

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 16, 2013**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Dan Emerine, DC Office of Planning
Dennis Enslinger, City of Gaithersburg
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Seth Grimes, City of Takoma Park
Jason Groth, Charles County
Rene'e N. Hamilton, VDOT
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax County
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Shyam Kannan, WMATA
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick
Tim Lovain, City of Alexandria
Michael May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT
Paul Smith, Frederick County
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Tommy Wells, DC Council
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Scott K. York, Loudoun County
Sam Zimbabwe, DDOT
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	
Nicholas Ramfos	
Robert Griffiths	
Andrew Meese	
Eric Randall	
John Swanson	
Andrew Austin	
Deborah Kerson Bilek	
Dan Sonenklar	
Ben Hampton	
Bryan Hayes	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Michael Farrell	
Daivamani Sivasailam	
Rich Roisman	
Marco Trigueros	
Joan Rohlfs	COG/DEP
Paul DesJardin	COG/DCPS
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Matt Kroneberger	COG/OPA
Bill Orleans	HACK
Judi Gold	CM Bowser
Pierre Holloman	City of Alexandria
Nick Alexandrow	PRTC
Malcolm Watson	Fairfax County DOT
Mike Lake	Fairfax County DOT
Cindy Petkac	USRC
Norman Whitgken	VDOT
John B. Townsend III	AAA Mid-Atlantic
Bob Chase	NVTA
Jim Dinegar	Board of Trade
Bob Grow	Board of Trade
Patrick Durany	Prince William County
Doug Allen	VRE
Chris French	CIOO/Navy Yard Neighborhood Association
Danielle Wesolek	WMATA

Chair York called the meeting to order. He asked for a moment of silence in remembrance of Ms. Karin Foster, a relatively young member of the TPB staff who passed away on September 30. Ms. Foster had worked at COG for six years and focused on freight-related issues. She was a diligent, enthusiastic, and steadfast worker, and a highly respected colleague. The Board observed a moment of silence in her honor.

Chair York then welcomed Dennis Enslinger, who is the Assistant City Manager of Gaithersburg, to the TPB.

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Nathaniel Cole, representing Urban Alliance and Youth Connect, a national nonprofit that provides high school interns with paid internship opportunities, spoke about the importance of connecting youth and their transportation needs with the larger goals and strategies outlined in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). He said that youth encounter transportation challenges that become barriers to their success, and that youth need effective, affordable transportation options. He advocated for the TPB to establish youth transportation as a priority issue for 2013 and beyond.

Mr. Townsend said that the AAA Mid-Atlantic Regional Advisory Board for the Washington metro area, on behalf of nearly 900,000 Washington area AAA members, issued a resolution endorsing the RTPP. He read aloud two paragraphs from this resolution: "Given that our region has some of the worst congestion in the nation, we find this report refreshing and far more realistic in its proposals to enhance roads and mass transit largely through the development of express toll lanes that can provide an extensive bus rapid transit network. Such a network can be developed at a fraction of the cost of a comparable rail expansion, while providing high-quality reliable rapid transit services and improved highways. Therefore, we, the AAA Mid-Atlantic Regional Advisory Board for the Washington metro area, on behalf of nearly 900,000 Washington area AAA members, do endorse this plan and urge the Transportation Planning Board to adopt it and work towards its full implementation."

Mr. Schwartz, representing the Coalition for Smarter Growth, expressed concern that the RTPP falls short of addressing goals and objectives outlined in Region Forward. He noted that the RTPP Executive Summary fails to mention Region Forward, and that the Introduction continues to portray the 2010 regional compact as a subset of the 1998 Vision. He added that while the RTPP now mentions Momentum, it only proposes incorporating the 2025 investments, and does not apply the same standard to toll and other highway investment proposals. He then addressed the solicitation document for the FY2104 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP), and said that the solicitation document fails to mention Region Forward, climate change, and other goals. He urged the TPB to amend the RTPP to conform it better to Region Forward, fully incorporate Momentum, and let it guide effective and sustainable transportation investments for the future.

Mr. Chase addressed the process of developing the RTPP and said that while there are many

transportation improvements and strategies that are important to local jurisdictions, many of these improvements do not significantly contribute to the overall operation of the regional network. He articulated a challenge with the RTPP process and with the TPB in general, namely that there is no specific accountability measure for the region's transportation network operation or efficiency. He added that in order for the RTPP to be a meaningful document, TPB members must focus on what is important to the region as a whole, rather than what is important to individual jurisdictions.

2. Approval of Minutes of September 18 Meeting

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the September 18 TPB meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Ms. Erickson said that the Technical Committee met on October 4 and reviewed all four of the TPB agenda items. She added that the meeting began by sharing a moment of silence and remembering Ms. Karin Foster, a dear colleague and friend who is and will be deeply missed. She continued and said that the committee discussed and reviewed the draft call for projects and schedule for the air quality conformity assessment for next year's plan and TIP, the RTPP, the final report of the Bus on Shoulders Task Force, and the regional Street Smart campaign. She added that members were impressed by the summary video of the campaign. She added that the committee discussed four additional items, including: a briefing on the new 141 Activity Centers for the region, a briefing on the draft Regional Green Streets Policy, a briefing on MATOC activities, and a letter for TPB approval regarding proposed federal guidance on the MPO transit representation requirement under MAP-21. She also mentioned that both VDOT and MDOT are either engaged in or about to be engaged in fall capital budget meetings, and pointed to where further information could be found.

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Mr. Still provided a summary of the October 10 meeting of the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). He said that the committee received a presentation by Mr. Farrell of the TPB about the Regional Green Streets Policy. The CAC supports adopting a Regional Green Streets Policy, and encourages the TPB to continue to host workshops for area jurisdictions to share green streets best practices. He added that Mr. Kirby presented on an update to the RTPP, and said that the committee would like to spend additional time working to provide feedback on the plan. He mentioned that the CAC would like to see more specifics about how the RTPP will be used to engage jurisdictions and possible evaluation criteria. He said that Mr. Austin of TPB staff presented an overview of the CLRP and TIP processes, and that the CAC discussed potential agenda items for future CAC meetings. These items include: CAC participation in TPB letters to the federal government regarding re-authorization of transportation legislation; encourage discussions that are more inter-jurisdictional and information sharing about bus rapid transit,

streetcars, and other emerging modes; and continued participation in the RTPP process.

5. Report of Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on October 4 and acted on one resolution, an amendment to the FY 2013-2018 TIP as requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT).

Mr. Kirby described a draft letter included in the letters packet from the TPB to the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). He said those agencies, per the requirements enacted in MAP-21, have issued proposed guidance regarding the representation of transit providers on MPO boards. He said the agencies have asked for comments by the end of October. He said that staff reviewed the proposed guidance and is recommending an approach under which each MPO should determine the best approach for incorporating specifically designated representatives of public transit agencies on its board. He said this approach would be preferable for MPOs such as the TPB that have a great number of transit providers in its region.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the proposed guidance's reference to representation on the board refers to voting representation.

Mr. Kirby said the guidance refers to equal representation for transit providers.

Mr. Zimmerman said that this point is confusing because the TPB currently has voting and non-voting members. He asked for further clarification on "equal" representation.

Mr. Kirby quoted the language in the proposed guidance: "the representative, once designated, will have equal decision-making rights and authorities as other members that are on the policy board."

Mr. Zimmerman asked for Mr. Kirby's personal interpretation.

Mr. Kirby said he interpreted the proposed guidance to mean the representative would have a vote and would also participate in the weighted voting system.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what the other, more onerous, considerations were in the proposed guidance.

Mr. Kirby said the proposed guidance suggested adding every eligible public transportation provider as a voting member. He said the draft TPB letter called for guidance that would give MPOs the opportunity to add transit representatives based on the board's best judgment.

Mr. Zimmerman said he is not sure that the approach suggested in the draft letter is more or less desirable, since he had not had an opportunity to review the various options provided in the

proposed guidance. He said limiting representation to those who are direct recipients of federal funding could be an interesting approach because there are a limited number of providers that meet that criterion. Under that approach, he said, there would be a large portion of the region's bus transit providers that would not be on the TPB, nor would NVTC or VRE.

Mr. Erenrich said that Ride-On is part of Montgomery County and that Montgomery County has a vote on the TPB. He said the members whose jurisdictions have transit providers theoretically consider those providers amongst their membership when they take a vote. He said one void might be VRE. He suggested that the letter go into greater detail and state that the other providers who are not direct recipients of FTA funding are represented by the local jurisdiction for which they provide service.

Mr. Kirby suggested adding a phrase in the letter following mention of the 13 providers noting that those providers are represented through other members at the TPB.

Chair York asked if any member had objection to sending the letter as amended. No objection was recorded.

Ms. Tregoning asked how the TPB would amend its bylaws regarding weighted votes for the transit providers.

Mr. Kirby said there is a process to amend the TPB bylaws. He said the Chair would appoint a task force of the board, usually consisting of three members, to work with staff in drafting an amendment to the bylaws. The proposed amendment would be brought back to the board for discussion with two months for comment prior to acting on the amendment.

Mr. Kannan said WMATA has received the proposed guidance and wanted to reiterate that WMATA has been a full participant in the TPB process. He said WMATA is not in a position to endorse any position on this guidance and he asked that WMATA be excluded from a statement of formal endorsement.

Chair York acknowledged WMATA's abstention from the endorsement of the letter.

Mr. Kirby continued summarizing the letters packet. He highlighted a letter from Youth Connect, which was presented during the public comment period. He said it deserves TPB consideration and might be appropriate for discussion during the item on the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.

Mr. Kirby, at the previous request of Mr. Snyder, referred to a written summary of the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program, including its involvement in the Navy Yard incident, as well as other incidents that occurred on that day. He summarized some statistics on MATOC operations that were detailed in the summary.

Mr. Snyder expressed his appreciation for the report, which supports the MATOC efforts very

strongly.

Mr. Mendelson asked if MATOC is becoming increasingly assertive in working with the departments of transportation in terms of incident response.

Mr. Kirby said MATOC is a partnership arrangement and that the MATOC Steering Committee is made up of the three departments of transportation and WMATA. He said the purpose of MATOC is for everyone to work together more effectively. He said his observation is that everyone sees the value of MATOC's role and that the departments of transportation have responded very quickly to the information they get from MATOC staff. He said everyone has a common interest in information sharing.

Mr. Mendelson said MATOC ought to be more than just information sharing, that it should provide some direction. MATOC staff sees the whole picture at the time of an incident and can provide higher-level guidance and direction.

Mr. Kirby said that final actions at the time of incidents must be taken by the departments of transportation because they have responsibility for the roads. He said it is fairly well established that MATOC has provided good information and recommendations, which the departments of transportation have typically followed. He said this is a result of mutual confidence and established relationships between the MATOC staff and staff from the departments of transportation. He reiterated that it is not a hierarchical structure.

Mr. Mendelson asked if MATOC's funding is adequate.

Mr. Kirby said it is for the moment. He said funding for MATOC is in the regular budgets of each of the departments of transportation.

Mr. Kirby said he would like staff to highlight a new online initiative launched by the TPB: the Transportation Planning Information Hub for the National Capital Region. He said there is an information card at each member's place. He said the purpose of the Hub is to provide a convenient way for people to access the major transportation studies and projects going on in the region by directing them to those websites.

Mr. Swanson said the Hub is divided into three overarching categories: planning processes; high-profile projects; and documents and resources. He demonstrated the themes and examples on the Hub to the TPB. He said it is designed to enhance the TPB's Citizens Guide. He said staff welcomes any suggestions for improvements.

Mr. Kirby added that it would be helpful to jurisdiction staff to review the Hub and provide any new information.

Chair York asked TPB staff to send information about the Hub to the board member's staffs.

Mr. Turner asked how the TPB is launching the Hub to the general public. He said there is a larger universe of people who would be interested in this information.

Mr. Swanson said the Hub will be launched using social media and press releases. He said TPB staff would welcome members' help in spreading the word about this resource.

Chair York said he will send information about the Hub to his e-mail list and his jurisdiction's public information officer.

6. Chair's Remarks

Chair York declined to make remarks.

ACTION ITEM

7. Briefing on the Draft Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP

Mr. Austin presented the draft call for projects and the schedule for the air quality conformity assessment of the 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP. He said the TPB will be asked to approve the document at its November 20 meeting. He said project inputs are due on December 16 and that the TPB will be asked to approve the project submissions for air quality analysis at the February 19 TPB meeting. He said the projects would be released for a final public comment period, along with the results of the air quality conformity analysis, at the June 12 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting, and that the TPB would be asked to approve the CLRP and TIP at its July 16 meeting. He said that the remaining sections of the memo address the policy framework for the CLRP, as well as the federal requirements.

Mr. Erenrich thanked staff for advancing the CLRP. He said many of the continuing discussion will likely focus on the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan and funding for Momentum, as well as other projects. He asked when the TPB would be providing information about the financial constraint of the CLRP.

Mr. Kirby said the TPB staff are currently updating the financial forecasts for the region and will present that information to the Technical Committee as soon as it is available. The submissions, once approved, will have to be within that funding envelope. He said those agencies developing submissions are likely aware of where the funding is and how much there is, but that it will be challenging to review all those components when they come together. He said he does feel that the CLRP schedule is rather optimistic. He said it would be possible to take more time if necessary. He added that the CLRP must be updated by the end of the calendar year.

Mr. Tregoning said that the last Call for Projects for the CLRP included an explicit acknowledgement of Region Forward, a document that had been approved by all 22 COG jurisdictions. She noted the absence of Region Forward in the current documentation and asked

that such language be included in the Call for Projects to remind people of that important policy context.

Mr. Austin said reference to Region Forward was removed because the language on the evolving policy context focused on the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. He said it would be fine to add language about Region Forward in the documentation.

Chair York asked if any member had objection to adding Region Forward back into the policy framework. No objection was noted.

INFORMATION ITEMS

8. Discussion of the Revised Draft TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)

Chair York introduced the discussion of the revised draft Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP), which was released for public comment on October 10, 2013. He granted staff five minutes to provide a brief overview of the updated draft and told Board members not to feel constrained by time in providing comments on the plan. He said Mr. Zimmerman had agreed to postpone the next agenda item to a later meeting in order to provide Board members ample time to discuss the revised draft.

Mr. Kirby provided the staff overview of the revised draft RTPP. He drew the Board's attention to a memorandum summarizing the comments received in recent months on the initial draft, released on July 24, 2013, and staff's response to those comments. He explained that many of the comments had been incorporated into the October 10 draft. He said that seven key themes emerged from the comments, all of which staff addressed in the revised draft. The following is a lightly edited transcript of Mr. Kirby's point-by-point response to the seven key themes:

Mr. Kirby: The first [item we addressed in the memo] was the relationship between strategies and programs and projects. The last paragraph [in the October 10 draft] points out that getting to projects takes quite a lot of work and evaluation, and that's why we stayed at the strategy level in this plan. But this will lead to projects as the ultimate outcome.

The second item was how the challenges and strategies in the plan were developed, which was a question the Citizens Advisory Committee asked. They were framed by the staff here. We drew on all the resources we had available. We had focus groups earlier in 2012, and we actually changed direction at that point from what was a very quantitative performance measurement-type approach, which didn't seem to be resonating with stakeholder groups, to a more qualitative approach. And we reframed that and brought it back to you last summer after another focus group. So that's how it was done. We revised it several times through the public comment. The main focus was to get it into a form that we could communicate to a member of the general public sitting behind their computer

somewhere in the region without any other assistance, other than us giving them access to our web-based survey.

The third item dealt with tolling of existing lanes, and we got a few comments that said we should be tolling existing lanes and not just looking at new lanes or HOV conversions. [In the spring,] we revised the Aspirations Scenario to remove cases where we were not going to have the same number of toll-free lanes after the improvement as we had before, and we changed the scenario to be in conformance with the strict limits of the law, MAP-21.

And the language in MAP-21 about tolling is quite complicated and convoluted. The law did make some significant changes. On the positive side, there was a blanket approval to toll new lanes and HOV conversions on the interstates without going to the federal government to get permission on a case-by-case basis. On the down side, they essentially said, “You’ve got to maintain the same number of free lanes as you had before you introduced the tolling.” There are some exceptions to that, but the window for tolling existing lanes got much smaller in this legislation. We put that language, as best we could capture it, into the report, and it pretty much tracks what you see in this memorandum.

The fourth item was the relationship between the RTPP and Region Forward. There was a sentence in the July 24 draft that talked about the Region Forward transportation objectives being a subset of the TPB Vision objectives, and indeed Region Forward was built on the Vision and some others. However, the word “subset” led some people to believe that we were saying that Region Forward was a subset of the TPB Vision, which is not the case. That was not the intention, and the offending sentence has been removed.

The section on Region Forward also quotes some of the key points from the [recent Economy Forward event held on] September 27. A summary of that event is attached to this memorandum.

Fifth, we did elaborate on the relationship between the RTPP and the CLRP process. Mostly this is the Citizens Advisory Committee’s interest, as was mentioned by Mr. Still earlier.

Sixth, we did add a reference to Metro’s Momentum [strategic plan] in the final chapter. That was being developed on the same timeline as the work we were doing this spring, so we didn’t capture it in the July 24 draft. It was approved by the WMATA board on June 27. There are specific recommendations in Momentum, particularly Metro 2025, which is the central component of it in terms of new capacity, plus the rehabilitation program. These are in a form which I think can be advanced if we can identify the funding in the CLRP coming up. So we’ve put more language in about that and would like to devote more attention to it.

Finally, the last paragraph [of the October 10 draft introduces] longer-range studies and initiatives. I included examples of ideas or concepts not ready for inclusion in the CLRP. That section also includes a reference to the Transportation Planning Information Hub that you were briefed on a few minutes ago. That is going to be our way of accessing ongoing studies in the region that at some point could result in projects coming into the CLRP.

Mr. Kirby explained to the Board that the October 10 draft of the RTPP will be available for public comment through November 10. He said the next steps for staff will be to respond to comments received on the draft in a revised version that could be released at the November 14 CAC meeting and brought to the Board on November 20 for further discussion. He said the Board could act on the plan as early as December.

Chair York asked each Board member to offer his or her feedback on the plan, limiting comments to approximately two minutes each. The following is a lightly edited transcript of Board members' individual comments:

Mr. Snyder: I would like to make three points. First, non-recurring incidents are a fundamental part of what's causing delays on our highway system, and I'm wondering if the plan really takes account of accident prevention and response that sometimes can be very cheap to do, but have amazing returns.

The second question I would ask is: "Does the plan really focus enough on operations and maintenance of the region's highways?"

And third, "Does the plan focus enough on the application of technology to manage the traffic flow and to provide consumers the kind of information that they need?"

None of these are the things that get most of the controversy and most of the debate, and yet these three things may provide us the highest impact at the lowest cost in terms of approving the efficiency of our highway system. And other comments, of course, about transit and the need to overlay the region with a more effective transit system would be in there as well.

Mr. Elrich: My biggest concern continues to be transit and what I think is a continued bias toward automobiles, and the failure to really design what I think is the kind of robust transit systems that all of us need if we're going to deal with future demand.

I wish I had some magic wand that I could wave over regional cooperation so that we didn't do things in one jurisdiction that make it difficult for other jurisdictions to do things. I really wish we would look more at regional solutions. How we, for example, exact funds from developers to provide infrastructure, which is done unevenly across the

region. How we set parking standards and mode share standards so that the people that we're trying to attract don't compete among us for which jurisdiction provides the lowest standards and requires the least give on the part of the development community.

Basically we are perpetually in a race to the bottom, where we are compared against what someone else is willing to do at great expense and with not much efficacy sometimes. And I wish we were more focused on what we could all do to set a level playing field that minimizes the amount of money we have to lay out constantly and lets the people who are going to make hundreds of millions of dollars on the future development of the region bear larger costs of what it takes to provide that infrastructure.

Ms. Hamilton: No comments. I just want to say that our staff has worked very hard on this effort and we do so appreciate the input that we've been allowed to have. Thank you.

Mr. Kannan: Metro provided detailed written comments to Mr. Kirby and those who are putting together the RTPP, relating to items such as the specific inclusion in the document of not just transit in general, but specifically initiatives that are called for in our strategic plan. We are pleased to see that by and large those comments have been reflected in both Mr. Kirby's report today as well as in an updated document. And I think it's important to note that you've got other notes from commuter rail now, asking to be specifically included. And the more and more specificity we can give to the actions that need to be taken in addition to the concepts, the more powerful the document will become.

I know that we're moving towards a more specific understanding of how this interfaces with the CLRP. I'm not sure that we're all, as a group, comfortable with exactly what that relationship looks like yet, so I'm continuing to seek additional clarification on that.

And finally, at some point in time we may need to address specialized transportation services in a much more regional context. It's a financial drain in some respects, and Metro as a provider of last resort is not the efficient way to move specialized transportation services forward. I don't know if the RTPP is the document for that, but if it is supposed to be a strategic document that focuses on regional mobility, it may in fact be a place to specifically address that.

But I'll conclude by saying that it is important, and I think that it's certainly laudable that we've gone forward and made more specific the calls not just for transit generally, but for the specific Metro or the transit investments that are now included in the document.

Mr. Grove: We're pleased to see a lot of the revisions that are proposed for the document. As a jurisdiction that's looking for high-capacity transit, and we're working

very closely with Prince George's County, we're always looking for implementation strategies in anything that the regional approach can offer to see this thing come through. We also struggle with the highway issues and congestion. So, as this document evolves, the more that it can be focused on that regional cooperation and that implementation strategy is greatly appreciated.

Mr. Zimbabwe: I think my comments -- and I think these are reflected in the letter sent by DDOT and the Office of Planning -- sort of go towards the focus on the constraints of MAP-21 as it relates to a regional long-range plan. While I think we need to be mindful of what the federal legislation currently gives us to work with, I think that we don't want to use that as a foregone conclusion for the next 25, 30 years, looking out into the future, as it relates to the tolling of existing lanes versus tolling of new capacity, and what the cost/benefit relationship is.

I think that's something that we could actually help inform federal transportation policy discussions by saying, "Here's what this line in seven different places in the bill, actually imposes on regions in terms of a cost versus a benefit. And that by mandating that that tolling be of new capacity, you're actually increasing the cost to provide that management." And I think that's where I see some of the challenges in where the RTPP still is in terms of that discussion.

Ms. Tregoning: The comments that Mr. Kirby provided today just conflate the confusion between the CLRP and this Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. We know that the CLRP has to be fiscally constrained. That's why we wanted an RTPP, so that we could say, "Out into the future, maybe an idea good enough could attract funding in our region." And that's really the frustration. We want it to not be constrained. We don't need to know what the funding source is going to be. The Momentum 2040 stuff should be in there, as should the commuter rail aspirations that we have.

A recent article in the Post said: "Of the 5.5 million square feet of office under construction, 4.6 million, or 84 percent, isn't just near Metro, it's within one-quarter mile of a Metro station." And almost every jurisdiction represented here aspires to be able to have that kind of development proximate to transit, whether that's light rail or streetcar or a new Metro facility or a commuter rail facility. So I think that that's manifestly expressed in the Region Forward documents, which everyone signed on to, and I just would love to see the RTPP reflect that aspiration.

I think it's still not clear, and not sufficiently analyzed, that the tolled capacity is on new lanes. I understand the MAP-21 problem, but the expense of constructing those new lanes is astronomical, and the benefit, according to previous analysis, that comes from that -- from almost anything that we look at in this plan really comes from better land use.

And so, when the local governments say, "We want development near transit," then the

onus gets to be on them to get the land use right, to give us these benefits. And I think those things really need to be stressed in this document.

Mr. Mendelson: I was sort of struck, Mr. Kirby, at the beginning of your presentation. You mentioned this letter from VRE and sort of brushed it off: “Well, there are some references to commuter rail [in the document].” But there's another letter that came in yesterday from the Committee of 100 on the Federal City that makes this point. So there have been several commentators who are saying that this plan is understating the role that commuter rail can play.

What the Committee of 100 says in their letter is that there have been quite a number of comments that have been received over the last couple of months with regard to commuter and passenger rail; from VRE earlier than today's letter, from the Washington Airports Task Force, the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission, the Action Committee for Transit in Montgomery County. I could go on.

There have been quite a number of comments which the Committee of 100 notes. And they point out that in this report from the staff there's not any mention with regard to the comments since July, not any mention of this as an issue. And I think it highlights that there needs to be more attention to commuter rail playing a role in our regional transportation system. The plan needs to address that more distinctly.

Mr. Kirby said that he had no record of a letter dated October 15 from the Committee of 100. Mr. Mendelson clarified that Chair York received the letter the day before the Board meeting and asked Mr. Kirby if staff could duplicate and distribute the letter to Board members during the meeting. Mr. Kirby directed staff to do so.

Mr. Wells: I agree with Ms. Tregoning and my friend and colleague Mr. Elrich from Montgomery County. This is a plan that, if we didn't have Metro, I wonder if this type of plan would have even envisioned a Metro. I think that the plan is underwhelming and does not adequately reflect the future of where our region needs to go together.

Mr. Zimmerman: I appreciate the comments of my colleagues, all of which have things I agree with, and I don't want to repeat what they said. But I want to pick up where Mr. Wells just left off.

First, I'm glad we have more time to discuss this plan, because we need it. So we have something to start with, but we really need to work on getting this to something where we're all going to feel good about it addressing the problems we have.

There is a lot of good material to work from. The D.C. Office of Planning sent a letter, that is a really good summary of most of the issues that need to be addressed, although people will doubtless identify others.

There are both specific issues that have been cited -- for instance, the dearth of commuter rail as part of the vision for the future as one example, but there's also the general issue, and I think that was what Ms. Tregoning was addressing a little bit. And to me, this is where I'd like to see focus brought to this document. I think that it is important to understand what it is and what it doesn't need to be, and I agree with Ms. Tregoning's point that we have a CLRP and don't need another one.

I think of this a little bit -- for those of us who do land use -- as the difference between the zoning and the land use plan. Zoning is the current state of where law is on what you can do, and the general land use plan is, "Here's what we want things to be." And it guides us over time in making changes to the other. So the things we fund, the things we want to fund; that's one level. But we need something that is the framework within which we're going to make those kinds of decisions, to try to push things.

So it need not be constrained either by what happens to be the current state of funding or by the current state of federal law. Those things will change. MAP-21 is a two-year bill, so it really does need to contain vision.

And then, in articulating a vision, it needs to be built on the other work we've done. And to me, the most relevant thing is not the '98 Vision plan, which I think I've said before was a real step forward in 1998 and people who did that did us a service. But that was 15 years ago, and what we have right now is something people have done in the last two years through Region Forward, in which they've articulated some very big, broad transportation goals, and every single jurisdiction in the region signed off on them.

So this should fit within that, not merely bow to it in some way, but actually reflect connections between that. Beyond that, I'd like to see some of the specific issues that have been addressed as part of strategies in the plan -- like commuter rail, the bus priority network with BRT, streetcars, and Momentum -- as major transportation priorities.

I will say that one thing that came out of '98, the one thing everybody agreed on after the '98 Vision plan was adopted, was that the number one transportation priority in the region should be Metro. And everybody signed off on that. It's the only thing we actually did agree on regionally as a transportation priority. So you'd think at this point, certainly, the Momentum plan would have at least as high a role now as we move forward.

And then the final comment I would make is simply that the focus in the current document on essentially HOT lanes expansion seems not only out of touch with all those other things, but also out of touch with what anybody's planning. We have two projects in Virginia, on 95 and on the Beltway, and there's the ICC in Maryland, but I don't know of another one being planned by anybody in the region. So while I agree that all the tools

should be in the box and we should look at them, I don't know why we have so much emphasis on something that, as far as I can tell, no one is planning right now.

Ms. Hudgins: The first thing that comes to my mind is the fact that we have not wrapped this plan around the three efforts that have already been done, because they really kind of set the tone in the work that's been done. And, most importantly, that a lot of folks at the table are already there.

Secondly, I fear that as we look at where we are, we think we have enough of a vision for where we need to go. And, from a long-term standpoint, [it's important to ask] what the plan does in order to make sure that we're going forward.

And I have to use the tolling as an example because, sitting right next to the Silver Line, I'm sitting next to people who are planning more lanes around areas that land use plans say, "I need walkability, I need connectivity." And so if we don't articulate that broadly in what we regionally want, I think we leave the jurisdictions sometimes without enough of an incentive to do more and do best. It's very easy to say what TOD is about; it's difficult to actually implement it and implement it in a way that it benefits all of us collectively.

Tolling is important in some places, and if you get the pricing right it can work. But it isn't the instrument that should be used for every new construction project that's going to provide a highway lane. The fact that we're already compelled by the transportation map, it means that too many people are going to use that map guidance as incentive to increase capacity rather than use existing capacity if we want to do things such as bus rapid transit and the like.

Finally, when I heard the gentleman from Youth Connect speak, I thought about the plan. Because what we want to see in the long-term future is not someone coming to us, telling us what they're doing and what youth need, but that our planning and implementation has provided youth with the transit, connectivity, walkability, integration of uses they need and want.

So I think some way to help us be much more visionary, but really to follow some of the visionary pieces that have already begun, really is what I'd look for as an improvement in the plan.

Mr. Smith: I have just a few comments that are from a broad perspective, but I'm very pleased with the current state of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. Obviously, in an area where we have projected growth, one of the few areas in the country where not only are we already congested, we're going to get worse, we do have to take this into consideration. I agree that highway maintenance ought to be at the top. And the second priority of dealing with congested areas or bottlenecks and expanding transit, I think

those are very smart and there's a lot of opportunity there.

In terms of roads, this area is one of the few in the country where you have two major cities with interstate highways leaving those cities, going basically in one direction, and then converging in Frederick. And that creates a regional bottleneck, and this is the perfect area to help us address that. It's not going to get any better, because some of the growth is coming there and those are the two major arteries where the commercial traffic that will come from increased activity in Baltimore, it's going to go through, and so I'm just happy that that is there and can be addressed.

Secondly, with regard to transit, on the 270 corridor and on the 70 corridor going from Frederick to Baltimore and Washington, rail is not a viable option for those of us who have looked at it, but there are a lot of opportunities for transit where it can be expanded. And there are plans for it, but the fact that our plan calls for these to be priorities is wonderful, from our point of view.

Mr. Lovain: First, I'd like to associate myself with Mr. Elrich and Mr. Snyder on the operational improvements, especially incident response. Half of all traffic is caused by nonrecurring incidents, and this region is just way behind other regions in that regard.

I'd also like to agree with those who think that the plan should give greater weight to Region Forward and especially to the relevant goals and objectives, a lot of those dealing with land use. Our land use decisions are going to make a bigger difference in our transportation than our transportation investments a lot of times. And in accord with that, I think that the plan should place a higher priority on Scenario B, which is most consistent with the recommendations of the Region Forward plan, which has been endorsed by all jurisdictions.

I agree with those who have talked about mentioning Momentum and the plans in Momentum, and not just to be consistent with it, but to be explicitly mentioning the recommendations of Momentum, and also to more explicitly mention commuter rail. I also agree that this should be a visionary plan without regard to currently available funding. And I also agree with what -- in the D.C. letter about more reference to the jurisdictions who are currently doing high-capacity transit apart from Metro. Or, I guess in Alexandria's case, having a new infill Metro station.

A lot of these matters are across jurisdictional lines and they matter as a regional priority. One of my great frustrations with Alexandria's decision on its Corridor C BRT is that it comes within half a mile of the Pike Transit streetcar line but doesn't connect. And probably in part because it was outside the boundary. So we need to coordinate these plans regionally on matters like vehicle choice and other things. Those are regional concerns and need to be addressed.

Mr. Wojahn: First of all, the Transportation Planning Board has two advisory committees, both of which submitted comments regarding the RTPP. To my knowledge, neither the CAC nor, certainly, the Access for All Advisory Committee, has received a response to those comments. I would ask that the staff respond to those comments on a point-by-point basis so that we can continue a dialogue as advisory committees to the Board, to make sure that the comments submitted by those advisory committees is taken seriously.

As chair of the Access for All Advisory Committee, I'd like to point out a couple of specific comments that the committee has made relating to accessibility to the transportation network for people with disabilities and other traditionally under-served communities, such as low-income individuals. Particularly, we ask that the RTPP take into consideration throughout, instead of just having a single priority or objective, accessibility for people with disabilities. As an example, the transit maintenance strategy should also focus on ensuring maintenance of elevators and other requirements for accessibility for people with disabilities and that the pedestrian infrastructure be maintained so as to consistently ensure accessibility.

Also, another point that I'd like to highlight is the notion of affordability. I don't think the Board has ever expressed, as a priority, maintaining affordability of our transit network, and that's critical for low-income members in our community, as we are still struggling with the recession, and in the future to ensure that our transit network is not only available, but affordable as well.

Mr. Weissberg: I think this is a very important document for setting the framework for moving the region forward, and I think great strides have been made to date.

The conversation has circled around how to address the issue of tolling, and I think there are some federal requirements that we're frankly not going to get around. I think it's important to decouple the issue of tolling from the issue of transit and walkable communities and TOD.

I think we really do need to focus on moving a transit-focused scenario forward, the BRT-oriented scenario, and also explore what we would consider true BRT -- fixed guideway connecting people to places, and less reliance on traveling on limited access highways.

We also appreciate the mention in the document of the east-west divide, and the amplification of the need to better balance the region is appreciated, and the emphasis on using transit to tie the region and centers, like TODs, together.

Mr. Turner: The two things that struck me today in some of the comments that I've heard, both from members and from the public, is, one, to talk about it as a regional

priority, and I think we've done a very good job on getting away from the project-focused discussion that might have been an easy thing to do -- listing projects, as opposed to changing the thought process.

Now, that could mean a couple of things, and I appreciate Mr. Zimmerman's analogy between your zoning authority and the general plan or your comprehensive plan, and which one this plan falls into. I think it falls into both, in all honesty, or should. One is how we implement it. I hear that a lot. And we've heard that a lot over the last couple of years; how we implement this as part of the TPB's review of projects that are submitted as part of the CLRP. I think that has to be a part of the plan because without having that role as the MPO to change the way that the states and the departments are submitting their projects and us to review them, I think that has to be part of that equation of being within the constrained plan.

But I also think that the document can be forward-thinking about the kind of transportation and/or planning issues that we've talked about. It's been talked about in Region Forward, it's been talked about in our scenario planning, it's been talked about and talked about and talked about. So now I'm hoping this plan is an implementation plan for how the Transportation Planning Board is going to look at those submissions and ask how do they address the regional priorities. And then we can have those measurables that I think everybody is looking for at the end of the process.

Ms. Erickson: I know we're never going to please everyone here, but I would like to thank staff for all the hard work that they've done in trying to please everyone. My one main comment is that I hope that the development of this plan doesn't impact the schedule for the long-range plan and TIP because our programs rely on that schedule.

Ms. Krimm: I want to follow up on former Chairman Turner's comments about implementation.

When we look at the goals of the RTPP -- of maintaining infrastructure, building new capacity of all modes of transportation, and in an environmentally-sustainable way -- who doesn't agree with that? I mean, you take that out on the street, everybody you talk to would agree with that plan. But I think what Mr. Turner was talking about was the implementation, and I think that's also what the CAC was trying to get at too. I did attend the Economy Forward event on [on September 27] and we had a CAC member at our table, and she was very vocal about knowing how we plan to get to these goals, these laudable goals that we have. So I think that, very soon after we approve the RTPP, we need to figure out how we get there.

And one thing that I would like to look at is the number of people who travel alone to work. That number doesn't seem to change. We have two-thirds of the traffic on the roads, and those people are traveling alone to work. There has to be a way to reduce

that number. Offering more transit, of course, is the first way. When I come to this meeting, and every time I ride up and down 270, you just look right and left, and you see just one person in the car. I'm one person in the car. So we have to figure out a way to reduce that percentage. And once we do, I think then we will reduce congestion and offer people more opportunities, more ways to get to work, whether it's commuter rail, whether it's commuter bus. I'm a big bus proponent now. I think that that is a way out of our current congestion. So I would like to see us move to that implementation phase as soon as possible.

And then I want to take a look at this statement we still have on the screen, "Transportation decisions in our region are made every day at many different levels of government." Getting back to what Ms. Tregoning was saying, if you just take out "transportation," and you go, "Decisions in our region are made every day at many different levels of government" – "that affect transportation." And that includes land use. Every day. I look back at my jurisdiction; yes, we make decisions every day on land use issues that we certainly could be affecting transportation in a more positive way.

Mr. Erenrich: First, I'd like to hope that we could take Mr. Turner and Ms. Krimm's words and get some sort of transcript of that, because I think that belongs in an introduction [to the RTPP]. Because really what we have is a document that's really two parts. We have regional priorities and we have slash plan, leading to plan, and projects. And it's that first part that we're all talking about – "regional priorities." And I thought that the letter from the District was excellent, and I think the comments are good.

There are a lot of regional priorities. We need to say that this is the body that should articulate them. They need to be consistent with the other planning work, whether it be Momentum, whether it be Economy Forward, and individual jurisdictional plans.

We then have to then say in this document how you go from priorities to developing plans and projects and programs. And that's what Ms. Krimm was talking about. Each jurisdiction has a process. We're not going to change the process by which the states develop programs and projects or local jurisdictions do, but it is important to have some sort of hierarchy to make sure that the projects fit together. And also I wrote down to myself that we need to highlight cooperation and coordination.

Now, whether Montgomery County and the District are going to work together on the streetcar system, so it doesn't stop at Takoma and goes to Silver Spring, and that our extensive network of BRT that we're planning in Montgomery County actually can deal with Howard County, can deal with Frederick County, can deal with the District and Prince George's County.

So we need to work, but we have to start with the priorities. And so my recommendation would be if we could look at maybe creating that distinction in the

document between “regional priorities” and then how to move forward into developing plans and programs.

And just a side comment. When we looked at the CLRP last go-round and we look at how much money we spend on transit, I believe we said two-thirds of the investment of all of the Constrained Long Range Plan is transit-oriented. And most of that is in maintaining the infrastructure -- maintaining the buses and buying buses and things like that. I think those things need to continue.

Mr. Enslinger: I don't have any comments at this time.

Mr. Grimes: No comments.

Chair York: I just got back yesterday from being overseas, and I'm always struck that when I go to various places that I'm able to get around without having to step into a car. And I bring that to my perspective from Loudoun County looking forward.

We went through the process of finally opting in to Metrorail. It is important for us to make sure that we get our transportation network as we have planned it, and that basically includes roads. We will now, in 2018, have two stations in Loudoun County, effectively three -- one's on the airport property, little we can do with that. And we'll essentially be sharing one that is next door in Fairfax County.

The one reason I supported it is because Loudoun County has very little option to expand the road network to add capacity going east. And the transportation system, including buses and Metrorail, are important.

And I think it's a shame that we're getting to the point that we're behind in funding and keeping these systems up to par, and maintenance, etc. And I wish the federal government were more involved in funding and helping us locally to maintain the system. But I think it is imperative for us, as a region, to work together to ensure, where it is feasible, to expand the bus network, even to include rapid bus transit as well as a rail.

And I think the one thing that we really need to take a look at is connecting all the dots. Unfortunately, the way Metro was designed, to go into one area and then go back out, as opposed to allowing you to go around a region without having to go into Washington itself. So I look forward to us getting this adopted and moving forward to implementation, because a plans going to do no good if you just leave it on the shelf to collect dust.

But we also have to realize that the difficulty that we all face is funding. And we've lucked out in this last legislative season in Virginia and Maryland, and that is probably the biggest challenge that we have. We know what's needed to be done; it's a matter of getting it paid for.

9. Briefing on the Final Report of the TPB Bus On Shoulders (BOS) Task Force

This item was postponed until the November 20 TPB meeting.

10. Update on the Regional “Street Smart” Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign

Mr. Farrell of TPB staff showed a video that summarized the FY 2013 Street Smart public safety advertising campaign. He also announced the kickoff meeting for the Fall 2013 Street Smart campaign on October 22. The video can be found here: <http://vimeo.com/78105356>

11. Other Business

There was no other business brought before the TPB.

12. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 1:53pm.