

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
June 18, 2008**

Members and Alternates Present

Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County Council
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Charles Jenkins, Frederick County
Timothy Lovain, Alexandria City Council
Michael May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Colleen Mitchell, DC Office of Planning
Emeka Moneme, DDOT
David Moss, Montgomery County
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
Rick Rybeck, DDOT
C. Paul Smith, City of Frederick
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Bob McDonald, VDOT
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
Lori Waters, Loudoun County
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force
Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Ron Kirby | |
| Michael Clifford | |
| Jerry Miller | |
| Jim Hogan | |
| Nick Ramfos | |
| Bob Griffiths | |
| Debbie Leigh | |
| Deborah Etheridge | |
| Andrew Meese | |
| Andrew Austin | |
| Beth Newman | |
| Monica Bansal | |
| Sarah Crawford | |
| Darren Smith | |
| Erin Morrow | |
| Michael Eichler | |
| Dusan Vuksan | |
| Tim Canan | |
| Towanna Hinton | |
| Dave Robertson | COG/EO |
| Bill Orleans | PG ACT |
| Bob Owolabi | Fairfax County DOT |
| Monica Backmon | PWC DOT |
| Angelica Betts | Aide, PWC BOCS |
| Matthew Moskitis | NVTA |
| Jonathan Earley | Student |
| Tony Chinyere | Tri-County Council, Southern Maryland |
| Michael Birnbaum | Washington Post |
| Tamara Ashby | Arlington County |
| Tom Biesiadny | Fairfax County DOT |
| Anwar Mahmood | ODR/DCG |
| Andy Wexler | Montgomery County Resident |
| Betsy Massie | PRTC |
| Matt Johnson | COG |
| Laurie Kelly | TPB-CAC |
| Larry Martin | TPB-CAC |

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Ms. Gail Parker of Fairfax County, Virginia, commented on the draft FY 2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), saying that the Program needs to include more rail projects and fewer road projects. She said that for reasons such as improved air quality and energy efficiency, she supports rail projects including commuter rail extensions and service improvements, circumferential light rail, and extension of the Metrorail system, particularly of the Yellow Line to Fort Belvoir and to Dumfries. She stated that she had collected more than 40,000 signatures of area residents who support more rail projects, and called for the TIP to be revised to include projects to address current transit demand along with projected future transit needs of area communities. Copies of her remarks were distributed.

Mr. Snyder said that while he agreed with many of Ms. Parker's sentiments, he wanted to point out that the TPB's role is near the end of the transportation project selection process, and that Ms. Parker should bring her concerns to the attention of transportation policymakers at the state level.

Ms. Ticer also thanked Ms. Parker for highlighting the need for transit investment, and encouraged her to also convey the message to federal legislators because the needs cannot be met without a significant increase in assistance from the federal government.

Ms. Eve Hill, Director of the D.C. Office of Disability Rights, commented regarding Item 8 on the TPB's agenda. She explained the role of the Office of Disability Rights in ensuring compliance with disability rights laws and noted the importance of providing options for people with disabilities in both public and private transportation systems, including taxicabs. She said that the District of Columbia currently has no wheelchair-accessible taxicabs, but that the TPB had the opportunity today to respond to that need by funding the New Freedom projects recommended for approval in Item 8. She said that the Office of Disability Rights supports approval of these projects, and pledged continued support in implementing efforts to increase the number of accessible taxicabs.

Chair Mendelson thanked Ms. Hill for her comments.

Mr. Leon Swain, Chairman of the D.C. Taxicab Commission, also commented in regard to Item 8 on the TPB agenda. He said that upon his appointment to the position of Chairman of the Taxicab Commission, he learned that there are no District taxicabs that are wheelchair-accessible, and that the Commission has to authorize companies in other jurisdictions to send accessible cabs in each separate instance of need. He said that since before his appointment to Chairman, the Taxicab Commission has been working with the D.C. Office of Disability Rights and with Ms. Wendy Klancher of TPB staff to address the need for accessible cabs. He asked TPB members to consider what it would be like to not be able to come and go as you please because of a disability, and encouraged them to support the recommended projects to purchase accessible taxicabs.

Chairman Mendelson thanked Mr. Swain for his comments.

Mr. Stewart Schwartz, Executive Director of the Coalition for Smarter Growth, called upon the TPB to undertake a thorough reevaluation of the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) in light of the urgent challenges of climate change and energy prices. He said that these challenges require fundamental changes in land-use and transportation planning, and that the current trends in energy prices have already caused a public reaction that has exposed an unprepared and inadequately funded transit system. He praised TPB staff for looking at climate change through the Scenario Study, but said that such study needs to lead to actual change in prioritization of transportation spending and the full integration of land-use and transportation at the local, regional, and state levels. In addition to taking a pause for thorough reevaluation of the TIP and CLRP, he called on TPB members to help communicate the challenges and changing needs to state and federal policymakers, including reconsideration of VDOT's transportation priorities and of the Intercounty Connector project in Maryland. He also said that the COG Greater Washington 2050 effort presents a great opportunity to endorse through a regional compact a fundamental change in regional priorities.

Chairman Mendelson thanked Mr. Schwartz for his comments.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the May 21 Meeting

Ms. Hudgins moved to approve the minutes of the May 21 TPB meeting, and Ms. Winter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Mr. Rawlings said that the Technical Committee met on June 6, and reviewed three items included on the June 18 TPB agenda. These included:

- Item 9: The Committee received a status report on the air quality conformity analysis for drafts of the 2008 CLRP and FY 2009-2014 TIP with and without NVTA-funded projects. The Technical Committee recommended that these documents be released for public comment on June 12.
- Item 10: The Committee received a briefing on a cost-benefit analysis framework for assessing transit investments.
- Item 11: Staff updated the Committee on the development of the "CLRP Aspirations" and "What Would It Take?" Scenarios as part of the TPB Scenario Study.

Mr. Rawlings said that the Technical Committee also reviewed and discussed four information items not on the June 18 TPB agenda, including a WMATA staff briefing on a recent Metrorail ridership forecast through 2030 and the system and station capacity needs identified to address

the expected growth; a TPB staff briefing on a draft policy report summarizing changes in travel trends and commuting patterns in the Washington region; a TPB staff briefing on a draft congestion management process technical report; and a TPB staff briefing on a draft report on performance of high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) facilities on freeways in the Washington region in 2007.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Mr. Martin said that the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) met on June 12, and that the meeting focused on providing feedback to TPB staff on the May 15 public forum on the TIP, and discussing the status of the TPB Scenario Study. He said that the Committee reflects a broad cross-section of viewpoints and members have been actively engaged in conversations about transportation priorities for the region. He said that one point of agreement among members is the importance of looking at transportation from a regional perspective and encouraging the TPB to address transportation issues with a regional approach. He said that he supports the kind of integrated cost-benefit analysis approach for assessing transportation investments outlined in Item 10 on today's TPB agenda.

Mr. Martin said that regarding the May 15 public forum on the TIP, the CAC was pleased with changes made to the format of the forum, and generally supports the proposal by staff to have two TIP forums during the next fiscal year, a plan that is consistent with past CAC recommendations. He said that the first forum would occur in September at the beginning of the TIP cycle to give the public a better opportunity to weigh in on project selection, and the second forum would be held in late spring to coincide with the TIP comment period. He said that members made other suggestions for making project information in the TIP easier for the public to review and understand, such as developing a brochure with condensed information on the TIP.

Mr. Martin said that members also expressed concern about conflicts between projects in the TIP and local transportation and comprehensive plans, and on that issue the Committee passed a resolution calling on the TPB to ask implementing agencies to clearly explain at the time of project submission how projects in the TIP are consistent with state or local transportation and land-use plans. He said that the CAC believes that it should be incumbent on the implementing agency to demonstrate this consistency through specific references to relevant state and local plans. He noted that the resolution is attached to the CAC report distributed at today's meeting.

Mr. Martin said that the CAC also received an update on the development of two new scenarios as part of the TPB Scenario Study, and that the CAC adopted a resolution recommending that any description of the performance of the scenario analyzing CO2 reduction goals also include measures of congestion and vehicle miles traveled. He said that this resolution was presented to the TPB Scenario Study Task Force at its meeting earlier today.

Mr. Martin said that TPB staff also reviewed the slate of staff public involvement activities for

FY 2009, and that generally CAC members reacted favorably to the program and indicated a willingness to work with staff on refining public outreach efforts for the coming year.

Chairman Mendelson asked Mr. Kirby if the CAC's resolution regarding the consistency of projects in the TIP with state and local plans could be implemented by staff by including a request for such information in the project submission process.

Mr. Martin clarified that the intent of the resolution was to encourage a consistency check between what the implementing agency is putting forward and what has been accommodated through state and local planning processes.

Mr. Kirby said that such a check could be incorporated into the TIP submission form.

Chairman Mendelson, in the absence of any objection, asked that this addition be made to the TIP submission form.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said that the Steering Committee met on June 6 and approved three resolutions, which were contained in the mailout item. He said that one resolution amended the work program for the Commuter Connections program to allocate \$150,000 in unspent money from this fiscal year to next fiscal year to support a car-free day campaign, which was initiated by the District of Columbia and supported by several other jurisdictions. He said that the additional resolutions amended the TIP in response to requests by VDOT, regarding transit projects in Northern Virginia.

Referring to the letters packet, Mr. Kirby noted the letter sent by the TPB to Mr. Badger of VDRPT as discussed at the May 21 TPB meeting. He said that the packet also contained notices of two new appointments to the TPB, and introduced Ms. Mitchell of the D.C. Office of Planning, and Mr. McDonald representing VDOT.

Mr. Kirby also referred to a letter from the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) requesting funds for a research project on travel demand forecasting, and he asked for the Board's approval to commit \$15,000 in FY 2008 work program funds as a contribution for this project. He said that seven or eight other Metropolitan Planning Organizations had already committed funding to the project, which arose from a study by the National Academy of Sciences that recommended that MPOs document their experience with advanced modeling practices and share that information with their peers.

Mr. Kirby noted several other items in the letters packet, including a letter from the Maryland State Highway Administration responding to Mr. Jenkins' inquiry at the May 21 TPB meeting regarding the I-270/US 15 corridor. He also described enclosed materials on the pedestrian safety

workshop recently sponsored by COG, WMATA, and the state DOTs, including a summary of recommendations that came out of the workshop and a resolution adopted by the COG Board of Directors endorsing those recommendations and asking for the TPB's support for them, particularly through the Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program. He noted that the TPB has a committee devoted to pedestrian and bicycle activities, and that there are other opportunities in the TPB work program to advance the recommendations from the workshop.

Mr. Kirby noted a summary of a regional forum held by the Greater Washington Board of Trade and co-sponsored by COG, where there was much discussion on funding for Metro and future federal transportation policy. He said that staff would update the TPB on the status of the federal transportation reauthorization discussions at the July 16 meeting. He said that TPB staff would be responding affirmatively to a request in the letters packet from the District of Columbia to provide staff support for the 14th Street Bridge Corridor Environmental Impact Statement.

Mr. Kirby said that the remaining items in the letters packet included approvals of the conformity analysis process for the most recent TIP from the EPA, FHWA, and FTA, and a long letter from Mr. Jonathan Morstein with some interesting ideas about transportation policy.

Mr. Snyder asked if the TPB could send letters to members of the area's Congressional delegation who voted for the Metro funding proposal in the House of Representatives, expressing appreciation for their votes and urging support for moving the bill forward in the Senate. He also asked if TPB staff could conduct an analysis of the costs of driving versus taking transit and other modes such as bicycling and walking, similar to the analysis contained in the letters packet of the cost savings of carpooling.

Mr. Kirby said that staff could incorporate the additional modes and cost-saving strategies mentioned by Mr. Snyder into the analysis in order to further promote those alternatives.

Chairman Mendelson, in the absence of any objection, directed staff to extend the analysis as Mr. Snyder and Mr. Kirby described, and directed staff to prepare letters to send to the region's Congressional delegation as requested by Mr. Snyder.

Ms. Hudgins said in regard to Ms. Snyder's comments on alternative modes of commuting that people are clearly choosing alternatives to single-occupancy vehicles without much encouragement, as evidenced by record-setting Metrorail ridership in recent weeks. She said that further information about alternative modes could facilitate even more change.

Chairman Mendelson asked for further clarification of the AMPO research project for which Mr. Kirby requested funding authorization.

Mr. Kirby said that the project involves documenting experiences that MPOs have had with advanced travel modeling. He said that a lot of organizations are trying new things and there is a need for diligence in documenting practices for the benefit of peers. He said that with the

funding contributions, AMPO would hire a consulting firm to report on various practices and provide documentation.

Ms. Ticer moved to approve a funding contribution from the TPB FY 2008 work program of \$15,000 to the AMPO research project, and Ms. Smyth seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Mendelson declined to make remarks.

7. Approval of Amendments to the FY 2007-2012 TIP that are Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Update Funding for Five Existing Projects and Include 14 New Projects as Requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation

Mr. McDonald said that this was a notice item on last month's TPB agenda, and described the amendments as an aggregation of projects that VDOT has been waiting to amend while the agency has been in the process of reverting back to the 2007 TIP. He said that the amendments include projects from most of the localities in Northern Virginia and that quick action is necessary so that the funding can be obligated before the end of the federal fiscal year. He said that he could answer questions on the specific projects, and asked for the Board's approval of the amendments.

Ms. Hudgins moved to approve Resolution 24-2008 incorporating amendments to the FY 2007-2012 TIP that are exempt from the air quality conformity requirement to update funding for five existing projects and include 14 new projects as requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation. Ms. Smyth seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

8. Approval of Projects for Funding Under the Job Access Reverse Commuter (JARC) and New Freedom Programs of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

Chair Mendelson said that the TPB, along with some other Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), was recently tasked with administering the JARC and New Freedom programs under the federal transportation reauthorization, SAFETEA-LU.

Mr. Lovain presented the second round of projects for funding under the JARC and New Freedom programs. He said the projects address critical human service transportation needs in the region, including the absence of wheelchair-accessible taxicabs in the District of Columbia. He provided a brief background on the history of the two programs and the TPB's recent activities. He said the TPB conducted rigorous outreach for the 2008 solicitation, contacting

1,800 organizations and agencies and holding seven pre-applications conferences, which were attended by over 60 regional organizations and agencies. He said the TPB received 14 applications for the 2008 solicitation.

Mr. Lovain said the Human Services Transportation Coordination Task Force identified two priority needs for the 2008 solicitation: wheelchair-accessible taxicabs in the District and travel training. He said the TPB held meetings on both subjects and presented best practices from around the country. He said the task force created an independent five-member selection committee with expertise in the area, but no vested interest in the applications. He said that if approved, the TPB would be able to obligate all of the FY 2006 and 2007 New Freedom funds, worth \$1.6 million, and all of the FY 2006 JARC funds, amounting to almost \$1 million. He said the TPB will lose the FY 2006 funding if it does not obligate it by September 30, 2008. He said \$1.2 million in FY 2007 JARC funds remain and will be available for the 2009 solicitation. He asked TPB staff-member Beth Newman to review the 12 projects.

Ms. Newman provided additional background and details on the 12 projects the TPB was being asked to approve. She noted that in April 2007, the TPB approved the Coordinated Human Service Transportation Plan, which was developed by the task force and includes an inventory of existing specialized transportation service, strategies and priority projects, as well as selection criteria to guide the JARC and New Freedom solicitation process. She described the selection process, including the lessons learned from the 2007 solicitation and improvements made to the 2008 solicitation and selection process.

Ms. Newman described each project, noting that further detail could be found in the memorandum that was included in the mailout packet under Item 8. She said that if all the projects are approved, \$1 million in JARC funding would be obligated, with \$1.16 million reserved for the 2009 solicitation, and \$1.57 million of the New Freedom funds would be obligated. She said the 2009 solicitation would occur between January and April of 2009. She said the task force again will focus on JARC priorities in the coordination plan, including car-sharing and an expanded Guaranteed Ride Home Program.

Mr. Lovain made a motion to approve Resolution R25-2008. Ms. Ticer seconded the motion.

Mr. Jenkins asked who will own the 21 cabs.

Ms. Newman said the three cab companies will retain ownership of the cabs.

Mr. Jenkins asked how much money the cab companies are providing in matching funds for the cabs.

Ms. Newman said they are required to supply a 20 percent match.

Mr. Jenkins said he will vote against this resolution for philosophical reasons. He said that after a year and a half on the TPB, there has only been one weighted vote. He said he is obliged to vote his conscience and would not want to fund a lot of these projects, as he does not see that as a fundamental role of the government. He said given the inability to vote on the projects individually, he will vote against the resolution.

Mr. Lovain responded that he understands Mr. Jenkins' philosophical position.

Mr. Moneme said he was pleased to see the Georgetown Metro Connection shuttle as part of the project package. He said DDOT requested \$1.2 million in combined funding for the project, and that the selection committee recommended the total project at \$670,000. He said DDOT will still support the entire project at \$1.2 million and will contribute the remaining funding.

Mr. Lovain said the committee was not comfortable approving the full funding because the information provided stated that only about 35 percent of the rides of the shuttle were low-income individuals. He noted that the purpose of the JARC funding is to serve low-income individuals. He said that instead of only funding 35 percent of the project, the selection committee decided to fund half of the project due to the merits of the shuttle.

Mr. Moneme said that as the District becomes more involved in operating the shuttle, they will get a better representation of the actual ridership, but he noted that the service supports a lot of low-income wage earners in Georgetown. He made a request for reinstating the full funding request for the project, as it meets a need that exists for the working population. He submitted a memo to the TPB outlining some of DDOT's concerns and questions.

Ms. Hudgins asked how the DDOT project met the priorities for the 2009 selection process, noting that shuttles to employment sites were listed as a priority.

Mr. Lovain said that the D.C. Circulator will replace the Georgetown shuttle, but that the application received was driven by the Georgetown BID in collaboration with DDOT.

Ms. Hudgins said this point raises a concern for the future. She said that since the funding is intended to serve low-income individuals and there is other funding for circulator projects, the TPB should question whether this project is truly meeting the JARC goals.

Ms. Waters said that she also had philosophic objections to the proposal. She asked if there was any relationship between the two recipient organizations designated in Project F and the National Council for Independent Living, which had a representative on the selection committee.

Ms. Newman said that the recipient organizations are member organizations of the National Council, which is a membership association, and that the selection committee representative as a staff person for the National Council would be familiar with the member organizations but would not be directly involved with them.

Ms. Waters asked if the relationship Ms. Newman described constitutes a conflict of interest.

Ms. Newman said that the relationship had not been seen as a conflict of interest because the representative on the selection panel is removed from the day-to-day operations of the individual recipient organizations, does not serve on their boards of directors, and does not have direct contact with their staffs or boards.

Ms. Waters said that the relationship nonetheless raises a red flag because the recipient organizations are members of the national organization and the funding amount is substantial.

Ms. Waters also asked if there had been a public comment period for the proposed slate of grants and if there was the possibility of holding a public comment period at this time.

Ms. Klancher of TPB staff said that there had been substantial public input during the development of the Coordinated Plan and the setting of regional priorities within that plan for disbursement of the funds.

Ms. Waters said that her jurisdiction always holds public hearings about the specific grants so that public input can be sought on specific projects, and that she would like to see such an opportunity for public input in this case.

Ms. Klancher said that the nature of the grant program is different than the grants overseen by local jurisdictions, in that the priorities are already established in the regional Coordinated Plan.

Ms. Waters said that if it is truly a competitive process, and the intent is not just to give money to everyone who applies, then there should be a public comment period.

Ms. Klancher said that she understood Ms. Waters' objection, but that she would be concerned that holding a public comment period for this program would set a precedent for soliciting public comment every time COG and TPB competitively procure contracts.

Ms. Waters said that the public should be able to weigh in before the TPB moves forward to distribute such significant amounts of money to specific organizations and efforts, in a manner similar to procedures used by the local jurisdictions.

Ms. Klancher noted that the procedures used were in conformity with those followed by WMATA and other transit agencies when they are designated recipients of JARC and New Freedom funds for urbanized areas. She said that it was perhaps more meaningful to have had public involvement at the stage in which the regional priorities were set in the Coordinated Plan.

Chairman Mendelson said that the TPB may determine that it wants to issue the proposal for public comment, but that the procedures adopted by the Board at the beginning of the process do

not call for that. He noted that it is a different situation than with the CLRP or TIP which are always issued for public comment, and said that the application process had been public.

Ms. Waters asked what the harm would be holding a 30-day public comment period for the proposal.

Chairman Mendelson said that he did not perceive any harm but that he also did not perceive any necessity to issue the proposal for public comment.

Ms. Waters said that she believes that anytime a decision involving this amount of money is made, there should be an opportunity for public comment on that decision.

Ms. Hudgins asked for more information from TPB staff on how the solicitation for applications is made public.

Ms. Newman said that a brochure and email notification goes out to the Human Services Task Force, TPB members, and other COG and TPB committees, as well as the inventory of human service transportation providers and related nonprofits, for a total of around 1,800 organizations.

Ms. Klancher noted that two focus groups were conducted during the development of the Coordinated Plan, and that those included participants from almost every TPB jurisdiction. She said that the focus groups yielded constructive input on the regional priorities and that she was confident that public concerns had been addressed through the process and incorporated into the Coordinated Plan.

Ms. Hudgins said that this is a critical area of service and her experience has been that a broad range of service providers and interested citizens participate in discussions related to this area of service at the TPB. She said that she thinks further public comment is not necessary because it is a case where there is a limited group of providers and they had an opportunity to weigh in on the criteria and priorities for the program.

Mr. Jenkins asked how the requests are reviewed and filtered for accuracy when it comes to identifying a need. He said that he found it hard to believe that more than half of District of Columbia residents have disabilities, as was implied by one of the earlier public commenters who supported one of the New Freedom projects.

Mr. Lovain said that federal agencies use a similar public process with grant programs in that they get public input on proposed regulations and selection criteria, but that when the grants are announced they are final. He said that the decision of this selection committee should be final as well.

Mr. Lovain also said in relation to the Georgetown BID project that he thought it would be appropriate to reconvene the selection committee to get additional relevant information and data,

and come back to the TPB with either a recommendation for additional funding or an explanation of why such funding is not appropriate. He said that there is additional funding available under JARC that could be used. He said that regardless of the situation with that particular project, he hoped the TPB would approve the proposal as submitted by the selection committee today.

Chairman Mendelson asked Mr. Moneme if that arrangement was acceptable from DDOT's perspective.

Mr. Moneme said that he found Mr. Lovain's suggested course of action to be acceptable.

Mr. Turner asked if the pertinent federal guidelines had been followed with respect to the awarding of the grants, and if there had been any statement earlier in the process that there would be a public comment period at the time of the selection.

Ms. Newman said that all federal guidelines had been followed and that the FTA would review the process before actually conveying the funding. She said that no indication had ever been given that there would be a public comment period at the time of project selection.

Mr. Turner said he did not think it would be appropriate to change the public comment process after it had already been set at the beginning, though he would be open to changing it for the next cycle.

Mr. Turner also asked for clarification that the five projects approved for 2007 were for only one year, and that they would be eligible during the next cycle if there is FY 2009 funding available.

Ms. Newman said that Mr. Turner was correct in that understanding.

Mr. Turner asked if the wheelchair-accessible taxicabs that would be purchased for use in the District of Columbia could be dispatched to other jurisdictions.

Ms. Newman said that most of the outlying jurisdictions already have accessible taxicab service, so the projects are primarily to address the needs in the District.

Mr. Smith said that he appreciated the discussion and agreed with Mr. Jenkins about wanting to consider each project separately. He said that he did not think additional public comment at this phase would be helpful and that public input occurred at the right stage.

Ms. Ticer called the question.

The motion passed by voice vote. Mr. Jenkins and Ms. Waters asked to be recorded as 'nay' votes.

9. Briefing on Two Versions of the draft 2008 CLRP, the FY 2009-2014 TIP (with and without NVTA Funded Projects), and the Related Air Quality Conformity Assessments

Mr. Kirby provided a status report on the 2008 CLRP, FY 2009-2014 TIP, and air quality conformity assessment, which were released for public comment at the June 12 Citizens Advisory Committee meeting. He said there is a memorandum in the mailout packet summarizing the results of the air quality conformity assessment. He noted that the CLRP and TIP meet the requirements under the Clean Air Act for volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, and fine particulates.

He said that the current TIP cycle is unusual in that there are two options of the TIP that are out for comment because of the uncertainty about the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) funding. He said that should the funding be restored by the Virginia General Assembly by the July 16 TPB meeting, the TPB may act on the entire program. He said that if the funding is not restored, projects that were to be funded through NVTA funding would be removed from the program. He said the public comment documentation contains information about both options.

Mr. Snyder asked if one TIP option performs better than the other in terms of air quality conformity.

Mr. Kirby said that staff has only analyzed the TIP that includes the entire slate of projects. He said that if the NVTA funding is not restored, staff would rerun the air quality analysis in the fall without the NVTA projects.

Mr. Snyder noted that many of the Virginia members are working with Virginia legislators to restore the NVTA funds.

10. Briefing on a Cost-Benefit Analysis Framework for Assessing Transit Investments, and on Possible Implications for Transportation Planning in the Washington Region

Mr. Kirby introduced Mr. Lewis, whose firm has worked on cost-benefit analysis for transit and infrastructure projects and also with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on its procedures for evaluating and ranking transit projects nationwide. He said this type of analysis will be useful for the TPB in reviewing highway and transit networks for the scenario study.

Mr. Lewis provided a PowerPoint presentation on a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis framework for assessing transit investments, noting that the practices and procedures of cost-benefit analysis are in place for virtually all modes and types of public infrastructure except for transit. He said the current assessment of transit projects tends to be confined to ridership potential and related performance measures. He outlined five additional benefits of transit that

generally go unmeasured in benefit analysis: congestion management, environmental benefits, safety, economic development, and transit-oriented development. He reviewed these measures in detail. He said that cost-benefit analysis is available for transit projects as a means of recognizing all sources of transit value. Mr. Lewis provided examples of previous transit cost-benefit analysis for Austin, Texas and Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mr. Lewis described current methods of transit project evaluation, principally FTA's New Starts program, which is designed to rate applicant projects for eligibility for funding from a fixed pool of federal resources. He added that the FTA process is not designed to guide local and regional infrastructure choices and investments, nor does it enable comparisons of total economic and social value among regional infrastructure alternatives such as highways, congestion pricing options, technology options, and public transportation. He concluded his presentation by noting that cost-benefit analysis is feasible for understanding the significance of transit investment for the economic and social well-being of a region. He said the analysis also allows for the comparative analysis of large-scale alternative scenarios for a region, including different portfolios of transit, highway, road pricing technology, and other policy options.

Mr. Snyder asked staff how the TPB plans to use this type of analysis.

Mr. Kirby said the approach will be applied to evaluating the new scenarios, adding that there may also be value in reviewing individual projects using cost-benefit analysis. He said the land development benefit that is associated with transit projects is often overlooked. He highlighted the New York Avenue Metro Station and the proposed Potomac Yard Metro Station as regional examples of development value associated with transit investment.

Mr. Moneme echoed the need to incorporate cost-benefit analysis into project review at the regional level. He asked Mr. Lewis if there is the ability to analyze how benefits may be impacted by shifts among transit modes, such as how light rail investment may impact WMATA.

Mr. Lewis said this is called the cross-elasticity of demand between modes and involves the quality or price of service changes, and how it affects the demand for potential substitute modes. He said that when rail capacity improvements are made, it does have the effect of shifting consumers from one mode to another. He said this impact can be forecasted, and then the effect can be valued for many users. He said he thinks FTA agrees that these effects can be measured, but they are not ready to endorse this type of analysis across the country because not all communities are equally capable of generating the analysis.

Mr. Moneme said this type of analysis is germane for the region, noting that the Metrorail system has capacity constraints on all lines and if other investments could provide relief, they should be explored. He asked if the analysis from other regions was supported on the basis of increased land values and economic development.

Mr. Lewis said it was and mentioned he is working with the city of Omaha, Nebraska to understand the extent to which projected development value from a streetcar investment would help stimulate private funding as a means to realize the benefits of the land available for commercial and residential development. He said he worked with Proctor and Gamble in Cincinnati to identify the potential for development at station areas to improve worker access to the Proctor and Gamble offices.

Mr. Moneme said the streetcar is a new phenomenon in the region and a cost-benefit analysis could be helpful in realizing the value of such a system.

Ms. Smith asked how market variability affects the analysis and how long of a timeframe the analysis covers.

Mr. Lewis said some of the studies indicate that the realization of land value takes place quickly. He noted that the realization of value often occurs before the development takes place, based on planning and zoning decisions. He cited an example in San Francisco where the value of residential property increased by as much as ten percent per foot on the opening day of the rail system. He said the value of commercial property also escalates quickly and used an example in the District for commercial properties around Metro stations. He said the economic impacts of infill development around existing stations happen more slowly.

Mr. Bottigheimer noted the value of this type of analytical framework. He said WMATA will be implementing a priority bus network of 24 lines that will service 50 percent of riders. He said cost-benefit analysis would allow the region to realize the environmental ridership benefit and the economic benefit. He asked about the precision of the techniques in comparing rail lines with bus rapid transit, and distinguishing between different levels of quality of bus service.

Mr. Lewis said there has been a wealth of analytical study on the effects of bus and rail in terms of changes in level of service and effects on consumer and commercial behavior. He said the results are presented in a statistical framework, based on the underlying statistical properties of the forecasting assumptions that are made.

Ms. Hudgins thanked Mr. Lewis for his presentation and noted that the analysis provides the kind of information the community needs to understand the value of development that occurs and how quality of life shifts when the investment is made. She noted that planning decisions made prior to transit investment impact the economic variables used in the analysis.

11. Update on the Development of the “CLRP Aspirations” and “What Would It Take?” Scenarios

Mr. Mendelson asked that this item be moved to the July agenda.

Mr. Kirby said staff would come back next month with an update on the scenario planning activities. He noted that a handout distributed at this meeting would provide a brief overview to TPB members. He said staff is proceeding with both scenarios.

12. Other Business

There was no other business.

13. Adjourn

Chair Mendelson adjourned the meeting at 2:00 p.m.