
**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**
Hybrid

April 17, 2024

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT *IN-PERSON*

James Walkinshaw – Fairfax County, TPB Vice Chair (presiding)
Charles Allen – DC Council
Matt Frumin – DC Council
Amanda Stout – DDOT
Haley Peckett – Montgomery County
Eric Olson – Prince George’s County
Drew Morrison – MDOT
Marc Korman – Maryland House
Takis Karantonis – Arlington County
Walter Alcorn – Fairfax County
Meagan Landis – Prince William County
Bill Cuttler – VDOT
Maria Sinner – VDOT
Amir Shahpar – VDOT
Julia Koster – NCPD

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT *ONLINE*

Heather Edelman – DC Council
Leigh Miles – DC Council
Mark Rawlings – DDOT
Rebecca Schwartzman – DC Office of Planning
Mati Bzurto – Bowie
Reuben Collins – Charles County
Jason Groth – Charles County
Jessica Fitzwater – Frederick County
Mark Mishler – Frederick County
Kelly Russell – City of Frederick
David Edmondson – City of Frederick
Neil Harris – Gaithersburg
Kristen Weaver – Greenbelt
Victor Weissberg – Prince George’s County
Monique Ashton - Rockville
Shana Fulcher – Takoma Park
Cane Aguirre – Alexandria
Dan Malouff – Arlington County
Tom Ross – City of Fairfax
Dave Snyder – Falls Church
Mike Turner – Loudoun County
Rob Donaldson – Loudoun County
Pamela Sebesky – City of Manassas
Jeanette Rishell – City of Manassas Park

Allison Davis – WMATA
Mark Phillips – WMATA
Michael Weil – NCP
Laurel Hammig – NPS

MWCOG STAFF AND OTHERS PRESENT

Kanti Srikanth
Lyn Erickson
Andrew Meese
Mark Moran
Tim Canan
Dan Sheehan
Leo Pineda
John Swanson
Sergio Ritacco
Rachel Beyerle
Deborah Etheridge
Kim Sutton
Jamie Bufkin
Cristina Finch
Andrew Austin
Amanda Lau
Jane Posey
Dusan Vuksan
Laura Bachle
Lindsey Martin
Kenneth Derryberry
Bill Bacon
Amy Garbarini – Technical Committee Chair, DRPT
Ra Amin – CAC Chair
Gary Erenrich – Montgomery County
Hana Fouladi – DC Council
Kari Snyder – MDOT
Regina Moore - VDOT
Robert Brown – Loudoun County
LaToya Crump – Prince William County
Evandro Santos – Prince William County
Tiffany Jennings – Prince George’s County
Steward Schwartz – Coalition for Smarter Growth
Bill Pugh – Coalition for Smarter Growth
Kevin O’Brien – WABA
Jason Stanford – Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Janet Gallant – DontWiden270.org
Lindsey Mendelson – Maryland Sierra Club
Garrett Gee – Environmental Law Center
Barbara Coufal – Citizens Against Beltway Expansion
Bill Orleans – public

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

Vice Chair Walkinshaw said that that Chair Henderson is unavailable to attend, and the meeting will be conducted in a hybrid format. He thanked members for participating in person and virtually. He stated that for action items, he would make a motion to act after the staff presentation and would invite a second from a member of the TPB.

Lyn Erickson conducted a roll call. Attendance for the meeting can be found on the first pages of the minutes. She confirmed there was a quorum. She said that a number of people had signed up to provide comments in person.

Lindsey Mendelson, senior transportation campaign representative with the Maryland Sierra Club, urged the TPB to reevaluate the proposed expansion project inputs in light of TPB's goals to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, Maryland's climate targets, and MDOT's VMT targets. She stated that the Maryland Sierra Club is glad to see multiple bus rapid transit projects and MARC service improvements but is concerned about the 900 lane miles of new and expanded highways including the Capital Beltway and I-270 with toll lanes and urged the TPB to remove those segments for inclusion in the air conformity report. She stated that it is critical that the TPB reject the I-495 Southside express toll lanes. She encouraged the TPB to categorize projects by highway capacity, highway preservation, transit capacity, and transit preservation using a category system currently used by the Baltimore Regional Transportation Board.

Barbara Coufal, chair of Citizens Against Beltway Expansion, stated that highway expansions of I-495 and I-270 are not consistent with TPB policies and should be removed from Visualize 2050. She said that Lines 206 to 210 of the air quality conformity network input tables include projects that would wrap toll lanes around the Maryland Beltway from Old Georgetown Road east through Silver Spring and Prince George's County. She commented that the study to add toll lanes from Bethesda through Prince George's County should be removed from Visualize 2050. She stated that it is clear from the MetroQuest survey that the public rejects highway expansion and urged the TPB to remove the study of toll lane extensions on the Maryland Beltway and to remove the Southside express lanes from Visualize 2050.

Janet Gallant, a coordinator of dontwiden270.org, stated that the group strongly opposes including the Southside project and MDOT's toll lane projects in Visualize 2050. She said that toll lanes on lower I-270 would mean gratuitous destruction of MDOT's innovative congestion management system, demolition of fully functioning bridges, years-long construction of unnecessary interchanges which would lead to unforced harms, worse bottlenecks, and more congestion. She said that there is the unexpected inclusion of toll lanes along the Beltway in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, and the fact that the Beltway project is listed as a study is no comfort. She commented that if MDOT procures funding, the listing can be changed to construct and widen. She urged the TPB to remove the Maryland Beltway toll lanes, lower I-270, and Southside toll lanes from Visualize 2050.

Jason Stanford reiterated the Northern Virginia Business Community's strong support for the projects submitted in Visualize 2050 and noted that population density and high-capacity transit corridors will nearly double under current regional land use plans by 2045, walking and biking will increase by 39 percent; and transit trips will increase by 28 percent. He stated that two-thirds of all transportation dollars will go towards transit and transit lane miles will increase by 27 percent, yet by 2045, 80 percent of the trips in our region will still be taken via automobile because jobs and population growth are the largest drivers of VMTs in the region. He commented that Visualize 2045's no-build scenario still shows a 13 and a half percent increase in vehicle miles traveled, and the TPB's 2021 climate change mitigation study showed when the most aggressive mode shift strategies, including free transit, DC congestion pricing, VMT charges, and 40 percent telework were implemented, the region would only achieve a 17 percent emissions reduction by 2050. He commented that eliminating roadway projects

will increase congestion, delays, and access to jobs and opportunities. He commented that Visualize 2045 showed a 10 percent drop in access to jobs for D.C. area residents in the no-build scenario.

Garrett Gee, senior attorney with the Southern Environmental Law Center, commented that the initial Visualize 2050 major project list for the conformity analysis is not consistent with greenhouse gas reduction goals for 2030 or for 2050 because it includes dozens of highway widenings and adds billions of dollars of costs. He recommended that the board ensure that the transportation conformity analysis includes climate in the analysis so greenhouse gas emissions and VMT induced from the projects is included. He recommended that any highway widening project also have a non-road alternative paired with it so that the TPB does not end up in the same position as with the 2045 plan where this board expressed concerns about the direction and the projects were included, but was told that it was too late in the process because conformity take about a year to do,

Stewart Schwartz, executive director of the Coalition for Smarter Growth, asked the TPB to see the letter submitted by Bill Pugh, the coalition's senior policy fellow which points out how the draft plan doesn't comply with the TPB's resolutions requiring agencies to seriously consider actions necessary to achieve a 50 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030, to provide true zero-based budgeting, and to do alternate scenarios. He stated that he does not think that the plan meets any of the requirements. He commented that the public comments have been overwhelmingly supportive of meeting climate goals, are opposed to highway expansion, and support transit, walk, and bike investments. He said that the TPB must significantly reduce vehicle miles traveled in addition to adopting electric vehicles and the approach has to be a comprehensive, full build-out of transit-oriented development at Metro Purple Line, BRT stations and corridors, plus transit expansion plus pricing, including parking pricing, to reduce vehicle miles traveled and emissions. He commented that the TPB voted for a new approach to the plan but still proposes 900 lane miles of road expansion, does not include all planned transit projects, and is not based on TOD build-out. He asked that the TPB run through the regional traffic model with a "What Would It Take" package to slash emissions.

Kevin O'Brien, Washington Area Bicyclists Association (WABA), encouraged the TPB to take a critical look at the Visualize 2050 project list and evaluations to ensure that the final plan will adequately deliver on the region's commitments around active transportation, vulnerable road user safety, and sustainability. He said that WABA questions an evaluation scheme that allows jurisdictions to grade their own projects and that almost every road widening project gets a checkmark for safety yet there is little contemplation on how additional lanes, higher speeds, and wider crossings compromise safety. He commented that WABA has noted that road diet projects have received some generally poor marks under the 2050 scoring rubric but are being touted as vital and worthy of transportation alternatives funding. He commented that this seems to reflect a disconnect between the TPB's stated values – better safety, fewer vehicle miles traveled, lower carbon emissions – and its metrics, which still prioritize roadway expansion on the now debunked theory of congestion relief.

Patricia Jackman, member of the Maryland Coalition for Responsible Transit, urged the TPB to remove the Southside express lanes from Visualize 2050. She said that when the Woodrow Wilson Bridge was built, policymakers ensured that there would be room for rail, and WMATA is studying the extension of the Blue Line to National Harbor. She said that public-private partnerships are long-term arrangements, and it would be too expensive for VDOT to pay off a concessionaire to allow toll lanes to be converted to rail and that Virginia would use its veto to block the extension of the Blue Line. She stated that of the people who expressed opinion on the Southside express lanes, 87 percent were opposed. She urged the TPB to remove the Southside express lanes project from Visualize 2050.

Lyn Erickson said that between noon March 20 and noon April 16, the TPB received five letters and 95 comments via email. She said a summary of the following can be found on the TPB meeting page. She went through the items quickly:

-
- Mike Litt, Sierra Club DC Chapter Sustainable Transportation Committee, voiced support for the TPB's efforts in reducing vehicle lane capacity to lower car speeds and enhance safety for cyclists and pedestrians; advocated for expansion of bus and bike lanes and rail in DC; congestion pricing and car-free zones; and enforcement against unsafe driving. He voiced concern that the Benning Road streetcar expansion project is focusing on road improvements for cars without including the planned streetcar extension.
 - George Aburn, DC EJ Coalition, resubmitted comments sent during the March comment period focusing on three EJ issues in the Envision 2050 plan that he thinks were not well addressed: the air quality conformity analysis is outdated and does not fully address air pollution; the plan fails to address high risk air pollution local hot spots in EJ communities of color; and their plan has weak climate change goals.
 - Douglas Stewart, Sierra Club Great Falls Group, stated that they appreciate the TPB's adoption of a more inclusive vetting and public engagement process for reviewing submitted projects in the constrained long-range plan (CLRP) update; however the draft CLRP still includes an excessive number of road and highway expansion projects that hinder progress toward greenhouse gas emissions and achieving net zero submissions. He said that public comments during the March TPB meeting highlighted the plan's failure to uphold its climate commitment, criticized the proliferation of highway and arterial expansion projects, and advocated for transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and road diet initiatives.
 - TPB received 94 email campaign forms with writers urging the TPB to ensure an evaluation that aligns with the board's 2021 resolution, and writers requested the TPB's evaluation to include a range of scenarios and a zero-based budgeting approach focusing on the TPB's strategic priorities and objectives, especially the goal of cutting greenhouse gas emissions from transportation by 50 percent by 2030. Writers said that some projects claim to support the 2030 climate target through counterproductive measures like highway expansion and the public has expressed a strong preference for transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and complete local streets projects over the expansion of highway and arterial roads.
 - Several speakers from the April 17 meeting included written comments. She said that remarks were submitted from Patricia Jackman, Garrett Gee, and the Coalition for Smarter Growth.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 21, 2024 MEETING MINUTES

Vice Chair Walkinshaw moved approval of the minutes. The motion was seconded by Takis Karantonis and was approved unanimously.

3. TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT

Chair Amy Garbarini said that the Technical Committee met on April 5. She said that the committee received briefings on Items 7, 8, 9b, and 11, which covered the Bike to Work Day proclamation, the Transportation Land-Use Connections recommended projects, Visualize 2050 briefing on public comments and air quality conformity project inputs, and a briefing on the Climate Pollution Reduction grants final priority climate action plan.

Amy Garbarini said that the Technical Committee reviewed three additional items, including the TPB equity deep dive analysis presented by the ICF consultant team, the Maryland critical urban freight corridor designation updates, and an update on the Performance Based Planning and Programming greenhouse gas emissions federal ruling.

4. COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

Chair Ra Amin said that the committee met on April 11. He said that the committee held a discussion with TPB Staff Director Kanti Srikanth about how the CAC can best advise the TPB. He said that the CAC members would like to hear from TPB members about what they view at the CAC's role and how the committee can be more effective. He stated that the committee conducted work planning to share ideas on work activities, which include a meeting with DDOT, MDOT, and VDOT representatives, a meeting with the TPB chairs and vice chairs, and the new COG and WMATA Unified Regional Transit Management Initiative. He stated that other topics of interest include expanding bike lanes beyond the urban core including Charles County, MARC through train service, an update on Union Station redevelopment, collaboration with the National Park Service and other federal land owners, multimodal transportation including the first and last-mile connections to transit as well as getting the word out about transit options.

Ra Amin said that the committee held a brief discussion about two of the TPB's safety and equity deep dives, what safety might look like from an equity lens.

Chair Walkinshaw invited board members to reach out to Ra Amin to answer the question of what the CAC can do to support the TPB's mission even more. He stated that he had the chance to meet with the CAC, enjoyed the session, and would be happy to meet with the CAC again.

5. STEERING COMMITTEE ACTIONS AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Kanti Srikanth announced the following from the Steering Committee and Director's Report:

- The TPB Steering Committee met on April 5 and approved two amendments at the request of Maryland DOT and Virginia DOT. He said that details are available in the packet.
- The TPB has written two letters of support, one to the Town of Herndon for its Safe Streets for All grant application and the other for Frederick County's Low or No Emissions (Low-No) grant.
- The solicitation for Maryland Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program funds is now open through May 15.
- The U.S. EPA has announced tougher emissions standards for heavy duty vehicles starting with model year 2027.
- Update on WMATA's FY 2025 operating funds: A pathway has been found to fund WMATA's operations in 2025 and likely 2026. The COG board issued a letter of invite to WMATA to develop a unified vision for transit in the region which would look at the kind of service needed, what the cost would be, how revenue might be raised, and how might all systems coordinate and cooperate in operating in their governance. The WMATA board responded positively, and there will be regular updates to the board for the next 12 to 16 months.

6. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Vice Chair Walkinshaw stated that the board has a couple action items on the agenda and three informational items. He commented that some discussion or Q and A may need to be curtailed and said that TPB members can place comments and questions in the chat in case the board cannot get to all the questions during the meeting.

Vice Chair Walkinshaw said that the COG and WMATA initiative is important to the region and stated that those who serve on both the COG board and TPB will be excited and enthusiastic to see all organizations working together on this.

ACTION ITEMS

7. APPROVAL OF REGIONAL BIKE TO WORK DAY 2024 PROCLAMATION

Chair Walkinshaw said that May 17 will be Bike to Work Day. He introduced LaToya Crump, BTWD Steering Committee Chair, who presented the proclamation. LaToya Crump said that each May, the Bike to Work Day event encourages bicycling as a viable form of commuting. According to the Commuter Connections 2022 State of the Commute Survey, 16 percent of all commuters in the region live fewer than 5 miles from their jobs. She said that from that same study we know that 90 percent of bicyclists and walkers are satisfied with their commute.

LaToya Crump said that Bike to Work Day celebrates existing bike commuters and serves as a springboard to try bike commuting for the very first time. She said that this year's free event coincides with National Bike to Work Week. She said that the number of registrants from last year's Bike to Work event was 14,600, and the Bike to Work Committee's goal for 2024 is 16,000.

LaToya Crump said that in addition to the TPB's regional Bike to Work Day proclamation signing, all TPB member jurisdictions are encouraged to host similar proclamations and that TPB members are encouraged to register for Bike to Work Day and attend the local pit stop of your choice.

Vice Chair Walkinshaw stated that the Regional Bike to Work Day 2024 Proclamation was unanimously approved.

8. APPROVAL OF FY 2025 TLC TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RECIPIENTS

Vice Chair Walkinshaw welcomed Deborah Bilek, Urban Land Institute Executive Director, and John Swanson, TPB Transportation Planner. Deborah Bilek said that she was pleased to be asked to serve as chair for this year's Transportation Land-Use Connections (TLC) selection panel. She said the TPB received a slate of great applications this year, and nine are being recommended for funding. She stated that since 2007, the TLC program has funded more than 170 projects throughout the region that promote vibrant communities, active transportation, and safer streets, and this year, the TPB received more applications than ever.

John Swanson said that all nine of the projects selected are in or near regional activity centers, adjacent to or supportive of high-capacity transit stations, eight projects are in Equity Emphasis Areas, and eight will support or provide access to the National Capital Trail Network.

John Swanson provided details on the selected projects and recommended TPB approval of the TLC funding for the following:

- Funding a fare study for the Capital Bikeshare Service
- Producing pedestrian and transit rider strategies for two commercial corridors; Okie Street and Martin Luther King Jr Avenue
- College Park: funding 30 percent design plans for protected bike lanes along the Purple Line corridor between the Metro station and the trail system
- Frederick: continuing design work for sidewalks, crosswalks, and bikeways
- Montgomery County: evaluating how the county can best transition its transportation impact analysis process for new development projects using vehicle miles traveled as a key metric
- Rockville: a study to make Congressional Lane more walkable and bikeable
- Takoma Park: identifying a route for cyclists to access the Purple Line

-
- Alexandria: improved connections between high-density residential communities, commercial areas, and transit stations
 - Fairfax County: design plans for a cycle track on Wiehle Avenue in Reston, connecting the Silver Line with the W&OD Trail.

Julia Koster asked if there is a way to expand the TLC program because all of these projects, even though they're benefiting each of the regional jurisdictions, is contributing to a much greater region as a whole.

Vice Chair Walkinshaw made a motion to approve the TLC Land Use Connections Program FY 2025 projects as presented.

Pamela Sebesky seconded the motion.

The board voted unanimously to approve the FY 2025 TLC technical assistance recipients.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

9. NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION TRANSPORTATION PLAN: VISUALIZE 2050 DEVELOPMENT

ITEM 9A: OVERVIEW OF MARYLAND EXPRESS LANE PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR VISUALIZE FOR 2050

Vice Chair Walkinshaw said that in March several board members asked MDOT for a briefing on the HOT lanes project proposed for inclusion in Visualize 2050. He recognized Drew Morrison of the Maryland Department of Transportation and William Pines from the Maryland State Highway Administration to brief the TPB and reminded board members that the TPB staff provided an FAQ handout on the item.

Drew Morrison introduced William Pines to provide an overview of the project planning and development of the American Legion Bridge I-270 program.

William Pines said that MDOT hosted four open houses in November and December 2023 to engage with communities and stakeholders on potential multimodal solutions for the corridor and also participated in two public meetings in Virginia. He said that stakeholder asks include strong support for bicycle and pedestrian connections to connect the existing facilities on the Maryland and Virginia sides, more transit options throughout the corridor, and at a minimum providing rapid and efficient bus transit, and addressing the aging infrastructure of the aging American Legion Bridge.

William Pines said that MDOT is looking at a comprehensive approach to the program that considers multiple projects in the corridor that prioritize transit and ridesharing opportunities with options such as improvements to the MARC-Brunswick Line, bus rapid transit, commuter bus options, and managed lanes in the corridor. He said this includes expansion of programs to encourage the reduction of single-use drivers on the road and transit-oriented development near WMATA transit stations, and connecting transit, rideshare, rail, and existing bike and pedestrian facilities. He stated that MDOT is looking at the replacement of the American Legion Bridge and the phased managed lanes and moving forward with the multimodal study on I-270 North of the 370 intercounty connector interchange.

William Pines said that the Maryland State Highway Administration is currently advancing design on a portion of the study including the American Legion Bridge and the west spur. He stated that MDOT will be launching the I-270 North study for north towards Frederick in the fall. He stated that work is not advancing on the section between I-270 at the Y split and I-370 but stakeholder engagement will

continue.

William Pines said that one of MDOT's key efforts is to determine how to avoid or minimize impacts to Plummers Island at the American Legion Bridge including looking at an option to shift the shared-use path to the west side of the bridge. He said that replacement of the American Legion Bridge and the managed lanes up to the 270 Y split are not currently funded for construction, and MDOT is exploring funding options to construct replacement of the American Legion Bridge.

William Pines said that immediate efforts have been refocused on the salvage and rebuild efforts of the American Legion Bridge; however, MDOT knows that the American Legion Bridge and I-495/270 corridor need to be addressed to support the needs of the community and the state, and MDOT is committed to continue the program. He stated that the American Legion Bridge is projected to be in poor condition within a 10-year timeframe.

Marc Korman referred to the map provided in the agenda FAQ. He asked if segments A and B on the map are going to look like A and B as shown on the chart with two lanes in each direction.

William Pines said that segments A and B are moving forward consistent with the Record of Decision, and E is where the study is starting in the fall. He stated that MDOT is not advancing any design or planning activities associated with segment D.

Marc Korman asked about the status of segment C.

William Pines said that segment C is functionally part of segment D and that parts C and D are in the Visualize document.

Marc Korman asked why C and D are in the document if MDOT is not doing anything with the segments in 2024.

William Pines responded that MDOT is trying to clarify what is being done today and to deliberately advance the program as the distinction between what is in the long-range plan environment versus what is the day-to-day activity of the department.

Marc Korman said that for those concerned about segment D hearing that MDOT is not doing anything on segment D right now is not a lot of comfort because it is still in the Visualize document.

Drew Morrison said that he and William Pines spoke with Rockville Mayor Monique Ashton earlier in the day and are continuing the conversation. He said the intention of the memorandum was to clarify where MDOT is on the project delivery side and to be clear of what the administration intends to do. He said that the segment is part of the Visualize 2050 plan, providing consistency between MDOT's environmental documents and the regional plan.

Eric Olson said that Prince George's County has not been supportive of a study for toll lanes around the Beltway and stated that the county would not want to have that in the 2050 document. He asked if MDOT could speak to the item.

William Pines, referring to the agenda item map, said that segments A through E show all that MDOT is incorporating into portions of potential tolling lanes. He said the segment near the Wilson Bridge is not part of the Visualize 2050 package that MDOT is submitting, and he could not comment on behalf of Virginia for the contemplated projects in the Prince George's County region.

Eric Olson said that he has not yet talked about the Southside project, but he understands that the HOT lanes study that MDOT was going to start is in the 2050 submission and that is a concern.

Drew Morrison said that MDOT's focus is on the project portions shown on the agenda item map, but he understands that there had previously been a line-item study for the rest of the Beltway in 2045. He stated that there is no active planning design activity from a toll lane standpoint in that section of the Beltway.

Eric Olson said that he appreciates that nothing is happening on the segment in question. He stated that on the Southside project he wanted to express deep concern about the project and pushing the bottleneck into Prince George's County along with the fact that there has not been regional discussion about rail on the Wilson Bridge. He said that he does not see how putting HOT lanes on the Woodrow Wilson Bridge would allow transit in the future.

Kanti Srikanth said that the Maryland portion of I-495 HOT lanes have been the subject of questions and comments. He stated from the TPB perspective, it is listed as a study. He said that does not mean that MDOT has the approval to include that part in the long-range plan for construction. He stated that MDOT will have to come back to the TPB board, and the board will have to take an action to explicitly include any part of that section for construction. He said that the TPB's approval at the next meeting would be just approving MDOT's request to study.

Haley Peckett said that MDOT has committed funding and construction for transit in Montgomery County related to additional bus bays, related to BRT construction, and a park and ride lot, as part of previous discussion on this. She asked if those projects are included for conformity in the list of projects.

Drew Morrison stated that MDOT is working through the project list and intends to engage more on what the potential menu might look like. He said that there may be some projects that are relatively advanced and more operational that are not necessarily part of the Visualize project list. He stated that MDOT would work with the county for any necessary TIP amendments that may be required to further define the program and the exact funding strategy for both the roadway project and the larger program may influence when do some things come to fruition.

William Pines said that there are some things in the NEPA Record of Decision that are included in the program and early commitments discussed focused around bus rapid transit options. He said that since then, through the public engagement process, MDOT has heard about the potential for New Brunswick Line expansions and other things that are of interest to stakeholders, so transit options need to be vetted to make sure that MDOT has an approach that makes sense and is affordable as part of the larger program.

Monique Ashton said that she met with William Pines and asked some of the same questions as Marc Korman and other Maryland colleagues. She said that she wants to make sure that MDOT is putting on the record what has been enumerated in terms of discussion for Rockville and to acknowledge she appreciates the support of colleagues north and south of Rockville. She said she knows there is a significant bottleneck north as the road goes from 12 lanes in Rockville to two lanes in other parts of Maryland. She said her continued concern is making sure that things are in writing as much as they can be because the document and plans will outlive administrators. She said that Rockville has the experience from the 1990s of lane expansion and the promise of sound walls that never happened.

Monique Ashton said she wants to make sure there is a roadmap for future administrators. She said she has concerns about taking free lanes in Rockville and turning them into HOT lanes from a variety of perspectives including equity. She stated that she wants to make sure that MDOT is being clear about transit and promises made when this project was discussed earlier in Montgomery County. She stated that she knows Frederick has interest in some of the transit projects and wants to see the statements documented.

Drew Morrison acknowledged Monique Ashton's statement and said that MDOT appreciates coordination with the mayor.

Kelly Russell said that Frederick north of I-370 feels like the cork on the top of a champagne bottle that keeps getting shaken and the pressure keeps building up towards Route 15 and just south of that which is a number one priority with the section of I-270 from I-370 to I-70. She said that all things happening to the south is only going to push traffic up, so Frederick needs the northern portions to be included.

Charles Allen said that he appreciates all of the Maryland colleagues' comments. He said that if he understands, segments C and D on the map are not moving forward, but he heard Kanti Srikanth say that the inclusion of the C and D segments is to allow for it to be studied. He stated that he is hearing MDOT say they are not planning on these segments. He said that this seems this contradicts the TPB's 2021 resolution.

In response to Charles Allen's comment about consistency with the TPB's 2021 resolution, Kanti Srikanth said that the 2021 resolution was an action where the Maryland DOT, in response to comments, removed the proposed construction of HOT lanes on the Maryland portion of the Beltway from C all the way through Woodrow Wilson Bridge. He said that MDOT in its current submission has removed this segment of HOT lanes and is not proposing it for construction. He noted that MDOT's submissions does show that it will continue to study the corridor for ways to improve mobility.

William Pines said that he would like to add that MDOT had a productive conversation with Monique Ashton about needs in the corridor, and sound walls have been mentioned as a need. He said that MDOT has no funding or plans to build anything in that D segment under the current Maryland administration unless there was an opportunity through the Record of Decision and based on stakeholder feedback for things desired in segment D. He stated there are transit pieces, noise wall pieces, pieces of the program in segment D that MDOT is hearing are still of interest, but the toll lanes portion of the Record of Decision has been deferred. He said that the timeframe of the segment in Visualize 2050 is significantly far into the future and well past this administration to where MDOT is not working on that in the near term but for specific stakeholder requests that MDOT may be able to fund and pursue.

Charles Allen said that 2050 is not that far away, and he is struggling with how something that there is no plan to do and does not seem to flow with the TPB's work and resolutions is going to be in the Visualize 2050 plan. He commented that maybe that is something between now and next month that can be remedied or worked on. He said he appreciates Kelly Russell's comments, and DC is going to be impacted as well.

Drew Morrison said an important flag is that we look vis-a-vis 2045, and where the 2021 conversation all landed is that actually the main play here has been to defer certain elements. He said that the Visualize 2045 plan had some of the elements happening earlier and the main move with this plan is to try to better reset on priorities of timing, which is the lower section, and to identify where sections are less a priority—which is segments C and D.

Drew Morrison said that MDOT is happy to converse more on the topic, and he thinks there is consistency and an effort to try to emphasize what is a near-term priority, what is not, and the focus of the program relative to a few years ago.

ITEM 9B: BRIEFING ON COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT PROJECT INPUTS AND SCOPE OF WORK FOR THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS OF VISUALIZE 2050 AND THE FY 2026-2029 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Cristina Finch said that there are two items included in the briefing packet: a list of projects proposed by the TPB member agencies to be included in the Visualize 2050 conformity analysis and the technical scope of work to conduct the analysis, including a forecast of future population, employment, and households. She said that the board will be asked to take action on these two items in May. She said that other materials are to help inform discussions that TPB members and their respective boards and councils can have before taking action in May.

Cristina Finch provided an update on comments received during the March Visualize 2050 comment period, which was focused on the Visualize 2050 technical inputs, including capacity impacting projects that must undergo an air quality conformity analysis to make sure the implementation of these projects does not exceed regional air quality goals in the future. She said that it is important for the TPB to vote on the inputs before TPB staff embarks on the months-long modeling process to keep on schedule for having a draft plan available for TPB approval in June 2025.

Cristina Finch referred to the air quality conformity project inputs table in her presentation and noted that technical corrections made in the last month are shown in pink. She referred to the air quality scope of work and stated that TPB staff has attached COG-approved data tables for employment, population, and household forecasts through 2050.

Cristina Finch stated that the project summary table is available in the packet, and the member agencies have been working with TPB staff to review and provide technical corrections to the information on the project summary table. She stated that the project summary table is supplementary material that is not for board approval in May. She said that all projects should now have goals alignment information.

Cristina Finch said that it is important to collect public comments at this stage because the air quality conformity analysis must be done before the plan can be adopted. She stated that TPB member agencies also undertake their own public engagement, and the March comment period was one more chance for the board to hear the public's thoughts on these key planned investments.

Cristina Finch said that the TPB communicated the public comment opportunity in many ways and used paid advertising through Facebook to promote it. She said that the TPB used MetroQuest, which received the most participants, and people provided feedback via email, letter, and in person at the board meeting last month. She stated that this was an open comment period and not a scientific survey, so the results are not statistically significant. She said that the comment review found that many participants showed support or opposition to a project based on type, rather than the application of a project type to a particular location or purpose.

Cristina Finch said concerns focused around: express toll lanes' effectiveness to reduce congestion, roadway widenings encouraging more automobile trips, increasing carbon pollution, not enough transit projects in the plan or to be completed soon enough, and bicycle and pedestrian projects not being included on the list.

Cristina Finch stated that bicycle and pedestrian projects are not part of the air quality conformity modeling process although many of the proposed projects do include bicycle and pedestrian components. She said that Maryland has provided a response to comments through the express lanes presentation today, and TPB staff responses to frequently asked questions are included in the packet including questions received from board members during the TPB March work session and from the

public during the comment period. She noted that VDOT provided a response letter also included in the packet.

Cristina asked board members to consider the information provided and ask questions, review the two items for action in May, review the comment period results, and updated packet materials.

Marc Korman said that there has been a number of comments about the I-495 Southside HOT lanes including the Wilson Bridge project. He noted that this is a Virginia project that he as a Maryland representative may not be able to directly go to VDOT about. He asked if the TPB staff could talk a little about the process here at the TPB on what actions the TPB takes.

Kanti Srikanth said that the TPB will be evaluating and considering all the projects proposed for inclusion in Visualize 2050 by all 24-member jurisdictions in May. He said that individually members can express their support or concerns on any of the projects, including projects they think they are not yet fully ready, or all the issues have not been resolved, they could propose excluding that particular project from the list of projects to be approved. He said that if there is a majority support for removing any particular projects that might still have unresolved issues, then the rest of the packet could be voted for. He commented that if members have specific questions about a project, staff can assist with those questions, working with the sponsoring agency, collecting those responses, and sharing it with the full board ahead of the next month's meeting to help members with their decision.

Marc Korman asked if the TPB could also send out a reminder about how weighted voting works.

Kanti Srikanth said that yes, the TPB staff can send out an explanation of the weighted voting process.

Vice Chair Walkinshaw said that there will continue to be a robust conversation in Virginia about the Southside project and the future of transit access on the bridge. He encouraged members who have questions to send them to Kanti between the April and May TPB meetings. He commented that VDOT will be happy to coordinate with Kanti to get answers and responses.

Eric Olson said that the draft includes claims that a lot of the road projects, almost half of the road projects, reduce greenhouse gas emissions. He said that he finds this puzzling because induced traffic is real. He stated that he does not understand how the TPB can make that claim and would like to understand this better. He commented that the TPB members do not have information from VDOT about greenhouse gas emissions, yet we do from DC and Maryland.

Speaking to the matter of roadway capacity projects and emissions levels, Kanti Srikanth said that it is a bit complicated and technical, and he would try to summarize it a high level. He noted that it is not borne by facts that all roadway projects by themselves will increase greenhouse gases. He stated that certain improvements to roadways have certain impacts on the speed of travel, and emissions are related to speed of travel. He said that certain emissions go up at higher speeds, and certain emissions go down or are very high or at low speeds.

Kanti Srikanth said that there was a public comment made that the TPB's conformity analysis should also look at greenhouse gases, and the TPB has been doing that since 2010. He commented that if one looks at the TPB's long-range transportation plan since 2010 there are always projects that have added roadway capacity, but at the regional level, the TPB is continuing to show that greenhouse gases are going to be going down into the future. He stated that there was also a comment made that the TPB's conformity analysis should include induced demand, which is true because when roadway capacity is improved through reduced congestion, people are likely to begin to shift to driving from transit, from carpools, from vanpool. He noted that the TPB's model does account for this, and there are factors beyond roadway capacity that reduce or increase greenhouse gases.

Eric Olson said that he is concerned that when capacity is added, traffic is added, and he understands that some projects will make traffic move smoother, but the subject is something he thinks the committee should be looking into further.

Vice Chair Walkinshaw said that for Fairfax County's project inputs, there are 14 road-widening projects that were removed during review. He said some were big and some small road widening projects that the county found no longer fits goals and priorities in Fairfax County. He said that some other jurisdictions did that as well, and the reduction of those road widening projects will reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Reuben Collins referred to page 86 to reemphasize comments made by Charles County. He stated that Charles County wants to ensure that the Visualize 2050 transformative document includes projects that not only break decades of endless congestion and provide mobility for all our citizens but also can truly achieve greenhouse gas emission goals for an entire region. He said that toll lanes will not be able to do that alone. He referred to the project on the page that is fully funded in the capital transportation program for the first phase of NEPA and has unanimous support from the federal delegation as seen by the repeated federal earmarks it has received. He stated that Charles County believes that this commitment shows that the project will be constructed by 2050. He commented that if Visualize 2050 only lists projects that are funded for construction, it is just a capital improvement program table of contents and not an actual planning document. He stated that the document is both a current planning document and aspirational.

Reuben Collins said that MDOT is a partner with Charles County that has traditionally shown resistance to include projects that are not fully funded for construction. He noted that SMRT is transformative and is now a primarily funded transit project and should be included in the plan.

Victor Weissberg said that he appreciates Reuben Collins comments on the SMRT project. He said that he has questions about the Southside study that can be placed in the chat and sent in an email to Kanti Srikanth. He asked whether VDOT has a timeline on implementing the bus plan that came out of the DRPT study with phasing connected to specific milestones and funding streams. He asked how VDOT will transfer from HOT lanes to rail when that project is advanced given the nature of the long term of P3 contracts. He stated that Prince George's County is concerned about how that will happen given the nature of these businesses.

Victor Weissberg said that a clearer and stronger understanding of how travel from locations east of Maryland 210, which is where the project drops off, will not be significantly adversely impacted. He asked what the benefits are to Prince George's County of having HOT lanes on that portion of the Beltway.

Vice Chair Walkinshaw said the questions might need to be submitted and responded to in writing.

Victor Weissberg said that he will send the four questions in writing and asked that the answers to the questions be provided in writing before the May meeting. He requested a briefing from VDOT on the Southside project.

Bill Cutler said that rather than answering every question asked, he would like to provide a quick summary of what VDOT is pursuing on behalf of Virginians and the region. He stated that there is a 94-mile network of HOV-3 facilities, bus lanes, and express lanes in Northern Virginia and an extensive park and ride program that feeds the system. He said that VDOT was part of the development of the Woodrow Wilson Bridge which provides the physical space for Metrorail as well as the bridge has the strength to handle rail. He said that VDOT does see Metrorail on the Wilson Bridge in the future. He stated that VDOT is looking at how to get the most out of the assets that exist today and are looking to see how we can make the most out of the interim until such time the region is ready for Metrorail.

Bill Cutler said it is possible to document through NEPA documents should the studies say two express lanes in each direction, it could be documented that in the future that could go back to one express lane in each direction plus Metrorail. He said that if and should it happen that a concessionaire is involved, that can be included in the contract language. He said that there are different ways that VDOT is able to place guard rails on the situation to follow through on the commitment to support Metrorail across the Wilson Bridge.

10. CARBON REDUCTION PROGRAM: MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

11. CLIMATE POLLUTION REDUCTION GRANTS (CRPG) FINAL PRIORITY CLIMATE ACTION PLAN

Chair Walkinshaw said that unless Items 10 and 11 can be covered in the five remaining minutes, they might need to be postponed until an upcoming meeting.

Kanti Srikanth said that TPB staff will look for another meeting where the two items can be presented together.

12. ADJOURN

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:57 P.M. The next meeting will be on May 15, 2024.