

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
July 20, 2011**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Melissa Barlow, FTA
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Colleen Clay, City of Takoma Park
Eulois Cleckley, DDOT
Barbara Comstock, Virginia House of Delegates
Kerry Donley, City of Alexandria
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Tawanna Gaines, Maryland House of Delegates
Edgar Gonzalez, Montgomery County Executive Branch
Jason Groth, Charles County
Rene'e Hamilton, VDOT
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Julia Koster, NCPC
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick
Bill Lebegern, MWAA
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Colleen Mitchell, DC-OP
Garrett Moore, VDOT
Michael Nixon, MDOT
Eric Olson, Prince George's County
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Paul Smith, Frederick County
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
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
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby
Gerald Miller
Bob Griffiths
Ron Milone
Nicholas Ramfos
Douglas Franklin
Daivamani Sivasailam
Andrew Austin
Wendy Klancher
Dan Sonenklar
Jane Posey
Michael Farrell
Karin Foster
Gareth James
Debbie Leigh
Deborah Etheridge
Sarah Crawford
Deb Kerson Bilek
Beth Newman
Rich Roisman
Dave Robertson
Paul DesJardin COG/DCPS
Patrick Powell COG/DPSH
John Mataya COG/DCPS
Lewis Miller COG/OPA
Steve Kania COG/OPA
Alex Verzosa City of Fairfax
Bill Orleans HACK
Randy Carroll MDE
Greg McFarland NVTC
Jennifer Fioretti Arlington County DOT
Jim Maslanka City of Alexandria
Bob Chase Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Bob Grow Greater Washington Board of Trade
Roger Diedrich Sierra Club
Mike Lake Fairfax County Department of Transportation
Tina Slater Action Committee for Transit

John Townsend	AAA
Patrick Durany	PWC
Bennett Lipscomb	AMPO
Art Smith	Citizen
Quynn Nguyen	M-NCPPC
Matt Dernoga	Councilmember Mary Lehman's Office – Prince George's County
Robert H. Wilson	VDRPT
Jennifer Aument	Transurban
Al Francese	Centreville VA Citizens for Rail
Judi Gold	Councilmember Bowser's Office
Nick Alexandrow	PRTC
Faramarz Mokhtari	Prince George's County – M-NCPPC
Ben Dendy	Vectre

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Vice Chair Turner called the meeting to order, and said that Chair Bowser was running about 15 minutes late.

Mr. Diedrich, representing the Virginia chapter of the Sierra Club, commented on amending the 2010 CLRP at the request of VDOT, the Scope and Process for the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, and amendments to the FY2012 UPWP. He said that he objected to the actions to widen I-66 from Route 29 to 50 and to revise the I-95 HOT lanes project. He added that the Regional Priorities Plan should be tied more tightly to the various scenario studies conducted by the TPB, and that the amendments to the FY2012 fall short of what's needed.

Mr. Chase, representing the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, urged the TPB to amend the 2010 CLRP to include the revised I-95 HOT lanes project, the I-395/Seminary Road reversible ramp, and the I-66 widening west of I-66. He stated that each of these projects include important multimodal regional improvements. He submitted comments for the record.

Mr. Grow, representing the Board of Trade, spoke in support of the I-95 HOV/HOT lanes project, stating that it will offer mobility increases and provide critical infrastructure and capacity for future regional transportation needs, particularly given the anticipated impacts of BRAC on the region. He submitted comments for the record.

Vice Chair Turner thanked the public for their comments.

2. Approval of Minutes of June 15 Meeting

Mr. Donley moved to approve the minutes of the June TPB meeting.

Ms. Smyth seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

3. Report of Technical Committee

Mr. Kellogg said that the Technical Committee met on July 8, and considered eight items that are on the TPB agenda, including: the Car-Free Day events scheduled for September 22, the update to the draft air quality conformity analysis and the TIP amendment relating to interstate projects in Virginia, the Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program, the Scope and Process for the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, and the proposed Sustainable Communities Planning Grant which COG intends to submit to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. He said that the Committee also received briefings on several new FTA grant programs as well as the upcoming TIGER competitive grant program, identifying improvements to the COG regional incident management plan relating to the January 26 snowstorm, and the amendment to the FY 2012 UPWP relating to the budget and recommendations and corrective actions included in the federal transportation planning certification review. He added the committee was also briefed on five information items, including: the housing and transportation cost study, which has been completed by the DC Office of Planning and the Center for Neighborhood Technology, the I-95 Corridor Coalition's Green Corridors Eco Driving Campaign, the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC's) request that the TPB develop and approve a regional policy on Complete Streets, a joint letter from the Commonwealth Transportation Board in Virginia and the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization about the project selection process for the transportation improvement program, and a grant submitted by COG to the US Environmental Protection Agency to prepare a regional climate adaptation plan.

4. Report of Citizen Advisory Committee

Mr. Dobelbower commented on the development of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. He conveyed the CAC's appreciation of the robust discussion that has occurred regarding this planning activity, and said that the CAC looks forward to being a part of this endeavor in the coming months. He also mentioned that at its last meeting, the CAC reviewed and had an opportunity to participate in the FHWA-funded Study on Public Acceptability of Road Use Pricing, which is being conducted jointly by the TPB and the Brookings Institution. He provided an overview of some of the CAC members' comments about the study.

Mr. Dobelbower said the CAC received a presentation on the Prince George's County Master Plan of Transportation, which included a thorough background on how the county-level transportation plan supports regional goals, including multimodal access and support for regional centers. He emphasized that CAC members extensively discussed the role of transit-oriented development as a key theme underpinning the plan. He added that CAC members have expressed concern regarding the proposed changes in the I-95 HOT lanes, citing that the public was not generally aware of these changes, and that the scaled-back project would no longer contain the previously developed transit plan. He concluded by stating that the CAC was pleased to learn that the TPB had favorably received the Committee's recommendation to develop a Regional Complete Streets policy.

5. Report of Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said that the Steering Committee met on July 8, and acted on six resolutions that he said were listed and further detailed in the mailout. He mentioned that the Committee amended the FY 2012 Commuter Connections work program to include vanpools in the Pool Reward program. He clarified that the intent is not to move forward with this program until there is full coordination with an ongoing vanpool incentive program study in Northern Virginia, which is due to be completed by the end of the year.

He summarized the letters packet, which included letters committing \$150,000 from Metro, \$15,000 from Loudoun County, and \$7,300 from Alexandria for the Street Smart Pedestrian Safety campaign; a press release on the Eco Driving Campaign implemented by the I-95 Corridor Coalition; a write-up of the Commuter Connections employer Recognition Awards program; notification of a new I-66 corridor study; a formal letter on the FTA/FHWA certification review; and an announcement about the establishment of the Suburban Maryland Transportation Alliance, which he said is chaired by former Montgomery County Executive Doug Duncan.

Ms. Tregoning, referring to the letter about the FTA/FHWA Certification Review, inquired about the nature of the corrective actions that TPB must take in order to meet all requirements of the certification.

Mr. Kirby replied that there are four corrective actions, which he said are all associated with the Fredericksburg Area MPO, or FAMPO. He mentioned that more detailed information on this matter was provided in a briefing to the TPB at its May 18th meeting. He said that three of the four corrective actions concern civil rights compliance, and that the final corrective action focuses on project selection procedures. He added that TPB staff is working with FAMPO staff to address these corrective actions, and, in some cases, significant progress has been made already.

Ms. Tregoning asked where she could find the text of the comments from the certification review.

Mr. Kirby replied that the entire report is posted under the documents for the May 18 TPB meeting.

Ms. Tregoning thanked Mr. Kirby.

6. Chair's Remarks

Chair Bowser thanked Mr. Wojahn for agreeing to serve as the chair of the Human Services Transportation Coordination Task Force and mentioned that he is also the chair of the Access for All Advisory Committee. She asked TPB staff to provide an informational update on commuter bus and other bus parking in the District, and that this update be added as a ten-minute item on a

future TPB agenda.

ACTION ITEMS

7. Approval of Regional Car Free Day 2011 Proclamation

Mr. Ramfos, referring to a PowerPoint presentation, provided an overview of Regional Car Free Day, which is scheduled for September 22. He discussed the history of the event, noting that it started in Europe in 1995, went global in 2000, first took place in the District on 2007, and then went region-wide with support of the TPB in 2008. He said the event invites citizens in the region to try alternative forms of transportation, and to pledge to go car-free or car-light for that day. He explained that car-light means using carpools, vanpools, and supporting telework activities. He said participation is open to anybody, and emphasized this year's goal is to get 10,000 pledges, up from 7,000 pledges received in 2010. He showed the pledge form, as well as some promotional materials. He discussed an advertising and marketing campaign that will occur in advance of and during the event, and said that local jurisdictions will have concurrent events as well. He mentioned that partnerships have been formed with some area transit agencies to promote the event, and that social media, including Twitter and Facebook, will also help promote the event. He said that volunteers from the TPB were welcome to participate, and offered to serve as a resource for any TPB member who is interested.

Vice Chair Turner moved to approve the Car Free Day 2011 Proclamation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Olson, and approved unanimously.

Chair Bowser signed the Car Free Day 2011 Proclamation.

8. Approval of the Air Quality Conformity Analysis, an Amendment to the 2010 CLRP to Modify the I-95/395 HOV/HOT Lanes Project, Widen I-66 between US 29 and Route 15, and Add a Ramp from the HOV Lanes of I-395 to Seminary Road, and an Amendment to the FY 2011-2016 TIP to Include Funding for the I-66 Project as Requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)

Mr. Moore made a motion to adopt Resolution R1-2012 to approve the air quality conformity determination for the 2010 CLRP amendment, the amendment to the 2010 CLRP, and the amendment to the 2011-2016 TIP. Ms. Waters seconded the motion.

Mr. Donley referred to several questions he asked of VDOT at the June TPB meeting related to clarification of proposed transit services along the I-95/I-395 corridor. He referred to a letter from VDOT Secretary Connaughton related to transit services and the HOV ramp at I-395 and Seminary Road. He asked VDOT to confirm that there is a commitment to expand park and ride lots at Horner Road, Stafford Boulevard, and Gordon Park.

Mr. Moore said that is correct and that there is a total of \$100 million in improvements,

including the ramp at Seminary Road. He noted that funding commitment was made prior to the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transit (VDRPT) study of the corridor.

Mr. Donley asked if the park and ride lots would be expansions of existing facilities to accommodate more transit usage in the area.

Mr. Moore said that is correct.

Mr. Donley said he appreciated the specific information related to transit accommodations along the corridor. He referred to the TDM study outlined in Secretary Connaughton's letter and asked if the study would include major activity centers within the beltway, such as the Pentagon, Crystal City, and the Mark Center.

Mr. Moore said that those major regional destinations are integral to the operation of the corridor. He said he hopes the study will provide outcomes that will reduce traffic on local roads.

Mr. Donley said he appreciated the Secretary's response to the TPB's concerns. He asked if any thought has been given to funding mechanisms that might be available to fund recommendations from the study.

Mr. Moore said those possible recommendations would be brought into the six year plan process and prioritized with VDOT's other needs.

Mr. Donley said the projects are critical and that there needs to continue to be more emphasis on transit in the corridor. He said he appreciates the current emphasis on additional park and ride lot capacity. He said one of the critical projects for the corridor will be the transit infrastructure at the Mark Center.

Mr. Moore said the transit improvements around the Mark Center and I-395 and Seminary Road are a key component.

Mr. Donley mentioned the shuttle proposed by the Department of Defense's Transportation Management Plan for the Mark Center. He said that of all the shuttle routes identified, the route using the HOV/HOT facility from the Mark Center to the Pentagon was the fastest. He said this information made it more clear that there is a need for a transit facility at the Mark Center.

Mr. Zimmerman said Mr. Donley is right about the need for a ramp on the facility to access the Mark Center. He believes the key question is whether transforming this facility from a public, transit-based facility, as it was built, to a privately run roadway allowing occupants of single-driver vehicles, is going to be able to move people with the efficiency that the roadway has been able to achieve up to this point. He said the express facility is one of the most efficient roadways in the Washington region, moving more people per lane per hour than many other facilities in the region, in part due to the commuter bus service using the facility. He asked what would happen if the roadway is not as successful as anticipated, but is then owned by a private entity. He said that this question should be considered over the next several years as the project proceeds. He said

those most immediately affected by a reduction in quality of the system would be commuters in Prince William and Stafford counties, who would end up with a longer or more expensive commute. He said secondary impacts could include more traffic elsewhere and increased air pollution, rippling up and down the corridor. He said that a positive end product is possible, but that it will take careful design and implementation, adding that a large component would have to focus on transit.

Ms. Smyth referred to a conversation she had with staff from the VDRPT, assuring her that Secretary Connaughton was committed to finding funding to implement transit along the corridor. She said she could not vote for the action at hand without the funding commitment.

Mr. Moore echoed that there is a funding commitment, as shown through the park and ride project. He responded to Mr. Zimmerman's concerns about coming up with the best solutions for the corridor at the best value. He said that as the transit analysis moves forward, VDOT will ensure that all options are reviewed carefully so that the facility functions correctly.

Ms. Smyth said everyone understands that transit isn't optional and that the corridor will not work without it.

Mr. Moore said there is a commitment to that.

Ms. Waters thanked VDOT for the time invested in making the clarifications to the project. She noted that the project is innovative and different, which necessarily brings about questions about implementation and operation. She said she thinks it can be done well and is confident VDOT will respond to jurisdictions' concerns. She said that transit does not work for everyone and that transportation solutions need to include options for all modes.

Ms. Tregoning asked Mr. Zimmerman to clarify his statement that the item would come back before the TPB so that the Board could have a better understanding of what the TDM study would show.

Mr. Zimmerman said he was not referring to the TPB when he said there would be further review. He said there would be future public hearings and forums, particularly through the NEPA process, that would provide for opportunities for input. He suggested that people at all levels, from citizens to elected officials, should partake of these opportunities.

Mr. Kirby mentioned that the TPB received some comments through the public comment process. He said there were relatively few comments, some of which were represented during the public comment session within this meeting. He said he does not believe the comments require further response.

Chair Bowser asked if the comments have been addressed directly by staff.

Mr. Kirby said the comments have been addressed.

Chair Bowser called for a vote. The motion passed with Mr. Roberts voting no.

9. Approval of Technical Assistance Recipients Under the FY 2012 Transportation/Land Use Connections (TLC) Program

Ms. Koster said it has been her privilege to chair the TLC Selection Panel and thanked TPB staff for their support. She said staff added an extra step for FY 2012 to provide more support to applicants prior to formal application submission, and that staff will work with applicants who were not selected to determine if there are opportunities to strengthen project proposals for FY 2013. She thanked the jurisdictions and organizations for submitting applications and noted that the applications submitted for FY 2012 funding represented a great deal of thought and innovation. She said the technical assistance program was oversubscribed and that the panel had to make some tough choices.

Ms. Koster said the panel wished to emphasize the importance of proposals that explicitly look at the connection between land use and transportation, not simply transportation. She said the panel was very encouraged by the fact that many of the applications involve different agencies working together. She asked Ms. Crawford to review the projects the panel recommends for funding.

Ms. Crawford provided a brief overview of the purpose of the TLC Program and a summary of program funding over the past five fiscal years. She said the TPB has funded 48 projects at roughly \$1.3 million. She said there is \$350,000 available in technical assistance funding for FY 2012, \$220,000 from the TPB's Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and \$130,000 from the Maryland Department of Transportation's technical assistance account in the UPWP. She said the panel recommends funding eight projects of the 15 applications received by the May 18 deadline. She provided a summary of the eight projects: one project is located in the District of Columbia, four projects are located in Maryland, two projects are located in Virginia, and one project was submitted by three jurisdictions: the District of Columbia, Prince George's County, and the City of Alexandria. She said staff will provide a full debriefing to jurisdictions whose projects were not funded.

Ms. Crawford said the TPB will host on September 16 the first event of the TLC Regional Peer Exchange Network, a new addition to the TLC Clearinghouse. The goal of the Regional Peer Exchange Network is to provide a mechanism to share information about past TLC technical assistance projects and to promote dialogue regionally about TLC topics.

Mr. Mendelson asked for more detail on the three jurisdiction project.

Ms. Crawford said the project was developed by Prince George's County in collaboration with the District of Columbia and Alexandria. She said the project will analyze affordable housing needs around transit stations in those jurisdictions and identify strategies to preserve, maintain, and develop affordable housing within close proximity to the transit stations.

Vice Chair Turner noted that this round of funding marks the sixth year of the TLC technical assistance Program. He asked if the TPB has conducted a review of jurisdictions to learn if any of the recommendations have been implemented.

Ms. Crawford said TPB staff followed up with all of the grantees earlier in the calendar year. She said that several jurisdictions whose projects contained recommendations for capital improvements have been able to secure funding to implement the recommendations. She said many of the projects recommending enhancements to policies and procedures have been implemented. She added that some projects were recommended for further study and that the jurisdictions have moved forward on several.

Chair Bowser asked if the funding is stable for the coming year.

Ms. Crawford said the \$350,000 for technical assistance is stable.

Chair Bowser asked if the project solicitation for the next round of funding would occur in March 2012.

Ms. Crawford said that is correct.

Chair Bowser asked what agencies TPB staff typically reach out to with information about the technical assistance program.

Ms. Crawford said staff contacts transportation partners, planning agencies, and housing agencies. She said TPB staff works with COG staff to reach out to other disciplines. She added that as the TLC Program has grown, many business improvements districts and other non-profits have worked with TPB member jurisdictions to submit an application.

Chair Bowser said she appreciates the hard work of the TLC Selection Panel and asked for a motion.

Ms. Koster made a motion to approve the recommended TLC technical assistance recipients under the FY 2012 TLC Program.

Mr. Bottigheimer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

10. Approval of a Scope and Process to Develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan

Vice Chair Turner said staff revised the scope and process to develop a Regional Transportation Priorities Plan based on comments received from TPB members at the July 20 TPB Meeting. He requested that the TPB move forward with this process, and added that the TPB will be continually involved in the development of the Priorities Plan and can refine the product as it occurs according to the schedule that staff recommended.

Mr. Kirby reviewed a memorandum containing the changes in the scope and process that were included in the latest version of the document. He reviewed the tasks and schedule for the development of the Priorities Plan. He said the structure of the process will allow for the TPB and interested stakeholders to see immediate outputs and become engaged in the process. He referred to a letter from Harriet Tregoning asking the TPB to take the opportunity to reframe the scope and process to include different work tasks and approaches. He said he does not feel that the TPB should delay progress on the Priorities Plan, and noted that many of Ms. Tregoning's concerns are covered in the scope. He added that the scope will not repeat earlier work conducted by the TPB, but will instead be used as the starting point for a new undertaking. He said he thinks the scope is sufficiently broad and flexible so as to accommodate diverse viewpoints in the process.

Chair Bowser thanked Vice Chair Turner, all of the task force members, and TPB staff for their hard work, noting staff has worked hard since the June TPB meeting to address a number of the concerns raised by the Board. She said her particular concern was that the TPB be urgent in how it compiles the Priorities Plan so that it would not lose the benefit of the planning when funding opportunities arise. She said her concern was addressed in the revised scope and process.

Ms. Tregoning said she agreed with Chair Bowser that the biggest concern is that the TPB needs to understand the priorities in the region in a sufficient timeframe so that it may have an effect on the funding opportunities. She said there is currently the chance to apply for FY 2011 TIGER funding, which highlights the need for the region to be well positioned. She said she is pleased that there will be interim products as soon as December 2011. She clarified that her concern was never that things were not covered in the scope and process, but that it erred on the side of being comprehensive and not strategic. She said she is happy to move forward.

Vice Chair Turner made a motion to approve the scope and process to develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan for incorporation into the FY 2012 UPWP.

Mr. Smith seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

11. Approval of TPB Participation in the Submission by COG of a Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Application to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

Mr. Robertson said that he sought the Board's approval to participate in COG's regional application to the HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Program. He informed members that the resolution before them laid out two action tasks, the first being their participation, and the second being an agreement to use a portion of the TPB's work program funding to provide some of the matching funds for the effort in the event of a successful grant application. He said that the initiative had been approved by the COG Board of Directors the previous week, and that it would synthesize transportation, land use, environmental, housing, and other areas. He said that participation by the regional council and the MPO are required to apply

for these grants, so the TPB's approval would be required to proceed with an application. He advised the TPB that an advance notice of the grant opportunity had already been received and that the release of the actual notice was imminent. He said that the information from the advance notice had been used to communicate with the Planning Directors Committee, the Housing Committee, the TPB Technical Committee, and other stakeholders. He said that the effort would be overseen by the new Region Forward Coalition, and he noted that TPB members including Mr. Olsen are members of that group, which would provide a nice cross-fertilization of ideas and information.

Mr. Robertson said that there were two key words in the title of the grant application: "regional" and "planning." He said that projects needed to be truly regional, so that the regional work supports the local initiatives, and the local initiatives support the regional work. He said that unlike the TIGER grant application, a later agenda item, this grant was principally intended for planning activities rather than for capital projects. He said that the grant opportunity had arisen from the Livability and Sustainability Partnership between the EPA, DOT, and HUD, and that such intra-agency work is a very welcome development. He reminded members that they had generously supported a similarly-themed application last year, and he said that while that application was unsuccessful, a debrief from HUD had highlighted the many strengths of the proposal and the areas in which the application could have been improved. He said that staff had communicated with successful applicants to learn what had made them successful, and he stated his belief that COG and the TPB would have a competitive edge going forward.

Mr. Robertson said the overarching goals of the proposed program include equitable transit-oriented development, and access to affordable housing, jobs, and services. He thanked Ms. Tregoning for providing valuable insight on this matter. He said that the effort should support the local and regional economy, and that it should help create more effective regional partnerships, which he noted had been a key factor in the award of these grants in the previous round of applications. He emphasized that the proposals would not be restricted to the existing transportation network, as it is important to anticipate where future transportation investments will be needed and to ensure that regional planning efforts support them. He informed members that it would be important to aggressively seek matching funds for the proposed effort, as another lesson that had been learned from the debrief was that those applicants who are more aggressive in seeking matching funds often have a slightly greater chance of success. He also explained that while the Notice of Funding Availability was yet to be released, he anticipated a tight schedule over the course of the summer, and he appreciated the ongoing support of all the staff and officials in helping take advantage of this opportunity.

Mr. Robertson invited Mr. Mataya of COG staff to provide some additional information. Mr. Mataya reiterated the overarching goals of the proposal, and mentioned some specific examples of how they might be achieved, such as by looking at the potential impacts of the Purple Line on small businesses, existing communities, and equitable access to jobs. Referring to a map in the PowerPoint presentation, he identified the other transit lines that would be the subject of research and analysis. He said the intention was to learn lessons from each of these examples that could be applied elsewhere in the region. He asked if anybody had any questions.

Chair Bowser moved for the adoption of Resolution R2-2012 to approve TPB participation in the COG consortium, and the move was seconded. Chair Bowser asked if there were any comments.

Vice Chair Turner asked for confirmation that the funding request was for \$100,000 per year over the next three years if the application were to be accepted.

Mr. Robertson confirmed that this was the case.

Vice Chair Turner asked if the COG Board had agreed to match that amount, for a total of \$600,000.

Mr. Robertson said that COG funds were available and that it was anticipated project partners would also provide some funding. He said it was likely that the amount of federal funding requested would be scaled back by the time of the application, based on feedback from the previous round of funding, and he reiterated that providing a higher level of matching funds would likely make the application more competitive.

Vice Chair Turner asked whether the amount of federal funding requested would therefore be in the range of three to four million dollars.

Mr. Robertson said this was around the figure they anticipated.

Chair Bowser called for a vote on approving Resolution R2-2012, and it was passed unanimously.

12. Endorsement of a Proposed TPB Project Application Concept for Funding Under the FY 2011 Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Competitive Grant Program, and of Applications Under Development by TPB Member Agencies for Four FTA Competitive Grant Programs

Mr. Kirby explained that members were being asked to approve a concept to be developed into an application for new TIGER funding. He said that the pre-application would need to be submitted on October 3 and the final application would be due on October 31, so there would be an opportunity for the Board to sign-off on the pre-application at its September meeting. He said that the proposed concept had been outlined in the memo that had been sent to members. Referring to a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Kirby summarized the key aspects of the TIGER program, and he outlined the goals and other details of the proposed concept, including potential partners, suggested criteria, and milestone dates in the application process. Mr. Kirby said that he expected the application process to be very competitive, as this was the third round of TIGER funding, so there would be more applicants and those applying would be more sophisticated. He added that the Notice of Funding Availability had made it clear that the modal and geographic distribution of the projects would also be considered, so higher ranked applications could make way for less well regarded proposals if the initial distribution did not appear to be satisfactory. He said it was not clear whether the fact the TPB had received funding in the first round of

TIGER would count against an application in this latest round, but that such a possibility was all the more reason to develop a very strong application.

Mr. Kirby said that the focus of the proposed concept was on capital projects that would promote better access around rail stations throughout the region. He stated that around six sites would be selected, meaning a \$20 million application could have an average of around \$3 million per site, an amount commensurate with the kinds of improvements that could greatly improve access to under-utilized stations. He said that while Silver Line stations could be considered, it would not be appropriate to include the Purple Line in this process, as projects would need to be “ready to go.” He said that the proposal can only request funding for capital projects that are ready for implementation, as there would be no funding available for planning in this round of TIGER, and funds would have to be committed before the end of FY 2013. He added that the US DOT would also prefer that the NEPA process for the projects is already taken care of or well underway, so that it would not delay implementation. He noted that the memo included a straw man set of six locations that had been selected on the basis of the TLC program and WMATA’s Metrorail bicycle and pedestrian access improvement study. He described the six projects, but emphasized that they were provisional and had been included in part to demonstrate the kind of projects that were being sought for the application. He encouraged jurisdictions to propose better alternatives if possible, especially projects that met all of the criteria and were closer to implementation, and he noted that the memo had included a list of some other potential candidates for inclusion. He stated that there were certain components of potential projects that could be particularly attractive, such as private developer participation in the form of funding matches and true partnerships with local land use planners. He said that creative initiatives that could be replicated elsewhere in the region would also be likely to attract US DOT’s attention and support.

Referring to the PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Kirby outlined the proposed schedule, including several milestones before the submission of the final application on October 31. He concluded by briefly summarizing a list of projects that member jurisdictions planned to submit for funding under other FTA programs, and he requested that the Board approve letters demonstrating TPB support for applications from Montgomery County, Prince George’s County, and the Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission.

Chair Bowser moved to approve the resolution and it was seconded. She invited discussion.

Mr. Bottingheimer endorsed the application concept.

Ms. Tregoning, noting that a TPB application for funding for bike-sharing in the second round of TIGER had been unsuccessful, asked whether there would be an interest in considering bike-sharing for inclusion in the latest application.

Mr. Kirby said that bike-sharing had been considered, but there was a feeling that it was not as innovative a concept as it had been a year or two ago, and that while it had been funded in a TIGER grant for Boston, the system in the Metropolitan Washington area was now further along. He acknowledged that there was the potential to do a lot more with bike-sharing in the region, but he said the concept that had been presented was considered to be the basis for a stronger

application.

Ms. Tregoning asked if it would be possible to have bike-sharing components in some of the proposed projects, especially as the current bike-sharing program was limited to just two from more than twenty jurisdictions in the region.

Mr. Kirby responded that this was a good point and said that bike-sharing could certainly be part of the application if new stations were to be integrated into the regional system.

Ms. Tregoning stated that bike-sharing also had the potential for the private sector match that Mr. Kirby had mentioned, especially given the cost-effectiveness of the system.

Chair Bowser asked if the TPB had submitted a project related to pedestrian access or bus facility enhancements to the Fort Totten Metro station.

Mr. Kirby said it had not, though he mentioned that all station areas would be studied should the TPB receive the US DOT Transportation, Community, and System Preservations Program grant for which it applied in June 2011.

Chair Bowser called for a vote on approving the resolution and it was passed unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

13. Update on COG's Regional Incident Management and Response (IMR) Action Plan

Chair Bowser invited Mr. Andrews to speak concerning the first of the information items, an update on COG's Regional Incident Management and Response Action Plan.

Mr. Andrews said it was a pleasure for him to have the opportunity to provide an update on the activity of the COG Incident Management Response Steering Committee that he had been privileged to chair. He said that while many people would rather forget the experience they had on January 26, when many spent hours in commutes home during the snow and ice storm, it was important to learn from the experience in order to try to prevent it from being repeated. He reminded members that the COG Board had established the Steering Committee in March and had set out an ambitious schedule. He said that they were on track to provide their recommendations by October, and that the TPB and the Emergency Preparedness Council would have a chance to review them and to advise the COG Board on what recommendations to adopt at its November meeting. He emphasized that what he was about to present was not a draft report, but a summary of some of the key points of the discussion to date and a sense of the direction in which the Steering Committee was headed.

Referring to the memo that had been sent out to Board members, Mr. Andrews presented a series of proposed actions that were grouped into four focus areas: 1) Improve Real-Time Information or Situational Awareness Among Local, State and Federal Government Agencies with

Operational Authority or Responsibilities; 2) Improve Real-Time Information to the Media and the Public; 3) Improve Regional Coordination; and 4) Strengthen and Focus Decision-Making.

Mr. Smith asked if there was something that could be done to get the message out better if a truck jackknifed on the I-270 or I-70, with no prospect of resolving the situation for many hours, as had happened in the last storm.

Mr. Andrews responded affirmatively, saying that there needed to be real-time information conveyed about traffic conditions on particular roads and potential alternative routes, so that people do not inadvertently arrive in a situation that they cannot get out of. He said that it would be possible to provide better and more timely information, and that once the system was demonstrated to be accurate, people would take the warnings more seriously. He added that the Federal Office of Personnel Management was reviewing its policies relating to its employees in such situations, and that the coordination of decisions among employers was also a work in progress. He said it was important to try to avoid releasing a large number of employees after the snowstorm had already started, and that those who had not left in advance of the storm might need to be encouraged to shelter in place until the worst of the storm was over. He noted that MetroRail had fared well that day, which made the situation better than it might have been.

Chair Bowser asked if the Steering Committee had taken a position on the effectiveness of MATOC and made any specific recommendations in that regard.

Mr. Andrews replied that the Committee had received a presentation about MATOC at its last meeting, and that there had been a comparison with a similar agency, TRANSCOM, in New York. He stated that MATOC seemed to be working reasonably well, but he said he believed some members were more expert than him in this matter, and he invited feedback and suggestions that he could take back to the Steering Committee.

Mr. Mendelson said that he viewed the challenge faced on January 26th as being similar to that faced on September 11th, 2001, and that the challenge was not simply one of information sharing, but also of decision-making. He said that an example of that was on September 11th, when DDOT turned the signals green so that people could get out of the city, but the military district closed the bridge. He said a variation of this had occurred on January 26th, when the Federal Office of Personnel Management decided to tell people they could leave early without consulting any of the DOTs, making it hard for the DOTs to handle an early and compressed rush hour. He said that one of the issues was that there are so many jurisdictions and that they do not want to cede decision-making authority to another body. He said he believed that could change if MATOC were to be fully supported and fully funded, as it would be credible, knowledgeable and respected, and it could make recommendations that people would follow. He said a conversation concerning legal authority might not be necessary, as if MATOC were to become credible, it could make decisions through the voluntary agreement of the jurisdictions.

Mr. Andrews thanked Mr. Mendelson and commented that MATOC had recently received a \$2.3 million grant from the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) process, which would enable it to expand. He said that it would not, however, be sufficient to make it a 24/7 operation like

TRANSCOM.

Chair Bowser thanked Mr. Andrews and said she looked forward to seeing the recommendations.

14. Briefing on Amendments to the FY 2012 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Revise the Budget and Respond to the Federal Transportation Planning Certification Review

Chair Bowser stated that time was running short, but that members should turn their attention to the materials for the final item in the mail-out packet, as they would be asked to vote on them at the September meeting. She asked Mr. Kirby if he could advise members what to focus on.

Mr. Kirby said that this item concerned the work program for this fiscal year, 2012, and that the memo had two features. He said it included final budget numbers that were about \$70,000 more than had been assumed last March, quite close to the initial estimate. He said the other feature was aimed at the recommendations from the federal certification review, and included amendments that members would be asked to consider in September. He stated that some language on the priorities plan and scope would also be included now that it had been approved.

Chair Bowser thanked Mr. Kirby and asked if anybody had any questions.

Ms. Comstock said she had a housekeeping question, and asked whether it would be possible to receive the materials electronically each month instead of receiving all the paper.

Mr. Kirby said that individual members could opt to be removed from the mailing list if they so wished, as they can already access the materials electronically on the TPB website.

Ms. Comstock said she would like to encourage electronic communication of materials to reduce costs, as the savings could be spent on improving transit and transportation instead of on paper.

Mr. Kirby said that this change had already been made for the Technical Committee, and that consideration would be given to doing the same for the Board.

15. Other Business

There was no other business.

16. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10pm.

