

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
January 18, 2006**

Members and Alternates Present

Stan Alster, City of Gaithersburg
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Rick Canizales, Prince William County
Wally Covington, Prince William County
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Andrew M. Fellows, City of College Park
Ludwig P. Gaines, City of Alexandria
Brian A. Glenn, Federal Transit Administration
Charles Graves, III, DC Office of Planning
J. Rick Gordon, Prince George's County
Jason Groth, Charles County
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council
Julia Koster, NCPC
Bill Lebegern, Metro Washington Airports Authority
Phil Mendelson, D.C. Council
Dennis Morrison, VDOT
David Moss, Montgomery County
Edith J. Patterson, Charles County
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT
Bruce L. Reeder, Frederick County
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Arthur J. Smith, Loudoun County
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax

Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County Board

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Gerald Miller	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Jim Hogan	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Deborah Etheridge	COG/DTP
Michael Farrell	COG/DTP
Mark Moran	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
Jill Locantore	COG/DTP
Andrew Austin	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Lee Ruck	COG/LEG
Joan Rohlfis	COG/DEP
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Paul DesJardin	COG/HSPPS
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Faramarz Mokhtari	Prince George's-MNCPPC
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Lee Schoenecker	TPB/CAC
Bob Chase	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Harry Sanders	Action Committee for Transit
Deborah Burns	Federal Transit Administration
Randy Carroll	MDE
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Bob Grow	Greater Washington Board of Trade
Jim Wamsley	Sierra Club
Robert P. Morgan	Arlington
Jeff Price	Arlington County DOT
Mike Lake	Fairfax County Department of Transportation
Audrey Clement	Green Party VA
Roger Diedrich	Fairfax resident
Alex Dewar	Wheaton College
Douglas Stewart	Sierra Club

Bill Orleans	Prince George's Act
Betsy Massie	PRTC
James M. Cheeks, Jr.	Grice & Associates
Allen Muchnick	TPB/CAC

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Ms. Clement said she opposed the study of spot improvements on I-66 inside the Beltway. She said that spot improvements on I-66 are a step toward adding a third lane. She expressed concerns about a number of comments made by officials in Northern Virginia, including comments made by Margaret Vanderhuy, the Governor's appointee to the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVRTA). Copies of her remarks were distributed for the record.

Robert Morgan said he opposed the study of spot improvements on I-66 inside the Beltway. He said the spot improvements that are to be studied include preliminary engineering work and amount to de facto widening. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Allen Muchnick, President of the Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation, said his organization continues to protest VDOT's proposed I-66 spot improvements study. Instead he said the I-66 study should be continued with a more comprehensive scope. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Jason Rylander, Arlington Transportation Commission, said he opposed the study of spot improvements on I-66 inside the Beltway. He said the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) had failed to adequately study all the alternatives for I-66.

Roger Dietrich said he opposed the study of spot improvements on I-66 inside the Beltway. He said that study funds should be used to examine other alternatives, such as HOV-3, HOV-4 and HOT lanes.

Peter Harnick said he opposed the study of spot improvements on I-66 inside the Beltway. He noted that a number of people had spoken about I-66 at the last TPB meeting, but there was not any mention of these comments in the *TPB News* newsletter. He said there was a feeling among the citizenry that the TPB is not listening to them. He said that VDOT needs to rethink the whole process for the I-66 study so that it focuses on moving people, not cars.

Harry Sanders, Action Committee for Transit, spoke about the TPB's Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. He expressed concern that the study's findings are released too late to affect decision making for the Constrained Long-Range Plan. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Vice Chairman Pourciau said that Mr. Sanders had a good point. She said that staff might be asked to use the scenarios to help determine which potential transportation investments should be considered priorities.

Bob Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, spoke about the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. He said that in six years of study, the scenarios have only demonstrated marginal improvements. He said that significant road and bridge capacity expansions should be studied. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Douglas Stewart, Sierra Club, urged the TPB to significantly amend the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendments proposed by VDOT for the study of I-66. He said the Sierra Club endorses the effort by Arlington County to require consideration of alternatives other than widening. As a private citizen, he expressed support for the proposed TPB request to WMATA for a designated point person for bicycle and pedestrian access at transit stations.

Mr. Zimmerman thanked the people who made comments, particularly the statements regarding I-66, which he said provided good summaries of the issue. Responding to Mr. Harnick's comment that the TPB was not listening, he said he did believe the TPB was listening. However, he agreed that TPB publications should reflect what went on at the meetings, including public comments.

Mr. Zimmerman said he wanted to clarify a public comment regarding a statement made by Margaret E. G. Vanderhye at a recent meeting of the NVTA. Mr. Zimmerman said a speaker had quoted Ms. Vanderhye as saying public opinion was "all over the map" regarding I-66, when in fact, Mr. Zimmerman said, Ms. Vanderhye had said that public opinion was "all over the map" on the whole range transportation issues.

2. Approval of Minutes of December 21, 2005 Meeting

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

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Mr. Canizales said the Technical Committee met on Friday, January 6 at COG. Three items were reviewed for inclusion on the TPB agenda on January 18.

- Related to TPB agenda Item 11, the Committee was briefed on new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) guidance on the Phase 2 State Implementation Plan (SIP) requirements for the 8-hour ozone standard and proposed PM2.5 SIP guidance. It was also

briefed on related Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) planning activities and schedule, and implications for future TPB air quality conformity assessments.

- Related to TPB agenda Item 14, the Committee was briefed on efforts to develop more effective and timely information on the Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and on enhanced public outreach activities including new ways to engage community leaders and those traditionally not involved in the planning process.
- Related to TPB agenda Item 15, staff briefed the Committee on the work activities and preliminary budget for the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY 2007 (July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007). The Committee will review the complete draft of the FY 2007 UPWP in February. The final version is scheduled for the Board's approval at its March 15 meeting.

Three items were presented for information and discussion:

- The Committee was briefed on the implications of recent US DOT Fiscal Constraint Guidance for the submissions for the 2006 CLRP and FY 2007-2012 TIP.
- Staff briefed the Committee on the changes between 2002 and 2005 in peak-period congestion on the freeway system in the Washington region.
- A consultant briefed the Committee on the draft results of the 2003 -2005 evaluation of the Commuter Connections Transportation Emissions Reduction Measures (TERMs).

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Jaffe said the Citizens Advisory Committee met on January 12. It was the last meeting of the 2005 CAC.

Mr. Jaffe said the CAC discussed the need for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) to improve coordination with respect to pedestrian access. Nat Bottighmeimer of the WMATA staff came to the CAC and made a well-received presentation on WMATA's station access program. Mr. Jaffe said the CAC was pleased that the TPB will be considering the draft letter under Item 8 that would urge WMATA to establish a dedicated pedestrian/bicycle staff position.

Mr. Jaffe said the CAC approved a report titled "Recommendations on Improving Information and Analysis for the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)." Mr. Jaffe emphasized the importance of providing information and hosting public meetings that provide citizens a real opportunity to have an impact on decisions.

Mr. Jaffe said this would be his last meeting as chairman and that he would be leaving the CAC. He called attention to a report that listed the committee's accomplishments, including providing input on the CapCom project, WMATA funding issues, and the need for improved pedestrian/bicycle coordination at WMATA.

Chairman Knapp thanked Mr. Jaffe for his service.

Referring to a handout report, Steve Caflisch, CAC member, presented the CAC "Recommendations on Improving Information and Analysis for the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)." The recommendations were grouped into three broad categories: information improvements, analysis improvements and process improvements.

Ms. Porter thanked the CAC for giving this very useful advice. She said she was also pleased that the committee has developed a good working relationship with the staff and that there has been some good cross-fertilization of ideas. She asked that the recommendations be put on the TPB agenda for follow-up discussion.

Chairman Knapp said he was going to make the same recommendation.

Ms. Pourciau asked if the CAC believed the committee needs bylaws or some type of enhanced organizational structure. She noted that some members had spoken to her about organizational concerns, including the role of alternate members on the CAC.

Mr. Jaffe thanked Ms. Porter for her support of further discussion of the recommendations presented by Mr. Caflisch. In response to Ms. Pourciau's question, he said the appointment of alternates is a good way to get people acquainted with the CAC and to become potential candidates for full membership. He also said that the TPB should more aggressively attempt to recruit new members and increase participation in the committee.

Chairman Knapp said he appreciated the suggestion to get the recommendations on a future agenda. He said the time commitment of the CAC, as a group of volunteers, is very significant, and the committee's perspective is very useful.

5. Report of the Steering Committee

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee acted on one item dealing with functional classification changes on highways in Frederick and Prince George's counties.

Referring to the “Letters Sent/Received” packet, Mr. Kirby called attention to a letter from the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration informing the Board of the federal approval of last year’s Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) update, the FY2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and associated conformity findings.

Mr. Kirby also said the mailout packet included a sample letter from the TPB that is being sent to the region’s state legislators regarding the region’s transportation funding concerns.

6. Chairman’s Remarks

Chairman Knapp said that four new members/alternates were in attendance: Edith Patterson from Charles County; Jason Groth the alternate member from Charles County; Charles Graves alternate member from the D.C. Office of Planning, and Nat Bottigheimer from the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA). He welcomed the new members to the TPB.

7. Approval of Appointments to the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) for the Year 2006

A motion was made to approve the list of CAC nominees that was distributed as a handout. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

8. Approval of Letter to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) Suggesting Designation of a Point Person for Pedestrian and Bicycle Access

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said that, pursuant to the Board’s direction at the December 21 meeting, staff had drafted a letter from the TPB to WMATA with the suggestion that WMATA appoint a designated point person for bicycle and pedestrian access. He said this issue had been discussed by the TPB and WMATA staffs, and with the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC).

A motion was made to approve the letter. The motion was seconded.

Vice Chairman Hudgins said the recommendations of the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) regarding this issue were very helpful. She said she felt confident that this issue could be addressed in a constructive manner.

Mr. Zimmerman said that WMATA previously had a pedestrian/bicycle coordinator, and he had been unaware that this person was not replaced. He said this issue is something that a lot of leaders

involved with WMATA would like to see addressed.

Vice Chairman Hudgins agreed with Mr. Zimmerman. She said it was important to develop a sensitivity to pedestrian and bicycle needs throughout WMATA.

Mr. Bottigheimer said that he made a presentation to the CAC the previous week regarding WMATA's Station Access Program. He said this program will provide an opportunity to determine the scope of duties for a pedestrian/bicycle point person and to determine where such a position should be located within the organization.

Chairman Knapp said it is important to designate a point person, but he cautioned that this designation should not reduce the need for everyone in the organization to be sensitive to pedestrian and bicycle concerns.

The motion was approved unanimously.

9. Approval of a Resolution on Amendments to the FY 2005-2010 and FY 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) that are Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Add Funding to the Idea 66 Study as Requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Sorenson said the I-66 Inside the Beltway Feasibility Study, called "Idea 66," had two broad recommendations. One was to study and to implement some spot improvements that were basically safety and evacuation oriented. The second recommendation was to conduct a long-term study to look at a variety of improvements, including rail transit, HOV lanes, HOT lanes, transportation demand management (TDM), road improvements, and others. She said the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) looked at these recommendations as two separate items and it acted on the spot improvements, but has not yet initiated the major study.

Ms. Sorenson said the TIP amendment was approved by the Steering Committee, but later, at the TPB meeting, concerns were raised about the project and the fact that the Steering Committee had approved it. Therefore, the TIP amendment was deferred until January. Subsequent to that meeting, she said that VDOT worked to address those concerns.

Ms. Sorenson said that at the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) meeting on January 12, Mr. Zimmerman offered some written suggestions and after extensive discussion and wordsmithing, the outcome of those suggestions have been incorporated into the revised resolution that was handed out the TPB. Ms. Sorenson called attention to the six points of clarification that were approved by NVTA and referenced in the revised resolution. She read the six points.

Ms. Sorenson moved approval of TPB Resolution R11-2006, as revised, to amend the FY2005-

2010 and FY2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) to add funding to the Idea 66 study, as requested by VDOT. She noted that the amendments were exempt from air quality conformity requirements.

Mr. Wren seconded the motion.

Mr. Zimmerman asked that the six points of clarification from NVTA be incorporated directly into the body of the resolution.

Ms. Sorenson said it did not make a difference to her. She said she understood that the reference to the attachment containing the six points was as good as having them in the body of the resolution.

Mr. Zimmerman said he was simply concerned that in the future, the resolution could be stuck in a file and the attachment could be detached and lost.

Without objection, the motion was amended to include the six points from NVTA directly in the body of the resolution.

Mr. Zimmerman said he would like to see the TPB action affirm the need for a multi-modal examination of I-66. He said such an examination was recommended by Idea 66.

Vice Chairman Hudgins noted that the need for a multi-modal study was included in the last paragraph of the NVTA letter to the TPB. She said this paragraph should be separated out in a separate motion that would direct that the multi-modal study be done.

Chairman Knapp asked if VDOT objected to a separate motion as part of the resolution.

Ms. Sorenson said that VDOT would not object as long as it is not considered part of the TIP amendment. She said VDOT wanted to keep the TIP amendment and the longer-term study as separate items. She said VDOT wanted to move forward on the TIP amendment and noted that the longer-term study was not yet funded.

Vice Chairman Hudgins said the language from the letter should be included in the resolution as stated, with no intention of changing the TIP amendment.

Chairman Knapp clarified that the resolution, R11-2006, would be amended to include the paragraph from the NVTA letter beginning with the words "Separate from the action on this TIP amendment..."

Ms. Smyth asked that the resolution also include the short following paragraph from the NVTA letter beginning with the words: "As part of the multi-modal environmental document..."

Based on these motions, the resolution was amended to include the following language:

“Separate from the action on this TIP amendment, at its January 12, 2006, meeting, NVTAs asked that funding be sought for a long-range multimodal environmental document that will address the public transportation needs for the I-66 Multimodal Corridor. This document will include a comprehensive and objective evaluation of long-term public transportation needs in the I-66 multimodal corridor. Most importantly, analysis must address any potential conflicts between the proposed improvements and the planned extension of Metrorail to Tysons Corner. This evaluation should also address the ability to accommodate third and fourth Metrorail tracks in the median of I-66 inside the Beltway, should they be required for express service for the planned 23-mile Dulles Rail Extension into Loudoun County, or for the planned Orange Line extension to Centreville or Gainesville, or to maintain adequate Metrorail capacity within Arlington County.

As part of the multimodal environmental document, VDOT should study value pricing and relatively low-cost traffic-operation, solutions such as provision of express bus service and HOV-3.”

Vice Chairman Pourciau thanked VDOT for the clarifying information they provided. She said she looked forward to the results of the study.

Ms. Jackson asked why two TIPs were being amended. She said that only one TIP can be in effect at a time.

Mr. Kirby explained that the TIPs approved by the TPB must go to the state level to be incorporated and approved at that level. He said that even though the FY 2006-2011 TIP has been approved by the TPB, it has not yet been incorporated into the state TIPs. So the previous TIP has to be amended so that the funding can be activated immediately.

Ms. Sorenson confirmed that was correct.

The motion was approved with one “no” vote by Mr. Zimmerman.

Mr. Zimmerman explained why he voted no. He thanked his colleagues for making improvements in the resolution that he considered sensible. But he said it was important for people to understand what is involved in the spot improvement proposal. He said the statements made during the public comment period were entirely accurate, namely this is an effort to segment the I-66 widening project so that something that would be very difficult to get through the usual process can be accomplished, piece by piece. He said the cost of the widening project would be somewhere between \$112 million and \$230 million. He said it is so expensive because there are a number of choke points, including tunnels, which would be very hard to widen.

Mr. Zimmerman referred to a map that he asked to have projected on the overhead screen. He said the spot improvements would look at widening the easy parts, but leave out the expensive parts. He said the intention of the spot improvements study was to start with the less expensive portions of the widening and try to make it inevitable that the additional funding – possibly as much as \$150 million or \$200 million – would be identified to complete the widening. He said the reason that I-66 has not been widened is not because the people of Arlington oppose it; rather it has not happened because it is a very expensive project. He said if it were ranked with other expensive projects in the region, it would not score very high. But he said it has been very easy in a political context to say that the reason I-66 has not been widened is because of the people of Arlington are standing in the way.

10. Update on Activities to Identify Dedicated Funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)

Chairman Knapp said that for the last two months, the TPB has discussed ongoing efforts to identify dedicated funding for WMATA. He said that the previous week the Board of Directors of the Council of Governments had decided to conduct a weekly regional conference call among any number of parties, civic organizations, business organizations, and regional advocacy and outreach organizations for the purpose of trying to further the efforts of last year's study on WMATA funding and to try to ensure there is some regional point of coordination on this issue. He said the first conversation took place the previous day and included 12 to 14 participants.

Mr. Zimmerman reported that legislation has been introduced in the Virginia House and Senate, which is consistent with the funding proposals agreed upon by the Northern Virginia jurisdictions. He said that Dana Kauffman, Fairfax County Supervisor and WMATA board chair, had spoken to the Virginia delegation and was well received. He said that the local jurisdictions have emphasized that the legislature was not being asked to levy new taxes, but to give the local jurisdictions the authority to do what has to be done to fund Metro.

Chairman Knapp added that similar conversations are occurring in the Maryland legislature. He said he was hopeful that legislation on this issue would be introduced in the coming weeks.

Mr. Mendelson said that legislation has been introduced in the Council of the District of Columbia. He said the bill, which has a majority of council members as co-introducers or co-sponsors, was scheduled for a hearing in the coming weeks. He said the legislation would set aside revenue from the equivalent of a half percent of the existing sales tax and dedicate that to Metro.

11. Briefing on the EPA Final Rule to Implement the Eight-Hour Ozone Standard and Proposed Rule to Implement the Fine Particles Standards

Referring to the mailout and handout materials, Ms. Rohlf's briefed the Board on the EPA final rule to implement the eight-hour ozone standard and the Proposed Rule to implement the fine particles standards.

She said the Washington region was designated as moderate nonattainment for the eight-hour ozone standard. The designation was effective in June of 2004 and the attainment deadline is June 2010. The region's air quality plan (State Implementation Plan or SIP) is due June 2007. She said there are three major requirements. First, the new rule requires the establishment of a 2002 baseline emissions inventory, which must be submitted by June of 2006. Second, the rule has a reasonable further progress requirement, which analyzes how the region is doing compared to that baseline of 2002. Third, there is a modeling and attainment demonstration requirement. She said the attainment demonstration has to show that the region will meet the standard by September 2009, since the rule requires the region to have one ozone season that meets that standard prior to the deadline of June 2010. She said this means that all of the control measures that are adopted must be in place by May of 2009. She described the requirements of the "Reasonable Further Progress Plan," which must show a 15 percent reduction in emissions between 2002 and 2008.

Ms. Rohlf's said there is also a requirement for reasonably available control measures, which requires consideration of whether potential measures, in combination with other measures, would help the region meet the standard a year earlier than is required.

Ms. Rohlf's also described the proposed rule for fine particles (PM_{2.5}). She said the attainment date for this is 2010, the same as for ozone. She said the SIP is due in April 2008, a year later than the ozone SIP. She said this SIP must look at additional pollutants that have not been looked at before.

Ms. Rohlf's said that by June of this year, the following must be completed for the ozone SIP: an inventory for the base year 2002; a reasonable further progress plan; and an attainment demonstration. She said that a SIP is expected to be ready for public hearing in late summer. The Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) is expected to approve the SIP in late fall or early winter. MWAQC would then submit the SIP to the Interstate Air Quality Council (IAQC) and then the states would submit the SIP to EPA.

Ms. Rohlf's described the implications for the Transportation Planning Work Program. For the eight-hour ozone SIP, the transportation network and analysis and the travel demand forecasting has to look at three years, 2002, 2008 and 2009. Mobile emissions inventories need to be constructed for these years, plus certain controlled and uncontrolled scenarios. She said that transportation control measures (TCM) analyses must be conducted and then the air quality conformity emissions budgets must be established.

Regarding fine particles, Ms. Rohlf's said that additional possible pollutants must be analyzed and

an emissions inventory constructed for the base year of 2002 and for future years. Air quality conformity emissions budgets will need to be established and a air quality conformity analysis must be conducted.

Mr. Fellows asked for examples of some transportation control measures that might be considered.

Ms. Rohlfs said that typically new control measures are not considered unless there is a need arising from the conformity analysis. If they are needed, the TPB would go through a process of determining funding and establishing priorities.

Mr. Fellows said that based upon the graph that Ms. Rohlfs distributed, it appeared that control measures would be needed.

Ms. Rohlfs said that the first measure that would be considered is power plant reductions, which can be very large. They will also look at controlling boilers and other industrial sources. She said there is a range of control measures that will be recommended by the Ozone Transport Commission and adopted across the mid-Atlantic area, but they would probably not be transportation measures.

Mr. Kirby said that it was important to consider what transportation measures might still be “low-hanging fruit,” i.e., what measures in the transportation sector could be still implemented to produce significant emissions reductions fairly quickly. He said that retrofitting large diesel vehicles might yield substantial reductions. He noted that Fairfax County had worked to retrofit school buses. He said the TPB and MWAQC staffs were also looking at non-road transportation construction equipment. A new provision in the SAFETEA-LU legislation makes diesel retrofits for this equipment eligible for federal Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funding.

12. Report on Regional Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Campaign

Referring to the handout and mailout material, Mr. Farrell briefed the Board on Street Smart, the regional pedestrian and bicycle safety campaign. He described the most recent media campaign in June 2005, coordination efforts with law enforcement, and the evaluation of the campaign’s effectiveness. He also described expected 2006 funding levels and plans for campaign activities in 2006. He noted that TPB members had asked the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee to consider having multiple kick-off events for this year’s campaign. He said the media consultant for the campaign had advised that having multiple events would cost significantly more and probably result in less press coverage than holding one event. He said that promoting three events would cost approximately \$30,000, as opposed to \$10,000 for a single event.

Mr. Farrell said that in 2007, the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee would like to explore the possibility of corporate sponsorships. He also suggested that the TPB consider soliciting funds for

the 2007 campaign in February of 2006 in order to give the funding agencies more lead time to plan their contributions and fit them into their budgeting process.

Mr. Zimmerman said he wanted to reiterate some concerns that he raised several times last year. He said this campaign is a very good effort, and by its nature this is something that should be done on a regional level. But he said that public information campaigns require a certain level of resources or they are not worth the money that is spent. He said he did not think enough money had ever been put into this campaign to maximize its effectiveness. He said he was concerned that the amount of funding put into the campaign this year has actually gone down since the original campaign. He said he was also concerned about the uneven level of support for the campaign. He recalled that the first time the campaign was launched, Montgomery County elected officials played a leadership role in getting it started. In contrast, he noted that 75 percent of the local money for this program over the last several years comes from Virginia. He said that if the Maryland localities and the state of Maryland do not think this campaign is worth funding, then the TPB ought to know that.

Chairman Knapp said he agreed that local jurisdictions need to act as a region and make the commitment to this program. He said it would be helpful if the request for funding would come in February so that it could get into Montgomery County's budget cycle.

Mr. Gaines said he wanted to echo the comments of Mr. Zimmerman. He said that last year he had asked that evaluation measures be used to determine if the program is having an impact, and he said he was pleased that this year, the evaluation seems to indicate that it is having a positive impact. On behalf of Alexandria, he said it is a pleasure to participate in this program. He said the city was particularly proud to be hosting this year's kickoff event. He said the site chosen for the kickoff is close to the Patent and Trademark's new offices, which is the largest federal campus in the country.

Mr. Jaffe said that he agreed with the comments of Mr. Zimmerman. However, he said he was concerned about the decision to only have one media event. He said he did not understand how \$10,000 could be spent in one day for free media, and he said that it was even more difficult to understand why three media events in the same day would cost \$30,000.

Ms. Porter said she had the same concern about the media events. She said that at the last kick-off event, the media was not interested in the press conference itself, but they were interested in the law enforcement effort that was going on. She suggested the media outreach should be more creative than simply promoting officials talking at a press conference.

Chairman Knapp said he agreed. He suggested that it was important for the media outreach to include different parts of the region, whether that meant doing separate kick-off events around the region or doing periodic events in different places throughout the month. He also said that the cost of \$30,000 for three events seemed too high. He asked Mr. Farrell to return to the Board in

February with some different proposals.

Mr. Farrell said that a possible wrap-up event was being discussed. He again emphasized the fact that this is a single media market and it is difficult to tell the same story three times.

Chairman Knapp noted that there are also local media outlets, and there are many ways to get the message out.

13. Review of Results of Five Alternative Transportation and Land Use Scenarios Analyzed to Date Under the TPB Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study

Mr. Kirby noted that prior to the Board meeting there had been a work session on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study. He said that a lot of useful comments were made. He said that the next step in the study would be to do a variably priced lane scenario for the remainder of this fiscal year and then move into putting some combination scenarios together next year. He said that staff welcomed suggestions on how to communicate the results of this work and make it useful. Mr. Kirby said that at the morning work session several participants had warned about the need to be realistic about what is involved in accomplishing some of the land use and transit proposals that have been examined.

Chairman Knapp said that it was important to think about how the work of the TPB can be packaged and presented to the public. He said it was important to get out the message that people are thinking about how the region is going to grow and how to incorporate land use, transportation funding, and a variety of other factors. He said that one of the reasons he wanted to put off the discussion on CLRP information (Item 14) was that he wanted to have a fuller discussion on how the TPB's broader messages might be communicated.

14. Briefing on Improving CLRP Information and Proposed Public Involvement Activities

This item was deferred until February.

15. Review of Outline and Preliminary Budget for FY 2007 UPWP

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said the work program for FY 2007, which will begin July 1 of 2006, is now being developed. He noted that one of the major items this next year will be to conduct a new household travel survey throughout the region with a sample of 10,000 households. He said that next month a detailed first draft of the complete work program will be

presented to the Board and that the Board will be asked to approve the work program at its March 15 meeting.

16. Other Business

Chairman Knapp called attention to the handout flyer that described how to sign up to receive TPB agenda material electronically.

Mr. Fellows asked that a future agenda include an item regarding recent COG actions regarding trash in streams as it relates to storm water and highways. He asked if Mr. Kirby would talk with COG staff to see if it would be appropriate for the TPB to have an action item on this issue.

Vice Chairman Pourciau noted that the CAC had not conducted a scenario forum in the District of Columbia. She said she had been talking to her counterpart from the Office of Planning and she said they would like to coordinate a forum in D.C. that would include the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee.

17. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:59 p.m.