
2025 END-OF-YEAR REPORT COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

*Daniel Papiernik, 2025 CAC Chair Presented to the TPB,
January 21, 2026*

For the last 30+ years, the Transportation Planning Board (TPB)'s Community Advisory Committee (CAC) has been providing region- oriented community advice to the TPB and promoting public involvement in the regional transportation planning process. As required by the TPB's Public Participation Plan, this report summarizes the committee's activities and interests in 2025.

Like 2024, much of the committee's attention in 2025 was focused on the update of Visualize 2050, the National Capital Region Transportation Plan. However, the CAC also focused on DMVMoves—the joint Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (COG) and Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) initiative to unify, optimize, and deliver a world-class transit network. The TPB CAC served on the Community Partners Advisory Group, a working group of the DMVMoves Task Force, providing valuable input. The work on DMVMoves was a key focus of the CAC in 2025.

The CAC also welcomed many new members. Earlier meetings included many transportation topics to orient the newer members on the work of the TPB. The new members have expanded our diversity both in viewpoints and geographically.

COMMENTS ON DMVMoves

Throughout the year, the committee discussed this initiative. The discussions culminated in a list of observations and recommendations the CAC provided to the Joint Task Force at their November 17 meeting. These comments were also provided to the TPB on October 15. The complete set of recommendations is appended to this report (Attachment 1). The CAC has chosen to concentrate on the four initiatives that are public facing, including: fare policy integration; regional service guidelines and performance reporting; consistent bus stop design, wayfinding and customer information; and a regional approach to bus priority.

Overall comments included the following:

- The CAC understands that funding and financing are the critical issues the effort needs to address. The committee wholeheartedly supports the leadership in finding a consensus-based path to meet the funding needs that a world-class transit system will take.
- The CAC strongly urges the TPB to continue engagement with the CAC and other organizations as funding policy decisions and strategy continue to be fleshed out.
- It's fundamental to understand that transportation issues are tied to the decisions jurisdictions make about land use. In particular, encouraging sprawl fosters pollution and congestion that the region cannot afford. The jurisdictions must prioritize and encourage affordable infill and transit-oriented development.
- Consistent policies across the DMV are better than the status quo.
- Implement what you can agree on; do not call for more studies.

VISUALIZE 2050

TPB staff provided frequent updates to the CAC on the final steps in approving the Visualize 2050 plan and related documents. This culminated in co-hosting the TPB's TIP Forum on November 13. During the final 30-day public comment period, the CAC was engaged in promoting the opportunities for the public to explore the plan on the Visualize 2050 website.

OTHER 2025 INITIATIVES

"Act Locally" Round Robins. The CAC continued the tradition that began in June of 2024 to hold some agenda time for members to share the work they were doing in their communities. Several members have shared their activism on an array of transportation and land use topics, including walkability clinics, legislation on land value return, volunteering for school safety, work on the Metro Riders Council, meeting with elected officials, and transportation justice initiatives.

In addition to the items described above, the CAC discussed a range of topics throughout the year, including the following presentations by TPB staff:

- 2024 Regional Roadway Safety Summit Report and Recommendations, Janie Nham
- Commuter Connections program, Dan Sheehan
- Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian planning, Mike Farrell
- Transportation Conformity, Robert d'Abadie
- TPB's Public Participation Plan, Laura Bachle
- TPB's Enhanced Mobility Program, Cherice Sansbury
- Inland Flooding Analysis, Katherine Rainone

LOOKING AHEAD

The CAC held its first meeting in December of 1992. Since that time, the committee has played an important role in questioning and commenting on regional-level transportation issues. The involvement of diverse voices such as the volunteers on the CAC is ever more critical. We look forward to continuing to provide the TPB with a sounding board and a conduit to the communities the TPB serves.

MEMBERS
2025-2026 COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Daniel Papiernik	Chair	Fairfax County
Ra Amin	Vice Chair	DC Ward 5
Felicia Brannon	Vice Chair	Montgomery County
Keba Baldwin		Prince Georges County
Juanita Beltran		DC Ward 8
Timothy Davis		Frederick County
Kyle Dunn		Montgomery County
Martha Fedorowicz		DC Ward 4
Heather Gaona		Rockville
Dan Hardy		Fairfax County
Kevin Jiang		Arlington County
Madeline Kaba		Charles County
Jenene Lee	AFA Rep.	Prince Georges County
Cooper Lohr		DC Ward 3
Mónica Martínez López		DC Ward 5
Dorothy Menelas		Frederick City
Felipe Millan		Prince Georges County
Asa Orrin-Brown		Alexandria
Jeffrey Parnes		Fairfax County
Lorena Rios		Loudoun County
Rick Rybeck		DC Ward 1
Mark Scheufler		Prince William County
Gail Sullivan		DC Ward 6
Connor Young		Manassas



National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

MEMORANDUM

TO: DMV Moves Community Partners Advisory Group (CPAG)
FROM: Ra Amin, CAC Vice-Chair, CPAG Representative
SUBJECT: Transportation Planning Board Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Comments
DATE: September 19, 2025

BACKGROUND

The CAC is a group of 24 residents of the metropolitan Washington region who represent diverse viewpoints on regional transportation issues. CAC members represent environmental, business, and civic interests in transportation. Fifteen of the 24 members are appointed evenly among the District of Columbia, suburban Maryland, and Northern Virginia. An additional nine members are appointed to represent [TPB member jurisdictions](#) and to ensure a diverse committee including representation of low-income individuals, people with disabilities, and traditionally disadvantaged racial and ethnic population groups.

The CAC appreciates the opportunity to have ongoing participation in the DMVMoves regional transit initiative's Community Partners Advisory Group (CPAG) and offers to advise the effort from the point of view of informed community members who regularly consider regional transportation matters. Through our representative on the CPAG, Ra Amin, the CAC has been kept informed and has offered reflections on the work of the task force and the advisory group to date. Now that the work of the CPAG is drawing to a close, we are offering these observations and recommendations for the group's consideration.

SCOPE OF THE CAC DISCUSSIONS

The CAC has chosen to concentrate on the four initiatives that are public facing, including: fare policy integration; regional service guidelines and performance reporting; consistent bus stop design, wayfinding and customer information; and a regional approach to bus priority. In addition, members of the CAC understand that funding and financing are the critical issues the effort needs to address. The CAC is providing comments on this as well. We wholeheartedly support the leadership in finding a consensus-based path to meet the funding needs that a world-class transit system will take.

Overall Comments

Focus on the service-related initiatives should not distract task force members from making a decision on finding sustainable and equitable funding for transit. The CAC strongly urges the task force to continue public engagement with the CAC and other organizations as funding policy decisions and strategy continue to be fleshed out.

- It's fundamental to understand that transportation issues are tied to the decision's jurisdictions make about land use. In particular, encouraging sprawl fosters pollution and congestion that the region cannot afford. The jurisdictions must prioritize and encourage affordable infill and transit-oriented development.

- Consistent policies across the DMV are better than the status quo.
- Implement what you can agree on; do not call for more studies.
- The recommendations will be more compelling to the public if there are examples of success stories from other regions.

Fare policy integration

Fare policy should be part of a broader strategy for funding transit. The fare box captures value from individual riders, but transit provides benefits to the communities it serves that stretch beyond those individual rides, such as pollution reduction, congestion mitigation, and increased land value. Inadequately capturing this value can disproportionately place the burden of funding transit operations and improvement on transit riders and municipalities. There are many available strategies for capturing transit value outside of the fare box.

(see <https://ggwash.org/view/98516/an-un-fare-kind-of-evasion> for a deeper discussion on capturing land value returns as an example).

Generally, there was overall support among the CAC members on universal transit credits and expanded regional transit passes. One shared concern was whether consideration had been given to potential impacts if there are changes to programs that help people qualify for the discounted fares, such as SNAP and Medicaid. Perhaps individuals can qualify through some other means? There are also ongoing problems with enforcement, for example, people not swiping their fare cards when boarding the bus.

There needs to be a balanced approach to providing free or discounted fares. Fare policies for seniors, youth, and people with disabilities should be uniform. Regarding the age at which older adults should start receiving fare discounts, look at when DC, MD, and VA require driver's license renewals. There is a tie to aging out of driving and moving to transit. CAC members understand that federal regulations set senior fares to age 65 and that there has been no discussion of changing this.

Consideration may need to be given to entire families, not just children or older adults. This effort could benefit by hearing from low-income families experiencing challenges. The approach low-income families use for these discounted fares might differ from the way in which they are administered. For example, a child receiving a voucher may be sharing it with a working parent—another example of ongoing problems with enforcement and lack of uniformity.

Some consideration should be given to making it easier for people with disabilities and older adults to receive their discounts from any transit provider. It can be extremely challenging to navigate the various policies that different providers have in addition to the physical challenges of physically obtaining the fare discounts. It is also preferable not to need to pull out cash or a credit card to pay. Members of the older adult and disability communities have expressed that they feel unsafe pulling out a form of payment at the farebox or faregates.

A unified approach should be considered for college students and youth. Encouraging transit use among teens and young adults develops the transit user base, but if each provider or college administers their fare policy differently, it can dissuade youth from transit.

Micromobility providers should also be considered as part of fare policy integration. These providers

are an important link in the whole commute, especially with use of these providers among low income communities rising.

Fare policies are tied to steady ridership. If there is a predictable level of riders, there is a stable base from which to plan. More riders need to be convinced to take transit, and they get convinced when service is reliable. Quality service will deliver more riders regardless of whether the fares are discounted or not.

Regional service guidelines and performance reporting

Both guidelines and reporting are important to the CAC. Members would like to see these as transparent as possible to the public. Regional service "guidelines" are not as effective as "requirements." While it is important to set goals and aspirations, if guidelines are unenforceable, are they going to be effective? There should be some consideration of baseline requirements.

Having a common set of metrics would clarify how regional service operators are performing individually and how the region is performing overall. There should be some common guidelines, such as meeting rider expectations for frequency, on-time performance, and safety. Perhaps some software provided to all operators, so they are all gathering the same data. Perhaps a regional dashboard displaying the metrics would help with accountability and assurance. Whatever is done with the metrics needs to be shareable.

Extending bus route naming/signage that identifies the current level of service that a route provides similar to WMATA's new bus routes would be good for all regional bus providers. For example, quickly identifying routes on a map based on whether they have a commuter-level of service, regional-level of service, local-level of service, and rapid transit-level of service. This information would help riders plan their transportation use efficiently and would help advocates and planners quickly identify where bus service is lagging current or planned development in an area.

Consistent bus stop design, wayfinding, and customer information

The CAC members favor a bus stop design that meets some agreed-upon standards, uniform wayfinding aids, and the one-call customer information number approach. There is not a need for uniform physical design so long as they meet standards for accessibility and make the wait attractive to riders. Language access was also suggested as a uniform standard to be addressed, including the use of braille at a uniform location at all stops.

This discussion on consistency should include first-party apps, websites, and other online or third-party resources since these are often a primary method for wayfinding and trip planning. There should also be consistent access to live location tracking as a means of knowing when other buses on other routes in the vicinity may be arriving so a person can make decisions.

Bus stop designs should be friendly for everyone and within the context of the surroundings. Adding cardinal points to wayfinding would also be very helpful. Connecting bike routes and sidewalks should be designed along with the bus shelter and kept in good repair. Amenities and wayfinding should incorporate the inclusion of Transportation Network Companies (TNCs) as part of the region's transportation services.

Customer service is related to bus driver training. Beyond a good pool of drivers, some baseline of

consistent expectations for bus drivers across the DMV would be helpful. Related to that is managing expectations among the public about what they can expect (or not) from a bus driver.

A regional approach to bus priority

In general, members support moving forward with the implementation of the bus priority routes identified rather than waiting for more analysis. The method of determining which routes to prioritize appears to be clear. These routes need to be administered in a coordinated manner. Also, expectations should be managed about implementation of routes.

Currently, the recommendation reads like all six projects will be completed in ten years. The BRT investments are aggressive considering other DMV/Moves objectives, inviting scrutiny of their feasibility that should be met with a robust path forward. Shared use of assets and grouped procurements, while achieving longer-term efficiency, will require some short-term disruption. Avoid the suggestion that all six projects will be completed in ten years. As an alternative, we suggest a 10-year window with incremental advancement. The final report should emphasize the need to “advance” BRT or “deliver BRT elements.”

Consideration needs to be given to the next set of priority routes, such as MD 210, routes further out in Virginia, Southeast DC, and southern Maryland overall. These routes could serve to grow ridership. Pilot projects could be explored for routes experiencing congestion that may not otherwise meet the criteria for BRT, being innovative in implementation, like using shoulders. Also the CAC is not suggesting other priority projects in design like Richmond Highway or MD 586 be deferred because they are not the top regional priority.

BRT projects should be planned with a full complement of improved pedestrian and multimodal last mile connectivity. It makes no sense to have a BRT stop that does not help you get to your ultimate destination.

CONCLUSION

The CAC appreciates the work of the task force to date and the opportunity for informed community members such as we to advise on these decisions. Funding a world-class transit system is paramount, and the CAC stands ready to support the task force in achieving this goal.

CAC MEMBERS

Daniel Papiernik	Chair	Fairfax County
Ra Amin	Vice Chair	DC Ward 5
Felicia Brannon	Vice Chair	Montgomery County
Keba Baldwin	Prince Georges County	
Juanita Beltran	DC Ward 8	
Timothy Davis	Frederick County	
Kyle Dunn	Montgomery County	
Martha Fedorowicz	DC Ward 4	
Heather Gaona	Rockville	
Dan Hardy	Fairfax County	
Kevin Jiang	Arlington County	
Madeline Kaba	Charles County	
Jenene Lee	AFA Representative	Prince Georges County
Cooper Lohr	DC Ward 3	
Mónica Martínez López	DC Ward 5	
Dorothy Menelas	Frederick City	
Felipe Millan	Prince Georges County	
Asa Orrin-Brown	Alexandria	
Jeffrey Parnes	Fairfax County	
Lorena Rios	Loudoun County	
Rick Rybeck	DC Ward 1	
Mark Scheufler	Prince William County	
Gail Sullivan	DC Ward 6	
Connor Young	Manassas	