
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
February 15, 2017

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT

Charles Allen, D.C. Council
Bob Brown, Loudoun County
James Davenport, Prince William County
Allison Davis, WMATA
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Dan Emerine, DC Office of Planning
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County DOT
Dannielle Glaros, Prince George's County
Jason Groth, Charles County
Rene'e Hamilton, VDOT
Neil Harris, City of Gaithersburg
Konrad Herling, City of Greenbelt
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Shyam Kannan, WMATA
R. Earl Lewis, Jr., MDOT
Tim Lovain, City of Alexandria
Dan Malouff, Arlington County
Phil Mendelson, D.C. Council
Ron Meyer, Loudoun County
Bridget Donnell Newton, City of Rockville
Martin Nohe, Prince William County
Mark Rawlings, DC DOT
Jeanette Rishell, City of Manassas Park
Kelly Russell, City of Frederick
Peter Schwartz, Fauquier County
Jarrett Smith, City of Takoma Park
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Brandon Todd, D.C. Council
Mark Wolfe, City of Manassas
Sam Zimbabwe, DDOT
Nicholas Ramfos
Eric Randall
John Swanson
Andrew Austin
Andrew Meese
Dusan Vuksan
Michael Farrell
Daivamani Sivasailam
Charlene Howard
Ken Joh
Brandon Brown
Mark Moran
Ben Hampton
Abigail Zenner

Lori Zeller	
Sergio Ritacco	
Lamont Cobb	
Jessica Mirr	
Arianna Koudoumas	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Chuck Bean	COG/EO
Stuart Freudberg	COG/EO
Paul DesJardin	COG/DCPS
Kari Snyder	MDOT
Bill Orleans	Citizen
Sree Nampoothin	NVTA
Malcolm Watson	FCDOT
Nichole Opkins	DC Council
Stewart Schwartz	CSG
Pierre Holloman	COA
Arielle Moir	CSG
Regina Moore	VDOT
Diane Patterson	MDOT
Norm Catterton	Prince William County
Andrew Mowry	Loudoun County Board of Supervisors
Ariana Geller	CSG
Claire Jaffe	CSG
Rebecca Hertz	ULI
Gary V, Hodge	Regional Policy Advisors
Keiko Yoshino	District of Columbia
Senanu Ashrabor	IML Consulting
Sonali Soneji	VRE
Monica Backmon	NVTA
Mike Lake	Fairfax County DOT
Regina Moore	VDOT
Norman Whitaker	VDOT
Tim Roseboom	VDRPT
Bob Chase	NVTA
Veronica Lewis	Frederick County Transit Division
Regina Sullivan	WMATA
K. Jane Williams	MDOT
Charlie Scott	WMATA

1. PUBLIC COMMENT ON TPB PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES

Chairman Newton called the meeting to order. Three members of the public spoke.

Stewart Schwartz spoke on behalf of the Coalition for Smarter Growth He spoke in favor of the draft resolution on the Long-Range Plan Task Force. He said that the resolution cites the many powerful studies and vision documents that the TPB and COG have developed. He also spoke in favor of coordinating land use and transportation and noted that the board has the authority to direct the planning effort.

Bob Chase from the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance also spoke about the Long-Range Plan

Task Force. Mr. Chase spoke about addressing congestion and bridge crossings. He noted that land use is very important and that there need to be projects included that are game changers for the region but that these projects are not currently in the CLRP.

Deb Bilek from ULI Washington spoke about the ULI Technical Assistance Program. She reminded the board of the partnership between COG and ULI and noted that applications for the program are being accepted until April 3.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE JANUARY MEETING

Chairman Newton reminded the board about remote participation guidelines and noted that Ms. Tawanna Gaines from the Maryland House of Delegates was on the phone.

There was a motion to approve the January 18, 2017 minutes. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

3. REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Davis presented the Technical Committee report. He briefly summarized two items. The first was the proposed bylaws amendment from MDOT. He said that the committee had asked how other MPOs handle the issue in their bylaws. The second item was a briefing on the Long-Range Plan Task Force. He explained that comments from Loudoun County and VDOT were available in the packets.

4. REPORT OF THE CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Martin presented the report of the Citizen Advisory Committee. The 2017 committee met for the first time on February 9. He said the committee focused on getting to know each other, developing priorities for the coming year, and continuing work on public engagement activities for the Long-Range Plan.

5. REPORT OF STEERING COMMITTEE

Mr. Srikanth presented the report of the Steering Committee. He explained that the committee met on February 3 and reviewed and approved four separate amendments to the FY 2017-2022 TIP. He explained that they were all in the packets. The first amendment added a total of about \$27 million in advance construction funding for Virginia projects for the preliminary engineering of I-66 express lanes and a preliminary engineering study of the I-95 express lanes project. The second amendment added about \$16 million in federal and state funds for a group of area-wide congestion management projects in Maryland. The third amendment reduced the planned obligation of some FTA funds for the MARC system by about \$40 million and the fourth added about four and a half million dollars in federal and district funds for the Anacostia Freeway bridge project in the District of Columbia. He also noted that the Steering Committee approved a letter from the board to the WMATA chairman to transmit concerns from the Access for All committee about the WMATA budget. Finally, he reviewed letters sent and received which were included in the packet.

6. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Ms. Newton began her remarks with some WMATA trivia questions in honor of the transit agency's 50th birthday. She praised WMATA for their excellent service during the inauguration and subsequent women's march weekend in January.

ACTION ITEMS

7. APPROVAL OF TPB BYLAWS AMENDMENT

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Erickson briefed the board. She said that the TPB amended the TPB bylaws in January to add a provision for remote participation. She said that at the end of that amendment process, MDOT proposed an additional bylaws amendment to change the membership requirements for a designated alternate board member. Because this proposal was a significant change, it needed at least ten days' written notice and therefore, action on it was deferred to the February board meeting. She said the proposed amendment had been discussed at the Technical Committee and Steering Committee. She asked the MDOT representative to speak to the amendment.

Mr. Lewis said the proposal is to amend the bylaws to state that "designated alternative representatives of local government, representatives must be appointed by their local governing body, and if the designated alternative representative is not an elected official they must be an employee of the participating jurisdiction's government." He said the proposal was intended to ensure the accountability of voting TPB members. He said that MDOT had conducted research that shows that their proposal is a common practice, although it is not always documented. He said he had several constructive conversations with Chairman Bridget Newton about this issue. He said he had learned that the three largest MPOs in Virginia have provisions consistent with the MDOT proposal. He said the practice for most of the MPOs in Maryland is similar, although it is not all documented. He said that after the resolution is finalized at the TPB, MDOT will be seeking similar provisions for all the other MPOs in Maryland. He noted a national survey on this issue, which shows that primary MPO members are typically elected officials, although information regarding alternates was consistently available. He also said that Prince William County has offered alternative language for the bylaws amendment that may be acceptable. In conclusion, he said that if the bylaws change is approved, MDOT would seek to have it become effective within 90 days, which would be approximately May 15.

Chairman Newton asked if there was any conversation on the original amendment.

A member said that it should be the purview of a locality to determine who its representatives are. He said he thought this was a needless infringement upon that. He said his jurisdiction would be very supportive of the Prince William amendment.

Mr. Schwartz said he did not believe that this bylaws amendment proposed by MDOT is a simple housekeeping amendment. He also said he did not believe that this initiative was MDOT's alone. He said it would affect only one or two people serving on the TPB. He said he believed it was aimed at himself and was an attempt to block his participation as retribution for his outspoken concern over the disconnect between the CLRP and the board's long-term vision goals and responsibilities. He said it was instructive that this amendment was introduced last month from the floor as an obvious surprise to the TPB chairman and to many of the participants at the meeting. He said he believed the amendment was introduced in this manner in an attempt to piggyback what appeared to be an innocuous bylaw amendment onto the bylaws amendment regarding remote participation which was already on the board's agenda. He said it seemed the amendment was pursued in this way to limit the opportunity for members to understand its implications. He said that if that were not the case, the amendment would have been vetted in advance of the meeting, as is done for other TPB agenda items, and it would have been presented to him or to Fauquier County to provide them the courtesy of an advance conversation indicating MDOT's need for the change and to solicit possible ways to accommodate Fauquier County's desire for Mr. Schwartz to represent the county at the TPB meetings. He said that Fauquier County was never contacted about this matter. He said the implications of this episode were important to the board. He said that no person serving either as a member or as an alternate and no jurisdiction represented on the board should be deterred from the quest to meet the region's transportation challenges by fear of intimidation or retribution by a state department of transportation or by anyone.

Mr. Schwartz said the TPB has a mandate to make sure that regional transportation investments are made in a manner that effectively, efficiently, and significantly alter the course of the region's failing regional transportation network that by any measure inadequately addresses the mobility of citizens and businesses. He said that this the TPB's purpose and responsibility. He said there is a lot of work to do and there are many participants in the process who are willing to do it. He said the board should tackle the region's challenge without needless distractions from those who are not willing to work on these issues. He urged defeat of the bylaws amendment, as proposed by MDOT, for the sake of the board's independence and the independence of the jurisdictions on the board. In closing he noted that he had reviewed the alternative proposed by Prince William County and he had no objection to it.

Ms. Smyth said she that Fairfax County supported Prince William County's amendment. She said that members of the board all participate in many committees which take a lot of time. She said that as the TPB grows, people will be coming from farther away and it is not always possible for elected officials to participate in all of the meetings they are expected to. She said it should be up to each local body to determine how it wants to be represented in regional organizations.

Mr. Nohe spoke to the amendment brought forward by Prince William County. He thanked Mr. Lewis and MDOT for providing the opportunity to propose this language. He said he was speaking from his perspective as a Prince William County supervisor and as chairman of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority, which in some ways is a body similar to the TPB. Regarding NVTA, he said that Virginia state law provides a set of voting rules and quorum rules and standards for who shall and shall not represent jurisdictions, and those rules were established with the very clear intent of the General Assembly to say that it was their expectation that at the NVTA level jurisdictions "must be represented by their chief elected official, the mayor or the chair, or his elected official designee." While the TPB is different, he said that from a Virginia perspective it is important that when individuals are acting on behalf of their locality it must be clear that they are acting on behalf of that elected body, and that is why this amendment is needed. Citing the example of the City of Frederick and himself, he noted the long distances that board participants must travel. He said that as the region grows, it will become necessary to become more flexible. He said it is very important to clearly define the rules for participation so that in the future board members do not find themselves quibbling over who can sit at the TPB table. He asked that MDOT incorporate the Prince William Amendment into their motion.

Mr. Lewis said it was not his intention to submit an amendment to deal with an issue that is related to Virginia. He said that MDOT is preparing to go through a federal review of its MPO oversight activities, and from past reviews, he said that MDOT staff know that accountability is an issue that the federal agencies look at. He said he fully agreed on the importance of the issues before the TPB and therefore is essential to partner with the District of Columbia and jurisdictions in Virginia. He said there is a need to ensure that the board's bylaws ensure accountability back to elected officials. He said he would entertain the amendment brought to the floor by Prince William County, which he asked Mr. Nohe to read.

Reading from a blue-sheeted handout, Mr. Nohe said the amendment would change the motion to read as follows: "Designated alternative representatives of the local government representatives must be appointed by their local governing body. If the designated alternative representative is not an elected official or an employee of the participating jurisdiction's government, then the participating jurisdiction's governing body must authorize a resolution appointing the external candidate, based on his/her qualifications and experience, to adequately represent the jurisdiction as an alternative representative."

Chairman Newton noted, for the record, that Mr. Nohe had misread two words in his amendment: 1) the word "alternate" should be used instead of "alternative" and 2) the word "expertise" should be used instead of "experience." Mr. Nohe's amendment, as distributed in written form, was correct.

Mr. Nohe said that for the record, the language that the chairman acknowledged was the intended

language.

A motion was made to approve the amendment to the amendment proposed by Prince William County. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Lovain noted that this would be a significant change for the TPB. He said that this would open up the possibility of significant private citizen participation in the board. He said, however, that he did appreciate the fact that Prince William County phrased the language in a careful way to make sure that those private citizens who serve as alternates have qualifications and expertise to serve.

Chairman Newton noted that the language also called for alternate members to have the formal backing of the jurisdictions they represent.

As a technical correction, Mr. Zimbabwe noted that Subsection C in the bylaws, which is referenced in the amendment, indicates that one of the TPB members is the Department of Public Works. He said this should be changed to the District Department of Transportation. He said that this year will mark the 15th anniversary of DDOT. He moved inclusion of this change. The motion was seconded.

The amendment to amend the bylaws, incorporating the changes proposed by Mr. Nohe and Mr. Zimbabwe, was approved in a voice vote. Ms. Gaines, participating on the telephone, indicated her vote was "aye."

Chairman Newton expressed appreciation for the serious consideration given to this issue.

8. APPROVAL TO AMEND THE FY 2017-2022 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) TO INCLUDE PROJECT AND FUNDING UPDATES FOR FY 2018 IN ORDER TO MATCH THE UPDATED WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY FY 2018 CAPITAL BUDGET

Mr. Kannan requested that the board move forward with Resolution R-11-2017 which sought the board's approval to modify the FY 2017-22 TIP so that it would reflect WMATA's FY 2018 capital budget. The increase would reflect the availability of federal, state, and local funds including the local match for these federal funds. He explained that the funds were not new funds and would not affect the CLRP. He also explained that this step would be needed to submit a grant application to FTA in March. He explained that the additional funds would help with the accelerated schedule of the new 7000 series rail cars and speeding up maintenance, repairs, and upgrades to the tracks.

A motion was made to approve the resolution. The motion was seconded.

A question was asked seeking clarification about where the money was coming from.

Mr. Kannan explained that this was not new money and that this was for capital needs and not connected to the operating budget.

The board approved Resolution R-11-2017 unanimously.

9. DISCUSSION ON WMATA'S PROPOSED 2018 BUDGET

Ms. Sullivan provided a presentation on WMATA's proposed 2018 operating budget. She explained that the board had asked her present the budget proposal from a regional perspective. She also explained that there had been numerous presentations throughout the region and opportunities for public participation. She explained that the budget is a reality check and that the agency has eliminated jobs and proposed to eliminate more. She also explained that there has been a reduction in ridership but that the agency is looking at enhancing advertising, fare enforcement and fare increases to fill the gap. She noted that the full presentation was available in the packets.

Mr. Allen asked if there were any increases in parking fees.

Ms. Sullivan said that there were.

Mr. Allen explained that he was most concerned about equity issues and that there was such a disparity between proposed increase in fares for the bus versus the train.

Ms. Sullivan said that the agency had received those comments from the public and that it was a top issue. She said she appreciated the feedback.

Ms. Hudgins noted that rail passengers have faced greater burdens because of SafeTrack work. She asked what the agency was planning to do to win those riders back.

Ms. Smyth said she has heard from constituents who were most worried about bus routes that were slated to be cut.

Mr. Herling noted his appreciation that when cuts are considered that alternate routes are thought through and presented by WMATA so that areas are not adversely impacted.

Mr. Zimbabwe spoke to the need to think about the long-term needs for the region. He said that the board should think about the financial planning process and how to strengthen WMATA to be more financially sound. He said that the trends should be troubling and he noted that WMATA has some hard work to do but that he appreciated the thoughtful presentation.

Ms. Glaros talked about how sensitive customers are to fare increases. She asked about the ridership data in relation to past fare increases. She specifically mentioned longer rides that also cost more. She also highlighted development projects near Metro stations in College Park and New Carrollton that will bring jobs but at the same time, she noted, service is being cut back. She said that because of cost and infrequency of service, she and others mostly drive on weekends and do not take Metro.

Ms. Sullivan said she would be happy to share historical data on ridership and to talk a little more another time about the historic points.

Mr. Kannan said that no one should be surprised by these numbers. He said that all of the rebuilding work that Metro has been doing was deferred for a long time. He noted that ridership began to decline when weekend track work began in 2010 and these disruptions are a fact of maintaining the system. He also said that he hopes the discussion of the long-range plan takes into account maintenance so that there can be more reliable service in the future.

Mr. Harris asked about the price elasticity of demand and if WMATA looked at how price sensitive riders would be to fare increases.

Mr. Kannan answered that Metro hired an outside firm to do that work. They found that right now the ridership is relatively price-inelastic meaning those who ride Metro likely have few other options. He said that WMATA's bus fares are among the lowest in the nation. He also said that the distance-based fares on rail allow customers to pay fares that are still below comparable commuter rail fares in the nation.

Mr. Erenrich talked about parts of Montgomery County with no rail or bus service. He specifically talked about the rail turn back at Grovesnor and mentioned the development at White Flint. He asked about different kinds of trade-offs like preventative maintenance and double counting train parts.

Ms. Sullivan answered that the budget has now gone to the WMATA board, that it has been discussed and gone through public comment. She also said that there has been a deliberative process with board workshops and public participation and she was sure that the board is considering all alternatives.

Ms. Newton asked about wage increases and had heard there would be consideration of a 3 percent increase for the union.

Ms. Sullivan said that there are no funds in the proposed budget for wage increases and that WMATA is still in negotiations with the union.

Ms. Newton asked about a flat fare.

Mr. Kannan explained that the question of a flat fare comes up now and then and that it is good to bring it up. He said that Metro leaders often see flaws in a flat fare even though it seems simple. He also said that Metro is part subway system and part commuter rail which serve different needs in different parts of the system which has some implications on a flat fare system. He said that most modern transit companies are moving towards a distance-based fare system.

Ms. Sullivan explained that they have looked at products like the university pass and passes for students and different fare products as ways to bring in more riders.

Ms. Hudgins said that it was important to look at the question of how to really fund the system to bring people back. She said that they could not offer a service that is not reliable and assume that ridership could be maintained. She said that there is a bigger conversation with the jurisdictions about how to fund the system and how to make it sustainable.

Ms. Newton asked if there could be chances in the future for more in-depth discussions with WMATA.

Mr. Srikanth said that they could work with WMATA on when the right time would be for a longer-term perspective and said that perhaps as part of the 2018 CLRP Update activities.

INFORMATION ITEMS

10. LONG-RANGE PLAN TASK FORCE BRIEFING

Chairman Newton introduced Item 10 by saying that the draft resolution presented to the board was a work product of the chairs, in an attempt to be inclusive of all the different constituents while still maintaining a bold stance. She asked if Mr. Srikanth or Ms. Erickson from staff had anything to add.

Mr. Srikanth said that the objective was to create an agreed-upon framework for the Task Force's activities to be formally adopted in March by the board, which will allow staff to move forward with work.

Mr. Meyer expressed concern about waiting one more month and stated that he felt the draft resolution set an aggressive path for moving forward. He asked Mr. Srikanth if staff would be interpreting actions to be taken from the "therefore" clauses. Mr. Srikanth confirmed this. Mr. Meyer acknowledged Mr. Srikanth's response and then stated his belief that the resolution was a compromise document by including polices as well as game-changing projects. He emphasized his interest in identifying game-changing projects and that the timeline is aggressive in an attempt to get ready for potential federal funding. He also expressed that cross-jurisdictional projects are important to explore and as a regional body the TPB should be working across jurisdictions. He stated his hope for the task force to start meeting next month.

Chairman Newton clarified that there were two documents before the board: one which was the draft resolution written by the chairs and one which was written by former CAC member Gary Hodge. She then invited Mr. Hodge to address the board to explain his draft resolution.

Mr. Hodge explained the element of his document which called for game-changing projects to advocate for to the federal government.

Mr. Schwartz expressed concern about "putting the cart before the horse" in terms of identifying expensive game-changing projects. He stated that he liked that the chairs' proposal balanced the importance of looking at policy solutions and program solutions which could be lower cost than some projects. He noted that projects should definitely still be considered, but that some programs, such as telecommuting, have gotten less focus in the recent past compared to projects.

Mr. Allen said he wanted clarification as to which document the board was working from. Chairman Newton stated that they were working off the document which was posted as Item 10.

Mr. Kannan stated he was satisfied that the document serves as a compromise. He noted that he would like the resolution to call on the board to create a long-range plan, which it did not.

Mr. Wolfe said it was important for the board to determine what “long-term” means. He also stated that he would like the resolution to call for a “limited number of high-impact projects” instead of specifying the number of projects. He also recommended changing the date from November to December 31.

Mr. Meyer moved that the Transportation Planning Board adopt a resolution establishing the mission and tasks for Phase II of the Long-Range Plan Task Force, labeled TPB R-12-2017, Item 10. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Nohe stated that there should be a direct reference from Charge 5 to Charge 7, just as there is from Charge 4 to Charge 7. He stated that by making this connection, the work produced under Charge 5 would directly inform the projects, policies and programs being chosen, which would make the charge more specific. He also stated that by connecting Charge 5 to Charge 7, it would make it so that Charge 7 was not only driven by performance measures. He also referenced Mr. Kannan’s statement about developing a long-range plan, and stated that he wanted to make sure there was staff and money to do so.

Mr. Meyer suggested the following in order to amend the resolution in line with what Mr. Nohe had stated: eliminate the first phrase in Number 5 from "charges" to "plans," retain the dashes, attach those dashes to Charge 4, so that Charge 4 would read "Charges the Task Force and staff to develop performance metrics that can be used to achieve the projects, policies, and programs as described in Number 7 below, (and this is where it jumps to 5) – including in the areas of performance measures, project evaluation and selection, and scenario analysis that have been developed by the MPOs."

Mr. Nohe stated that he accepted Mr. Meyer’s suggestion. He also noted that NVTA is engaged in similar work to what the TPB is working on.

Mr. Emerine stated that he had no objection to Charges 4 and 5 being combined. He also stated that a particularly valuable task in this work is the presentation of information from peer MPOs from around the country, because much good work has already been done.

Mr. Erenrich moved to add another charge before Charge 8, which would say: "Charge the task force with identifying sources of funding and financing strategies to advance these regionally significant projects." He stated his reasoning was to explicitly mention funding, whereas before it had only been implied.

Chairman Newton responded to Mr. Erenrich saying that the topic had come up before and that there had been concern about things being removed from the CLRP if funding sources were to be discussed.

Mr. Erenrich responded to Chairman Newton, adding that a discussion of funding may result in a large project being substituted for another large project.

Mr. Allen asked to clarify what Mr. Erenrich had proposed, asking if the amendment would make it so that projects which were reviewed by the Task Force would need to have funding already identified.

Mr. Erenrich responded to Mr. Allen, saying that it had not been his intent. He stated that knowing the costs of potential projects in the context of the already-funded program would be helpful.

Mr. Meyer made a point of order: if Mr. Erenrich had moved to amend the resolution, it would need to be seconded. The amendment was then seconded.

Mr. Lovain suggested that Mr. Erenrich change his amendment to say “possible sources of funding.” He also noted his support for retaining the language in the text calling for the identification of “6 to 10 projects.”

Mr. Erenrich accepted Mr. Lovain's suggestion as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Meyer noted that he would not take Mr. Erenrich's amendment as friendly because the CLRP is financially constrained and the Long-Range Plan Task Force has the opportunity to look beyond the CLRP at unfunded projects.

Mr. Groth stated that he would like these activities to be focused on identifying the unfunded projects, since the CLRP already involves funded projects. He also referenced Mr. Hodge's draft proposal and said that he liked it because it aims to hold the board accountable to regional priorities and lays out a path to work towards them. He wanted to incorporate the sixth charge from Mr. Hodge's draft proposal into the proposal on the table because it mentions "game-changing" projects.

Chairman Newton made a point of order, noting that Mr. Groth could not introduce a new amendment until Mr. Erenrich's proposed amendment had been settled.

A question was asked as to whether the previous amendment which involved combining Charges 4 and 5 had been passed. Chairman Newton stated that it had been accepted as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Harris stated that he would like the Task Force to address potential funding sources, rather than mandating that funding sources must be identified.

Mr. Lewis attempted to introduce another amendment in the "Whereas" clauses and Chairman Newton asked him to wait until the amendment on the floor was finished.

Mr. Snyder recommended changing Mr. Erenrich's amendment to say "projects, policies or programs," to parallel what is described in Charge 7.

Mr. Erenrich accepted Mr. Snyder's suggestion as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Kannan asked Mr. Erenrich if he would consider using the term "recommend" or "suggest" instead of "identify," so that the activities in the unconstrained element are clearly separate from the financially constrained element.

Mr. Erenrich accepted Mr. Kannan's suggestion as a friendly amendment.

Chairman Newton asked if there was any further discussion on the amendment and called for a vote. The amendment passed by a voice vote, with no one opposing and no abstentions.

Mr. Kannan introduced a new amendment which would add "constructing a long-range transportation plan" into Charge 7, after the word "of" in the original charge. The proposed amendment was seconded.

Mr. Meyer accepted Mr. Kannan's amendment as friendly.

Mr. Wolfe proposed two amendments: 1) to change Charge 7 language from the limitation of "six to ten projects" to say "a limited number of projects", and, 2) to change the date from November to December 31 for the completion of all the activities. The amendments were seconded.

Mr. Meyer did not accept the amendments as friendly.

Chairman Newton opened the discussion on the amendments by saying the "six to ten" limit was written by the chairs in an attempt to constrain the discussion of the Task Force. She also said she would be fine with the date change, but that the chairs wanted to work within deadlines that staff are under.

Mr. Srikanth noted that whether the date is November or December, it would be almost impossible to complete all the tasks as described, due to limitations of staff time, funding to pay for staff time, and funding for consultant assistance. He suggested that the language for the final deadline at the end of the year call for "the first set of results."

Mr. Malouff recommended that the word "approximately" be inserted before "six to ten."

Mr. Meyer takes the “approximately” recommendation as a friendly amendment and also took the date change to December 31 as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Martin noted that the proposed amendment has no reference to public participation, and thought it could fit into the Charge 4/5 revision or Charge 7/8.

Chairman Newton responded to Mr. Martin saying that Charge 1 requires participation in the Task Force by a member of the Citizen’s Advisory Committee as well as the Access for All Committee. She said those representatives would be the “spokes of the wheel” for outreach.

Mr. Martin replied to Chairman Newton, saying that it will be great to be included in the Task Force but that it would also be great to reference public participation more directly in the resolution.

Mr. Groth noted that he was reading Mr. Hodge’s document and the proposal on the table and was trying to determine a way to incorporate the “game-changing” projects piece from the former into the latter, but that he did not have an amendment at that moment.

Mr. Malouff noted that the proposal on the table did refer to “significantly better progress” which sounded to him like “game-changing,” and he said that perhaps the wording could be changed.

Chairman Newton stated she thinks the “game-changing” project task is different from the Task Force’s regional project identification.

Mr. Meyer stated that he believes identifying the “game-changing” projects as described in the sixth charge in Mr. Hodge’s document could be added to the charges of the Task Force, and he suggested amending the proposal on the table to include the sixth item from Mr. Hodge’s document. He and other board members discussed the numbering of the charges, because previous amendments had changed the numbering, and the discussion was unclear as to what this new proposed amendment would be numbered.

Mr. Schwartz explained that he took issue with the sixth item from Mr. Hodge’s document because it charges the Task Force with its first priority as identifying a limited number of regional high-impact projects. He disagreed with that being the first priority, and instead suggested the first priority should be setting measurable goals. He recalled language from the “whereas” clauses which refer to the regional goals and vision, and stated some of these are not definable by metrics. He stated his preference for the first priority of the Task Force to identify measurable goals in the areas of congestion, mobility, access and equality, before the Task Force begins to look at specific projects, programs and policies.

Mr. Emerine stated that his understanding was that the task at hand was to develop a long-range plan and not to develop a quick-turnaround funding package submission. He stated concern that chasing dollars which do not yet have a scope and have potential strings attached would change the focus of the board. He urged the TPB to consider the opportunity to create a sound long-range plan that charts a direction for the region, and not to let the scope of this task force be swallowed by short-range funding opportunities.

Mr. Kannan stated that if the TPB does wish to put together a package of projects for potential federal funding, that it should be a separate activity. He also expressed concern with the sixth item from Mr. Hodge’s document, in that it reminded him of the CLRP as it already functions, with jurisdictions submitting their own projects.

Mr. Snyder echoed previous comments opposing Mr. Groth’s amendment, saying that it would push too far in one direction and that he would prefer for the Task Force to have more flexibility, and that potential funding sources will be discussed anyway.

Mr. Groth withdrew his amendment as a result of the discussion, and stated that he hopes the discussion will remain in the forefront of everyone’s mind.

Mr. Lewis proposed an amendment which would add footnotes which would identify the sources of the figures to the “whereas” clause at the top of page 2 of the proposed resolution.

Mr. Meyer accepted Mr. Lewis’ request for footnotes as a friendly amendment.

Mr. Schwartz proposed an amendment to add a charge which would say, “Charges the task force and the staff with identifying measurable goals consistent with the TPB's prior vision documents, in the areas of congestion, mobility, access, and equity.” He noted that this could be added to Charge 4 which discusses performance metrics, so that the measurable goals would be established and then measured by the metrics. The motion to amend was seconded.

Mr. Snyder emphasized that there are other regional goals which were not mentioned by Mr. Schwartz and which are not mentioned in the proposed resolution, such as safety and air quality. He opposed mentioning specific goals, as Mr. Schwartz’s amendment would do, because the resolution was not meant to be an inclusive list of all the TPB’s goals.

Mr. Schwartz recognized Mr. Snyder’s point, and changed his amendment to add language to Charge 4 instead of creating a new charge. His revised amendment would be to add “measurable goals and” before the mention of performance metrics in Charge 4. The amendment as revised was seconded.

Mr. Meyer accepted the amendment as friendly.

A motion was made to call the question and this motion was seconded.

Mr. Srikanth asked to make a technical correction to the resolution before the board formally adopted it. He noted that in the “whereas” clause which references past performance analyses of the CLRP, the figure which stated that transit ridership would decrease by 51,000 was incorrect. He noted that the performance analysis of the 2016 CLRP showed that between now and 2040, transit ridership would increase by about 32%, which is approximately 350,000 additional trips.

Mr. Lewis stated that his amendment requesting footnotes was intended to address the statistics in that “whereas” clause, in order to make sure the statistics were correct.

Chairman Newton asked for clarification and Mr. Srikanth said the only statistic which was incorrect was the transit ridership one.

Mr. Kannan asked Mr. Srikanth if he thought the 51,000 figure was the transit cap in the out year, meaning the additional transit ridership which could be added to existing forecast growth, if the transit constraint was removed from the model.

Mr. Srikanth confirmed that he believes that is likely where that figure came from, although he could not be certain since he did not write the resolution and could not mean to speak for those who did.

Mr. Meyer proposed to remove the statistic referring to transit ridership. There was verbal agreement to accept this proposal.

Ms. Hamilton asked if the board would be voting to adopt the amendments, and if the resolution as a whole would be voted on presently or if it would come back to the board the next month for a final vote.

Chairman Newton responded that the board would be acting on the resolution on the floor today.

Ms. Hudgins stated that the discussion had been good but that it was difficult to vote on the resolution at that time because board members did not have an updated version in front of them.

Chairman Newton expressed concern that by not voting on the resolution today, another month would be lost.

A comment was made that it would be beneficial to board members to be able to review the changes so they could better understand what they are voting on.

Mr. Harris suggested tentatively scheduling the first meeting of the Task Force for after the next TPB meeting so that the vote could occur at the meeting and then follow it up with the Task Force meeting.

Chairman Newton stated that she agreed with Mr. Harris' suggestion to tentatively schedule the first meeting of the Task Force for after the next TPB meeting.

Mr. Meyer said that he took the amendment as friendly to move the vote on the proposed amendment to March with the intent of holding the first Task Force meeting after the TPB meeting.

Mr. Herling said that the Task Force should meet before the TPB meeting.

Mr. Harris said that the Task Force could not meet if it had not yet been created by the resolution.

Chairman Newton stated that the motion on the floor was to move the action on the proposed resolution to the March TPB meeting, to be immediately followed by the Task Force meeting. The motion was seconded.

A voice vote was taken with a majority in favor, with two opposed, and no abstentions. The motion carried.

Mr. Snyder expressed that he would like his vote to be recorded as "no," for the reason that he believed the board was ready to act at the present and did not.

11. BRIEFING ON THE DRAFT FY 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP)

Chairman Newton asked Mr. Srikanth if she needed to move to skip the rest of the agenda items for the day or if she should just adjourn.

Mr. Srikanth responded that he would like to say a few quick things. He stated that the remaining items were informational and in draft form, intended to solicit comments. He described the first one, which was the information on the draft FY 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP).

12. BRIEFING ON THE DRAFT FY 2018 COMMUTER CONNECTIONS WORK PROGRAM (CCWP)

Mr. Srikanth also made note of the briefing material regarding the FY 2018 Commuter Connections Work Program.

Mr. Srikanth said that for both the UPWP and CCWP, 30-day public comment periods were already underway and that staff would present final versions of the UPWP and the CCWP at the next board meeting. He requested that if any TPB members had comments, they should submit them soon so that approval of these documents might be action items in March.

13. NOTICE TO AMEND THE FY 2017-2022 (TIP) TO INCLUDE PROJECT AND FUNDING UPDATES FOR THE NORTHERN VIRGINIA SECTION OF THE TIP, AS REQUESTED BY THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (VDOT)

Mr. Srikanth stated that the last item was a notice item about VDOT's request to update the TIP, which was described in the materials as part of the mailout, for which the public would be notified, and which the TPB would take action on in March. He told the board if they have any questions to please contact him.

14. ADJOURN

Chairman Newton adjourned the meeting at 2:37 p.m.