

REPORT

TPB Citizens Advisory Committee

June 9, 2011

Zach Dobelbower, 2011 CAC Chair

The CAC meeting on June 9 included a discussion on the Draft 2010 CLRP document, a briefing on the JARC/New Freedom Programs, discussion of a CAC recommendation for a Regional Complete Streets Policy, and discussion on the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, which covered the TPB staff response to CAC comments on the draft scope, as well as a discussion of the scope itself.

Staff Update on Public Involvement Activities

John Swanson of TPB staff provided a status update on the TPB study on public acceptability of road use pricing, which is being conducted in partnership with The Brookings Institution and is funded through a grant from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). He said that this project will include several large-scale deliberative forums, and that a series of smaller sessions aimed at soliciting specific feedback are being conducted as preparatory research in advance of these forums. As part of this process, he said that staff would be seeking CAC's reactions to road use pricing, and that this matter would be part of the agenda at the July meeting.

Discussion and Comment on the Draft 2010 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP)

Rex Hodgson of TPB staff provided an overview of the draft 2010 CLRP document. He summarized the differences between the proposed 2010 CLRP document and previous CLRP documents, highlighting significant milestones that have recently occurred, including major plan update, an augmented performance analysis section, as well as the recent TPB adoption of new bicycle/pedestrian plan and a new regional freight plan. He asked for the CAC to provide comments to the document by June 15 so that the document could be brought before the TPB at its July meeting.

CAC members had the following comments and questions:

- **What is the process for TPB approval of this document?** Mr. Hodgson explained that the document chronicles the plan and process of the CLRP, and that the actual 2010 CLRP has already been adopted by the TPB.
- **Does the TPB ever weigh in on project submissions to the CLRP?** Mr. Kirby explained that a decentralized process ultimately leads to the compilation of the CLRP document. He said that the effort to develop a priorities plan will use the CLRP document as a baseline, and that the performance measures in the CLRP document are the same as those that will be used to develop regional transportation priorities.

- **The layout of the document is readable and clean, with a good combination of visual material and text.** CAC members acknowledged that the CLRP document is a useful document for public consumption, and has come a long way from the CLRP documents of ten years ago.
- **Given the decision to move from a summary document to a more comprehensive document, suggestions were offered to make the document more accessible to the common user.** These suggestions included: matching chapter numbers within the document to their references at the beginning of the document, beginning each section with a summary, and stating outright what is being evaluated in the performance measures.

Briefing on the JARC/New Freedom Programs

Beth Newman of TPB staff provided an overview of the JARC and New Freedom programs that are administered by the TPB. She provided information and background on the programs, discussed the projects that have been funded to date, and summarized the recent solicitation process as well as the recommended projects for funding, which will be presented to the TPB for approval.

CAC members had the following questions:

- **What is the relationship between JARC/New Freedom and MetroAccess?** Ms. Newman explained that the JARC/New Freedom projects do not support MetroAccess, although the subject matter overlaps. She confirmed that MetroAccess provides door-to-door (not door-through-door) service.
- **How are the bus stops identified in the project for a regional bus stop improvement program, which was recommended for funding?** Ms. Newman explained that the list of bus stops will be drawn from those that have been previously submitted to the WMATA ADA office.

Discussion of a Draft CAC Recommendation for a Regional Complete Streets Policy

The CAC discussed a draft document recommending that the TPB develop a Complete Streets Policy. CAC members expressed strong support for a regional Complete Streets Policy, stating the importance of the perception of public safety on streets – namely that if a street is perceived to be safe, it would be used more frequently and by a variety of users. The CAC also discussed context-sensitive road policies, implementing regional standards or guidelines, and asking TPB members to set a target for each jurisdiction to have in place a Complete Streets Policy.

At the end of the discussion, a motion was made and seconded to approve a request for the TPB to develop a Complete Streets Policy. The motion passed unanimously.

TPB Staff Response to CAC Comments on the Priorities Plan Scope, and Discussion on the Scope for a Regional Transportation Priorities Plan

Mr. Kirby provided an explanation of his responses to the comments submitted in May by the CAC regarding the draft scope for a Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. These comments were sent to the CAC in advance, and are included in Item 9 in the June TPB mailout. Additionally, the CAC briefly discussed the draft scope of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan.

At the end of the discussion, a motion was made, seconded, and approved unanimously to support Item 9 on the TPB Agenda: Approval of Scope and Process to Develop a TPB Regional Priorities Plan.

Other Business

Mr. Kirby provided a briefing on items on the TPB Agenda. Additionally, Amanda Campbell, an alternate CAC member from the District, offered her resignation from the CAC because she recently started a new position working in the Department of Environmental Programs at COG.

ATTENDEES CAC Meeting, June 9, 2011

Members Present

1. Zach Dobelbower (DC), Chair
2. Maureen Budetti (VA)
3. Kelby Funn (MD)
4. Stephen McCoy (DC)
5. Allen Muchnick (VA)
6. Tina Slater (MD)
7. Fred Walker (VA)
8. Brian Winterhalter (VA)
9. Emmet Tydings (MD)

Members Not Present

1. Harold Foster (DC)
2. Bill Easter (MD)
3. Madeline McDuffy (VA)
4. Faith Wheeler (DC)
5. Kimberley Kaplan (VA)
6. Howard Levine (MD)
7. Larry Martin (DC)

Alternates Present

Amanda Campbell (DC)
Stephen Sill (VA)
Mauricio Hernandez (DC)

Staff and Guests

Ron Kirby, COG/TPB staff
John Swanson, COG/TPB staff
Deborah Bilek, COG/TPB staff
Rex Hodgson, COG/TPB staff
Beth Newman, COG/TPB staff
Mike Farrell, COG/TPB staff
Bill Orleans, citizen

**RECOMMENDATION
THAT THE TPB DEVELOP A *REGIONAL COMPLETE STREETS POLICY***

**TPB CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)
JUNE 15, 2011**

The CAC requests that the TPB develop and approve a *Regional Policy on Complete Streets*. A *Complete Streets* approach recognizes that streets should be designed, built, and operated to enable safe access for all users and potential users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders of diverse ages and abilities. The CAC further requests that each TPB member jurisdiction pledge to adopt a Complete Streets policy for their jurisdiction by 2014.

Why does the Region need a Regional Complete Streets Policy?

- *Improve Safety* – A regional policy will support the regional goal of reducing injuries and deaths on our streets and help ensure that our streets are perceived as safe.
- *Public Health* – A Complete Streets policy supports federal and regional public health efforts and promotes the linkages between public health and the built environment.
- *Economic Activity* – A network of Complete Streets is safer and more appealing to residents and visitors, which is good for retail and commercial development.
- *Climate / Environmental* – A regional policy will support efforts to reduce ground level pollution, GHG emissions, and decreases noise pollution.
- *Quality of Life / Environmental Justice* – A variety of transportation options allow everyone – particularly people with disabilities, older adults, children under 16, and those without cars – to get out and stay connected to the community.

Why does the TPB need a Regional Complete Streets Policy?

- *Help meet broader regional goals and strategies* – The region broadly agrees that we need to promote walkable, mixed-use, more compact communities, and give people more options for getting around. These objectives can be supported through a Complete Streets approach to street design, planning, and engineering.
- *Provide regional leadership* – The TPB needs to put a finer point on its existing policies. If we believe in *Complete Streets*, we need to say it, clearly. Providing recommended guideline for different street typologies will further encourage adoption by member jurisdictions that currently don't have complete street policies or standards.
- *Save money* – A *Complete Streets* approach will save money in the long run. By building streets right in the first place, we will avoid expensive retrofits later.
- *Federal Funding* – A regional Complete Streets policy better positions COG/TPB to pursue federal financial assistance and funding for competitive grants.
- *Potential Federal Mandate* – Proposed Congressional legislation would require MPOs to adopt Complete Streets policies that meet specified criteria.
- *Inter-Jurisdictional Travel* – Because travel within the Washington area often crosses jurisdictional boundaries, transportation projects that inadequately accommodate non-

motor vehicle modes impede the access and mobility of residents of neighboring jurisdictions.

What is the regional planning context related to Complete Streets?

- TPB policies promote key principles linked to *Complete Streets*:
 - Improved pedestrian and bicycle safety
 - Walkable mixed-use communities
 - Community Connectivity
 - Reduced reliance on driving
- These policies were articulated in the TPB’ *Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region* (2010), COG’s *Region Forward* (2010) and the *TPB Vision* (1998).
- Many of the TPB’s member jurisdictions have approved *Complete Streets* policies.

Some specifics:

As a group of citizen volunteers who are not experts on this topic, the CAC is not in a position to provide direction regarding the specific components of this policy. However, we would recommend the following:

- As a starting point, the process for developing a regional policy should begin with the “Ideal Complete Streets Policy” from the National Complete Street Coalition: www.completestreets.org. TPB staff should also research and potentially draw from the *Complete Streets* policies that have been developed by other MPOs.
- The regional policy should emphasize the regional goals that will be served by the implementation of *Complete Streets* policies and plans. These include regional transportation objectives such as the reduction in VMT, congestion and auto-dependence. They also include broader regional goals such as the creation of economically vibrant, mixed-use communities.
- A regional *complete streets* policy should note there is not a one-size-fits-all approach—a Complete Street will not look the same in Purcellville as it would look in Petworth. But the policy should emphasize commonalities throughout the region and the benefits of a *Complete Streets* approach for all types of communities.
- The regional policy should emphasize that *Complete Streets* planning is a common-sense approach that is cost-effective. Particularly on the regional level, it should not be perceived as a bureaucratic or rigid set of rules.
- The TPB *Complete Streets* Policy should require implementing agencies to publicly report to the TPB how each project would accommodate walking, bicycling, public transportation, and freight movement or document why walking, bicycling, public transit, and/or freight considerations are irrelevant to that project. In addition, the policy should require implementing agencies to document that each project, including freeway

expansion projects, would at least not degrade the level of service for pedestrians, bicyclists, and bus riders. To avoid excessive burdens, full *Complete Streets* documentation could be delayed until a project is proposed for addition to the TIP, rather than for its first addition to the CLRP.

- In addition to articulating an overarching Regional *Complete Streets* Policy, the TPB's policy should encourage the TPB's member jurisdictions to develop their own *Complete Streets* policies, if they have not already done so.
- The TPB's Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee should take the lead in developing this policy, but the process for developing the policy should also interface with the Access for All Advisory Committee, the CAC and the task force or committee that will oversee development of the TPB's Priorities Plan.