
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
October 17, 2018

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT

Charles Allen, DC Council
Paolo Belita, Prince William County
Ron Burns, Frederick County
Christian Dorsey, Arlington County
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County
Danielle Glaros, Prince George's County
Jason Groth, Charles County
Rene'e Hamilton, VDOT
Neil Harris, City of Gaithersburg
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Fazlul Kabir, City of College Park
Sakina Kahn, DC Office of Planning
Shyam Kanaan, WMATA
Kacy Kostiuk, City of Takoma Park
R. Earl Lewis, Jr., MDOT
Tim Lovain, City of Alexandria
Dan Malouff, Arlington County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Ron Meyer, Loudoun County
Bridget Donnell Newton, City of Rockville
Marty Nohe, Prince William County
Mark Rawlings, DDOT
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Kelly Russell, City of Frederick
Eric Shaw, DC Office of Planning
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Tammy Stidham, National Park Service
Dolly Turner, District of Columbia
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County Exec.
Sam Zimbabwe, DDOT

MWCOG STAFF AND OTHERS PRESENT

Lyn Erickson
Tim Canan
Andrew Meese
John Swanson
Eric Randall
Mark Moran
Dusan Vuksan
Jane Posey

Martha Kile	
Andrew Austin	
Matthew Gaskin	
Jon Schermann	
Kenneth Joh	
Michael Farrell	
William Bacon	
Sergio Ritacco	
Abigail Zenner	
Arianna Koudounas	
Lynn Winchell-Mendy	
Jessica Mirr	
Sanghyeon Ko	
Brandon Brown	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Wendy Klancher	
Chuck Bean	COG/EO
Paul DesJardin	COG/DCPS
Malcolm Watson	Fairfax County/DOT
Regina Moore	VDOT
Maria Sinner	VDOT
Bill Orleans	
Norman Whitaker	VDOT
Chris Laskowski	DC Council
Kristin Calkins	DC Office of Planning
Kari Snyder	MDOT
Dan Goldfarb	NVTC
David Donaldson	University of Maryland
Mike Lake	Fairfax County DOT
Sree Nampoothiri	NVTA
Stewart Schwartz	CSG
Jesse Herman	Fairfax County
Lee Schoenecker	Citizen
Duane Rosenberg	Mayor New Carrollton
Rob Whitfield	Fairfax County Taxpayer's Alliance
Nydia Blake	Prince William County
Peter Johnson	DC Council
Andrew Mowry	Loudoun County
Alex Waltz	Charles County

1. PUBLIC COMMENT ON TPB PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES

Mr. Wojahn, Mayor of College Park, said that he was TPB chair in 2014 when the board passed the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. He said he appreciates all the work that has happened since then, including the work that has gone into Visualize 2045. He said that he wants to raise concern about the “traffic relief plan” that was included in the constrained element of Visualize 2045 for Maryland. He said that the proposal to add four managed lanes to I-270 and I-495 could impact communities along those corridors. He said those impacts could include the taking of homes. He said that College Park’s city council unanimously approved a letter asking the TPB to include amendments to the Visualize 2045 resolution that would address these concerns.

Ms. Kaplan, Greater Washington Partnership, said that her organization supports the adoption of Visualize 2045. She referred to her written statement of support. She said that COG members played an important role in securing dedicated funding for WMATA. She said that the Washington region, stretching from Richmond to Baltimore, is the third-largest economy in the country and seventh-largest in the world. She said her partnership views that improving transportation is vital to the region's economy, and that Visualize 2045, including the aspirational components, is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Schwartz, Coalition for Smarter Growth, said that the TPB and have COG have done a lot of good work, including the transit components of Visualize 2045 and the outreach and communications that went into making that plan. He said that his group has serious concerns that the constrained element of Visualize 2045 is overwhelmingly focused on large freeway and arterial expansion projects that will increase vehicle miles traveled, create more bottlenecks, and increase greenhouse gas emissions. He said that it is the right of elected officials on the board to represent citizen concerns regarding neighborhood and environmental impacts and the need to study alternatives to a proposed project. He urged all members to support and weigh in on projects proposed by state DOTs. He said that Transportation agencies and the TPB are not fully accounting for induced demand.

Mr. Orleans, said that he attended the October CAC meeting. At that meeting the committee discussed the possible demise of WMATA's Riders Advisory Council, and that members of the CAC supported doing something about that. He said that WMATA should fully continue to support public participation and maintain their riders group. He said that he endorses all suggestions that widening I-495 and I-270 are silly. He finished by saying that WMATA's bus transformation study does not include enough public involvement.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 21, 2018 MEETING

A motion was made to approve the minutes from the September TPB meeting. The motion was seconded and approved.

3. REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Brown said that the Technical Committee met on October 5, and that notes from the meeting have been posted. He highlighted a resolution made by the committee which compliments and comments staff for the effort put into the plan and encourages the board to approve the plan.

4. REPORT OF THE CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)

Ms. Kortum said that the CAC met on October 11 and had a vigorous discussion about WMATA's Riders Advisory Council (RAC). She said that the WMATA board is likely to vote at their October 25 board meeting to dissolve the group. She said that WMATA had determined that they can get the value that they seek from public hearings and through social media and online survey platforms. She said that members of the RAC, including herself, do not agree that the proposed alternatives are sufficient. She said that the CAC expressed dismay that a sibling citizens advisory group would no longer exist but expressed enthusiasm that the CAC would continue to represent the voice of citizens from across the region.

Ms. Kortum said that the committee received a briefing on the performance analysis of Visualize 2045. The committee also participated in an activity in which members were asked to place future growth on a map and then build transportation infrastructure to support that growth. Feedback from this activity will be used by staff as they plan future engagement activities.

Chair Allen said that it is a bad idea to get rid of the RAC. He said it is possible to improve the group without dissolving it. He asked Mr. Srikanth for advice on how the TPB could respond. He suggested that if the board could reach a consensus on its comments to the WMATA Board, staff could work on a letter that would be sent to the WMATA board ahead of its meeting next week. Mr. Srikanth also said that the Technical Committee had not discussed the matter to better understand the issues, what had been done to address them, and the proposal to disband the RAC. He noted that the matter had come to the staff's attention only recently. He also asked if WMATA staff could provide some details on the matter.

Mr. Kannan deferred to WMATA Board members who were also on the TPB.

Mr. Dorsey, a WMATA Board member, said that Ms. Kortum had succinctly summarized the situation. Mr. Dorsey said the WMATA board is planning on considering this issue on October 25. He said the board could change course, but at this point the working plan was to disband the RAC. He added that he was part of a task force that had been tasked with performing an operational review of the Riders Advisory Council. Working in consultation with Ms. Kortum and some other members of the RAC leadership, that task force came up with an operational proposal to actually deal with some of the challenges of RAC operations. He said that unfortunately, that reform proposal did not meet favor with the board, at least in a closed session. He said he believed that the reform proposal ought to get a full and public consideration. Mr. Dorsey offered himself as a resource to work with TPB staff on a letter if the TPB chooses to comment on the matter.

Mr. Nohe said he thinks the TPB should submit a letter encouraging the WMATA board not to dissolve the RAC.

Chair Allen asked if there was staff capacity to work on a letter if the board requests one. Mr. Srikanth said that staff has capacity.

Mr. Roberts made a motion which was seconded.

Ms. Hudgins said that as an alternate on the WMATA board she thinks that a letter has merits in conveying the TPB's perspective on the matter of the RAC.

The motion was approved.

5. REPORT OF STEERING COMMITTEE ACTIONS AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Mr. Srikanth said that in the interest of time he would not provide his usual review of all materials. He said that the complete written report was made available. He said that the following items may be of interest. First, he noted that the Steering Committee met on September 7 where it reviewed and approved a request from VDOT to amend the TIP to provide additional funding for four projects in Loudoun County. He said details of this amendment are on pages 3 through 12 of his report. He said that the TPB received a couple letters from TPB member jurisdictions and agencies on the long-range transportation plan. He said that those items will be discussed during Item 7. He said that the TPB's bicycle and pedestrian subcommittee will host a regional workshop to examine issues surrounding dockless bicycles and scooters on October 31. More details about the event are on page 33.

Mr. Srikanth said that TPB's Director of Travel Forecasting and Emissions Analysis program, Mr. Ron Milone is retiring after 33 years of working for the TPB. He started as a transportation engineer in 1982. He said that Mr. Milone is well respected and was recently awarded a national award for outstanding individual leadership, and also the Community Transportation Award from the Washington D.C. Institute of Transportation Engineers.

Mr. Milone said that it has been a privilege to serve the TPB for so long. He said he was proud of the transportation accomplishments that the TPB has made over the last 30 years.

The board applauded Mr. Milone.

Chair Allen thanked Mr. Malone for his service.

6. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

Chair Allen said that there is a lot to discuss and approve at the meeting. He said that many of the items have been shared with the board before. He said that Items 7 to 10 are over the TPB's primary responsibility, to develop a long-range transportation plan for the region that balances many priorities, including providing affordable multi-modal transportation options for residents and businesses. He said that over the past four years the TPB and members have worked hard to bring Visualize 2045 together. He said that the plan improves on previous plans, and he hopes that the next plan will improve on the current one. He said that one of the features in this plan is the articulation of the region's aspirations toward improved mobility and accessibility as represented by the initiatives that the board endorsed. This, together with TPB's previous priorities plans, can inform continuing discussions and efforts to try to make this plan even better.

Mr. Allen said that in November there will be a work session where the board will receive recommendations on the types of projects and programs that can be implemented in the region and the types of policies that could be enacted to help realize the improved mobility and accessibility anticipated from the aspirational initiatives. He said that he hoped that the TPB members will receive these recommendations, discuss them, and take them back to their own planning and programming processes and treatments so they might be considered for inclusion in the next update.

Chair Allen said that a DC resident and a friend was struck and killed while walking. He said that as the board considers making decisions and bold choices it is important to keep focus on moving people around well, efficiently, and safely.

ACTION ITEMS

7. REVIEW OF ALL COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE 30-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND ACCEPTANCE OF RECOMMENDED RESPONSES FOR VISUALIZE 2045, THE FY 2019-2024 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP), AND THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Erickson provided an overview statement regarding the comments. She noted that the development of Visualize 2045 was a more extensive process than past long-range plan updates and that staff was proud of the items on the agenda. She highlighted the TPB's federal responsibilities and that the deadline for approval of the plan, and associated documents, was tight because the federal agencies need to approve the plan no later than January 5. She said that all comments received are included in the documentation. She said that staff had summarized the comments and provided recommended responses. She said the board action would be to accept the recommended responses to all the comments received for the conformity analysis, Visualize 2045, and the TIP. She noted that many of the comments received this year were different than in past years.

Referring to the mailout materials, Mr. Austin said that comments were received from 97 individuals, eight advocacy organizations and nonprofits, from TPB members such as the City of Falls Church, Fairfax County, the National Capital Planning Commission, and from the TPB's own Access for All

Advisory Committee. He said there was a noticeable difference in the tenor of many of the comments received this year. He said that many comments reacted to the plan as a whole rather than to individual projects, which was more typical for previous iterations of the long-range plan. He listed the categories of the comments received. He said that some comments on specific projects were received, and he noted that staff worked with the implementing agencies to provide informed responses to such comments.

Ms. Kostiuk, chair of the Access for All Advisory (AFA) Committee, summarized that committee's comments on the plan. She said the AFA called for more and restored bus services, pedestrian and bicycle facilities that consider the needs of people with disabilities and older adults, and consideration of the impacts of toll lanes on low-income populations. She said the committee called for future plans to better consider the impacts of technology. Finally, the AFA expressed concern that the access to jobs measure shows that the region is not divided only by race and income, but also by access to jobs. The AFA supports an increase in all modes of transportation to connect the eastern part of the region to the job-rich western portion.

Ms. Hudgins called attention to the letter from the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, which was broadly supportive of Visualize 2045. is a really important piece to do. She said the letter emphasized the importance of improving pedestrian connections and also favorably noted two highway projects in the plan.

Mr. Snyder spoke about a letter from the City of Falls Church that identified several projects of interest. He highlighted the need, in future plans, to focus on the opportunities provided by new technology. to get us past the old fight between transit and roads, recognizing that we live in the conditions of today where we have to serve our current populations. He said he thought the plan and the region overall is insufficiently addressing and taking potential advantage of technology that will help move people and help promote sustainability. However, he said Falls Church was generally in support of the plan.

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Posey called attention to a letter from the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC). She said the letter expressed concern the forecasts in the conformity analysis exceed the Tier 1 mobile emissions budgets and therefore Tier 2 budgets are invoked. She said the letter stressed that MWAQC would hope that Tier 2 budget would not be used in the future. In their letter, MWAQC pledged to work with the TPB to further reduce air pollution and they were encouraged that the region is achieving reductions in VMT per capita, but the urged the TPB to continue to invest in public transit and ride-sharing and bike and pedestrian projects. She noted that the letter also requested a technical correction in a graphic in the draft plan document. The letter also expressed appreciation for the TPB's support for a joint letter that would be discussed under Item 13.

Ms. Posey described the TPB's draft recommended response which noted that the inputs used in the conformity analysis are different from those used to set the budgets and that the Tier 2 budgets were established exactly for such a situation. She said the TPB response gives statistics on the significant reduction in mobile source emissions in the past and projected in the future. It also talks about transportation improvements in Visualize 2045, such as increased high-capacity transit miles, increased jobs and household growth in activity centers, and significant decreases in congestion compared to plans in the past. She said the TPB agreed with MWAQC about continued investment in public transportation and ride-sharing as well as WMATA and the Commuter Connections Program. Further, the draft letter stated that the TPB agrees that there should be a continued effort to reduce emissions across all sectors. She said that staff has updated the graphic as follow-up to the technical correction that MWAQC requested.

Ms. Erickson moved on to the comment received after the public comment period closed.

Referring to a handout, Ms. Erickson described a letter from the Maryland Department of Transportation regarding the “Transportation Relief Plan” and the I-495 and the I-270 managed lane study and the National Environmental Policy Act process. She said the letter declared that the state’s approach would be to implement a solution within existing rights-of-way, and they are committed to working with citizens, businesses, and federal, state, and local agencies to ensure that concerns related to property and environmental resources are addressed. They also highlight that this is the early stage of planning.

Referring to a handout, Ms. Erickson noted a letter from the Greenbelt City Council that expressed concerns over the inclusion of several MDOT roadway widening proposals for I-495, I-270, and Maryland 201 in Visualize 2045.

Referring to a handout, Ms. Erickson called attention to a letter from College Park that Mr. Wojahn had described in his statement during the public comment period. The letter encouraged the TPB to pass an amendment to reiterate and reinforce the requirements of the Maryland Department of Transportation NEPA process on the I-270 and I-95 managed lane study.

Referring to a handout, Ms. Erickson noted a letter from the Town of Cheverly Planning Board that also expressed concern about the draft recommendations for the inputs for the managed lanes on Interstate I-95/495 in Prince George's and Montgomery Counties.

Mr. Lewis elaborated on the contents of MDOT’s letter. He said that MDOT takes a multimodal approach to transportation, but he emphasized that importance of making sure that roads in the state have the capacity to handle current and long-term growth. He spoke to the NEPA process. He said that MDOT is studying 15 different alternatives as part of the NEPA study for the Traffic Relief Plan (TRP). He said that if there are significant changes related to the outcome of the NEPA study, then such changes, by law, would have to come back to the TPB. He said that if the TPB adds an amendment that calls for MDOT to follow the NEPA process, then such a provision should be added for all the projects in Visualize 2045. He noted that these concerns were being raised at the last minute, and that the process of compiling the inputs for Visualize 2045 had been underway for 10 months. He emphasized that the TRP is consistent with one of the aspirational initiatives approved by the TPB.

Chair Allen interrupted Mr. Lewis and asked that his further comments be reserved for Item 9. He asked others who had submitted letters if they wanted to provide short clarifying statements.

Mr. Roberts, commenting on Mr. Lewis’ statement that the TRP would work within existing right-of-way, noted that the state is demanding access to historic properties in the City of Greenbelt adjacent to the Beltway that are hundreds of feet from the Beltway. He said the state is claiming eminent domain to do borings on those properties.

Chair Allen asked that this question be addressed under Item 9.

Ms. Newton, responding to Mr. Lewis’ comment that concerns are being raised at the last minute, said that the City of Rockville has written directly to the state about its concerns. With regard to this being brought up at the TPB, she said that it sometime takes a while for jurisdictions to coordinate on these kinds of issues. She thanked her colleagues from other jurisdictions for their work on this. She said that under agenda item 9, she would bring forward an amendment put together by a number of the jurisdictional representatives on the TPB who share some of the concerns that have been raised regarding these projects.

Mr. Meyer asked if staff would be presenting information on their recommended responses to the comments received.

Ms. Erickson said the requirement is to provide opportunity for public comment, and where a response is available, staff provided that.

Mr. Meyer asked if any of the responses represented changes to the Visualize 2045 plan.

Ms. Erickson said no changes in the plan were made based upon specific comments.

Mr. Meyer moved to accept the recommended responses for the comments received for Visualize 2045, the FY 2019-2024 TIP, and the air quality conformity analysis.

The motion was seconded.

Ms. Glaros said she wanted to confirm that the late comments would be included in the motion.

Mr. Meyer said that he would accept a friendly amendment to include late comments including those received during the meeting.

The motion was approved by voice vote.

8. APPROVAL OF AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS OF VISUALIZE 2045 AND 2019-2024 TIP

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Erickson said that information on this item was extensively presented in September. She noted that the conformity analysis found that the forecast of mobile emissions for VOC and NOx are within required budgets for all analysis years of the plan and therefore, staff recommended that the TPB adopt Resolution R4, finding that the Visualize 2045 and the TIP conform with the requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

Mr. Nohe moved approval of Item 8. The motion was seconded.

Ms. Glaros observed that the Visualize 2045 draft plan document included language that she believed needed to be updated. She said she was not sure when would be the appropriate to raise such concerns.

Ms. Erickson asked Ms. Glaros to specify which language she was referring to.

Ms. Glaros said that page 43, in the second paragraph under “Expand Express Highway Network,” stated that I-495 would not have the opportunity for express bus service. She said she did not think this was accurate. She said she understood that the MDOT study was considering express bus lanes as an alternative. She said there is a process that is still underway with NEPA and the text in the draft document indicated presumptions regarding the outcomes. She said she expected the tensions regarding ongoing process and presumed outcomes will be played out in the future, which is why the resolution that would be coming forward later in the meeting was important. She noted that Prince George’s County has a significant portion of the lane mileage for I-495, and a significant portion of that does go through municipalities, including several of the municipalities that she represents beyond just being the chair of Prince George’s County Council.

Chair Allen asked if Ms. Glaros would have a higher degree of comfort if the motion included a provision allowing staff to make technical and conforming changes.

Mr. Srikanth said the text on page 43 that Ms. Glaros was referring to describes projects that are currently proposed for inclusion in the plan, but it does not describe what could happen in the future.

Ms. Glaros said she appreciated that comment, but the language still made her uncomfortable because as it is currently framed it almost seems to exclude the possibility of adding express bus services. She suggested that some wordsmithing was needed to make the language more in line with the variety of different proposals and alternatives that are on the table.

Mr. Lewis said that the Maryland assistance attorney general had advised against doing things that would prejudice the NEPA evaluation.

Ms. Glaros said she agreed with the recommendation not to prejudice the NEPA evaluation. She said she would like the TBP to ensure that the plan document does not do that.

Mr. Mendelson said that the motion before the board was whether to approve the conformity analysis. He noted that changing the description of a project would not change what the conformity analysis was based on. He said the discussion about a description of a project was germane to the next agenda item.

Mr. Srikanth said this point was correct. Under the next agenda item, there would be opportunity to discuss revising the language.

Ms. Glaros said that was fine.

Mr. Kannan thanked staff for their work on the plan, which he said was the most exciting long-range plan he had seen in his short tenure on the TPB. However, he also noted the recent United Nations report that predicted a crisis cause by climate change as early as 2040. He said the very purpose of the work was to improve the environment. He acknowledged progress on NOx, ozone and particulates, but he said that insufficient progress is forecast for CO₂. He said that for the next version of the long-range plan, he would be calling for a CO₂ reduction target.

Mr. Lewis said that Maryland has a 40 percent reduction in greenhouse gases from 2006 levels by 2030.

The motion was approved on a voice vote.

Two members indicated they wished to be recorded as “No” votes: Mr. Roberts and Mr. XXX (Kannan?)

9. APPROVAL OF VISUALIZE 2045

Chair Allen said he would limit speakers to statements of two minutes.

Ms. Erickson said that staff recommended that the board adopt Resolution R5-2019 approving Visualize 2045, the long-range transportation plan for the National Capital region.

Mr. Meyer moved approval of Resolution R5-2019 to approve Visualize 2045. The motion was seconded.

Ms. Newton introduced an amendment that she said was a friendly amendment. Copies of the amendment were distributed, and it was projected on the screen. She said that the amendment is consistent with the NEPA process and would not slow down the process. She said it would ask for more intense consideration of the impacts on local jurisdictions surrounding I-495 and I-270, and for an appreciation and an effort to look more at multimodal options. She said that the jurisdictions that will be potentially affected are seeking clarity. She noted that Mr. Lewis had said that the projects would not go outside existing right-of-way, but that unfortunately, they had been hearing different things.

Mr. Meyer said he would not accept the amendment as a friendly amendment.

Chair Allen said that the amendment was not accepted as friendly, and therefore there was a motion on the floor to revise the resolution approving the plan.

The motion to revise the resolution was seconded.

Mr. Roberts said he had no confidence that the state is looking at 15 alternatives for the TRP. He said he thought the state was pressing ahead and that unless the TPB says no, they were going to have it. He also explained that he voted against the conformity analysis, under the previous agenda item, because it is based on a law from 1990, a time when there was no inclination of the implications of global warming. He said the board needs to consider conditions today and not based on what was in 1990. He said he would be voting against all these associated actions because they are wrong and because the state of Maryland just want its highway.

Speaking to the proposed revisions to the resolution, Ms. Glaros said that one of the reasons that such a specific amendment was brought to the board is because of the process that the communities have been encountering over the last bunch of months. She said that the MDOT public process has not felt transparent. For example, she said that that when Mr. Lewis indicated that the projects would "stick to the right-of-way," it was unclear if that alluded to the right-of-way of the existing road or the right-of-way of what MDOT owns on either side of the highway. She said that houses are very close to the road along portions of the Beltway. She said the presentations given at the public forums in July were very vague and had no dimensions associated with them. She said that residents who attended the forums asked for details, but the staff attending the sessions were not very forthright in providing details. She said the comments that were being expressed at the meeting resulted from the vagueness of the MDOT presentations at the public forums, concerns about how comments would be considered, and concerns about language in Visualize 2045 that could be prejudiced in terms of the NEPA process.

Mr. Lewis said the NEPA process is an iterative process which starts at a high level and gets more detailed as the process proceeds. He said the state is 100 percent committed to working with the communities involved and along the right-of-way. He said the language in the amendment just articulates what is required by law. He said it would make no sense to just apply this language to the I-270 and I-495 projects.

Ms. Smith said that these comments sounded familiar based on her experience with the I-66 project. She said she was still working closely with VDOT on that project and that is because it started off in one place but, because of public involvement, it is ending up in a very different place. She said these processes should be iterative and that VDOT has listened to input from the jurisdictions.

Mr. Burns said that MDOT came on strong when this project was initiated, but he said that things have progressed. He said that this is not a vote on MDOT, but rather it is a vote on the process of the board and the staff. He said he agreed with Mr. Lewis that the motion should apply to all projects, not just the I-270 and I-495 projects. He said that the TPB has a process, including a period for comments, and the that part of the process has ended. He objected to the last-minute nature of this amendment, which seems secretive. He said the TPB process is very public and it's important to keep it that way.

Mr. Kabir said he supported the motion to revise the resolution document. He noted that as Mayor Wojahn had commented, the College Park City County the previous night had passed a resolution expressing the city's concerns. He said that in north College Park there are 45-50 homes right next to the Beltway and the residents there are worried about their homes and the traffic, the noise, the pollution, and how they will be impacted directly or indirectly.

Mr. Elrich said he too supported the revision to the resolution. He said these projects were initiated as part of a secretive process. He noted that borings had been performed on property that is outside the right-of-way. He said it would not be possible for some of the plans under consideration to possibly fit in the right-of-way. He said that if the state is truly committed to not going outside the right-of-way, then the list of alternatives should have been modified and the discussion at the TPB would have been different. Finally, he observed that this project is different from the others in the plan because of its magnitude, cost and impact.

Mr. Meyer said that during the work of the Long-Range Plan Task Force he had supported more connections between Maryland and Virginia. But he said the opponents of another bridge crossing had countered that the region should instead be building express lanes and expanding the Legion Bridge. He said that those opponents had now become the supporters of this amendment to oppose express lanes. He said express lanes are working effectively in Virginia and they will have Bus Rapid Transit on them. He said that if the Maryland express lanes are not built, congestion would be exacerbated in Virginia. Finally, he noted that if Maryland members decide they do not want a bridge, then he would support re-opening consideration of a new crossing between Loudoun and Montgomery counties.

Ms. Kostiuk said she supported the revision to the resolution because it is important to be sure the process is focused on the impact on property and business. More broadly, however, she said she did not support a proposal to widen the Beltway. She said the region should focus on public transportation. She said the MDOT proposal was outdated and does not address pressing environmental and equity concerns.

Chair Allen asked for second-round comments. He said speakers would be limited to one minute.

Mr. Lewis said the region's political leadership has made an unprecedented commitment to transit, citing data in the Visualize 2045 document. But he said that transit will not be an option for everyone, and therefore as a multimodal agency, MDOT has to look at all aspects of transportation.

Mr. Lovain said the process of approving Visualize 2045 had been overwhelmed by this one project. He noted that the additional text would comprise the majority of text in the resolution. He asked if the issue could be considered as a separate resolution. He questioned whether it was appropriate for this to take over the Visualize 2045 resolution.

Chair Allen said the votes on the motion to revise the resolution will determine the answer to that question.

Ms. Newton said the amendment was an effort to make the Maryland proposal better by building express lanes, but not to widen the roads. She said she supports an outer crossing as opposed to widening the American Legion Bridge. She expressed concerns that a widening of I-270 would continue to drive the traffic south on I 270 to force more congestion around I-495. She said they have been trying to get MDOT and the State Highway Administration to talk with communities since January, but these efforts have not been successful. She said that if the state does intend to not expand the road, then the six or eight options that call for a widening should be taken off the list that is under consideration. She said she was sorry to have to bring this to the TPB, but she said that this process is "where the buck stops."

Mr. Erenrich said that Montgomery County's master plan includes HOV lanes on I-270 and on the western leg of the Beltway, so the county is interested in pursuing what is available within the right-of-way and within their master plan. He also noted that at the request of the local jurisdictions, MDOT has added a provision to the project to examine transit options. Finally, he asked if the Federal Highway Administration representatives whether a resolution like the one under consideration would jeopardize

the region's ability to approve an acceptable plan.

Mr. Nohe said that as a regional and local leader in transportation, his primary role was to help get citizens home to their families at the end of the work day faster. He said he feared that debates like this take can detract from that primary motive. He said he did not support the amendment because it represented an attempt to use Visualize 2045 to resolve a project-specific issue, which was not its purpose.

He made a motion to close debate on the amendment. The motion was seconded.

A member asked if Ms. Jackson would respond to Mr. Erenrich's question.

Chairman Allen said he would follow up on that question, but he first called for a vote on the motion to close debate.

The motion was approved in a voice vote.

Chair Allen said that debate was closed, but he asked Ms. Erickson if there were any questions that still needed to be answered.

Ms. Erickson answered no.

Ms. Newton, in a point of order, asked why Mr. Erenrich's question, which was raised before debate was closed, could not be answered.

Mr. Srikanth said that while the question had been called on the motion to revise the resolution, Mr. Erenrich's question, which was posed to the Federal Highway Administration representative, was still open. The question asked whether adding this resolution would affect FHWA's ability to approve Visualize 2045. He said that from his perspective, the amendment would not affect the approval of Visualize 2045, but he said that Ms. Jackson could correct him, if he was wrong.

Upon seeking a clarification of the question, Ms. Jackson said the change to the resolution document being discussed would not constrain the ability of FHWA and FTA to review and approve the plan.

Chair Allen called for a vote on Ms. Newton's amendment.

The outcome of a voice vote was unclear.

In a show of hands, the outcome was 13 noes and 12 yeses.

Ms. Newton asked for a weighted vote.

Ms. Erickson said the TPB bylaws say that any member may call for a weighted vote. She said that she would read the name of the member agency and the member should answer "yes," "no," or "abstain." She said that if no one answers the roll call, the vote would be recorded as an abstention. She said staff would be putting the answers into a spreadsheet that would calculate the weighted vote. Under the weighted vote system, she explained, there are five votes for each jurisdiction. One vote goes to the state DOT, one vote goes to the general assembly of each state, and then the other three are divided by population within the state-level jurisdiction.

The roll-call votes were recorded as follows:

-
- D.C. Department of Transportation (Mr. Zimbabwe voting): Abstain
 - D.C. Office of Planning (Mr. Shaw voting): No
 - D.C. Council (Mr. Mendelson voting): Yes
 - D.C. Council (Mr. Allen voting): Yes
 - D.C. Council (Ms. Turner voting for Mr. Todd): Yes
 - Maryland Department of Transportation (Mr. Lewis voting): No
 - City of Bowie: Absent
 - Charles County (Mr. Groth voting): Yes
 - College Park (Mr. Kabir voting): Yes
 - Frederick County (Mr. Burns voting): No
 - City of Frederick (Ms. Russell voting): No
 - City of Gaithersburg (Mr. Harris voting): No
 - City of Greenbelt (Mr. Roberts voting) : Yes
 - City of Laurel: Absent.
 - Montgomery County Executive (Mr. Erenrich voting): Yes
 - Montgomery County Legislative (Mr. Elrich voting): Yes
 - Prince George's County Executive (Mr. Weisberg voting): Yes
 - Prince George's County Legislative (Ms. Glaros voting): Yes
 - City of Rockville (Ms. Newton voting): Yes
 - Takoma Park (Ms. Kostiuk voting): Yes
 - Maryland Senate: Absent
 - Maryland House of Delegates: Absent
 - Virginia Department of Transportation (Ms. Hamilton voting): No.
 - City of Alexandria (Mr. Lovain voting): No
 - Arlington County (Mr. Dorsey voting): No
 - City of Fairfax: Absent
 - Fairfax County Legislative (Ms. Smyth voting): No
 - City of Fairfax: Absent
 - Fairfax County Legislative (Ms. Hudgins voting): No
 - Falls Church (Mr. Snyder voting): Abstain
 - Fauquier County: Absent
 - Loudoun County (Mr. Meyer voting): No
 - City of Manassas: Absent
 - City of Manassas Park: Absent
 - Prince William County (Mr. Nohe voting): No
 - Prince William County (Mr. Jenkins voting): No.
 - Virginia Senate: Absent
 - Virginia House of Delegates: Absent

Ms. Erickson clarified that under the bylaws, WMATA does not participate in weighted votes.

Ms. Erickson said that the yeses had a weighted vote of 7 and the noes had a weighted vote of 8.

Chair Allen said the motion to revise the resolution document had failed. He said the board would take up action on the underlying motion to approve Visualize 2045.

Ms. Glaros returned to the comments she made earlier under Item 8. She reiterated that it would be unwise to prejudice the NEPA evaluation related the MDOT studies for I-270 and I-495. She said the language was on page 43, second paragraph, second sentence. She said this sentence could be

rewritten to include language that would reference the fact that Maryland is undergoing a NEPA evaluation so none of the specific things that speak to I-495 or I-270 should be seen to predetermine the NEPA evaluation. She said another option could be to completely remove the sentence in question.

Mr. Lewis said that the clarifying language suggested by Ms. Glaros would apply to all projects that will undergo a NEPA study, so the I-270 and I-495 projects should not be singled out.

Chair Allen asked if a specific amendment was being moved.

Ms. Glaros said she would like to include additional language to clarify that any reference to I-495 or I-270, does not predetermine or prejudice the NEPA evaluation.

Chair Allen asked Ms. Erickson if she could put in writing the verbal changes that Ms. Glaros was offering.

Ms. Erickson said it would be easier to simply delete the sentence instead of adding new language.

Ms. Glaros said that, in response to this suggestion, she would move removing the second paragraph on page 43.

Mr. Srikanth said the first sentence of the paragraph was factual, but the second sentence of the paragraph could be considered subjective. Therefore, he suggested deleting the second sentence of the second paragraph.

Chair Allen asked staff to read back the amendment so that the board members would have a clear understanding of what was being amended.

Mr. Srikanth read from the draft document, page 43. He read the first sentence in the second paragraph: "The financially constrained element also includes adding dynamically priced toll lanes along I-495 in Maryland and I-270." He said that sentence would be maintained. He read the second sentence in the second paragraph: "These projects, otherwise known as the Traffic Relief Plan, supported the endorsed initiative by adding express toll lanes but fall short of fulfilling the calls in the endorsed initiative to add express bus service to connect activity centers and to allow for HOVs to travel for free in the express lane." He said this sentence would be deleted because that sentence could be potentially construed as prejudicing the NEPA outcome.

Ms. Glaros agreed with deleting the second sentence of the second paragraph but keeping the first sentence in that paragraph. She said she had some continuing concerns about the first sentence, but she noted that she understood that the language in the first sentence was consistent with the language in the air quality conformity analysis.

The language, as stricken in the amendment, was projected on the screen for the board to see.

Mr. Meyer said he would accept the deletion of the language as a friendly amendment. He asked for confirmation from staff that this change would not delay the implementation of Visualize 2045.

Mr. Srikanth said it would not delay the plan.

Chair Allen said that the board would consider this change as a regular amendment. He said Ms. Glaros had moved approval of the amendment and it had been seconded.

The amendment was approved in a voice vote.

Ms. Glaros said she had a second item, which was to remove all references in the document to “for HOT lanes.” She said she did not have page numbers.

Chair Allen said it was difficult to ask people to vote to strike language if they do not have clear references to what they would be changing.

Mr. Zimbabwe said that one challenge is that the language under question was the input used for the conformity analysis.

Mr. Srikanth said that was correct.

Mr. Zimbabwe asked how this was dealt with when it came up in the context of I-66.

Ms. Smyth said she understood that the projects included for air quality conformity were essentially “worst-case scenarios.” She said that if a project ultimately is changed in a way that produces fewer emissions would already be covered by the conformity analysis because the worst-case scenario was already analyzed. As an aside, Ms. Smyth emphasized the importance of connecting Maryland projects with those in Virginia.

Ms. Glaros said that Ms. Smyth’s comments spoke to the 15 different alternatives that are being studied through the NEPA process.

Chair Allen asked Mr. Srikanth if there was a motion that could be conveyed in writing.

Mr. Srikanth said he understood Ms. Glaros was referring to page 37, items 7 and 8. He said the two Maryland projects that were under discussion were described as “managed lanes.” He asked if Ms. Glaros was proposing that a different term be used.

Ms. Glaros said she took Mr. Lewis at his word earlier when he said it would be unwise to prejudice the NEPA evaluation, and so she was attempting to make sure that Visualize 2045 does not do that. She reiterated that she understood that a change at this point might not be possible because the inputs had already been plugged into the conformity analysis.

Mr. Lewis said the text in the document describes what the original proposal was. But he said a variety of alternatives for the project would be studied under the NEPA process. He said he did not think it was necessary to further edit the document.

Ms. Glaros said she would not move forward on this additional potential change.

Mr. Nohe noted a project in Loudoun and Prince William counties that was originally part of a study called the Tri-County Parkway. He said the preferred alternative for the project only passes through two counties, but it is still called the Tri-County Parkway. He said this was an example of how things can change. Just because the I-270 and I-495 projects are called managed lanes in this plan does not mean they cannot ultimately be something else.

Mr. Meyer said he wanted to acknowledge the work of staff on this plan as part of a multi-year process. He said the plan is truly multi-modal and it takes a comprehensive look at establishing a vision. He said he thought it was a huge step in the right direction.

Mr. Roberts said that managed lanes are not effective, and they are too expensive. He said people were fooling themselves if they thought the plan would improve conditions, now and in the future.

Mr. Snyder said he thought the plan took steps in the right direction, particularly with the inclusion of an aspirational element. He said that for the future, it was important to determine how to include the aspirational aspects into the constrained element. In addition, he said he believed the plan insufficiently used imagination to identify what technology is capable of doing to improve people's quality of life. He said he was asking the TPB to come back with a program as to how to address that. He noted that the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority is starting to address that issue. Finally, he said the region needs to do more to meet the challenges of climate change. He said he would vote for the plan, but he expressed concern that the region was responding to current conditions but was not really taking control of the future.

Chair Allen thanked staff for their hard work that went into the plan and to the public who helped to shape it. He also thanked Ms. Newton who started the work to include the aspirational ideas in the plan.

In a voice vote, the board approved Resolution R5-2019, which approved Visualize 2045.

Mr. Roberts and Ms. Kostiuk asked to be recorded as "no" votes.

10. APPROVAL OF THE FY 2019-2024 TIP

Ms. Erickson said that the TIP stands for Transportation Improvement Program and is the TPB's short-term list of obligated projects. She reminded the board that they were briefed on this item last month. She recommended that the TPB adopt Resolution R6-2019 to approve the 2019 to 2024 TIP. A motion was made to adopt Resolution R6-2019 to approve the FY 2019-2020 TIP. The motion was seconded and approved.

Mr. Roberts and Ms. Kostiuk voted no.

11. CERTIFICATION OF THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

Ms. Erickson said that every time an MPO, like the TPB, updates the TIP it is required to self-certify. That means that the staff looks at all the federal requirements and makes sure that the federal transportation planning process is being met. She referred to document for this item, which includes ten declarations on the last page. These declarations say that the TPB does meet federal requirements. She said that the resolution the board is being asked to adopt endorses this document that describes how the TPB is meeting the requirements. The resolution also authorizes Chair Allen to sign the document. She recommended that the TPB approve Resolution R7-2019.

A motion was made to adopt Resolution R7-2019 to endorse the appended Statement of Certification.

The motion was seconded and approved. Mr. Roberts voted no.

12. APPROVAL OF PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING UNDER THE FY 2019 TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES SET-ASIDE PROGRAM FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. Swanson referred to his presentation which summarizes all the project recommendations that the board is being asked to approve under the Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside program for the District of Columbia. He said that this federal program funds pedestrian facilities, trails, Safe Routes to School, and a variety of different non-motorized transportation improvements. He said that a similar but separate process is run for Virginia, Maryland, and D.C. He said that to date \$50 million in Transportation Alternatives capital improvement and preliminary engineering projects have already been funded in the region. He said that the allocation this year for D.C. was \$1,190,000. He said

applications were received for that amount. He said that the four projects include: the Glen Echo Trolley Trail preliminary design project, a trailhead at the convergence of the Capital Crescent and C&O Canal in Georgetown, the Rock Creek Park Military Road feasibility study, and some work to support the retrofit of Union Station.

Chair Allen made a motion to adopt Resolution R8-2019 to approve projects for funding under the Federal Transportation Alternatives Set Aside Program for DC for FY 2019.

The motion was seconded and approved.

13. COMMENTS TO US EPA AND US DOT ON THE SAFER AFFORDABLE FUEL EFFICIENT (SAFE) VEHICLES PROPOSED RULE FOR MODEL YEARS 2021-2026

Mr. Vuksan said that the EPA and National Highway are seeking comments on a proposed rule for model year 2021 to 2026 light-duty vehicles. He said that a draft letter from the Metropolitan Washington Air-Quality Committee and the Climate Energy and Environment Policy Committee has been shared with the board. He said that the proposed rule would relax existing corporate average fuel economy and CO2 emissions standards for passenger cars and light-duty trucks. He said the board is being asked to approve a joint TPB, MWAQC, and CEEPC letter urging the EPA to stand by its January 12, 2017 final determination, which would maintain existing CAFÉ and greenhouse gas standards. He said that if the rule is changed it could be difficult for the region to conform to mobile emissions budgets.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the letter.

Mr. Meyer, from Loudoun County, said that the letter means well, but that the letter could end up being worse for the environment and safety. He said that the EPA is trying to encourage the purchase of newer trucks with better emissions, and that 2012 standards make the trucks more expensive, which in turn will result in fewer new trucks purchased. Older trucks pollute more and are less safe. He said he would vote against the letter

The board voted to approve the letter. Mr. Meyer voted against it and Ms. Hamilton abstained.

14. NICE BRIDGE BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN DRAFT COMMENT LETTER

Chair Allen said that in September the board received a memo covering the best ways to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle traffic over the proposed Harry Nice Bridge in Maryland. Based on that memo the board advised staff to draft a letter to the Maryland Transportation Authority, the agency that is proposing the bridge. He said the letter would make clear the TPB's preference for how the bridge should accommodate pedestrians and cyclists.

Mr. Lewis said that it is appropriate for the board to send a letter to the MTA.

Chair Allen said the letter makes a deliberate and strong recommendation that the Harry Nice Bridge should include reliable and safe pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.

Ms. Newton said she appreciated the strength of the letter.

Chair Allen made a motion to approve the letter. The motion was seconded and approved. Mr. Lewis abstained.

OTHER ITEMS

15. ADJOURN

Chair Allen reminded the board that the next meeting is Friday, November 16 from noon to two. No other business was brought before the board.

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.