

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

777 North Capitol Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20002-4226
(202) 962-3200

**MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
October 19, 2011**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Eulois Cleckly, DDOT
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Edgar Gonzalez, Montgomery County Exec. Branch
Jason Groth, Charles County
Rene'e Hamilton, VDOT
Tom Harrington, WMATA
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax County
Eric Olson, Prince George's County
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT
Art Rodgers, DC Office of Planning
Paul Smith, Frederick County
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
Jonathan Way, City of Manassas
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby
Gerald Miller
Robert Griffiths
Daivamani Sivasailam
Andrew Austin
Jane Posey

Michael Farrell
Jinchul Park
William Bacon
Dusan Vuksan
Anant Choudhary
Clara Reschovsky
Gareth James
Wenjing Pu
Karin Foster
Eric Randall
Ben Hampton
Daniel Sonenklar
Erin Morrow
Jonathan Rogers
Rich Roisman
Debbie Leigh
Deborah Etheridge
Paul DesJardin COG/DCPS
Steve Kania CPG/OPA
Lewis Miller COG/OPA
Nicole Hange COG/EO
Jeff King COG/DEP
Alex Verzosa City of Fairfax
Bill Orleans Citizen
Randy Carroll MDE
Jim Maslanka City of Alexandria
Bob Grow Greater Washington Board of Trade
Judi Gold Councilmember Bowser's Office
Mike Lake Fairfax County Dept. of Transportation
Jennifer Fioretti Arlington County/DOT
Cody Christensen STV Incorporated
Al Francese Centreville (VA) Citizens for Rail
Will Handsfield DC Office of Planning
Nick Alexandrow PRTC
Carey Roessel Marguise Management
Patrick Duruny Prince William County

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

No members of the public chose to comment.

2. Approval of Minutes of September 21 Meeting

Mr. Turner made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 21 TPB meeting. Ms. Smyth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3. Report of Technical Committee

Mr. Kellogg said the Technical Committee met on October 7 and reviewed seven items on the TPB agenda: the TPB FY 2011 TIGER grant application; proposed amendments to the 2012 Unified Planning Work Program to reflect changes in federal funding; the draft call for projects document and schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013 to 2018 TIP; a sensitivity test of the CLRP Aspirations Scenario; the draft conformity analysis for the 2011 CLRP; the draft 2011 CLRP; and evaluation of the fall 2010 and spring 2011 Street Smart Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety campaigns. He said the Committee also received information on three additional items: the activities of the COG Steering Committee that is developing an action plan to identify improvements to regional incident management and response arising from the January 26th snow event; the draft regional congestion report that utilizes INRIX vehicle freeway speed data; and the successful regional car-free day that was held on September 22.

Mr. Rodgers of the DC Office of Planning asked if in addition to providing information about highway speeds, the dashboard feature with INRIX data could provide information about alternative routes, including the status of traffic and transit.

Mr. Kirby said that currently the database includes highway speed data compiled from GPS systems that feed into INRIX. He said developing transit speeds would entail collaboration with WMATA and other transit agencies, but that it is a good idea and something to explore.

Chair Bowser noted that 11,787 pledges were received on Car Free Day, well over the goal of 10,000 set prior to the event. She asked how that compares to participation in the past several years.

Mr. Kirby said this was the third year that the region participated in Car Free Day and that it is growing significantly, adding that the numbers are included in the information handout.

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Mr. Dobelbower said the TPB Citizen Advisory Committee's (CAC) October 13 meeting focused on three topics: the TPB's FY 2011 TIGER grant application, the results of the sensitivity test of the CLRP Aspirations scenario, and the draft Regional Complete Streets Policy. He said the CAC was interested in the benefit-cost analysis in the TIGER grant application and asked if the projects in the TPB's application would be ranked based on the results from the BCA. He responded that TPB staff said all projects would be included in the application and that US DOT would pare down the application if limited funding were available. He said the CAC was interested in the results from the streamlined CLRP Aspirations scenario

and asked if it would yield regional priorities the TPB can officially endorse. He said TPB staff had responded that segments of the network identified as providing congestion relief might be incorporated into the priorities planning effort. He said the CAC was concerned that the language of the draft Regional Complete Streets Policy is not strong enough to ensure that the principles are incorporated into projects throughout the region. He said the CAC suggested requiring that project sponsors report complete streets information when submitting projects for inclusion in the TIP.

Mr. Dobelbower announced that he would be leaving the CAC after the November meeting due to relocation to Denver. He said it has been an honor to serve on the CAC.

Chair Bowser thanked Mr. Dobelbower for his leadership and told him he should be proud of the work he and the CAC have accomplished over the past year.

Vice Chair Turner asked when the Regional Complete Streets Policy would come before the Board.

Mr. Kirby said he hopes staff will present a draft policy to the TPB in November. He said the draft will go through the TPB subcommittee process prior to being brought before the Board. He added that the TPB's policy would meld together existing policies at the state and local levels.

5. Report of Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on October 7 and, in addition to reviewing the TPB agenda, approved three TIP amendments: funding for engineering for the I-95/I-495 Branch Avenue Metro Access Phase II project; funding for construction of the Maryland 355 Multimodal Crossing project; and funding for the Route 659/Belmont Ridge Road Reconstruction project. He summarized the letters packet and invited Mr. Wojahn to speak to the TPB Access for All (AFA) Advisory Committee's comments on the CLRP, noting that three members of the AFA Committee have been active in the Regional Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force.

Mr. Wojahn spoke to the memorandum summarizing comments of the AFA Committee on the 2011 CLRP. He said that the AFA Committee is concerned about several aspects of the CLRP, including: investment in transit service, specifically bus service related to several projects in the CLRP; fare increases for Metro Access services and limited payment options that are offered to persons with disabilities; and impacts of major road construction projects on minority-owned businesses. He said the AFA Committee recommends WMATA offer alternative forms of messaging for persons with visual impairments, and commends WMATA's outreach to solicit public feedback on the restructuring of Metro Access.

Chair Bowser said she has received questions from her constituents about the Metro Access fares. She said she would share the AFA Committee's comments with her colleagues on the Metro Board, noting that Ms. Hudgins, Chair of the Metro Board, is concerned about these issues

as well. She said the issues of Metro Access fares should be addressed as part of a larger conversation on fare structures for the transit system.

6. Chair's Remarks

Chair Bowser said that some of the issues that will be addressed during the meeting have been part of the TPB's year's work in focusing on the Regional Priorities Plan, specifically related to the notion of having projects in the queue and ready for funding, as was the case for many of the projects in the TPB's FY 2011 TIGER application. She thanked Vice Chair Turner for his work chairing the Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force, a crucial step in the process that will benefit the region into the future.

7. Approval of TPB Application for Funding Under the FY 2011 Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Competitive Grant Program

Mr. Randall provided an overview of the TPB's FY 2011 TIGER grant application. He said there is approximately \$387 million that will be available for urban area projects under this grant opportunity, and from TIGER I and TIGER II only 3 percent of applicants received awards. At its September meeting, the TPB passed a resolution approving the pre-application and the development of the final application. He said the TPB's application concept focuses on small-scale capital bicycle and pedestrian improvements around regional rail stations, and that many of the projects included in the application would be challenging to fund under traditional funding stovepipes. He said most of the projects are a result of previous regional planning efforts, including the TPB's Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program and WMATA's Metrorail Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Improvements Study.

Mr. Randall said there is one change to the application package from that which was presented to the TPB in September. He said the project to construct a green street on a portion of Ager Road in conjunction with the West Hyattsville Metrorail station improvements was removed. He summarized the seven projects, noting that the total project package cost is just over \$31 million, with the TPB requesting just over \$24 million in federal funds. He said that a draft application narrative was included in the TPB mail-out and that the required benefit-cost analysis (BCA) is well underway. He provided a summary of the BCA for the Forest Glen Metrorail Access Project. He said the TPB is being asked to approve the application for submission to US DOT by the application deadline of October 31.

Chair Bowser asked if TPB staff created the BCA model or if a template was included as part of the application.

Mr. Randall responded that the model was created by TPB staff. He added that a consultant was procured to assist with the development of the input needs for the model. He said the notice of funding availability contained an extensive appendix related to the development of the BCA, which was also used in developing the model.

Chair Bowser asked if a detailed BCA would be provided for each project.

Mr. Randall said that a detailed BCA would be conducted for each project, but that some final data points are still being collected.

Chair Bowser asked how TPB staff came up with the summary table.

Mr. Randall said the summary is a total of the current benefits and costs based on current information.

Chair Bowser clarified that the inputs needed to obtain the summary came from each individual project.

Mr. Randall said that is correct.

Chair Bowser asked if TPB staff could provide the specific benefit to cost ratios for each project.

Mr. Randall said he could and added that the application will include this information at a 3 and 7 percent discount rate. He said that at a 3 percent discount rate, the most competitive project is the VRE bicycle lockers with an internal rate of return of 25 percent. He said the next most competitive project is the Arlington Army Navy Drive project. He said the West Hyattsville, New Carrollton, Twinbrook, and Fort Totten projects are each within the same range of approximately 15 percent. He concluded that the Forest Glen project has an internal rate of return of 9 percent.

Mr. Snyder asked Mr. Randall to repeat a statistic he referred to in his presentation on the number of people who walk to Metrorail stations.

Mr. Randall said the WMATA has a comprehensive list of this data for all stations as part of another study. He said through SmarTrip data, WMATA determined that approximately one-third of the people parking at Forest Glen and Fort Totten live within one mile of the station, and that over half of the people parking at West Hyattsville live within one mile of the station.

Mr. Snyder said this type of data should be considered within the region to showcase the need for low-cost, high-impact investments. He said that at fairly little cost, more people could access the stations without an automobile and reduce congestion around the stations. He said he supports the TPB's application, but is concerned about the priority given to projects that are ready, which suggests that it may be difficult for smaller jurisdictions to bring projects forward as they do not often have the resources to do so. He said it does not mean that a project that is ready is better than a project that is less ready. He said he is impressed with the types of projects in the application, as it is important to make better use of existing capacity in a cost-effective manner. He thanked staff for their work on the application.

Mr. Cleckley of the District Department of Transportation asked for clarification on the Forest

Glen BCA, specifically referring to the discrepancy between the benefits for the bikeshare portion of the project as related to the entire project.

Mr. Randall said that the bikeshare piece of the Forest Glen project is proposed for \$500,000, noting that the total benefit of that piece is just under \$4 million. He said the construction of the tunnel portion of the project is significantly more costly and the BCA includes the assessment of that portion of the project.

Chair Bowser said the Citizens Advisory Committee had asked if a bridge had been considered for this project.

Mr. Gonzales noted that the project is still in draft form and that the county will conduct a NEPA study, from which it will be determined if the county should move forward with the tunnel option or a bridge option. He said that while the station is ADA accessible, a person using a mobility device currently has to travel a great distance out of the way to reach the station entrance from Georgia Avenue. He said the county is looking at how to make the project more cost effective and increase the rate of return. He noted that one of the selection criteria is that a project be multimodal and multijurisdictional. He said the Forest Glen project includes transit, pedestrian, bicycling. He said Holy Cross Hospital is a partner on the project. He concluded by saying a bridge will be considered, but that many people believe that a bridge is not appropriate for the area due to aesthetics.

Chair Bowser said the county built a lovely pedestrian bridge over the Beltway.

Mr. Gonzales said that bridge was only \$14 million.

Chair Bowser asked if the county has embarked on a formal agreement for the bikeshare component.

Mr. Gonzales said the county has a grant with the City of Rockville for bikesharing at the Rockville and Shady Grove Metrorail stations and that they are looking at other areas of the county for locations to expand the system. He said Bethesda and Silver Spring are both interested.

Chair Bowser said everyone is interested in the county joining the system, noting that it helps all of the jurisdictions. She asked staff to provide the due date for the application.

Mr. Randall said TIGER applications are due on October 31.

Chair Bowser asked when the TPB can expect to hear about the funded projects.

Mr. Randall said US DOT staff has said they would expect to make award notifications in February.

Chair Bowser confirmed that the Board is being asked to approve the application package.

Chair Bowser made a motion to approve the TPB's FY 2011 TIGER grant application package.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Harrington said WMATA staff is very supportive of the TIGER application, noting that WMATA has conducted extensive bicycle and pedestrian planning activities over the past several years, but added that much of the work focused on WMATA station property. He said these projects are exciting because they represent opportunities to enhance access to the stations in areas WMATA cannot implement without working with local jurisdictions. He referred to a station access strategy study that WMATA is working on with TPB that looks at longer terms station access issues.

Mr. Turner said he is supportive of the application and pleased that it falls within the recommended range of federal funding, though he added that it was unfortunate that the Ager Road portion of the West Hyattsville project was not ready to move forward. He asked if there would be an opportunity to look at the projects that were submitted for consideration but not included in the TPB's application to see if perhaps those projects might be in a position to compete for funding in the future.

Mr. Kirby said that Mr. Turner and Mr. Snyder's comments represent some lessons learned from the application process. He said some of the projects, even those that went through a planning study, were not far enough along in the design process to meet the federal criteria and to conduct a full BCA. He said that when there is only three months turnaround time, projects must be well along in the process. He said that suggests the region ought to be devoting more resources to getting projects to that point before it is faced with a three month deadline for capital improvements. He said a lot of the projects are low cost and the funding needed to complete the design phase is also small and becomes available from time to time. He said he had recently noticed some of the TIP amendments where larger projects have come in under budget and additional money became available for some smaller projects. He said this type of reallocation of resources can happen fairly quickly.

Chair Bowser asked if the TPB will receive a briefing on the status of implementation of the TIGER I projects.

Mr. Randall said he can provide a thorough update on the TIGER I projects at the November or December TPB meeting.

Chair Bowser asked that that item be placed on the November agenda. She called for a vote on the motion, which passed unanimously.

8. Approval of Amendments to the FY 2012 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Revise the Budget, Respond to the Federal Transportation Planning Certification Review, and Incorporate the Scope and Process to Develop a TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan

Mr. Kirby told members that the memorandum and resolution that had been included in the mail-out packets provided a lot of detail concerning the proposed amendments to the 2012 UPWP. He said that the proposed amendments reflect changes to the work program since it had been approved by the Board in March 2011. He stated that there were three major changes: an adjustment to the DOT federal fiscal 2012 funding levels to reflect the final numbers; the inclusion of the work scope for the regional transportation priorities plan; and new language to address recommendations and corrective actions emanating from the Federal Highway and FTA certification report. He described each of these changes in detail by reference to the relevant parts of the memorandum. He noted that three of the certification report's four corrective actions relating to the Fredericksburg Area MPO (FAMPO) had already been completed, and that new language had been added to better document the relationship between the TPB and FAMPO.

Mr. Kirby stated that in addition to the three major changes, new language had been added to the CLRP and MOITS items to address climate change adaptation. He said that the TPB had done a lot of work on climate change mitigation, but that it was also necessary to pay attention to adaptation measures related to climate effects such as an increased incidence of severe weather events. He noted that incident management is one area in which such effects were likely to be of importance to TPB activities, particularly the MATOC program, and he said there would be an explicit focus on this area.

Chair Bowser thanked Mr. Kirby and moved to approve the resolution to amend the FY 2012 UPWP. The motion was seconded by Mr. Turner and Chair Bowser asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Turner thanked Mr. Kirby for his presentation. Referring to page five of the memorandum, he asked whether the money that was to be transferred from regional studies to public participation would actually be used for public participation.

Mr. Kirby responded affirmatively, explaining that the plan was to achieve two objectives by implementing the public participation techniques the federal agencies had recommended as part of obtaining extensive public input into the regional priorities plan.

Mr. Turner expressed his support and appreciation for the proposal.

There were no further questions, and Resolution R4-2012 was passed unanimously.

9. Approval of Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2012 CLRP and the FY 2013-2018 TIP

Mr. Austin directed members' attention to the relevant mail-out material, the call for projects document for the 2012 CLRP and the FY2013-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He said that if the resolution were approved, December 16th 2011 would be the deadline to submit new projects with air quality conformity impacts and any changes to existing projects in the air quality conformity analysis. He said that all project submissions would be released for public comment on January 12th 2012, briefed to TPB members on January 18th 2012, and put to members for approval on February 15th 2012. He said that the air quality conformity analysis for the CLRP would begin once the project submissions were approved, and that work would begin on the update for the new TIP, although the deadline for the TIP inputs is May 1st 2012. Mr. Austin stated that the air quality conformity analysis would be completed by June 2012, and that the results would be released along with the draft TIP on June 14th 2012. He said there would be a 30-day public comment period and that TPB members would be briefed on the air quality conformity analysis at their June meeting. He said they would be asked to approve the CLRP project submissions, the TIP, and the accompanying air quality conformity analysis at the TPB meeting on July 18th 2012.

Mr. Turner asked for a motion to approve the final call for projects for the 2012 CLRP and the FY 2013-2018 TIP. The motion was made and seconded, and it was approved unanimously.

10. Briefing on a New Sensitivity Test for the CLRP Aspirations Scenario

Mr. Kirby briefed the Board on the results of a new sensitivity test of the CLRP Aspirations Scenario. He began by reminding the Board of the details of the original Aspirations Scenario, which was presented in September 2010 and included land use changes, managed lanes, and greatly increased bus rapid transit service in the region compared to the baseline assumptions for the CLRP. He explained that the baseline for the new sensitivity test is the year 2030 and the 2008 CLRP, but assured Board members that after the 2011 CLRP is adopted in November, staff will re-benchmark all of the work related to the sensitivity test.

Mr. Kirby first presented the results of the sensitivity test of the full Aspirations Scenario relative to the 2030 baseline to remind Board members of the regional effects of that scenario, which included reductions in vehicle-hours of delay, increases in vehicle-miles of travel, and increases in transit, non-motorized, and HOV trips. He explained that the revenue from the tolls in the full scenario only covered about 80% of the costs of the construction of the toll facilities and the new bus rapid transit system included in the scenario, and that Board members had voiced concern that too much capacity was being added without the project paying for itself. He then presented the results of the new sensitivity test of the "streamlined" version of the Aspirations Scenario, which reduced the number of new lane-miles and interchanges to be constructed, but showed nearly comparable congestion-reduction benefits and increases in transit, non-motorized, and HOV trips. He also presented the results of a "land-use only" sensitivity test, and showed the results of the sensitivity tests of the full, streamlined, and land-use only scenarios relative to conditions in 2009.

Chair Bowser thanked Mr. Kirby and opened the floor to discussion and questions.

Chair Bowser began the discussion by asking whether the conclusion of the “land-use only” scenario was that more people would be attracted to concentrated areas around transit, and that those people would use transit but that it would have little impact on vehicle trips.

Mr. Kirby responded by saying that when more people live in mixed-use centers served by transit, more trips will be made by transit, biking, and walking, with fewer vehicle trips. He reminded the Board that staff will also re-benchmark the results of the new sensitivity tests to the new Version 2.3 travel forecasting model, which takes advantage of new household travel survey data, and will use a 2040 horizon year instead of 2030.

Mr. Snyder asked Mr. Kirby about the congestion reduction benefits of the sensitivity test, pointing out that 50% of congestion is caused by non-recurring events like maintenance and traffic incidents. He asked whether staff would be comparing the cost-benefit analysis of the scenarios presented today with other strategies designed to target non-recurring congestion. Mr. Kirby confirmed that the scenarios presented today deal only with recurring congestion, but suggested that other work focusing on strategies to deal with non-recurring congestion would likely be incorporated as short-term strategies for reducing congestion, while the scenarios would serve as longer-term strategies.

Supervisor Hudgins asked Mr. Kirby about the extent to which new capacity was really necessary in the tolling and pricing element of the scenarios, since, with good mixed-use centers, it would mainly be work trips using the highway network. Mr. Kirby confirmed that the “land-use only” scenario does have a lot of benefits on its own, but he said that highway congestion will still be a problem and that the toll lane network would still be needed to address that problem.

Mr. Elrich expressed concern that, for being such an ambitious project, the network of managed lanes included in both the full Aspirations Scenario and the streamlined version does not do enough to address congestion on non-highway routes. He wondered whether mutual parking constraints, agreed to by each of the jurisdictions in the region, might be a better approach. He specifically suggested moving toward maximum parking restrictions in all of the region’s transit-oriented development centers in order to decrease single-occupancy vehicle trips to those areas. He also voiced concern that the TPB is spending time studying a scenario that would cost more money than is available and that will never be built. Mr. Kirby responded by saying that the streamlined scenario would pay for itself through tolls, and that construction on some segments of the network is already underway. He acknowledged that parking is an important dimension, and that the TPB could test the effects of priced parking or parking constraints.

Chair Bowser affirmed Mr. Elrich’s point that in land use and development, including parking policy, the jurisdictions in the region could coordinate and avoid competing with one another. She said she would be happy to entertain a discussion of regional parking policy at the next meeting, and to have staff investigate the effects of various regional parking policies.

11. Briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2011 CLRP

Ms. Posey of TPB staff briefed members on the draft conformity analysis of the 2011 CLRP, which she said would be brought to them for approval at the November meeting. She said that the summary report had been included in the mail-out and is also on the COG website along with the project listing.

Referring to a PowerPoint presentation, she said that there had been several updates to the technical approach compared to previous years, including the introduction of the Version 2.3 Travel Demand Model, and a new TAZ Area System which increased the number of zones from 2191 to 3722. She said the emissions model, Mobile 6.2, and the emissions criteria, had not changed since the last analysis. She outlined the emissions criteria and the results of the travel demand analysis, noting that the new travel demand model continued to show an increase in transit and vehicular trips throughout the region from 2002 to 2040, but that emissions were being reduced due to factors such as cleaner fuels and more stringent vehicle emissions standards. She said this reduction in emissions was good news, but she noted that an upturn in emissions was forecast again after 2030. She then referred to graphs in the presentation to describe the emissions forecasts for various pollutants in greater detail. She concluded the presentation by informing members that all the conformity criteria had been met, adding that the public comment period had started the previous week and would end on November 12th.

12. Briefing on the Draft 2011 CLRP

Mr. Kirby referred members to the summary of the draft 2011 CLRP on the first page of the mail-out materials, and informed them that there were only six significant projects, three of which had already been incorporated into the 2010 CLRP amendment that had been approved in July. He said the other three projects were the H Street peak period bus-only lane, the Crystal City/ Potomac Yard streetcar, and the widening of U.S. 1 in Virginia. He stated that they were relatively modest changes that would be included in an action item at the TPB's November meeting.

13. Update on the Regional "Street Smart" Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign

Mr. Farrell of TPB staff said that this would be the tenth year of the Street Smart pedestrian and bicycle safety program. He said he would summarize the activities of the program over the last year and outline plans for the coming year. He said the reasons for the program had not gone away, as progress had been made on virtually all aspects of traffic safety except bicycle and pedestrian fatalities, which now account for a third of traffic fatalities in the region. He said that the 2011 Street Smart budget of \$600,000 had been weighted toward the spring 2011 campaign, as the fall 2010 campaign was conducted using the previous year's materials, while the spring 2011 campaign made use of new materials. He summarized the media campaign, highlighting several examples of 'value added' elements such as free exposure on various transit properties,

including those belonging to WMATA. Referring to a PowerPoint presentation, he summarized the results of a survey of 500 of the region's motorists to determine the effectiveness of the campaign, noting it had found that people were hearing and remembering the messages, for the most part. He said that DDOT had funded an additional evaluation element, a study of four target locations which had been subjected to extensive enforcement and public education efforts, and that this had shown significant improvements in driver behavior.

Mr. Farrell stated that the budget for fiscal year 2012 would probably be around \$630,000, a figure that includes funding from two new contributors, Loudoun County and the City of Bowie. Referring to slides 14 to 17 in the presentation, he summarized the funding arrangements in greater detail, including the suggested contributions by TPB member jurisdictions. He said that a major element of the 2012 campaign would be a stronger focus on law enforcement, and that there had been a seminar of law enforcement officers at COG the previous day for sharing best practices in pedestrian enforcement. He informed members that the November campaign would run from November 6th to December 3rd, including a press event in Montgomery County on November 14th, and that focus groups would be used to test a new campaign theme for the spring.

Chair Bowser said that she had recently represented the TPB at the COG Finance Committee meeting, where it had been suggested that Street Smart's local funding might be better added to the COG dues to enable the program to be funded as a regular part of the TPB's activities. She drew a parallel between Street Smart and the Commuter Connections program, which she said was a core part of the TPB's activities with a regular funding stream. She proposed that the TPB send a recommendation to the COG Board to fund the local contributions for Street Smart through regular COG dues.

Mr. Turner recalled that the TPB had expressed some support for the idea some months earlier, when it had previously been discussed at the COG Finance Committee, and he agreed that the TPB should send a letter to the COG Board requesting the change proposed by Chair Bowser.

Mr. Way said that many programs were funded in the same way as Street Smart and he did not believe that Street Smart should be a special case. He objected to the proposed change and requested that a no vote be recorded for Manassas.

Mr. Smith said that while he supported the purpose of the program, he was not convinced about its cost-effectiveness, so he would oppose the change for Frederick County.

Mr. Snyder said he did not believe there were many more important programs for the region and that he believed the change was appropriate. He expressed his desire to see greater outreach to parts of the private sector that would want to participate in the program. He said more private funding would result in lower public contributions, which might help address some of the concerns that had been raised.

Chair Bowser thanked members for their comments and said that as this had not been included as an action item, it would be brought back to the Board for further discussion.

Mr. Turner asked Mr. Farrell if he could share the information that had been provided at the previous day's seminar on pedestrian enforcement with the Board.

Mr. Farrell said he would post the presentations that had been given on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee website and provide the link.

Mr. Turner thanked Mr. Farrell and expressed his pleasure at seeing the City of Bowie contribute to Street Smart for the first time, adding that he hoped this was reflective of his participation and leadership on the Board.

14. Other Business

There was no other business.

15. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:05pm.