

**METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

777 North Capitol Street, NE
Washington, D.C. 20002-4226
(202) 962-3200

**MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
November 19, 2003**

Members and Alternates Present

Kate Hanley, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Ludwig P. Gaines, City of Alexandria
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT
Marsha Kaiser, MDOT
Karina Ricks, DC Office of Planning
Edgar Gonzalez, Montgomery County Executive Branch
Brian A. Glenn, FTA
Tom Farley, VDOT
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Jim Burton, Loudoun County
Mike Knapp, Montgomery County Council
Peter J. King, City of College Park
Carol Petzold, Maryland House of Delegates
Cicero Salles, Prince George's DPW&T
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Edward Thomas, WMATA
Tom Blaser, Prince William County
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Wayne Cooper, Charles County Commissioner

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Jim Hogan	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Andrew Austin	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Jane Posey	COG/DTP
Deborah Etheridge	COG/DTP
Hailemariam Abai	COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam	COG/DTP
Robert Snead	COG/DTP
Joan Rohlfs	COG/DEP
Paul DesJardin	COG/HSPPS
Greg Goodwin	COG/HSPPS
Lora Byala	WMATA
Fatimah Al-Amin Hasan	MDOT
Grady Ketron	VDOT
Stuart Schwartz	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Randy Carroll	MDE
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Howard Chang	Tri-County Council
Bill Vincent	BTI
Harriet Dietz	Arlington County DPW
Harry Sanders	Action Committee for Transit
Robert T. Catlin	College Park City Council
Tom Masog	M-NCPPC-Prince George's County
Tim Nutter	NVTA
Arlee Reno	Cambridge Systematics
Carroll George	Citizen
Allen Muchnick	Citizen
Robert T. Catlin	College Park City Council
Tim Nutter	NVTA
Annah Owens	College Park

Jocelyn A. Pena-Melnik
Micah D. Bobo

College Park Woods
Senator John Giannetti (Maryland State Senate)

1. Public Comment

Carroll George, retired engineer, spoke about his idea to demonstrate the effectiveness of giving ramp traffic the right-of-way when merging onto a freeway. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Allen Muchnick, speaking as a private citizen, spoke about the Citizens Advisory Committee's public meeting the previous evening on the proposal to expand the Beltway in Virginia with High Occupancy/Toll (HOT) lanes. He said that managed travel lanes is an idea whose time has come, but that the conversion of existing freeway lanes and especially all HOV lanes to managed HOT lanes is a far more cost-effective and financially prudent strategy than creating HOT lanes by the construction of additional travel lanes. He said that rail transit alternatives need to be considered in this corridor.

Vice Chairman Hanley clarified that the comment period is about to close on the Public-Private Transportation Act (PPTA) proposal for Beltway HOT lanes. She said the public comment period on the Preliminary Engineering (PE) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process is ongoing and will have to be revised. She noted that one additional HOV lane on the Beltway has been in the Constrained Long-Range Plan for a number of years.

Jocelyn Pena Melnik, newly elected council member for College Park District Four, spoke in opposition to the study of the University of Maryland Connector that is included in the draft Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRPP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) documents. She said the road would be destructive to the local community and to the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center. Copies of her remarks were submitted for the record along with more than 70 signatures on a petition opposing the project.

Anna Owens, resident and former mayor of College Park, echoed Ms. Melnik's comments opposing the University of Maryland Connector study. She said a road project was never agreed to by the City of College Park and it is now being pursued because of pressure from the University president. She said the project would be a private-use road at taxpayers' expense, which would be wasteful.

Bob Catlin, City of College Park Councilmember, also spoke against the study of the University of Maryland Connector. He said the project would negatively affect a much wider area than the 500 homes that would be most immediately impacted. He said the City Council has grave concerns about the way this project is being pushed through by the University, especially when funding is desperately needed for

Route 1 improvements.

Tim Nutter, speaking for the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, said the Alliance urges the TPB and the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) to support a bill in Congress, HR-999/S-485, that would enable EPA to grant relief to metropolitan areas adversely impacted by large concentrations of air pollution transported from other parts of the nation. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Stewart Schwartz, executive director of the Coalition for Smarter Growth, submitted comments regarding the draft Update to the 2003 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2004-09 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). He said the Coalition opposes including the Tri-County Parkway and Battlefield Bypass in Virginia. The Coalition also requested the removal of the Western Transportation Corridor study, which the Coalition understood to have been de-funded by Governor Warner. The coalition also asked the TPB to vote against inclusion of the Intercounty Connector (ICC), because the study scope has been designed to ensure that a highway will be built. Furthermore, the level of funding already designated for the project and the governor's expressed commitment to building it will ensure that other alternatives will not be considered. He said a vote for the CLRP and inclusion of the ICC "as a study," would actually represent a vote to construct it. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the October 15, 2003 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Referring to the mailout report, Ms. Byala described the topics discussed at the Technical Committee's November 7 meeting:

- Regarding TPB agenda item 8, the committee was briefed on the air quality conformity analysis for the 2003 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The committee recommended that the TPB approve the conformity determination if EPA approval of the emissions budgets is received in time.
- Regarding TPB agenda items 9 and 10, the committee again recommended that if EPA had ruled on the emissions budgets, that the TPB approve the new CLRP and TIP.
- Regarding TPB agenda items 11 and 12, the committee recommended TPB approval of the interim CLRP and TIP, if EPA approval of the emissions budgets has not been received.

-
- Regarding TPB agenda item 16, the committee recommended the TPB send the proposed draft letter to the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC).
 - Regarding TPB agenda item 17, the committee was briefed on the new study to quantify the region's near-term transit and highway needs over the next six years.
 - The committee was updated on activities related to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) update.
 - The committee was briefed by MDOT on some joint public hearings which are being held to review two statewide MDOT initiatives for updating Maryland's critical transportation needs and revenue options.
 - The committee was briefed on recent activities related to the Transportation Research Board's (TRB's) letter report on travel demand modeling, which is being discussed in depth at the Travel Forecasting Subcommittee.

4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Muchnick, CAC vice chair, said the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) met on November 13. The main topics for the meeting were pedestrian safety and other pedestrian/bicycle planning activities, and the Transportation Research Board's review of the TPB's travel forecasting process. Mr. Muchnick also reported that the CAC has elected six individuals to serve on the 2004 CAC. The TPB officers for 2004 will nominate nine individuals to fill the remaining CAC membership positions. All 15 members for 2004, including the six people elected by the 2003 CAC, will be approved by the TPB.

Mr. Muchnick reported that the CAC held its fifth outreach meeting for the year on November 18, at George Mason High School in Falls Church. The topic was, "Should the Beltway be Expanded with HOT Lanes." Tom Farley of VDOT and Gary Groat of Fluor Daniel consultants were the speakers. The meeting, which was attended by about a hundred citizens, was moderated by Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Supervisor and TPB member. The last public outreach meeting for the year, which is called "Columbia Pike Revitalization: Can It Be a Model for the Region?" and will be held December 3, at the Arlington Career Center in Arlington. Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board Member and TPB Member, will be one of the featured speakers at this session.

Finally, the CAC's vice chair for the District of Columbia, Dennis Jaffe, reported on his work advocating distribution and display of bus maps which is moving forward at the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA). The CAC passed a resolution in May, supporting the proposal to distribute free maps and post maps at rail stations and bus shelters.

Ms. Hudgins thanked the CAC for providing the opportunity for the community to hear the proposal on the Beltway High Occupancy/Toll (HOT) lane proposal.

5. Report of the Program Committee

Mr. Kirby reported that the Program Committee met on November 7, and acted on two resolutions. One is to program Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds to fund the incident response units that are positioned on the 14th Street Bridge, as requested by VDOT. Mr. Kirby also said the District of Columbia Department of Transportation requested an additional CMAQ funding allocation to create a roadway operation patrol program.

Referring to the handout packet of additional letters sent/received, Mr. Kirby said there were a number of comments on the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and air quality conformity action that was before the Board today; these letters were all supportive of the Board approving those items if it were able to do so.

Mr. Kirby said he also enclosed an article from the *Washington Post* on the energy bill introduced by Congressman Barton that would extend air quality attainment dates for downwind areas.

Mr. Kirby said the additional letters packet also included public comments that were received at the CAC public meeting the previous evening on the Beltway HOT lane proposal.

Mr. Kirby reminded the Board that the COG annual meeting would be held on December 11 at the National Press Club

Referring to the comments on the Beltway HOT lanes, Vice Chairman Hanley said that the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors was in the process of preparing responses. She thanked the people who submitted those comments.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Vice Chairman Hanley had no remarks.

7. Review of Comments and Approval of the Recommended Responses for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment, the 2003 Update to the Constrained Long Range Plan, the FY2004 to 2009 Transportation Improvement Program, and the Project Information to develop an interim 2003 CLRP and FY2004-2009 TIP

Referring to the memorandum from the mailout, Mr. Kirby described the responses to comments. He said that only one set of comments had been received, which was from the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance. He went through a synopsis of their comments, and the draft responses.

Vice Chairman Mendelson moved approval of the recommended responses. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the Board was being asked to approve the memorandum from the November 13th mailout.

Vice Chairman Hanley said yes.

Mr. Zimmerman said he did not understand why the Board needs to act on this item.

Vice Chairman Hanley said she understood this was part of the process.

Mr. Kirby said that in order for the federal agencies to approve the plans that will be submitted to them, they must be able to see that there has been a public comment period, that the comments have been considered and have been responded to. He said the responses are included in the documents that are sent for federal approval.

Mr. Zimmerman said he understood there is a federally required process, but he was not convinced that it means that the TPB has to vote to endorse the statements that the staff has made in the memorandum before the Board.

Mr. Kirby said the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) are documents approved by the TPB, and the responses will be part of those documents, so it seems important that Board approve the responses.

Mr. Zimmerman said he believed it was important that the Board acknowledge that the comments have been received. He said the Board does not need to specifically endorse particular statements that are drawn up in response to a comment that itself is a summary of something else.

Ms. Petzold asked if Mr. Zimmerman would accept a modification in the motion to indicate that the Board accepts the responses to be included in the CLRP and TIP documents.

Mr. Zimmerman said that would be better.

Vice Chairman Mendelson said he had no objection to the modification.

Mr. Thomas offered a motion to change Response Number 3 to indicate that public transportation helps to improve air quality.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Zimmerman said this motion provided an example of why he did not like endorsing the responses because he felt that this response, as presented to the Board, was a weak response.

The motion to change Response Number 3 to indicate that public transportation helps to improve air quality was approved unanimously.

The main motion, as modified, was passed unanimously.

Vice Chairman Hanley suggested that in the future, Mr. Kirby should frame such items as staff responses that have been seen by the TPB and recognized by the TPB for inclusion in the CLRP and TIP documents.

- 8. Approval of the Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2003 Update to the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**
- 9. Approval of the Update to the 2003 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP)**
- 10. Approval of the FY 2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Vice Chairman Hanley asked if approval had been received from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for the new emissions budgets.

Mr. Kirby said that approval had not been received.

Vice Chairman Hanley said that these items would need to be deferred because the new Mobile6-based mobile emissions budgets, which are necessary for the TPB to make an air quality conformity determination, had not been approved by EPA.

Vice Chairman Hanley asked why the budgets had not been approved.

Mr. Kirby said the submittals of the air quality plan have to be sent individually by the three state air agencies. He said they were submitted to EPA in the first week of September. EPA says it needs

90 days to process these kinds of amendments and mobile budgets; those 90 days will not be up until the first week of December.

Vice Chairman Hanley said the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) had worked hard to get the regional air quality plan done in time to meet conformity deadlines. She said it was distressing that the plans had not been submitted in a more timely way.

A motion was made by Mr. Zimmerman to postpone Items 8, 9 and 10. The motion was seconded by Mr. Burton and was approved unanimously.

11. Approval of the Interim 2003 Constrained Long-Range Plan

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said the development of these documents began with a discussion with the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration representatives in late summer. He said the purpose of this exercise was to have a Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in place and approved by the federal agencies before the existing plan lapses on January 21, 2004. He explained that federal law requires that regional long range plans be updated every three years. The last CLRP was approved on January 21, 2001. He said that after January 21, 2004, if a plan is not in place, then there will be no basis on which to have federal funding continue to flow to the region.

Mr. Kirby said the way to address the potentiality of a conformity lapse is to approve an interim plan, which contains only those projects that do not require an air quality conformity finding. The plan can also continue to include those projects that involve highway and transit expansions that have reached the point of having approval in terms of a federally approved contract being let, or in the case of a non-federally-funded project, approval by an appropriate local board that can commit the funds for the project. He said that staff had investigated over the last few months the status of the implementation of projects in the plan, which he said was a complex task. He said that a few corrections in this information, which were distributed as a handout, had been recently received.

Mr. Kirby said that after the meeting, if the Interim CLRP is approved, a document will be prepared reflecting the full plan minus the projects that cannot go forward. That Interim CLRP will be forwarded along with the Interim TIP to the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration for their approval. Because they will not have to deal with air quality conformity for these interim documents, those federal transportation agencies have indicated that they should be able to get them approved by January 21, 2004.

Mr. Kirby said that staff hopes to receive EPA approval of the mobile budgets early in December, which

would permit the Board to act on the full CRLP and TIP at the December 17 meeting. But he said that even if that happens, the period between December 17 and January 21 is too short to expect federal approval of the air quality determination and the full CLRP and TIP, and therefore in all likelihood, approval will not occur until February, March or April. So there will be a period in which the Interim CLRP and TIP will be the effective plan and TIP for the Washington region, to allow projects to move forward.

Vice Chairman Hanley asked if the blue sheet modified Items 11 and 12.

Mr. Kirby said it did.

Vice Chairman Hanley asked what the boldface items in the projects listings meant.

Mr. Kirby explained that boldface items in the project listings indicate the difference between the old plan that was preexisting and the full plan that was distributed as Item 9, which was deferred.

Using an example from the list, Mr. Zimmerman said he understood that a project, which would have been new to the CLRP had it been fully adopted, was included in the Interim CLRP for everything except construction.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct.

Mr. Zimmerman added that presumably construction would not be occurring in the next three or four months for this example project anyway.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct; staff's expectation is that if this interim period lasts only a few months, these projects will not be affected, because if they are not already under contract, they are not really ready. If the interim period stretches on for a much longer period, project construction could be affected.

Mr. Zimmerman asked Mr. Kirby if he could identify any projects whose construction could be seriously impacted by this interim period.

Mr. Kirby answered that he was not aware of any projects that would be affected in the next three to four months.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the term "project excluded" in the memorandum meant that project implementers would not be permitted to even do design.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct; the entire project was excluded.

Picking an example, Mr. Zimmerman asked about Item 87 in the list, which is Virginia Route 236, reconstruction of intersection at Braddock Road. He asked if the year in the listing, 2005, meant that work would not begin until 2005.

Mr. Kirby said 2005 represented the completion date of the project.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if this was an example of a project that would be immediately impacted because engineering and other preparatory work would be delayed three or four months.

Mr. Kirby said that some work would be continuing, but it would not be able to proceed to construction.

Mr. Zimmerman that if that was the case, why did the listing say “project excluded” instead of “construction excluded.”

Mr. Kirby said there are instances where the listing excluded the whole project because nothing is really happening at this point.

Vice Chairman Hanley explained that this particular example is an interchange construction, which is not very elaborate and could have been done from start to finish in a couple of years. It does not require enormous land acquisition and design.

Mr. Zimmerman said he was trying to understand to what extent real projects would actually be affected. He said it seems like that example is one that would actually be delayed now from getting work done that would otherwise be done in the next few months. He said it would be useful to know which projects in the list would be immediately affected in this way.

Mr. Kirby said the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which would be considered as an Interim document under the next item, provided more detailed information about these projects, which are broken out in phases.

A motion was made to adopt Resolution R8-2004 approving the Interim Update to the 2003 Constrained Long-Range Plan. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Burton asked if the projects listed in boldface represented items that had been added since the last update to the CLRP and would have been included had the full CLRP been approved under Item 9.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct.

Mr. Burton asked for the reason that they would have been added at this time.

Mr. Kirby answered that they have moved through the review process and funding has been identified for them.

Mr. Burton asked if the emissions budgets had increased significantly enough to make room for the new projects.

Mr. Kirby said that yes, the new projects were included in the conformity determination that would have been considered under Item 8.

Mr. Burton asked why Item 34 on page 8, a study of the Western Transportation Corridor, was included in the CLRP and Interim CLRP when he understood that Virginia Governor Mark Warner had pulled the funding for it. He said that he knew that Loudoun County had pulled the study from its comprehensive plan and transportation plans.

Mr. Farley said he understood the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is still under review. He said his office had not received any official word that funding for the study had been removed.

Mr. King made a motion to amend the motion under consideration to delete Item 11 on the Studies page, which is called the Study of the University of Maryland Connector Road. The motion was seconded by Mr. Roberts.

Mr. King distributed material on his amendment. He said he had attempted to send an e-mail on this amendment to all the TPB members the previous evening. He said the request to delete the study is not a reflection of the Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) syndrome. He said the City of College Park and the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC), which are in support of deleting the study, have agreed to accommodate the University of Maryland's Campus Facilities Master Plan, which called for a study of mass transit, not for a roadway study as is now included in the Interim CLRP. He said this was not an issue of elected officials overriding the informed decisions of transportation professionals. The roadway concept was conceived by the University of Maryland and it was sponsored by a local state senator, who is also a member of the TPB.

Mr. King said this is an issue of local priorities and available funding. He said that in contrast to this study, the need to improve Route 1 has been recognized as a priority for College Park. He said that Route 1 improvements are already in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) but are awaiting funding for design and engineering. Finally, he said this cannot be dismissed as stepping outside the allowable rules. He said that many TPB members know or recognize him from having participated in TPB meetings for nine years. He said he was coming to the body today to ask for something.

Mr. King said that the proponents of deleting the study have tried to work through established channels. He said that the State Highway Administration (SHA) had recently withdrawn a commitment to meet with residents. He said he did not believe the entire transportation planning process had gone astray, but that this particular project needed correction. He asked the TPB to exercise its appropriate function by refusing to rubber-stamp a planning choice which is destructive of local authority, which is destructive of a landmark federal facility -- the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, and which is destructive to the community.

Ms. Kaiser thanked everyone for their comments on the project. She said it was important to get input. She thanked Mr. King also, but said that his comments were misplaced in this body. She read a description from the draft capital program that was not yet approved by the General Assembly: "A study to provide improved access between I-95 and I-495 interchange and the University of Maryland campus in College Park. Justification: The project would provide an alternative means of access to the University of Maryland College Park campus. Status: Project planning is underway." She said the project has been stalled for some time. She again quoted the state's capital program description: "MDOT will be coordinating this study with Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, the City of College Park, and the University of Maryland at College Park."

Ms. Kaiser said this project is purely local in nature, not regional. The planning study is funded with state funds. The draft program has yet to be approved by the governor and has yet to go to the General Assembly for approval. It is at that point that this project can be considered for deletion from the state's capital program, not at the TPB level. She emphasized that the state is in discussions with BARC and the federal government, and with the Congressional delegation, and they have not been able to reach a decision on the scope of the study, which is why it has not moved forward. But MDOT has made the commitment that it will not move forward until the scope is committed to by those parties affected by it.

Ms. Kaiser said this is a decision that should be made at the local level, not at the regional level, and it should be made by the governor and the General Assembly. She said the TPB is a transportation planning body, and it should not stop projects from going through the planning phase and interfering with studies before getting the information needed to make informed decisions.

Mr. Gonzalez described the planning process in Montgomery County, emphasizing the various stages and opportunities for affected parties to participate in the decision making process. He said that if anybody feels like coming to the TPB saying, "We don't like this project, let's take it out," and then TPB members from different jurisdictions, who may or may not know anything about the project, are going to make decisions on whether to take it out, then the region is going to be in super gridlock in the future. He said local issues are much better resolved by local officials.

Mr. Roberts said the City of Greenbelt has long been steadfastly opposed to any action that will undermine the ability of BARC to do its job. He said the preservation of BARC is an issue of national significance. He said the City of Greenbelt supports the motion to remove this project from any planning. He said he agreed with Mr. King that funding for this study would essentially take away funding from other projects that are desperately needed.

Mr. Salles said the Prince George's County executive recognizes that there are many issues associated with the study, and the only way to fully understand those issues is to actually conduct the study.

Ms. Petzold associated herself with Mr. Salles' remarks. She said this would be just a study, and she was not willing to jump in beforehand and make the decisions.

Mr. King responded to the comments. He said that in response to Mr. Gonzalez's description of the planning process in Montgomery County, the process in Prince George's County regrettably is different. He emphasized that the study, when it was originally presented to the community, the city and BARC, was to be for a transit-only option. Those three parties made it clear that the roadway study currently under discussion was not appropriate. He said the suggestion that decision-makers should wait until the study is finished reflected a certain element of faith in a state transportation body that in this case is not warranted. To wait for the study to come back suggests that the TPB is simply avoiding its responsibility and failing to deal with it at the earliest possible time, especially when funding is so short for other projects that are needed.

Vice Chairman Hanley asked if the study area for the connector primarily is located primarily in the City of College Park.

Mr. King said that three of the alignments run directly across the BARC South Farm. He said it is right on the boundary of the city; two of the alignments are within 30 feet of the city's boundary. The study area is in an unincorporated area because it is a federal facility.

Ms. Pourciau asked if the study would examine what was originally envisioned as well as other options.

Clarifying the question, Vice Chairman Hanley asked if the study would have the transit-only option.

Ms. Kaiser said yes.

Mr. King said no. He said the University and the State Highway Administration have made it clear that they are no longer interested in a transit option.

Ms. Kaiser said the transit study has been completed already.

Vice Chairman Hanley asked why, if the transit study has been completed already, it was being done again.

Ms. Kaiser said that the transit study demonstrated that there was little impact on U.S. 1 and Maryland 650. So the scope of the study was expanded to help get students into the University of Maryland. She said the study that has been done on the transitway will also be looked at when the full study is done.

Mr. Roberts said that spending \$1 million on this study was a waste. He said the area where they want to put a road is not in an appropriate location, especially a private roadway.

Vice Chairman Hanley called for a show of hands.

The motion to amend the motion by deleting the study of the University of Maryland Connector was defeated by a vote of 9 to 8.

Mr. Gonzalez asked that project 36 on page 2 be revised to read "Montrose Parkway East." The maker of the motion accepted the revision without a vote.

Mr. Burton moved an amendment to the main motion to delete Item Number 34 on the Studies page 8, the Western Transportation Corridor, if staff can confirm that the project's funding has been removed. He said he has been handed information from the Virginia Department of Transportation's website indicating that the current six-year plan has no funding for the study.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Farley said he would rather not remove the project until a confirmation had been made that the project's funding had been removed.

Vice Chairman Hanley said that Mr. Farley's concern, which was that there should be confirmation that funding has been removed, was reflected in Mr. Burton's motion.

The motion to remove the Western Transportation Corridor study, if staff can confirm that the study's funding has been removed, was approved unanimously.

The main motion, to adopt Resolution R8-2004 approving the Interim 2003 Update to the Constrained Long-Range Plan, was approved by a vote of 15 to 2 in a show of hands.

12. Approval of the Interim 2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Vice Chairman Mendelson made a motion to adopt Resolution R9-2004 approving the Interim TIP. The motion was seconded by Ms. Pourciau.

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby explained how the lists identified projects or portions or projects that would be retained for the Interim TIP. He also indicated that a handout memorandum included corrections to the mailout listings. He described these corrections.

Mr. Zimmerman used a couple of examples to ask for clarification on how the handout corrections affect what was included in the Interim TIP.

Mr. Kirby explained that the Item 29, Anacostia starter light rail line, as described in the handout, would be included in the Interim. Item 20, the Battlefield Parkway, was excluded because it should not have been in the TIP to begin with.

Mr. King said he would not resubmit the amendment he offered under the previous agenda item. He thanked the people who supported his motion. He said he will be angry if the argument is made in the future that the project cannot be deleted because it has been in the Constrained Long Range Plan since November 19, 2003. He said he predicted that day would happen, and he predicted that the TPB would see him on that day.

Mr. Burton moved an amendment, identical to the amendment he offered under the previous agenda item, to delete the study of the Western Transportation Corridor if staff can confirm that funding for the study has been removed.

The motion was seconded and was passed unanimously.

Mr. Blaser asked for clarification on page 1, line 20, which referred to the Route 28 Bridge over Broad Run, which is a major bottleneck. He said the Prince William County Board of Supervisors had been informed by VDOT that the project would be constructed in 2005, but from the Interim TIP he was understanding that that construction date would no longer be included.

Vice Chairman Hanley asked Mr. Farley what the Board of Supervisors had been told.

Mr. Farley said that if the emissions budgets receive EPA approval, the project will be restored once the full CLRP and TIP are approved.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct.

The main motion to adopt Resolution R9-2004 approving the Interim TIP was approved unanimously.

13. Certification of the Urban Transportation Planning Process for the National Capital Region.

Referring to the mailout item, Mr. Kirby said this action is a self-certification that is a requirement of the MPO process. This action is taken every year after the TPB acts on the CRLP and the TIP. It certifies that the TPB has done all the things it is supposed to do as a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). He said the Board was being asked to approve the certification statement. The state departments of transportation will be asked to sign their certificates, which staff will send in to the federal transportation agencies with the CLRP and TIP.

A motion was made by Ms. Petzold to approve the certification statement. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kaiser.

Mr. Kirby pointed out that two certification options had been provided in the mailout packet: one would have applied in the case of an approval of the full CLRP/TIP, along with the conformity determination; the other, which the Board was acting on under this item, was associated with the approval of the Interim CLRP/TIP.

The motion was approved unanimously.

14. Approval of Funding and Transmittal Letter for the TPB's 2004 Membership in the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations

A motion was made by Vice Chairman Mendelson to approve funding and the transmittal letter for the TPB's 2004 membership in the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

15. Appointment of the Nominating Committee for Year 2004 TPB Officers

Vice Chairman Hanley said that the TPB Chairman has provided a list of the member of the Nominating Committee to be appointed. Traditionally, the chairman appoints those who are the most recent chairs, who are still on the Board, from Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. The members appointed by the TPB chairman are Kathy Porter to be chair from Maryland, Patsy Ticer from Virginia and Michelle Pourciau

from the District of Columbia.

16. Approval of Letter to the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) Providing TPB Comments on the Revised State Implementation Plans (SIPs) Related to the 2005 Mobile Budgets, TCM Substitution, and Conformity Requirements Under the New 8-hour Standard

Vice Chairman Hanley asked when the 8-hour standard was supposed to go into effect.

Mr. Kirby said EPA is supposed to designate areas in April of 2004, with an effective date of May, 2004. The TPB will have to make the first conformity determination under the 8-hour standard within one year of designation.

Referring to the mailout, Mr. Kirby described the three points in the draft letter relating to the 2005 mobile emissions budgets, Transportation Control Measures (TCM) substitution, and conformity requirements under the new 8-hour standard. He described in detail the contents of the letter distributed to the Board.

A motion was made to approve the letter to MWAQC. The motion was seconded and was passed. Vice Chairman Mendelson abstained.

17. Briefing on the Study of Near Term Regional Transportation Funding Needs, Funding Availability, and Project/Program Priorities

Referring to the handout material, Arlee Reno of Cambridge Systematics described the purpose, process and timeline for developing the study. He said the preliminary estimates will be provided to the TPB's Technical Committee on December 5. A draft will be included in the December mailout to the TPB and presented at the TPB meeting on December 17. The information will be refined based on comments received, and then will be put into a brochure for distribution in January. Referring to the handout material, he described the six-year financial information that has already been obtained, and what is still needed.

Mr. Thomas said that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) appreciates that the TPB has undertaken this work. He said this effort should extend beyond the production of a brochure. He said this information positions the region to work more directly on the federal transportation reauthorization legislation.

18. Report on Recent Coordination Planning Activities for Regional Transportation

Evacuation/Protective Actions

Vice Chairman Hanley deferred this action.

19. Other Business

Mr. Salles said Vice Chairman Hanley did a great job of chairing the meeting.

20. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:58 p.m.