

**METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
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
January 19, 2005**

Members and Alternates Present

Phil Mendelson, D.C. Council
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT-NOVA
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT
Ludwig Gaines, City of Alexandria
Ron Spalding, MDOT
Julia Koster, NCPC
Karina Ricks, DC Office of Planning
David Moss, Montgomery County DPWT
David Harrington, Prince George's County
Andrew Fellows, City of College Park
Marsha Kaiser, MDOT
Art Smith, Loudoun County
Damon Harvey, DDOT
Bill Lebegern, MWAA
Dick White, WMATA
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force
Carol Petzold, Maryland House of Delegates
Cicero Salles, Prince George's County
Edward Thomas, WMATA

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Nick Ramfos	COG/DTP
Jim Hogan	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
Andrew Austin	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Deborah Etheridge	COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam	COG/DTP
Michael Farrell	COG/DTP
Jill Locantore	COG/DTP
Steven Kania	COG/OPA
Heather Nalbone	COG/OPA
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Rick Rybeck	DDOT
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Bob Chase	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Bob Grow	Greater Washington Board of Trade
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Randy Carroll	MDE
Howard Chang	TCCSMD
Sharmila Samarasinghe	VDRPT
Ritch Viola	Arlington County
Mark Maggio	George Mason University
Douglas Stewart	Fairfax
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Mike Lake	Fairfax County Dept. of Transportation
Phil Tarnoff	University of Maryland
Tom Jacobs	University of Maryland
Kellie Gaver	MDOT
John Contestabile	MDOT
Rudolph G. Penner	Urban Institute
Virginia W. Gaddis	Self & Community

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Vice Chairman Knapp called the meeting to order.

Dr. Bud Keith expressed concerns about a recommendation regarding the MetroAccess paratransit service that was included in the report of the regional panel to address funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA). The panel's report stated that MetroAccess should be considered a societal expense and not a transportation expense. He said it was wrong to treat the funding of MetroAccess separately from other transportation funding. He said that Congress, through the Americans with Disabilities Act, has determined that there is not to be discrimination against people with disabilities where public money is concerned.

Bob Grow, Greater Washington Board of Trade, commended the work of regional funding panel for Metro. He said the Board of Trade, the Federal City Council and the Downtown D.C. Business Improvement District (BID) are forming a Business Transportation Action Coalition to advocate for the funding recommended by the panel. Mr. Grow also commended the work of the Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) task forces for working for more efficient use of existing infrastructure and to improve safety and security through better coordination of transportation management and operations. He said the Board of Trade supports Item 12 on the agenda, "Actions to Improve Regional Coordination and Communications." Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Bob Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, said the TPB needs to endorse the recommendations of the COG Metro funding panel. He said the TPB has published a number of documents and policy statements since the early 1990s calling for regional funding mechanisms. He said the TPB several years ago named the Metro system a regional priority, and the Board should now quickly endorse the COG panel's recommendation for Metro funding. He said the TPB should send emissaries to Annapolis, Richmond and the District governments to advocate for a regional funding solution. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

2. Approval of Minutes of December 15, 2004 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes by Mr. Smith. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gaines and was approved unanimously.

Ms. Pourciau asked that Item 15 on the agenda be deferred. She said the mailout that was distributed with that item was in conflict with the directive that was provided by the District of Columbia in terms of funding for the Commuter Connections Program. She said it was not appropriate to review this document at the meeting, even as an information item.

Mr. Kirby said there is ongoing discussion on the funding for this year and the mailout document

lays out a baseline program that is the basis for that discussion. He said he thought it was important that it be part of the discussion. He said it was presented to the Technical Committee the previous week.

Ms. Pourciau said the baseline document was totally inaccurate.

Vice Chairman Knapp said that without objection he would defer this item until next month, in consultation with the chair.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

In the absence of Mr. Mokhtari, chair of the Technical Committee, Mr. Miller of the COG/DTP staff gave the report. Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Miller said the Technical Committee at its meeting on January 7 was briefed on a number of agenda items before the Board, including the results of the eight-hour conformity assessment; the priority regional unfunded bicycle projects; a final review of the solicitation document; and the Street Smart Pedestrian Safety Campaign. He said the committee also reviewed the draft outlines for the FY2006 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and the FY2006 Commuter Connections Work Program baseline.

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Mr. Kirby reported that Ms. Barg from Prince William County had called to report that she was tied up in traffic.

In the absence of Mr. Jaffe, chair of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), Mr. Kirby gave the report. Referring to the handout report, he said the CAC met on January 13. He said that because the TPB has not yet appointed the 2005 committee, the 2004 members convened for this meeting. He said the CAC had an extensive discussion on the report of the Metro Funding Panel and received a briefing from a newly formed organization called MetroRiders.org. Regarding the Metro Funding Panel, Mr. Kirby noted that the CAC had concerns about the report's language about MetroAccess. He said those concerns were reflected in Dr. Keith's statement during the public comment period.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Referring to the mailout materials, Mr. Kirby reported that the Steering Committee, at its meeting on January 7, approved a number of resolutions, including amending the two Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) for FY2004-2009 and FY2005-2010 to modify a number of projects, as requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation and the Maryland Department

of Transportation. In addition, there was a resolution on changes to the Federal Functional Classification System in Maryland.

Mr. Kirby said the letters packet included a letter from David Snyder, chair of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority, expressing general support for the report of COG's Metro Funding Panel. He said the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission also has submitted a letter of support for the panel recommendations.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Mendelson said he understood that Ms. Petzold wanted to give a report regarding value pricing, and he suggested this would be an appropriate time to do that.

Ms. Petzold said the Task Force on Value Pricing met nine times beginning in 2003. Ms. Petzold said the task force's report was being distributed on a blue sheet. She said the task force had just agreed to the language in the report at its meeting that morning. She asked staff to send the report to the entire membership of the TPB because it was not included in the packets mailed out prior to the meeting.

Ms. Petzold read the 11 goals listed in the report.

Mr. Snyder said he would be prepared to move endorsement of the report today. If that were not possible, he asked that it be placed on next month's agenda for action. He thanked Ms. Petzold and the members of the committee for the report.

Chairman Mendelson said he thought it was premature to act upon the report at the January meeting, so he asked that it be put on the agenda for next month.

Mr. Zimmerman asked how Ms. Petzold would characterize the document as an action by the TPB.

Ms. Petzold said that as the three jurisdictions move forward with projects, these are regional goals, where possible, for value priced lanes.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if it was a "best practices" statement urging certain considerations for value pricing to agencies that might be implementing them.

Ms. Petzold said that was correct. She noted that goals in the report were not mandates; she said they are "shoulds" and considerations.

Mr. Zimmerman said he found that aspect confusing because the TPB does not have the power to implement. The report is purely advisory, so what was the basis for hesitating to make declarative

statements

Ms. Petzold said that participants at the meeting that morning noted that bonding is required for some projects, and bond counsel is very reticent about various documents. She said such concerns caused the committee to frame the document as guidance rather than mandates.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the TPB does not have the power to produce mandates. He said the TPB would not be making any proposals or operating any roads. He noted the language under Goal 11, which he said was very soft for a statement which is merely advisory.

Ms. Petzold said the committee spent two hours on the language that morning and she was sorry Mr. Zimmerman was not part of the conversation. She said the resulting document was a carefully balanced statement that met the needs of several jurisdictions.

Mr. Zimmerman said he would better understand that caution if the body were actually planning to pursue a specific proposal. But if the body was simply attempting to give advice, then heavily conditioned statements seem to be less effective in doing so. He suggested the Board look at the document and think about it before it comes before the Board for action at a future meeting.

Chairman Mendelson asked that the report be sent to the Board members and that it be an action item in February.

7. Approval of Appointments to the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for the Year 2005

This item was deferred to the February meeting.

8. Review of Comments Received, Acceptance of Recommended Responses, and Approval of 8-Hour Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2004 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Clifford explained that the analysis under this item was very similar to the air quality analysis approved by the Board in November. He explained that the eight-hour standard took effect while the current CLRP and TIP were being developed and analyzed. He said that under the new standard, there is a requirement that the conformity of transportation plans and programs be demonstrated by June 15th, 2005. Otherwise, the region would face a conformity lapse of the TIP.

Mr. Clifford called attention to the draft resolution, documenting conformity under the interim rules of the eight-hour standard. He also noted a letter from Dana Kauffman, chair of the

Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC), which included comments on the conformity finding.

Mr. Clifford said the new analysis before the Board involved adding 2010 as a forecast year to the work that was acted on in November. He noted that the analysis showed that forecast emissions were within the emissions budgets. The interim rules permitted the conformity analysis to be based on the emissions budgets developed under the one-hour standard. MWAQC is expected to develop and approve new emissions budgets in 2006.

Mr. Clifford said the letter from MWAQC acknowledged that the plan analysis for 2010 meets the approved budgets. The letter also noted that the gaps between the emissions inventories and the emissions budget levels are temporary, because the one-hour budgets will be replaced by the eight-hour budgets. MWAQC also urged the maintenance of commitments by transportation agencies to Transportation Emissions Reduction Measure (TERMs) and other emission reduction measures, regardless of whether that implementation is necessary for conformity. Mr. Clifford said that staff responded to MWAQC's comments by incorporating those points explicitly into the TPB resolution.

Chairman Mendelson said it was his understanding that in comparison to the action in November, the analysis before the TPB was different in that it included the year 2010.

Ms. Pourciau moved approval of Resolution 12-2005. The motion was seconded and was passed unanimously.

9. Review of Priority Regional Unfunded Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Sebastian, chair of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee of the Technical Committee, briefed the Board on the updated list of priority unfunded regional bicycle and pedestrian projects recommended by the subcommittee for consideration in the FY2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He said the subcommittee selected the projects based upon a list of regional criteria, described in the handout, including regional connectivity, safety, access to transit, reasonable time frame, local support, reasonable cost and lack of full funding. Mr. Sebastian said that as projects have received funding over the years, the list of unfunded regional projects has evolved, which is a sign of progress.

Ms. Kaiser said she knows of important projects in Maryland that were not on the list. She asked for more detail on the process for selecting the projects.

Mr. Sebastian said there are more projects in each jurisdiction than were included on the list. He said the intention of this list was to highlight a relatively small number of projects to give them prominence. He said the projects were chosen by the jurisdictions themselves based on the

regional criteria. The list is coordinated through the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee, which includes representatives from the jurisdictions.

Chairman Mendelson asked if one of the criteria was that the projects were not fully funded.

Mr. Sebastian said that was correct.

Ms. Kaiser said she understood that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee was being a champion for a limited number of projects. She said the criteria used to select the projects might be different from the criteria she might use.

Mr. Sebastian said the criteria might be slightly different. But he emphasized that it was contingent upon the individual jurisdictions to pick from their lists of priorities.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that the report said that the projects represent less than one percent of the estimated spending in the first year of the TIP. He asked what percentage of funding they would represent over the six-year time frame for the TIP. He also asked what percentage of the bicycle and pedestrian projects are funded, and what percentage this priority list would comprise of that total.

Mr. Sebastian said he was not sure. He said the figure of one percent was being used as a rough guideline to show that these projects did not represent a large amount of funding.

Mr. Zimmerman said it would be useful to know the total percentage of transportation funding that would be spent on bicycle and pedestrian related improvements. He said he was concerned that far too little was being spent.

Mr. Sebastian said this information could be provided.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what the basis was for this list being produced in the first place. He said he did not remember a list like this in past years.

Mr. Kirby said a similar list was provided last year, and Mr. Zimmerman had asked a question about the Arlington project on list. He said a new list has been produced each year for a number of years. The subcommittee selects the projects based on regional criteria. He said the subcommittee brings the list back to the Board at the same time that the Solicitation Document is being produced. The list is intended to draw attention to high priorities that are not yet funded.

Mr. Zimmerman noted this list was being provided as an information item. He said that before it is folded into an item that the Board acts on, he would like more information, including details about the process and the comprehensive list from which the projects were selected. He said he was concerned that the list was too minimal. He said the region needs to ask more comprehensively if

enough of its transportation resources were being devoted to bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

Mr. Harrington said he had questions similar to Mr. Zimmerman. He said he was interested in a specific project that was not on the list. He said it would be useful for the Board to have a comprehensive list of all the bicycle and pedestrian projects that are under consideration, and for the Board to more fully understand the criteria and the process for selecting priority projects.

Ms. Porter asked if the subcommittee had representatives from the local jurisdictions, including municipalities.

Mr. Sebastian the subcommittee had representatives from county and municipal jurisdictions, although not frequently from Takoma Park.

Mr. Salles said he also would like to get more comprehensive information about the development of the list. He said he would have questions about projects in Prince George's County.

Ms. Pourciau said she remembered the evolution of the process. She noted that projects that had been highlighted in previous reports have actually been implemented, which she believed was an indication that the process works. But she said that that the information presented at the meeting was out of context and seemed to be creating skepticism. She said she looked forward to more comprehensive information.

Mr. Sebastian said a full bicycle plan is currently in development. He said it had roughly 200 projects with an overall cost of approximately \$100 million.

Ms. Petzold noted that this was an information item only; the Board was not being asked to act on it.

Chairman Mendelson said the reason this was scheduled was to influence the thinking of the members of the Board, including the consideration of the Solicitation Document under the next agenda item, which was an action item.

Mr. Kirby continued the chairman's point, saying that the Board was being asked to alert those agencies that are putting the TIP together that, on page I-19 of the Solicitation Document there is a set of priority projects that have been identified by the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee. He said through the Solicitation Document, the agencies were being asked to consider these projects as they put their programs together. He called attention to a section of the mailout memorandum that listed projects that had moved through this process and received funding in previous years.

Mr. Zimmerman said that based on Mr. Kirby's comments, this now appeared to be a back door action item. He said through the next item, the Board was being asked to endorse the list, even though several members had asked to receive more information before moving forward.

Mr. Kirby said there was no mandate that the projects be funded. It was just an alert that these are projects that have come out of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee.

Before moving on to Agenda Item 10, Chairman Mendelson said he wanted to finish this item. He thanked Mr. Sebastian and he noted that a number of board members had commented that they wanted to get more information regarding the broader context for selecting the priority projects. He asked if this information could be provided at the Board meeting in February.

Mr. Kirby said he believed that could be done.

10. Approval of Draft Solicitation Document for the 2005 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2006-2011 (Transportation Improvement Program (TIP))

Chairman Mendelson called attention to the draft Solicitation Document. He said this was the document that would be distributed to the transportation agencies for their use in submitting projects for the TPB's consideration in the 2005 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Mr. Kirby described the proposed schedule for developing the CLRP and TIP. He noted that the deadline for the implementing agencies to submit the projects would be February 4.

Chairman Mendelson said it was his understanding that the Solicitation Document is intended to influence the submission of projects, but it is not binding. He said that later in the schedule, the TPB would approve the TIP and CLRP, and that action would be binding.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct.

Chairman Mendelson said he was making this point because he did not want members to think that at this point there was a finality to the projects that were highlighted.

Vice Chairman Knapp asked if it was correct that it would behoove Board members to go back to their individual jurisdictions to ensure that important projects, which may have been left off the list under the previous item, are included in the projects submitted by February 4.

Mr. Kirby said the priority list was not binding. It was just information to be considered by the agencies.

Vice Chairman Knapp asked whether projects that are not on the list would replace projects on the list.

Chairman Mendelson said he would not use the word “replace.” He said the Board members can work with their transportation departments to include projects in their TIP submissions that may or may not be on the priority list.

Mr. Zimmerman asked whether his understanding of the process regarding the bicycle and pedestrian priorities was correct. He said he understood that the priority list was essentially developed by a subcommittee comprised of the jurisdictions’ staff. He said the list was then be used through the Solicitation Document to lobby their own transportation agencies. He said he thought he had conflicting reactions to this process. On one hand, he expressed concern that the TPB was being used in this way; on the other hand, he said he was concerned that the list was so minimal that it seemed to reflect a lack of ambition on the part of the Subcommittee. He asked if the Board would have the opportunity to amend the Solicitation Document after the Board has received a briefing on the development of the priority list.

Chairman Mendelson said the project submission deadline of February 4 would occur before the Board would have a chance to amend the Solicitation Document. However, he noted that the Board would have the opportunity to amend to amend the list of projects that are submitted. Further, he noted that Board members can work directly through their transportation agencies on the list of projects that are submitted.

Mr. Zimmerman said he was concerned that the list seemed focused on bicycle trails and did not adequately emphasize pedestrian projects. He said his overall concern was that these projects were being given short shrift and inadequate funding.

Chairman Mendelson suggested that when the issue is taken up next month, the Board might consider ways in which the process might be more pedestrian-focused.

Vice Chairman Hudgins asked for a clarification of to what degree the list guides the submission of projects.

Mr. Kirby said this was not meant to be an exclusive list. It was meant to be a list reflecting priorities that have bubbled up at the regional level. He said the agencies may determine they have priorities other than the projects on the list. He said that staff in February or March can brief the Board on how the submissions compare to the list of priorities.

Chairman Mendelson emphasized that the TIP and the CLRP have many projects, and the Solicitation Document is not binding in terms of what is submitted.

Ms. Kaiser said she was concerned with the process. She said that some jurisdictions may not have been represented on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee. But she said her larger concern was why the Solicitation Document should have any projects listed. She said she thought the purpose of the document was to solicit a list. She suggested that the list be deleted from the

Solicitation Document. She said the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee should be directed to develop a more comprehensive list of projects. She said she agreed with Mr. Zimmerman that the list should include more pedestrian priorities.

Mr. Kirby said it would be appropriate to ask the Subcommittee to provide a more comprehensive picture of their process and priorities, including pedestrian priorities. He said the Subcommittee has been working on the priority list for a number of years. He emphasized that it was simply being provided as information to the implementing agencies.

Chairman Mendelson said that although the process for developing the list of bicycle and pedestrian priorities may be awkward, he wanted to emphasize that the TPB needs to more fully examine its role as a Metropolitan Planning Organization. He said that because the TPB has to approve the projects, it should also have a role influencing the selection of priority projects in the region. He said the TPB is federally constituted to look at regional priorities. He said that if the Board would take out the list of regional bicycle and pedestrian priorities from the Solicitation Document, the TPB would be making no statement as a regional planning body as to priorities, and he said he did not think that was appropriate either.

Chairman Mendelson noted that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee is a subcommittee of the Technical Committee. He said that perhaps the Board needs to look at the makeup of the Technical Committee.

Mr. Harrington said he was not comfortable voting on this item at the meeting.

Mr. Kirby said the Board might consider approving the Solicitation Document, but requesting that the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee come back with the requested additional information with a view to amending the list in the future.

Mr. Harrington said even though there is flexibility regarding the project submissions; the Solicitation Document does give a sense of the body's endorsement. He asked about a letter that had been distributed from the Coalition for Smarter Growth regarding a chart in the Solicitation Document on regional activity centers and clusters. He asked how the chart was devised and whether it was based on information received from planning departments.

Mr. Kirby explained the activity centers were developed through a process at COG, including the Planning Directors Committee, which has representatives from all the jurisdictions. He said the activity centers were based on forecasts of employment densities. The activity centers were aggregated into activity clusters. He said the Coalition for Smart Growth has said that activity centers instead of clusters should be the focus of attention. He said they apparently believe the clusters are too large in area. However, the planning directors wanted to use the clusters because that picks up nearby housing and other activities. He said there is some debate regarding the grain of the analysis.

Mr. Harrington said this issue raised concerns, similar to the bicycle and pedestrian discussion, about how complete the information in the Solicitation Document is regarding activity centers and clusters. For example, he said he was surprised that anticipated developed near the Intercounty Connector (ICC) was not included.

Mr. Kirby said that when the activity centers were adopted, there was a recognition that they would be updated regularly. He said the planning directors would be revisiting them in the next several months.

Mr. Harrington said that this point should be noted in the document.

Ms. Porter said that several years ago, she had chaired a committee on greenways that put together a plan identifying priorities. She said that plan would be worth revisiting. Regarding the Solicitation Document, she strongly encouraged the Board to keep the bicycle and pedestrian priorities, and if necessary revise the list later. To take the list out, she said, would send the signal that bicycle and pedestrian improvements are not priorities.

Mr. Snyder moved that the Board approve the Solicitation Document, with the addition of an explanatory sentence after the list of pedestrian and bicycle projects that this list is subject to further discussion and review.

Mr. Harrington asked that similar language also be added regarding the activity centers.

Mr. Kirby said that language regarding the intention to regularly update the activity centers could be taken from a previous TPB resolution.

The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously with the addition of the two previously noted caveat sentences.

11. Acceptance of the Final Report of the Regional Panel to Address Dedicated Funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Penner, chair of the funding panel, briefed the Board on panel's findings and recommendations. The panel was cosponsored by the Council of Governments (COG), the Greater Washington Board of Trade and the Federal City Council. He emphasized that although the panel considered a sales tax preferable, the panel was most concerned that a reliable and stable source of revenue be provided, and was less concerned with what source would be used. He also pointed out that dedicating a tax is different from increasing a tax.

Ms. Porter said she supported efforts to find dedicated source of revenue for Metro. But she expressed objections to language in the report suggesting that MetroAccess is not part of Metro's core service and should be considered a social service. As chair of the TPB's Access for All Advisory Committee, she said she had heard from a number of people in the disability community who find very offensive the notion that getting someone without disabilities to work is transportation while getting someone with disabilities to work is a social service. She said she would like the Board to consider language, which was included in a revised draft resolution that was distributed, that said that "the TPB considers it entirely appropriate that transportation system revenues be used to serve people with disabilities who cannot use the fixed route system."

Mr. Zimmerman said the language in the report was not meant to suggest that paratransit is not an important and valuable and essential service. Rather, he said the question was whether transit riders should pick up the bill for this service. He said that recent fare increases at Metro have been driven by the growing cost of paratransit. He asked if it was fair that automobile drivers were not asked to pick up some of these expenses. He said the key question is what would be the most appropriate mechanism for funding paratransit. He said he believed it should be funded through mechanisms that are more broad-based. He said that any new revenue source, such as a sales tax, would be likely to be limited, and he said it was important to ask how far those funds should be stretched.

Vice Chairman Hudgins moved that the TPB approve the resolution, as revised to reflect Ms. Porters concerns, and that the Board endorse the recommendations of the panel. She said it was important to note the role of the federal government in meeting WMATA's needs. She also said that the needs of people with disabilities should be considered as part of the overall solution.

Ms. Porter seconded the motion.

Ms. Pourciau commended the work of the panel. She said the District of Columbia is struggling with the shortfall it faces in terms of WMATA funding. She said the District is funding almost 40 percent of the Metro program and is expecting to have difficulty maintaining that level of commitment.

Mr. Smith said the report was important and deserves thoughtful consideration. However, he said that in Loudoun County's view, it should be an information item. He said Loudoun was concerned about the use of the word "accept" in the resolution because it could be construed as an acceptance of a dedicated sales tax. He said that the previous day, the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors passed a resolution opposing any tax increases at this time. He said that Loudoun would have to vote "no" on the question.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if Loudoun was opposed to a tax increase in other jurisdictions.

Mr. Smith said the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors did not understand what this resolution

implies in terms of an impact on Loudoun County.

Mr. Zimmerman said the resolution could be altered to clarify that the recommendations were limited to WMATA's compact jurisdictions. He said the resolution also could be delayed. However, he said it was important to make a strong statement.

Chairman Mendelson asked Mr. Penner if the recommendation regarding taxes would only apply to the compact jurisdictions.

Mr. Penner said that was correct.

In response to Mr. Zimmerman's comments regarding MetroAccess, Ms. Porter said that the Access for All Advisory Committee had endorsed WMATA's efforts to make the regular system more accessible to people with disabilities and to train people with disabilities to use the system. In a previous action that the TPB endorsed, the committee has also recommended a study of MetroAccess to identify more cost effective ways to serve more people. But she reiterated that MetroAccess needs to be part of Metro's core services.

Mr. Fellows said the action should not be delayed a month.

Ms. Petzold said she also had problems with the word "accept" as did Mr. Smith. She made a motion offering an amendment changing the word to "receive." She said that change would show that TPB had received the report, but did not endorse all aspects of it.

Mr. Salles seconded the motion.

Mr. Smith said he would support this change.

Vice Chairman Hudgins voiced objection to Ms. Petzold's amendment. She noted that her motion was not to "accept" the report, as was written on the blue handout, but to "endorse" it.

Chairman Mendelson clarified that Vice Chairman Hudgins' motion was not identical to the resolution with the blue-cover page that had been handed out: Instead of "accepting" the panel's recommendations, the resolution would "endorse" them.

Mr. Zimmerman said that when the region endorsed the Metro Matters funding plan last fall, it merely delayed the system's funding crisis. He said the system still needed a long-term funding resolution. He said that if TPB members were not willing to endorse the report, he did not know how they could expect anyone else to do it. He strongly supported Vice Chairman Hudgins' motion.

Vice Chairman Hudgins emphasized that a failure to endorse the panel's recommendations would

be a relinquishing of the Board's responsibility to deal with critical transportation issues. She noted that the Board may not be in full agreement on the specifics of the report, but she said it gives the Board an opportunity to be more focused on how the system's problems might be solved. She said she did not understand why the Board would need to continue to have discussions on this while they watch the system continue to deteriorate.

Mr. Salles said that everyone on the Board supports Metro, but he said that at this point, he could not endorse a sales tax or something like that. He said he thought it was premature to be discussing a specific recommendation.

Chairman Mendelson said he believed Ms. Petzold's amendment would take a resolution that was already tepid and make it even worse. He said the region's transportation system is facing serious problems and that a number of studies and other indicators show that a dedicated funding source is needed. He said that the choice before the TPB was whether to make a strong statement or not.

Following a voice vote on Ms. Petzold's amendment, Chairman Mendelson said the "no's" had it.

Chairman Mendelson said the resolution before the Board was as distributed, except where the word "accepted" would be changed to "endorsed."

Mr. Kirby said that on the issue of MetroAccess as suggested by Ms. Porter, the COG legal counsel had suggested the language "... be used to assist in serving people." He said the implication of this language would be to include the opportunity to secure social service money.

Ms. Porter said she would rather leave it as it was distributed.

A question was asked as to whether using the term "endorsed" would mean that a "yes" vote would endorse a sales tax.

Mr. Zimmerman said no, because the report does not really endorse a sales tax.

Vice Chairman Hudgins added that the report offered options and did not say a sales tax was the only solution.

Vice Chairman Knapp emphasized that the report did not endorse a specific tax. It said a dedicated funding source was needed for WMATA funding.

The motion was approved with Ms. Kaiser, Ms. Petzold, and Mr. Smith voting "no," and Mr. Salles abstaining.

12. Update on Actions to Improve Regional Transportation Communications and

Coordination During Incidents

Mr. Snyder introduced this item, noting that the TPB in the past had endorsed a general approach to these improvements. He said that the Management, Operations and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) had been working with the agencies to develop a specific plan for implementation.

Mr. Snyder introduced Phil Tarnoff to make a presentation. He also recognized the contributions of John Contestabile with the State of Maryland.

Referring to the handout presentation, Mr. Tarnoff described the existing situation, including the need for an improved system for regional coordination. He said the proposed solution would be the establishment of an agency called CapCom, which would provide operations support and planning and preparedness efforts. He described a proposed work program for establishing CapCom. He said TPB assistance is needed to: endorse the work plan; identify start-up funding; request a Congressional earmark; and endorse an application with the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) to support interface with emergency management agencies. He said the start-up funding would be \$345,000 for the preparation phase.

Mr. Snyder made a motion proposing that the TPB:

- endorse the work plan;
- agree to work to identify start-up funding;
- support the congressional earmark; and
- endorse the UASI application.

Mr. Snyder said the UASI application process required an endorsement from the TPB before the next Board meeting because projects will be reviewed in the near future.

Ms. Pourciau said she understood that a group of officials from across the region will be meeting in early March to make a final selection on the regional UASI funds. She suggested that a very clear proposal be brought back to TPB at the February meeting, which could be endorsed by the TPB and then forwarded to the COG Regional Emergency Preparedness Council. The REPC could then submit the proposal as an official submission for the region.

Ms. Kaiser thanked Mr. Snyder for his hard work. She also thanked Mr. Tarnoff and Mr. Contestabile. She said she supported moving forward on this issue.

Mr. White also thanked everyone who has been working on this issue. He noted that page 4 of the handout provided a compelling case that the region needs to act quickly to make the improvements.

Ms. Sorenson said the Virginia Department of Transportation was also in support of Mr. Snyder's motion.

The motion was seconded and was passed unanimously.

13. Report of the Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign

This item was deferred to the February meeting.

14. Review of Outline and Preliminary Budget for FY 2006 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

This item was deferred to the February meeting.

15. Review of Outline and Preliminary Budget for FY 2006 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

This item was deferred to the February meeting.

16. Other Business

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.