

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
February 15, 2012**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Melissa Barlow, FTA
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Derrick L. Davis, Prince George's County
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jason Groth, Charles County
Rene'e Hamilton, VDOT
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax County
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
John Jenkins, Prince William County
Emmett V. Jordan, City of Greenbelt
Julia Koster, NCPC
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick
Bill Lebegern, MWAA
Peter May, National Park Service
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Garrett Moore, VDOT
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT
Art Rodgers, DCOP
Paul Smith, Frederick County
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
Jonathan Way, Manassas City
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
Gerald Miller
Robert Griffiths
Nicholas Ramfos
Andrew Meese
John Swanson
Andrew Austin
Jane Posey
Wendy Klancher
Sarah Crawford
Gareth James
Karin Foster
Eric Randall
Ben Hampton
Michael Farrell
Karin Foster
Debbie Leigh
Deborah Etheridge
Jonathan Rogers
Paul DesJardin COG/DCPS
Betsy Self COG/DPSH
Lewis Miller COG/OPA
Bill Orleans Citizen
Jim Maslanka City of Alexandria
Randy Carroll MDE
Judi Gold CM Bowser's Office
Alex Verzosa City of Fairfax
Peter Denningan CAC
Danielle Wesolek WMATA
Nick Alexandrow PRTC
John B. Townsend AAA
Patrick Durany PWC
Will Handsfield DC Office of Planning
Austina Casey DC DOT
Jonathan Kass CM Wells' Office
Howard Simons MDOT

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Roger Diedrich introduced himself as a representative of the Virginia chapter of the Sierra Club, and declared their opposition to the proposed inclusion of the Manassas Battlefield Bypass in the CLRP update and air quality analysis. He said the Sierra Club had been opposed to this bypass since 2005, stating that the proposed four-lane highway on three sides of the Manassas Battlefield would traverse largely undeveloped landscape with no clear destination. He said it would be auto-dependent, energy-intensive, and a very poor expenditure in the face of many more pressing needs. He said there are plausible alternatives that have not been fully investigated, such as co-locating Route 29 onto I-66 and providing improvements in transit to better serve the east-west traffic. He said Route 28 should continue to receive improvements to serve some north-south demand on the east of Dulles Airport, and that Pageland Road should receive safety improvements to better serve the local traffic. He stated that adding more capacity to VRE would relieve some demand in the corridor, as would the planned widening of Route 7. He stated that there are studies underway that are likely to provide more detailed options on how that area could be served and, more importantly to the TPB, which improvements would be best for the region. He stated that in light of the Region Forward goal to improve service to activity centers, this kind of project should be at the very bottom of the priority list.

John Townsend from the American Automobile Association Mid-Atlantic urged the TPB to support the proposed updates to the CLRP, and to approve funding for the construction of the I-95 HOV HOT lanes project. He said it was necessary to get serious about the fact that the Washington area suffers from the worst congestion in the country, and that these proposals present an opportunity to do something tangible about solving the problem. He said that critics had focused on two projects in particular, the auxiliary lane from northbound I-395 between Duke Street and Seminary Road, and the Manassas Battlefield Bypass. He said that the I-395 project had been a political lightning rod, but that it shouldn't be, as workers in that area were facing a transportation crisis and it was of the utmost importance to help them. He said that the real issue concerning the Manassas Battlefield Bypass project is the safety of visitors to one of the most visited Civil War battlefields in the country, and that the proposed project would help protect pedestrians, park-goers, and motorists. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Stewart Schwartz, Executive Director of the Coalition for Smarter Growth, remarked that the I-95 HOT lanes project is flawed because alternatives were not considered, it would not fund adequate transit in the corridor, the impact on carpooling had not been considered, and the public process had been a travesty. He said he could not support the project without further study. He stated his opposition to the inclusion of the Manassas Battlefield Bypass project in the CLRP, as less damaging alternatives had been offered by a coalition of preservation groups. He said the TPB had been sent a letter by Southern Environmental Law Center, the Piedmont Environmental Council, the Coalition for Smarter Growth, and the National Parks Conservation Association. He said the National Trust for Historic Preservation and the Sierra Club had also been strong allies. He said resources in the Battlefield were a major concern and that roads through the park should be closed, but that this project would make things worse, not better. He said he had yet to see legally-binding guarantees that roads through the park would be closed, and he summarized the

alternatives that had been proposed. He said the Bypass was a Trojan horse, as Virginia's Deputy Secretary of Transportation, David Tyeryar, had told Bob Chase and others that they had to get the road to Route 7. He said the planned project was, therefore, a 50-mile road from I-95 all the way up, not a 10-mile segment of the Tri-County Parkway or a couple miles of bypass, and he called on the TPB to remove it from the CLRP.

Bob Chase of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance said he would like to offer their thoughts on the draft submissions of the 2012 CLRP update. He said the Alliance supports the I-95 HOT lane financial plan. He commended the District for the improvements made on and around the 11th Street Bridge and I-295 and I-695, and said the proposed BRT connection from Van Dorn Metro to the Pentagon is precisely the type of innovative transit solution that the region needs more of. He remarked that the I-395 auxiliary lane is another great example of innovative thinking that will hopefully offset some of the damage done by the loss of the I-395 HOT lane project. He said the Manassas Battlefield Bypass is an excellent example of federal, state, and local cooperation to help preserve a national treasure while improving regional mobility. He said several decades of studies have documented growing Northern Virginia north-south travel demand, and that denying the existence of tens of thousands of travelers would only make matters worse. He said the Bypass would not only better protect the battlefield from cut-through traffic, but would actually make it easier for visitors to access the battlefield, and that these improvements promote connectivity between major activity centers and north-south public transit. He urged the TPB to reject the divisive appeals of special interests and approve these project submissions. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

2. Approval of Minutes of January 18 Meeting

Mr. Smith made a motion to approve the minutes of the January 18 TPB meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Krimm and passed unanimously.

3. Report of Technical Committee

Mr. Rawlings said the Technical Committee met on February 3 and reviewed eight items that were on the agenda for the TPB's February meeting: technical corrections to the project submissions for the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP; the draft scope of work for the air quality conformity assessment; the proposed TIGER application based upon the TPB's FY 2011 submission to implement multimodal access improvements in rail station areas; a request to EPA for redesignation of the Washington DC-MD-VA nonattainment area to attainment status for PM2.5, along with a maintenance plan demonstrating compliance with PM2.5 standards through 2025; activities that address recommendations in the Incident Management and Response Action Plan developed by the COG IMR Steering Committee; an update on the reauthorization of federal surface transportation legislation; the draft Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP) for FY 2013; and the draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY 2013. He also reported that three items were presented for information and discussion: progress toward developing a draft regional Complete Streets policy template; the proposed theme for the 2012

Street Smart Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety campaign; and an update on the development of the TPB Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Ms. Slater said that the first meeting of the CAC for 2012 took place on February 9. She said the CAC has 23 members and alternates, half of whom are new. She said they were pleased to host Chair Turner to speak about TPB priorities for 2012, and that he expressed his appreciation for the role the CAC has played over the years and encouraged the CAC to participate in the new Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. She said that he outlined a number of urgent transportation issues, particularly continued funding shortfalls, and that he mentioned a possible summit of key leaders to identify regional solutions. She said Mr. Swanson of the TPB staff gave an overview of the CAC's role and its responsibilities, and that Mr. Kirby emphasized the importance of the TPB's long-range transportation planning, citing the Wilson Bridge as an example of a success that took many years to accomplish.

Ms. Slater said Mr. Farrell gave a briefing on the materials to be used in the new Street Smart campaign, including a storyboard for use in a television piece. She said a lively discussion followed. Some members felt the campaign apportioned an inappropriate amount of blame to the behavior of pedestrians, when the main problem with pedestrian safety is inadequate infrastructure. Others commented that pedestrian safety is often a larger problem in minority communities, but that this year's campaign did not seem to represent minority communities. Someone asked why the woman must always have red shoes and nail polish. Ms. Slater concluded her report by saying that new CAC members had been invited to attend the next Community Leadership Institute on March 29th and 31st.

5. Report of Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby stated that the Steering Committee had met on February 3, and that there were two actions taken, as detailed in the mail-out packet: an amendment to the TIP to include funding to purchase replacement buses for the Ride-On bus system in Montgomery County; and the approval of the Long Bridge study to look at the bridge's structural integrity and to analyze long-term multimodal capacity improvements to support future freight and passenger traffic on the bridge.

Referring to an item in the letters packet that had been distributed immediately prior to the meeting, Mr. Kirby briefly summarized a status report on the Complete Streets policy development process, including a workshop on January 30th that involved 40 people representing all of the participating jurisdictions and the CAC. He said a draft Complete Streets Policy Guidance and Template was currently under review and would hopefully be ready to be presented to the Technical Committee and the TPB in March. He added that a work session on the draft Template was being considered prior to the March TPB meeting to explain details of how it would work, and that the focus was on identifying commonality among the existing

policies and providing guidance for when these are updated or when jurisdictions are developing new policies.

Mr. Kirby said that the next Community Leadership Institute would take place on March 29th and 31st, and that suitable participants were being sought. He said that Kathy Porter, former TPB Chair and former Mayor of Takoma Park, would be facilitating this effort, and that previous sessions had been very well received. He noted that some members of the Board had participated, and asked that members pass on the details of anyone who might be interested to Deborah Bilek, whose email and phone number are on the bottom of the brochure in the mail-out.

Mr. Kirby called members' attention to a letter from Tony Kinn, of the Office of Transportation Public-Private Partnership for the Commonwealth of Virginia. He said Mr. Kinn had asked to meet the TPB to discuss priority projects for public-private partnerships, and that his letter had laid out the kinds of projects that his office is looking for. Mr. Kirby said this could present the TPB with significant opportunities, and that he would brief members further once more information became available.

Mr. Kirby said that letters on the findings of the TPB's recently-completed JARC and New Freedom assessment had been sent to AMPO and APTA, and that they would be included in next month's packet.

Chair Turner thanked Mr. Kirby for his report and said that, as a graduate of the Community Leadership Institute, he could testify that it represented a great opportunity for newer members of the Board and for community leaders. He requested that an electronic copy of the brochure be sent to members, and that they send it to their listservs and distribution lists to raise awareness of the opportunity.

6. Chair's Remarks

Chair Turner informed the Board that Mr. Kirby had participated in a discussion on News Channel 8 the previous month and had done an excellent job of representing the Transportation Planning Board. He said he had appreciated the invitation from the CAC to come to its first meeting of the year and that he had enjoyed meeting its new members. He introduced Prince George's Council Member Derrick Davis (District 6), an alternate member of the TPB who was attending for the first time in the place of Mr. Olson. He also recognized Emmett Jordan, mayor pro-tem of the City of Greenbelt, as a newly appointed alternate on the TPB from Greenbelt.

ACTION ITEMS

7. Review of Comments and Approval of Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2012 Financially Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and the FY2013-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Kirby said that the mailout item summarized the proposed significant additions and changes to the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP. He said Mr. Austin would present some technical corrections, the public comments received and the recommended responses that were made by the National Park Service and VDOT, regarding the Manassas National Battlefield Bypass. A memorandum summarizing these corrections, comments received and responses was distributed.

Mr. Austin summarized the technical corrections to the project submissions for the air quality conformity analysis for the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP. He said that VDOT submitted technical corrections to the I-495 HOT lanes project and to the I-495 auxiliary lanes project, and pointed out that the distributed material includes a complete table of all the changes for these projects.

Mr. Smith asked why the technical corrections included a 17-year delay, from 2013 to 2030, for the expected completion of ten segments of I-495 auxiliary lanes.

Mr. Austin replied that he believed that it was due to the fact that the funding agreements are not yet finalized and that the completion dates would be revised when they are finalized. He said he would defer to VDOT to follow up on this question. He continued to review the comments received and recommended responses regarding the Manassas National Battlefield Bypass. He said the first comment, from an individual, was a proposal that the Route 28 bypass could provide better congestion relief for Manassas residents than the Battlefield Bypass. He said that the National Park Service responded by stating that the purpose of the Battlefield Bypass is to remove non-park traffic from within the park off of Routes 234 and 29. He said the second comment, which was mentioned by Mr. Schwartz earlier, was a joint letter from the Coalition for Smarter Growth, the Southern Environmental Law Center, the National Parks Conservation Association, and the Piedmont Environmental Council. The letter was summarized into 12 points which he reviewed, along with the responses.

Mr. Kirby said that representatives from both VDOT and the National Park Service were present and able to answer further questions.

Ms. Backmon made a motion to adopt Resolution R8-2012 to approve the project submissions for inclusion in the air quality conformity assessment for the 2012 CLRP and FY2013-2018 TIP. Mr. Jenkins seconded the motion.

Mr. Snyder, emphasizing the importance of the Civil War as a milestone in United States history, said that the Manassas Battlefield is one of the great battlefields of the Civil War. He asked for clarification on whether the approval would build a bypass as well as shut down roads, and what, if any, the legally binding effect of these actions would be. He also asked who currently controls

these roads, and who would control them in the future. Finally, he inquired about induced traffic, and questioned whether the approval would bring significantly more traffic into the Battlefield area.

Ms. Smyth, referring to the documents, noticed on the response to the question about enforceable commitment that the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors stated support. She clarified that this was a statement to indicate good intentions.

Mr. Moore said that VDOT concurs with the United States Park Service comments. He said that the NEPA process is being rigorously followed, and that VDOT is actively working with the National Park Service to move traffic from the close vicinity of the main historic sites on the Manassas National Battlefield Park in order to preserve it. He said that VDOT has submitted the project for the CLRP for the air quality conformity analysis, and that transferring the property and roads will take a combination of local and legislative action. He added that pulling this project out of the CLRP would result in disallowing the completion of the NEPA studies.

Mr. Way said that the City of Manassas has not taken a position on this project. Recognizing the expense and timeframe for the project, he said that disagreement on the details should not be a reason to oppose it. He added his strong support of the Tri-County Parkway, stating that it would alleviate congestion along Route 28 and help connect activity centers.

Mr. Jenkins, emphasizing his longevity on the Prince William County Board of Supervisors, said that the Tri-County Parkway is in the County's comprehensive plan. He stated his support for the Manassas Battlefield Park project and urged the TPB to pass the resolution.

Mr. Beecher stated his support of Mr. Moore's comments, and said that Loudoun County would vote to affirm the motion.

Ms. Smyth asked for clarification regarding the closure of Routes 29 and 234, and if these closures would be clearly stated in writing.

Mr. Moore replied that this has already been done in the submission for air quality conformity.

Mr. Snyder asked for clarification that the project includes the Bypass as well as closing the roads in the battlefield. Hearing staff respond affirmatively, he stated that the record should reflect that the project includes both the Bypass and the road closures.

Mr. May of the National Park Service thanked those who support the project. He said that it is encouraging to hear the TPB discuss the mission of the Park and how best to protect it, and to hear that the disagreement at hand reflects different opinions on how best to protect the park. He said that this was the best alternative to eliminating roads that go through the park while addressing safety and preservation issues.

Ms. Tregoning acknowledged the potential for the development of a corridor of statewide significance that runs from I-95 in Stafford County to Route 7 in Loudoun County. She

expressed concern about the impact this may have on introducing new truck traffic, and suggested that this could have an adverse impact.

Mr. Moore stated that the TPB would not be voting on a corridor of statewide significance. He said he would need to get specific boundary information to address parts of Ms. Tregoning's concern. He added that the corridor in its current form is already congested, and the focus of this project is to make improvements.

Ms. Koster asked if induced demand was an issue that was being evaluated.

Mr. Moore said he would have to refer to staff for an answer to that question. He said that he could bring people in to review the draft environmental impact statement in its current form if the TPB wanted to go into such detail.

Chair Turner called for a vote on R8-2012 to approve the project submissions for the inclusion of the air quality conformity assessment for the 2012 CLRP and FY2013-2018 TIP. The resolution was passed unanimously.

8. Approval of Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2012 CLRP and FY2013-2018 TIP

Ms. Posey said the mailout item presented the scope of work, which includes work tasks, technical inputs, and the schedule for the conformity analysis of the 2012 CLRP and FY2013-2018 TIP. She reminded the TPB that the schedule allows for the TPB to approve the conformity analysis in July. She added the scope of work with project inputs went out for public comment, and no comments were received. She said that the TPB is being asked to approve the scope of work in order for staff to begin the conformity analysis of the 2012 CLRP and FY 2013-2018 TIP.

Chair Turner called for a vote approving of the scope of work for the air quality conformity assessment for the 2012 CLRP and FY2013-2018 TIP. The scope was approved unanimously.

9. Approval of Amendment to the FY 2011-2016 TIP that is Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Include Funding for the Construction of the I-95 HOV/HOT Lanes project, as requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)

Mr. Kirby said VDOT is seeking an amendment to the TIP which specifies funding that is going to the I-95 HOV/HOT Lane project. He said the amendment shows sources of funding from private debt service as well as VDOT funding. He said the TPB is being asked to act on this amendment due to the large amount of funding involved.

Chair Turner noted that the amendment was discussed at the February Steering Committee meeting and the committee decided to bring the item before the TPB.

Mr. Moore made a motion to adopt Resolution R9-2012 to amend the FY 2011-2016 TIP. Mr. Way seconded the motion.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for clarification that the cost of the project is roughly \$940 million.

Mr. Moore said the numbers have not been finalized and that \$780 million is close to accurate.

Mr. Zimmerman expressed concern about the definitiveness of the response. He asked Mr. Moore if he thought that the final project cost would be higher than \$780 million. He said he does not expect that amount to cover the entire projected cost of the project.

Mr. Moore said he does not think the final cost will be higher than \$780 million.

Mr. Zimmerman asked Mr. Moore to confirm that he expects the project to be constructed based on what is presented in the amendment to the TIP. He asked Mr. Moore if a future amendment would be necessary.

Mr. Moore said the TPB may see some amendments as the project cost is being finalized. He said \$780 million is the best estimate for the project at this time.

Mr. Zimmerman said he would be surprised if that is true. He said he anticipates the project will cost more than \$780 million and that the TPB will again be requested to approve amendments to the project. He asked Mr. Moore about the transit component that should be included in the project.

Mr. Moore said a transit component is not included in the \$780 million project cost.

Mr. Zimmerman said the TPB was told that there is to be a transit component to the project. He asked Mr. Moore if that had changed.

Mr. Moore said there is no transit component for this portion of the project. He said the transit component would be done separately in the six-year plan and as part of future plans.

Mr. Zimmerman asked Mr. Moore to clarify whether transit is currently included in the HOT Lanes project, or will be included later.

Mr. Moore said the particular project included in the amendment at hand does not have a transit component, unlike the original HOT Lanes project that included I-395 and had an integral transit component. He said this project is separate, and that a transit component for the corridor would be completed as part of the six-year plan and funded through a separate project.

Mr. Zimmerman confirmed that part of the reason for a project cost that is lower than he expected is that the transit has been cut out of the project.

Mr. Moore said that is correct.

Mr. Zimmerman said that when the project is implemented, he wonders whose responsibility it will be to monitor the project to see how it actually performs. He reminded the TPB that the project is taking a current transit facility and turning it over to a private company, which will then charge admission for people who are in single-occupant vehicles. He questions what that action will do to the transit that has provided so much of the mobility in the corridor, and if that transit will be negatively affected. He asked if the TPB has any role in monitoring the impacts of the implementation of the project.

Mr. Kirby said the TPB has done quite a lot of HOV monitoring work for VDOT through the TPB's work program. He said monitoring for this particular project is not included in the work program because the facility has not yet been built.

Mr. Zimmerman said his question is not whether VDOT wants the TPB to perform that action, it is whether the region should expect the TPB to perform that action, given the impact of this major corridor on the mobility of the entire region. He suggested that it would be a good idea for the TPB to commit at the outset to conducting this future analysis and begin collecting the base data for a point of comparison. He said that information, along with monitoring as the project is being implemented and after the project has been completed, will inform the region of the utility of the project and if it should be replicated throughout the region or not.

Chair Turner said that the TPB will approve the work program at its March meeting, noting that there is an opportunity to add this activity as a part of that work program. He said this request ties in with some of the discussion the TPB has had over the last several years on the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan in terms of evaluating projects and potential impacts on the region. He said perhaps this request could be included in those efforts.

Mr. Zimmerman suggested that staff develop a template for the Board to consider at its next meeting, given the direction of this item. He said it might be incorporated anyway, as the Chair suggested, but the TPB should have an opportunity to go on the record and make clear the intention to conduct this analysis.

Mr. Kirby said staff can speak with VDOT about scoping out this activity in the upcoming FY 2013 work program and how it could be carried out in subsequent years.

Chair Turner said he understands the importance of getting the base data to see how the facility performs over time.

Ms. Smyth said she wanted to be sure that the record indicates that the TPB will be passing this amendment with the understanding that the Commonwealth has another commitment for transit in this corridor and that VDOT will be working on that.

Mr. Moore said that is correct.

The motion passed unanimously.

10. Approval of Application for Funding Under the FY 2012 Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Competitive Grant Program

Mr. Randall provided a presentation on the FY 2012 TIGER grant application proposal. He said the notice of funding availability for the program came out on January 31, the pre-application is due on February 20 and the application is due on March 19, providing only a seven-week turnaround. He said TPB staff proposes to submit a revised version of the FY 2011 TIGER application, which was well-received by USDOT staff even though it was not funded. He said USDOT staff indicated to TPB staff that improving project readiness and providing a high match and private contributions would make an FY 2012 application more competitive.

Mr. Randall reviewed the application concept – small-scale, innovative multimodal improvements for accessibility around regional rail stations. He said the FY 2012 application proposal contains seven project components identifying improvements at 16 rail stations throughout the region. He reviewed minor project adjustments from the FY 2011 application. He said the total application would request \$22 million worth of federal funding with a 32 percent match, yielding a total project cost of \$32 million.

Mr. Randall briefly reviewed other competitive grant programs administered by the Federal Transit Administration. He said WMATA is proposing to resubmit through the livability grant opportunity its FY 2010 Regional Bus Stop application that it prepared in cooperation with local jurisdictions and TPB staff.

Chair Turner noted the quick turnaround required for submittal of the TPB's FY 2012 TIGER application and he said that he hopes the TPB will be successful given the positive feedback from USDOT.

Mr. Erenrich made a motion to adopt Resolution R10-2012 to approve the FY 2012 TIGER application. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion.

Mr. Zimbabwe said it is his understanding that USDOT reserves the right to less than fully fund the overall proposal if there are a variety of components included in the proposal. He said that the overall size of the federal request is larger than any of the projects funded in the FY 2011 round of TIGER grants. He asked if there has been any discussion about stating priorities for the projects within the TPB's application.

Mr. Randall said USDOT staff spoke favorably about the segmentability of the TPB's application in that it provided a menu of projects and performed an independent benefit-cost analysis for each of the project components. He said that USDOT has previously selected components of a project application to fund. He said USDOT staff made very clear that whatever priorities the TPB might have, they would select projects based on their priorities and selection criteria.

Ms. Tregoning noted that a lot of the project components involve Metrorail stations and asked if it would be possible to determine the ridership at those stations. She said that could be a convenient way to array the projects. She also noted that the largest project has the minimum local match. She said she understands that the ability to over-match was a factor in previously successful TIGER grants.

Mr. Erenrich said ranking the projects according to ridership would be counterproductive because the purpose of the grant application is to enhance ridership at under-performing stations. He used Forest Glen as an example, stating that it is currently a hardship for pedestrians to access the station because of the need to cross Georgia Avenue. He reiterated that the TPB is not being asked to prioritize its project components.

Mr. Randall said USDOT staff acknowledged that the pure benefit-cost numbers do not always indicate qualitative benefits. He said that the numbers showing the impact on accessibility for mobility device users traveling between Forest Glen Metrorail Station and Holy Cross Hospital might not be high, but qualitatively could have a significant impact on users.

Ms. Tregoning said she appreciates that differentiation. She said she was also looking at projects that have been funded in the past and the trend shows that most all of the projects had a significant over-match. She said she is concerned that meeting the minimum match requirement might again place the TPB's application as an outlier.

Chair Turner said he agrees that it is not necessary to prioritize the TPB project components.

The motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

11. Briefing on Mobile Emissions Inventories for Fine Particle Pollution (PM2.5) for the 2012 Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan

Mr. Kirby introduced Joan Rohlfs, of the COG Department of Environmental Programs (DEP), and Elena Constantine, of the Department of Transportation Planning (DTP), to provide a briefing on mobile emissions inventories for fine particle pollution. He told the Board that the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) would be moving forward with adopting a maintenance plan for the region in the next month or two, and that it was important for the Board to be aware of the plan and how it is developed.

Ms. Rohlfs began by explaining fine particle pollution to the Board. She said fine particles are extremely small and create visibility and respiratory problems, and that they are created by emissions from mobile sources, power plants, road construction, coal combustion and other sources. She explained that the Washington region is currently meeting air quality standards for fine particles, and that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 2009 issued a clean data

determination for the region, allowing the states to seek re-designation to attainment and to submit a ten-year maintenance plan.

Ms. Rohlfs also explained that the region has conducted an emissions inventory to show emissions from each major source sector for the years 2002, 2007, 2017, and 2025. She said that nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emissions declined significantly between 2002 and 2007, and that projections show them continuing to decline beyond 2025. Fine particle emissions will decline during the 2002 to 2025 timeframe, but not as much as NO_x. She pointed out that on-road sources were the greatest contributor to NO_x emissions.

Finally, Ms. Rohlfs described the schedule for re-designation. She said the first step—calculation of emissions inventories—had been completed, and that MWAQC will review and potentially approve the draft plan for public comment in March. The public comment period will probably occur in April and final approval by MWAQC could happen in May. Following MWAQC approval, the plan will be submitted to EPA, with final approval currently anticipated in September.

Ms. Constantine showed the Board the results of an analysis to estimate emissions from mobile sources in the region using the TPB Version 2.3 travel demand forecasting model, the 2011 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP), and the MOVES 2010a emissions estimating model. She pointed out the dramatic declining trend in emissions since 2002, and explained that the inventory looks out to 2040, the out year for the CLRP. She also highlighted the fact that while NO_x emissions continue declining between 2025 and 2040, fine particle emissions experience a slight uptick during that period. She noted that there are some minor jurisdictional variations in emissions, mainly a greater reduction in NO_x emissions in Maryland, which staff attribute to the fact that Maryland has instituted the California Clean Car Program while Virginia has not. She also explained that dramatic NO_x emission reductions have been achieved mostly through emission control technologies on autos, while some fine particle emissions are the result of brake and tire wear, which are not as easily reduced through new technology.

Finally, Ms. Constantine explained that the estimates out to 2025 and 2040 have some degree of uncertainty, due mainly to the ever-changing composition of the vehicle fleet and to the likelihood of future changes to the emissions models. She said that, in order to accommodate future uncertainties in the age of the vehicle fleet mix and the MOVES emissions model, staff are considering adding safety margins of 10 percent or 15 percent to the current projections in recommending mobile budgets for the maintenance plan.

Chair Turner opened the floor to questions.

Mr. Erenrich expressed concern that, without safety margins added to the forecast mobile emissions inventories for 2025 and 2040, future emissions budgets could be set so low that the region would be unable to meet them, which would potentially restrict use of transportation funds for future highway and transit projects. He recommended that staff attend the MWAQC Technical Committee meeting to express the need for adding safety margins to the mobile emissions budgets.

Mr. Mendelson asked why safety margins were needed, as the slides indicated that future emissions were well below the 2007 attainment levels.

Mr. Kirby explained that projected emissions in 2020, 2030, and 2040 would not be measured against 2007 levels, but against budgets based on the levels projected for 2017 and 2025. He said that there is concern that with future budgets being set at such significantly lower levels than 2007, the degree of uncertainty in current projections for future emissions means there is no guarantee that the region will continue to be in attainment in future years. He also highlighted the slight uptick in emissions of fine particles between 2025 and 2040, something which further indicates the risk of exceeding future attainment budgets.

Mr. Mendelson asked whether the state departments of transportation participate in the MWAQC process.

Mr. Kirby confirmed that they do.

Mr. Mendelson suggested that this debate occur in that forum rather than at this Board meeting.

Mr. Kirby said that today's briefing to the Board was simply to let the Board know about the process and that there will be discussion about the concerns raised by the transportation sector regarding the maintenance plan budgets and levels of uncertainty.

Ms. Erickson said that the reason for bringing this issue to the Board's attention and expressing concern about next year's results is that the departments of transportation support a reasonable safety margin and would like for the Board to recommend that.

Mr. Mendelson responded by saying that he thought it was premature to make such a recommendation at today's meeting, and that the departments of transportation would be able to voice their concerns directly during the next MWAQC Technical Advisory Committee meeting.

Chair Turner said he would have no problem directing staff to raise the concerns about the safety margins at the MWAQC Technical Advisory Committee meeting and possibly to bring the issue back to the Board for further action.

Ms. Constantine reminded Board members that extra copies of her presentation would be available after the meeting.

Mr. Kirby noted that both Ms. Constantine's and Ms. Rohlfs's presentations would be posted online.

12. Update on COG Incident Management and Response (IMR) Action Plan Transportation Recommendations

Mr. Meese provided the Board with an update on the COG Incident Management and Response (IMR) Action Plan that the Board first heard about at its November meeting. He reported that COG's IMR Steering Committee would be meeting on February 22 and had requested updated information on the transportation recommendations made in the Action Plan, which included expansion of the hours of operation of the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) information-sharing program, enhancing the information MATOC provides to agencies, decision-makers, and the public, and providing power back-up for the region's major traffic signals.

Mr. Meese explained that MATOC is currently capable of operating on a 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week basis as needed, but that resources have not yet been identified to operate "24/7" permanently. He said that the Regional Incident Coordination (RIC) Program recommended by the IMR Action Plan could request off-hours activation of MATOC on an as-needed basis.

With regard to MATOC's information sharing, Mr. Meese said that MATOC has undertaken a snow mobilization coordination effort that has convened the snow managers from the major transportation agencies to facilitate better coordination and to improve communications on roadway conditions. He also said that they are looking at how MATOC can better interface with the regional decision-making process regarding school- and personnel-release policies.

The other major activity Mr. Meese described to the Board was a survey of 20 agencies and jurisdictions in the region that have responsibility for maintaining traffic signals. Of the more than 5,000 traffic signals on which information was collected, Mr. Meese reported that about 20 percent have some sort of power back-up system—15 percent have battery-based systems that are instant-on but have limited duration, while 5 percent are capable of being powered by mobile generators for longer periods of time. He noted that agency-specific details vary widely, with zero percent of traffic signals in some jurisdictions with power back-ups to 100 percent of traffic signals in at least one jurisdiction—Prince George's County—having back-up systems in place. He pointed out the installation and ongoing maintenance costs of some systems, and said that agencies are aware of this issue and working to add new systems as their budgets allow.

Mr. Meese concluded by saying that staff will continue working with the IMR Steering Committee to refine cost estimates and identify high-priority intersections for installation of power back-ups, and that discussions about expanding MATOC's hours of operation and its involvement in the regional decision-making process will continue.

13. Update on Reauthorization of Federal Surface Transportation Legislation

Mr. Kirby provided a brief update on reauthorization of federal surface transportation legislation. He said that House and Senate versions of a bill are currently moving through Congress. He said that the current SAFETEA-LU authorization expires March 31, and that either a new bill or an

extension will be needed by then.

Mr. Kirby explained that neither bill raises gas taxes or other user revenues, instead relying on non-transportation sources to supplement existing gas tax revenues. He said that the Senate bill, which is a two-year bill, would be funded in part through various offsets elsewhere in the federal budget. The House bill, which is a six-year bill, would be funded in part through oil lease and other energy-related provisions. He said the Senate bill has a good chance of passing and being ready for conference, while the House bill faces more uncertainty.

Overall, Mr. Kirby said, the two bills are funded slightly above the current SAFETEA-LU authorization, and that metropolitan planning provisions and funding levels for large MPOs remain essentially unchanged. He also said that both bills have new provisions on performance measures and performance-based programming, which he said were likely to be present in any final bill that comes out of Congress. Neither bill provides for earmarks.

Chair Turner urged Board members to make sure their jurisdictions do their respective lobbying and advocacy on behalf of the region, and speak with their respective House and Senate delegations.

14. Review of the Draft FY 2013 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

Chair Turner deferred Item 14 to the next Board meeting.

15. Review of the Draft FY 2013 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Chair Turner deferred Item 15 to the next Board meeting.

16. Other Business

No other business came before the Board.

17. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 2:19 p.m.