

**NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

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

**MINUTES OF THE  
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD  
June 17, 2009**

Members and Alternates Present

William Bronrott, Maryland House of Delegates  
Robert Catlin, City of College Park  
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County  
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT  
Jennie Forehand, Maryland Senate  
Jason Groth, Charles County  
Don Halligan, MDOT  
Tom Harrington, WMATA  
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Sandra Jackson, FHWA  
Charles Jenkins, Frederick County  
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County  
Tony Knotts, Prince George's County Council  
Timothy Lovain, Alexandria City Council  
Michael C. May, Prince William County  
Phil Mendelson, DC Council  
Colleen Mitchell, DC Office of Planning  
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt  
Rick Rybeck, DDOT  
C. Paul Smith, City of Frederick  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park  
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT  
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate  
Todd Turner, City of Bowie  
Lori Waters, Loudoun County Board of Supervisors  
Jonathan Way, City of Manassas  
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County  
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force

---

William Wren, City of Manassas Park  
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby  
Michael Clifford  
Gerald Miller  
Robert Griffiths  
Nicholas Ramfos  
Debbie Leigh  
Deborah Etheridge  
Andrew Austin  
Rex Hodgson  
Darren Smith  
John Swanson  
Tim Canan  
Daivamani Sivasailam  
Dusan Vuksan  
Mark Moran  
Michael Farrell  
Michael Eichler  
Monica Bansal  
Joan Rohlfs  
Feng Xie  
Yu Gao  
Dave Robertson                   COG/EO  
Lee Ruck                            COG/LEG  
Paul DesJardin                   COG/DCPS  
Andrew Beacher                 Loudoun County  
Robin Marlin                     ANC – Ward 7  
Konrad Herling                 City Council of Greenbelt  
Randall White                   Fairfax County DOT  
Randy Carroll                    MDE  
Bill Orleans                     PG ACT  
Betsy Massie                    PRTC  
Kiman Choi                     Maryland Department of Planning  
Jim Maslanka                    City of Alexandria  
Alex Verzosa                    City of Fairfax  
Tom Biesiadny                  Fairfax County DOT  
Greg McFarland                 NVTC  
Harry Sanders                  Purple Line NOW  
Randy Carroll                    MDE

---

Eric Gilliland	WABA
Stephen Flippin	CSX Transportation
Doug Guernsey	Guernsey Office Products
George Leventhal	Montgomery County Council
Craig Simpson	Amalgamated Transit Union Local 689
Cheryl Cort	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Nate Trager	Falls Church resident
Paivi Spoon	County Executive Office in Prince George's County
Julius Friend	Rollingwood resident
Linda Skalet	Bethesda Civic Coalition
Kristin Schneeman	East Bethesda resident
Francesca Kelly	Bethesda resident
Rolf Sinclair	Chevy Chase resident
Ms. Pam Browning	Petition to Save the Capital Crescent Trail
Mary Rivkin	Bethesda resident
Matthew Moskitis	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Nathaniel Decker	District of Columbia resident
Anita Maya	East Bethesda resident

## 1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Mr. Eric Gilliland of the Washington Area Bicyclists Association expressed the association's support of the Purple Line project, but said that the association is concerned about a lack of bicycle and pedestrian projects in the draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and within the projects funded by federal stimulus funds. He said that the results of the TPB's household travel survey show little improvement in bicycling and walking despite the TPB's stated goal of increasing the share of these modes, and encouraged the region's transportation implementing agencies to dedicate more funds to bicycle and pedestrian projects. Written copies of his remarks were distributed.

Mr. Stephen Flippin of CSX Transportation commended the TPB for creating the Freight Subcommittee to look at issues regarding freight mobility and planning. He noted that freight traffic in the region is expected to grow significantly in the next several years, and said that the National Gateway Initiative spearheaded by CSX would improve the efficiency of rail movement in the region by allowing for double-stacked intermodal trains. He said that he hoped the TPB would support this effort. Written copies of his remarks were distributed.

Mr. Doug Guernsey of Guernsey Office Products thanked the TPB and the Freight Subcommittee for addressing issues related to freight in the region. He said that everyone in the region is affected to some degree by the strengths and weaknesses in the region's freight infrastructure and the flow of goods. He said that drivers for his company face many hindrances in making their deliveries, and questioned policies that reduce the availability of curbside loading zones, particularly in the District

---

of Columbia. He said he has concluded that it is impossible for the job of delivery driver in downtown DC to be performed legally, and asked that transportation planners relieve the burden of delivery drivers by expanding the availability of commercial loading zones. Written copies of his remarks were distributed.

Mr. George Leventhal, of the Montgomery County Council and board member of the advocacy group Purple Line Now!, noted that the executive offices and county councils of both Montgomery and Prince George's Counties have all stated strong support of the light rail option for the Purple Line corridor. He said that any other alternatives would encounter other problems. He said that there would not be a trail along the corridor had Montgomery County not acquired the right-of-way in 1990 for the purpose of an eventual transit line. He said that the light rail alternative is the right option for the region, and urged the TPB to approve it.

Mr. Craig Simpson of the Amalgamated Transit Union Local 689 said that his organization represents about 10,000 active and retired transit workers in the region. He said that the union supports the light rail alternative for the Purple Line because it improves regional transit connectivity, particularly in allowing east-west movement without traveling through the downtown core. He said that the Purple Line would be vital in connecting residents to employment centers in Suburban Maryland. Written copies of his remarks were distributed.

Ms. Cheryl Cort of the Coalition for Smarter Growth said that her organization strongly supports the light rail alternative for the Purple Line because it would move more people in a shorter amount of time, and divert more auto traffic, consume less energy, and emit less pollution than other alternatives. She said that it would also be more effective at promoting revitalization and encouraging walking and bicycling. She said that the Purple Line would serve as an important east-west connection and facilitate job creation in Prince George's County in the long term, while connecting more workers to jobs in Montgomery County in the short term.

Mr. Nate Trager, resident of Falls Church, said that he supports the Purple Line project because making the best use of existing infrastructure in developed areas is crucial to protecting America's natural heritage by limiting sprawl and helping cities remain vital. He said that the Purple Line would encourage walkable communities instead of more roads. He said that although he has been a user of the Capital Crescent Trail for much of his life and has an appreciation for the value of the trail, he supports the Purple Line because of its broader environmental benefits for the region. Written copies of his remarks were distributed.

Ms. Paivi Spoon of the County Executive Office in Prince George's County spoke for the record on the County Executive's position on the Purple Line. She said that the County is proud to support the inclusion of the 16-mile Purple Line as a light rail corridor in the Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP). She noted that the Bethesda to Silver Spring segment of the project has actually been in the CLRP for several years, and that the County is pleased to see MDOT move forward with the whole project. She said that the hub and spoke transit system is insufficient in connecting suburban centers and that the Purple Line would provide a crucial transit connection,

---

while enhancing connectivity with existing and future bus networks and bicycle and pedestrian routes.

Mr. Julius Friend, a resident of Rollingwood in Montgomery County, said that the light-rail option for the Purple Line would be too costly and take too long to build, in part because of the constraints of the corridor on which the Capital Crescent Trail currently exists. He said that corridor is narrow and sloped in places and that if a light-rail line is put in, the trail will be treeless and not desirable. He said that implementing modern bus technology would be quicker and less costly.

Ms. Linda Skalet of the Bethesda Civic Coalition said that the organization opposes the Purple Line light-rail alternative because of the impact it would have on Bethesda's central business district. She said that the project would destroy the small amount of green space left in the area. She said that the destructive impact on downtown Bethesda is not warranted because the Purple Line needs to serve the Naval Hospital Medical Center and the relocated Walter Reed Hospital in order to have an impact on traffic congestion. She said that transit needs would be met more economically and effectively by a bus rapid transit option that would connect to the Metro Red Line at the Medical Center station. She said that she has been unable to get specific information on how the Purple Line would connect to the Red Line in Bethesda and is concerned about the potential impacts. Written copies of her remarks were distributed.

Ms. Kristin Schneeman, a resident of East Bethesda, said that a TPB decision about the Purple Line would be premature because a final decision had not yet been made about the exact route of the light rail line. She said that circumstances have changed significantly since the project was first conceived, and that other options may now be more appropriate. She also said that the cost of the project will lead to a lack of funding for other projects such as the Corridor Cities Transitway and for project amenities such as landscaping and trail reconstruction. She said that the Purple Line light rail alternative is not consistent with a regional commitment to preservation and enhancement of open space and to smart growth. Written copies of her remarks were distributed.

Ms. Francesca Kelly, a resident of Bethesda, said that the Purple Line light rail alternative is outdated and an unwise use of funds. She said that it does not address larger traffic issues or expansion at the Medical Center. She said that it will destroy natural areas and may lead to loss of the trail. She also said that the project will diminish the quality of life of residents near the trail, and that it should be built on existing roadways rather than a treasured trail corridor.

Mr. Rolf Sinclair, a resident of Chevy Chase, said that he is one of many users of the Capital Crescent Trail who oppose the Purple Line light rail alternative. He said that many aspects of the plan are unclear or outdated, and that ridership estimates are constantly shifting. He said that protecting the trail corridor would be appreciated in the future, just as protecting the C&O Canal corridor from highway construction is appreciated now. He said that the region needs robust and flexible transit infrastructure, and that putting the Purple Line underground would be a better alternative so as to preserve accessible urban green space. Materials related to his remarks were distributed.

---

Ms. Pam Browning, organizer of the Petition to Save the Capital Crescent Trail, said that the petition has more than 18,000 signatures from people who do not want the Purple Line to be built along the Capital Crescent Trail. She said that there are other feasible options that would not have such drastic environmental impacts. She referred to photos of the trail corridor and project illustrations which she said do not accurately capture the nature of how the corridor would appear after construction of the light rail line. She said that trail users would be fenced in on both sides, with no tree canopy. She also referred to an article related to pedestrian deaths along railroad corridors in Maryland. Materials related to her remarks were distributed.

Ms. Mary Rivkin, an associate professor of education at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County, and resident of Bethesda, said that she advocated protection of the Capital Crescent Trail corridor because of its importance as an outdoor space for children in Montgomery County. She said that there is increasing evidence about the importance of access to nature and the outdoors for childhood development. She noted that the State of Maryland has supported policies to increase access by children to outdoor spaces, and said that the Capital Crescent Trail is a perfect example of something the State should be looking to preserve. She said she feared that infill development will lead to a lack of urban green spaces. Written copies of her remarks were distributed.

Mr. Matthew Moskitis of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance said that his organization urges the TPB to approve amendments to the 2009-2014 TIP that allocate federal stimulus funding for several important highway projects in Northern Virginia. He said that these projects will unlock major chokepoints and improve the quality of life for many residents of the region. He said that these projects, funded with federal dollars, also point out a failure by the state government in Virginia to meet fundamental transportation needs. He said that states and regions have not stepped up to do their part in funding transportation improvements, and that the TPB could do more to facilitate discussion and build consensus among local and state officials for new transportation funding. Written copies of his remarks were distributed.

Mr. Zimmerman said that he understood NVTAA's position on the failure of the State of Virginia to do its part on transportation funding, but that the inclusion of "regions" in that criticism is something that members of the TPB from Northern Virginia localities would find difficult to accept given their efforts to obtain more funds for transportation, including voting for new taxes that have since been repealed at the state level.

Mr. Moskitis said that his written remarks elaborated further on possible actions by the TPB to promote additional transportation funding.

Mr. Harry Sanders of the advocacy group Purple Line Now! and resident of Silver Spring said that the TPB's pending action on the Purple Line is a significant event for those who have advocated for years for transit connections between Montgomery and Prince George's Counties. He noted that the Bethesda to Silver Spring portion of the project has been in Montgomery County's master plan since 1990. He said that the corridor is a valuable regional resource because of its ability to expedite

---

transportation between major suburban business districts. Written copies of his remarks were distributed.

Mr. Nathaniel Decker, a resident of the District of Columbia, said that he supports the Purple Line project because of the connection that it provides between the two spokes of the Red Line, while preserving the system of biking and walking trails. He said that while the loss of trees along the right-of-way is an important issue, it is an acceptable price to pay for the benefits the Purple Line will bring. Written copies of his remarks were distributed.

Ms. Anita Maya, a resident of East Bethesda, said that while effective east-west transportation is needed, it should not come at the expense of a treasured urban linear park. She said that her family chose to live in their neighborhood because of the proximity to downtown Bethesda and to the trail. She said that a large part of the appeal of the trail is that it is quiet and shaded, attributes that would be lost if light rail is built in the corridor. She said that every great city has great public spaces and parks, and the need is clear for preserving urban green spaces. She said that the Purple Line light rail option will not take that many cars off the road, is more expensive and less flexible than bus rapid transit, and will not serve the expanding Medical Center.

## **2. Approval of the Minutes of the May 20 Meeting**

Mr. Halligan moved to approve the minutes of the May 20, 2009, meeting of the TPB. Ms. Smyth seconded the motion.

Mr. Halligan asked that a section of the minutes be clarified to indicate that MDOT is requesting the light rail alternative for the Purple Line because of its benefits for the region, not simply recommending it because it is better than any other alternative. He asked that his statement be changed to read the following: “Mr. Halligan said that there are other alternatives, but that MDOT believes the requested alternative best meets the mobility and access needs of the region.”

The motion to approve the minutes was passed by unanimous consent.

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

Mr. Erenrich said that the TPB Technical Committee met on June 5, with nine items for discussion pertaining to items included on today’s TPB agenda. He said that the Committee discussed the amendments to the TIP funded by American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds, as well as the CLRP and TIP amendments for the Purple Line and the Return to L’Enfant projects, all of which were to be considered by the TPB at this meeting. He said that the Committee was also briefed on the recommended slate of projects for TPB funding through the JARC and New Freedom Programs, along with updates on the Air Quality Conformity Analysis, the MATOC Program, and activities of the Freight Subcommittee. He said that as an information item, the MDOT Assistant

---

Secretary briefed the Committee on MDOT's policy and programmatic direction, and that the Committee looked forward to receiving similar presentations from VDOT and DDOT in the near future.

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

Mr. Keough said that the June 11 meeting of the CAC served as a public forum on the CLRP and TIP, with presentations by TPB staff and representatives from each of the state DOTs. He said that there are two such forums each year, at the beginning and end of each TIP cycle, with the next one scheduled for September. He said that members had raised concerns at the forum about information that is provided in the CLRP and TIP about bicycle and pedestrian projects, and that often details about funding for bicycle and pedestrian improvements are not provided separately and get lost within larger projects. He said this is one of several ways in which the documents could be made more useful to the public and easier to understand, and suggested that two types of documents could be produced – one to meet federal requirements and one geared toward public consumption.

Mr. Keough said that CAC members also raised issues of how projects and spending priorities could be influenced at this stage, and the importance of being involved and expressing opinions at an earlier stage of the project development process. He said that the September TIP forum, which comes at the beginning of the TIP development cycle, is when members can begin thinking about projects in the works and how to provide input to influence the process. He again emphasized the need for clear, understandable information so that members of the public can figure out when and how to provide input, particularly as they see information about certain projects appearing in the newspaper.

Mr. Keough said that the CAC membership also discussed ideas for creation of a regional unconstrained plan that could be a guiding document for development of the CLRP and TIP. He said that the Committee asked TPB staff to provide more information on possibilities for such a plan at the July 9 CAC meeting.

Mr. Keough also noted that the CAC was interested in having at least one more outreach meeting outside the COG offices similar to the meeting held in May in Frederick.

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

Mr. Kirby said that the Steering Committee met on June 5<sup>th</sup> and approved two resolutions included in the TPB mailout packet, one a minor amendment to the Commuter Connections Work Program, and another one to add funding to projects in Virginia that are already in the CLRP and TIP.



---

Mr. Kirby described the content of the letters packet, including a letter for the TPB to send to the region's congressional delegation and the Secretary of Transportation. He said this letter was drafted in response to Vice Chairman Snyder's request, and focuses on three issues raised by Mr. Snyder at the May 20 TPB meeting: expressing support for strengthened CAFE standards and the proposed federal "Cash for Clunkers" program, and expressing concern about the multi-billion dollar shortfall in the Highway Trust Fund. Mr. Kirby said that the remaining contents of the letters packet included a letter from Mayor Davis expressing the Greenbelt City Council's support for the Purple Line light rail alternative, a summary of the agenda for the TPB-sponsored bus priority transit conference to be held on June 24<sup>th</sup>, a letter from the Maryland Motor Truck Association expressing concerns about the impacts of certain local land use issues on the freight trucking community, and a letter from Mr. Smith expressing reservations about TPB support of more stringent CAFE standards.

Mr. Kirby said that the TPB could choose to endorse the letter drafted in response to Vice Chairman Snyder's request, or choose to amend it. He said that he believes the concern about Highway Trust Fund shortfalls is important to state in a letter at this point in time.

Chairman Jenkins said that he does not believe in the idea of manmade global warming and is not overly concerned about greenhouse gas emissions. He said he also shared Mr. Smith's concerns about possible government overreaching in dictating fuel efficiency standards to the auto industry, along with the possible unintended consequences of more stringent standards, such as increased highway fatalities due to smaller, lighter vehicles. He said that he would be willing to go forward with endorsing the letter if some modifications could be made to the first paragraph.

Mr. Kirby said that the first paragraph could be reworked or just left out, given that the main point of the letter is attention to the Highway Trust Fund, and the two issues mentioned in the first paragraph – CAFE standards and "Cash for Clunkers" – are already done or look to be moving along regardless. He asked if Chairman Jenkins was also concerned about the language regarding the "Cash for Clunkers" program.

Chairman Jenkins said that he was fine with the language on "Cash for Clunkers" but was not willing to sign his name to anything that expresses concern about greenhouse gas emissions. He said that if all members of the TPB would like to sign the letter as-is, that would be fine, but that his signature would not go on it.

Mr. Zimmerman said that if the letter states a position of the TPB as a body, then it is the Chairman's role to sign it. He said that when he served as TPB Chairman, he signed his name to positions that he did not fully support, but that he saw it as his role as Chairman to represent the body's position. He said that if a Chair has a problem of conscience with a position, then he or she should step back and let a Vice Chair sign the official correspondence.

---

Chairman Jenkins said that he would have no problem with letting Mr. Snyder sign the letter, if it was the will of the Board to send the letter as-is.

Mr. Smith said that he felt the Board could unanimously support an expression of support for improving fuel economy, but that it could be worded so as not to explicitly state support for more stringent CAFE standards. He said he believes that such standards have contributed to the nation's economic problems.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the TPB currently has an official position on CAFE standards.

Mr. Kirby said that the TPB did endorse a letter in support of the strengthening of CAFE standards in 2007 when they were last modified, but that the Board has not taken a position on the recent Obama Administration proposal to further strengthen the standards. He clarified that President Obama has proposed applying standards in effect in California to the whole country, to avoid having multiple standards in place in different parts of the country.

Mr. Zimmerman said that it would be unfortunate for the Washington Region, which is struggling with its air quality attainment status, to not be forthright in supporting more stringent standards that would improve the region's air quality.

Mr. Rybeck asked if the TPB had endorsed the report of the COG Climate Change Task Force.

Mr. Kirby said that the TPB had provided comments on the report but did not endorse it.

Chairman Jenkins asked if Mr. Kirby had enough information to move forward.

Mr. Kirby said that the letter could be reworded to speak generally to fuel efficiency improvements rather than specific standards, while still mentioning the Cash for Clunkers program.

Chairman Jenkins said that he would be comfortable with that outcome.

Mr. Elrich said that he was in disbelief that the TPB could not make a statement as a body on greenhouse gas emissions. He said that with various bodies on which he has served, it has been the role of the chair to sign official communications that represent the will of the body, even if he or she has disagreed with the content. He said that it is not his understanding that the chair should have the power to veto or censor statements. He said that the language in question should stay in the letter because greenhouse gas emissions pose a real problem that the TPB has a responsibility to address, and that the vast majority of the Board agrees with that. He said that if Chairman Jenkins did not want to sign a strong statement about the issue, then someone else would.

---

Chairman Jenkins likened the situation to a local zoning decision, saying that in his jurisdiction if the chair does not agree with a decision then the members comprising the voting majority would sign the action on the chair's behalf. He suggested that if members of the TPB feel that strongly about the issue, then a letter can be submitted with the signature of everyone in agreement, but that he would not sign the letter in its current form.

Mr. Mendelson suggested that the first paragraph of the letter be changed to begin: "The TPB, federally designated MPO for the region, is pleased with recent efforts encouraging consumers to purchase more fuel-efficient vehicles. The TPB is increasingly concerned, however . . ." He said that this would keep the focus of the letter on the Highway Trust Fund.

Chairman Jenkins said that he would be fine with such wording of the letter.

Ms. Hudgins said that she supported the original wording of the letter, because it seemed that a substantial majority of TPB members supported it and to make changes on the account of the Chair would circumvent the will of the Board. She said she worried about setting a precedent in which every potentially objectionable portion of a communication is up for debate even if supported by a clear majority. She said she was satisfied with the letter as it appeared in the mailout, and expected to be acting on that letter.

Ms. Waters said that she agreed with Mr. Mendelson's proposed wording for the first paragraph of the letter, and the desire to focus on the Highway Trust Fund issue rather than over the letter's introductory sentence. She noted that the letter was labeled as "draft" in the mailout packet, and said that it made more sense to refine it than to have it signed by a Vice Chair and potentially raise questions on the part of the recipients.

Mr. Smith said he did not recall the TPB having debated greenhouse gas emissions, and that though he was prepared to have that sort of debate, it was not necessary to have it now if a letter with more general language could be used.

Mr. Way said that the first sentence of the letter could simply be omitted as gratuitous.

Chairman Jenkins said he agreed with omitting the first sentence of the letter.

Mr. Elrich moved to endorse the letter as written, and Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion.

Chairman Jenkins asked Mr. Elrich to clarify his motion to stipulate that the Vice Chairman would sign it on behalf of the body, or alternatively that all supporting members would sign the letter.

Mr. Elrich clarified his motion to state that a Vice Chairman would sign the letter.

---

Mr. Rybeck said that air quality has been a focus of the TPB for many years, but that the region is still not in attainment of all standards. He said that it is one of the Board's mandates to try to improve the region's air quality, and that any opportunity for the Board to take strong action in this area should be used.

A voice vote was taken on the motion by Mr. Elrich to endorse the letter as written. Ms. Waters asked for the vote to be taken by a show of hands. The motion was passed by a majority of the Board.

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

Chairman Jenkins declined to make any remarks at this time.

## **7. Approval of Amendments for the FY2009-2014 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Include Projects under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said there were two resolutions before the Board. One was for VDOT projects and the other was for projects in Charles County. Before proceeding with those resolutions, however, Mr. Kirby called attention to some administrative changes that did not require Board approval. These included an administrative change in a WMATA project and a change in a project in Prince George's County.

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Sorenson described the four projects in the VDOT TIP amendment. She moved approval of Resolution R32-2009.

The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

Mr. Groth explained the project included in the Charles County TIP amendment. He moved approval of Resolution R33-2009.

The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

## **8. Review of Comments Received and Approval of the Purple Line Light Rail Project Submission for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for an Amendment to the 2009 CLRP and FY2010-2015 TIP**

Referring to the handout material, Mr. Kirby explained that staff has compiled a summary of comments received during the public comment period regarding the inclusion of the Purple Line light rail project in the air quality conformity assessment. He said the public comment period lasted from May 14 to June 13. He said the comments were all posted on the TPB website. In

---

addition, he said that in response to comments the Maryland Department of Transportation has provided additional information on the project, including information on the trail along the Purple Line alignment.

Mr. Halligan noted that the written information his office had provided was intended to directly address some of the controversial aspects of the project that had been raised during public comment. He thanked citizens and groups for expressing their concerns and comments. He also thanked groups and elected officials who have supported the project. He pointed out some key points regarding the trail. He said the controversy is largely related to a three-mile portion of the Purple Line alignment in Montgomery County. He said Montgomery County purchased this right-of-way for the purpose of constructing the transitway. Both the trail and transitway on this right-of-way have been a part of the county master plan since 1990. He said the Purple Line project will include a trail connection between Bethesda and Silver Spring that does not currently exist. He said the western portion of the Purple Line project, referred to as the Georgetown Branch, has been in the TPB's Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) for many years now and there have been no comments on that in the previous planning efforts. He said the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) is committed to continuing to work with the community in the design of the trail. He said they recognize the value of the trail and will seek to enhance the trail as a community resource and make it as safe as possible. In conclusion, he spoke about the purpose and need of the project, as well as the project's key features.

Mr. Halligan moved Resolution R34-2009 to approve the submission for inclusion in the air quality assessment of the amendment to the 2009 CLRP.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Bronrott spoke in support of the Purple Line. He emphasized that the project has already been approved by the County Executive of Montgomery County, County Executive of Prince George's County, the Montgomery County Council, the Prince George's County Council, and both counties' planning boards. He said there is unanimous agreement among the bodies about the 16-mile light rail project along the proposed alignment. He spoke about the opportunities for mixed-use, transit-oriented development at key points along the line. He said this is the most tangible action, among options currently on the table, to address environmental concerns in a meaningful way. He asked for the support of the entire Board, noting the regional significance of this project.

Mr. Weissberg said he wanted to echo Mr. Bronrott's comments. He said Prince George's County strongly supports the resolution. He noted the CLRP previously included the Bethesda-Silver Spring portion of this project, but the amendment on the table would for the first time extend the project into Prince George's County, putting the entire 16-mile project into the CLRP.

---

Ms. Forehand said she wanted to echo the previous comments. She said the Maryland Senate is strongly in support of the project. She said she believed Mr. Halligan's handout shows that it can be done safely alongside of the trail.

Mr. Roberts said he thought that Maryland should be able to do more than the Purple Line to "green the state." He said the Greenbelt City Council supports the project with some concerns about the trail. He expressed his personal opinion that the trail is a scarce resource that should not be sacrificed for this project. He said he would prefer to see the project pursued as a streetcar project in which the space on roads would be taken up by streetcars, instead of parks being taken up by streetcars.

Mr. Knotts reiterated that the Prince George's County Council supports the project. He said the Council also supports the possibility of the extension including other destinations that would take it across the Woodrow Wilson Bridge.

Mr. Erenrich emphasized that the Montgomery County Executive, as well as the County Council, will be working to ensure the project includes a high-quality trail.

Chairman Jenkins said he would be supporting the project. He noted that the TPB is a regional body and this project is a regional solution. He said he has continuing concern about the effects that this project might have on the timing of other projects in the CLRP. He said he would continue to be an advocate for projects in Frederick County, especially the I-270 improvements. He said he hoped that in the future other jurisdictions might reward places like Frederick County for their support of this action.

Mr. Turner said that Bowie's support of the project is documented in a letter distributed to the Board. He noted that a priority project for Bowie was being delayed because of this action. He said he looked forward to that project moving forward in the future.

The resolution was approved unanimously.

**9. Review of Comments Received and Approval of the Project Submission that Includes the Closure of the I-395 Southbound Exit Ramp to 3rd Street NW, the Reconfiguration of the Southbound Entrance and Northbound Exit Ramps, and the Reconnection of F and G Streets between 2nd and 3rd Streets NW in Conjunction with the "Return to L'Enfant" Planned Unit Development on the I-395 Air Rights between E Street and Massachusetts Avenue NW**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said the Board was briefed on this item the previous month by Mr. Rybeck. He said the mailout packet included comments from VDOT and MDOT regarding traffic impacts from the project. He said he did not believe these comments called for any delay in the project.

---

Mr. Rybeck moved approval of Resolution R35-2009. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

**10. Approval of Scope of Work and Budget for An Air Quality Conformity Assessment for An Amendment to the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP to Include the Projects Described in Items 8 and 9 Above**

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Posey said this item included two action items: 1) approval of the scope of work for the air quality conformity analysis of the two projects approved under Items 8 and 9, and 2) amendment of the TPB's Unified Planning Work Program to fund that conformity analysis. She explained the scope of work, the schedule and the budget for the conformity analysis. She also called to the Board's attention a letter from DDOT asking TPB staff to include in this analysis a modification of the network coding on K Street to reflect current plans for the K Street Busway.

Ms. Sorenson asked for an explanation as to why there would be a comment period for one month and yet Ms. Posey had indicated the analysis would begin right away.

Ms. Posey said that it was important to get started because the TPB does not meet in August. If the TPB decides later to change the scope of the conformity analysis, those changes could be incorporated at a later date.

A motion was made to approve the scope of work for the air quality conformity assessment for the amendment to 2009 CLRP and to adopt Resolution R36-2009.

The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

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

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Lovain said he was pleased to present to the Board the third round of Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom Project grant proposals for the Board's approval. He provided some background on these programs, noting that in 2007 the TPB approved the region's Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan that, among other things, established a competitive selection process for recommending JARC and New Freedom projects. He said the ten project recommendations were developed by a five-member selection committee, which was geographically balanced, and reflected a lot of local and national expertise. If approved, he said the ten projects will provide \$1.1 million in New Freedom funds from FY2007 and FY2008 funds, and approximately \$1.4 million in FY2007 and FY2008 JARC

---

funds. The next solicitation would then be in early 2010, when the TPB would distribute the remaining FY2008 funds and the FY2009 funds that would become available.

Ms. Newman from the TPB staff briefly described the ten project recommendations. She described the federal requirements for project selection. She also described the selection process.

Mr. Erenrich asked why some projects were receiving more money than had been requested.

Mr. Lovain noted that some of the applications were very impressive and because funding was available, the selection committee decided, with input from the recipients, it would be appropriate to provide additional funding.

Mr. White noted that some projects would cross multiple jurisdictional lines. He asked how the required local match for such projects would be split among affected jurisdictions.

Ms. Newman said the match comes directly from nonprofit agencies, not from local governments.

Ms. Hudgins expressed her satisfaction that travel training was being addressed in these projects. She said it was important on a long-term basis to find more ways to get people with disabilities to use fixed route services.

Mr. Lovain moved approval of Resolution R37-2009. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

Chairman Jenkins noted that this would be Mr. Lovain's last meeting as a TPB member. He noted Mr. Lovain's important role as chair of the Human Services Transportation Coordination Task Force since 2008. He presented Mr. Lovain with a plaque recognizing his service to the TPB and to the region.

## **12. Briefing on the Draft 2009 CLRP and the FY 2010-2015 TIP, and the Related Air Quality Conformity Assessment**

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Posey briefed the Board on the air quality conformity analysis of the 2009 CLRP and FY2010-2015 TIP, which was released for public comment at the CAC meeting on June 11. She said the public comment period continues until July 11. The TPB will be asked to approve the conformity analysis on July 15. She said the analysis shows that although emissions forecasts are higher than previously anticipated, all the requirements for air quality conformity have been met.



---

### **13. Update on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program**

Referring to the mailout packet, Mr. Kirby called attention to a PowerPoint presentation, which staff has been presenting in executive briefings to the senior officials in the state DOTs and Metro. He noted that funding through a federal earmark will last through the next fiscal year, but following that, the program will be seeking funding from the states – a total of \$1.2 million a year -- \$400,000 each from Maryland, Virginia, and the District.

Mr. Kirby introduced Mr. Ey who is the operator of the program.

Chairman Jenkins asked Mr. Ey if he has conducted outreach with county sheriffs, fire chiefs and EMS directors.

Mr. Ey said he has not done much outreach yet to all of the public safety agencies, but he intends to do a lot more. He added that these agencies deal with an average of 12 to 15 incidents per month, which keeps them very busy.

### **15. Update on the June 17 Scenario Task Force Meeting, the Development of a Regional Priority Bus Transit Project, and the June 24 TPB Conference: “Opportunities For Priority Bus Transit in the Washington Region**

Mr. Kirby spoke for a few minutes about the Scenario Study Task Force. He said the task force is currently putting together a regional priority bus transit grant proposal for federal stimulus funds. He said the task force plans to present the draft grant proposal to the TPB on July 15 for approval.

### **16. Other Business**

There was no other business.

### **17. Adjournment**

Chairman Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 2:06 p.m.