

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290 (202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202 TDD: (202) 962-3213

MEMORANDUM

TO: TPB Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force

FROM: Ronald F. Kirby, Director, Department of Transportation Planning

SUBJECT: Materials for the December 15th Task Force Meeting

DATE: December 9, 2010

Based upon the first meeting of the Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force on October 15, we have compiled the following information for your consideration at the next meeting of the task force on December 15:

- Meeting agenda
- A memo from Deborah Kerson Bilek laying out options for improving public information on the current regional transportation planning process.
- A strawman outline for the priorities plan document that describes potential contents of a priorities plan. This outline was developed based upon the input given by task force members at the October kickoff meeting.
- Notes from the initial meeting of the task force on October 15, 2010.

Agenda

Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force December 15, 2010 10:00 – 11:45 a.m.

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| 10:00 – 10:10 | Introductions |
| 10:10 – 10:50 | Discussion Regarding Options for Improving Public Information on the Existing Process
Drawing upon a memo from Deborah Bilek of TPB staff, participants will discuss potential ways in which the TPB can do a better job of explaining the current process to the public. |
| 10:50 – 11:30 | Briefing on a Strawman Outline for the Priorities Plan
Participants will discuss a strawman outline for a Priorities Plan that has been distributed to the task force in advance of the meeting. |
| 11:30 – 11:45 | Next Steps
Participants will discuss the task force's work plan and next steps, including the agenda for the next meeting scheduled for February 16. |

National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board

777 North Capitol Street, N.E., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20002-4290 (202) 962-3310 Fax: (202) 962-3202 TDD: (202) 962-3213

MEMORANDUM

TO: TPB Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force

FROM: Deborah Kerson Bilek, Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: Helping citizens with differing levels of understanding access appropriate points of entry into the planning process

DATE: December 15, 2010

TPB staff has traditionally stratified the public into three categories: The Involved, The Informed, and The Interested. With these categories in mind, the following memo outlines suggestions for ways to enhance TPB's public involvement strategies given its recent formation of a Priorities Scoping Task Force, which resulted from the May 26 Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities.

I. **Goal: Provide as much information as possible to the largest amount of people possible**

TPB staff should actively work to provide information to the public with the intent of (1) getting the most information to the most informed people, and (2) providing tools to understand how to participate effectively in the TPB planning process. The TPB produces two main categories of information that should be made available to the public on a regular, on-going basis. These are (1) TPB Process-Related Activities, and (2) Regional Analyses.

Though it will be hard to measure how enhanced information will affect participation levels, providing a steady stream of information will undoubtedly lead to more effective participation. Additionally, if more people know and understand what regional plans are available, citizens will be better positioned to communicate with their elected officials. Because much of the information produced by TPB is either decentralized or technical in nature, it is particularly important to package information in an accessible, "punchy" manner. Doing so will require capitalizing on existing resources, and considering/reinvigorating additional opportunities for information-sharing.

II. **Existing Resources**

TPB has a variety of existing resources that can be used to enhance public involvement as it looks towards scoping out regional transportation priorities. In some cases, these existing resources are underutilized, and could be strengthened to extend the reach of staff public involvement efforts.

Community Leadership Institute (CLI):

This two-day educational workshop attracts approximately 20 community activists and leaders who are interest in learning more about the regional transportation planning process, and gaining a better understanding of regional challenges, strategies for change, and opportunities for successful public involvement. The CLI occurs one or two times per year at COG offices, and reaches a total of approximately 30-40 informed members of the public annually. Some of these participants continue their involvement with the TPB through becoming a member of the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), attending TPB meetings and/or TIP forums, writing about transportation in local publications, serving in public office, and other ways. All CLI participants are added to the TPB News mailing list and listserv.

The TPB can capitalize on the existing CLI program in several ways:

- 1) Take the Show on the Road – The CLI has a stand-alone, established curriculum that would enable staff to take part or the entire program and deliver it to a variety of partners, stakeholders, and other entities on their own turf. This would enable those who are interested in learning more about the TPB process to “bring in” subject matter experts rather than attend a formal seminar at COG’s office. By travelling offsite, TPB could also extend its reach to traditionally marginalized populations.
- 2) Create Webinar versions of the CLI – As part of Taking the Show on the Road, the CLI curriculum could also be modified to be delivered in a webinar format. This would enable citizens from all corners of the region to participate and learn in a way that may be less interactive, but would provide greater flexibility in meeting time of day.
- 3) Create an Ambassador Program – The CLI was originally designed to enable participants who completed the program to go back into their communities and share what they had learned with the citizen groups to which they belonged. This informal way of spreading TPB-related information could be molded into a formal Ambassador Program, where staff provides support to a group of self-identified citizens who serve as “Transportation Planning Liaisons” between TPB and communities around the region. Some things to consider in formalizing such a program would be setting up an online interactive space for members to share ideas, access TPB information, and interact with each other, with staff, and with elected officials.

Citizens Guide:

The Existing Citizens Guide to Transportation Decision Making is a stand-alone, static document that provides an overview of the various processes that comprise the TPB planning process. TPB staff is considering ways to modify this document so that it becomes an interactive, web-based feature on the CLRP website known as the Regional Transportation Clearinghouse. This Clearinghouse will be a “one-stop shop” portal that centralizes information about TPB-related processes and major projects. This portal would ideally include a calendar of ongoing public meetings throughout the region as a way to provide citizens with an efficient site to visit and learn about appropriate avenues for public involvement. Because so many decisions related to regional planning are made at the local level, establishing and maintaining such a calendar is paramount to providing the public with the information they need to participate in the TPB planning process. Such a task would require a dedicated amount of staff time, and could be delegated as part of an intern job description.

TPB News:

TPB news is a paper and online monthly publication with stories that are based on the monthly TPB agenda. It includes the TPB and related COG calendar of events for the next three months, and provides information on recent TPB activity as well as regional policy information.

The TPB could capitalize on TPB News by adding one or several regular columns to the newsletter. Some ideas include:

- 1) A monthly tutorial on a TPB-related process
- 2) A regular themed and educational cross-word puzzle or word-search
- 3) A monthly themed “guess what this is a picture of...?” Etc.
- 4) A monthly “Ask your elected official/TPB Chair/CAC Chair/AFA Chair” question-and-answer column

Social Media:

COG and TPB use a variety of social media outlets. The TPB could benefit from embracing the functionality of social media as a way to spread snippets of interesting information to the public.

- 1) TPB Facebook Page - TPB has a facebook page with 26 “fans.”The TPB facebook page is seldom updated – the last posted update was October 28, 2009. By comparison, the COG facebook page has 200 “fans,” and the last update was three hours before this sentence was written. Facebook provides an opportunity to announce, cross-link, and comment on information. TPB could further embrace the facebook age to spread information among a wide variety of citizens who range in their knowledge about transportation. Information that is posted to facebook must be accessible, punchy, “bite-sized chunks” of interesting tidbits with linked addition information available for those who want to learn more. This page should also be readily featured on the COG and TPB website, and possibly cross-referenced on other websites as well. TPB Facebook page may be found here: <http://www.facebook.com/#!/pages/National-Capital-Region-Transportation-Planning-Board/108100024037?v=wall>
- 2) Yardstick Blog – The Yardstick is the blog associated with implementing COG’s Region Forward. It is updated at on a rough daily basis with pieces of information about the region. Anyone at COG is welcome to contribute, but must work through OPA to do so. TPB may wish to consider contributing more regularly to The Yardstick, or establishing its own blog as a way to disseminate information. This blog could be linked to the facebook page. The Yardstick blog may be found here: <http://www.regionforward.org/>
- 3) COG Podcast - Podcasts are a way for COG members and staff to connect with the public on a variety of topics important to the National Capital Region. The audio recordings feature the COG Board Chairman as well as other COG members and staff. Podcasts are advertised with press releases and available for use by radio stations. TPB chair Dave Snyder and DTP Director Ron Kirby have in the past been featured on podcasts, which represents an opportunity to provide information audibly. Information that is shared through the COG Podcast could also conceivably be shared through a video podcast. The COG Podcast can be found here: <http://www.mwcog.org/about/rss/podcasts.asp>

Print and Radio/TV Media:

TPB and COG have routinely been featured on a wide variety of traditional media, including but not limited to Dr. Gridlock on the Washington Post, WTOP radio, the Kojo Nnamdi show on National Public Radio, and Bruce DuPuyt on ABC News. Building on these existing relationships with traditional media outlets could result in increased and perhaps regular occurrences of TPB in the media, thereby expanding TPB’s reach to citizens around the region.

III. New Opportunities

In addition to the aforementioned existing resources, TPB should consider the following new opportunities and recommendations for enhancing public involvement

Social Media:

Making improvements to the existing streams of social media is only one small step towards amassing the full benefit that social media offers. TPB could consider adding one or any of the following ways to continue spreading information:

- 1) Creating a YouTube Channel – this would enable various presentations, short films, and public service announcements to be advertised online. OPA has the requisite technology to film and post this information. One such way to execute this notion would be to record audio commentary to PowerPoint slides, and make a full presentation available online. This YouTube channel could be linked to any and all other TPB social media.
- 2) Opportunities for piggybacking and co-branding – providing content that can be linked to information from partner and industry websites and blogs would expand the TPB’s online presence, and its reach to general public. Blogs such as [Greater Greater Washington](#) already reference the TPB throughout much of its content. Establishing relationships with

the authors of this material could increase the amount and quality of information that is circulated. Some blogs are maintained by members of the TPB internal committee structure. [Beyond DC](#), for example, is maintained by Dan Malouff of Arlington County. In this case, an institutional partnership already exists, so capitalizing on the opportunity to co-brand or link information may not be especially difficult.

- 3) Twitter – like Facebook, Twitter allows widespread access to small amounts of information for those who are interested in receiving such information. The TPB could use this tool to inform citizens about the release of publications, advertise public meetings, provide updates to the progress of the Priorities Plan, and other related matters.
- 4) Managing Social Media – Strategically using the social media network to spread information does not happen on its own. Making such a job a specific job function – or a significant part of several job functions – is necessary to have the desired messaging and branding outcome. Additionally, such work can be broken out among existing staff, as follows:
 - a. Establish a team of TPB Social Media Administrators. Each Administrator would be responsible for posting a certain amount of content on a certain web interface each week.
 - b. Consideration would have to be put towards managing the information that is posted. For instance, how informal/formal would the posts need to be? What, if any, is the approval process? How can we ensure that the process of posting does not result in lengthy delays towards posting the information?
 - c. Another option would be hire a TPB Social Media Intern to take charge of and coordinate these efforts. This could be a part- or full-time intern position under the Public Involvement Team’s purview.

The Jurisdiction’s Processes are our Processes:

Capitalizing on social media is only one way to expand our reach. An additional – and equally important – way requires a holistic review of the TPB structure as it relates to the TPB process.

The TPB Planning process draws upon a series of processes of TPB member states and jurisdictions. Insofar as the TPB, by virtue of its membership structure, is part of these disparate planning activities, TPB staff could devote more resources to interacting with the processes of its members. Certain TPB staff could serve as dedicated liaisons – and process experts – for each state or jurisdiction. For instance, TPB staff could regularly attend functions such as the TransAction 2040 meetings, and the MDOT tour, and have the opportunity to present materials, pitch the TPB planning process, and provide the context for any relevant regional activity.

Through implementing some or all of these recommendations, TPB staff could work to develop a more comprehensive public involvement plan that corresponds with TPB’s efforts to scope out regional transportation priorities.

“Strawman” Outline for Regional Priorities Plan Document

I. Current Regional Planning Activities

(1) The Region’s Current Regional Planning Process

Reference the Citizens Guide and the TPB Community Leadership Institute. Also reference the new TPB clearinghouse and the new brochure, which both describe the current process.

- The Players, the Process, the Principles
- Continuing, Cooperative, Comprehensive

(2) The TPB Vision

Reference Vision text

- Adopted in 1998
- Summarize overall goals, as referenced in project solicitation
- Note comprehensive goals – land use, environment, airport access

Relationship to Region Forward

(3) The CLRP & TIP

Reference detailed planning documents

- Brief descriptions
- Instructions on how to identify what’s in the CLRP and what’s not

(4) Scenario Planning (2001-2010)

Reference scenario study reports and documents

- Brief descriptions of previous, current, and ongoing work

(5) Current Regional Programs Reflecting Adopted Regional Priorities

Brief descriptions with references to detailed descriptions, web links

- Commuter Connections
- MATOC
- TLC
- JARC/New Freedom
- TIGER Priority Bus Improvements

II. Major Regional Challenges

Where are we falling short of the Vision goals and objectives? (Compare CLRP Baseline to Vision Goals)

- (1) Adequate maintenance, preservation, rehabilitation replacement of existing infrastructure

- Metrorail
 - Metrobus, local bus
 - Federal, State, local roadways
- (2) Regional Activity Centers
- Amount of concentration
 - Degree of “mixed use”
 - Geographic distribution (east-west divide)
- (3) Roadway and transit system congestion
(Improved internal mobility, efficient and safe movement of people, goods --)
- (4) Services to the transportation disadvantaged
- (5) Air quality (GHG projections)
- (6) Airport Access
- (7) Freight Movement

III. Identifying Regional Priorities for the Future

- (1) Key resources for identifying priorities
- The CLRP assessment (“the Baseline”)
 - Projects: Included, dropped, delayed
 - Metro funding
 - Congestion
 - Accessibility Measures
 - Environmental Indicators of concentration of mixed use in activity centers (east-west divide) (“jobs, housing and services in a walkable environment)
 - Indicators of mode use (highway, transit, bike/ped, telecommuting)
 - TPB Land-Use Transportation Scenarios
 - CLRP Aspirations Scenario
 - “What Would It Take?” Scenario
 - Priorities identified in adopted TPB Documents (summarize, reference detailed documents)
 - Bike/ped plan & priorities
 - Freight plan & priorities

- Airport access plan
- Management & operations & safety strategic plan (MATOC, other)
- Human Service Transportation Plan
- Regional Bus priorities
- Major corridor and Subarea Studies
 - Such as: I-66, I-270, DC Streetcar, Purple Line (Highlight some, reference CLRP document, web links)
- State, WMATA, Sub-Regional, and Local Planning Processes and Priorities
 - State Transportation Plans (DC, MD, VA)
 - WMATA Transit plans
 - TransAction 2030/2040
 - Local government transportation plans (DC, MD, VA)
 - “Inventory” of transportation priority projects developed by TPB staff

(2) Regional Priorities the TPB Should “Get Behind” (the Regional Parking Lot)

- Which components of the CLRP should be given highest priority? (Identify priorities in 10-year increments)
- Which transportation proposals from the list in III (1) above would make the greatest contribution to addressing the shortfalls relative to the Vision?
- Are there other proposals not in the list in III (1) that should be considered?

IV A Regional Priorities Plan Incorporating the Priorities Identified in III Above

- (1) Specify and evaluate with respect to the Vision goals a land use/transportation scenario that incorporates the priorities from III above (essentially the CLRP modified by the priorities).
- (2) Specify and evaluate variations on this scenario that might improve its performance or increase its feasibility.
- (3) Comprehensive benefit/cost analysis relative to the Vision goals.
- (4) Process for TPB approval.

Timeline

CLRP	Priorities Plan
November 2010: Approval of the 2010 CLRP	
	Spring 2011: Scoping Task Force Report
	July 1, 2011: Priorities Plan development begins
	July 1, 2013: Priorities Plan is completed
November 2014: Deadline for approval of the 2014 CLRP	

MEETING NOTES

TPB Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force

Todd Turner, Chair

October 20, 2010

Chairman Turner welcomed participants and explained that the purpose of the task force will be to develop the scope and process for a regional transportation priorities plan.

Mr. Swanson of the TPB staff explained that the task force had been formed as follow-up to the event the TPB held on May 26 called the Conversation on Setting Regional Transportation Priorities, which addressed regional transportation challenges, opportunities, and possibilities for enhancing the process of setting and implementing regional priorities. The impetus for that event was a request by the TPB's Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for the TPB to develop a "Regional Priorities Plan" that would serve as a financially unconstrained regional vision for transportation investment.

Mr. Swanson said the Conversation brought together nearly 80 participants including members of the TPB, the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), the TPB Access for All Advisory Committee, and the TPB Technical Committee. Participants discussed an overarching question: What would a regional transportation priorities plan mean? This question was further broken down to three questions: How do we understand the current process? What are the reasons to change? What are the options for change? Mr. Swanson described key points from the Conversation summary report, which can be found at:

http://www.mwcog.org/transportation/committee/committee/documents.asp?COMMITTEE_ID=263.

Mr. Orlin asked if there was any federal requirement for an MPO to develop a regional priorities plan.

Staff answered no. Federal law and regulations only require a financially constrained long-range plan, which is what the TPB currently has.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the federal certification review conducted earlier in the year would be helpful for the development of such a plan.

Staff noted that the report from that review had not yet been released.

Mr. Tydings noted that federal certification reviews in the past had recommended enhanced public involvement activities. He suggested that the development of a regional transportation priorities plan would provide opportunities for such enhancements.

Mr. Swanson briefed the task force on background materials that had been developed for the task force.

He began by distributing a draft inventory of priority projects that are included in regional, state and local plans in our region. He also referred to the methodology for developing the inventory. He said the inventory is intended to be limited to projects that are 1) regionally significant, and 2) included in plans or documents that have been officially approved by TPB members. The sources for projects in the inventory are as follows: District of Columbia - DC's Transit Future System Plan; Maryland – County Priority Letters to MDOT; Virginia – TransAction 2030 (Northern Virginia Transportation Authority) and a draft version of Virginia DOT's Surface Transportation Plan 2035.

Mr. Harrington said that such an inventory of priorities should include an indication that keeping infrastructure in a state of good repair is a top priority for the region.

Mr. Orlin asked for a clarification that all the projects on the list were unfunded. Staff confirmed that only unfunded projects were supposed to be included.

Mr. Weissberg pointed out that the projects were not ranked on the list in order of priority.

Mr. Srikanth said it would be helpful to know how the source documents for the inventory are currently being used. For example, it would be helpful to know that TransAction 2030 is used for advocacy purposes.

Ms. Erickson explained that the priority letters in the Maryland counties are each quite different.

Ms. Krimm expressed confusion regarding the inclusion of a top priority project for the City of Frederick. She said that in general, the differences among different lists of projects were confusing for citizens.

Mr. Weissberg said that the current draft inventory list was unclear, and he said it needed to be improved. But he also said it would become more confusing if it were parsed to include a variety of different categories and caveats.

Mr. Biesiadny said that to avoid confusion, the inventory needs to include projects in CLRP in addition to unfunded priorities.

Mr. Erenrich said that it would be useful to have a list of unfunded projects from the jurisdictions' master plans. He also noted that the life of a project is typically ten years.

Ms. Koster said it would be helpful to know how states identify projects and how those projects fit into a regional vision.

Mr. Smith of the TPB staff briefed the task force on the priorities planning activities of other MPOs. He said that staff had researched the plans of nine other agencies and found that they all engage in some form of unconstrained regional transportation planning or regional prioritization of projects. The research identified variety of methods for developing their Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and roles for using them. He said that unconstrained elements are often included in some RTPs to show funding shortfalls by mode/category or to list specific projects that could be built if additional funds became available. Some MPOs prioritize projects by filtering RTP project submissions through regional criteria or through a scoring system based on regional goals. Some MPOs set aside a certain percentage or amount of regional transportation revenues to be used for projects that are designed specifically to achieve regional goals. Finally, he said that staff found examples of MPOs that produce an unconstrained plan as a “vision plan” resulting from a regional policy process or scenario analysis that arrives at a consensus-preferred alternative. It is also significant to note that none of the MPOs investigated for this research conduct updates for their RTPs on an annual basis.

Mr. Swanson finished the background briefing by describing activities the TPB will pursue to better inform citizens about how this region’s planning process currently operates. These tools will include: 1) A web-based “Regional Transportation Clearinghouse” on the CLRP website will provide interested citizens with links to up-to-date information on planning activities that are currently underway at the local, state and regional levels throughout the region; 2) A new brochure called “Transportation Planning in the Washington Region: An Introduction to Players, Process and Principles”; and 3) future sessions of the TPB’s Community Leadership Institute (CLI).

Mr. Kirby called attention to a succinct list of the TPB’s current planning activities that was distributed to the task force along with the agenda. He said this list is indication that the TPB is already pursuing quite an extensive range of activities. He said the key question now is: what’s missing? What should the TPB be doing that we are not currently doing? He said that based upon the feedback from this meeting, staff would develop a rough scope that would be presented to the task force for its next meeting on December 15.

Chairman Turner went around the table and individually asked participants to comment.

Mr. Weissberg said it was important to address the region’s east/west divide. He said it was generally important to find ways to get more people to live closer to their jobs. He said that TOD is an important method to pursue that goal.

Mr. Tydings said the public is confused by the current process. He questioned whether the CLRP is the region’s best effort – is it the best method we can use to identify priorities?

Mr. Orlin said that the sovereignty of each state will prevent the TPB from ultimately determining which projects get funded. But he said he would like to see a process for scoring all projects – including those proposed, plus those in the CLRP. He said the Vision could be used for this process. He said this would be useful public information.

Ms. Erickson said we need a better way to explain how our process works. She said that people currently have no idea of how priorities are reached.

Mr. Erenrich said he agreed with the previous statements. He said it could be useful to try to figure out how we can complement our current planning process to identify priorities. He suggested a new plan might be based upon a funding envelope that would identify what the region's priorities would be if we had "X billion dollars" over 20 or 30 years. He said that if a consensus were developed, maybe agencies would work together to implement regional priorities.

Mr. Delfs said the region needs a reference source of where these projects are coming from, and how they are getting into the regional transportation plan. He said that DC has established a "parking lot" for unfunded projects. He suggested it would be useful to develop a "regional parking lot."

Mr. Block said the process for prioritization was more important than the plan itself. He said the TPB's staff's difficulty in assembling the inventory shows the shortcomings of the current process. He said it seems the current process does not identify key priorities that we have agreed upon in case funding becomes available. He said the current process is missing the "connective tissue" between the region's goals and what is in the CLRP. He said the process for a new plan should ask: What do we need to meet our regional goals? What is the gap? How are we going to get there?

Mr. Rawlings said there needs to be a more transparent process. The state DOTs need to put their decision making processes on the table and explain how projects got into the TIP.

Mr. Biesiadny said the fact that the public does not understand the process is the major point. He reiterated that we are not doing a good job explaining the process. He said that for TransAction 2030, they have done project scoring in Northern Virginia, and he emphasized that it is not clear cut. Finally, he noted that TransAction 2040 was divided by mode, so bike projects did not compete with highway or transit projects. He said they have been criticized for separating projects by mode. For a regional plan, he said a key question is: What is regional? Where is the cut-line of regional versus non-regional?

Mr. Srikanth said the scope should be multi-modal and have land use as a component. He further said it should focus on regional projects and accommodate the diversity of the region. He noted that the goals of jurisdictions are different and the scope should be consistent with jurisdictional priorities.

Ms. Budetti said she found the meeting very useful for understanding the process.

Mr. Way agreed that it would be important to determine how the term “regionally significant” would be defined. He said he found the TransAction 2030 process credible and he saw no reason why it couldn’t be done on a region-wide basis. He said the role of activity centers in the scope would be important. He said the new plan shouldn’t just be another scenario, but it needs to establish a credible relationship to other scenarios (WWIT, CLRP Aspirations).

Mr. Martin said he believes the CLRP Aspiration Scenario offers an example of a scope that makes sense. He noted the Aspirations Scenario’s comprehensiveness – it incorporates land-use through Activity Centers, provides multi-modal solutions, and applied key analysis measures, including VMT reduction. He noted that he was not in full agreement with some of the inputs for the Aspirations Scenario, but he said he believed it provides a useful starting point. More broadly, he said the region should have a vision (which would be comprehensive and easy to comprehend like the Aspirations Scenario) that would provide something for the public and leaders to discuss and work toward.

Mr. Harrington said he found the scoring idea interesting. He said it seemed there was much consensus. He said the inventory was a good idea, but it must include “state of good repair.” Finally, he said he agreed that it would be helpful if the region had a plan that would “park” unfunded priorities. He said we need to develop a public statement of regional needs, eg, “suburban to suburban connections.”

Ms. Koster said she saw three potential products: 1) An explanation of how we actually make decisions as individual agencies/jurisdictions; 2) a mechanism (perhaps a scoring system) that shows projects are moving forward regional goals. This mechanism would show how we are working toward shared goals in individual contexts; and 3) an articulation of system-based priorities that would show how our region is competing with other regions. This is a critical strategic element.

Ms. Krimm said that people hear about the region’s variety of different plans, and it all gets confusing. She said the people want to know how these plans and projects affect them. She said we need to “harness” the public’s energy and engage them to support more investment in infrastructure. She said it’s clear that we are not keeping up, but the public “doesn’t get it.” She added that she would like to see subsets of priorities defined between adjoining jurisdictions/states.

Mr. Beacher said the success of a new plan will hinge on the criteria. He said there needs to be fairness in the criteria and an acknowledgement that one size does not fit all. But he said it would be useful to identify some regional priorities that the TPB can get behind.

In closing, Chairman Turner said he heard a lot of good ideas and he particularly agreed with Ms. Koster. He said the inventory potentially could be useful, but it will be challenging to pull together. He said we need to educate the public and ourselves about scoring process, including

how other MPOs do it. He also noted the challenge of defining “regional” for this planning activity. Finally, he noted the possibilities for building upon past scenario analysis of the TPB.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50. The next meeting will be held on December 15 at 10:00 a.m. prior to the TPB meeting.