

**Minutes of the Board Planning and Development Committee**  
Open Session - January 5, 2006

Mr. Zimmerman called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Present were:

**Committee Members:**

Mr. Christopher Zimmerman (Chairman)  
Mr. Marcell Solomon (Vice Chairman)  
Mr. Charles Deegan  
Mr. Jim Graham  
Ms. Catherine Hudgins  
Mr. Dana Kauffman  
Mr. Gordon Linton  
Mrs. Gladys W. Mack  
Mr. Robert Smith

**Other Board Members:**

Mr. Dan Tangherlini

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** The minutes of the December 1, 2005, Planning and Development Committee meeting were accepted and approved as presented.

**ACTION ITEMS:**

**A. Approval of WMATA Compact Public Hearing & Release of Public Hearing Staff Report for Proposed Environmental Assessments and Refinements to the Dulles Corridor Rapid Transit Project**

Mr. James Haggins sought P&D Committee concurrence and Board of Directors approval, as set forth in the resolution, to:

- ▶ Authorize WMATA to conduct a Public Hearing jointly with the Commonwealth of Virginia on several proposed refinements to the design and General Plans (GP) for the Wiehle Avenue Extension that was approved by the Board of Directors in September 2004;
- ▶ Authorize the General Manager/Chief Executive Officer (GM/CEO) to release the Environmental Assessment (EA);
- ▶ Authorize the GM/CEO to release the Public Hearing Staff Report for Environmental Assessment (EA) and proposed revisions to the General Plans/Modifications to the Adopted Regional System as soon as the report is available.

Mr. Smith asked if WMATA changed the platform surface composition as it relates to changes in canopy coverage. Mr. James Haggins responded that one of the aspects of this exercise is to shorten the platform canopy, and then there would be longer trains servicing this particular route with customers standing on the platform without coverage, which could cause a safety hazard with the paver tiles previously in use. The Staff suggested that to reduce that hazard as well as maintenance cost, changing the paver tile was an option. Mr. Smith questioned what kind of product would be seen on the platform. Mr. Haggins responded that the staff would be coming back to the committee with that information. Mr. Smith stated that this issue is a concern of the Committee due to the life-cycle cost and platform surface safety issues.

Mr. Zimmerman asked about a new tunneling technology that would reduce costs. Mr. Haggins responded that the design/builder, Dulles Transit Partners, is scheduled to meet on January 11, 2006 to discuss Bore Tunnel Technology.

Mrs. Hudgins asked if the Staff will come back to the Committee upon resolution of the safety standards and other implications of the change at issue. Mr. Haggins responded that some items will be brought back to the Committee, while others may not depending on the responses of the contractor.

Mr. Zimmerman asked when the Public Hearing is scheduled. Mr. Haggins responded that the public hearing will be held in March of 2006.

Mr. Zimmermann suggested that Staff look for joint development opportunities in an effort to help solve, i.e, fund canopy coverage problems.

The Motion was unanimously approved.

**B. Approval to Release the Columbia Pike Alternative Analysis Report to Arlington and Fairfax Counties**

Ms. Robin McElhenny sought P&D Committee concurrence and forwarding to the Board for approval and release of the Columbia Pike Alternatives Analysis Report to Arlington and Fairfax Counties for selection of a locally preferred alternative.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the purpose of this action was to simply release the study to the jurisdictions of Arlington and Fairfax County. Mr. Salpeas responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Zimmerman and Mr. Kauffman questioned whether the Columbia Pike Analysis Report might have utility for other corridors, in particular, the Richmond Highway Corridor. Ms. McElhenny responded that the process for studying alternatives could also be applicable to the Richmond Highway Corridor as many of the same issues, concerns and challenges are present in the Richmond corridor. The Staff has already done some feasibility work on the Richmond corridor and will be proceeding after input from the jurisdictions.

Next steps include:

- ▶ Select a locally preferred alternative (Arlington and Fairfax Counties);
- ▶ Issue a request for an Expression of Interest to solicit industry input in innovative project financing and implementation;
- ▶ Determine organizational entity for project advancement for WMATA, the Commonwealth of Virginia, and Private non-profit sector (e.g., DC Circulator, Portland Streetcar, Inc.);
- ▶ Conduct an environmental assessment;
- ▶ Identify funding strategy; and
- ▶ Update Constrained Long Range Plan to include the Columbia Pike Transit Project.

Motion approved.

C. **Approval of Staff Recommendations for the West Ox Bus Facility Public Hearing and Authorize Agreement with Fairfax County**

Mr. John Dittmeier sought P&D Committee concurrence and forwarding to the Board for approval, as set forth in the resolution for:

- ▶ Approving the Public Hearing Staff Report;
- ▶ Approving the financial plan; and
- ▶ Authorizing the General Manager/Chief Executive Officer (GM/CEO) to execute the Joint-Use Agreement with Fairfax County for the West Ox Bus Facility.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Tangherlini asked if the amount for the new garage related to Metro Matters (MM) is roughly \$8 million. Ms. Carrol O’Keeffe responded that the budget agreement for Metro Matters is \$48.9 million and that MM funds would be used to pay the expansion portion of the garage, and joint development funds from TIIF, once realized from sales, would provide the rest.

Mr. Smith asked if the funds that we will receive from TIIF in the future and repay the Metro Matters budget, fall under the cash management area. Ms. O’Keeffe responded that this is what is being proposed by the Staff. Mr. Smith questioned which part of the Project this TIIF money will cover. Ms. O’Keeffe responded that the TIIF money will go to the non-expansion space. Mr. Smith questioned how funds were allocated for the non-expansion spaces for Arlington bus redevelopment. Ms. O’Keeffe responded that all of the facilities that will support those spaces that have been allocated for the forty-five expansion spaces should come from Metro Matters. The residual money is non-expansion, and therefore, cannot be paid for with Metro Matters funds.

Mr. Smith along with several Committee Members raised questions regarding the use of Metro Matters funds for a joint use facility and what is the continuity plan if the projected TIIF funds are insufficient. Mr. Smith also questioned putting Metro Matters funds towards a facility that at the end of the 75-year lease, WMATA would not own. Mr. Tangherlini replied that the asset would have depreciated well before the 75-year lease expired.

Mrs. Mack and Mr. Smith requested a two-page analysis on the impact of Metro Matters funds and suggested that there be a broader discussion of when the projected TIIF funds are expected. Mr. Tangherlini asked if the Metro Matters savings could be used for other projects. Mr. White replied that MM funds are subject to the MM Funding Agreement and staff will come back with an analysis in March, 2006.

Mr. Solomon asked from what garages would the fifty-five buses come. Mr. Hughes responded that the Metrobuses would be reassigned from all three existing garages in Virginia.

Mr. Deegan and Mr. Zimmerman raised questions regarding contracting out the paint shop, and asked staff to look into that possibility generally for WMATA.

Mr. Zimmerman cited several reasons for concurrence with the resolution: There is less funding than anticipated in the Metro Matters Funding Agreement; the facility has received its local land use and zoning approvals; and, the facility is the only timely option that offers expansion capability.

Motion approved.

## **INFORMATION ITEM:**

### **Station Access Capacity Study Assessment**

Mr. Edward Thomas briefed the P&D Committee on:

- ▶ Ridership trends, existing development and related station access conditions;
- ▶ “Go- forward” strategy and next steps for the Station Area Access Planning Program; and
- ▶ Sought Board guidance on criteria for making decisions on Station Improvements.

Mr. Thomas stated that this presentation is a follow-up to a presentation the Staff made to the Committee in December, 2005 as part of the station area access planing program. Mr. Thomas described this presentation as the first step in a series of discussions that the Staff will have with the Board in reference to Metrorail stations, plans for joint development and other property development near stations.

Mr. Zimmerman asked to see the quarter-mile data concerning the Station Value Capture Study and asked what geographic area the Maryland number represented in the development trends as it relates to ridership. He also suggested that Staff assess Metro’s contribution to the economic value in the areas surrounding stations. Mr. Bottigheimer responded that the mode splits are for those stations included in the development related ridership survey and are not a comprehensive set of development projects in each jurisdiction. The Staff sampled select buildings and stations to represent a wide variety of development settings throughout the region, and the survey represents the result of sampling in the jurisdictions.

Mr. Zimmerman questioned to what degree the stations augment the value of the land, the actual numbers are of interest because this would show what WMATA is contributing in actual values and could provide the basis of soliciting a funding stream from the jurisdictions.

Mr. Thomas stated that the Staff will come back to the Board in March with a discussion of some initial proposed improvements with parking as one of those areas. Mr. Thomas also stated that Foggy Bottom station in the District will be the subject of a discussion with a developer for the old site of the George Washington University Hospital.

Mr. Zimmerman, Mr. Linton and Mr. Tangherlini raised questions about the parking demand and said they would like to see the algorithm used to derive the demand figures in the presentation.

Mr. Tangherini also stated that the percentages can be misleading and suggested Staff focus on the raw numbers of station utilization growth and parking demand as well. Mr. Bottigheimer responded that the numbers are based on a relationship between demand and the amount of parking that is occupied by 8:00 a.m. Mr. Kauffman questioned what time frame was being alluded to in reference to the Station Vision Plans for Franconia/Springfield and emphasized the need to move quickly on the program due to extensive pending development. Mr. Thomas responded that the Staff should be issuing a notice to a technical support contractor within the next couple of weeks on the station vision plans. The Staff is hoping to come back to the Board in May, 2006 with the first round of discussions.

Mr. Kauffman suggested that the Franconia/Springfield analysis needs improvement and recommended that the Staff contact Jim Zook, Director of Planning and Zoning for Alexandria, Virginia.

Mr. Solomon questioned what five stations were on the initial list. Mr. Thomas responded that these stations include East Falls Church, Franconia, Springfield, Largo Town Center and Cheverly. Mr. Solomon stated that although Cheverly is listed, Prince George County's priority is Capital Heights and he suggested that the Staff consider switching the two. He stated that the local elected officials were pressing the County Executives and the other Planning Board members to develop Capital Heights and only developers were interested in Cheverly.

Mr. Graham requested the opportunity to discuss the problems with the West Ox Bus Garage item briefly and stated that he appreciated the efforts and work that have gone into the West Ox Bus Facility agreement and the creativity of Staff in developing the program.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.