

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
April 18, 2012**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jennie Forehand, Maryland Senate
Tawanna Gaines, Maryland House of Delegates
Jason Groth, Charles County
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax County
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
John Jenkins, Prince William County
Emmett V. Jordan, City of Greenbelt
Garrett Moore, VDOT
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie
Jonathan Way, Manassas City
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County DPW&T
Tommy Wells, DC Council
Robert Werth, Private Providers Task Force
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Sam Zimbabwe, DDOT
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby
Gerald Miller
Robert Griffiths

Nicholas Ramfos	
John Swanson	
Andrew Austin	
Wendy Klancher	
Sarah Crawford	
Deborah Kerson Bilek	
Gareth James	
Eric Randall	
Ben Hampton	
Michael Farrell	
Karin Foster	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Nicole Hange	COG/EO
Betsy Self	COG/DPSH
Bill Orleans	Citizen
Jim Maslanka	City of Alexandria
Randy Carroll	MDE
Judi Gold	Councilmember Bowser's Office
Patrick Durany	Prince William County
Nick Alexandrow	PRTC
George Clark	Tri County Council for Southern Maryland
Frank Johnson	FHBP
Bernadette Beffard	Herndon/FFX Co.
Barbara Ditzler	Montgomery County
Michael Proffitt	CLI – Frederick Area Comm. For Transportation
Ryan Kelly	VDOT
Mike Lake	Fairfax County DOT
Greg Billing	Washington Area Bicyclist Association
Tracy Hadden Loh	DC Resident – Ward 6
Ashley Halsey	Washington Post
Peter Pennington	CAC
Allen Muchnick	Virginia Bicycling Federation
Bonnie Moore	Leadership Conference
Stewart Schwartz	CSG

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Allen Muchnick, a board member of the Virginia Bicycle Federation and a member of the TPB's Citizen Advisory Committee, spoke about the draft Regional Complete Streets Policy and Complete Streets Guidance and Policy Template. He said that the latest revision of the policy, while incorporating much of the feedback received to date, still fails to establish a standard policy. He recommended that a question be added to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) project description form that asks agencies to describe not just what modes a particular

facility will accommodate but how it will accommodate them. He said that implementing agencies should be easily able to report this information to the TPB at the TIP submission stage.

Stewart Schwartz, Executive Director of the Coalition for Smarter Growth, spoke in reference to a recommendation he made at a previous Board meeting to study the feasibility of transit on the American Legion Bridge (I-495) between Montgomery County, Maryland, and Fairfax County, Virginia. He acknowledged a memorandum written by TPB staff regarding previous experiences and studies of transit on the route (included in the “Letters Sent/Received” packet for the April 18 Board meeting), but still urged the TPB to move forward with the study. Mr. Schwartz also commented on a presentation to be given later in the Board meeting by VDOT staff regarding a study of collecting tolls on I-95 south of Fredericksburg. He said he looked forward to the study and its results, and suggested that VDOT look at whether it might be possible to use some of the toll revenue for improvements to other travel modes in the corridor, especially commuter rail and Amtrak intercity passenger routes.

2. Approval of Minutes of March 21 Meeting

Chair Turner entertained a motion to accept the minutes of the March 21 meeting as presented. So moved and seconded, the minutes of the March 21 TPB meeting were approved.

3. Report of Technical Committee

Mr. Rawlings said that the Technical Committee met on April 6 and reviewed five items for inclusion on the agenda for the TPB’s April meeting: this year’s Bike to Work Day on Friday, May 18; comments received and proposed responses on the Regional Complete Streets Policy and Complete Streets Guidance and Policy Template; a briefing on comparisons of the household travel characteristics and behavior identified in different parts of the region; a briefing on the results of the Continuous Airport Systems Planning (CASP) program; and, an update on reauthorization of federal transportation legislation. Two additional items were presented for informational purposes: a briefing on the update of the geographic extent and population of the region’s urbanized area using Census 2010 data; and, a briefing on activities to date on the development of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP).

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Ms. Slater said that the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) met on April 12. At the meeting, the CAC: received a briefing on the TPB’s Household Travel Survey; briefly talked about the Regional Complete Streets Policy; elected two vice-chairs; discussed topics the CAC would like to focus on in the coming year; and, passed a resolution recommending that the TPB establish a working group to provide input on the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP).

Ms. Slater reported that Bob Griffiths of TPB staff gave the briefing on the TPB’s 2011

Household Travel Survey of seven focused geographic sub-areas in the region. She said that John Swanson of TPB staff led the CAC in a focus group-style feedback session following Mr. Griffiths' presentation, and that many CAC members made substantive comments about the data and recommendations for future studies. (The main feedback from that session is available in the April 2012 CAC Report, available online.)

Ms. Slater also reported that the CAC appreciates the new draft Complete Streets policy and its responsiveness to previous CAC comments. She said that the Committee is pleased that the draft now includes a document that is explicitly called "Complete Streets Policy." She also noted that the Committee elected two vice-chairs during the April meeting: Veronica Davis from the District of Columbia; and, Stephen Still from Virginia. And she said that the Committee would like to be more involved in the planning of next year's Street Smart campaign, that the Committee continues to support assembling a comprehensive list of unfunded transportation projects in the region, and that the Committee would like to receive briefings on Bike to Work Day, the TPB's study of the public acceptability of congestion pricing, transportation issues related to low-income and minority communities, bikesharing in the region, and how land-use forecasts are made.

Finally, Ms. Slater reported that the Committee discussed its role in developing the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). She said that several members expressed confusion about the current state of development of the RTPP and expressed their desire to be more actively involved in the plan's development, including design and implementation of outreach activities, methods for identifying priorities, and the use of performance measures. The Committee unanimously passed a resolution calling on the TPB to reestablish the task force that in 2010 and 2011 oversaw the development of the scope for the RTPP, or to establish some new structure to provide regular and substantive input in the development of the RTPP, and that either oversight group include members of the CAC.

Chair Turner thanked Ms. Slater for her presentation, and noted that the task force that developed the scope for the RTPP had ceased to meet once its recommendations had been completed. He said, however, that he was supportive of providing continuing opportunities for participation, both by the TPB and the CAC.

Mr. Kirby said that when the TPB approved the scope and process for development of the RTPP, it was decided that oversight for the process would come from the TPB as a whole and that no ongoing task force would be established. He recommended that an informal work session prior to the June 2012 TPB meeting take place to serve as an opportunity for the TPB, the CAC, and other stakeholders to provide feedback on development of the RTPP.

Chair Turner expressed his support for the idea of holding a work session prior to the June TPB meeting, and asked Ms. Slater to extend to the CAC an invitation to attend and participate in it.

5. Report of Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby reported that the Steering Committee met on April 6. At the meeting, the Committee acted on three resolutions: one, to amend the TIP to include funding for preliminary engineering on the auxiliary lane project on northbound I-395 between Duke Street and Seminary Road that was added to the CLRP last year; two, to add funding for MARC preventive maintenance, requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation; and, three, to amend the Unified Planning Work Program to modify two project budgets for the WMATA Technical Assistance Program.

Mr. Kirby pointed out two of the letters that were mailed out to the Board prior to today's meeting: a letter of support from Senator Webb for the TPB's recent FY2012 TIGER application; and, a one-page summary of the Spring 2012 Street Smart media event. He said that staff would provide a more detailed report of the entire Street Smart campaign at a later meeting.

The third item in the mailout packet that Mr. Kirby described was a memorandum written by staff in response to a recommendation made at a previous meeting to study the feasibility of transit service across the American Legion Bridge on I-495. He said the memorandum reviews some of the things that have happened there, that have been planned, or that have been studied: Metrobus 14 service, which was discontinued in 2003 due to low ridership; existing vanpool service; a 2003 license plate study to determine origins and destinations of those crossing the bridge each day; the 2009 West Side Mobility Study that looked at the physical capacity of the bridge; the TPB's own CLRP Aspirations Scenario, which includes bus rapid transit (BRT) and express lanes on the bridge; and, a WMATA study of demand for rail service.

Mr. Kirby pointed out a couple of other important considerations with regard to the feasibility of transit on the American Legion Bridge that were included in the memo: the need for improved circulation at the destinations served by transit in order to make it a viable option; and, the need to address the provision of free or low-cost parking in destination areas as part of a package deal to encourage ridership. He said there are some ongoing regional studies on this topic and he suggested bringing the results to the TPB later in the calendar year.

Mr. Zimmerman asked Mr. Kirby whether a recent story that aired on WTOP radio about the memo had accurately reflected the memo's findings.

Mr. Kirby responded by saying that he thought the story may have mischaracterized the memo somewhat, and that the story seemed unnecessarily negative about the potential for transit on the bridge.

Mr. Zimmerman highlighted WTOP's use of the example of the eventual discontinuation of Metrobus 14 included in the memo as evidence of a lack of demand for transit across the bridge. He pointed out that its low ridership probably had a lot to do with the fact that VDOT would not allow buses on the route to use exclusive shoulder lanes, enabling them to bypass congestion (whereas MDOT had allowed such use). He also pointed out that transit service and demand for transit has grown tremendously since the route was discontinued in 2003. He also commented on

the memo's findings related to the dispersed origins and destinations of those using the bridge. He said that transit service across the bridge would not have to serve even a majority of travelers; serving just a small percentage of travelers could have a significant impact on congestion since congestion is sensitive to very slight changes in demand. He said that allowing buses to use exclusive lanes across the bridge is probably one of the most effective, low-cost things that could be done to improve traffic conditions on the bridge.

Mr. Erenrich said that Montgomery County believes a transit connection between Montgomery County and Fairfax County is very important, and that the County has been studying a regional bus rapid transit system for years. He said the County has made comments on the Environmental Impact Statement for the Dulles Metrorail project that a provision should be made to allow high-capacity links connecting Maryland to the Silver Line and Orange Line in Virginia. He encouraged staff to look at how the TPB can use regional work program funding to study how such concepts and services can all tie together and what benefits the region as a whole can enjoy from such connectivity.

Ms. Hudgins also voiced support for studying additional transit connections between Montgomery County and Fairfax County, citing the regional need for such connections and the savings that some transit services offer as compared to other far more expensive and impractical options that could be pursued.

Mr. Kirby completed his report by mentioning or describing the remaining "Letters Sent/Received" that were not included in the mailout, but that had been distributed during today's meeting: a handout describing a forum held in Arlington about infrastructure banks, attended by Mr. Kirby and Stuart Freudberg of COG's Department of Environmental Programs; a letter from the City of Greenbelt to the Federal Highway Administration expressing opposition to the widening of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway; the agenda for the most recent Community Leadership Institute, held on March 29 and March 31; the final version of the letter from TPB to Chairman Mendelson of the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee; a letter from TPB to the Federal Transit Administration supporting an alternative analysis request by Charles County to look at the MD Route 5/US 301 corridor from Branch Avenue to Waldorf and White Plains; and, finally, a letter to Chair Hudgins of the WMATA Board from the TPB's Access for All Committee on the fare changes that are being considered by WMATA.

6. Chair's Remarks

Chair Turner welcomed Delegate Gaines and Senator Forehand upon their return from the Maryland General Assembly, which had concluded its 90-day session. He thanked those who attended the Street Smart event, which occurred on March 28 in Prince George's county. He said the event went very well, and that the TPB will continue to look forward to it annually each fall. He also said that he and Mr. Kirby made a presentation about the TPB to the COG Board of Directors, which came at a request from the COG Board. He acknowledged the recent activity of the US House of Representatives, and said that the federal surface transportation legislation had been authorized for an additional three months. He then turned his attention to the TPB

Community Leadership Institute (CLI), citing that the most recent CLI, which was held on March 29 and 31, was the ninth installment of the program. He added that 21 citizens from around the region participated in the CLI, which was facilitated by Kathy Porter, who he said is the former mayor of Takoma Park, former Chair of the TPB, and current member of the WMATA Board. He invited Ms. Loh, a CLI participant and current alternate member to the CAC, to make a few remarks about her CLI experience.

Ms. Loh, acknowledging the attendance of several CLI alumni, thanked the TPB for the opportunity to participate in the CLI. She said the program is valuable, described some lessons learned, and discussed the value of participating in a program that attracts diversity from throughout the region.

Chair Turner thanked Ms. Loh, and mentioned that he participated in the CLI program when he first became a TPB member. He said the program was instrumental and informative, and commented about the relationship between his previous CLI participation and his current TPB chairmanship. He then called up the members of the CLI who were in attendance, and presented them with certificates of completion.

ACTION ITEMS

7. Approval of Regional Bike to Work Day 2012 Proclamation

Mr. Ramfos gave a presentation summarizing the 2012 Bike to Work Day event and the survey of participation trends of Bike to Work Day since its inception about a decade ago. He said that Bike to Work Day will be on May 18 and the goal is to attain at least 12,500 participants, which would be about a 13 and a half percent increase from last year. He said there will be nine more pit stops for 2012 Bike to Work Day, totaling 58 pit stops throughout the region: 12 pit stops in the District of Columbia, 21 in Maryland, and 25 in Virginia.

Mr. Ramfos said Commuter Connections has partnered with the Washington Area Bicyclist Association (WABA) to sponsor a dedicated website for Bike to Work Day that provides information that would help employers, participants, and persons who have never participated in the event. He displayed the marketing materials and said there will be a poster in Spanish for 2012 Bike to Work Day. He said the committee received nearly \$45,000 in contributions from sponsors for the event. He recognized Greg Billings from WABA, acknowledging the strong partnership in planning for the event.

Chair Turner thanked Mr. Ramfos for his efforts in organizing Bike to Work Day. He said he has participated the last several years and encouraged all TPB members to participate in the event, whether they bike to work or show support at a pit stop. He signed the proclamation immediately following the meeting.

INFORMATION ITEMS

8. Briefing on Comments Received and Proposed Responses for Revising the Regional Complete Streets Guidance and Policy Template

Mr. Farrell provided a presentation on the history of Complete Streets, noting that there has been a trend in policy at the federal, state, and local levels towards providing better accommodation on roadways for a diversity of users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists. He said 25 states have enacted Complete Streets legislation with policies, and 31 MPOs and over 200 cities have enacted policies. He said that in the Washington region, the three state-level jurisdictions have a form of Complete Streets policy and most of the TPB member jurisdictions have a policy or are in the process of developing one.

Mr. Farrell said that in June 2011, the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) suggested that the TPB develop and approve a regional policy on Complete Streets. He said the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee took the lead on developing the policy and worked with numerous committees to get feedback. He summarized the changes to the policy, guidance document, and TIP Project Description Form since they were presented at the March TPB meeting. He said the policy is open for public comment and the TPB is scheduled to approve the document at its May 16 meeting. He reviewed the implementation schedule for the components of the policy.

Chair Turner thanked Mr. Farrell, as well as the CAC for bringing this subject to the attention of the TPB.

Ms. Backmon asked Mr. Farrell to clarify previous discussion regarding consistency of language with local jurisdictions' comprehensive plans.

Mr. Farrell said there is an exemption on the TIP Project Description sheet that addresses this concern. He added that the proposed template is meant to be adapted to meet the needs of specific jurisdictions.

Ms. Tregoning thanked Mr. Kirby and his staff for being so responsive to the comments of the TPB from its March meeting. She said she believes the revised version of the document is the right direction for a regional policy.

Mr. Beacher asked Mr. Farrell to clarify what he meant when stating the template is just a template, and asked if jurisdictions would be expected to adapt current policies towards that template and if this adaptation must occur within a certain timeframe.

Mr. Farrell said the document would demonstrate that the TPB endorses the concept of Complete Streets and suggests that its member jurisdictions adopt something along the lines of the proposed guidance and template. He said it is not a requirement that a jurisdiction adopt every provision of the guidance. He said those who drafted the guidance thought it would be valuable to give member jurisdictions a very clear picture of what the TPB has in mind without making it mandatory.

Mr. Erenrich said the proposed template is an improvement. He said he is concerned about using

the term “Complete Street” rather than something more inclusive, such as “Complete Transportation Facility.” He said he struggles with making the distinction between how funding for a roadway will be differentiated from that for a bus purchase or maintenance facility. He wondered why a jurisdiction would have to create a policy and then constantly have to ask for exemptions because projects are obviously not part of a street. He suggested that the policy focus on roadway right-of-ways and that nothing else be included in the policy. He cited several examples that would require exemptions: purchase of buses, funding for commuter rail, and funding for trails. He said the policy should be defined differently so that when projects are evaluated in the future, the majority of projects are not exempt, which in his opinion would not look very good.

Mr. Farrell said the TIP Project Description sheet was designed to filter out the non-applicable projects up front, which would define those projects as not applicable. He said the language of the inclusions section of the template was vetted through a large group of stakeholders and contains a variety of inclusions. He said the language could be altered to state “all transportation projects” instead of “all roadway projects.” However, he said there was concern with the definition of roadway, particularly related to FHWA’s Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), which defines roadways as only being curb to curb, not including the associated right-of-way. He said he proposed defining a Complete Street as a roadway and its associated right-of-way, but that not all parties agreed. He said, for example, that VDOT preferred language that does not define Complete Street but merely states that a Complete Street safely and adequately accommodates all users as appropriate.

Mr. Wojahn thanked the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee. He said the TPB Access for All (AFA) Advisory Committee sent a memo to the Subcommittee in October incorporating its recommendations and he noted most of the recommendations have been incorporated. He said one of the AFA comments that has not been clearly conveyed in the document is the notion that access to a transportation facility should be continued during construction or maintenance of the facility. He said these comments focused specifically on people with disabilities, but could apply generally to making sure the roadway remains complete during construction.

Mr. Wojahn said he thinks the policy is good in general terms, but that it is not very specific in terms of providing guidance on accessibility once a construction project is complete. He asked if there is a plan to make any technical assistance available to local jurisdictions to ensure that streets are complete for people with disabilities and the elderly. He added that there are a lot of technical issues that are not always clear, but are important for engineers to keep in mind.

Mr. Farrell agreed that there are a lot of details that need to be clarified when moving towards implementation with such a policy. He said it was the feeling of those involved in developing the policy that a shorter document would be more powerful and general statements were preferable to specific guidance. He said the general feeling was that it was not appropriate to reproduce an entire design manual within the policy and tie the region to specific guidelines. He said that the statement that facilities “should be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained so that all users” have access covered those sentiments. He said TPB staff plans to hold a follow-up training session within about six months of the adoption of the policy, which would allow for those responsible for implementation of Complete Streets to obtain resources for this task. He

added that implementation would likely be a very localized effort in terms of design work and staff training.

Mr. Wojahn said that the language regarding facilities needing to be constructed in a way that maintains accessibility can be read two ways. He said one reading implies that it should be constructed so that the end result is accessibility, and that it needs to be clear that this statement also means that the construction itself must be done in a way that maintains accessibility throughout the construction process.

Mr. Way asked if the TIP Project Description form would be applicable to small streets in residential areas, or only for projects that are in the CLRP.

Mr. Farrell said the form would be used strictly for projects that are in the TIP, and noted that there are myriad smaller local projects that are not included in the TIP.

Mr. Zimbabwe said this policy and accompanying documents represent a great step forward since the March TPB meeting. He said he would encourage that the TIP submission form include as much documentation as possible to provide an opportunity for people to view all related project documents in one location.

Chair Turner said this item will come back before the TPB for adoption at its May 16 meeting. He said that the document is designed to be flexible and relevant to TIP project submissions over time. However, he added that it is also not meant to be static and that there will likely be changes to the policy document as the TPB learns more about its implementation. He said it is important to encourage TPB member jurisdictions to adopt a formal Complete Streets policy. He said it is also important that the TPB set the standard for the jurisdictions to ensure that they have the flexibility to be able to implement a policy while also having some level of accountability through the TIP process.

Mr. Way suggested that the documentation directly state that this form is only applicable to projects that are in the CLRP.

Mr. Farrell said the form is simply one of several methods the TPB is using to document implementation of Complete Streets principles in the region. He said the policy statement and guidance template to which it refers is more comprehensive and does not only relate to projects in the CLRP. He said it refers to all projects for which a public agency is going to assume maintenance responsibilities.

Mr. Way asked if there is any roadway or project that would be explicitly exempt because it is does not fall within the bounds of a local Complete Streets policy.

Mr. Farrell said that any facility that does not provide access to the public, such as a bus maintenance depot, would not be applicable under a Complete Streets policy. He said railways and trails would also be exempt because access to motorists would be restricted on those facilities.

9. Briefing on the Possible Addition of Tolling on I-95 in Virginia

Mr. Estes said the objective of his presentation is to make sure that the MPOs in Virginia are informed on VDOT's process to develop a pilot program for submission to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to add tolling on I-95, and to open dialogue for feedback on the process. He said that this was his fourth meeting with MPOs along the I-95 corridor. He explained that the process is still in the preliminary phases, and is not yet to the point of determining where the tolls might be, or how much they will be. He reviewed the FHWA Interstate System Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Pilot Program (ISRRPP), and provided an overview of the VDOT ISRRPP application to FHWA. He discussed benefits of tolling revenue, as well as ongoing activity, including the vision plan, environmental scoping analysis, traffic and revenue study, project development/facility management plan, tolling structure and strategy, and outreach and coordination. He also provided a preliminary schedule, and said that the intent was to execute a tolling agreement with FHWA in the Winter of 2012, which would then lead to discussions about project implementation.

Mr. Jenkins asked about the I-81 corridor, and indicated concern that it may become a pass-through over I-95 for big trucks.

Mr. Estes said he shared Mr. Jenkins' concerns, and that the Commonwealth Transportation Board has emphasized reviewing diversion to the entire network in the Commonwealth of Virginia as part of the studies relating to this effort.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for confirmation that one main reason for this effort is to generate funds necessary for improvements to the I-95 corridor for safety and capacity improvements.

Mr. Estes confirmed Mr. Zimmerman's remark, citing that generating revenue is a critical piece of this effort.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if there was something beyond generating revenue that would contribute to tolling I-95.

Mr. Estes replied that part of the process is to demonstrate the need on the corridor, and to ascertain other means that might bring in revenue to offset the demonstrated need.

Mr. Zimmerman reiterated that this project focuses on resources for facility improvements. He continued by referring to page 16 of the report, which was included in the mailout, and pointing out that Goal 3 for this project is Mobility. He pointed out that the first listed strategy under this goal was to reduce single occupant vehicles along urbanized areas of the I-95 corridor. He said that the map that runs alongside this goal in the report has highlighted segments along the I-95 corridor in the area of Fredericksburg and between Fredericksburg and Richmond, and asked if the goal for Mobility and the map were connected.

Mr. Estes replied that the highlighted segments of the map refer to the extension of the HOV lanes as well as widening the road between Fredericksburg and Richmond, both of which he said

are identified as part of the long-range plan and statewide plan.

Mr. Zimmerman said that these plans more likely refer to Goal 2, System Maintenance and Preservation.

Mr. Estes agreed that this is the case for general purpose lanes.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for confirmation that the strategy to reduce single-occupant vehicles along urbanized areas of the I-95 corridor would include at least the areas of Northern Virginia through Fairfax, Alexandria, and Arlington.

Mr. Estes replied in affirmation.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for examples of expected improvements that would result in reducing single-occupant vehicles along urbanized areas.

Mr. Estes clarified that the Vision document to which Mr. Zimmerman referred aims to obtain illustrative examples to meet set goals. He said that the HOV extension identifies a need, and that toll revenue could potentially accelerate a response to this need. He added that the study aims to review improvements to the Interstate, such as ITS programs, and to communicate to the traveling public to provide options that may encourage less single-occupant vehicle use on the I-95 corridor.

Mr. Zimmerman strongly suggested that the most congested parts of the corridor would benefit from a review of possibilities that would increase transit capacity in the corridor. He referred to Mr. Schwartz's previous testimony, and mentioned the need to consider VRE, Amtrak, and other rail options as a functioning part of the corridor. He emphasized that the areas with the heaviest congestion are the ones that are going to need the biggest solutions.

Mr. Kirby asked if there was any sort of limitation within the Interstate System Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Pilot Program on how much can funding could be put towards increasing capacity.

Mr. Estes replied that the program requirements have a focused priority on reconstruction and rehabilitation. He added that in speaking with FHWA, it has become clear that capacity improvements are also an area to be reviewed. He said that part of the process at this point is to find the perfect blend between reconstruction, rehabilitation, and increased capacity.

Mr. Zimbabwe asked if there are any restrictions on where revenues could be spent outside of the I-95 corridor, such as restrictions on spending for Amtrak or local transit improvements.

Mr. Estes replied that a strict interpretation indicates that this program is solely facility-based. He added that that VDOT is working with FHWA to expand this interpretation.

Chair Turner asked for confirmation that the authority that has been granted to toll the corridor is

part of a pilot program from the federal government.

Mr. Estes replied in affirmation.

Chair Turner asked Mr. Kirby about the information that has been collected on tolling throughout the region as part of the TPB sponsored study on the public acceptability of road-use pricing, and inquired how this might relate to any input the TPB might have on this matter.

Mr. Kirby replied that it would be good for the TPB to consider what to contribute in the way of input for the study, including how specific to be, now that a formal invitation has been extended.

Mr. Estes said he did not discuss this presentation with Mr. Kirby ahead of time, and added that some more definitive data may be available in late May. He offered to come back to the TPB and share this information, and said that there is a fairly aggressive timeframe for this project, with hopes to create an application in late summer. He reiterated that any input and guidance from the TPB would be of great value.

Chair Turner said that this item should appear on a future agenda once more information is available. He added that he would be curious to hear from jurisdictions, particularly in Virginia, about what their input on this proposal may be.

10. A Briefing on Household Travel Characteristics and Behavior in Six Focused Geographic Subareas of the Region

The briefing on household Travel Characteristics and Behavior in Six Focused Geographic Subareas of the Region, was postponed.

11. Update on Reauthorization of Federal Surface Transportation Legislation

Mr. Kirby reported that the US House of Representatives has approved their version of the legislation, which is another 90-day extension that goes through September 30 and includes language on the Keystone Pipeline. He added that this bill go to conference with the Senate's version of the bill. He said that more information would be available next month.

12. Other Business

There was no other business to bring before the TPB.

13. Adjourn

Chair Turner adjourned the TPB meeting at 2:00 p.m.