

**METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

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

**MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
November 17, 2010**

Members and Alternates Present

Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Colleen Clay, City of Takoma Park
Barbara Comstock, Virginia House
Kerry Donley, City of Alexandria
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jason Groth, Charles County
Tom Harrington, WMATA
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Julia Koster, NCPC
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick
Michael C. May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Colleen Mitchell, DC Office of Planning
Garrett Moore, VDOT
Glenn Orlin, Montgomery County Council
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT
Karina Ricks, DC-DOT
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning

Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
Lori Waters, Loudoun County Board of Supervisors
Jonathan Way, Manassas City
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Blaine R. Young, Frederick County
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby
Gerald Miller
Elena Constantine
Robert Griffiths
Nicholas Ramfos
Andrew Meese
John Swanson
Andrew Austin
Michael Farrell
Wendy Klancher
Beth Newman
Deb Kerson Bilek
Sarah Crawford
Monica Bansal
Jane Posey
Jinchul Park
Dusan Vuksan
Debbie Leigh
Deborah Etheridge
Darren Smith
Rex Hodgson
Gareth James
Ryan Hand
Lewis Miller COG/OPA
Paul DesJardin COG/DCPS
John Mataya COG/DCPS
Randy Carroll MDE
Bill Orleans HACK
Catherine Baker Quantico Growth Mgmt. Committee
Alexis Verzosa TPB Tech Committee Chair
Maureen Budetti TPB/CAC Chair
Tom Biesiadny Fairfax County DOT
Art Smith Arlington Citizen

Rick Canizales	Prince William County DOT
Famararz Mokhtari	M-NCPPC/Prince Georges County
Robert Klosowski	DC Citizen
Stewart Schwartz	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Roger Diedrich	Sierra Club – Virginia Chapter
Ethan Goffman	Sierra Club – Montgomery County
Tracey A. Johnstone	Action Committee for Transit
Greg McFarland	NVTC
Claudia Llana	VDOT – Northern Virginia District
Pierre Holloman	City of Alexandria Transit
Michael Weinberge	PRTC
Anthony Foster	PRTC
Taran Hutchinson	MATOC
Bob Chase	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Greg Stevenson	Prince William County
Peter Pennington	EPC Alexandria
Sylvia C. Brown	Advisory Neighborhood Commission
Diana Zinkl	DC – WMATA Riders’ Council

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Chairman Snyder introduced Garrett Moore, the new district administrator for Northern Virginia.

Tracey Johnstone, Action Committee for Transit, expressed concerns about the inclusion in the Constrained Long-Range Plan of a road widening project for the I-270 corridor costing \$3.4 billion. The speaker expressed concern that transit options have not been adequately considered for this corridor and also expressed concern about the way the decision had been made, claiming that there had been little or no public discussion about the inclusion of the project in the CLRP. Copies of her remarks were submitted for the record.

Chairman Snyder said that Maryland representatives would be given a chance to address these comments later in the meeting during the appropriate agenda item.

Ethan Goffman, Montgomery County Sierra Club, expressed concern about the inclusion of the I-270 road widening, costing \$3.4 billion, in the CLRP. He expressed concern that transit options have not been adequately considered and that opportunities for public involvement had not been sought.

Bob Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, spoke in support of the report released that morning by the WMATA Governance Review Task Force. He said the Alliance also supports the expansion of Route 234 from the Loudoun/Prince William line to Route 50. He said the Alliance endorses the proposed I-270 improvements in Maryland. Regarding the Round 8 cooperative forecast of land-use, he said it is inaccurate to classify Chantilly, Herndon, Lorton,

Reston, Rockville, Gaithersburg, and similar communities as "inner suburbs." He also said the Cooperative Forecast's projected population increases such as 100,000 more in the District were wildly optimistic. With regards to the development of regional priorities, he said the Alliance urges the TPB to include game-changing projects such as new bridges not currently in the CLRP. He said the inadequacy of the existing CLRP is well-documented and simply prioritizing an inadequate plan would not "advance the ball" very much.

Stewart Schwartz, Coalition for Smarter Growth, expressed concerns about the CLRP process. He said his organization had not taken the time this year to notify its members to get involved in the CLRP/TIP approval because all the real decisions take place at the state level. He echoed concerns expressed earlier about several projects -- I-270, Route 28/198, and Beltway HOT lanes -- noting that decision makers had failed to adequately consider alternatives. He said it appeared that these projects had failed to go through a vetting process, following a TPB vote in October 2009, in the TPB's Call for Projects document, which said the solicitation "shall consider" a number of studies and policy documents including COG's climate report and scenario studies. He further claimed, although he said he needed to verify this, that the language in the Call For Projects, agreed upon by the TPB, had been watered down. He said it did not appear that the CLRP is being influenced in any way by the numerous studies, costing millions of dollars, which have been conducted by the TPB.

Chairman Snyder noted that there would be responses to the comments made at the meeting.

David Alpert, who runs the website Greater Greater Washington, said he finds the TPB process bizarre. As an example, he said the I-270 expansion had appeared on the plan with little or no public discussion. He said that the project did not have adequate funding, but he suspected that the project will sit in the plan for a few decades and eventually people will start to say the project must be built because it has been in the plan for so long. He said that a number of important transit projects have not been put in the CLRP because there is no funding, but he noted there was no clear funding for the I-270 widening either, and yet it has been included. He asked TPB members to ask themselves at what point residents get to weigh in on which long-term projects they want. He said that MDOT has not conducted such a process; MDOT's listening sessions, he said, mainly happen in the middle of the day and nobody knows about them. He said the TPB should do one of two things: either confine the CLRP to projects that are actually ready to be built or have a real discussion about which long-term projects the region wants, not just stapling on long-term projects that state DOTs happen to want this year. He urged that the TPB either remove the I-270 project or make sure that alternatives including MARC expansion are on equal footing.

2. Approval of Minutes of the October 20 TPB Meeting

Mr. Turner made a motion to approve the minutes of the October 20 TPB meeting. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Referring to the handout summary, Mr. Versoza said the Technical Committee met on November 5, and reviewed the following items for inclusion on the TPB agenda:

- Regarding items 9, 10, and 11, the Committee was briefed on the conformity analysis, the contents and the performance of the 2010 CLRP and the FY 2010-2016 TIP. The committee recommended that the TPB act on these documents at its November meeting.
- Regarding agenda item 13, the committee was updated on the draft call for projects document and schedule for the air quality conformity assessment of the 2011 CLRP and FY 2012 to 2017 TIP. The committee recommended that TPB approve the final call for projects document.
- Regarding agenda item 14, the committee was briefed on the current operations of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program.
- Regarding agenda item 15, the committee was briefed on the proposed amendment to the FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to revise the budget and several work tasks.

At the Technical Committee meeting, two items were presented for information and discussion: a briefing on the District of Columbia's 2010 Transit Future System Plan and a staff update on activities and progress on implementing the TIGER grant-funded Regional Bus Priority project for \$58 million.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Tina Slater, CAC vice chair, presented the CAC report. Referring to the handout report, she said the CAC included three topics at their meeting the previous Thursday: 1) A presentation on WMATA's regional transit system plan, 2) discussion of the TPB Priorities Scoping Task Force, and finally, 3) developments regarding the WMATA Governance Review Joint Task Force that was organized by the Board of Trade and COG. Regarding this last topic, Ms. Slater said the CAC has been considering organizing a public meeting on the WMATA Governance Task Force recommendations, but she said that before deciding whether or not to hold this event, the committee would wait until the task force report had actually been released. Finally, Ms. Slater noted that TPB staffer Darren Smith would be leaving COG. She said that Mr. Smith has been a tremendous asset for the CAC and the committee wished him well.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Referring to the handout and mailout materials, Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on November 5 and acted on one amendment to the 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program and one to the Unified Planning Work Program. He said that materials related to those

actions were in the TPB mailout. He said the amendment to the TIP was to include additional funding for the reconstruction of an interchange on I-66 at U.S. 29, and the widening of U.S. 29 between the Beltway and Merrilee Drive. He noted, with the concurrence of Ms. Smyth, that the limits of this project had been incorrectly described in the mailout. Mr. Kirby noted that the amendment to the Unified Planning Work Program would modify a project in the technical assistance program for WMATA.

Referring to the packet with letters sent/received, Mr. Kirby called attention to several letters, including:

- A transmittal to the WMATA Chairman, Peter Benjamin, of the comments that Mr. Orleans made at the TPB meeting on October 20 concerning the use of the public hearing process with regard to service changes;
- A letter to WMATA General Manager, Richard Sarles, responding to a comment that Mr. Sarles made to David Robertson, COG's executive director, concerning a proposal for a MetroAccess same-day service pilot project that is being considered by the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force. Mr. Sarles expressed concerns that this proposal could be very expensive and perhaps too much for Metro to commit to implementing. Mr. Robertson's letter responded that Mr. Sarles' comment would be forwarded to the chair of the task force where it will be considered.
- A letter from Chairman Snyder, based on the discussion at the TPB's meeting on October 20, to Kwame Brown, chair of the COG Budget & Finance Committee, suggesting that the local match for the Street Smart program could be incorporated into the COG dues structure, at 1 or 2 cents per capita, rather than being a separate request, which is the current practice.
- A letter from Mayor Euille of Alexandria, which transmitted Alexandria's contribution for Street Smart for last year but also noted that Alexandria would prefer that these contributions be included as part of COG's regular budget.

Mr. Kirby noted that the TPB did vote at the previous month's meeting to approve the inclusion of Street Smart in the COG dues structure, with one vote against this motion from Prince William County and an abstention from Loudon County.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Snyder recognized recent graduates of the Community Leadership Institute (CLI), describing them as a group of citizens who were willing to contribute their time to learning more about regional transportation challenges and solutions. He presented certificates to those in attendance: Mr. Peter Pennington, Mr. Roger Diedrich, Ms. Diana Zinkl, and Commissioner Sylvia Brown. He invited Mr. Pennington to make a few remarks.

Mr. Pennington said that the CLI involved some interesting exercises, one that required small groups to agree on regional transportation priorities, and another that required the transportation

needs of a growing population to be balanced with the constraints of a budget. He noted that compromise was an important part of both exercises, and everyone realized just how difficult it is for people coming from totally different areas to arrive at some sort of solution, and how it may be possible to navigate through the process to get some change.

Chairman Snyder thanked the citizens and said it is important to have knowledgeable citizens who understand the challenges as well as potential opportunities to make things better.

Chairman Snyder said it was time to appoint a new Access for All Advisory Committee (AFA) Chair. He thanked Ms. Hudgins for having graciously served as Chair for the last four years. He noted that under her leadership, the AFA had, among other things, advocated for improving Metro Access, better information for limited English speakers, and an expanded discounted Smart Trip card program. He said he was pleased to appoint College Park Council Member Patrick Wojahn as the new chair of the AFA, and thanked him for being willing to serve in this capacity. Chairman Snyder said that Mr. Wojahn is a lawyer and advocate for civil rights, who has represented some of the most disadvantaged residents in the region. Chairman Snyder commented that Mr. Wojahn's background would serve the AFA very well, adding that he looked forward to learning more about the work and the committee's recommendations.

Chairman Snyder said that the "Moving Metro Forward" report of the Joint WMATA Governance Review Task Force had been released in the morning, and the work was sponsored by the Greater Washington Board of Trade and the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. He commented that we all know a healthy Metro system is fundamental to the welfare of the region, as well as to its transportation plans and environmental goals, and that this report is of keen interest to the region's citizens and to the TPB. He asked if there were any objections to the TPB being briefed on the report in the December meeting, as that would give an opportunity for public reaction, and a brief lapse of time would give a better indication of the true significance of the report. There were no objections to the TPB being briefed on the "Moving Metro Forward" report in the December meeting.

Chairman Snyder thanked the Board of Trade and the Council of Governments for their leadership on a very important initiative. He commented that discussions could take place before December's meeting, and at December's meeting, to determine if there are any further actions on the part of the TRB.

7. Appointment of Nominating Committee for Year 2011 TPB Officers

Chair Snyder moved to appoint Ms. Hudgins, Mr. Mendelson, and Ms. Krimm, all of whom had agreed to serve, to the Nominating Committee for year 2011 TPB officers, with Ms. Hudgins as chair.

Ms. Bowser seconded the motion. There was no discussion, and the motion to appoint the Nominating Committee passed unanimously.

8. Review of Comments Received and Acceptance of Recommended Responses for Inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Assessment, the 2010 Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP), and the FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Kirby said that the TPB had received comments on the air quality conformity assessment and the CLRP, and that staff had provided responses to the comments. He explained that he would go through these responses one by one, and then ask the TPB to accept them as part of the action for the plan. He said he did not believe there were any issues that would preclude moving forward with the plan, but that there were issues that would require continuing attention and consideration.

Mr. Kirby explained that the 30-day comment period had begun on October 14th and that the public comment period had been announced in various regional newspapers. He said the first set of comments had come from the Access for All Advisory Committee (AFA), and had been presented at the TPB meeting on October 20. Referring to a handout memorandum, he summarized each comment received from the AFA and others, and the proposed response to each comment. He then suggested that Ms. Erickson would be happy to respond, since there was a great deal of attention paid to MDOT's activities in the comment period.

Ms. Erickson thanked the Action Committee for Transit (ACT) and the other citizens for commenting, noting that some of these groups had been involved in the project planning process for many years. She said that the Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT) and the I-270 project cannot be moved forward for federal funding at this time unless these projects are in the long range plans, as it is part of the NEPA requirements. She added that for the Corridor Cities Transitway in particular, MDOT is looking to submit a New Starts application to the FTA in a few months, and she noted that the I-270 project had been included in the CLRP since 2003.

Ms. Erickson referred to a letter that MDOT had sent in May that identified their prioritization process for funding. She noted that Maryland had fully funded Metro and the MARC growth and investment plan, at almost \$700 million. She said MDOT's guiding principle is to preserve the Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) project schedule that had been in place for many years, explaining that it reacted to a funding shortage by trying to delay projects as equally as possible among the Maryland counties. She said they wanted to restore a couple of projects back to full construction so they could finalize the NEPA process, as some highway projects had been downgraded to add the Purple Line into the long range plan about a year ago. She said they were not going to add any new highway projects unless all current CLRP projects could be included, and that they worked closely with TPB members to determine which projects would be included and which would not be. She said she would be happy to answer questions.

Chairman Snyder thanked Ms. Erickson and asked if there were any further questions.

Mr. Erenrich stated a desire to elaborate on comments made by Ms. Erickson, noting that two environmental impact statements for the Corridor Cities Transitway had been issued, one in 2002

and the other, he thought, in 2008. He stated that MDOT had looked at alternatives to the CCT and I-270, that it had been in the public realm, and that there had been hundreds of comments on both the highway and transit components. He added that a third document was due for release by the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) at the end of the month, which would examine additional alignments or options for the CCT, with a public hearing currently scheduled for December 15. He said that once the alignment choices are concluded, the U.S. DOT, Federal Transit Administration, and Federal Highway Administration would hopefully agree to separate the highway project from the transit side, upon which he thought there would be a new attempt made to resolve the issue of a locally preferred alternative for I-270. He said it was important to keep the project in the CLRP until the two projects could be separated.

Ms. Krimm thanked all those who had commented on the I-270 multimodal project, noting that it is MDOT policy to seek public input on all of its projects. She said that studies had been going on since 1994, and that she had been attending meetings on the plan since 1999. She said that the project planners had always been forthcoming with information and wanted to come out into the community to answer questions whenever they could. She thanked Mr. Kirby and Ms. Erickson for their comments. She added that the city and state are trying to get more cars off the road, for example by putting park and ride lots in and expanding the buses from Frederick down the I-270 corridor. She said that most of Frederick's traffic comes from outside the county, including West Virginia and Pennsylvania, so that even though the city and county implement local measures, they still have to deal with traffic intersecting Frederick County to come down the I-270 corridor.

Chairman Snyder asked if there was a motion to accept the proposed responses to the comments so that they could be incorporated into the plan approval documents.

Ms. Ticer moved to accept the responses.

Mr. Erenrich seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

9. Approval of the Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP

Ms. Posey presented a summary of the air quality conformity analysis for the 2010 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP. She noted that the only public comment the TPB received during the public comment period was a letter from the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) noting that the CLRP and TIP meet all the mobile source emissions tests for conformity. She said MWAQC commended the TPB for its compliance with the proposed budgets, but noted that MWAQC supports the need for new federal emissions control programs and encourages continued investment in systems such as transit and ride-sharing. She said MWAQC pointed out that the EPA released a new motor vehicle emissions model and that the EPA is considering tightening the 8-hour standards, which would require additional emissions reductions. She said the recommended response to MWAQC is included in the memorandum from TPB staff. She said the TPB is being asked to approve the attached resolution.

Mr. Donley made a motion to adopt resolution R5-2011. Ms. Ticer seconded the motion.

Mr. Donley thanked TPB staff for proactively including some of the projects that are proposed to be deleted from the CLRP. He said he was concerned that the resulting congestion from deleting the projects would have an adverse impact on air quality conformity, but noted that the fact that those projects are included makes the report much more valid. He said the deletion of projects would not solve the region's transportation problems, but that they serve as a reminder of the lack of adequate revenue sources and financing.

Mr. Zimmerman said it might be useful to include a summary of the reductions and removals of projects that have occurred over the past three, five, ten years. He said that seeing the magnitude and specific kinds of projects that have been cut back in one place would be useful.

Chair Snyder noted no objection to Mr. Zimmerman's recommendation and asked TPB staff to complete the requested task.

Ms. Waters asked if the TPB had specific language in mind when it noted in its response to MWAQC that the TPB agreed with MWAQC on the need for new federal emissions control programs. She said it seems like a blanket statement.

Ms. Posey agreed that it is a general statement.

Ms. Waters said she was not sure how she felt about including a general statement like that, without having something better to offer.

The motion passed unanimously.

10. Briefing on the Contents and Performance of the Plan, and Approval of the 2010 CLRP

Mr. Kirby distributed a draft letter from the TPB to the Congressional delegation from the Washington region emphasizing the importance of enacting a new surface transportation authorization bill. He briefed the Board on the performance of the 2010 CLRP and projects that were proposed to be added to and deleted from the plan. He reviewed the factors that shape the plan, including land use forecasts, transit fares and constraint, employment projections, and financial constraint related to revenues and expenditures. He provided information about the projects being added to the plan, as well as projects proposed for delay or deletion. He reviewed the performance of the plan, noting in particular that congestion is expected to increase on both the roadway and transit systems. He also noted that mobile emissions estimates are on the decline from 2010 to 2030, but start to increase slightly from 2030-2040. He reviewed the status of funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects. He closed by informing the Board that there is an online searchable database for the projects in the CLRP.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for the definition of “outer” and “inner” suburbs for land-use.

Mr. Kirby said it is based on forecasts shown on slide four. He said the inner core is the District of Columbia and Alexandria and Arlington in Virginia. He said the inner suburbs are Fairfax County in Virginia and Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties in Maryland. He said the outer suburbs are Loudoun and Prince William Counties in Virginia and Frederick County and the St. Charles Urbanized Area in Maryland.

Mr. Zimmerman confirmed that “outer” represents outside of Fairfax, Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties, and that the forecast growth rate is highest in the outer suburbs.

Mr. Kirby said that is correct.

Mr. Zimmerman said that forecasting by extrapolation is an illustration of one of the dangers of planning. He said he thinks the land-use forecasts presented are a fantasy given energy prices. He said it is not realistic that the next 30 years will look like the last 30 years. He said the TPB should take a step back and ask if these forecasts are realistic, noting that the forecasts the TPB adopts have implications for actions taken by the Board. He commented that it doesn’t matter as much when there is not any funding available to fund transportation, but that when there is funding available, the TPB needs to take a careful look at what is actually happening so that infrastructure can support actual growth.

Chair Snyder noted that there are two action items as part of this agenda item: a resolution approving the CLRP and a resolution to send a letter to members of the Washington region Congressional delegation encouraging them to adopt a new surface transportation funding bill.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that the presentation noted that 64 percent of expenditures in the CLRP will go to transit. He said he does not think it is reasonable to compare the cost of highway construction to that of transit infrastructure and operations. He said there is no mention of the cost of operating vehicles on the roads as compared with the cost of using transit. He said it has been estimated that the cost of owning a car is about \$15,000 per year, whereas the cost of using the Metro system is about \$2,000 per year per rider. He also noted that the projected 2040 congestion on Metrorail assumes operating the system with 50 percent 8-car trains.

Ms. Waters questioned Mr. Zimmerman’s assumption that the outer jurisdictions would not grow at the rate predicted. She said she believes the growth will continue, as shown through recent development approvals, including many mixed use development proposals. She also noted that the growth is related to employment as well as population. She said it is the responsibility of local jurisdictions to make sure that growth is shaped in the best way for local communities and the region.

Mr. Roberts said that he will vote against approving the 2010 CLRP. He said that many of his constituents rely on public transit and continually see service cuts. He said the CLRP still represents a highway mentality and he cannot support it. He said the region needs to do more in

the way of public transportation.

Ms. Tregoning asked for clarification on the language for the project solicitation adopted in November 2009 and the actual language used in the project solicitation. She noted that while the analysis of the plan shows the region is making some minute and incremental progress, it basically shows that the TPB is failing. She thinks the appropriate question to ask is how we are going to do something different.

Mr. Kirby said that he believed Ms. Tregoning was referring to the draft project solicitation language presented to the TPB in November 2009 that was amended by the TPB. He said the final version of the project solicitation document included the amended language.

Ms. Tregoning asked how the consideration of reports like Region Forward and the COG Climate Change Report has enhanced TPB decision making.

Mr. Kirby said the TPB is addressing the factors and measures in these reports. He reviewed several measures and how the plan performs related to these factors. He said the TPB is not at the point of being able to respond to all of these factors at this point, but they are looked at in the analysis.

Chair Snyder noted that one of the purposes of the Priorities Plan Task Force is to look at the whole process for how the TPB is managing performance measures.

Mr. Roberts commented that if the highway system is performing so badly, why is it the TPB's policy to continually assign more funding to the highway network. He asked if the TPB is at the point where it can say that it will not work to add more money to a failing system.

Mr. Kirby said there are two ways of looking at congestion – one is to add capacity and the other is to manage demand. He said the TPB is trying to do both, but that it is not a simple process. He summarized the programs and scenarios the TPB has supported and analyzed.

Mr. Roberts noted that small business owners who rely on the road network are negatively impacted by variably priced roadways.

Mr. Kirby said that is why the TPB believes it is important to add capacity as well as manage demand.

Mr. Elrich said that he continues to be frustrated by conversations such as this. He said it relates to discussion on land-use growth projections in that growth is forecast and planners and decision-makers scramble to accommodate that projected growth. He said that the projections are not set in stone, but are the result of decisions made by policy makers to say that the population of the region will increase by a certain number based on projections. He wondered why the region does not match growth projections to the ability to provide infrastructure. He said he thinks growth should be allowed as long as the infrastructure can accommodate the additional people and jobs.

He said that if the region wants to impact VMT, that instead of road pricing, it should look at parking requirements in employment centers and at Metro stations. But, he said that the jurisdictions could not agree jointly to adopt a common parking standard, or other standards that would lead to a more rational form of development.

Chair Snyder reiterated that issues related to regional projects and growth will be reviewed as part of the Priorities Plan Task Force.

Ms. Krimm said that because highways are beyond capacity, the region needs to contribute to improving and expanding the highway system. She said that her constituents rely on the region's highway network, particularly I-270 on a daily basis because they do not have other options.

Chair Snyder noted that approval of this plan does not suggest satisfaction or happiness. He said the message of frustration is clear, regardless of personal perspective. He said the TPB is doing what it has to do, but that the resources do not exist to do what needs to be done.

Mr. Turner made a motion to adopt resolution R6-2011, which was seconded.

Mr. Turner thanked MDOT for adding the project to the CLRP that was of concern to the residents of Bowie. He noted that another project was removed as part of the process.

A vote was taken and the motion passed. Mr. Roberts and Mr. Snipper voted against the resolution.

Chair Snyder said the next item is to approve a letter to the members of region's Congressional delegation urging them to move forward on new surface transportation authorization.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the letter, which passed unanimously.

Chair Snyder asked for a briefing at the next TPB meeting on streetcars and light rail projects in the region.

11. Approval of the FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Kirby said the document under consideration is the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which is the first six years of the CLRP.

A motion was made and seconded to adopt Resolution R7-2011. The motion passed unanimously.

12. Certification of the Urban Transportation Planning Process for the National Capital Region

Mr. Kirby explained that the certification of the transportation planning process is a federally required self-certification conducted each year. Referring to the mailout, he said the Statement of Certification is a detailed document that states that the TPB is meeting federal planning requirements and regulations. He said that, upon approval, the document would be signed by each of the three state Departments of Transportation, and submitted to the US Department of Transportation

A motion was made and seconded to approve Resolution R8-2011 endorsing the appended Statement of Certification. The Resolution passed unanimously.

13. Approval of Call for Projects and Schedule for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2011 CLRP and the FY 2012-2017 TIP

Mr. Kirby said that the release and pending approval of the Call for Projects begins the cycle for the 2011 CLRP and FY2011-2016 TIP approval process. Referring to page 14 of the Call for Projects from the mailout, he mentioned that the document contains all of the requirements added by the TPB to the previous year's request. He said this item was an information item on the October TPB agenda, and, upon TPB approval, would be sent out to begin a new CLRP and TIP cycle.

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to approve the final call for projects document for the 2011 CLRP and FY2011-2016 TIP for distribution to state, regional, and local agencies. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Ms. Ricks commented that while she appreciates the new searchable feature on the CLRP website, citizens have mentioned that there is a lack of transparency in understanding of how projects are selected. She expressed concern that information provided on the CLRP website is too basic, and does not address how projects can achieve regional goals.

Mr. Kirby responded that the policy guidance that comes from the TPB would hopefully influence planners who assemble projects for inclusion in the CLRP. He acknowledged that project development is largely driven by implementing agencies at the state and local level. He mentioned that the Task Force for Setting Regional Priorities, which will have its second meeting in December, has expressed an interest in making the regional planning process more transparent, and is working to find innovative ways to provide information to citizens on the appropriate ways to get involved. He also noted that the TPB Citizens Guide aims to explain how planning decisions are made in the region. He said that this document could be more widely distributed as a way to do a better job of explaining the process that leads to project selection.

Ms. Ricks emphasized the importance of advancing the notion of transparency that has been

outlined by the federal government by making information more readily available.

Mr. Kirby responded that the Task Force for Setting Regional Transportation Priorities is focused on providing better information and transparency.

Chairman Snyder asked if it was possible to refer to specific policy goals on the CLRP Project Description Form.

Mr. Kirby said yes.

Chairman Snyder summarized that many decisions are made at the local level before they are ever advanced to the TPB. He said if citizens want to have an impact on these decisions, the best place to influence these decisions is at the local level.

The motion to approve the final call for projects document for the 2011 CLRP and FY 2011-2016 TIP for distribution to state, regional, and local agencies passed unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

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

Mr. Zezeski, referring to a PowerPoint presentation, provided an update on MATOC funding. He said that the total committed funding for MATOC for FY2011 is \$1.2 million, which he said is sufficient to maintain MATOC's core program. In particular, he mentioned that changes in VDOT's commitment had occurred since September. He said that VDOT/NVTA committed to contributing \$150,000, which reflects an additional \$50,000 from VDOT over what was presented to the TPB in September. He said that agreements and contracting relating to this funding are underway. He introduced Taran Hutchinson, the MATOC Facilitator, to review specific MATOC operations and events.

Mr. Hutchinson said he started in the capacity as the new MATOC Facilitator in July, and that he was formerly a traffic operations manager with VDOT. Referring to the PowerPoint presentation, he showed images of the MATOC Operations Floor, which is co-located with the CapWIN offices. He said MATOC is staffed from 4:30am to 8:00pm to cover the weekday rush and the daily operations of the transportation system. He said that MATOC uses RITIS, the Regional Integrated Transportation Information System, as one of its main applications, and monitors public safety and media outlets, commuter bus and rail operations, and the weather.

He provided an overview of how MATOC notification and coordination occurs, stating that MATOC Operations Staff provides incident notifications to over 3 dozen traffic, transit, and public safety operations stakeholders and agencies, including the VDOT, MDOT, DDOT, WMATA and local transit agencies, as well as the police, homeland security, and other

emergency management agencies. He mentioned that MATOC provided notifications for 58 incidents in October, and said that, on average, about 70% of these were freeway incidents.

He provided an overview of some examples of incidents covered, including a building fire in the District and a bus crash on I-270 on September 29, a freight train incident near Randolph Road that had impacts on MARC service on October 13, and the Rally to Restore Sanity and/or Fear on October 30. He said that in each case, MATOC sent notifications to stakeholders and coordinated their responses. He provided several screen shots to illustrate situational awareness through the RITIS system.

He provided an overview, in response to a September request of the TPB, about MATOC's role in the Discovery Channel incident on September 1. He discussed the timeline for that day, beginning at 1:20pm when the incident detection via police scanner occurred. Between 1:30 and 1:45pm, he said MATOC confirmed the incident with Maryland SHA, and sent out a situational awareness alert. He said that road closures and Silver Spring Metro station closure occurred between 2:00pm and 3:00pm, along with other activities including a DDOT traffic advisory. From 3:00pm-4:00pm, he said that road closures and signal timing was in place, with traffic flowing steadily around downtown Silver Spring without incident. He also provided a summary of other incidents that occurred during the Discovery Communications incident, most of which were accidents that had occurred on freeways.

Mr. Zezeski said that outreach is now aimed at getting additional transit agencies more involved, and that there is specific attention to transit incidents as well as traffic incidents that may influence bus routes. He concluded by mentioning that an additional benefit/cost analysis focusing on urban and transit issues will be underway in early 2011, and that development of a public MATOC website will be underway by mid-2011.

Mr. Mendelson commented on the worsening congestion in the region, citing that congestion is caused not only by lack in capacity, but also by incidents such as the ones that MATOC manages. He inquired about how MATOC reduces congestion during incidents, specifically asking if MATOC reviews the regional map to inform neighboring jurisdictions about rerouting during incidents.

Mr. Zezeski confirmed that MATOC works with several jurisdictions during incidents to reroute traffic accordingly.

Mr. Mendelson asked about the specific level of collaboration that MATOC undertakes to coordinate responses among the region's jurisdictions.

Mr. Hutchinson said that MATOC circulates alert messages to urge travelers to stay away from areas of incidents.

Mr. Mendelson asked if MATOC makes specific recommendations in addition to circulating alert messages.

Mr. Zezeski replied that MATOC makes strong suggestions to its partner agencies, and that he did not know, off hand, of a case when an agency does not comply with these strong suggestions.

Mr. Mendelson noted that he did not see a timeline illustrating such a correspondence during the presentation.

Mr. Weissberg asked about lessons learned from the I-270 bus incident on September 29.

Mr. Hutchinson, referring to the PowerPoint presentation, summarized the stakeholder actions taken and the real-time incident status and communications that occurred in connection with the I-270 bus incident on September 29.

Chairman Snyder summarized that congestion can be caused by incidents at all times of day, and not only by capacity constraints.

15. Briefing on an Amendment to the FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to Revise the Budget and Certain Work Tasks

Mr. Kirby, referring to a Report of the Joint WMATA Governance Review Task Force that was handed out, mentioned that this report was recently finalized and is now available.

Mr. Kirby provided a summary of the budget amendment for the UPWP. He said that the UPWP was approved last March with conservative estimates of the federal money that would be available. When the federal budget was finalized by the end of September, an additional \$730,000 in federal, state, and local funding from DDOT, MDOT, and VDOT was identified, signaling the need to allocate this funding to certain tasks in the UPWP.

Referring to a PowerPoint presentation, he summarized the proposed amendments to the UPWP, and explained how additional funding would be used for certain work activities. He said the proposal includes adding \$50,000 to the Congestion Management Process, and \$25,000 to Transportation Safety Planning. He said that an additional \$80,000 for Human Service Transportation Coordination would be used for an independent consultant assessment of the work that has been accomplished so far under the JARC and New Freedom programs administered by the TPB. He said that adding \$20,000 for Freight Planning would continue the effort of the freight plan. He explained that adding \$200,350 to Regional Studies would be used to provide staff support for the TPB Regional Priorities Plan Scoping Task Force and for initial work to develop a regional priorities plan, provide staff support for COG's FY 2011 Region Forward regional planning efforts, and prepare marketing materials for bike-sharing. He said that adding \$250,000 in funding for the Household Travel Survey is also included to conduct focused household travel survey samples in three additional areas. These would include: Federal Center/Southwest/Navy Yard in the District; Friendship Heights in the District and in Montgomery County; Largo and Purple Line International Corridor in Prince George's and

Montgomery Counties; the City of Frederick in Maryland; and, Reston and Woodbridge, in Virginia.

He provided an option for two work activities. He explained that at its November meeting, the Technical Committee was incorrectly advised that a geographic subarea household travel survey would cost \$40,000. He said that, based upon this information, the Committee recommended adding a seventh focused geographic subarea survey and reducing the budget by \$40,000 for the assessment of the TPB program funding JARC and New Freedom. He said that after the meeting, staff determined that surveying a new subarea would actually cost \$80,000. Thus, adding a new subarea would require that the JARC and New Freedom assessment be dropped from the proposal entirely. He summarized that the choice is either to remain with the \$80,000 evaluation, or to eliminate it and conduct one more survey site. He said that the Technical Committee would revisit this issue in December, and that a recommendation will be brought back to the TPB at its December meeting.

He continued by stating that \$50,000 in additional funding would be used for getting more real-time traffic monitoring data from the INRIX program, and that \$25,000 in additional funding would be used for a study of crash records for the District, Maryland, and Virginia. He also said that some of the funding would be used for technical assistance accounts for each of the District, Maryland, and Virginia, and that based on a formula sub-allocation, the District would receive \$4,000, Maryland would receive \$70,500, and Virginia would receive \$24,000 in technical assistance for Miscellaneous Services to address short-term requests for regional data and analysis.

Chairman Snyder said the TPB and the Technical Committee would review this proposal in December.

16. Other Business

There was no other business.

17. Adjourn

Ms. Ticer made a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 2:25pm.