

---

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES**

June 16, 2021

**VIRTUAL MEETING**

**MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT**

Charles Allen, TPB Chair – DC Council  
Ella Hanson – DC Council  
Andrew Trueblood – DC Office of Planning  
Kristin Calkins – DC Office of Planning  
Mark Rollings – DDOT  
Anna Chamberlin – DDOT  
Lezlie Rupert – DDOT  
Reubin Collins - Charles County  
Jason Groth – Charles County  
Patrick Wojahn – College Park  
Denise Mitchell – College Park  
Kai Hagen – Frederick County  
Kelly Russell – City of Frederick  
Neil Harris – Gaithersburg  
Dennis Enslinger - Gaithersburg  
Emmett V. Jordan – Greenbelt  
Michael R. Leszcz – Laurel  
Gary Erenrich – Montgomery County Executive  
Evan Glass – Montgomery County Legislative  
Terry Bellamy – Prince George’s County Executive  
Victor Weissberg – Prince George’s County Executive  
Deni Taveras – Prince George’s County Legislative  
Bridget Donnell Newton – Rockville  
Kacy Kostiuk – Takoma Park  
Marc Korman – Maryland House of Delegates  
R. Earl Lewis, Jr. – MDOT  
Canek Aguirre – Alexandria  
Christian Dorsey – Arlington County  
Dan Malouff – Arlington County  
David Meyer – City of Fairfax  
Jeffrey C. McKay – Fairfax County Legislative  
James Walkinshaw – Fairfax County Legislative  
David Snyder – Falls Church  
Adam Shellenberger – Fauquier County  
Matthew Letourneau – Loudoun County  
Kristen Umstattd – Loudoun County  
Robert Brown – Loudoun County  
Pamela Sebesky – Manassas  
Jeannette Rishell – Manassas Park  
Ann B. Wheeler – Prince William County  
Victor Angry - Prince William County  
David Marsden – Virginia Senate  
Maria Sinner – VDOT

---

---

Rob Cary, VDOT  
Norman Whitaker- VDOT  
Shyam Kannan – WMATA  
Mark Phillips - WMATA  
Sandra Jackson - FHWA  
Dan Koenig - FTA  
Tammy Stidham – NPS

MWCOG STAFF AND OTHERS PRESENT

Kanti Srikanth  
Chuck Bean  
Lyn Erickson  
Mark Moran  
Tim Canan  
Andrew Meese  
Paul DesJardin  
Tom Gates  
Sharon Pandak  
Stacy Cook  
Andrew Austin  
Leo Pineda  
Karen Armendariz  
Sergio Rittaco  
John Swanson  
Abigail Zenner  
Sarah Bond  
Kyona Davis  
Eric Randall  
Jane Posey  
Deborah Etheridge  
Nazneen Ferdous  
Dusan Vuksan  
William Bacon  
Ciara Williams - DRPT  
K. Youngsbluth - DRPT  
Kari Snyder - MDOT  
Elisa Walton - CAC

Materials referenced in the minutes can be found here:  
[mwcog.org/events/2021/6/16/transportation-planning-board/](http://mwcog.org/events/2021/6/16/transportation-planning-board/)

**1. VIRTUAL PARTICIPATION PROCEDURES, MEMBER ROLL CALL, AND VIRTUAL PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY**

Chair Allen called the meeting to order and reminded the board that the meeting is being recorded and broadcast. He said that the process for asking questions and voting is the same as past meetings. After each item members would be asked to comment or vote by jurisdiction.

Ms. Erickson conducted a roll call. Members that were present are listed on the first pages of the minutes.

---

Ms. Erickson said that staff received 14 comments for the meeting. Eleven of those comments urged the TPB to consider climate change when approving projects for Visualize 2045 and to support projects that will help the region to meet the 2030 regional climate goals. She said one comment urges the board to reject any resolution that would require TPB staff to divert time and resources from the region's air quality conformity process. All comments are posted to the meeting page.

## **2. APPROVAL OF THE MAY 19, 2021 MEETING MINUTES**

Chair Allen made a motion to approve the May 2021 TPB minutes.

Mr. Jordan seconded the motion.

The board unanimously approved the minutes.

## **3. TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT**

Mr. Groth said that the Technical Committee met on Friday, June 4. He said that the committee was briefed on the TPB climate change and mitigation study of 2021 and an overview of post-pandemic regional transportation. The committee also learned about the Aspiration to Implementation plan for public outreach. He said it is regional transportation planning at its best. He encouraged the board members to review the other business section of the Technical Committee report. He said more details on the committee meeting are also in the report.

## **4. COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT**

Ms. Walton said that the Community Advisory Committee met on Thursday, June 10. She said the first hour of the meeting was part of a public meeting about Visualize 2045. Committee members were encouraged to attend. During the one-hour committee meeting the committee was briefed on the June TPB agenda and board discussion from the May TPB meeting. The remainder of the meeting focused on how CAC members can fulfill the committee mission by promoting public involvement in regional transportation planning, particularly by supporting Visualize 2045. Long-serving members shared some past experiences and the committee discussed possible strategies for this year. More details on the CAC meeting can be found in the report.

## **5. STEERING COMMITTEE ACTIONS AND DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Mr. Srikanth said that the Steering Committee met on Friday, June 4. At the meeting, the committee discussed the possibility of returning to in-person meetings at COG. He said board members will be sent a survey. He added that COG will acquire new audio and visual equipment to facilitate meetings with in-person and online participants. He anticipates that in-person meetings could start as soon as September. He said that more detail from the Steering Committee meeting can be found in the report.

Mr. Srikanth said on page 21 of the report, there is a memo describing Steering Committee recommendations to fund five project proposals made by member jurisdictions as part of the new Regional Roadway Safety Program. The board will be asked to approve these recommendations at the July meeting. He said that another memo, on page 33, describes a public outreach activity that will run to the end of July. Called Aspirations to Implementation, this activity is part of Visualize 2045. On page 54, there is a memo notifying the board that a new biennial technical assistance program, called Transit Within Reach, has started. Through the program, TPB will provide technical assistance to jurisdictions with proposals to improve walk and bike access to high-capacity transit stations.

## **6. CHAIR'S REMARKS**

Chair Allen recognized a new board member, Senator Marsden, from the Commonwealth of Virginia. He said that the Steering Committee had a detailed and informed discussion about today's agenda. He said he anticipates that the board will have a healthy, robust, and lengthy discussion about the action

---

items. He reminded board members to be mindful of the time and make sure there is enough for all members to speak. He said that the agenda has two action items. He said Item 7 asks the board to approve a set of projects and scope of work so that staff can begin the Air Quality Conformity Analysis. Item 8 asks for a parallel scenario study that would provide additional analysis of the climate impact of the long-range transportation plan. He said the board received a lot of materials for these items to review in advance of the meeting.

Chair Allen, based on input from board members, proposed substituting the resolution included in Item 7. This proposed resolution would allow the board to take action on both agenda items, combining Items 7 and 8.

No members of the board objected to combining discussion on the items.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **7. VISUALIZE 2045: APPROVAL OF THE PROJECT SUBMISSIONS FOR INCLUSION IN, AND THE SCOPE OF WORK FOR, THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS FOR THE 2022 UPDATE TO VISUALIZE 2045 AND THE FY 2023-2026 TIP**

Chair Allen introduced the item and said that Items 7 and 8 would both be presented before discussion. He noted that while Item 7 dealt with a time-sensitive plan update, Item 8 dealt with a proposal for climate change focused scenario analysis intended to affect future long-range plans. He said that a few members of the board have been collaborating and working to see if these two actions can be combined. He said that out of this collaboration had come a substitute resolution for the TPB to consider under Item 7.

He said that this substitute resolution, as currently drafted, would allow the TPB to take action on both agenda items – approving project inputs for the air quality conformity analysis updating the region’s long-range plan and also committing to undertaking a scenario study. So essentially, he said, this substitute resolution combined the topics under agenda Items 7 and 8. He said that unless there was an objection, he proposed taking up both matters under Item 7. Once the resolution is on the table, he said the board would discuss and take action.

Mr. Srikanth said his briefing would cover three sets of documents that were shared with the board. The first, called “Staff Resolution Approval Packet Visualize 2045 Project Inputs and Air Quality Conformity Scope of Work,” contained the staff resolution, TPB Resolution R19-2021. If approved by the board, this resolution would: 1) approve the scope of work for the federally required Air Quality for Conformity Analysis, 2) approve the transit and highway projects that would be included in the analysis, and 3) approve the use of the forecasted population, employment, and household data provided by the COG planning director’s technical advisory group. The second, was “The Substitute Resolution” and Mr. Srikanth said that Mr. Allen had already described this document. Mr. Srikanth then referred to the third document called “Memo Packet for Visualize 2045 Project Inputs and Air Conformity Scope of Work.” This document contained information from staff to the board pertaining to the TPB’s request to FHWA and FTA to grant an extension to the timeframe of the long-range transportation plan update. This included the TPB’s letter and the federal response, which did not grant an extension. This document also included a memo on the financial constraint analysis. He asked the chair if there was time to cover the memo about the requested extension.

Chair Allen said there was enough time.

Mr. Srikanth shared the letter that the TPB wrote on May 10 requesting a six-month extension to the date that the TPB has to complete and receive federal approval for the updated plan, the updated TIP, and for the revised conformity analysis. That date would be December 13, 2022. In the letter the TPB clearly cited the reason it requested the extension, specifically the board’s desire to explore specific

---

greenhouse reduction actions in the transportation sector. He said that on May 25 the TPB received a letter from FHWA and FTA that the TPB should continue its required updates along the original timeline. The letter also said that if there was a delay, the region's conformity would lapse, which would impact the availability of federal funds for the region.

Mr. Srikanth then described a memo that provided more background on Visualize 2045, the Transportation Improvement Program, and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis. Page 3 described the beginning of the process in March 2020 when staff worked with members to document financial projects for the next 25 years. Page 4 summarized the consequences to the region if the plan, TIP, and conformity lapses. Page 5 provided information on the options available to the TPB when exploring a climate-focused, long-range transportation plan without the six-month extension.

The board had no questions on the TPB request for an extension and the federal response.

Next, beginning the staff briefing for agenda Item 7, Mr. Srikanth referenced the presentation and described what the board was being asked to approve. He said that the board vote would give approval to staff to start a nine-month technical process to demonstrate whether the long-range transportation plan will conform to the ozone-related emissions limits established for the region by the EPA. He said the TPB is legally required to develop and document air quality conformity and fiscal constraint in order for agencies and jurisdictions to receive federal funds for their projects. He said that in addition to the constrained federally required portion of the plan, the long-range plan also includes an aspirational element. The Aspirational Initiatives are not projects, but they represent priority principles around which partners are encouraged to develop projects, programs, and policies. This aspirational element is not federally required, but it does clearly reflect the board's aspirations and goals for improving the region's transportation system.

Mr. Srikanth said that there are three elements of conformity. First, there is the 25-year forecast for the number and location of population, employment, and number of households in the region. More information on the cooperative forecast can be found on slide 2 to 4 of the presentation. Slide 5 covers the scope of work for the Air Quality Conformity Analysis. He said that slide 6 included a sample of transit and highway projects listed on pages 11 to 52 of the memo. He said that the plan included more than 600 projects.

Mr. Randall referred to his presentation on the financial element of Visualize 2045. He said that the financial analysis must meet federal requirements from FHWA, FTA, and the EPA. He said his memo has more information. He said that the requirements emphasize reasonable revenues drawn from existing or legislative sources, with due allowance for growth, and reasonable shares of any discretionary grant funding programs. The goal of the financial analysis is to demonstrate financial constraint, to fund the operations and state of good repair of the existing transportation system, and to provide what capacity expansion can meet forecast population and economic growth. He described the sources of transportation revenues. He said that most funding is not fungible and cannot be reallocated outside its purpose.

Mr. Randall shared the preliminary analysis for transportation revenues for the long-range plan. He said the financial analysis started over a year ago and should be completed by December 2021. He said that there are five categories of transportation funding for the region which add up to \$228.9 billion. He said that a large portion of this funding goes to transit operations and maintenance and state of good repair. Highway projects also account for a significant portion. He said WMATA is the region's biggest project, with 45% of all funds going to support Metrorail, Metrobus, and Metro Access. He said about half of the transportation revenues support the Aspirational Initiatives. He also described how the region is meeting federal requirements for Performance-Based Planning and Programming (PBPP) target setting.

Mr. Randall said that the financial analysis only covers government sources of transportation revenue and spending and that as a society the region spends significantly more on transportation, mostly on personal vehicles, parking, and more. He said governments provide the road and transit network, which

---

when operated safely and maintained with a state of good repair takes up about 84% of the planning funding. Expansion projects take time and are often studied for years before they are implemented. He said evaluation and funding takes place through an established process, which was determined by state legislations and Congress. He said the TPB priorities were established through the TPB Vision, the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, and the Aspirational Initiatives. To advance projects that support these priorities, decision-makers and jurisdiction staff need to advance projects from design through to implementation.

Ms. Kostiuk asked if the results of the Air Quality Conformity analysis can be compared with findings from the climate change mitigation study. She requested that the board be briefed on how these two activities compare.

Mr. Srikanth said the climate mitigation study is expected to be complete by December 2021. He also said that the TPB has been voluntarily calculating changes in greenhouse gases and reporting it to the board and to the public for over 11 years. He said that the results of the analyses can be presented jointly in April 2022.

Mr. Collins said that Visualize 2045 contains no projects in southern Maryland. He said that there is a lot of support for rapid transit in southern Maryland. He asked how southern Maryland fits into long-term planning if it is not represented in Visualize 2045.

Mr. Srikanth said that transportation projects are presently being planned at the county level may not be reflected in Visualize 2045. He said that staff can only model certain projects. He said that projects, including many bicycle and pedestrian projects, cannot be modeled at the regional level. He said that once the rapid transit project is funded, it can be modeled.

Mr. Collins emphasized that the rapid transit project impacts Prince George's and Charles Counties. He said it is a regional project.

Mr. Lewis said that MDOT is working to get additional federal funds to help move the rapid transit project forward.

Chair Allen asked Mr. Srikanth to review the contents of the resolutions and highlight the difference between the two.

Mr. Srikanth referred to his presentation and said that there is a staff resolution under Item 7. He said that the substitute resolution is also under Item 7. He said that the staff resolution asks the board to approve the scope of work that staff will use to conduct the Air Quality Conformity Analysis, the projects that will be included in that analysis, and the forecast data for population, employment, and households. He said that the substitute resolution included all those elements. Additionally, the substitute included a provision that commits the TPB to developing another long-range transportation plan update for 2024. He said that plan update will include multiple build scenarios and an analysis of each scenario's impact on the region's adopted goals and targets, including reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The substitute also says that the 2024 update would be based on the concept of zero-based budgeting, meaning that all projects currently in the plan would need to be resubmitted for consideration. He said the substitute resolution also commits the TPB to use scenario analysis to inform subsequent plan updates.

Chair Allen invited Mr. Glass to share his thoughts on the substitute resolution.

Mr. Glass said he introduced the substitute because he believes it is important that thorough climate impact analysis be the basis for the 2024 and future long-range transportation plan updates. He said it is important to recognize that the region is facing a climate crisis. He said that the substitute resolution calls for accelerating the subsequent plan so the region can move more swiftly to address this crisis. He said he developed the resolution after consultation with board members and others in the region, many of whom believe that the TPB's long-range transportation plan needs to do a better job of accounting for climate change.

---

Mr. Erenrich said that he was prepared to vote to support Part B of the substitute resolution but is unable to support Part A until specific projects are removed. He made a motion to split the substitute resolution into separate items for voting.

Mr. Srikanth said that there was nothing in the substitute resolution that would preclude making changes to the conformity inputs in Part A or making changes to Part B. He said that amendments to resolutions are typically made after a motion has been formally made and seconded

Ms. Taveras said she supported the substitute resolution because it took into consideration political sensitivities that will be voiced in the coming years.

Mr. Snyder said he supported the substitute resolution.

Ms. Sinner said that VDOT also supported the amendment. She asked for further explanation regarding the procedure.

Chair Allen said that the next step was for a board member to make a motion to make the substitute resolution the main resolution. At that point, he said, someone could make a motion to separate the motion into two pieces.

Mr. Srikanth said that legal counsel said that was correct. He said the first action was the board deciding whether they want to go with the staff resolution, or the substitute resolution.

Ms. Umstatt said she supported the substitute resolution as a unified resolution.

Ms. Rishell thanked Mr. Glass and Mr. Snyder for their outreach. She said she planned to support the substitute resolution.

Mr. Glass made a motion to make the substitute resolution the main resolution for consideration by the board.

Ms. Sebesky seconded that motion.

Chair Allen conducted a vote by state. Members from the District of Columbia, Virginia, and WMATA approved the motion to make the substitute resolution Resolution R19-2021.

Mr. Erenrich from Montgomery County in Maryland voted "no."

Chair Allen said the motion was approved by the board. The substitute resolution thus became the main resolution. He made a motion for the board to adopt Resolution R19-2021.

Ms. Sinner seconded the motion.

Mr. Srikanth suggested that the board first discuss Part A of the resolution then move on to Part B.

Mr. Erenrich said he had an objection to Part A. He said that the Montgomery County Executive acknowledged all the good work of MDOT to change the recommended preferred alternative to eliminate the widening of I-495 and I-270-I-495 east of I-270, and that this was a significant step to reduce the impacts of the proposed project in Montgomery County.

Mr. Erenrich said that the Montgomery County Executive does not support the inclusion of four new toll lanes on I-495 and I-270 in the conformity analysis for Visualize 2045. He said the county executive has substantial concerns about MDOT's entire project development approach, including determination of the project limits, the definition of the purpose of need, the alternatives considered, the environmental impact analysis, the proposed P3 structure, and contracting with the P3 developer partner before the environmental clearances are obtained.

Specifically, Mr. Erenrich said that in terms of Visualize 2045, the Montgomery County Executive believes that the congestion issues on this corridor can be addressed through less costly and less environmentally impactful changes to these roadways, and substantial improvement to transit along these corridors.

---

Mr. Erenrich said that the Montgomery County Executive further believes that replacing the American Legion Bridge should be a national infrastructure priority funded through a federal infrastructure program. He noted, in closing, that while the County Executive had no desire to delay the region's conformity analysis, he must vote no on the resolution that includes the four lanes on each of these highways.

Chair Allen asked if Mr. Erenrich was making a motion or making a comment.

Mr. Erenrich made a motion to strike the I-495/I-270 recommended preferred alternative from the conformity analysis.

Mr. Jordan seconded that motion.

Mr. Srikanth said that the Chair has discretion to decide whether the motion to remove projects can be considered friendly.

Chair Allen said that based on reaction from the board he would not accept it as a friendly amendment.

Ms. Sinner agreed that the amendment should not be considered friendly.

Mr. Lewis said that MDOT studied this corridor for many years. He said the solution proposed by Montgomery County does not stand the test of time. He said that the public private partnership is necessary to fund the project. He said that congestion is a significant issue in the region. He said that only replacing the American Legion Bridge is not going to solve corridor issues related to congestion. He added that asking the federal government to pay for the bridge replacement may impact funding for other projects in the state. He said that models run by the TPB and COG show that the I-495/I-270 project increases access to jobs as part of Visualize 2045, which includes this project. He encouraged members to vote the way they did when adding the project to the plan in 2018.

Ms. Newton said that the I-270 expansion project does not take into considerations lessons learned through the pandemic. She said that the City of Rockville submitted a list of questions to MDOT in November 2020 and is waiting for answers. She said this project does not move the region forward. She said that nine neighborhoods in Rockville will be negatively impacted by this expansion. She said the city would lose almost 10 acres of parkland and would have to pay to expand three bridges over the highway. She supports removing the I-495/I-270 projects until more analysis can be completed.

Mr. Glass said he supports the motion to remove the projects.

Ms. Sinner said that VDOT supports keeping the Maryland projects in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis. She said they have been working for years with MDOT on these projects and that they would complete the Virginia express lanes effort and provide much needed relief to the American Legion Bridge. She invited Virginia's Deputy Transportation Secretary Mr. Cary to speak.

Mr. Cary said that the Virginia strongly opposes this change. He said the benefits of the public private partnership are clear in Northern Virginia. He said the Commonwealth has an agreement with Maryland for the American Legion Bridge.

Mr. Wojahn said that the City of College Park has consistently opposed proposals to widen I-495. He recognized that expansion east of the I-270 spur has been removed from the plan, but he said that did not change the fact that it remains a bad proposal. He said he supported the amendment.

Mr. Hagen said that the project has changed considerably since 2018 and that as knowledge has developed it is appropriate for members to vote reflecting that new information. He said that of all the options on the table, the one selected by MDOT is the worst one for the environment.

Mr. Korman said that the reason this project does not have consensus in Maryland is because it is an extremely flawed project. He said that the Maryland House of Delegates has voted numerous times to make changes to this project and the process for developing it. He said he will support the motion to remove the project.



---

Mr. Dorsey associated himself with comments from Ms. Newton. He said that it seems there is still room for MDOT to work with the local jurisdictions and counties to come up with a consensus plan.

Mr. Lewis said that the project has not consistently changed. It has gone through a NEPA process that looks at alternatives and involves community discussion and input. He said that the project has changed for the better as a result of this process.

Ms. Newton said that there are currently two HOV lanes that will be converted into three HOT lanes, taking away one free lane. She said that the NEPA study was not conducted for the northern part of the I-270 expansion.

Ms. Russell said that she was not going to support removing this project because the HOT lanes would make it easier for people living in Frederick to commute via bus using the tolled express lanes.

Mr. Bellamy asked about the impact of removing this project.

Mr. Srikanth said that Maryland is awaiting federal approval for the environmental document that Maryland has been working on for the entire project. He asked Mr. Lewis to share the schedule and impacts of removing the project from the long-range plan.

Mr. Lewis said that the TPB is not the only point of approval for this project. He said that there are many more steps that localities will be involved in as the project moves forward. He said it is important to keep the project as part of the conformity inputs. He said that there will be ample opportunity for discussion going forward.

Chair Allen called for a vote.

Mr. Lewis requested a weighted vote.

Ms. Erickson said that she was going to conduct the vote by calling on members. The options were "yes," "no," or "abstain."

Chair Allen clarified that a "yes" vote would support removing the I-495/I-270 project from the conformity inputs.

Ms. Erickson conducted the vote.

Board members voted thusly:

- Yes: Ms. Hanson, Chair Allen, Mr. Wojahn, Mr. Hagen, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Leszcz, Mr. Erenrich, Mr. Glass, Mr. Bellamy, Ms. Taveras, Ms. Newton, Ms. Kostiuik, Mr. Korman, Mr. Aguirre, Mr. Dorsey, Mr. Meyer
- No: Ms. Russell, Mr. Enslinger, Mr. Lewis, Mr. McKay, Mr. Walkinshaw, Mr. Letourneau, Ms. Umstattd, Ms. Sebesky, Ms. Rishell, Ms. Wheeler, Mr. Angry, Mr. Marsden, Ms. Sinner
- Abstain: Mr. Trueblood, Ms. Chamberlin, Mr. Collins, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Shellenberger

Ms. Erickson reminded the board that WMATA does not have a weighted vote.

Ms. Erickson said that "yes" votes carried the motion. She said the weighted vote was 9.2 for removing the projects, and 5.7 against removing the projects.

Chair Allen asked for clarification that the motion to strike would carry.

Mr. Srikanth said yes, the motion carried.

Chair Allen said that the discussion would turn to Resolution R19-2021.

Mr. Lewis said that the region made a bad decision by removing the I-495/I-270 projects. He said those projects would make a difference for a lot of people.

Ms. Newton asked if a roll call vote still needed to be called.

---

Ms. Pandak said that the weighted vote supersedes the roll call.

Ms. Russell asked if the board moved forward with the resolution.

Chair Allen said that the revised resolution had not been voted on.

Ms. Pandak agreed. She said the board is now considering the substitute resolution with the I-495/I-270 project removed.

Ms. Sinner asked if there was a possibility of running the conformity analysis with the project included, so MDOT has the opportunity to work on it before the plan is approved next year.

Mr. Srikanth said that staff does not have the resources to conduct two parallel conformity analyses. Additionally, he noted that even if an analysis could be done as a scenario, with the board having removed the project from further consideration, it would not be possible for the board to, at a later date, adopt a plan with the project in it. He said that if the issues are resolved, the project could come back to the board as soon as next year as an amendment.

Mr. Allen thanked the members for the discussion on the action to amend one part of the resolution. He noted that next would be the action on the full resolution. Speaking to the second part of the resolution, Chair Allen said that the board has been working really hard to push through a more thorough climate change analysis for the region. The result of that work was the resolution before the board. He said the resolution strikes the right balance between infrastructure needs in the region and the different demands. He said that if this resolution is approved, the process for all future long-range transportation plan updates will be different.

Mr. Cary asked for clarification that the previous vote removed the I-495/I-270 projects including the American Legion Bridge.

Mr. Srikanth said that that is correct.

Chair Allen said that the only thing that has changed since Mr. Srikanth's presentation on the alternative resolution is that the I-495/I-270 project was removed.

Chair Allen called for a roll call vote on the full resolution.

Ms. Sinner and Mr. Cary asked if the board could vote to re-instate the removed projects.

Ms. Pandak said that would not be in order unless there is a motion to reconsider in which some new information was presented.

Mr. Allen noted that the prevailing side of a motion has to ask for reconsideration. Ms. Erickson then began to take the roll call vote.

Ms. Russell asked for clarification on the resolution that was being voted on. She said that the substitute resolution that was adopted as the main motion was approved when the I-495/I-270 HOT lanes project was part of the package. Now that the project had been removed, she asked if the board should revisit the approval of the use of the substitute resolution.

Ms. Pandak clarified that the motion to make the substitute resolution the main resolution was already properly made and approved. The main resolution was properly moved and seconded, and now the board was being asked to vote on that resolution with the I-495/I-270 project removed as part of the discussions on the main resolution.

Ms. Sinner asked if it was possible to make a motion to reintroduce the portion of the removed project that includes the American Legion Bridge and up to I-370, but not the entire length.

Ms. Pandak said that that would be inappropriate, since the vote had already begun. She said that the vote would need to be completed.

Chair Allen said that since the vote had started, the board would not consider another motion at this time.

---

Mr. Cary asked the Chair to accept a new motion to add the HOT lanes project, from American Legion Bridge to I-370, back to the list of projects.

Chair Allen said that the motion had already been ruled out of order and that the board would not be able to accept the motion. He asked Ms. Erickson to continue with the roll call vote.

Ms. Erickson said that the board was considering Resolution R19-2021 (the substitute previously adopted) to adopt Resolution R19-2021 to approve the project submission for inclusion in, and the scope of work for the Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the 2022 Update to Visualize 2045 and the FY 2023-2026 TIP with the I-495/I-270 project removed.

The board voted thusly:

- Yes: Mr. Allen, Mr. Trueblood, Ms. Chamberlin, Mr. Collins, Mr. Wojahn, Mr. Hagen, Mr. Enslinger, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Leszcz, Mr. Erenrich, Mr. Glass, Mr. Bellamy, Ms. Taveras, Ms. Newton, Ms. Kostiuik, Mr. Korman, Mr. Aguirre, Mr. Dorsey, Mr. Meyer, Ms. Umstatt, Mr. Sebesky, Ms. Rishell, Ms. Wheeler, Mr. Angry, Mr. Marsden, Mr. Kannan
- No: Mr. McKay, Mr. Walkinshaw, Mr. Shellenberger, Ms. Sinner
- Abstain: Ms. Hanson, Ms. Russell, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Letourneau

Ms. Erickson said that motion was approved with 26 “yes” votes, four “no” votes, and four abstentions.

## **8. PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE BUILD SCENARIO**

The discussion and action for Item 8 occurred during Item 7.

## **OTHER ITEMS**

## **9. ADJOURN**

No other business was brought to the board. The meeting adjourned at 2:21 p.m.