

**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  
December 21, 2005**

Members and Alternates Present

Rick Canizales, Prince William County  
Wally Covington, Prince William County  
Lyn Erickson, MDOT  
Andrew M. Fellows, City of College Park  
Ludwig P. Gaines, City of Alexandria  
Brian A. Glenn, Federal Transit Administration  
Charles Graves, III, DC Office of Planning  
J. Rick Gordon, Prince George's County  
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council  
Julia Koster, NCPC  
Bill Lebegern, Metro Washington Airports Authority  
Deborah Lipman, WMATA  
Phil Mendelson, D.C. Council  
David Moss, Montgomery County  
Harry J. Parrish, Virginia House of Delegates  
Carol Petzold, Maryland House  
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park  
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Arthur J. Smith, Loudoun County  
David F. Snyder, City of Falls Church  
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT  
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate  
Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax  
Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park  
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County Board

---

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Jim Hogan	COG/DTP
Gerald Miller	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
Mark Moran	COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam	COG/DTP
Jim Yin	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Michael Farrell	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Lee Schoenecker	TPB/CAC
Harry Sanders	Action Committee for Transit
Arlee Reno	Cambridge Systematics
Takumi Yamamoto	TFHRC/FHWA
Randy Carroll	MDE
Chris Carney	Metro DC Sierra Club
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Miriam Rollin	Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation
John Barrett Townsend, II	AAA-Mid-Atlantic
Allen Muchnick	CAC/TPB
Robert P. Morgan	Arlington
Audrey Clement	Green Party VA
Bob Chase	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Bob Grow	Greater Washington Board of Trade
Jeffrey Bryan	U.S. DOT/Volpe Center
William Faulkner	BTS, Inc.
Jeff Price	Arlington County
Unwana B. Dabney	FHWA – Virginia
Mike Lake	Fairfax County DOT

**1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities**

---

Audrey Clement commented on the I-66 Inside the Beltway Feasibility Study. She said it appears that the authors of this study used the results of a travel forecast model analysis to justify a foregone conclusion; namely, road widening as a remedy for congestion along the I-66 corridor between Rosslyn and the Beltway. She said she was particularly disturbed by the study's dismissive remarks about a potential Metrorail mass transit option for this corridor. Copies of her remarks were distributed for the record.

Miriam Rowland, member of the Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation, said that if regional leaders are going to widen I-66, they need to have a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS); it should not be called "spot improvements." She said that decision makers should look at alternatives, including HOV and HOT lanes. She also said environmental impacts on adjacent areas should be examined. Most importantly, she said that long-term impacts on Metrorail should be examined. Copies of her remarks were distributed for the record.

Peter Harnick, representing the Maywood Community Association in North Arlington, said they did not want a widening of I-66 to do the same thing to North Arlington that happened to South Arlington with the widening of I-395. He said the spot improvements would actually eliminate shoulder space on I-66. Referring to highways in New York, he said it is very dangerous to widen roads by eliminating a breakdown lane. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Robert Morgan said he opposed TPB approval of the two amendments that were approved by the Steering Committee on December 2 in their current form. He said "spot improvements" on I-66 were simply a means of moving forward with plans to add a westbound lane to I-66 inside the Beltway. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Chris Carney, Sierra Club, said his organization urged the TPB to significantly amend the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendments proposed by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). They endorsed the effort by Arlington County to require consideration of alternatives other than widening and also endorsed the position and recommendations of the Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Allen Muchnick, president of the Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation, referred to his letter that was included in the mailout packet. He said his group objected to two amendments to the TPB's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for "spot improvements" to I-66 in Arlington County that the TPB Steering Committee approved on December 2 at the request of the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). He asked the TPB to direct VDOT to substantially modify its scope of work as follows: 1) Analyze long-range public transportation needs, right-of-way boundaries, and incident response and emergency evacuation strategies for the corridor; 2) Study and implement relatively low-cost traffic-operations solutions to I-66 congestion that do not involve any significant roadway widening; 3) Establish a new long-range management plan for both highway and Metrorail operations in the corridor.

---

Bob Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, described recent efforts in the Hampton Roads area of Virginia to identify regional transportation priorities and establish a plan for implementation. He said the Washington region should look at this as a good example. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

## **2. Approval of Minutes of November 16, 2005 Meeting**

A motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and was passed unanimously.

## **3. Report of the Technical Committee**

Mr. Mokhtari congratulated Chairman Mendelson for receiving this year's Elizabeth and David Skull Metropolitan Service Award.

Referring to the mailout memorandum, Mr. Mokhtari said the Technical Committee met on December 2 and reviewed the following items on the TPB's agenda:

- The results of the fine particles conformity assessment for the 2005 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The committee recommended that the Board approve this assessment.
- The final draft Call for Projects documents and schedule for the air quality conformity assessment for the 2006 CLRP and companion TIP. The committee recommended the Board approve the document.
- Proposed amended version of the Fiscal Year 2006 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), which provides additional money as part of the 2005 federal reauthorization legislation. The Committee recommended that the Board approve this amended version of the Fiscal Year 2006 UPWP.
- A proposal to update the information in the TPB 2004 "Time to Act" Brochure on the region's critical transportation capital needs and funding shortfalls.
- The results of the 2005 regional pedestrian and bicycle safety education campaign titled "Street Smart" and funding commitments for 2006.

Mr. Mokhtari said the committee was also briefed on the aerial survey of traffic quality on the

---

Metropolitan Washington freeway system, which will be presented to TPB early in 2006.

Noting that this would be his last meeting, Mr. Mokhtari thanked the Board for recognizing the value of the Technical Committee.

Chairman Mendelson thanked Mr. Mokhtari and presented him with a plaque recognizing his contributions as 2005 chairman of the TPB Technical Committee.

#### **4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee**

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Jaffe said the CAC met on December 20. The committee discussed the need for better pedestrian and bicycle coordination at the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), which does not have a dedicated staff person who is charged with responsibility for coordination on pedestrian and bicycle access at the stations. While he recognized that the TPB is not directly responsible for personnel issues at WMATA, he emphasized this issue reflects the priorities of the TPB with respect to increasing bike and pedestrian access as a means to increase transit use and decrease traffic and air quality problems.

Mr. Jaffe said the CAC had elections in the past week to fill six slots for next year's committee. In a first round, four candidates were successful. Two additional candidates would be chosen in a runoff election to fill the remaining seats.

Mr. Jaffe said the committee discussed the topics that would be included in the CAC's end-of-year report, which will be presented to the TPB in January. In January, the committee also plans to issue a set of recommendations regarding improvements in information and analysis of the CLRP and TIP.

Mr. Jaffe said the CAC hosted another public meeting in its series "What if the Washington Region Grew Differently?" The meeting was held in Takoma Park and included TPB Vice Chair Michael Knapp, Takoma Park Mayor Kathy Porter and Maryland State Senator Ida Ruben.

Senator Ticer said she was interested in the suggestion that a point person is needed at WMATA for pedestrian and bicycle access. She said it was a good suggestion. She said she did not know whether that was an appropriate suggestion for the TPB to make to WMATA, but she thought it would be.

Chairman Mendelson suggested this could be an agenda item for the next TPB meeting.

Ms. Lipman said this suggestion is something that WMATA could certainly look at. She said that ultimately, it would be the Board's decision about the allocation of resources, and it is something that the local jurisdictions would have to be involved in.

---

Senator Ticer said she thought it would be good if the TPB would formulate a recommendation and direct it to the WMATA Board.

Chairman Mendelson asked that this be scheduled as an agenda item for the next month with the possibility of it being scheduled as an action item with a recommendation from the TPB. He asked Mr. Kirby to work with WMATA staff. He suggested that maybe WMATA staff would want to make a presentation on the issue.

Chairman Mendelson thanked Mr. Jaffe for his service as 2005 CAC chair, and presented him with a plaque recognizing his contributions.

## **5. Report of the Steering Committee**

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on December 2 and acted on four resolutions. The first two amended the Commuter Connections Work Program to modify two work activities and funding levels. The third amendment reconciled project funding levels between Virginia's state program and the regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), as requested by VDOT.

Mr. Kirby said the fourth amendment, approved for the FY 2005-2010 TIP, added funding to the ongoing I-66 study as well as modifying some highway projects. He said this action prompted some letters as well as some statements that were made during the public comment period. He called attention to the letter in the mailout packet from Allen Muchnick, which included an attached resolution from the Arlington County Board. He also noted a comment from the Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce supporting widening of I-66. He said the "Additional Letters Sent/Received" packet included a letter from the Westwind Homeowners Association expressing concerns about the I-66 study, a letter from the Prince William Chamber of Commerce supporting improvements on I-66, and a letter from the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) that provides some elaboration on what is in this amendment and clarifies that it is a study of spot improvements. The VDOT letter states that any major improvements would be part of a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process that would require subsequent approval. He noted that the VDOT letter included as an attachment an excerpt from the current Idea 66 Study that was published in March of 2005 and is on the VDOT Web site, which is the basis for the recommendations in the TIP amendment to continue studying the spot improvements.

Mr. Kirby said that staff had distributed copies of a letter signed by Chairman Mendelson that was sent to the region's Congressional delegation. The letter forwarded copies of a study on transportation funding conducted by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Kirby said that Jeffrey Price from Arlington County staff that morning had submitted by email a proposed amendment to the action the Steering Committee took regarding I-66. Copies of the

---

proposed amendment were distributed.

Ms. Pourciau said she noticed in the detail package that the project included \$10 million in the design phase. She asked if this actually was design or if it was a study.

Mr. Srikanth said the detailed scope of the study is yet to be finalized and therefore, there are no recommendations for consideration to develop designs. He said the Spot Improvement Study is going to look at a wide variety of options, as was recommended in the Idea 66 study. It includes looking at travel management strategies, it includes looking at ramp metering, and it includes looking at safety and operational issues that currently exist. He said that as the scope of the study is developed, the first order of the study would be to clearly identify and quantify the problem, and describe and assess the potential solutions that are available. He said the findings would be taken through the state and federal environmental review and presented to the Commonwealth Transportation Board. He said that once there is a decision on the set of spot improvements to move forward with, then the designs and costs estimates will be developed.

Ms. Pourciau asked if that meant there is no funding for an EIS in this \$10 million.

Mr. Srikanth said VDOT appreciated the various comments on the project, but he noted that there was some confusion expressed in those comments. He said the Idea 66 Study was a feasibility study that started in 2004 and was completed in March 2005. He said the study looked at potential long-term solutions to the congestion and mobility challenges in the I-66 corridor. It did not conclude or select a preferred long-term alternative to recommend. Instead, it said there are a number of potential long-term solutions that have to be looked at in a very detailed, thorough environmental document, which could be an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), and it recommended to the Commonwealth Transportation Board that such a detailed study be undertaken. However, the study also said that existing safety and operational issues ought to be addressed in a relatively low cost manner and these would be limited to the specific spots where there are problems. So the scope of the Spot Improvement Study was defined in that recommendation by saying it will be limited to only those places where there are problems that have been studied, analyzed and quantified. He noted that even that study will have to follow the state environmental process and federal environmental process. Whether the spot improvements will require an EIS will be assessed as the study moves forward, but he emphasized that all the federal and state review processes will be followed.

Ms. Pourciau said that this project is regionally significant and therefore it should follow the normal process for coming before the full board. She asked if Mr. Kirby could answer what that process would be.

Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee is empowered under the bylaws to act on items that are not regionally significant and it has to make judgment calls on those items that are presented before it. In this instance, since it was adding to an existing study, the Steering Committee believed it met

---

the criterion.

However, Mr. Kirby also noted that the bylaws also require that Steering Committee actions be reported to the Board. If the Board wishes to take another look at the actions the Steering has taken, then this would be the opportunity to do so.

Ms. Pourciau moved that the action be tabled until the next meeting. She said there were too many unanswered questions regarding the project, and furthermore she noted that it was an interstate project.

The motion was seconded.

Chairman Mendelson clarified that the motion would only postpone one action taken by the Steering Committee; the other three actions taken would go forward.

Ms. Ticer asked VDOT to clarify some statements about the problems that would be studied. She asked if those issues were articulated in this item.

Mr. Srikanth said VDOT wrote a written response to the TPB clarifying the scope of the Spot Improvement Study.

Ms. Ticer said she was not referring to the spot improvements, but to the other transportation system studies.

Mr. Srikanth said that VDOT's letter said that the Commonwealth Transportation Board has accepted the recommendation from the Idea 66 Study to undertake a detailed study of the long-term improvements, which will include all of the elements that were in the Idea 66 Study. He said VDOT had not decided whether to start a full EIS. If VDOT does pursue an EIS, that matter will be brought before the TPB.

Ms. Ticer said she wanted to be sure that VDOT would be studying the area that is already the right-of-way, including implications for possible new rail requirements in the future. She said she was interested in other issues as well, including reverse HOV lanes and HOT lanes. She said she did not believe there could be a successful small-scale study without looking at the whole picture at one time. Because she would not be able to attend the meeting in January, she said she wanted to be sure all these issues are on the table.

Mr. Srikanth said he had a limited ability to speak for the agency and a limited knowledge about this project. However, he said that right-of-way issues will be addressed immediately as part of the spot improvements and will not wait until the Commonwealth decides on a longer term study. He said the spot improvements will have a specified framework; they will be within the existing right-of-way, will not impact any new homes in the vicinity, and will follow all environmental review



---

processes.

Mr. Srikanth said that the other potential solutions that Ms. Ticer identified, including potential rail widening, future HOV lanes or HOT lanes, would need to be looked at in an environmental study to comply with NEPA requirements.

Mr. Snyder asked if postponing action would have any impact on the program.

Mr. Srikanth said that funds for the Spot Improvement Study, which were programmed by the Commonwealth Transportation Board in July, would be delayed because of the TPB's action. But given the concerns expressed, he said that VDOT agreed to this action. He noted that VDOT had not had the chance to review all the comments received or the proposed amendment that had been submitted. Furthermore, he noted that the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority had not had the opportunity to review the proposed amendment and the comments received.

Mr. Snyder said he was willing to support the action because VDOT concurred and because he understood that there was money left and therefore the action would not delay the project. He said he was willing to support the changes suggested by Arlington.

Mr. Srikanth said that contrary to Mr. Snyder's understanding, the delay in fact would represent an inconvenience because there was no money left for the project. Further, he noted that the motion on the table was to delay this action, not to approve the amendment proposed by Arlington.

Mr. Zimmerman said he would be happy to consider the amendment, but he suggested that it should be deferred, along with the action taken by the Steering Committee, until the next meeting of the TPB.

Chairman Mendelson reiterated that the motion before the TPB was to postpone the action of the Steering Committee related to I-66, which was one of four actions taken by the Steering Committee. He said the other three actions would go forward.

Ms. Petzold clarified that the motion would defer TPB SR9-206.

Mr. Kirby noted that the TIP amendment under consideration dealt not only with I-66 but with some other project components. He suggested that the action should only defer the I-66 component.

With that understanding, Chairman Mendelson asked for a vote on the motion.

The motion was approved with one "no" vote by Mr. Snyder.

---

## **6. Chairman's Remarks**

This being his last meeting, Chairman Mendelson gave a short recap of the year. He described a number of successful achievements, including funding for CapCom, the passage of the federal transportation reauthorization legislation, and progress on funding for Metro. He noted that his three priority areas for the long-range plan— emergency preparedness, traffic signal optimization, and activity centers— would again be highlighted in the Call for Projects for the CLRP.

For the future, Chairman Mendelson suggested that the TPB should revisit its Vision, which was approved in 1998. He said he did not think the TPB should rewrite or reopen the Vision, but that the Board should seek out ways to revisit it and the various goals that went into it. He thanked the members for their support. The Board applauded.

## **7. Report of the Nominating Committee for 2006**

Ms. Porter announced that the Nominating Committee recommended to the Board the following slate of officers for 2006: for Chair, Michael Knapp; for First Vice Chair, Catherine Hudgins; and for Second Vice Chair, Michelle Pourciau. She moved that the Board adopt this slate of nominees.

The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

Vice Chairman Knapp made note of Chairman Mendelson's service on a number of boards and committees at COG. He said he was unaware of the extent of Chairman Mendelson's contributions until he heard a presentation on the chairman when he recently was awarded the COG Elizabeth and David Skull Award for outstanding regional service. He thanked him for his continued service and presented him with a plaque in recognition of his 2005 chairmanship of the TPB.

## **8. Appointment of the Six Members Designated by the 2005 Citizens Advisory Committee to the CAC for the Year 2006**

Referring to the handout material, Mr. Kirby said that the 2005 Citizens Advisory Committee had elected four designees for the 2006 CAC. The committee would designate an additional two members through a runoff election. The TPB was being asked to approve the four individuals who had already been designated: Steve Caflisch from Maryland, Howard Foster from the District of Columbia, Dan Malouff from Virginia and Allen Muchnick from Virginia.

A motion was made to approve the four individuals as members on the 2006 CAC. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

---

## **9. Review of Comments Received, Acceptance of Recommended Responses, and Approval of Fine Particles Air Quality Conformity Assessment of 2005 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Clifford explained that this is an action item to find that the 2005 CLRP and the FY 2006-2011 TIP conform to the air quality requirements from the 1990 Clean Air Act amendments with respect to PM<sub>2.5</sub>. Therefore, this is a supplemental assessment to the CLRP and TIP approval actions taken by the Board in October. He noted that the technical documentation stated that forecasted direct emissions of particulate matter and precursor emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>) would meet conformity requirements. He also called attention to a letter from the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) that noted that the emissions tests were acceptable, but also urged transportation agencies to maintain their commitments to transportation emissions reduction measures. The letter also urged continued consultation between TPB and MWAQC.

A motion was made to approve TPB Resolution R9-2006 to approve the fine particles air quality conformity assessment of the 2005 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The motion was seconded.

Referring to the handout material, Mr. Kirby said this material included comments that were received just before the close of the comment period on Friday afternoon, after the mailout had been sent. The comments include a letter from Earth Justice that raises a concern that had been raised last year with regard to the requirement that the CLRP and TIP meet federal financial constraint requirements. He said the comment did not specifically relate to the emissions calculations for PM<sub>2.5</sub> or anything else that Mr. Clifford has presented. Rather the letter was aimed at the action the Board took in October in approving the CLRP and TIP, which involves certifying that those documents have met the financial constraint requirements. To meet those requirements, in the outyears all of the projects must have revenues that are “reasonably expected to be available,” and in the first two years of the TIP, the revenues for projects must be “available or committed.”

Mr. Kirby said the main issue that Earth Justice raised, both currently and in their earlier letter from October 2004 (which was referenced in their current letter and included in the handout) is that because WMATA's rehabilitation program is not fully funded, as recognized by the Blue Ribbon Panel and our efforts to get additional funding, that we have not met the financial constraint requirement in terms of adequate commitments to maintenance. Mr. Kirby said that the TPB had responded to that comment in conjunction with the CLRP and TIP approval in November of 2004.

Mr. Kirby said that Earth Justice subsequently sent two letters to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) in January and March of 2005. He said that the TPB had provided a detailed response to these additional Earth Justice comments

---

in June, just prior to the FHWA/FTA approval of the CLRP and TIP and the certification that the TPB had met the financial constraint requirement.

Mr. Kirby said this response to the most recent Earth Justice letter references those previous comments and previous responses, and also the action that the federal agencies took on June 14, 2005, in approving the fiscal constraint provisions that the TPB had adopted.

Mr. Kirby said the one new item in the Earth Justice comment speaks to funding for the Intercounty Connector (ICC) that was included in the current FY 2006-2011 TIP, but not in last year's FY 2005-2010 TIP. Regarding the ICC, Mr. Kirby said that Earth Justice has argued the TPB has not met the criterion in federal law requiring that project revenues be available or committed for the first two years of funding.

Mr. Kirby said the response to the recent Earth Justice letter included a letter that the TPB had received from Trent Kittelman, executive director of the Maryland Transportation Authority (MTA), in February of this year. Ms. Kittelman indicated that the ICC funding included a combination of GARVEE bonds (Grant Anticipation Revenue Bonds) from federal funding, as well as commitments from MTA. The letter articulated in great detail the Authority's ability to bond based on revenues that are already being collected from other toll facilities. He said this MTA letter from Ms. Kittelman was submitted in the February time frame, when the TPB was deciding whether to approve projects for inclusion in the conformity analysis, which is the appropriate time to ensure that the financial constraint is met.

Chairman Mendelson noted that the Earth Justice letter dealt with financial constraint, while the motion on the table dealt with conformity. He said he would rather that the TPB look to have a further discussion on financial constraint at a point when there would be more time and it would be more germane to the discussion. He suggested that one approach would be to have a presentation at a future meeting on this issue.

Mr. Zimmerman said he wanted to make sure he understood what the communication with Earth Justice said. He said he understood that they were saying that the federal requirement is that in adding new projects to the CLRP, the TPB essentially has to show that it is maintaining the existing system adequately. He said he understood Earth Justice was asserting that the CLRP did not do that and the TPB's response was that it did.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct.

Chairman Mendelson asked that the Board move forward with a vote on this. If there is time, the constraints could be discussed under Item 14 or the issue could be discussed at a later meeting.

The motion was approved unanimously.

---

## **10. Approval of Final Call for Projects Document**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said this document has been updated since last month to include the three priority issues that Chairman Mendelson had requested: Activity Centers, traffic signal coordination, and CapCom. Mr. Kirby also noted that the TPB staff has prepared, at the suggestion of the CAC, a brochure about what is in the CLRP of record that was recently adopted.

A motion was made to approve the document. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

## **11. Approval of Amendments to FY 2006 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said these amendments involve a substantial increase in planning funds resulting from the 2005 reauthorization of the federal surface transportation programs. He said the TPB was briefed last month on these amendments and they have been discussed with and approved by the Technical Committee.

A motion was made to approve the amendments. The motion was seconded and was passed unanimously.

## **12. Update on Activities to Identify Funding for WMATA**

Vice Chairman Knapp said he wanted to maintain the focus on funding for WMATA, which he said was probably the most critical transportation issue facing the region. He asked Mr. Zimmerman to comment on recent developments in Virginia.

Mr. Zimmerman reported that Northern Virginia is in agreement on an approach that has been presented to members of the General Assembly with a request for action. He said the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission and the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority jointly signed off on a proposal by which those jurisdictions that are members of the Metro Compact would be authorized to levy an additional sales tax of a quarter cent that would be dedicated to Metro, in accordance with the recommendations of the Blue Ribbon Panel and the requirements of the Davis legislation. This action would provide adequate revenue to meet the commitment required in the Davis bill. He said that while this action is far from completed, he was pleased that there is unanimous agreement across the jurisdictions of Northern Virginia to seek this authorization from the General Assembly.

Chairman Mendelson reported that legislation had been introduced by four councilmembers in the

---

District of Columbia and co-sponsored by another six that would dedicate one-half of one percent of the retail sales tax as additional funding for maintaining and improving operations of WMATA. It is contingent upon actions by Congress and actions by the Maryland General Assembly and the Virginia General Assembly, but the legislation is now pending in the Council.

Vice Chairman Knapp said he hoped that Maryland would have something similar to announce in the near future. He asked Mr. Kirby to include this as an agenda item for next month. He said it was important to try to identify potential action items that the TPB can pursue to move these initiatives forward.

### **13. Status Report on Regional Transportation Coordination Program**

Chairman Mendelson introduced Mr. Jeffrey Bryan from the Volpe Center to provide an update on efforts to improve regional transportation incident coordination, including CapCom.

Referring to the mailout and handout presentation, Mr. Bryan explained that the Volpe Center, which is a research and development facility of the U.S. Department of Transportation, had reviewed the CapCom initiative and developed some initial recommendations for its implementation. He described the study's findings, including the recommended business functions for CapCom, and recommendations for moving forward. He said four functional areas for CapCom operations were recommended: regional planning, regional incident coordination, regional information systems, and finance and administration.

Mr. Bryan said it was recommended that CapCom be formed as a regional program that would be integrated within the existing transportation management centers. He said it was suggested that the TPB hire a dedicated program manager for CapCom as a first step. He noted that TPB staff had developed a draft 'request for qualifications' for this position. He said the next piece of work is to go forward with what is the initial work plan with the available funds.

Ms. Pourciau announced that she had just received an e-mail through [www.alert.dc.gov](http://www.alert.dc.gov), that said that I-95 South is closed at Exit 161 due to a major accident. She said she made this little plug for [www.alert.dc.gov](http://www.alert.dc.gov) because it is one of the systems that was examined in the Volpe analysis to see how systems that are already place can be integrated. She noted that [alert.dc.gov](http://alert.dc.gov) is an existing system that citizens all over the region can sign up for to receive emergency messages.

Ms. Erickson said that MDOT had been participating very closely in the Volpe Study and supports it.

Mr. Snyder said he hoped the TPB would call for an action to endorse these findings and move forward with all possible speed. He said the report, to some extent, is an independent validation of what he and other members of the Management, Operations and Intelligent Transportation

---

Systems (MOITS), as well as the CAC and the TPB, have been saying for at least the past couple of years.

Mr. Snyder made a motion to endorse the findings and the recommendations of the Volpe study, along with a request that TPB staff move forward as rapidly as possible with implementation.

Ms. Pourciau seconded the motion.

Vice Chairman Knapp noted that the presentation spoke of the need for a dedicated program manager, and he asked how that position would be coordinated with the regional CapCom staff.

Mr. Kirby said that the available funding would be used to hire the program manager, with the oversight from the Steering Committee. He said that COG/TPB would be the administrative agent to hire the program manager and have the program manager work under the oversight committee to get this program started. He said the program manager would spend considerable time at the operating centers, although the position might be officially located at COG.

Mr. Gordon noted that the presentation had referred to four transportation management centers. He said that several local jurisdictions had made substantial investments in transportation management centers, and he asked if they could be included.

Mr. Bryan noted that Arlington and Montgomery counties have operations centers. He said the CapCom structure would not preclude them from joining.

The motion was approved unanimously.

#### **14. Briefing on a Proposal to Report on Progress Since the "Time to Act" Brochure Highlighting the Region's Near-term Transportation Capital Funding Needs**

Referring to the mailout material and handout presentation, Arlee Reno from Cambridge Systematics described a proposed approach to developing a report on near-term funding needs that would essentially update the Time to Act brochure from 2004. He said there would be three purposes for the report: 1) Summarize what has been accomplished, 2) Identify what else needs to be done in terms of funding, and 3) Review potential solutions to fill the remaining gaps. Referring to his presentation materials, he described how these issues would be addressed in the report.

Chairman Mendelson said it appeared that this report would be more substantive than the Time to Act brochure, which he said he believed was actually too abbreviated.

---

Vice Chairman Knapp said he was concerned that the legislatures that will soon be coming into session would not have a document to review during the course of their three-month deliberations. He asked if it would be possible to develop this in two phases in which a short document could be quickly assembled for the legislators to use this winter.

Chairman Mendelson suggested the 2004 brochure might be resubmitted.

Mr. Kirby said the 2004 brochure was out of date. He suggested that instead, a summary of Mr. Reno's presentations from the last two meetings could be prepared. That summary could be transmitted to key legislators.

Vice Chairman Knapp suggested that a cover letter could be written that would identify some of the new funding developments along with the Time to Act brochure and the Chamber of Commerce report.

Chairman Mendelson asked that this approach be taken while a more in-depth report was being developed.

Ms. Pourciau suggested that some simple addition and subtraction could be performed to update the Time to Act numbers.

Mr. Kirby said that time was short because the legislative sessions would begin in January, so a letter would have to be developed based on the information that is available right now. He noted that Mr. Reno's slides included a recap of the Time to Act numbers and changes since 2004.

Ms. Winter questioned how cars with greater fuel efficiency would be affected by the revenue proposals that Mr. Reno described.

Mr. Reno said that if a fee based on vehicle miles of travel (VMT) was assessed, that would assure that over the long term, as the fleet gets more fuel efficient because of hybrid technology or because of smaller cars, transportation revenues would still be maintained.

Chairman Mendelson noted that this meant that under this approach, vehicles would not be rewarded for their fuel efficiency, but everybody would be paying more for driving longer distances.

Ms. Pourciau noted that the motor fuel tax is supposed to be used for the repair and maintenance of the road system. Heavier, less fuel-efficient vehicles tend to do more damage, and therefore it can be argued that they should pay more.

Ms. Porter said this issue deserves more discussion. She noted that one benefit of the motor fuel



---

tax is that it also penalizes heavier and less fuel efficient vehicles. She also agreed that heavier vehicles probably do more wear and tear to the roads than lighter vehicles.

### **15. Report on the Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign**

Chairman Mendelson asked if this item could be deferred until the next meeting.

Mr. Kirby said the campaign would be moving forward in April. The TPB had received contributions from most of the jurisdictions. The funds received were reported in the mailout item. He added that the request for funding would start earlier next year because it was too late this year for some of the jurisdictions' budget cycles.

Mr. Kirby also reported that Councilmember Gaines from Alexandria has offered to host the kickoff event in April in Alexandria at a new pedestrian tunnel under Duke Street, near the King Street Station.

Ms. Petzold said that a kickoff event in Virginia would not get much press in Maryland. She suggested that the event might be done three times that day on a rolling basis in Virginia, D.C. and Maryland.

Mr. Kirby said that staff could look into the implications of this suggestion.

Chairman Mendelson said he would leave it up to Mr. Kirby's judgment as to whether this item should be put on the TPB agenda for next month.

### **16. Other Business**

Ms. Pourciau said that a flier had been distributed regarding the new D.C. car sharing program. She thanked Arlington County for their assistance in setting up the program.

### **17. Adjournment**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.