

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

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

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

Members and Alternates Present

Melissa Barlow, FTA
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Muriel Bowser, DC Council
Robert Catlin, City of College Park
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jason Groth, Charles County
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Julia Koster, NCPC
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick
Michael C. May, Prince William County
Eric Olson, Prince George's County
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Morteza Salehi, VDOT
James Scott, Virginia House
David F. Snyder, City of Falls Church
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office Of Planning
Todd Turner, City of Bowie
Blaine R. Young, Frederick County
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby
Michael Clifford
Gerald Miller
Nicholas Ramfos
Ron Milone
Andrew Meese
Daivamani Sivasailam
Tim Canan
Deborah Etheridge
Beth Newman
Monica Bansal
Deborah Bilek
Sarah Crawford
Karin Foster
Erin Morrow
Marisa Lang
Wenjing Pu
Steve Kania COG/OPA
Tom Biesiadny Fairfax County DOT
Phillip Ellis Sierra Club
Bill Orleans Citizen
Lou Farber Prince George's County DPWT
Rob Burfield Cape Jones Consulting
Al Francece Centreville Citizens for Rail
Edith Holmes Falls Church Citizen
Anthony Foster PRTC
Monica Backmon Prince William County
Dan Malouff Arlington DOT
Colleen Mitchell DC Office of Planning
Alyssa Brown PWC
Greg McFarland NVTC
Stewart Schwartz Coalition For Smarter Growth
Maureen Budetti TPB/CAC Chair
Gail Parker TPB/CAC
Andrew Wexler Montgomery County Resident

Chairman Snyder began the meeting by recognizing the life of Harry Sanders and his contributions to the region. He invited comments for the record about Mr. Sanders.

Mr. Erenrich said that he thought Mr. Sanders was an exceptional person and a dedicated transit advocate. He recalled that he had worked with Mr. Sanders on the Purple line and on other transit issues, and found him to be helpful, accommodating, and exceptionally effective.

Chairman Snyder asked for a moment of silence in honor of Mr. Sanders.

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Ms. Gail Parker, Fairfax County resident and member of the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee, spoke in support of high speed rail. Referring to a handout, she discussed projections for the rising cost of gasoline which predict a cost of \$9 per gallon in 2024. She also urged the TPB to support 11 miles of new rail in Stafford and Prince William County, and said that it is important to provide rail as a viable transportation option for people in outlying communities.

Mr. Stewart Schwartz, representing the Coalition for Smarter Growth, reflected on the life of Mr. Sanders. He recalled that Mr. Sanders was one of the first people he had met when he started as a volunteer in 1996, and that Mr. Sanders was a mentor and a civic expert in transit. He commented that Mr. Sanders was passionate and dedicated, and thanked Chairman Snyder for recognizing Mr. Sanders as a citizen who contributed for the greater good of the region. He also offered comments relating to the updated schedule for the CLRP, including the April 2 deadline for jurisdictional submissions to the CLRP and TIP. He commended the TPB for citing the Greater Washington 2050 effort and other contextual factors relevant to transportation planning in the region in the project solicitation document, and expressed hope that the next CLRP and TIP will be different from years past. He noted that this is a time to consider ways to create a sustainable region and transportation plan, and urged the TPB to be certain that submissions comply with stated TPB goals and with other COG-wide efforts. He said that while maintaining and operating existing systems is one important goal, another equally important goal should be to build a transportation system that will make the region competitive in the future. He added that such a goal will include more transit, and investment in local street networks that make activity centers function well. He commented on the importance of complete streets that are accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists. Finally, he expressed concern that the update to the TPB Travel Demand Model will not be complete until after this plan update cycle, and said that a new travel demand model and travel survey would be very helpful.

2. Approval of Minutes of February 17 Meeting

Ms. Hudgins made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 17, 2010, meeting. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Mr. Versoza said that the Technical Committee met on March 5, and reviewed seven items. Among these were TPB agenda item 9, which involves carryover funds from FY 2010 to FY 2011, and agenda item 10, the approval of the FY 2011 UPWP. He added that the Technical Committee was briefed on a variety of additional items, including: the final draft of the

Commuter Connections Work Program for FY2011; the status of the project submissions for the conformity assessment of the 2010 CLRP and the FY 2011-2016 TIP; a revised schedule for project submissions and conformity assessment; the Department of Housing and Urban Development announcement on the new Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program; and the Spring 2010 Street Smart Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Campaign, including the status of funding for the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 Street Smart campaigns. He mentioned that the Technical Committee was also updated on the status of the TPB TIGER grant for the regional priority bus project that was announced by U.S. DOT on February 17.

Mr. Verzosa said the Technical Committee agenda also included four items for information and discussion, including: an update on the transportation funding implications under the new job stimulus legislation that would extend federal highway and transit funding at the pre-recession FY2009 levels to December 31, 2010; a briefing by FTA staff on the federally required planning certification review that will occur on April 19 and 20; a briefing on the call for projects for the FY 2011 Transportation/Land-Use Connections Program; and a briefing on a letter from the Martz National Coach company requesting TPB support for directing FTA Section 5307 funding to Martz services for bus procurement, preventive maintenance, or capital cost of contracting for its commuter bus service. He noted that the Technical Committee decided to discuss this matter further, upon receiving additional information from Martz and on practices in other metropolitan areas.

Mr. Erenrich commented that federal transit funding usually flows through a formula allocation. He expressed concern that new funding from reauthorization or a second jobs bill may result in restricting local governments from getting access to funding that supports their transit systems. He acknowledged the broader issue of the need to ascertain what local transit needs are vis-à-vis new opportunities for funding, and said that he would like to discuss this within the Technical Committee and the TPB.

Ms. Tregoning asked if the TPB knows how much of the bus service provided in the region is supplied by agencies or providers other than WMATA.

Mr. Erenrich responded that the number is substantial. He noted that that Ride-On is the largest carrier in Montgomery County with over 350 buses carrying more than 100,000 riders per day.

Ms. Tregoning asked if the TPB could receive a briefing at a future meeting on this matter.

Mr. Kirby said a briefing could be arranged. He mentioned that the Regional Bus Subcommittee received an inventory of the amount of service by all of the different providers in the region. He acknowledged Mr. Erenrich's concern about setting a precedent for situations like this one, where private bus providers add their mileage to the formula and generate money for the region, and also request additional funding according to their earnings.

Ms. Tregoning acknowledged the funding crisis facing WMATA, and said that a conversation about how to handle this challenge would benefit from a better understanding of service

distribution among different providers in the region. She also acknowledged bus trends, citing that DC did not have a circulator service three years ago, and is now considering its expansion. She said that DC is not the only jurisdiction making inroads into bus service, and reiterated that it would be beneficial to the TPB to get that snapshot and some sense of this kind of trend.

Mr. Kirby agreed that this would be a good context to use in bringing the Martz request to the TPB, and suggested that such a briefing could happen at the May TPB meeting.

Mr. Zimmerman commented that while Metro provides the largest amount of service, there are several substantial transit providers throughout the region that are not regional agencies. He acknowledged Montgomery County as well as Northern Virginia's Fairfax Connector. He said that the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission collects data for Northern Virginia, but that there is not an easily accessible source of this information on a region-wide basis. He suggested that such information would provide interesting insight into ridership and other related matters. He asked if the TPB could serve as the central entity for gathering this data and making it available, which would be a real service to the region.

Mr. Kirby responded that this is possible because a lot of this information is already housed with the Regional Bus Subcommittee. He said TPB staff could work through the Technical Committee to provide a presentation to the TPB in a couple of months.

Chairman Snyder summarized the consensus that the TPB would begin by collecting data, and then will review some of the policy ramifications of various funding strategies.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Ms. Budetti provided a summary of the first meeting of this CAC, which had been postponed until March because of the snow-related cancellation in February. She commented that there is a good balance on the CAC between new and returning members, citing seven new members, three new alternates, and ten returning members. She said that the meeting started exactly at 6:00pm, and that the CAC was very appreciative that Chairman Snyder was able to attend and offer remarks on transportation revenue, the TIGER grant, and MATOC. She also thanked Chairman Snyder for asking CAC members for ways in which they thought existing capacity and future transportation investment might be maximized. She noted some of the ideas that were offered, including: improving the use of HOV lanes and freeway shoulders for bus service; shaping travel patterns by imposing a carbon tax or some other auto usage fee; the possibility of utilizing more privately-run transit systems in the area; a focus on inter-city rail service; and gathering information from other countries about their transportation strategies.

Ms. Budetti said the meeting also included a discussion of the upcoming spring event that the TPB is planning, which is scheduled for May 26, 2010. She noted that this event has been scheduled in response to long-standing efforts by the CAC. She said that the structure of the event would provide an opportunity for interaction between the members of the TPB, the TPB

Technical Subcommittee and the CAC members and maybe others who are in the TPB structure. She said that she had designated herself and Larry Martin to participate on a planning team for the event, and that she also plans to appoint an additional member to the planning team.

Ms. Budetti said the meeting concluded with a discussion about the possibilities of enhanced regional plans and planning activities. She added that several members expressed a sense that there is an increasing interest in developing a plan that would be more of a vision and priority-setting document. She cited the TIGER grant success as an example of what can be done by working collaboratively. She concluded by stating that the CAC also held a moment of silence in honor of Mr. Sanders.

Chairman Snyder thanked Ms. Budetti for her work, and acknowledged the dynamism of the CAC membership. He reiterated the importance of the May 26 event, and asked TPB members to mark their calendars for this date.

Ms. Budetti clarified that May 26 event will be invitation-based.

Chairman Snyder acknowledged this clarification, and stated that the TPB would be as open as possible should there be additional requests to attend.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby said that the Steering Committee met on March 5 and acted on a request by WMATA for an administrative amendment to the FY 2010-2015 TIP to add additional funding from ARRA funds into the preventive maintenance project for WMATA. He noted that these were ARRA funds that have been reprogrammed from other projects, and that further detail was provided in the mailout. He also provided a reminder about the TPB's Transportation/Land-Use Connections (TLC) Program, and said that applications are due May 12. He said that a workshop was scheduled for April 1 for anyone interested in submitting an application. He reiterated the benefits of this program for local jurisdictions, citing the nearly 40 projects that have been completed since the program's inception.

Referring to the mailout, Mr. Kirby summarized the letters packet. He described the first item as a one-page summary of the May 26 event, which will be held from noon until 3:45 p.m. at the Hyatt Regency near COG's offices. He mentioned that Peter Shapiro is providing consultant assistance in planning this event. He clarified that the event is being referred to as a "conversation," rather than a "forum," because of its interactive nature. He said that the primary focus of this event would be focused roundtable discussions to encourage mixed participation by TPB members, CAC, and members of other committees within the TPB structure. He discussed the formation of a planning team, which he recommended would include up to three CAC members representing Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Virginia; up to six members of the Technical Committee; the TPB chairman; and representation from the TPB Access for All Advisory Committee. He said that this will be an open meeting, and also reiterated Ms. Budetti's

point that this event would be invitation-based in order to maximize participation from the various groups within the TPB structure.

Mr. Kirby summarized the remaining items in the letters packet, which included: a summary of the CSX TIGER award of \$98 million spread across Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, and a summary of the Norfolk Southern TIGER award of \$105 million for the Crescent Corridor program; an outline of the required planning certification by FHWA and FTA that occurs every four years and will be conducted this year on April 19 and 20; a report on extending the Commuter Connections program; an announcement of the Snow Summit that COG will host on April 5th from 1:30 to 4:00 pm; and a response to HUD's request for comment on their sustainability planning grant initiative.

Vice Chair Bowser asked if members of the public would be able to attend the Snow Summit.

Mr. Robertson clarified that the Snow Summit's primary audience is city and county managers, elected officials, emergency managers, and other officials. He said that it would be an invitation-only event for public officials, and will also be open to the public. He said that media will also be invited.

Vice Chair Bowser expressed concern about the nature of invitation-only events, and urged the TPB to be mindful of involving the public in discussion on issues that affect citizens at large.

Chairman Snyder clarified that both the CAC Conversation on May 26 and the Snow Summit will be events that are open to the public, and suggested using different terminology to accurately indicate the nature of these events.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chairman Snyder commented that focusing on maintenance, management, and operations as well as low-cost, high-impact improvements are central tenets that will occupy the time of the TPB in 2010.

Chairman Snyder also acknowledged a request from the District Department of Transportation to add an item to the agenda.

Mr. Rawlings moved that agenda item 17, an amendment to the FY2010-2015 TIP, to include funding for the Georgetown-Rosslyn Connector as requested by DDOT, be moved to the end of the action items following agenda item 11. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.

7. Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2010-2015 TIP to Include Construction Funding for the I-70 Project in Frederick County as Requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT)

Ms. Erickson said that MDOT was requesting an amendment to the FY 2010-2015 TIP to include construction funding for Phase 2d of the I-70 Project in Frederick County. She said that the project is an element of a broader I-270 project that has been listed in the CLRP and TIP for several years, but that funding for this element had been deferred due to budget constraints in 2009. She said that because the project is ready to be advertised immediately as a design-build project, MDOT could not wait for approval of the FY 2011-2016 TIP and needed to amend the current TIP.

Ms. Erickson said that the project includes replacement of the I-70 structures over South Street, geometric improvements to the Monocacy Boulevard ramps at I-70 westbound, geometric improvements to the South Street/Reichs Ford Road ramps at I-70 eastbound, and approximately one mile of I-70 mainline widening. She said that the total project cost is \$48.9 million, and that there is considerable local support for the project.

Ms. Erickson moved to adopt Resolution R16-2010 to amend the FY 2010-2015 TIP to include construction funding for the I-70 project in Frederick County. Vice Chair Turner seconded the motion.

Ms. Krimm said that there is indeed a lot of local support for this project.

The motion passed unanimously.

8. Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Include Funding for Constructing a Third Track on a Rail Line in Stafford and Prince William Counties under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), Preliminary Engineering of a Ramp Replacement on I-95 to the Fairfax County Parkway, and Widening Telegraph Road in Fairfax County, as Requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)

Ms. Sorenson said that the requested amendment to the FY 2010-2015 TIP was for three projects – one to add \$74.84 million in stimulus funding for the construction of an 11.4-mile third track from Arkendale in Stafford County to Powell Creek in Prince William County; the second to add \$2.5 million in federal demonstration grant funding for preliminary engineering for a BRAC-related project to replace a ramp from northbound I-95 to northbound Fairfax County Parkway; and the third to add \$22.28 million in federal funding for widening Telegraph Road between Beulah Street and Leaf Road in Fairfax County.

Ms. Sorenson moved to adopt Resolution R17-2010 to amend the FY 2010-2015 TIP to include funding for the third track rail construction project, the preliminary engineering to replace a ramp

on I-95 to the Fairfax County Parkway, and the widening of Telegraph Road between Beulah Street and Leaf Road. Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion.

Mr. May said that Prince William County supported the amendment, but noted an ancillary issue of concern to the county, related to the plan by VRE to implement high-speed rail with three stops in Stafford County but none in Prince William County. He said that the project would still benefit Prince William County residents by creating additional capacity for the system, but that the County nonetheless had concerns about the decision on stops and would be working with colleagues on the VRE Board to address those concerns.

Ms. Tregoning noted that the attached letter from VDOT dated March 8th states that “the project will allow for expanded inter-city rail service while preserving freight rail capacity.” She asked if the third line planned for construction would be dedicated to passenger rail, and noted that this issue of the balance of freight and passenger rail capacity had come up at previous TPB meetings.

Ms. Sorenson said that the planned third line would not be dedicated for passenger rail use.

Ms. Tregoning asked if that meant it was a freight line that would be used for passenger rail when there is no demand for freight use.

Mr. Salehi said that he was not certain about the prioritization of freight versus passenger rail service on the planned rail line.

Ms. Tregoning said that she was acknowledging previous interest by the TPB in rail projects that provided dedicated capacity for passenger rail, and just sought to clarify if this project fit that description.

Ms. Sorenson said that the project would help alleviate a bottleneck that inhibits both freight and passenger rail traffic, and would potentially improve on-time performance for VRE.

Mr. Salehi said that his interpretation of the VDOT letter referred to by Ms. Tregoning was that the new rail line would be used by both freight and passenger rail service.

Mr. Zimmerman said that as the former chair of the VRE Board he might be able to provide some additional perspective on the project. He said that the fact that the corridor in question had been reduced to two tracks over the years had been a real constraint on the ability to manage the flow of both freight and passenger rail traffic. He said the third track could be expected to greatly enhance the movement of both types of rail traffic, and that since VRE tends to be the last priority in the management of the corridor it stands to gain the most from the additional capacity. He said that for this reason, the project in question has been a major priority for VDRPT, along with the localities included in PRTC and NVTC, due to the expected benefit for passenger rail. He said that while the issue of dedicated capacity for passenger rail raised by Ms. Tregoning was important, he and his colleagues in Virginia are confident that this project would indeed carry

significant benefits for moving passengers on VRE.

The motion passed unanimously.

9. Approval of Amendments to the FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), and Approval of FY 2010 UPWP Carryover Funding to FY 2011

Mr. Kirby said this item is made up of two actions related to project work in the FY 2010 UPWP that will not be completed by June 30. He said Resolution R18-2010 will remove funding for those project activities from the FY 2010 UPWP, and Resolution R19-2010 will transfer the activities to the FY 2011 UPWP. He spoke from the memorandum provided to the TPB and summarized the activities that would be transferred to FY 2011.

Mr. Zimmerman moved to adopt both resolutions. Ms. Tregoning seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

10. Approval of the FY 2011 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Kirby said the FY 2011 UPWP was constructed based on the funding the TPB is expected to receive July 1, 2010 from the federal highway and transit programs. He said the funding levels assume that the SAFETEA-LU authorization will be extended to the end of the calendar year and will be funded at a level comparable to previous years. He highlighted an additional item related to the Household Travel Survey that will involve doing additional household surveys focused on certain geographic sub-areas. He said that these focused surveys will have a short turnaround period and can be conducted on a more frequent basis. He noted that the recent Household Travel Survey was conducted 14 years after the last region-wide travel survey, completed in 1994. He said that the survey would ideally be conducted every ten years, but funding issues complicated that schedule.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if Mr. Kirby was referring to additional funding that would make possible the additional sampling.

Mr. Kirby confirmed that was the case.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for clarification about how this additional work addresses the issue regarding the length of time it takes to analyze the data once it is collected.

Mr. Kirby said that the length of time to which he was referring was between 1994 and 2008 when the surveys were conducted. He said he would like that time to be no more than ten years, but that a lack of funding caused the delay. He said the proposal in the UPWP is to strengthen the database by doing additional samples in focused sub-areas around the region.

Mr. Zimmerman said this additional effort is positive. He expressed concern about the length of time it takes to turn around the analysis of the data and noted that it would be more useful to have the analysis as soon as possible before conditions change.

Mr. Kirby said analysis of the sub-area surveys should be available more quickly, but noted that the ten-year regional survey generates a lot of data and that there is a lot of checking and analysis that must be conducted before the results are ready for public consumption.

Mr. Zimmerman suggested reevaluating how resources are deployed both in conducting the survey and analyzing the results.

Mr. Zimmerman moved to adopt Resolution R20-2010. Ms. Ticer seconded the motion.

Mr. Bottigheimer asked for information about what is included in the UPWP related to TPB staff work such as that in support of the TIGER grant application, and how such capacity might be used for future opportunities.

Mr. Kirby said the analytical work related to the TIGER grant is included in the regional studies item. He added that work in FY 2011 would include re-benchmarking of the analysis that had been conducted, focusing on developing implementation guidelines for prioritizing bus transit on arterials, and developing a regional arterial corridor network with three- and five-year timelines based on the WMATA priority corridor network.

Mr. Bottigheimer asked if future analysis would be looking at corridors beyond Metro's priority corridor network to corridors served by local providers.

Mr. Kirby responded that the regional arterial corridor network to be analyzed would be a larger network than just the WMATA priority corridor network.

Ms. Tregoning spoke on the issue of the frequency of data collection for the household travel survey and noted that she thinks ten years is a long period of time between surveys. She said she is concerned not only about the expense of such surveys, but how much time it takes to get information to which the TPB may respond given rapidly changing conditions. She said that the U.S. Department of Transportation recently issued a policy statement on bicycle and pedestrian accommodation, which noted that there is a lack of routine data collection on walk and bike trips. She said that while this type of data collection may be happening at the jurisdiction level, methodologies may be different making it harder to compare the data. She said she would like to TPB to think about how it may more routinely collect that information. She noted that this type of data was helpful in compiling the TIGER grant application.

Mr. Kirby said that the 2007/2008 Household Travel Survey did sample more intensively around Metrorail stations, generating better data than that which was collected in 1994. He said the focused sub-area surveys will provide more detail in walkable areas to show how those conditions may be replicated elsewhere.

Ms. Krimm noted that the City of Frederick is not depicted on the maps for this item.

Chairman Snyder said Frederick should definitely be added to the regional maps.

Mr. Kirby said the maps would be corrected.

Ms. Koster asked how the FY 2011 UPWP supports the Greater Washington 2050 effort.

Mr. Kirby said the Greater Washington 2050 effort is multi-faceted, with transportation as one component. He said TPB staff have provided support to that effort and will continue to do so. He said that work developing applications for the Sustainable Communities Grant Program, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, will provide greater opportunity for integration between the different work programs within COG. He said the departments within COG have in the past worked somewhat independently of each other, reflecting their funding streams and associated requirements. He noted that the funding the TPB receives from the U.S. Department of Transportation comes with requirements and regulations for work the TPB must conduct. He said these regulations also contain requirements for multi-sectoral discussion beyond transportation requirements.

Chairman Snyder said that he is looking forward to the management and operations strategic plan and asked when the TPB could expect to see this plan.

Mr. Kirby said the plan will be reviewed by the TPB Technical Committee on April 9 and will subsequently be included on the TPB agenda.

Chairman Snyder explained that the plan will position the region as far ahead as funding will allow in terms of operations, maintenance and management of transportation infrastructure.

The motion passed unanimously.

11. Approval of the FY 2011 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

Mr. Ramfos said the TPB was briefed at its February meeting on the FY 2011 CCWP, which was released for public comment at the February 11 TPB Citizens Advisory Committee meeting. He said the TPB did not receive any comments on the document.

Mr. Erenrich highlighted the increasing cost of gasoline and likely fare increases for transit. He said that as a result, he believes that vanpooling will make a resurgence in the near future. He said he is concerned that the region is lacking the ability to market and provide for this increase in vanpool ridership. He asked if the FY 2011 CCWP might accommodate this type of trend.

Mr. Ramfos said that a spike in vanpool and carpool ridership was experienced when gasoline

topped \$4.00 per gallon and that the region was able to accommodate the extra demand, which was roughly a 150 to 200 percent increase. He said Commuter Connections will watch out for another potential upward trend.

Mr. Zimmerman moved to adopt Resolution R21-2010. Ms. Hudgins seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

17*. Amendment to the FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Include Funding for the Georgetown-Rosslyn Connector as Requested by the District Department of Transportation (DDOT) on Behalf of the Georgetown Business Improvement District.

** Item 17 was added to the agenda by motion earlier in the meeting, and placed at the end of the Action Items*

Chairman Snyder asked DDOT to provide background on this item.

Mr. Rawlings said DDOT is requesting an amendment to the FY 2010-2015 TIP and that copies of this request and the proposed resolution are included in the handout. He said the purpose of the amendment is to authorize the expenditure of an earmark of \$712,500 in federal Section 5309 funding that was awarded to the Georgetown Business Improvement District for public transportation services for the Georgetown-Rosslyn Connector. He said the proposed project is not adding additional capacity for motorized vehicles and is exempt from air quality conformity.

Mr. Rawlings moved to adopt Resolution R22-2010. Ms. Tregoning seconded the motion.

Chairman Snyder noted that the TPB agreed to add this item to the agenda, but asked how issues like this are normally addressed.

Mr. Kirby said this item would normally be addressed by the TPB Steering Committee, but the request to amend the TIP to include this item came after the March Steering Committee meeting. He said there seemed to be an urgency to include this item in the TIP to secure access to the earmark.

Chairman Snyder emphasized that there is a process for bringing forward amendments, though the TPB tries to be understanding and flexible. He noted that this item has been expedited beyond this process. He said if any TPB member has concerns about the amendment, it should go back through the established process. He called for a vote on the resolution.

The motion passed unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

12. Status Report on the 2010 Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2011-2016 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Kirby said the process has been delayed a month and that the deadline to submit projects has been extended to April 2. He noted that the funding projections are uncertain, causing difficulties for the implementing agencies in developing their submission packages for the plan update. He said this delay will move the final consideration of TPB approval to November 2010, which will still be within the required period for the federal approval of the 2010 CLRP.

13. Briefing on the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program

Mr. Robertson provided a PowerPoint presentation on the Sustainable Communities Planning Grant Program sponsored by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) in partnership with the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). He noted that the six livability principles outlined through the initiative are consistent with the principles in the Region Forward Report that was shaped by the Greater Washington 2050 Coalition. He said this unprecedented joint-agency initiative was launched about a year ago and the advance notice for comment on the program was issued by HUD several weeks ago. He said that on March 1, COG organized an ad hoc working group to provide input and develop comments for COG to submit to HUD. He said the comments focused on two points: that regional councils and MPOs should be the recipients of the grant, and that there are opportunities to leverage regional relationships and the work completed through these partnerships to date. He said it is anticipated that HUD will issue a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) in early- to mid-April and that the grant application will be due in June. He said it is anticipated that there will be \$150 million available through this grant program in three categories, with a 20-percent leveraging requirement that can be an in-kind match. He said small metro areas would be eligible to apply for up to \$2 million in grant funding and larger metro areas, like the Washington Region, would be eligible to apply for up to \$5 million.

Mr. Robertson said the funding has been divided into three pools: \$100 million for Integrated Regional Planning Initiatives; \$40 million for Challenge Grants (separate NOFA); and \$10 million for Technical Assistance (separate NOFA). He said that COG/TPB would be most interested in applying for the Integrated Regional Planning Initiatives and noted that HUD developed three categories within this pool of funding. He said that Regional Plans for Sustainable Development (category 1) includes funding for regions that are just starting to build partnerships and may not have collaborative projects ready to go. He said that Detailed Execution Plans and Programs (category 2) would include funding for regions that have built partnerships and are ready to start or continue regional planning efforts. He said that Implementation Incentives (category 3) includes funding for regions that have projects ready to implement. He noted that the Washington Region and potential proposal ideas would likely fall

under category 2.

Mr. Robertson said that the COG Board of Directors has acted to create a task force to oversee the preparation of the grant. He invited members of the TPB to participate on the task force. He thanked the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) for its support on this effort.

Mr. Zimmerman reiterated that HUD is currently requesting comments on the design of a program for which COG/TPB may be interested in applying. He expressed confusion about the delineation between the three categories and asked if HUD has set fixed pools of funding for each category within the \$100 million or if applicants applying for each category would be evaluated against each other.

Mr. Robertson said he does not believe HUD has made any delineation within the \$100 million, though that may come out of the comments they received. He said it is his belief that the administration is interested in seeing results and would be more apt to fund projects that would be ready to go and yield interesting ideas and results. He said that COG/TPB is well-positioned to submit these types of projects and will be strategic in compiling an application that demonstrates the ability to begin projects immediately.

Ms. Hudgins said that one of the questions she has is how the region as a whole and the individual localities will be best served through this grant. She said that while this grant process can work well for the region, there are some jurisdictional initiatives that many would like to see included. She said she hoped this type of dialogue was happening as COG/TPB prepares to submit an application.

Mr. Robertson said there is a lot of dialogue with HUD, DOT, and EPA officials, as well as a lot of opportunities to tease out the details in the coming weeks. He said the staff team charged with preparing the application is already being assembled and that the COG Regional Task Force will be composed of multi-sector, multi-jurisdictional players.

Ms. Tregoning noted that there is not a lot of funding available for this grant, which is particularly apparent when one considers capital costs for implementation. She acknowledged that it is important to see results, but that it is difficult to produce results with such little funding. She wondered if the region might be well served by thinking about how a small amount of implementation money might be used to seed some programs. She specifically mentioned the Live Near Your Work program. She also suggested dedicating some of the planning funds to jurisdictions that have signed on to the 2050 Compact.

Chairman Snyder asked if Mr. Robertson could brief the TPB when the program is launched and the funding is awarded.

Mr. Robertson said that he would.

Chairman Snyder asked if there was any advance work TPB staff ought to be doing in

preparation for the grant application.

Mr. Kirby said TPB staff has been participating on the COG-wide team to develop comments to submit to HUD. He said he thought Ms. Tregoning had a good suggestion concerning a focus on implementation, and added that anything COG/TPB can do to separate itself from the rest of the applicants would be beneficial.

14. Briefing on Changes in Daily Travel Patterns Based on the Results of the 1994 and 2007/2008 Regional Household Travel Surveys

Mr. Griffiths from the Department of Transportation Planning, referring to a PowerPoint presentation distributed at the meeting, presented some key findings from the 2007/2008 Regional Household Travel Survey. He noted that future surveys will feature quicker turnaround for results because the infrastructure is now in place to more quickly process the survey data. He said that staff has been primarily focused on incorporating the data from the 2007/2008 survey into the regional Travel Demand Model, but now has had time to do some analysis of the changes in travel patterns since the 1994 survey.

Mr. Griffiths began by summarizing changes in the characteristics of the region's households, noting a large increase in the proportion of single-person households in all of the region's jurisdictions that has led to a reduction in rates of daily trips per household. He presented the daily per-person trip-making rates broken down by age group, showing that there have been decreases in rates for younger age groups up to age 35, and that the rate for the group of persons 65 and older has increased, while the rates for the ages in between have largely stayed the same. He said this is likely an indication that the senior population in the region is healthier and wealthier than in past years, and therefore making more daily trips, though probably not primarily in the peak periods. He also said that given results regarding the breakdown of trips by purpose, it appears that the decrease in trip rates for the 16-24 and 25-34 age groups is largely due to a substantial decrease in social/recreational trip-making, possibly because of the rise of social networking through technology. He said there was also a large drop in work-related trips for the 16-24 age group, perhaps due to recent high unemployment and more choosing to extend schooling.

Mr. Griffiths presented a breakdown of percentage changes in travel mode choice among different age groups. He noted in particular decreases in auto use in the 16-34 year-old and 55-64 year-old groups and corresponding increases in transit and walk share among those groups. He also showed the modal share by age group for areas inside and outside activity centers in the region's core, inner, and outer jurisdictions. He pointed out that higher proportions of the 16-24 and 25-35 age groups are choosing to live in the regional activity centers, particularly in the core and inner jurisdictions. He also noted that in the core jurisdictions, children are less likely to be living in activity centers, indicating a challenge in attracting families to the centers. He said that in outer jurisdictions, there is much less of a difference in travel patterns between areas inside activity centers and those outside, but that the walk share is substantially higher in activity center

areas.

Ms. Smyth said she noticed from the information in the mailout packet that the survey results were seasonally adjusted to represent non-holiday weekends in the spring and fall. She said that her husband had been selected for the survey and was told to keep a travel diary the week of July Fourth. She asked if one way the survey could be streamlined would be to make sure that the surveys are actually conducted during the target time periods rather than going through the exercise of seasonally adjusting the numbers.

Mr. Griffiths said that the goal is to do surveys throughout the year so that the results are representative of the average annual conditions, but for the purposes of comparison with the 1994 survey, which was done only in spring and fall, the 2007/08 results had to be seasonally adjusted. He said the state of the practice is to have data from all 12 months of the year.

Ms. Smyth said that data from the week of July Fourth likely was not very representative of normal conditions.

Ms. Tregoning said that the aggregation of data by jurisdiction may have masked some interesting findings regarding the increases in transit and non-motorized trips. She said that in some jurisdictions these trips increased 25 to 200 percent between the survey years, and that there were likely much larger increases within smaller geographies. She said that the region's ability to demonstrate such impacts on travel behavior as the result of policy changes and transportation investments in small areas would be valuable in the pursuit of federal grant funding. She said the TPB should further pursue more detailed data about modal shifts in small areas.

Mr. Griffiths said that the TPB's Work Program allows for more detailed analysis of the data within smaller geographies, and that the manner in which the surveys are conducted provides the capability to target small areas for study and supplement the region-wide findings. He said that staff is currently working with Arlington County to gain supplemental findings within Shirlington and along the Columbia Pike and Jefferson Davis Highway corridors.

Ms. Tregoning said that it would be helpful to every jurisdiction to have finer-grained results and that each should consider supplementing the TPB budget to obtain supplemental information to aid in land-use and transportation decision-making.

Ms. Hudgins said that she also valued finer-grained analysis because of the significant variation between one part of a jurisdiction and another, particularly in Fairfax County. She said that the County has worked to adjust census tract designations to allow for more clear definition of distinct communities, which would allow for better analysis of differences in travel trends.

Mr. Griffiths said that such efforts are appreciated.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the presentation of the data leads to some important questions about

what is really being shown, such as the way in which activity centers are defined. He noted that the differences in travel behavior between activity center areas and non-activity center areas are minimal in the outer jurisdictions compared to the inner suburbs and regional core. He said that this is likely due to a difference in character between the inner and outer activity centers, but also could partly be a product of the larger units of geography (transportation analysis zones) by which the data for outer jurisdictions are broken down. He said that despite that result, there are small areas within the outer jurisdictions that likely show large differences in travel behavior compared with the other parts of those jurisdictions, and the TPB should attempt to get at those differences as much as possible in order to inform policy.

Mr. Griffiths noted that the recent increase by more than 2,000 in the number of transportation analysis zones in the region should allow for finer-grained analysis in the future.

Mr. Zimmerman said that accordingly, there may be an opportunity to revisit how those zones are categorized within the activity center nomenclature.

Mr. Griffiths said that focused surveys conducted in various locations over a number of years could produce very useful data and analysis. He also noted that even in the outer jurisdictions, the City of Frederick does stand out as an activity center where the mode share differs substantially from the non-activity center areas in the same jurisdiction, with substantially more walking.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that it would be interesting to see how mode share figures compare between the 1994 and 2007/08 surveys in areas that have comparable levels of transit service. He said that the oft-cited trend of decreases in the transit mode share in the region as a whole might be deceptive in that it is not known if transit levels of service have remained constant or fluctuated.

Mr. Griffiths said that it would be easy to obtain results in relation to transit service levels for the 2007/08 survey, but tougher to go back and do that for the 1994 survey. He said it was something that staff could attempt, however.

Chairman Snyder asked that the Technical Committee consider the Board's comments regarding the survey results and perhaps report back with additional findings and analysis.

15. Briefing on the Regional "Street Smart" Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign

Chairman Snyder said that in the interest of time he would forego the presentation on the item and summarize the key point that there are many pedestrian and bicycle fatalities and injuries in the region, and that the Street Smart Campaign is an effective way to address them. He noted that local government participation and contribution to the program should be better, and thanked

those jurisdictions that have committed support. He said he had inquired as to why his jurisdiction of Falls Church had not yet contributed its suggested portion.

Mr. Kirby said that the kickoff event for the spring Street Smart Campaign is March 23 in Silver Spring at noon.

Mr. Farrell said that a more detailed announcement about the kickoff event would be circulated shortly. He noted that in-kind contributions from local jurisdictions in the form of law enforcement participation and safety enforcement are very helpful and valuable for the campaign.

Chairman Snyder asked that further discussion of the Street Smart Program be placed on the agenda for the April 21 TPB meeting. He confirmed that all TPB members are welcome to attend the kickoff event.

16. Update on the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project under the Transportation Investments Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program

Mr. Kirby said that staff had been working with FTA and the local project owners regarding the TIGER grant. He said staff had learned that Melissa Barlow and Brian Glenn are the designated FTA representatives for the TPB grant, and that there would be a formal approval step for the grant on May 15. He said that at the moment all project owners are being asked to develop detailed project scopes and budgets for review and approval by the FTA. He said that a meeting is tentatively planned for April 15 to coordinate the assembly of that information.

17. Other Business

Mr. Kirby mentioned that staff had received news that the U.S. Senate had approved a Jobs Bill that extends the transportation authorization known as SAFETEA-LU through the end of 2010 and funds it fully.

18. Adjournment

Chairman Snyder adjourned the meeting at 2:01 pm.