muchnick served as chair. The meeting focused on the CAC's plans to hold public meetings on the TPB's Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. The committee also discussed the document for the 2003 Update to the Constrained Long-Range Plan and the upcoming TPB agenda.

Public Outreach on the TPB's Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study

In May, the CAC decided to hold public meetings this fall focused on issues raised by the TPB's Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. A CAC subcommittee on outreach held a special meeting on August 10 to discuss the first results of the study and how to proceed with organizing the public meetings. A summary of the August 10 meeting is attached to this report.

At the September 9 CAC meeting, John Swanson of the COG/TPB staff presented a draft PowerPoint briefing which staff has developed for use in the public meetings. The presentation is centered on key challenges – such as the jobs/housing imbalance or the “region divided” – that the study's scenarios are intended to address. The presentation was designed to be relatively easy for citizens to understand and should trigger thoughtful discussion.

The draft PowerPoint briefing will be presented and distributed to the TPB under Item 11 of the TPB's September 15 agenda.

Member comments on the draft PowerPoint presentation included the following points:

- ***Very good start.*** Overall, committee members said that the presentation was appropriate for a citizen meeting in terms of style, complexity and length.
- ***Improve the graphics.*** Members said the presentation should be enhanced graphically to make it more visually interesting and “punchy.”
- ***Provide more information.*** Members suggested that more background or context was needed. Another member suggested that absolute numbers should be provided in places where the presentation only used percentages. However, some members cautioned against adding too much additional information which might detract from the presentation's basic messages.

- ***Is the presentation too pessimistic?*** The draft presentation stresses that the problems confronting transportation and land use will be difficult to change, especially in the short term. Some members said that this general message seemed too gloomy. One commenter said that we need to provide hope that real effects can be realized in a 20-year timeframe. However, others emphasized that the presentation does need to caution people to be realistic about what can be achieved and how quickly.
- ***Be clear that ambitious transportation scenarios have not yet been studied.*** A member said the presentation needs to explicitly state that significant transportation alternatives have not yet been analyzed for the study. That will be the next step.
- ***Fix some details.*** Members provided suggestions on details in the presentation, such as word choice or the use of color.
- ***Presentation should end with a set of questions.*** Members agreed to end the presentation with a set of questions that will guide a discussion afterward that will be facilitated by a trained moderator. The basic questions will be:
 - ***What did you think of this presentation?*** Was it clear? What are your gut reactions?
 - ***What do you think of the various scenarios?*** Did some scenarios seem more realistic than others? Do some seem more critical to you or your community?
 - ***What transportation scenarios need to be tested?*** What would your priorities be?

The CAC agreed to pursue four meetings for this fall. If one or two of these meetings cannot be scheduled this year, those events will be planned for early in 2005.

The committee preliminarily agreed to these four venues:

- Dulles Corridor, co-hosted by a business or community association
- Montgomery County, co-hosted with County Councilmember Michael Knapp
- Prince George's County, at the University of Maryland, in partnership with their Center for Smart Growth
- District of Columbia, working with the Office of Planning or National Capital Planning Commission

The CAC agreed that the PowerPoint presentation at the public meetings will be followed by a facilitated discussion. In general, the meetings will loosely follow a focus group-type format. After the series of meetings is completed, the CAC and staff will prepare a report comparing the comments made at the different forums.

Discussion of the Draft Document for the 2003 Constrained Long-Range Plan

Wendy Klancher of the COG/TPB staff presented the draft 175-page document for the 2003 Update to the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP). This document provides detailed analysis of the CLRP, which was approved in December 2003. Ms. Klancher asked the CAC to provide any comments on the document by September 17. The document will be published as a CD as well as in hard copy.

Pursuant to a CAC suggestion a couple years ago regarding the last CLRP document, the TPB staff has developed an executive summary of the 2003 CLRP that will be printed as a citizen-friendly brochure.

Regarding the full draft document, an observer said he wished that more of this type of analysis could be made available to the TPB before they voted on the actual CLRP so that this information might be part of the decision-making process.

Staff responded that typically time is very short between the submittal of projects for the CLRP and the CLRP's approval, and the overwhelming majority of staff time is devoted to air quality analysis. In the event that some limited analysis might be completed prior to the approval of future CLRP updates/amendments, staff asked the CAC to make specific suggestions regarding which type of analysis should given priority.

Staff further noted that when adopting CLRP updates or amendments, decision makers should be encouraged to look at analysis produced for the most recent CLRP. Ms. Klancher suggested that the TPB's Solicitation Document, which lays out the process for transportation agencies to use when submitting projects, could be enhanced to include more analysis of the most recent CLRP.

CAC members said that the CLRP document should promote opportunities for citizen involvement.

Upcoming TPB Agenda

Ron Kirby briefed the committee on upcoming agenda items, including a briefing on the Metro system's funding shortfall, status report on approval of the 2004 CLRP amendments (including air quality conformity), the EPA's new 8-hour standard for air quality conformity, and emergency preparedness coordination.

ATTENDANCE
CAC Meeting, September 9, 2004

Members in Attendance

1. Allen Muchnick, Vice Chair, VA
2. Ephrem Asebe, MD
3. Nathaniel Bryant, MD
4. Steve Caflisch, MD
5. Bob Chase, VA
6. Don Edwards, DC
7. Mark Friis, MD
8. Michael LaJuene, VA
9. Lee Schoenecker, DC
10. Emmet Tydings, Vice Chair, MD
11. Merle Van Horne DC

Members Not in Attendance

1. Dennis Jaffe, Chair, DC
2. Steve Cerny, VA
3. Harold Foster, DC
4. Stewart Schwartz, VA

Staff/Others

Ron Kirby, COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths, COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher, COG/DTP
Jill Locantore, COG/DTP
John Swanson, COG/DTP
Julie Ruszczyk, VDOT
Glen Harvie
Harry Sanders

**TPB Citizens Advisory Committee
Subcommittee on Outreach**

Summary of Meeting, August 10, 2004

Overview

In May, the CAC decided to focus its public outreach forums this year on the TPB's Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study (RMAS).

On August 10, the CAC's Subcommittee on Outreach met to learn about the first results of RMAS and how this information might be the subject of public meetings. CAC Vice Chair Emmet Tydings chaired the meeting.

As a result of the meeting, the subcommittee decided to move forward on hosting 2-4 meetings this fall. Staff will develop a "citizen-friendly" PowerPoint presentation for the meetings. The presentation will be presented in draft form to the CAC at its September 9 meeting.

Discussion of the RMAS First Results

Bob Griffiths of the TPB staff gave the subcommittee a briefing on the study's analysis of five land use scenarios. These scenarios would shift significant amounts of forecasted jobs/housing growth around the region in alternate ways.

The analysis of the land use scenarios used a transportation scenario (called "CLRP Plus") based on the transportation system in the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) along with a package of enhancements to maximize system efficiency, especially for the Metro system.

Member questions and comments included the following:

- Bob Chase asked what would be the pricetag of CLRP+. Bob Griffiths replied that it is estimated at \$2-3 billion. This would include the \$1.5 billion that Metro says it needs over the next six years for essential priorities, including rehabilitation, maintenance and basic capital improvements to accommodate anticipated new riders.
- Stewart Schwartz suggested that the impetus and guiding policy for each scenario should be explained.
- Merle Van Horne asked about the cooperative forecasting process at COG for jobs and housing. He wondered whether this process adequately reflected future "frictions"—such as long commutes or water supply problems—that might work against growth trends. Harold Foster explained that the forecasted jobs and housing numbers are based on inputs provided by the jurisdictions and therefore they reflect

those jurisdictions' plans and policies. He emphasized that these numbers are "not cooked up at COG."

- During the discussion some key points were made about the study that did not necessarily stand out in the presentation. These included:
 - The study has assumed that land use patterns **cannot be changed before 2010**. This leaves an increment of only twenty years—2010-2030—in which potential changes in forecasted growth are being measured.
 - The study is looking at hypothetical shifts in future new jobs and housing after 2010. It is **not looking at moving already established jobs and housing**.
 - The scenarios would, for the most part, shift jobs and housing to regional **activity centers/clusters**.
 - The scenarios seek to achieve **improved balance of better housing/jobs** within each jurisdiction and this goal was reflected in the allocated shifts for each scenario. For example, a scenario to move more housing into inner jurisdictions did not substantially increase housing in Prince George's because that county's policy is to seek more jobs, not housing.

Discussion of the Fall 2004 Outreach Meetings

The subcommittee agreed to move forward on planning meetings for this fall.

Some broad areas of discussion and agreement:

Location

Several locations were suggested for the meetings. The subcommittee preliminarily agreed to pursue four suggestions:

- Dulles Corridor, co-hosted by a business or community association. (Bob Chase's suggestion.)
- Montgomery County, co-hosted with County Councilmember Michael Knapp. (Emmet Tydings' suggestion.)
- Prince George's County, at the University of Maryland in partnership with their Center for Smart Growth. (Stewart Schwartz's suggestion.)
- District of Columbia, working with the Office of Planning or National Capital Planning Commission.

Staff and CAC members will investigate whether, when and how meetings might be set up at these venues. If it is not possible to schedule the meetings this fall, they may also be scheduled for January or February.

Presentation

Members agreed the presentation must be short, engaging and understandable. It must provide a compelling picture of forecasted problems associated with the current plan and forecasts. And it is also important for people to know how much of the region's future is already committed; substantial changes will be very long term. But is also important for people to know that if we want to "turn around the Queen Mary" we have to start now.

Staff will work in the coming weeks to develop a PowerPoint presentation for the meetings. A draft of this presentation will be presented to the CAC at its meeting on September 9.

Format

Stewart Schwartz provided a handout suggesting a format the would include: 1) introduction fby a host elected official from the TPB; 2) presentation by Bob Griffiths; and 3) panel that would include Bob and two CAC members reflecting contrasting positions.

The subcommittee did not agree on a format for the meetings. This will be a subject for future discussion.

ATTENDANCE

August 10, 2004

This was a special meeting of the CAC Subcommittee on Outreach, which all CAC members were welcome to attend. But attendance was voluntary.

CAC Members

Emmet Tydings, MD, chair of meeting
Nathaniel Bryant, MD
Stephen Caflisch, MD
Bob Chase, VA
Harold Foster, DC
Allen Muchnick, VA
Lee Schoenecker, DC

Stewart Schwartz, VA
Merle Van Horne, DC
Alphonso Coles, DC alternate

Staff

Ron Kirby
Bob Griffiths
Jill Locantore
John Swanson