

**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 28, 2008**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County  
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County  
Muriel Bowser, DC Council  
Colleen Clay, City of Takoma Park  
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County  
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County, DOT  
Brian A. Glenn, FTA  
Don Halligan, MDOT  
Tom Harrington, WMATA  
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Charles Jenkins, Frederick County  
Julia Koster, NCPC  
Bill Lebegern, MWAA  
Timothy Lovain, Alexandria City Council  
Phil Mendelson, DC Council  
Mark Rawlings, DDOT  
Rick Rybeck, DDOT  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
David Snyder, City of Falls Church  
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT  
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT  
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning  
Todd Turner, City of Bowie  
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park  
Christopher Zimmerman, Arlington County

---

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	
Michael Clifford	
Gerald Miller	
Robert Griffiths	
Michael Farrell	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Andrew Austin	
Sarah Crawford	
Beth Newman	
Rex Hodgson	
Dusan Vuksan	
Mark Moran	
William Bacon	
Karin Foster	
Anant Choudhary	
Feng Xie	
Michael Farhoodi	
Stuart Freudberg	COG/DEP
Joan Rohlfs	COG/DEP
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Jeanne Saddler	COG/OPA
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Bill Orleans	PG ACT
Randy Carroll	MDE
Robert Thomson	Washington Post
Matt Greenwald	WMATA
Lewis Miller	COG/OPA
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Tamara Ashby	Arlington County DOT
Sabri Benachour	WAMU

**1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities**

There were no public comments.

---

## **2. Approval of the Minutes of the December 17, 2008 Meeting**

Ms. Smyth moved approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Turner and was approved unanimously.

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

Referring to the handout summary, Mr. Erenrich said the Technical Committee met on January 9 and reviewed a number of items on the TPB agenda.

- Related to Agenda Item 8, the committee reviewed a joint draft letter from the TPB, MWAQC, and the COG Board to EPA on designating Montgomery County and Prince George's County as part of the Baltimore Non-Attainment Area for PM 2.5.
- Related to Agenda Item 9, the committee discussed the stimulus package.
- Related to Agenda Items 10 and 11, the committee discussed air quality conformity for the 2009 CLRP, including the scope of work for the assessment and the major project and schedule changes.
- Related to Agenda Item 12, the committee discussed the household travel survey. The committee expressed interest in a number of aspects of the survey, which will be discussed further in the future.

Mr. Erenrich said the committee discussed a number of issues not on the TPB agenda, including capturing the impact of high fuel prices in travel demand modeling, the 2007 air passenger survey, and the continuation of the "What Would It Take?" and CLRP Aspirations scenarios.

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

Ms. Crawford of TPB staff reported on behalf Mr. Martin, CAC chair, who was unable to attend due to inclement weather. She said that Mr. Martin hoped to be able to present the CAC's end-of-the-year report at the TPB's February meeting.

Ms. Crawford said the committee discussed the scenario study and the federal stimulus package at length. She noted that the TPB's December discussion on the stimulus package had included a reference to the CAC recommendation to develop the scenario study process to support creation of a financially unconstrained transportation plan of regionally prioritized projects for consideration. She said the CAC plans to continue to be involved in scenario planning throughout 2009, particularly the development and implementation of the public outreach component of the study.

---

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

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on January 9. In addition to reviewing the agenda for the TPB meeting, the Steering Committee approved an amendment to the 2009 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to reprogram funds for the WMATA Technical Assistance program to include an evaluation of the Metrobus Priority Corridor Network.

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

Chairman Jenkins thanked the TPB and COG for not raising the FY 2010 COG member dues.

Chairman Jenkins said he intended to maintain the close interest of his predecessor Phil Mendelson in the development of the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) program. He said that as TPB chairman, he will continue to advocate for the full development and implementation of MATOC. He noted that the TPB in November had requested a briefing on MATOC at the meeting on February 18 and he looked forward to that briefing.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **7. Approval of the Appointments to the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee for the Year 2009**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby explained that the procedures for the Citizens Advisory Committee appointments call for the previous year's committee to designate six members -- two from each of Maryland, Virginia, and the District -- for the new year. The remaining nine members are designated by the three offices for the TPB. The chairman of the CAC is nominated by the chairman of the TPB. He said that all those nominees have been identified and included in the mailout item, along with brief biographies and information about each member. He noted that there are some new members and this is a balanced group.

Mr. Rybeck moved approval of the 2009 CAC nominations. The motion was seconded by Mr. Snyder and was approved unanimously.

---

## **8. Approval of TPB Letter to EPA Commenting on the Proposed Inclusion of Montgomery and Prince George's Counties in the Baltimore Nonattainment area for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulates (PM 2.5) Standard**

Referring to the handout material, Ms. Rohlfs described a draft letter to EPA Region 3 commenting on the proposed EPA designation of Montgomery County and Prince George's County as part of the Baltimore non-attainment area for the 2006 daily fine particle standard. She noted that Montgomery County and Prince George's County have been an integral part of air quality planning and transportation planning and transportation conformity in the Washington region since the early 1990s. She said that the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) is opposed to the proposed designation that would put Montgomery and Prince George's Counties into the Baltimore non-attainment area. She summarized the reasons for this opposition, which were described in the draft letter: the proposed designation is based on flawed technical analysis; the Baltimore region is expected to be in attainment of this standard this year; and if the Baltimore region is in attainment, then Montgomery and Prince George's County are probably contributing to improving air quality in Baltimore. She said the draft letter said that the Washington region's air quality planning and transportation planning has improved air quality in the Washington region, and it has improved air quality and reduced the contribution to the Baltimore region as well. In addition, she noted that taking Montgomery County and Prince George's County out of the Washington region would complicate transportation conformity analyses and air quality planning without any associated air quality benefits.

Ms. Rohlfs said the major difference between the letter that was distributed and the one that was mailed out is that the last sentence of the earlier version, which was removed entirely, said that this letter is consistent with Maryland Department of the Environment's recommendation. She said the Maryland Department of Environment's comment letter, which was made available the previous Monday, makes a very strong argument that Baltimore is attaining the standard. That argument is not included in the MWAQC letter. The other argument of the Maryland Department of the Environment is that if EPA looks at areas that contribute to Baltimore's problems, they should look at the entire Washington region. She said that argument would be difficult to dispute, but she did note that the monitors in the Washington region show attainment of this standard, including the monitors in Montgomery and Prince George's counties.

Mr. Rybeck suggested that the second sentence in the second to last paragraph be changed to include the word "deemed" before the words "significant contribution to Baltimore's problems," significance." He said this change would make the letter more consistent with the rest of the letter, which makes the case that the significance is not great.

Ms. Rohlfs urged the letter be approved in the form in which it was presented because it had gone through extensive internal review and would be presented to MWAQC that afternoon. She noted that the deadline for the letter was February 1.

Mr. Rybeck withdrew his request.

---

Noting that his signature was being requested for the letter, Chairman Jenkins said he would like to see the word “significant” removed altogether. He asked whether that change would delay the other two signatures on the letter.

Mr. Kirby said that MWAQC would be meeting immediately after the TPB today. He said the suggestion could be passed on to them to consider removing the word “significant.”

Chairman Jenkins asked if it would be difficult to get Ms. Gross’ signature on the letter with the requested change.

Ms. Rohlfs said the essence of the COG Board's action was to essentially endorse what MWAQC and TPB have approved. She said the revised letter could be faxed to Ms. Gross for her approval. She noted that the letter already included Ms. Gross’ comments.

Mr. Mendelson said he believed the COG Board of Directors and MWAQC would concur with the requested removal of the word “significant.”

Ms. Rohlfs agreed.

Mr. Kirby said that Mr. Robertson, COG Executive Director, had just indicated that he did not believe this change would be objectionable to the COG Board.

Mr. Erenrich moved approval of the draft letter, as revised to remove the word “significant” in the second sentence of the second to last paragraph.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Rybeck and passed unanimously.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **9. Briefing on the Federal Stimulus Package**

Referring to the mailout memorandum and a handout of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Kirby said that the TPB in December had asked staff to respond to three items:

- Staff was asked to write a letter on behalf of the Board to the Congressional Delegation including a number of points, including that the transportation stimulus package must reflect a fair and equitable distribution to metropolitan areas. Mr. Kirby described some of the details of the letter, which was signed by 2008 chairman, Phil Mendelson. A copy of the letter was included in the mailout package.
- The TPB asked the Steering Committee to report back at the January meeting on what process the TPB might use to exert maximum influence over the use of the stimulus

---

funds. Mr. Kirby said that the federal agencies have clarified that current programming processes, including the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), must be followed, unless Congress specifically indicates otherwise. He emphasized that the TIP process is the vehicle for the TPB to exert, at least in a formal fashion, its input on project selection. He said there was an opportunity at the meeting to give guidance to the state DOTs and WMATA about the types of projects that the TPB would like to see in this package when it comes back in February. Mr. Kirby called attention to the points articulated in the TPB's Reauthorization Principles. In addition, Mr. Kirby said that his memo had identified functional program areas that he believed reflected TPB priorities. These priorities have been part of discussions in recent years at TPB, they are in the TPB Vision document, and they are not geographically specific. He briefly described these priorities.

- The TPB asked that the Scenario Task Force suggest new priority projects, not currently included in the Financially Constrained Long-Range Plan, that TPB would want to put forward as high priorities for the region, if the opportunity would arise. Mr. Kirby said that the Scenario Study Task Force had not met since December and staff is not scheduled to complete its current scenario analysis until June or July. However, he said it is important to point out that there is a baseline set of assumptions in those scenarios, not all of which are fully funded at this point. For example, he noted that the CLRP still has a constraint on transit capacity to and through the core. In addition, he noted that several transit projects, not yet included in the CLRP are included in the scenario study. These projects include the Purple Line between Silver Spring and New Carrollton, bus rapid transit on Georgia Avenue, US 1 Transitway in Virginia and an extension of VRE to Haymarket. He suggested that additional funding ought to be focused on meeting those priorities first, particularly the transit capacity constraint.

Mr. Kirby concluded by briefly explaining the funding levels and some of the key requirements of the Senate and House versions of the stimulus legislation. He also described some of the key differences between the two bills.

Mr. Zimmerman asked for information on the status of the Nadler amendment to add transit capital funds and the DeFazio amendment to add transit operating funds to the House Stimulus Bill.

Mr. Lovain responded that the House Rules Committee found the Nadler amendment in order, but not the DeFazio amendment.

Ms. Tregoning noted that Mr. Kirby had mentioned in the report of the Steering Committee that WMATA was going to analyze the 24 regional priority bus routes. She said that the Scenario Study Task Force could have worked on this task had it met, but it did not.

Mr. Lovain described some aspects of the pending legislation, including the discretionary fund in the Senate bill and the tight schedule for final enactment.

---

Chairman Jenkins asked Mr. Glenn or Mr. Kirby to speak about whether the stimulus could include new projects, and how “round two” of the stimulus package might work.

Mr. Glenn described the process for putting together project lists at the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). He indicated that about \$160 million could be allotted to WMATA, given most recently discussed funding levels. He indicated that the Dulles Rail project, which is the only local project in the federal New Starts Program, might also receive stimulus funding. He also noted that VRE is looking to buy additional rail cars, which may be included in the funding. He emphasized that needs are much greater than anticipated funding, so it is extremely important for the region to set priorities.

Ms. Hudgins said that both Phase I and Phase II for the Dulles Rail Project were on the Virginia list. She said it was important that both phases be considered priorities.

Mr. Kirby said that new projects can be added to the TIP through amendment. As long as the projects do not require air quality analysis, the inclusion of such projects would be relatively quick and could be addressed on February 18. Regarding the second round, Mr. Kirby said that this would involve pooling the funds that have not been committed in the current round, and conducting a new round of applications. He said that details of that process will not be known until later.

Mr. Glenn noted that Congress is scheduled to consider the second half of the FY09 appropriations in early March when the current Continuing Resolution is scheduled to expire. He noted that this legislation will be extremely important to local transit agencies.

Referring to Mr. Kirby’s presentation, Mr. Zimmerman asked what a “metropolitan area” means in relationship to the statement that significant funding should go to metropolitan areas.

Mr. Kirby answered that this referred to programs that are already in place at the metropolitan level, including the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Management/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. He noted that these funds in Northern Virginia are allocated through the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA).

Mr. Zimmerman said he understood that this would not necessarily mean the funding would go to the MPO.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct. In the Washington metropolitan region, there are three pots of STP funds. All the funds end up within the region, but they are broken up by state.

Mr. Zimmerman pointed out that the stimulus projects are supposed to be new, but on the other hand they need to be obligated in a very short period of time. He said that with the availability of stimulus funding, new projects will have to be put in the plan very quickly in order to be able to



---

use the funding. He said it seems there will be a very narrow window in which this can be accomplished.

Mr. Kirby noted that there are a lot of maintenance and rehabilitation projects that are ideal candidates for this kind of funding. As to coming in with a brand-new project, he said that he did not think it would be possible in this time-frame.

Mr. Lovain noted that the House bill requires the governors to certify that they are not substituting the stimulus money for state money, but there is not an enforcement mechanism in the bill. Money being fungible as it is, he said there probably will be some substitution.

Mr. Kirby asked if the state DOTs could speak about their plans for the stimulus funds.

Chairman Jenkins said he understood that Maryland would be using the funds for deferred projects. He asked Mr. Halligan to further explain.

Referring to a handout memorandum, Mr. Halligan said that Maryland's capital program has a \$2.1 billion shortfall this year. He said the stimulus will provide some backfill and the federal legislation is emphasizing that projects must be implemented quickly. Other important requirements include preserving and creating jobs. Consistent with Mr. Kirby's presentation, he said that MDOT understands that the funding will be provided through regular formula distributions. He said this means projects must meet federal-aid eligibility requirements. He said MDOT has received a number of project requests from local jurisdictions and many of those would not meet those federal eligibility requirements. He said that Maryland's focus is going to be on the diverse mix of system preservation and maintenance projects for both highways and transit. He also noted that it was important to have an equitable distribution around the state. He said a detailed list should be released in the next few days.

Ms. Sorenson said that VDOT would wait on determining how to use the funds until the federal legislation is finalized. She said there is more than \$2 billion worth of projects in Virginia that are already delayed. She said they have lists of projects from virtually every jurisdiction. Considering the need to use the money quickly, she said the most likely projects would be bridge and highway maintenance projects.

Mr. Rybeck said the City Administrator has been compiling a list of potential projects that have been identified by several District agencies, including but not limited to the District Department of Transportation. He said that until the legislation is finalized it would be premature to speculate about which projects may ultimately be eligible.

Referring to a handout summary, Mr. Harrington described WMATA's preparation for stimulus funding. He said a basic criterion used to the prepare the list was whether a project could be obligated within 90 days of federal funding being made available. He said the agency would be going through a process of prioritizing the list of about \$530 million in projects. He described the

---

kinds of projects on the list. In order to meet the tight schedule, he said the list would have to be taken to the WMATA Board in February and then brought to the TPB for inclusion in a TIP amendment in February.

Mr. Lovain asked how funds would be shared with local bus systems.

Mr. Harrington said the funding would come through the normal formula and be shared accordingly.

Vice Chairman Snyder said it is the obligation of the Board to look beyond the immediate circumstances. He moved two points:

- 1) The Board should reiterate to the region's Congressional delegation the importance of the 35 percent apportionment to metropolitan areas. He said it did not currently appear that percentage would be provided in the legislation.
- 2) The Board should adopt the criteria presented by Mr. Kirby in the fourth slide of his presentation.

He emphasized the issue was not just the immediate creation of jobs. The country also needs to lay the groundwork for sustained job growth in the future by supporting innovation and business, and moving people and freight.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Zimmerman.

Regarding the second point in Mr. Snyder's motion, Mr. Turner asked if the TPB would reject projects that do not fall within those criteria.

Vice Chairman Snyder said the criteria should be considered guidance. He said it would be up to the Board, ultimately, to agree to the particular lists that it receives.

Chairman Jenkins said he concurred wholeheartedly with the motion.

Mr. Halligan asked if the target of 35 percent for metropolitan areas would be applied as a general rule across a state, or would it specifically mean 35 percent for Metropolitan Washington.

Mr. Kirby explained that intent of the point in December was to get 35 percent for metropolitan areas, as opposed to non-metropolitan areas. He said that in the current House bill 25 percent of the total for roads and bridges has to go through this sub-allocation. On the transit side, he said that 60 percent or more that goes through the formula program. So when taken together, the 35 percent is accomplished.

---

Mr. Lovain said the Senate bill is calling for 40 percent of the highway funds to go through the sub-allocation process. He said he believed that both bills are generally responsive to pressure from the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations and others in providing a necessary share to metropolitan areas.

Ms. Tregoning asked to amend the motion to include a request to the Scenarios Task Force to meet and redouble their efforts to identify one or more regional projects that could be included in the February or subsequent TIP amendments.

Vice Chairman Snyder agreed to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment was added to the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Kirby said he understood that as a rule of thumb the total amount of money in the stimulus is roughly the equivalent of one year of funding for highway and transit. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Glenn answered it was a little more for transit.

Mr. Kirby noted that this level of funding would more than double the money that would be available this year. He noted that Ms. Sorenson had indicated that Virginia has estimated that \$800 million would be made available. He asked if Mr. Halligan had information on funding that would be made available to Maryland.

Mr. Halligan said they were anticipating roughly \$600 to \$700 million.

Mr. Kirby noted that Mr. Glenn had indicated that \$275 million would be available for Metro. He said that he understood that the District of Columbia anticipates \$120 million. He asked Mr. Rybeck if this was correct.

Mr. Rybeck said that figure was probably just partial.

Mr. Kirby said that staff would be adding up the totals as the legislation proceeds.

## **10. Briefing on Draft Scope of Work for Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2009 Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) and FY 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Posey briefed the Board on the draft scope of work for the air quality conformity analysis of the 2009 CLRP and the fiscal year 2010-2015 TIP. She said

---

the scope was identical to the material presented at the December meeting. She said the scope and the project inputs were released for public comment at the Citizens Advisory Committee meeting on January 15. The public comment period would end on February 14. The TPB would be asked to approve the scope and the project inputs at its February meeting. She noted that staff was still expecting comments from the Virginia and Maryland Departments of Transportation regarding the assumptions for changes in HOV requirements and from WMATA regarding the transit capacity constraint.

### **11. Briefing on Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2009 CLRP and FY 2010-2015 TIP**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby briefed the Board on the significant changes that have been received from the implementing agencies for the CLRP and TIP update cycle. The changes were released at the CAC meeting for public comment. He said the public comment period would end on February 14. The Board would be asked to approve these inputs on February 18 so that the air quality analysis may begin.

Mr. Kirby said that the project list mostly indicates that projects are being delayed. He said there were no new projects this year, which is a reflection of revenue shortfalls at the state and local levels.

Mr. Lebegern asked that the access highway widening on page B-34 be delayed to 2017.

Mr. Mendelson asked if the DOTs could be asked to provide an update on how they are implementing traffic signal optimization.

Mr. Kirby said that staff could provide that information. He noted that an update on all the Transportation Emission Reductions Measures (TERMs) would be available in June, which might be an appropriate time for the signal optimization information.

Mr. Mendelson said he would like to see the development of some sort of verification process. He noted that several years ago, the DOTs had committed to signal optimization and he was concerned that some of those commitments might have slipped.

Mr. Kirby said a report on implementation could be developed.

Mr. Mendelson said he would like to get beyond a just reporting process and develop a verification process.

Mr. Kirby said that staff could provide a status report next month.

---

Mr. Mendelson said he was also interested in whether it would be appropriate to have a report on MATOC.

Mr. Kirby said a report on MATOC was already scheduled for the February meeting.

Mr. Mendelson asked that the report include information on the pre-inauguration gridlock.

Mr. Kirby said the report would include everything in which MATOC was involved. He said he was not sure how much MATOC was involved in the pre-inaugural activities, but staff would try to make the report as comprehensive as possible.

Mr. Snyder noted that the TPB had asked the DOTs to fund MATOC as part of their stimulus packages. He said that at the appropriate time that needs to be reiterated.

Mr. Kirby said he thought the question of funding for MATOC was being addressed, but staff would be sure to include it in the February briefing.

## **12. Briefing on Initial Results from the Regional Household Travel Survey**

Referring to the handout material, Mr. Griffiths briefed the Board on the methodology used in the Household Travel Survey and some initial results. In concluding, he noted that this presentation only covers the basic analysis. He said that staff has the ability to “drill down” with the data and look at smaller geographic areas and more specific aspects of travel patterns. He said that staff will also be looking at demographic changes in the region and how they are impacting daily travel. He said he would return with more information at the next TPB meeting.

Mr. Halligan asked if Mr. Griffiths had the chance to look at previous surveys and compare macro trends.

Mr. Griffiths said from the broad-brush analysis done to date, two trends can be identified: an increase in transit use throughout the region in most jurisdictions and a precipitous decline in car and vanpooling. He said that the decline in carpooling seems to be linked to telecommuting and flexible work schedules in which it becomes more difficult to maintain carpooling arrangements.

Ms. Smyth said her household participated in the survey and she had some experiences to share. She said that when they first received a postcard about the survey, her husband called and the survey firm said they were not ready and they would call back. When they got the trip diary to fill out, it was during the July 4<sup>th</sup> holiday week, which had abnormal traffic conditions. She also noted that most trips are part of trip chains; for example, stopping at the grocery store on the way home from work. She was concerned that these trips were not appropriately counted. Finally, she said that she typically walks to work, but she was concerned that the survey firm was not prepared to accept that as a form of commute.

---

Mr. Griffiths said that staff listened in on some of the interviews. He said the interviewers had to be trained to be sure they were counting transit commutes correctly. He also said that staff was aware of the challenge of counting trips that are linked.

Mr. Zimmerman said he was interested in the demographics for the sample.

Mr. Griffiths said that would be provided later.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if bicycle trips were counted.

Mr. Griffiths said they were. He said bike trips were roughly one-half of one percent.

Mr. Zimmerman said this figure seemed lower than he had seen in other surveys. He said this could be due to the fact that the survey is region-wide, including the outer suburbs, but he said he was also concerned about the representative nature of the survey, especially given Ms. Smith's comments. He said it would be important for the Board to be able to disaggregate the data.

Mr. Griffiths said staff has made an effort to capture bike trips. He said that in future presentations he can provide numbers on bike-only trips as well as bike-to-transit trips.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if commuter rail trips were captured.

Mr. Griffiths said they were.

Mr. Zimmerman commented that the survey data is already a year and a half old in some cases. He noted that it does not reflect increased transit use since the gasoline price increases of last summer.

Ms. Tregoning asked if it would be helpful to staff if members of Board would generate questions regarding the specific kinds of data they would like to see.

Mr. Kirby said staff would be pleased to receive and respond to such questions as the data are presented to the Board over the coming months.

### **13. Review of Outline and Preliminary Budget for FY 2010 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)**

Mr. Kirby said that an outline for the FY2010 work program was in the mailout to the Board. He said it was a flat-line budget, consistent with expectations for funding. He said staff would return next month with a full draft narrative of the work program. The TPB would be asked to approve the FY 2010 work program in March.

---

**14. Other Business**

There was no other business.

**15. Adjourn**

Chairman Jenkins adjourned the meeting at 11:55 a.m.