

**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
February 17, 2010**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Melissa Barlow, FTA
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Robert Catlin, City of College Park
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jason Groth, Charles County
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Julia Koster, NCPC
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick
Christopher Lawson, FHWA
Michael C. May, Prince William County
Colleen Mitchell, DC Office of Planning
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Morteza Salehi, VDOT
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
John B. Thomas, Frederick County
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office Of Planning
Todd Turner, City of Bowie
Jonathan Way, Manassas City
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
Michael Clifford
Gerald Miller
Nicholas Ramfos
Andrew Meese
Tim Canan
Deborah Etheridge
Beth Newman
Monica Bansal
Deborah Bilek
Sunil Kumar COG/DEP
Lewis Miller COG/OPA
Bill Orleans HACK
Gary Euler MATOC
Alyssa Brown PWC
Greg McFarland NVTC
Bob Owolabi Fairfax County
Matt Welbes FTA
Jeff Ensor PB
Harold Foster MNCPPC-Prince George's County
Jim Maslanka Alexandria
Stewart Schwartz Coalition For Smarter Growth
Megan McConville World Resources Institute
Richard Retting Sam Schwartz Engineering
Maureen Budetti TPB/CAC Chair

Chairman Snyder welcomed two new TPB members, Carol Krimm from the City of Frederick, and Christopher Lawson, Division Administrator from the Federal Highway Administration.

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

There was no public comment.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the January 20 Meeting

Ms. Smyth moved to approve the minutes of the January 20, 2010 TPB meeting. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Mr. Verzosa said that the Technical Committee met on February 5th, and reviewed seven items on today's TPB agenda including two action items and five information items. These included a briefing on a resolution endorsing the establishment of a Virginia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (Item 7); an update on potential transportation funding under a new stimulus bill under consideration in Congress (Item 8); a briefing on FTA's new policies for funding New Starts and Small Starts transit projects (Item 9); a briefing on the timing and transportation planning implications of changes proposed by the EPA for emissions standards and modeling (Item 11); an update on potential funding and staffing changes for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination Program (MATOC) (Item 12); a review of the draft 2011 Commuter Connections Work Program (Item 13); and a review of the draft 2011 TPB Unified Planning Work Program (Item 14). He noted that final drafts of both work programs would be reviewed by the Technical Committee on March 5 and presented to the TPB for approval on March 17.

Mr. Verzosa said that the Technical Committee also received updates on implementation of Version 2.3 of the TPB Travel Demand Model, the status of the financial analysis for the 2010 Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP), and the potential next steps in the analysis of the "CLRP Aspirations" and "What Would It Take?" greenhouse gas reduction scenarios.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Chairman Snyder introduced new TPB Chair Maureen Budetti, noting that she is a former planning commissioner for the City of Falls Church and has been active with transportation issues.

Ms. Budetti said that the February CAC meeting was canceled due to the weather. She said that the CAC plans to continue to follow regional long-range planning efforts including the TPB Scenario Study, and noted that the Committee looks forward to participating in the planning of a regional forum approved by the TPB to discuss those efforts.

Chairman Snyder said that there was a pending action before the TPB regarding the CAC to approve the appointment of Faith Wheeler as the final member representing the District of Columbia.

Vice Chair Bowser moved to appoint Ms. Wheeler to the 2010 TPB Citizens Advisory Committee. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said that the Steering Committee met on February 5th and acted on three amendments to the FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), one to add funding for the purchase of three hybrid compressed natural gas buses for Arlington Transit as requested by VDOT, one to add funding to reconfigure the interchange of I-295 and Malcolm X Avenue as requested by DDOT, and one to add funding for the Ways to Work Program, requested by VDOT.

Mr. Kirby described the six items in the Letters Sent/Received packet. He said the first item is an announcement by the Secretary of Transportation regarding changes in the FTA's process for reviewing New Starts and Small Starts transit projects, provided as background for Item 9 on the TPB agenda. He said that the second item is a letter of commitment from the Maryland SHA to fund the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) program for FY2011. He noted that the TPB had sought \$400,000 from each of the three state-level jurisdictions for MATOC, and that Maryland's commitment was the only one received thus far. He said the third item was a request from the Martz Commuter Bus Service asking to receive a sub-allocation of regional funding equal to the amount that the miles they operate contribute in the FTA bus replacement funding formula. He said that TPB staff would be discussing this request with the region's transit agencies and would update the TPB at a future meeting.

Mr. Kirby said that the fourth item in the letters packet is the approval by FHWA and FTA of the TPB's conformity assessment for the amendment to the 2009 CLRP that included the Purple Line and the Return to L'Enfant project, and was acted on by the TPB in Fall 2009. He said the fifth item was a copy of the proposal submitted by WMATA on behalf of the TPB for regional bus stop improvements under the FTA Livability Bus Program. He said the final item is an announcement from the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regarding a new Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program, which would make \$100 million available to fund planning efforts that integrate housing, environmental, and transportation planning. He said that the program calls upon Metropolitan Planning Organizations like the TPB to work with housing and environmental agencies, and could be an opportunity for the TPB to work with other components of COG in seeking funding through the program.

Ms. Tregoning asked Mr. Kirby if the intent is for the TPB to submit comments to HUD regarding its plans for the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program, as the notice appears to solicit comments on the structure of the program, and there might be an opportunity to shape the program in a way that would be advantageous to the Washington Region.

Mr. Kirby said that the COG Board will likely be submitting comments, and the TPB could contribute comments to be incorporated into that submission. He said that TPB members with comments could contact him and he would work with COG Executive Director David Robertson to incorporate them into the COG submission.

Chairman Snyder noted an item in the COG newsletter indicating that there would be a meeting

to review regional snow removal and management efforts, and asked Mr. Kirby if he had any more details regarding that meeting.

Mr. Kirby said that COG staff is planning the event and that he did not have any more details at this time.

Chairman Snyder requested an update on any transportation-related aspects of that meeting at the next meeting of the TPB.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Snyder said that there would be some exciting news as part of Item 10 on the TPB agenda, but said he would not give away too much about the item so that no one would leave early.

7. Endorsement of the Establishment of the Virginia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (VAMPO)

Mr. Kirby explained that in February 2009, Virginia's General Assembly passed HJR 756 requesting that the Secretary of Transportation support and assist the 14 MPOs in the Commonwealth with the establishment of a Virginia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (VAMPO). Referring to a white paper in the mailout, he said that it had been developed to outline the Association's structure, mission and preliminary recommendations. He said that there seems to be general support for the concept among the state's MPOs, and that other states such as New York have very effective state associations. The Board will be asked to adopt Resolution R16-2010 endorsing the concept of the formation of VAMPO.

Mr. Kirby said that the TPB Technical Committee had discussed the issue at past meetings and had assisted staff in putting together a resolution for TPB approval that generally endorses the concept of the association and encourages the Association of Virginia Planning District Commissions to complete its organizational recommendations for the body. He noted that the TPB would be represented in VAMPO by the TPB member agencies in Northern Virginia, working in collaboration with the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA).

Mr. Salehi noted that the resolution would endorse the "concept of the formation" of VAMPO, and that the concept is already well-established by the state law. He suggested that in addition to endorsing the concept, the resolution could speak to some of the initiatives or actions that might be taken by VAMPO.

Mr. Kirby said that the resolution wording is in response to the specific request of a committee of the Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions (VAPDC), and follows the sample

MPO resolution provided as part of the white paper.

Mr. Salehi said that he finds the resolution to be harmless and would support it.

Vice Chair Bowser asked if any member of the TPB had requested to move the resolution.

Mr. Kirby said that the request had come to the TPB through the Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions, which is organizing the structure of VAMPO. He noted that the TPB is mentioned in HJR 756 as an organization that would be invited to participate.

Vice Chair Bowser said that she thought it would be more appropriate if one of the Virginia members of the TPB had brought the item before the Board.

Mr. Zimmerman clarified that no one had yet made a motion to approve the resolution. He said that he agreed with Vice Chair Bowser in questioning the impetus for the TPB passing a resolution, and questioned if anyone on the TPB was actually interested in moving approval or could state why formation of VAMPO would be important for transportation in the Washington Region. He said that the issue seems rather trivial and irrelevant to the challenges facing the TPB. He said that he was going to ask to be recorded as abstaining from a vote, but that he may not have to if no one actually moves approval of the resolution.

Mr. Salehi asked if the TPB's membership and involvement in the nationwide association, AMPO, aids the TPB in terms of obtaining various sources of federal funding.

Mr. Kirby said that most of the TPB's interest at the federal level is expressed through AMPO, and that the TPB has been an active member of that association. He noted that the TPB was not part of the initiation of the VAMPO concept and that the idea had come from a transportation committee of the Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions, which has hosted a variety of MPO-related discussions and functions and has asked the TPB for its support of the concept. He acknowledged that it is a bit awkward for the TPB to participate, as a three-state organization.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that adding to the awkwardness for the TPB's potential participation in VAMPO, in Northern Virginia transportation issues are not covered by the Planning District Commission but are instead dealt with by separate transportation bodies including the NVTA and NVTC. He said that in other parts of the state the Planning District Commission serves as the MPO, but that is not the case in Northern Virginia so it seems particularly irrelevant here.

Mr. Way said that in deference to the wishes of the Virginia legislature, and recognizing that Northern Virginia should have some representation in VAMPO and there is no MPO to provide that other than the TPB, he would move adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Way moved to adopt Resolution R16-2010 endorsing the concept of the formation of VAMPO. Mr. Salehi seconded the motion.

Ms. Hudgins said that she had concerns about whether an organization such as VAMPO would enhance or encumber the work of the TPB and the transportation-related entities in Northern Virginia, particularly if VAMPO would seek funding and staffing assistance from them. She said that perhaps more information could be provided from the Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions as to the value and cost of VAMPO.

Chairman Snyder asked Ms. Hudgins if she intended to move to table the motion. He suggested that a contrary vote on the resolution may send a signal that is unintended at this time.

Ms. Hudgins moved to table the motion made by Mr. Way to approve Resolution R16-2010. The motion to table was seconded and passed unanimously.

8. Approval of An Amendment to the FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Include Projects in Anticipation of Funding under the Potential New Federal Stimulus Legislation as Requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT)

Ms. Erickson, referring to a handout distributed at the meeting describing the status of federal legislation known as the “Jobs Bill”, said that MDOT had intended to propose a TIP amendment based on the House version of the bill which was similar to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) of 2009. She said that the Senate version of the bill, however, does not include a provision in the House bill requiring projects to be under contract within 90 days of enactment of the bill, and so would not necessitate an amendment at this time.

Ms. Erickson moved to table Resolution R17-2010 to the March 17, 2010 meeting of the TPB. Mr. Erenrich seconded the motion, which was passed unanimously.

9. Briefing on the Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) New Policy on Funding New Starts and Small Starts Projects

Chairman Snyder welcomed Mr. Welbes, Executive Director of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

Mr. Welbes congratulated the TPB on its success regarding the U.S. DOT TIGER grant program.

Mr. Welbes, referring to a PowerPoint presentation, gave an overview of the FTA’s New Starts Program including the evaluation process and project rating framework. He explained that the program pertains to new fixed-guideway transit projects including exclusive busways, bus rapid transit, light rail, and heavy rail. He said that it is one of the largest federal capital discretionary programs, funded at nearly \$2 billion in FY 2010, though the demand for funds exceeds the program resources. He noted that some elements of the Metrorail system have been funded as

New Starts projects, including the Largo Extension in Maryland and the Wiehle Avenue Extension in the Dulles Corridor in Virginia.

Mr. Welbes described the budget formulation directive received from the administration in March 2005 as having focused the evaluation and rating of projects on a relatively narrow definition of cost-effectiveness, largely disregarding other factors. He said that a new policy regarding the program was announced by the current administration on January 13, 2010 that restores the process to what was initially prescribed in the statute that created it, and includes all the project justification criteria listed in the statute.

Mr. Welbes summarized the FTA rulemaking process that is taking place to implement the new policy and noted opportunities for input, including the pending issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking. He said that in general terms, the regulatory framework will be changed to consider not only transit travel time and ridership, but also the economic development, environmental, social, and congestion relief benefits of potential projects, and a revised cost-effectiveness measure that reflects all of those factors. He also summarized the near-term implications of the new policy, especially for the sponsors of projects currently in various stages of the evaluation and implementation process.

Mr. Welbes also noted that the changes to the program fit with the overall livability agenda of President Obama and the partnership between U.S. DOT, HUD, and EPA. He said that identifying local financial resources and demonstrating regional consensus on projects will continue to be important factors in the success of transit projects. He also mentioned the Small Starts Program, which is modeled after the New Starts Program but funds smaller capital investments.

Mr. Zimmerman, referring to slides 3-5 of the PowerPoint presentation, pointed out that the previous administration had chosen not to follow the law establishing the program, and that the changes restore the original intent of the law. He said that unfortunately, because the proper rulemaking process wasn't conducted previously, it would take some time to shift the program's direction and establish the new structure. He said he hoped that it would move as quickly as possible.

Mr. Welbes agreed that the changes would take time, but noted that FTA staff had undertaken some research in recent years focused on measuring the environmental and economic development benefits of transit investments. He said that two Transportation Research Board studies that are nearing completion speak to that issue and should help inform the new measures. He said that FTA will likely hold outreach sessions to gather input regarding new measures of project benefits. He said that FTA will seek to balance a desire for more robust measures with a desire to not create too much added burden for project sponsors in reporting information.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the perfect should not be the enemy of the good in implementing the policy change, because there are many transit projects at key stages of their development and it is important for the federal funding framework to be changed as soon as possible. He said that

while cost-effectiveness is an important criterion, it should be a broad definition that includes all kinds of costs and all factors that reflect project benefits. He also suggested that the FTA revisit the structure of the Small Starts Program to potentially make it less like the New Starts Program by simplifying it and allowing it to more expeditiously evaluate and fund smaller projects.

Ms. Tregoning noted that local governments are facing many fiscal constraints that may affect their ability to provide local funding matches for transit projects, even with a new definition of cost-effectiveness. She suggested that the FTA could allow local governments to offer changed land-use scenarios that promote concentrated, mixed-use development as a substitute for a significant portion of their local match. She said that it is a powerful way for local governments to ensure that transit projects are successful. She said that when the land use changes happen after funding decisions on transit projects have been made, the outcomes often are not optimal.

Mr. Welbes said that one of the issues that the FTA would be considering in revising the program structure would be the match requirement and what is eligible. He said that they were contemplating changes in the rulemaking process that would go beyond simply revising the cost-effectiveness criterion.

Ms. Hudgins said that the potential changes to the program are refreshing to someone who has been struggling to move a transit project forward. She said that she hoped project sponsors that have not yet completed the preliminary engineering process might be allowed to revisit elements of the project, to further engage the public and come to a consensus on preferred designs that maximize the full suite of benefits.

Chairman Snyder said that the TPB would like to be informed of and engage in any further opportunities for dialogue with the FTA on the rulemaking process, and thanked Mr. Welbes for his presentation.

Mr. Welbes said that the FTA looked forward to more good project applications from the Washington Region, and encouraged the TPB to use FTA district staff Brian Glenn and Melissa Barlow as resources as the rulemaking moves forward.

10. Report on the TPB Regional Bus Project Application under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) program

Chairman Snyder stated that the TIGER Program was one of the most significant planning efforts that the Washington Metro region has engaged in since the Metrorail plans moved forward. He recognized Mr. Kirby to share an update on TIGER grant awards.

Mr. Kirby, referring to a distributed handout, summarized the announcement awarding TPB a portion of the requested \$204 million that was submitted in a December revision to a September application to the \$1.5 billion TIGER program. He noted that a formal announcement of all awardees under the TIGER program was made earlier that day by Transportation Secretary Ray

LaHood, and that this announcement came at the one-year anniversary of the signing by President Obama of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). He discussed the funding breakdown of the award, including \$13.6 million for the District of Columbia, \$14.8 million for Maryland, and \$30.4 million for Virginia, totaling \$58.8 million in awarded federal funds for the region.

He reviewed an email that was received by the US Department of Transportation, where they reported receiving over 1,400 applications and \$60 billion in requested funds for the \$1.5 billion program. Fewer than 3% of these applications were accepted. He suggested that, mathematically, the average award would be in the \$30-35 million range. He suggested that TPB's award of nearly \$60 million should be viewed very positively.

He reviewed the components of the TPB application, acknowledging that the original funding request included 21 project components. He said this was high and that he was not expecting that it would be fully funded, but that the application was structured in a scalable way so that DOT could select portions of the application to fund. He said that DOT prioritized the bus priority components of the application. He reviewed the awarded project components, which included Items 2 through 14, the corridor enhancements package and the bus priority package. DOT also funded Item 16, the I-95/395 multimodal improvements in Virginia, as well as the Takoma-Langley Transit Center, a bus transfer center in Maryland. Components that were not funded include the bike-sharing program and the K-Street Transitway, among a few others.

He mentioned that he not received any detail from U.S. DOT on their reasoning for selecting this particular subset of the application to fund. In reviewing the handout, he acknowledged that the overall TIGER dollars awarded for the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia correspond to the totals from the TPB TIGER application, indicating that these were the only components in the District, Maryland, and Virginia that were funded under the TIGER program. He said that given the level of competition and the number of awards and the amount of funding that we received, the TPB should be very pleased with its effort.

Mr. Erenrich commented that CSX and Norfolk Southern received hundreds of millions of dollars in awarded funding, and said that rail freight projects did really well through this grant program.

Chairman Snyder asked if any of the CSX or Norfolk Southern awarded projects were part of this region.

Mr. Kirby clarified that none of the CSX or Norfolk Southern projects were located in this region.

Mr. Erenrich commented that West Virginia received \$33 million in federal TIGER funding for a CSX double track. He said Ohio and Pennsylvania received funding also.

Chairman Snyder asked if any of the funded CSX projects include those that were supported by

the TPB.

Mr. Erenrich clarified that the TPB supported applications for both Norfolk-Southern and for CSX, and while CSX projects were funded around the country, no CSX projects in the national capital region were funded. He said there were some regional projects submitted, in which each state had a different component. He commented that, in reviewing the handout, none of the components of those railroads in the TPB member jurisdictions were funded.

Chairman Snyder asked if the awarded components were part of overall projects that the TPB supported.

Mr. Kirby clarified that the TPB did not support the CSX freight projects for the TIGER program.

Chairman Snyder concurred that the TPB had elected to support CSX in concept, but had submitted its own TIGER application and therefore did not support the CSX application for TIGER.

Mr. Weissberg commented that it may be prudent to do further research into the awarded freight projects to figure out what they cover.

Mr. Snyder agreed, and noted that this may a piece of information that could be available by the next TPB meeting.

Mr. Zimmerman thanked everyone from around the region who participated in this grant application. He noted that assembling this application involved a high level of cooperation across agencies and jurisdictions, and that the effort was successful. He commented that a bigger benefit from this process is a new attempt to do something comprehensive about mobility in the region even though funding is limited. He said that pursuing these methods will enable the TPB to move more people efficiently. He said that this award creates a foundation to build upon for the future.

Chairman Snyder recognized Ms. Tregoning's efforts in this grant application. He also recognized the staff who have been involved in this application, as well as the members of the TPB, the Steering Committee, and the Technical Committee.

Mr. Bottigheimer extended congratulations to Monica Bansal, Michael Eichler, Ron Kirby, and the rest of the TPB staff for their effort in compiling the TPB TIGER application. He recognized Ms. Tregoning as well.

Mr. Turner echoed Mr. Bottigheimer's remarks.

11. Briefing on the Transportation Planning Implications of the Environmental Protection

Agency (EPA) New Nitrogen Dioxide Standard, Proposed Changes in the Eight-hour Standard for Ozone, and New Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulated Model (MOVES)

Mr. Kirby, referring to a memo from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), summarized information on upcoming developments in the region pertaining to air quality requirements. He said that on January 22, 2010, the EPA set a new standard for nitrogen dioxide that will take effect in January 2013. He commented that this is not an area that the TPB has been involved with in the past and noted that this new standard will require roadside monitoring, which could have implications for non-attainment designations for nitrogen dioxide in the future.

He mentioned that on January 6, 2010, the EPA proposed to strengthen the 8-hour primary ozone standard by lowering it from the current standard of 75 parts per billion that was set in 2008 to somewhere in the range of 60 to 70 parts per billion. The EPA is currently taking public comment on this proposal. He said that the region will most likely be designated as a non-attainment area under this new standard. Non-attainment designations are expected by August of 2011. He noted that certain levels for transportation emissions will need to be met going forward.

He said that the new MOVES model, which was mentioned during the report of the Technical Committee, has been released, but has not been formally announced in the Federal Register. He noted that once the Federal Register announcement is released, there is a two-year grace period before the model has to be used for conformity purposes. He noted that TPB staff has been working jointly with air quality staff in testing this model, and that it differs significantly from the model that has been used in the past and generally produces higher emissions, which will have an impact on conformity requirements.

Referring to the mailout, he summarized a timeline from Exhibit 1. He said that the nitrogen dioxide standards had been set, but nothing will happen for a couple of years in terms of designations and monitoring and potential conformity. He said that the new ozone designations are expected by August of 2011, and while the standard is currently unknown, it will be much tougher than what exists currently. Finally, the MOVES model is expected to be announced in the Federal Register in February, and there will be a two year grace period before it will be required for use.

12. Briefing on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program

Mr. Euler, Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations and Coordination (MATOC) Program Implementation Manager, provided the TPB with an update on MATOC activities. He explained that MATOC continues its regional coordination, monitoring, and notification activities through the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System (RITIS), and reiterated that the focus of MATOC is on the ripple effects on the transportation network of serious incidents in the region. He reported that MATOC has been involved in disseminating information for

approximately 20 such incidents a month since the program's inception.

Mr. Euler reported on the involvement of MATOC in disseminating information during the recent snowstorms, as well as information coordination on several Metro incidents. He spoke about one of the new activities under MATOC, which is the development of a traveler information website that would position MATOC as a wholesaler of incident information, working with the media to deliver this information to the public.

Mr. Euler reviewed the challenges facing the MATOC Program, specifically the resignation of the MATOC Facilitator and funding for FY 2011. He said the position of MATOC Facilitator is currently vacant and the MATOC Steering Committee will begin looking to fill this position. Additionally, only a portion of the necessary funding for full MATOC operations has been identified for fiscal year 2011. He explained that the original federal grant provides funding through June 30, 2010, and the MATOC program requires \$1.2 million per year to fully sustain the program. He said that the MATOC Steering Committee has identified several potential sources of funding for the program in FY 2011. He said that MDOT has pledged \$400,000 for MATOC operations and that the DDOT and VDOT shares are still under consideration within those agencies. He said that MATOC has potential for a \$100,000 contribution from VDOT of CMAQ funds that may become available later in FY 2011. He added that in the short term, the Steering Committee will seek to extend the eligibility period for the original federal grant to extend the transition period beyond June 30, 2010.

Mr. Salehi said that it was his understanding that a cost-benefit analysis was conducted through the MATOC Program. He assumed there must be a consultant on retainer to conduct this work and quantitatively demonstrate the benefits of the system. He asked what the source of funding was for the analysis and when it would be completed.

Mr. Euler said the cost-benefit analysis was conducted through the federal grant. He said it is almost complete. He noted that the approach for the analysis was to conduct several case studies and project the information based on frequencies and other measures. He said the first two case studies are essentially complete and that the MATOC Steering Committee is working to define the third case study. He said the work should be completed within the month.

Mr. Salehi asked if the \$1.2 million requested from the District, Maryland, and Virginia is for continuation of studies like the cost benefit analysis or for the operations of the MATOC Program.

Mr. Euler said the money would fund both kinds of activities, and that the specific activities would be defined by the MATOC Steering Committee.

Chair Snyder noted that one of the issues faced by the MATOC program is long-term funding and he expressed thanks to Maryland for recognizing the significant benefit of MATOC to the region and for MDOT's leadership in coming forward with a funding commitment for MATOC. He asked for a report from DDOT and VDOT.

Mr. Rawlings said DDOT recognizes the value of the program is considering DDOT's share. He said DDOT hopes to update the TPB at the next meeting.

Mr. Salehi said VDOT has an active involvement in the MATOC program and noted that the first chairman of the MATOC Steering Committee, Dick Steeg, was from Virginia. He said VDOT will also report back to the TPB on the status of a potential funding commitment.

Chair Snyder asked Mr. Salehi to confirm that VDOT continues to support the program.

Mr. Salehi said absolutely and noted that VDOT has always been an active supporter of the program and recognizes the value of MATOC. He said that he is not aware of the result of the communication from Mr. Snyder to the former Virginia Secretary of Transportation. He said he will get back to the TPB.

Chair Snyder thanked Mr. Euler for his presentation and said the TPB would be interested in receiving the cost-benefit analysis.

13. Briefing on Draft FY 2011 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

Mr. Ramfos provided an overview of the Draft FY 2011 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP). He spoke briefly about the purpose of Commuter Connections and that it has evolved and expanded in the past three decades following its inception in 1974. He provided a PowerPoint presentation in which he provided information about transportation emission reduction measures (TERMs), the employer outreach program, the guaranteed ride home program, and the telework programs.

Mr. Ramfos said the FY 2011 budget is based on state funding shares for each of the program areas calculated using a population-based formula. He noted there is a decrease in the Commuter Connections budget from FY 2010 to FY 2011. He said there are two major changes. The first is a decrease in the program evaluation component due to data collection efforts that are being completed in FY 2010 for the 2010 State of the Commute Survey and the guaranteed ride home applicant survey. He said there is also a drop in the employer outreach TERM, due to the fact that DDOT will be handling the pass-through dollars for the employer outreach contractor directly, as opposed to COG/TPB handling this work.

Mr. Ramfos also provided information about new Commuter Connections activities for FY 2011. He spoke about the possibility of expanding a carpool incentive demonstration project called "Pool Awards." He said Commuter Connections will also conduct additional monitoring and evaluation work which includes preparing the technical report and draft general public report for the 2010 State of the Commute Survey. He said they will also be doing an employer telework survey for Maryland and Virginia employers.

Mr. Ramfos said the Commuter Connections Subcommittee has reviewed the Draft FY 2011 CCWP and endorsed the document. He added that state agencies have endorsed the CCWP. He said the Draft FY 2011 CCWP will be released for public comment on February 11 and will be brought to the TPB for approval on March 17.

14. Briefing on the Draft FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Kirby provided an overview of the Draft FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), which funds all of the planning activities at the TPB. The UPWP is a required document for all federally assisted state, regional, and local transportation planning activities. He said the UPWP must address all of the federal planning regulations. He said that 80 percent of the TPB's funding is federal and comes from a takedown from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) programs. He said that of that 80 percent, 75 percent is from FHWA and 25 percent is from FTA. He said there is a 20 percent local match, and that half of that match is provided by the three state departments of transportation and the other half comes from local dues that the local governments pay to the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

Mr. Kirby said that the funding level for FY 2011 is \$11,337,500, which is about a five percent drop from FY 2010 due to the fact that the federal funding has been flat over the past several years. He said that this funding level assumes that the SAFETEA-LU legislation will be extended for at least another year and be funded at the same level as the previous fiscal year. He noted that the SAFETEA-LU legislation has been extended only through February 28, 2010, and would likely be extended further until new federal transportation legislation is adopted.

Mr. Kirby briefly described the different programs within the FY 2011 UPWP and highlighted several changes from FY 2010. He said that since the TPB is conducting the federally required four-year update of the CLRP in FY 2010, it would not need as much funding to complete the update in FY 2011. He said that the Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Committee is conducting a strategic plan in FY 2010 and would not need that level of funding for FY 2011. He said that the budget for regional studies is being reduced due to work that will be completed in FY 2010 and not repeated in FY 2011. He said the final version of the FY 2011 UPWP would be brought to the TPB for approval on March 17. He said the TPB would then submit it to the federal agencies for their approval so work may commence on July 1, 2010.

Chair Snyder said that this is the slate of work to be completed by the TPB in FY 2011 and encouraged members to review it and provide comments to Mr. Kirby.

15. Notice of Proposed Amendment to the FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Include Construction Funding for the I-70 Project in Frederick County as Requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT)

Ms. Erickson said that on March 17 MDOT will be requesting an amendment to the FY 2010-2015 TIP to restore construction funding for an I-70 project in Frederick County. She said this project includes replacement of the bridge over Reichs Ford Road, reconstruction of the ramps to Monocacy and Reichs Ford Road, including the extension of the acceleration and deceleration lanes, and construction of a third lane in each direction from Maryland 85 to Maryland 144. She added that this phase of the project is part of a larger I-70 project.

16. Other Business

There was no other business.

17. Adjourn

Chair Snyder thanked the TPB members for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 1:55 p.m.