
**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
MEETING ATTENDEES
May 18, 2022
HYBRID MEETING**

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT

Pamela Sebesky, TPB Chair – Manassas
Charles Allen – DC Council
Christina Henderson – DC Council
Ella Hanson – DC Council
Heather Edelman – DC Council
Sakina Khan – DC Office of Planning
Anna Chamberlin – DDOT
Mark Rawlings - DDOT
Reuben Collins – Charles County
Patrick Wojahn – College Park
Jan Gardner – Frederick County
Kelly Russell – City of Frederick
Neil Harris – Gaithersburg
Dennis Enslinger – Gaithersburg
Rodney Roberts - Greenbelt
Brian Lee - Laurel
Gary Erenrich– Montgomery County Executive
Christopher Conklin – Montgomery County Executive
Victor Weissberg – Prince George’s County Executive
Mel Franklin – Prince George’s County Legislative
Bridget Newton - Rockville
Peter Kovar – Takoma Park
Marc Korman – Maryland House of Delegates
R. Earl Lewis, Jr. – MDOT
Canek Aguirre – Alexandria
Takis Karantonis – Arlington County
Dan Malouff – Arlington County
David Meyer – City of Fairfax
Walter Acorn – Fairfax County - Legislative
James Walkinshaw – Fairfax County Legislative
David Snyder – Falls Church
Adam Shellenberger – Fauquier County
Robert Brown – Loudoun County
Kristen Umstattd – Loudoun County
Jeanette Rishell – Manassas Park
Ann B. Wheeler – Prince William County
Victor Angry – Prince William County
David Marsden – Virginia Senate
John Lynch – VDOT
Maria Sinner - VDOT
Allison Davis – WMATA
Mark Phillips - WMATA
Sandra Jackson – FHWA
Julia Koster - NCPC
Tammy Stidham - NPS

MWCOG STAFF AND OTHERS PRESENT

Kanti Srikanth
Chuck Bean
Lyn Erickson
Mark Moran
Tim Canan
Andrew Meese
Leo Pineda
Stacy Cook
John Swanson
Sergio Ritacco
Andrew Austin
Rachel Beyerle
Dusan Vuksan
Deborah Etheridge
Kim Sutton
Eric Randall
Erin Morrow
Michael Farrell
Jane Posey
David Lorenzo-Botello – Montgomery County Legislative
Matt Arcieri – Technical Committee Chair
Ashley Hutson - CAC Chair
Michael Grant - ICF
Rebecca Schwartzman – DC Office of Planning
Amir Shahpar – VDOT

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

Chair Sebesky called the hybrid meeting to order and said that the board will continue the practice of limiting the number of attendees in the board room. She said that a climate strategies work session was held just prior to the meeting and that Item 8 on the agenda would provide a report on the session. Public comments will continue to be received online due to limits on the number of people present in the board room.

Ms. Erickson conducted a roll call confirming those participants in the room and those attending remotely. Attendance for the meeting can be found on the first page of the minutes. She confirmed there was a quorum.

Ms. Erickson said that between the April 2022 TPB meeting and noon on Tuesday, May 17, the TPB received six comments. All comments were submitted via email, and two included letters. A memo with a summary of the comments, as well as each comment themselves, can be found on the TPB meeting page. She briefly summarized each of the comments.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 16, 2022, MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Umstattd moved approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

3. TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Arcieri said that Technical Committee met on May 6 and reviewed

material related to Items 7-10 on the TPB's May agenda. In addition, the committee received a briefing on Voices of the Region public engagement activities for Visualize 2045, as well as briefings on potential expansion of the MARC Brunswick line and the reconstruction of the Long Bridge between DC and Arlington.

4. COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

Referring to the CAC report, Ms. Hutson said the committee met on May 12. She said the committee received an overview from staff on regional transportation safety activities and comments received regarding the update to Visualize 2045. She described some key points that CAC members made regarding these presentations. Lastly, she said that on July 14, the CAC will jointly meet with the TPB officers, and the committee welcomes other TPB members to join this meeting as well.

5. STEERING COMMITTEE ACTIONS AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Mr. Srikanth said the Steering Committee met on May 6 and reviewed and approved amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), at the request of each of our four largest agencies: D.C. DOT, Virginia DOT, Maryland DOT, and WMATA.

Mr. Srikanth said the mailout packet included 13 letters from the TPB in support of federal grant applications. He said the report included information regarding the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's new corporate average fuel efficiency standards, which were approved on May 2. He also said the packet includes information about COG's Climate and Energy Leadership Awards.

Finally, Mr. Srikanth announced the departure of two TPB staffers: Lynn Winchell-Mendy and Bryan Hayes. He thanked them for their service and wished them well.

Chair Sebesky and Mr. Aguirre both said they had worked with Ms. Winchell-Mendy and they also thanked her for her service.

6. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Chair Sebesky thanked the board for remaining focused and engaged over the last 18 months on the dual tasks of the four-year update of the region's long-range transportation plan and developing a more detailed description of the board's previous statement on environmental and sustainability goals. She said this work is truly significant and meaningful. She said that earlier that day, the board held its second consecutive work session on what action the regional body can take on climate change. She thanked the board for the spirit of collaboration and cooperation with which it has approached this work so that the TPB's actions will be inclusive of all jurisdictions and the needs that they all might have.

ACTION ITEMS

7. DRAFT 2022 UPDATE OF THE BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PLAN FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

Referring to the posted meeting material, Mr. Meese said the board was briefed the previous month on the draft plan and provided comments. He said that staff has reviewed the draft plan and is confident that the comments raised have already been addressed in the document, with one major exception, which was the inclusion of text on the concept of rails with trails. He described the review process that the plan has undergone, and he noted that technical corrections have been made. He said that staff recommended the approval of Resolution R14-2022 to approve the 2022 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan for the National Capital Region.

Ms. Newton moved approval of R14-2022. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wojahn and was approved unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

8. COMMENTS ON THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS OF THE PLAN AND TIP, AND THE 2022 UPDATE TO VISUALIZE 2045, FY 2023-2026 TIP

Ms. Cook said that TPB staff presented the draft Visualize 2045 long-range transportation plan during the April TPB meeting and that a public comment period on the draft plan, Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and Air Quality Conformity Analysis was held April 1-May 1. She referred to the Item 8 comment summary, stating that TPB staff received about 600 comments and said that the summary is offered to the board before it is asked to approve the Visualize 2045 plan in June.

Ms. Cook stated that the purpose of the comment period is to meet the federal requirements associated with the Clean Air Act for Air Quality Conformity Analysis and to respond to substantive comments on the air quality conformity determination. She said that the comment summary includes a summary from the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee confirming the TPB's determination of the air quality conformity for the plan and the TIP.

Ms. Cook said that the comment period is also a chance for organizations, individuals, and people across the region, businesses, and others to offer comments, to identify any errors, and provide an opportunity for our technical agencies to review and make sure that all of the information is accurately represented in the documentation.

Ms. Cook stated that the TPB conducted a comment period in April 2021 on the technical inputs to the conformity analysis and financial analysis of the plan. She said that the TPB approved the conformity inputs in June and July 2021, and the inputs cannot change at this time. She referred to a slide that showed what could change in the plan such as text or descriptive data that needs corrections or updates.

Ms. Cook stated that the transit asset management targets approved by the TPB in March will be incorporated into the financial section of the plan and any actions the board takes in May and June can be incorporated into the language of the plan to highlight board priorities.

Ms. Cook referred to a slide that described the types of outreach and communications conducted around the plan including the TPB newsletter, mailed postcards, social media, and newspaper ads. She stated that outreach was conducted through virtual open houses and a TIP Forum. She said that TPB staff received more than 500 comments, with 483 coming from the TPB comment email, one letter was received through the U.S. mail, and 34 comments were received through the COG website online form.

Ms. Cook noted that most comments came from individuals and individuals who are part of an advocacy organization who used form letters to reflect their ideas and wishes. She said that 10 letters were received from non-profit organizations, one comment from a TPB board member, and one comment from an advisory committee.

Ms. Cook referred to a slide that listed comment themes and said that staff also received some project-specific comments. She said that comments provide an opportunity for clarification, and the TPB staff asks the state departments of transportation and local jurisdictions to respond to those comments. Ms. Cook referred to a letter from the Coalition for Smarter Growth that has six to seven pages of tables offering suggestions on the comments. She said that the comment summary and the entire list of comments has been shared with technical committee members so that they can share with local transportation agencies to make sure that all comments provided are being considered for future project development.

Ms. Cook said that one of the comments that the TPB staff wanted to address clearly concerned the status of the Maryland Op Lanes, which are part of an overall Maryland project. She stated that there is confusion

because there are technical details associated with project development and said that staff wanted to assure TPB members that what they voted on in June and July 2021 is represented in the constrained element on which the conformity analysis is conducted.

Ms. Cook said that Appendix B of the draft plan includes reference to a specific project listing that provided technical detail and is a snapshot in time of the project development for projects in the plan and the TIP. She said that projects evolve at the move from the plan to the TIP, but the takeaway is that the projects in the constrained element is what the TPB approved in 2021.

Ms. Cook said that other comments focused on stopping climate change. She said that a third topic was to improve transportation safety, and a fourth topic theme is investing in sustainable, walkable communities and to improve options for walking and biking, reflected in 270 comments. She said that a fifth topic is equity with comments referring to walking, biking, and transit equity, and others acknowledging that a lot of people live in outer areas where they don't have good transit as an option and improving roadways or travel times is a step toward equity.

Ms. Cook said that a sixth topic was both opposition and support for highway expansion and road widening. She said that 38 comments were received asking the TPB to approve Visualize 2045 to invest in all transportation modes. She stated that some commenters suggest removing projects, others encourage not removing projects, and others encourage particular types of projects to advance in the future; however, the constrained element of the plan cannot be changed at this time.

Ms. Cook said that the TPB will receive final plan documentation in June and staff will ask the TPB to accept the recommended responses to comments and with acceptance of the responses, the plan, TIP, and air quality conformity will be included in the air quality conformity report. She said that the TPB will be asked to adopt a resolution finding that the Visualize 2045 update and the TIP conform with requirements of the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990, adopt the 2022 update to the Visualize 2045 plan and the TIP, and then self-certify that the TPB is following the metropolitan transportation planning process.

Chair Sebesky called for comments and questions.

Mr. Srikanth said that one of the significant takeaways is that once every four years the TPB is required to redo the financial analysis for fiscal constraint and air quality conformity because of the non-attainment status for federal air quality conformity standards. He said that the financial analysis and air quality analysis take the longest time to conduct and is the primary focus of federal review. He said that after 45 days of review, none of the comments have found fault with any of the assumptions or analysis made by staff. Mr. Srikanth said this is encouraging for staff who have spent almost two years working on the financial analysis and 11 months working on the air quality analysis. He said that the TPB staff will submit the plan, with the board's approval to the federal agencies, and hopefully they will concur, and the plan, TIP, and air quality conformity will be approved by the end of the year.

Mr. Karantonis asked how the step "Accept recommended responses to comments" works and will TPB staff provide the draft responses and will the board be invited to provide comments on those?

Mr. Srikanth replied that the draft responses are what has been provided to the board at the May 18 meeting. He said that the federal requirement states that the TPB needs to solicit documents and consider all comments, so this is acknowledgement of doing so.

Ms. Erickson said that there is a comment in the chat from Ms. Newton asking, "Can you please give us a breakdown of positive and negative comments in number 6 regarding expansion of roads?"

Ms. Cook said that TPB staff would be able to find those numbers and provide it to the board.

Ms. Erickson said that Ms. Koster asked in the chat, “Can you provide or restate a short, clear description of what exactly is included in the scope of the Maryland 270 Op Lanes project?”

Mr. Srikanth said that the Maryland Ops Lane program, which is a state-wide program, conceivably can have many projects under that program. He said that currently there is a single project under that program, and that single project is the proposed managed lanes or HOT lanes on 495 and on 270, and that single project under the Ops Lane project has three segments to it.

Mr. Srikanth explained that the southern segment of the project extends from George Washington Memorial Parkway in Virginia, where the current HOT lanes on 495 end. The project then picks it up from there, goes across the American Legion Bridge, all the way up to and including the I-270 spur and continues on I-270 all the way up to I-370, making up the southern piece. He said that what is included in the plan is constructing these HOT lanes, two lanes in each direction, and to be opened for operations by 2025.

Mr. Srikanth said that a second part of this project is also in the plan, and that is constructing managed or HOT lanes on I-270 from I-370 all the way to I-70 in Frederick. That segment is also to be constructed, two lanes in each direction, and open for operations by 2030. He said that the third and the last piece of this project is a study on building managed lanes or HOT lanes on I-495 in Maryland, starting at the I-270 spur all the way east and up to the vicinity of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. This study segment is not included in the plan for construction. He said that in June 2021, the TPB voted not to include that project, which was proposed for construction, but rather have Maryland Department of Transportation study further the various concerns about the impacts it was going to have, and the TPB granted approval to include the study in the long-range transportation plan.

Mr. Roberts expressed concern that he did not see how anyone could challenge the validity of staff information because he doesn't see how anyone could as there is no one person or probably even any groups that have the technical ability to go through the entire plan and look at everything and say what is true or not true. He said that he does not expect someone to challenge the underlying information there, because it's probably an impossibility. He said that what's happening in the communities in the region and around the state has an impact, and the TPB is not taking into account the effect that highways are having on communities.

Mr. Srikanth replied that the assumptions that the TPB has made on the revenue projections provided by each TPB member agency, including the state DOTs and WMATA, have been documented in detail based on the amount of money each local jurisdiction, state DOT, and WMATA assume they will have over the next 25 years. He said that revenue is then matched against project cost estimates that have been submitted by jurisdictional agencies, WMATA, and the three state DOTs. He said that the cost of building, operating, maintaining, our transportation system should match the projected revenue, and that is the critical piece of the plan that took close to two years to complete and is documented. He said that similarly all of the assumptions made, and the technical methodology used in the air quality conformity analysis has been documented in details and the report made public. He said that there are many agencies and groups and consultants who are very familiar with this type of work and do indeed review and comment on staff's work. Regarding the impact of projects on communities, he stated that there are different views on the benefits and costs or implications of any project or program to address the mobility and accessibility needs of our region. The TPB staff received comments on this topic, and there is a rich diversity of viewpoints on any given project, whether somebody sees it as truly beneficial or maybe something better could have been done.

There were no further comments on Item 8.

9. UPDATE ON TPB PLANS TO SET GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION GOALS AND STRATEGIES FOR THE TRANSPORTATION SECTOR

Mr. Srikanth referred to the meeting materials on the TPB webpage that cover the greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals and strategies discussion to date, including a May 12 memo which provides details on the three topics for TPB review and a draft supplemental report from the TPB's consultant, ICF, that provides information on additional analysis that was done based on the advice and discussions and comments at the TPB's work session in April 2022. He said that TPB members should also have an April 14 memo that provides results of the TPB member survey on the climate change mitigation study.

Mr. Srikanth said that the TPB has stated its intent to consider adopting GHG reduction goals for the transportation sector, and the TPB has said that it would also like to adopt a set of GHG-reducing strategies as planning priorities so that the TPB members can, as they make transportation investment decisions, reflect these priorities in decisions. He said that the TPB member survey indicated support for TPB adopting GHG reduction goals and some GHG reduction strategies. He said that the survey also showed that there were some strategies or ideas that were analyzed in the TPB's climate change mitigation study that have the potential to reduce GHG emissions; however, there are substantive implementation issues that need further discussion involving representatives from other entities and agencies at the local, state, and regional levels. He stated that these potential strategies are for the TPB to acknowledge and reaffirm for continued discussion and further explanation.

Mr. Srikanth stated that based on the two work sessions held in April and May 2022 and general comments received by staff, that there is broad agreement among the TPB members that the TPB should adopt GHG reduction goals for the transportation sector. He said that TPB research has revealed that if the TPB should adopt the GHG goals and strategies, it will be the first MPO in the country to do so voluntarily. He noted that there are only a few MPOs that have received mandates to adopt GHG reduction goals by state law, and in most of those MPOs, the goals that they have adopted are less than half of what the TPB is considering.

Mr. Srikanth presented the options for the TPB to consider for approval. He said that the first option is that the TPB can adopt a GHG reduction goal for transportation at the same level as the region's multisector goal, which is 50 percent reduction by 2030 or 80 percent by 2050, noting that the 50 percent reduction by 2030 goal has been set by the President of the United States and many TPB jurisdictions. He said that no pathway to achieve this level of reduction in the transportation sector has been identified.

Mr. Srikanth said that the second level of GHG reduction that the TPB could consider is a 32 percent reduction by 2030 or an 80 percent reduction by 2050 and that the 32 percent number comes from the TPB's climate change mitigation study that evaluated up to 14 strategies and combined them into 10 different scenarios. He said that three of the 10 scenarios, if implemented, could achieve a 32 percent reduction; however, some of the strategies in these scenarios are extremely aggressive and assume strategies such as a commuter tax, a VMT tax, and free transit, and at this point, the TPB is not sure how the strategies could be implemented.

Mr. Srikanth said that the third option that the TPB has is adoption of seven strategies that the TPB members surveyed indicated that a majority of members would be ready to adopt as planning priorities. He explained that the GHG reduction potential of those seven strategies could result in a 29 percent reduction in greenhouse gases by 2030. He said that based on discussions at the April and May 2022 work sessions, there appears to be TPB member support for Options A and C, with the highest level of support for Option C, the next level of support for Option A, followed by Option B. He stated that the TPB will consider adopting one of the three options in June.

Mr. Srikanth said that TPB staff worked with a consultant for additional analysis on the seven strategies that the TPB members have indicated support for adoption yet implemented at a more modest level, although,

the more modest level of implementation is still considered very aggressive. He said that the TPB study assumed that 100 percent of all new light duty vehicles sold in the region in the next eight years will be clean fuel, and 100 percent of buses in the region will be zero emission vehicles. In addition, he mentioned that the study assumed that 50 percent of all medium and heavy duty trucks sold in the region will be zero emission by 2030. He said that the modest level is that 50 percent of the new vehicles sold would be zero emissions and that 50 percent of the buses operating would be zero emissions.

Mr. Srikanth said that those two levels of options within the seven strategies were discussed at the May 18 work session, and there was a sense that TPB members were comfortable pursuing the seven strategies at the highest level with the understanding that the strategies would need work, and TPB staff would assist in understanding what all of the requirements are in order to be able to hit some of the targets. He gave examples of requirements: funding level, enacting new projects or programs, private sector involvement, manufacturing, and how the region could come together to build a robust network of EV charging stations.

Mr. Srikanth stated that there were seven additional strategies that the survey indicated that the TPB should explore further because they are good ideas but have implementation issues that need to be better understood and addressed. He said that TPB staff has been asked to work with jurisdictional staff to communicate what the strategies are, what some issues are, and staff has also been asked to identify what issues could be associated with each the seven strategies that would need to be addressed.

Mr. Srikanth said that for next steps that TPB staff should be able to bring for the TPB's consideration and vote in June a set of GHG reduction goals and the seven strategies at the highest level of implementation.

Chair Sebesky asked that board members who were not able to attend the work session ask any questions they have for Mr. Srikanth.

Mr. Snyder thanked and commended TPB members who participated in the discussions. (Mr. Snyder had previously asked staff and the Chair had agreed to share a tally of the options for the GHG reduction goals and strategies members participating in the work session had indicated with the board). He asked whether there was a majority for Option 1 at this point in time.

Chair Sebesky said that by her count, the majority picked Option 3.

Mr. Srikanth said that he concurs with Chair Sebesky that the majority chose Option C, followed by Option A, and then followed by Option B.

Mr. Srikanth said that Option C is the 23 percent level reduction by 2030, and Option A is the 50 percent, which means adopting the same goal that the region has for all sectors but just for the transportation sector, and Option B is the 32 percent.

Mr. Snyder asked if this refers to the goals or strategies.

Mr. Srikanth clarified that the options he described referred to the GHG reduction goals. He said that for the 50 percent goal there is no strategy of reaching that level; for the 32 percent goal the TPB has some scenarios and strategies to achieve; however this involves strategies where it is not known how to implement them; for the 23 percent level, there are strategies that are ready to work on within the region.

Mr. Roberts expressed concern with the terminology being used when electric vehicles are referred to as having zero emissions because of the natural resources and carbon expenditure involved in manufacturing vehicles. He said that this has a big effect on the outcome of environmental problems and stated that taking the existing fleet and converting to electric to run indefinitely would have an impact but making billions of new vehicles will not.

Mr. Srikanth replied for clarification that the TPB analysis accounts for and assumes the GHG that will be generated by the electricity sector. He said that in the TPB climate change mitigation study, each of the 10 scenarios analyzed had three sub-scenarios, one of which was existing grid, the second was a significantly modified grid, and the third was a clean grid with 100 percent of electricity generated by renewable sources.

Mr. Erenrich said that he would like to mention next steps in the process. He said that the previous agenda item on Visualize 2045 discussed what can change or cannot change in the long-range plan. He said that one thing that can change for the plan is addition of the discussion on greenhouse gases as a priority, and the addition does not change any projects, the conformity, or the fiscal impact. He asked how the priorities affect the call for projects for the 2024 update, and how will the information in the priority list be used to identify, screen, and select projects for the next round of conformity. He said that he wants to talk about this step in the process and other steps on how the TPB is going to determine whether progress is being made through goals, strategies, and performance measures.

Mr. Kovar asked about the second seven strategies and whether the TPB is building into the idea that once that exploration of the second set of strategies is completed, will there be a vote on those seven strategies.

Mr. Srikanth said that, yes, using fare free public transportation as an example, once the TPB member jurisdictions indicate that they have figured out a way to make that happen, then the TPB could adopt that as a strategy and estimate what additional reductions there would be to GHG if that action takes place. He said that the goals set today can be revised upwards.

Mr. Kovar asked for clarification as to whether whatever percentage is agreed to, whether it is 50 or 32 or 29 percent, that the figure is regional. He asked to confirm whether the number selected is something that all jurisdictions will do if they can, but it is not a number that each jurisdiction has to hit. He asked whether it is the overall amount for the region?

Mr. Srikanth replied that that is correct.

Mr. Kovar said that closer jurisdictions might end up with a higher percentage or reduction.

Mr. Srikanth replied that yes, the percentage reduction is collectively for everybody because the TPB will not be able to track the impacts of individual projects or even projects within a jurisdiction in an area of almost 4,000 square miles.

Mr. Allen said that in listening to the conversation, he remembers when the TPB released the mitigation study, it felt daunting and crushing about what it was that the TPB would have to achieve to realize the region's goals. He said that when he heard about TPB members gravitating toward an option that they felt most comfortable with, he thought about when COG was creating Equity Emphasis Areas (EEAs), and six years later the EEAs are considered in evaluations and have made a significant impact. He stated that the TPB was able to take an aspirational approach and was able to help drive decision making as colleagues across the region, and it helped to move the TPB forward. He said that he thinks the TPB will need to go aspirational and urged members to go with Option A, recognizing that this is going to be incredibly hard to achieve, but the TPB will have to not find what it feels most comfortable with but to really push outside that comfort.

Mr. Allen asked whether a vote was taken on the options or was it more of a straw poll, and then the TPB would vote in June.

Mr. Srikanth said that work sessions do not have votes, and TPB members were responding to the question 'Which of the three options appeals to you or your jurisdiction?' He said that a formal vote was not taken; however, the TPB will collectively take a vote at its June meeting.

Mr. Harris commented that he thinks all TPB members want the biggest impact possible. He said that he thinks the vote was split between the inner jurisdictions and the outer jurisdictions, where those jurisdictions that do not have access to high-capacity transit would have a hard time reaching the more aggressive goals and more aspirational goals, because mechanisms or funding are not in place to increase use of transit.

Chair Sebesky commented that she thinks that the TPB members have had great discussions in the two work sessions over the last two months, and she hopes that those who live closer to the core and those living further out are getting a better understanding of the different challenges that each area faces. She said that in her jurisdiction, if there is not road development such as third lane on Route 28 to get a bus down, it affects not just equity, but it affects the ability for people to get their jobs. She remarked that even though bike lanes have been increased by 300 percent in the last five years, bike facilities are mostly for people just getting around in the City of Manassas and are not necessarily being used for biking to work. She said that she understands the importance of the inner jurisdictions increasing the ability for people to get to public transit in other ways, other than private vehicle, and that opens up roads for better transportation of buses and vanpools. She said that each jurisdiction has challenges that cost money, and each has to figure out how its boards are going to address the challenges.

Chair Sebesky said in summation that she would hope that the TPB members can all be inclusive in understanding of all of these challenges as the board makes these decisions that are not easy. She said that she has heard consistently in the time that she has participated on the board that everyone, in every jurisdiction, is interested in climate change and making these changes happen.

**** As noted, a formal vote was not taken in the work session. However, at the board's request, a summary of the input provided during the work session is attached as an addendum to this document.***

10. PBPP: CMAQ PROGRAM DRAFT 2022-2025 TARGETS

Mr. Randall referred to the Item 10 agenda materials and provided a briefing on proposed performance targets for the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) Program and explained that the performance measures are part of federally required a performance-based planning and programming (PBPP) process set by the federal government through MAP-21 and FAST Acts that MPOs, state DOTs, and transit agencies must follow. He said that adopted targets are included in the long-range transportation plan and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Mr. Randall explained that the PBPP process performance areas include highway safety, transit safety, transit assets, highway assets, and highway systems performance. The CMAQ targets are set on a four-year cycle. There are three CMAQ targets: peak hours of excessive delay (PHED), mode share in non-single occupancy vehicle (SOV), and emissions reductions achieved through the CMAQ program. The two traffic congestion measures are set specifically for the D.C. urban area. He said that the TPB is taking the lead on the targets and works in coordination with the states in the region, the Fredericksburg Area MPO and the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board as the agencies adopt the same targets as the TPB due to the urban areas overlapping the MPO areas.

Mr. Randall said that the TPB set a PHED target for 2018-2021 that by the end of 2021 shows that a person would experience 26.7 hours of delay during A.M. and P.M. peak periods. The mode share in non-SOV target figure for the 2022-2025 period is approximately 36 to 37 percent. The TPB met its four-year target due to the coronavirus pandemic; however, due to uncertainties about the future, the TPB will use the same methodology used in 2018 for new targets. He said that the pandemic years will be excluded and the TPB will extend trend data with model data and extrapolate from 2019. The TPB has non-SOV mode share

through 2020 that indicates that the TPB is close to target on the measure, and a similar methodology as used for PHED will be used for non-SOV mode share.

Mr. Randall said that the TPB was able to exceed emissions reductions targets for volatile organic compounds and nitrous oxides in part due to continuous improvement by the District DOT, Maryland DOT, and Virginia DOT. Emission reductions came from a Maryland State Highway Administration adapted smart signal systemization. The TPB is not adding to the emissions targets and is using forecast reductions and the average of the past annual reductions.

Mr. Randall said that TPB staff will take comments on the CMAQ targets through May and will ask the TPB for approval of the targets at the June 15 TPB meeting. He stated that TPB staff will write two performance plan reports: the first on the past four years and the second on the next four years. The state DOTs will submit the reports to the Federal Highway Administration by October 1. He stated that the board would receive review highway asset targets, pavement, bridges, and other time travel targets under highway performance by the end of the year.

Chair Sebesky called for questions or comments. There were no questions or comments.

**TPB May 18, 2022 Meeting summary – Addendum
(Provided at the request of the board)**

June 9, 2022

May 18, 2022 TPB Climate Change Mitigation Work session #2
Input from attendees on greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals and strategies

Note:

Not all members of the board attended the TPB work session on May 18, 2022. The following input was part of the comments made by members present during the work session regarding the options for GHG reduction goals and strategies that were being discussed during the work session. The TPB does not conduct formal votes at work sessions, so the information below is simply a summary of the input that was provided. Note that some jurisdictions have two representatives (on account of their population, as per the TPB Bylaws) and hence input from such jurisdictions could be listed more than once. Also, since a few members indicated support for either option A or B, these jurisdictions are listed under more than one option.

Regarding the level of 2030 GHG reduction goal for the on-road transportation sector.

No	A– 50% below 2005 levels	B– 32% below 2005 levels	C– 23% to 29% below 2005 levels
1	Takoma Park	Takoma Park	Charles County
2	Montgomery County (1 of 2)	Arlington County	Prince William County (1 of 2)
3	City of Falls Church	Maryland DOT	Prince William County (2 of 2)
4	City of Rockville	City of Rockville	Virginia DOT
5	District of Columbia (1 of 3)	District of Columbia (1 of 3)	City of Laurel
6	District DOT	WMATA	City of Manassas Park
7		City of Frederick	City of Gaithersburg
8			Loudoun County (1 of 2)
9			City of Manassas

Regarding the level of implementation of the GHG reduction strategies to be considered for adoption.

No	1 – Highest level¹	2– Reduced (yet aggressive) level²
1	District of Columbia (1 of 3)	City of Gaithersburg
2	District DOT	City of Laurel
3	District OP	Maryland DOT
4	Charles County	Fauquier County
5	College Park	Loudoun County (1 of 2)
6	City of Frederick	City of Manassas Park
7	Montgomery County (1 of 2)	Prince William County (1 of 2)
8	City of Rockville	Prince William County (2 of 2)
9	Takoma Park	Virginia DOT
10	Arlington County	
11	Fairfax County	
12	City of Falls Church	
13	City of Manassas	
14	WMATA	

¹ For example, for one of the seven strategies, 100% of new LDV sold, 50% of M&HDV sold and 100% of all buses on road would be clean fuel by 2030. Would yield 29% GHG reduction by 2030. Changes in the level of implementation of a few other strategies had little effect on the total GHG emissions reduced.

² For example, for one of the seven strategies, 50% of new LDV sold, 30% of M&HDV sold and 50% of all buses on road would be clean fuel by 2030. Would yield 23% GHG reduction by 2030. Changes in the level of implementation of a few other strategies had little effect on the total GHG emissions reduced.