

**METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
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**

**May 16, 2012**

Members and Alternates Present

Monica Backmon, Prince William County  
Melissa Barlow, FTA  
Andrew Beacher, Loudoun County  
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA  
Muriel Bowser, DC Council  
Kerry Donley, City of Alexandria  
Dan Emerine, DC Office of Planning  
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County  
Lyn Erickson, MDOT  
Jennie Forehand, Maryland Senate  
Jason Groth, Charles County  
Rene'e Hamilton, VDOT  
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax County  
John Jenkins, Prince William County  
Carol Krimm, City of Frederick  
Mark Rawlings, DC-DOT  
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt  
Paul Smith, Frederick County  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Reuben Snipper, City of Takoma Park  
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT  
Todd M. Turner, City of Bowie  
Jonathan Way, Manassas City  
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County DPW&T  
Tommy Wells, DC Council  
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	
Rich Roisman	
Andrew Austin	
Wendy Klancher	
Sarah Crawford	
Deborah Kerson Bilek	
Ben Hampton	
Eric Randall	
Ben Hampton	
Michael Farrell	
Karin Foster	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Nicole Hange	COG/EO
Betsy Self	COG/DPSH
Steve Kania	COG/OPA
Lewis Miller	COG/OPA
Bill Orleans	HACK
Jim Maslanka	City of Alexandria
Randy Carroll	MDE
Judi Gold	Councilmember Bowser's Office
Patrick Durany	Prince William County
Nick Alexandrow	PRTC
Mike Lake	Fairfax County DOT
Danielle Wesolek	WMATA
Melissa Chow	WMATA
Christopher Falkenhayen	AAA Mid-Atlantic
John B. Townsend II	AAA Mid-Atlantic
Anne-Laurie Seannez	US DOT/FTA
Tina Slater	CAC Chair/President Action Committee for Transit
Robert Brown	Loudoun County – Transportation
Amy Inman	Virginia Dept. of Rail & Public Transportation
Alexis Verzosa	City of Fairfax

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

There were no public comments.

**2. Approval of Minutes of April 18 Meeting**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from the April 18 TPB meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

---

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

Mr. Rawlings said that the Technical Committee met on May 4 and reviewed three items for inclusion in the TPB agenda, including the draft final Complete Streets policy, the household travel survey study on travel characteristics in specific sub-areas of the region, and the potential schedule for further Congressional action on the Federal surface transportation authorizing legislation. He added that four informational items were discussed, including the final COG Region Forward draft baseline report, the NCHRP study that the TPB is participating in to look at a performance-based planning and programming process with a focus on congestion and capacity improvements along bus priority corridors in Maryland, a status update of the FY2012 CLRP and new TIP inputs, and a discussion of the status of the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project, which he said includes 16 project components being implemented by five project owners under a \$58 million TIGER grant administered by the FTA.

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

Ms. Davis, sitting in for Ms. Slater, provided a summary of the CAC meeting, which was held on May 10. She said the CAC received a presentation from the Access for All Advisory Committee, which included an outline of the “Three A’s Approach” – Awareness, Analysis, and Action – to including low-income, minority, and disabled persons in the regional transportation process. She added that the CAC discussed how it could contribute to the inclusion of low-income, minority, and disability perspectives in the region, as well as expanding the reach of the Access for All Advisory Committee.

She said the CAC also received an update on the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, including the forum scheduled for June 2, and that the CAC would like to be part of the public outreach activities that may result from the June 2 activities. She mentioned that some CAC members plan on participating in the June 20 work session on the priorities plan that is scheduled to occur in advance of the TPB meeting. She said that the CAC discussed the TPB Weekly Report, including ideas for improvement, and received an update on the draft Regional Complete Streets Policy, which she said the CAC wholeheartedly supports. She added that the CAC has some concerns surrounding on how this policy will be tracked in the TIP, and how implementation might work. Finally, she said that the CAC received an update on the Regional Clearinghouse initiative and an on the analysis of public acceptance data for the Value Pricing study.

Chair Turner thanked Ms. Davis and the CAC for their feedback on the TPB Weekly Report. He asked to whom the TPB Weekly Report was circulated, aside from the TPB, CAC, Technical Committee, and members of the TPB.

Mr. Kirby said that the TPB Weekly Report is circulated to a comprehensive list of interested recipients, and said that adopting some of the CAC’s suggestions for improvements, such as

---

including a short header in the subject line, would be a good idea.

Mr. Wells thanked Ms. Davis for her leadership.

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

Mr. Kirby said that the Steering Committee met on May 4, and acted on two amendments to the FY2011-2016 TIP, which he said were described in detail in the mailout packet. He summarized that these amendments updated the funding for system preservation projects in Maryland, and added funding for the Sunnyside Avenue bridge replacement project in Prince George's County. He provided an overview of the letters packet, which he said included only one letter from Metro Board Chair Hudgins responding to the Access for All Advisory Committee Chair Wojahn who expressed the committee's views on the proposed fare increases.

Ms. Hudgins thanked Mr. Wojahn and the Access for All Advisory Committee, and said that the Metro Board has tried to respond to some of the fare issues raised. She added that she looks forward to continuing participation from the Access for All Advisory Committee in formulating future changes to the fare structure.

## **6. Chair's Remarks**

Chair Turner introduced Mr. Emerine from the District Office of Planning, who filled in as an alternate at the TPB meeting.

Mr. Emerine thanked Chair Turner.

Chair Turner acknowledged that many TPB member jurisdictions are deep into their budget cycles, and advocated for the importance of transportation and transit as part of these budget discussions and negotiations. He reminded members of the TPB that Bike To Work Day is scheduled for Friday, May 18, and reminded the TPB of the previous month's briefing and the call to action for support on this initiative. Finally, he asked the members of the TPB to remember to keep both active-duty and retired veterans in mind in celebrating the Memorial Day weekend holiday.

Mr. Roberts said that the Sunnyside Avenue amendment mentioned by Mr. Kirby in his report of the Steering Committee is a very sensitive issue in the City of Greenbelt. He asked for clarification on whether the funding is solely for the bridge, or if it relates to other roadways as well.

Mr. Weissberg replied that the funding was approved just for the bridge.

Mr. Roberts asked if the county was coordinating this project with the state in relation to the proposed widening of Kenilworth Avenue.

---

Mr. Weissberg replied that the coordination with the state is intended to get the project included in the state TIP. He added that a community meeting would be held the following day, and invited Mr. Roberts to attend.

Mr. Roberts asked if Mr. Weissberg was aware of past litigation relating to this project.

Mr. Weissberg said he was aware of the project's history and is coordinating appropriately.

Mr. Roberts reiterated that he hoped that the City of Greenbelt would be included as a coordinating party on this project.

Mr. Weissberg agreed.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **7. Approval of Complete Streets Policy for the National Capital Region**

Mr. Farrell said the TPB received a presentation on the Complete Streets policy at the last two meetings and that he would provide a short summary of the process and most recent changes to the policy and guidance. He said the concept for a regional complete streets policy came from a recommendation of the TPB's Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) as a way to support to the TPB Vision, the regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, and Region Forward goals. He said TPB staff worked with several subcommittees to develop the policy over the past year.

Mr. Farrell reviewed the changes made to the Complete Streets policy since the April TPB meeting. He said the most extensive changes were made to the TIP Project Description Form since it will now document the agency's own Complete Street policies. He said that following TPB approval, staff will survey members on the jurisdictions' complete streets policies, hold a training session for jurisdiction staff on complete streets, and create a regional information clearinghouse to direct members of the public to agency websites where detailed design information may be found.

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to adopt Resolution R15-2012 to approve the regional Complete Streets policy. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Snyder proposed an amendment to II. of the Complete Streets Guidance and Policy template based on experience related to complete streets procedures in Falls Church. He proposed adding under Inclusions: "5. Significant public input should be acquired prior to the implementation of the policy to any particular facility." He said this language emphasizes that while the policy is generally good, there may be many unintended consequences, particularly in retrofit circumstances.

Mr. Zimmerman said there is a difference between a policy and a specific project proposal. He

---

said the application of a policy in particular situations does have to be sensitive to each situation. He said he has no objections to the amendment.

Ms. Smyth asked if the policy is geared more towards new projects or retrofit projects.

Chair Turner said his understanding is that a jurisdiction would adopt a complete streets policy pursuant to the regional Complete Streets policy that would only impact projects going forward. He asked if the complete streets policy would apply retroactively to a project that is already in the CLRP or TIP.

Mr. Farrell said the policy would not be retroactive. He said that in general, complete streets policies are aimed at new construction. He said it is up to the individual agency and jurisdiction to decide if it would like a policy that attempts to retroactively incorporate complete streets principles on existing facilities.

Ms. Smyth said a lot of what is done in her jurisdiction is redevelopment and revitalization, noting that the right-of-way is often limited and choices must be made between on-street parking and residential property.

Mr. Beacher spoke on behalf of Vice Chair York and said the Loudoun County supports complete streets policies and has such principles in its comprehensive plan. He said Vice Chair York would have preferred to leave the TPB's Complete Streets document as a template due to concerns that there could be an inherent disconnect between the jurisdiction's policies and what the TPB is advocating. He said that there is a concern that there is an implication that if a jurisdiction does not following the recommendations of the TPB policy, that it is not measuring up to a regional standard. He said there is also a concern about including the complete streets language in the TIP form for the same reasons. He said certain projects may have to justify adherence to the regional policy when the project may be perfectly suitable in the context of the local jurisdiction's policy.

Mr. Farrell said the TIP form has been altered so that it documents an agency's implementation of its own complete streets policy. He said the information contained in the TIP form is for informational purposes only. He said that there are certain common elements of the template that numerous jurisdictions felt should be included in a regional Complete Streets policy, but that there is plenty of flexibility to add or subtract provisions to meet a local complete streets policy.

Mr. Way said that at the April TPB meeting, it was discussed that the policy would apply to all roads and all jurisdictions, not just projects in the CLRP. He said this would have the TPB take an active role in encouraging and evaluating jurisdictional compliance with the policy. He said he understands that the TPB would establish a region-wide database to allow the public to identify and evaluate how well the policy is being implemented in each jurisdiction. He said the issue before the Manassas City Council was the level of involvement of the TPB in smaller road projects and the staff workload in reporting and updating projects in the TPB's database. He said the Council voted to direct him to vote in favor to support the TPB policy if it is restricted to larger regionally significant projects, or vote against the policy if it will be applied to all road

---

projects in a jurisdiction.

Ms. Hudgins questioned the use of the word “significant” in Mr. Snyder’s amendment to the motion. She said that simply including the opportunity for community input is preferable rather than attempting to measure the adequacy of community input as “significant.” She suggested removing the word “significant.”

Mr. Snyder said he accepted the revision to his amendment.

Mr. Zimmerman confirmed that the Snyder amendment as revised is now part of the main motion.

Chair Turner said that is correct, there being no objection. No objection was registered.

Mr. Zimmerman noted that some jurisdictions have had a complete streets policy for quite some time. He said that the policies often represent an aspiration of what a jurisdiction wants to look like and that it’s not just for new projects. He said the policies prescribe an ideal of what a jurisdiction is trying to accomplish. He said jurisdictions understand that full implementation of a policy, including retrofitting facilities, takes time, resources, and exceptions. He said the TPB’s policy is a flexible policy. He said that the TPB’s Complete Streets policy statement is an endorsement of the concept, including encouraging member jurisdictions to adopt a complete streets policy that includes common elements that the TPB believes reflects best practices. He said project information collection is a role that the TPB should be undertaking as a regional agency, as well as providing training for jurisdiction staff. He said that the TPB does not truly function as a regional transportation planning agency and that most of the control is with the local jurisdictions. He said one of the important roles for the TPB is to encourage something regionally that is identified as a good practice, keep records on it, and centralize information that can be provided to jurisdictions.

Mr. Roberts said that a complete streets policy would need to be for both new construction and for major redevelopment or reconstruction of a facility, particularly related to capacity expansion.

Ms. Bowser acknowledged the work of the CAC and thanked all involved for bringing the final document to the TPB. She said she would like to associate herself with Mr. Zimmerman’s comments. She said it is important to work towards balance in the transportation infrastructure and how every mode can access the network. She said it is important for all modes to be represented and to increase capacity for all users. She said every jurisdiction can aspire to incorporate some of the goals into local policies, as they are very achievable. She said she looks forward to seeing what can be done in the District.

Mr. Wojahn said that as Chair of the TPB’s Access for All Committee, he acknowledges that there is a lot of importance contained within the TPB’s Complete Streets policy for persons with disabilities and low-income communities. He said it is important to develop this policy to reflect priorities as a region. He reiterated that the policy is a guidance document that demonstrates

---

priorities for the region, not requirements for individual jurisdictions. He said the training that will be provided by TPB staff is critical for jurisdictions that may need some assistance in implementation of a complete streets policy.

Ms. Hudgins spoke on behalf of WMATA and said that access to transit is critical and requires the jurisdiction to work to provide adequate facilities for all modes.

Vice Chair Wells said that COG's Region Forward plan clearly aims to increase the share of walk, bike, and transit trips in all regional activity centers, thus reducing vehicle miles traveled per capita. He said adopting this policy would be concurrent with what is outlined in Region Forward.

Chair Turner said that he supports moving forward with the resolution. He said he shares many of the comments and concerns voiced by members. He said it is aspirational for each jurisdiction to adopt its own complete streets policy. He called for a vote. The motion passed, with Mr. Way voting no.

## **8. Approval of an Amendment to the FY 2011-2016 TIP to Include the WMATA FY2013 Capital Improvement Program**

Mr. Bottigheimer said the TPB is being asked to approve WMATA's FY 2013 CIP as a routine administrative action. He said the budget has been approved internally at WMATA and will allow WMATA to apply immediately for federal grants so it may begin spending on July 1 on the highly needed capital projects within the CIP.

Ms. Hudgins made a motion to approve an amendment to the FY 2011-2016 TIP to include the WMATA FY 2013 CIP. The motion was seconded by Ms. Bowser and approved unanimously.

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **9. Briefing on Household Travel Characteristics and Behavior in Ten Focused Geographic Subareas of the Region**

Mr. Griffiths of TPB staff briefed the Board on initial results from recently-completed household travel surveys in ten geographically-focused areas of the region: the 14th Street NW/Logan Circle neighborhood in the District of Columbia; the Crystal City area, the Shirlington area, and the Columbia Pike corridor in Arlington County; the Purple Line corridor in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties in Maryland; the area around the White Flint Metrorail station in Montgomery County; the area around the Largo Metrorail station in Prince George's County; Reston, Virginia; Woodbridge, Virginia; and the City of Frederick in Maryland.

The surveys are a follow-up to the regional Household Travel Survey conducted by the TPB in 2007 and 2008. Mr. Griffiths explained that the follow-up surveys came as a result of requests



---

for information from local planning staff who wanted data for more focused geographic areas to support local planning efforts. He said that detailed data for small geographic areas is no longer available either through the decennial Census or the Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS). He explained to the Board that the focused surveys took place in a variety of different communities to provide opportunities to compare and contrast the travel patterns in areas with different densities, physical characteristics, and transportation options. He also said that the longer-term objective of the focused survey project is to build a database that can be used to measure changes over a period of time—for example, before and after major redevelopment in a given area occurs or when major new transportation facilities are constructed.

Mr. Griffiths' presentation to the Board included an overview of each of the ten study areas, why the areas were chosen, and some highlighted findings from each. His presentation also included tables of key characteristics for all ten survey areas to aid in comparing survey areas to one another as well as to the regional average. In particular, he featured comparisons of mode share of all daily trips, mode share of all commute trips, household size, vehicle availability, and age of household members for the ten study areas. He also listed the areas where the next round of surveys is currently underway and those where surveys are planned for fall 2012 and spring 2013.

Chair Turner thanked Mr. Griffiths for his presentation and opened the floor to questions from Board members.

Ms. Smyth asked why staff were planning to survey Tysons Corner in fall 2013. Mr. Griffiths said that it would set a baseline for later analysis after the Silver Line opened through that area.

Mr. Wojahn suggested that staff work with the University of Maryland to take advantage of the extensive surveying of faculty, staff, and students that they do regarding travel patterns.

Mr. Wells asked whether the term "vehicle availability" includes car-sharing. Mr. Griffiths said that it does not. Mr. Wells also suggested that staff make a point of including lower-income neighborhoods in the District as a baseline before housing prices and family incomes in those areas increase in coming years. Mr. Griffiths said that staff would be working with the District Department of Transportation and the District Office of Planning to select future study areas.

Mr. Roberts asked how staff thought the availability of public transportation affects the numbers that were shown in the presentation. Mr. Griffiths responded by saying that distance from the regional core generally results in less access to transit, and that staff will be focusing on the question of how accessibility affects transit ridership as they continue to analyze the survey results. Mr. Roberts suggested that perhaps planners ought to focus more on bringing transportation to people rather than encouraging development everywhere just to make use of the transportation system.

Mr. Emerine suggested that staff should take the information gathered so far and begin looking for causal relationships to determine what factors really drive mode choice among travelers. He suggested looking at relationships between travel patterns and physical characteristics like land

---

use mix, density of street intersections, and block sizes in a given area.

Mr. Zimbabwe asked how the data from the focused surveys gets folded back into the regional travel demand model, noting that the mode split observed in the Logan Circle area probably dramatically outperformed what the regional model would have predicted. Mr. Kirby said that the regional travel demand model is based on regional data, that there are ways of characterizing different areas in the model but that obviously such fine-grain detail as was collected during the focused surveys has not made its way into the model. He said that one good opportunity to use the neighborhood-level data is in the TPB's scenario planning efforts to model what would happen if certain land use and transportation conditions were replicated elsewhere in the region.

Mr. Zimbabwe followed up Mr. Kirby's response by commenting that if the models are overestimating vehicular traffic, then those who are planning and making decisions about transportation investments might be overbuilding infrastructure. Mr. Kirby responded by noting local staff interest in using the focused, neighborhood-level data to implement and monitor compliance with adequate public facilities requirements.

Mr. Erenrich reminded staff and the Board that the data presented by Mr. Griffiths was just a sample, and that trying to expand the information to larger areas might not be appropriate. He also suggested that staff should look more closely at population density and land use to answer questions about what kind of transit can be supported by different population and employment densities.

Mr. Zimmerman echoed Mr. Erenrich's point, suggesting that staff look more closely not only at population density but also the availability and frequency of transit. He explained that knowing where behaviors change the most—relative to increasing densities and increasing transit availability—is important in figuring out how to achieve the desired results.

Ms. Hudgins asked whether the population listed in the presentation for Reston included all of Reston or a subarea. Mr. Griffiths said that only a subarea of Reston was studied and that the population that was listed was the population of that subarea.

Ms. Hudgins also pointed out that the initial results and analysis provided by staff do not take into account employment density in the study areas, and its influence on walking and other transit trips "to work" might not be captured by the surveys as a result. But she said that the current survey will serve as a good baseline for when the Silver Line comes to Reston.

Mr. Griffiths provided one point of clarification on a point raised earlier by Mr. Zimbabwe. He explained to the Board that part of the reason for conducting the focused surveys—especially in the case of Arlington County, which instigated the focused survey project—was to provide planners with empirical rather than model-derived data that they could use as part of their outreach to the public, especially when trying to show what effect higher-density, mixed-use development can have on traffic patterns when it is introduced.

Finally, Chair Turner asked whether the information that was collected as part of this project is

---

being shared directly with the local jurisdictions, and departments of transportation and planning. Mr. Griffiths confirmed that it will soon be available to local jurisdictions. Chair Turner also asked if staff and the Technical Committee would consider adding the City of Bowie to the list of future survey sites.

## **10. Briefing on the Results of Recently Completed Projects under the Continuous Airport Systems Planning (CASP) Program**

Mr. Roisman provided a briefing on the recently completed projects under the Continuous Airport System Planning (CASP) program. Referring to a PowerPoint Presentation, he said that the program provides a regional process that supports planning, development, and operation of airport and airport-serving facilities, and is monitored by the Aviation Technical Subcommittee of the TPB Technical Committee. He added that partner agencies include the FAA and the state airport planning and DOT agencies as well as MWAA, and that the program is focused on the three commercial service airports in the area: National, Dulles, and BWI. He discussed air system planning as part of the TPB Vision, and summarized historic forecast data for the three regional commercial service airports, citing significant growth in air cargo. He reported that the CASP program periodically monitors travel times between regional activity centers and the three commercial airports. He presented vehicular and transit travel pattern trends for the region's airports. He summarized identified projects – both past and future – that improve access to the region's airports, including the expansion of the ramp from the Capital Beltway outer loop to the Dulles toll road, the replacement of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, the Intercounty Connector, the Silver Line the Dulles, the HOT lanes on both I-95 and the Capital Beltway, and the spot improvements along I-66. He added that, in general, recent air passenger and air cargo trends and forecasts show continued strong growth at the region's three commercial service airports. He said that travel times from major regional activity centers along the highways to the airports are increasing, and previous TPB actions have resulted in some surface network improvements that have improved airport access. The annual regional economic impact of the three commercial airports has been estimated at more than \$30 billion and a quarter of a million jobs per year.

Mr. Snyder stated that he uses all three airports frequently in connection with his job, and has noticed that the difference between most major international airports and the region's airports is the absence of transit connections, and very little transit connection outside of the daylight hours, particularly to BWI. He said this challenge contributes to time loss and frustration for passengers, air pollution, and is holding back airports from economic viability. He said he'd be interested to see how the TPB works with the information presented in the future.

Chair Turner thanked Mr. Roisman. He expressed the importance of monitoring these issues since airports are a key part of the transportation network.

## **11. Update on Reauthorization of Federal Surface Transportation Legislation**

Mr. Kirby said that the SAFETEA-LU legislation has been extended through June 30. He added that the House of Representatives approved an extension through September 30 that mostly

---

resembles SAFETEA-LU. He said that if a bill is passed, it would likely resemble the Senate MAP-21 bill, which he explained has a number of new provisions relating to performance-based planning, as well as an expansion of the TIFIA loan program.

Chairman Turner thanked Mr. Kirby, and called on members of the TPB to advocate for the passage of legislation to their respective members of Congress. He then asked Mr. Kirby for confirmation that a Regional Priority Plan Work Group has been scheduled for the morning of the June 20, prior to the TPB meeting.

Mr. Kirby provided confirmation. He said this Regional Priority Plan Work Group would begin at 10:30am in the COG Board Room on June 20.

## **12. Other Business**

There was no other business brought before the TPB.

## **13. Adjourn**

Chair Turner adjourned the TPB meeting at 1:55pm.