
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
October 21, 2015

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT

Charles Allen, DC Council
Robert Brown, Loudoun County
Ron Burns, Frederick County
Rick Canizales, Prince William County DOT
Allison Davis, WMATA
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County DOT
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jay Fisette, Arlington County
Renée N. Hamilton, VDOT
Neil Harris, Gaithersburg City Council
Konrad Herling, City of Greenbelt
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax County
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Shyam Kannan, WMATA
Tim Lovain, City of Alexandria
Dan Malouff, Arlington County
Michael May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Mark Rawlings, DC DOT
Kelly Russell, City of Frederick
Peter Schwartz, Fauquier County
Elissa Silverman, DC Council
Eric Shaw, DC Office of Planning
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Todd Turner, Prince George's County
Jonathan Way, Manassas City
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County/DPW&T
Robert Werth, Private Provider Task Force
David T. Whitaker, Frederick County
Patrick Wojahn, City of College Park
Scott York, Loudoun County
Sam Zimbabwe, DDOT

MWCOG STAFF AND OTHERS PRESENT

Robert Griffiths
Andrew Meese
Eric Randall
Rich Roisman
John Swanson
Ron Milone
Daivamani Sivasailam
Wenjing Pu
Dusan Vuksan
Michael Farrell
Andrew Austin
Ben Hampton
Bryan Hayes
Sergio Ritacco
Lamont Cobb
William Bacon
Anant Choudhary
Debbie Leigh
Deborah Etheridge
Paul DesJardin
John Kent
Bill Orleans
Faramarz Mokhtari
Stewart Schwartz
John Whitaker, AICP
Sree Nampooltrin
Gregory Matlesky
Tom Calcagni
Jeanette Tejada de Gomez
John Hartline
Mary Hagopian
Patrick Durany
Kari Snyder
Ramond Robinson
Sree Nampooltrin
Elizabeth Patel
David Koch
Tim Robertson
Nancy Davenport
Julie Hirka
K. Jane Williams
Ryan Emery
Charles Armstrong
Robert Whitfield
Dennis Anosike
Richard Price

COG/DCPS
COG/DCPS
Resident
Prince George's M-NCPPC
Coalition for Smarter Growth
Frederick County
NVTA
Chair Mendelson
AAA Mid-Atlantic
AAA Mid-Atlantic
Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland
Dunn Loring Resident
Supervisor Jenkin's Office
MDOT, Regional Planning
City of Alexandria
NVTA
FTA on detail to NVTC
NVTC
VA-DRPT
PWC-DOT
VA Citizen
MDOT
US Navy
US Navy
Fairfax Co. Taxpayer Alliance
WMATA
Coalition for Smarter Growth

1. PUBLIC COMMENT ON TPB PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES

David Miller, resident of Dunn Loring, recommended all D.C. area transportation projects be federally funded, with a slate of projects completed in the next ten years. Mr. Miller commented that the federal government and its agencies have expanded beyond the capacity of the region's transportation infrastructure and systems. He said the only solution is the creation of new federal legislation to mandate full funding of all projects.

Diana Haier, resident of Dunn Loring, commented that her community is opposed to the reconstruction of the I-495 / I-66 interchange. She stated that project planners should reconsider the alternatives for the interchange and evaluate the costs and benefits. She also requested that if TPB approves the projecting the meeting, a contingency be included where VDOT would continue to work with the community to mitigate right-of-way and environmental impacts.

Mary Hagopian, resident of Dunn Loring, stated her family lived near the I-495 and experienced the impacts of four years of construction of the I-495 HOT lanes with no sound wall. She commented that the final alternative for the interchange reconstruction does not properly evaluate the vertical and horizontal impact of the project, including visual pollution and cost of raising the sound walls. She requested the TPB slow down the project.

Marcia Hook, resident of Dunn Loring, stated that her home is in the right-of-way of the I-66 Beltway project. She believes the TPB should not approve VDOT's current project proposal for the CLRP until Virginia decides whether this project would be funded with public or private funds and the federal environmental review process has been completed. She said VDOT has neither confirmed the private concessionaire's involvement in the project's construction, operation or financing nor adequately completed the federal environmental review process. She requested that the TPB's approval for this project must include conditions regarding the mitigation of community impacts, specifically access to nearby Metro Stations and safety of adjacent schools.

Brian Zelle, resident of Vienna, Virginia, reported that his community is not opposed to improvements for I-66, but has issues with VDOT's plans for the corridor, particularly the new express lanes and the concessionaire agreement. He stated that the existing express lanes in Virginia have worsened congestion, and are case studies for I-66. He commented that VDOT's agreement with the concessionaire would preclude an Orange Line Metrorail extension through a non-compete clause. He asked the TPB to reconsider a slower review of the project.

Julie Hirka, resident of Vienna, Virginia, stated that the HOT lanes on I-495 have worsened congestion, and that the TPB not consider similar plans for I-66. She stated she was skeptical of VDOT's assertion that their plans would not violate national air quality standards, and requested air quality be tested at the I-495/I-66 interchange before approving reconstruction. She also expressed that the project should protect Fairfax County's existing tree canopy and not be exempted from any stormwater regulations. She asked for alternatives to focus on upgrading the overloaded interchanges and merge areas of I-66.

Konh Hill, Dunn Loring resident, stated that he would be one of several homeowners whose homes are located in the right-of-way VDOT will acquire for the I-66 project. He requested the TPB have VDOT reevaluate the widening of Gallows Rd, for him the project will not improve I-66 and poses unnecessary cost and environmental impact through eminent domain acquisition. He emphasized the negative impact of the project for his and other families.

Sonia Kirschner, Dunn Loring resident, said that the widening of Gallows Rd would cause several negative impacts to the community, including the loss of five homes, increased traffic, reduced access to the adjacent Metro Station facility, and added costs. She mentioned that VDOT should work with the HOA to reduce impacts to homeowners and their property values from pollution, noise level and safety concerns. She also mentioned the negative effects to Stenwood Elementary School and the local tree line and vegetation.

Carol Hook said that she was one of the homeowners impacted by VDOT's right-of-way acquisition for the I-66 project. She stated that the existing toll lanes on I-495 have not worked to reduce traffic, and that residents do not support HOT lanes for I-66. She expressed her displeasure with the proposed public/private partnership with a concessionaire for the toll lanes.

Douglas Stewart, of the Virginia Sierra Club, stated that his organization believes the TLB should reevaluate the CLRP because it does not meet key regional goals in addressing economic development or improving transportation infrastructure. He also commented that the CLRP does not support COG's goals in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. He said that the CLRP should focus more on transit and better target investments toward land uses that promote multimodal transportation choices. He mentioned that the Sierra Club supports tolling I-66 inside the Beltway and including a true transit-first approach for I-66 outside the Beltway in the CLRP.

Jim Dinegar, of the Greater Washington Board of Trade, expressed that the Washington region is the worst congested in the country, and this fact dissuades new business from locating here. He expressed the region should weigh in on Metro's GM search and support the agency as an economic driver in the region.

Tom Calcagni, of Triple AAA, expressed the organization's support of the CLRP and encouraged the TPB to adopt the proposed amendments. Triple-AAA supports alternative 2B for the I-66 corridor outside the Beltway and corridor improvements inside the Beltway. He requested the TPB hasten new lane construction on I-66 inside the Beltway, and set aside more toll revenues for lane construction. He stated that the organization is concerned with the proposed tolling scheme for I-66, and described the proposed tolls on single occupant motorists and exorbitant. He asked the TPB to review the tolling plan considering discrimination against low-income drivers and lack of funding for new roadway capacity.

Tim Stevens, a member of COG's CEEPC and the Virginia Sierra Club, said he supported the Coalition for Smart Growth's ideas for the CLRP to reflect COG's goals around reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Nancy Smith, of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, commented on her organization's support for the CLRP amendments related to I-66. She expressed NVTA's support for alternative 2B outside the Beltway and encouraged the TPB to hasten efforts to including new lane capacity inside the Beltway.

Joe Vidulich, of the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce, reported that the Chamber supports the scope and scale of proposed improvements for I-66 outside and inside the Beltway. The Chamber asked the TPB to accept the CLRP amendments regarding the I-66 projects.

Richard Parsons, of the Suburban Maryland Transportation Alliance, stated that the Alliance supports the amendments proposed and echoes earlier comments regarding a revised assessment of the CLRP. He mentioned that the forecasts for the existing CLRP show an unacceptable level of increased congestion, and the region needs more multimodal capacity. He also commented on Alliance's support for the working group on Unfunded Capital Needs and their plans to submit a list of items for further

review.

Stuart Schwartz, of the Coalition for Smart Growth, stated that the CLRP shows the benefits of DC's revitalization and transit oriented development, but supports fuel sprawling auto-dependent development, undermines regional commitments to smart growth, and falls short of climate change goals. He mentioned that inner suburbs of Fairfax, Prince George's and Montgomery counties have not made enough progress on shifting mode shares. The Coalition wants more review of the outside the Beltway I-66 proposal before inclusion in the CLRP. He also commented that the inside the Beltway proposal was innovative, effective, and has the Coalition's support.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTMEBER 10 MEETING

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the September 10 meeting. The motion was seconded and approved.

3. REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Rawlings reported that the Technical Committee met on October 2. He said the committee discussed a status report on the final stages of approval process for the 2015 Amendment to the CLRP and draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis; the work session preparation for the draft Regional Freight Plan; and outcomes of the fall 2014 and spring 2015 Streets Smarts campaign. He said that the committee also talked about the Unfunded Capital Needs working group kick-off meeting, the interim report from COG's Multisector Working Group to address Greenhouse Gas Emissions reductions, and the 2015 Regional Air Passenger Survey.

4. REPORT OF THE CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Summersgill reported that the CAC met on October 15. The Committee heard a summary of the 2015 CLRP amendments, an update on the Unfunded Capital Needs working group, and a briefing on the regional Street Smart campaign. The Committee recommended the working group focus on bicycle and pedestrian projects, as well as Metro's capital needs. They also discussed a proposal to recommend to the TPB and its members to set goals for zero traffic deaths.

5. REPORT OF STEERING COMMITTEE

Mr. Srikanth summarized the memorandum including the action items of the Steering Committee and the Director's report, and letters sent and received. The Steering Committee met on October 2.

Part one of the memo included two TIP amendments approved by the Steering Committee. The first amendment was \$7 million in federal and state funding for bridge reconstruction from MDOT. The second was \$700,000 in bicycle and pedestrian improvements in Arlington County from VDOT.

Part two of the memo included letters sent and received. The first letter was from the City Manager of Bowie, MD, stating the City's opposition of plans to intensify freight operations of CSX-Pope railroad beyond current usage. The second letter was from Mr. Schwartz from the Coalition for Smart Growth, regarding the methodology used by the Texas Transportation Institute to compare regions through a congestion index. TPB staff regrets that this was not included in the September TPB agenda items.

Part three of the memo included updates to a number of ongoing activities.

Mr. Srikanth said that on September 30 the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) released an urgent safety recommendation in response to the January 12, 2015, L'Enfant Plaza Metrorail smoke incident. The recommendations from NTSB ask that Congress reclassify Metrorail as a commuter authority, which would result in the safety oversight of Metrorail operations to move away from the Tri-State Oversight Committee (TOC) and the FTA. Instead, the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) would handle oversight. He said that on October 9 Secretary Fox proposed an alternate plan. He said that plan would have the FTA assume leadership of the TOC, which would allow the FTA to take actions that the TOC cannot. He also said the memo provided information on the efforts underway by Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia to reconstitute the TOC—as required by MAP 21—into a Metro Safety Commission, which will have the independent legal authority to enforce safety recommendations. COG/DTP staff is providing the decision support services to the three states in this effort.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the TPB's solicitation for projects to receive about \$5 million in federal funding through the Enhanced Mobility Program is open and that project submissions are due by November 2. He said that VDOT will hold nine public meetings across the Commonwealth to seek input from the public on the projects and strategies that have been submitted for consideration for funding while the House Bill 2 (HB2). He said that staff released the results of analysis that quantified the traffic impact of the Pope's visit to the Washington region. That analysis showed a significant reduction in highway and transit congestion relative to a small change in travel demand.

6. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Mr. Mendelson said that he had concerns about the safety oversight for the Washington region's public transportation system. He said that he would rather that oversight be managed locally than at the federal level with the FTA. He said that he understood that MAP 21 requires the states to set up a Metro Safety Commission and that the DOTs are working on this. He said he was concerned about reports that the commission would not be in place until 2019. He said he understands that creating this commission will require a tristate agreement. He said that the DOTs are currently working together to see if they can come up with legislative language, with the tentative deadline to send legislation to the legislatures in January. He noted that some members of the Board are legislators and that they would like to know more how they could assist with the process.

Mr. Srikanth said that staff could provide a report of the activities of the Tri-State Oversight Committee's process of organizing the new Metro Safety Commission. He also said the 2019 date was identified a year ago and that he understands the state DOTs are working to complete this work sooner with the help of the Federal Transit Administration.

Mr. Mendelson said that he would like the report next to include the DOTs and hear about what has been to date, their current status and plans to complete this work.

ACTION ITEMS

7. REVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED AND ACCEPTANCE OF RECOMMENDED RESPONSES FOR INCLUSION IN THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS OF THE 2015 CLRP AMENDMENT

Referring to the handout and mailout material, Mr. Srikanth briefed the Board on the comments received and on recommended responses for inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the 2015 Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP). He said these draft documents and web-based information were released for public comment on September 10. The public comment period for these documents ended on October 10. Public comments were posted on the TPB web site. The final version of the comments and responses memorandum will be incorporated into the final version of the documents scheduled for consideration under agenda items 8 and 9.

Mr. Srikanth noted that two items were released for public comment. One was the technical analysis of the Air Quality Conformity Analysis itself, and the other one was the proposed amendments to the Constrained Long-Range Plan, the 2015 amendments. He said 78 comments were received from individuals, organizations, and agencies. He noted that the comments were grouped into five categories: 1) comments submitted by the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee as part of the inter-agency consultation; 2) general comments on the CLRP itself and the TPB's process; 3) comments in support of the two proposed projects on I-66 in Virginia; 4) comments in opposition to some or all aspects of I-66 outside the Beltway; and 5) comments in opposition to some or all aspects of the I-66 project inside the Beltway. He described the staff responses to the comments. He also noted that detailed responses by VDOT for all of the comments related the two I 66 projects provided were included as attachment to the memo. He also informed the Board that he had just received a copy of Fairfax County Board's official position supporting the I 66 improvements outside the Beltway project that and that it would be added to the records of the TPB.

A motion was made to accept the public comments and recommended responses to those comments. The motion was seconded.

Ms. Smyth noted that the response to comment number 9 in the memorandum indicated that VDOT would share an evaluation of the proposed Phase I of the project. She further noted that the memorandum indicated that VDOT would share more information about the preferred alternative at a public information meeting. Similarly, for comment number 14, VDOT was supposed to provide more information about the do-no-harm alternative. She said that VDOT has not yet provided adequate information on those two points, and she asked that the "responses" document be revised to reflect that.

Mr. Srikanth agreed that the comments and responses document would be revised.

Ms. Hamilton said that Ms. Smyth was correct. She noted that the information that VDOT presented at a recent public meeting did not include detailed information about future project phases because the project team is now focused on Phase I. She said that information regarding the do-no-harm analysis was available and should be up on the VDOT website, but if it was not yet on the site, it would be provided.

Mr. Schwartz agreed with Ms. Smyth's comments relating to the I-66 project, particularly outside of the Beltway. He added that he would vote not to accept the responses.

Mr. Way noted that in the action, the TPB was being asked to “accept” the responses drafted by staff. He said he was concerned about the use of the word “accept” because it could be perceived to be an endorsement. He noted that this was the first time the board had seen the document. He offered a friendly amendment that would change the word “accept” to “receive.”

Chair Mendelson asked Mr. Srikanth if the change in wording would still meet federal requirements.

Mr. Srikanth answered that yes, the word change would meet federal requirements. He said the federal requirement is that the TPB must solicit and receive public comments, and that responses to those public comments must be prepared as part of the action to approve CLRP amendments and Air Quality Conformity Analysis.

Hearing no objection, Chair Mendelson said that the word “accept” would be replaced with “receive” in the action before the board.

A question was asked requesting clarification regarding the steps that were being taken at the meeting to approve the CLRP and the air quality conformity determination.

Chair Mendelson said that there were three action steps on the agenda: receive comments and responses, approve the air quality conformity determination, and approve the 2015 CLRP Amendment.

Mr. Kannan asked that staff revise the text in reference to WMATA’s eight-car train program. He said he did not believe that the statement that “funding for 50% eight-car trains is part of the CLRP” was correct. He said it was his understanding that funding levels reflected in the existing CLRP would not increase eight-car trains beyond the 33% that WMATA is currently running in the peak. He said he would confirm those numbers with staff.

Mr. Srikanth said he would follow up on this point.

The board voted to accept the recommended responses to comments received for inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the 2015 CLRP. The vote in favor was unanimous.

8. APPROVAL OF AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY DETERMINATION OF THE 2015 CLRP AMENDMENT

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Srikanth said that in September, the board received a briefing from staff on the results of the findings of the Air Quality Conformity Analysis. He noted that this analysis used a set of assumptions and inputs that the board had previously approved in February. He said the results of the analysis were released for public comment on September 10. He said the analysis for the criteria pollutants, for which the Air Quality Conformity Analysis is required, is for ozone, particulate matter, and carbon monoxide. He said that the analysis found that all of the emissions levels of those three pollutants were below the approved levels for this region, as approved by the EPA. He said that staff recommends that the board approve the analysis.

Mr. Srikanth noted no public comments were received questioning the analysis or the results and as such, staff recommends that the analysis be approved by the Board by adopting Resolution R2-2016.

A motion was made to adopt Resolution R2-2016 approving the air quality conformity determination for the 2015 CLRP Amendment. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Way asked for clarification regarding the “so be it resolved” clause.

Mr. Srikanth explained that the conclusion of the resolution essentially states that the Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the draft CLRP Amendment found that forecast emissions of criteria pollutants would be below the approved levels.

Chair Mendelson further explained that the approved levels were identified in a State Implementation Plan (SIP) that was approved by the three jurisdictions of Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. He explained that these approved emissions levels, called “emissions budgets,” are not set by EPA, but EPA does approve what is in the SIP.

Ms. Smyth noted that the I-66 project outside the Beltway has included a number of different alternatives during the project development. She said she understood the version currently in the CLRP Amendment has been broken in phases. She said that after Phase I, future phases are somewhat undefined, and more specifically, she said, she understood the funding for the future phases was not clearly identified. She said this is a concern of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors because one of the county’s future Metro stations would be affected. She questioned whether the project met federal requirements for inclusion in a financially constrained plan.

Mr. Srikanth said the Air Quality Conformity Analysis was dependent on the information submitted, which was still at a planning level. He said the project as proposed to the TPB for inclusion in the CLRP at this time does not distinguish between Phase I and Phase II. We know that the Commonwealth is working to finalize a preferred alternative, which will be different from what we now have. Therefore, this is approval for the project as best as it is known today, but any further substantive changes to the project, including funding, will have to come back to the Board for the Commonwealth to be able to get federal approval for the design or for approval of federal funding. Ms. Hamilton said that a financial plan has to be completed for this project. She said that VDOT is working with their federal partners to make sure that the financial plan is submitted at the time they submit the overall environmental document.

Ms. Smyth asked that VDOT provide a commitment to work with the county so that better definitions of those future phases will be provided.

Ms. Hamilton said that VDOT has already worked closely with Fairfax County and with the entire region. She emphasized the extensive amount of outreach already conducted. She said VDOT would continue such activities.

Ms. Smyth said she could attest to the level of outreach that Ms. Hamilton described.

Chair Mendelson asked if the project in the CLRP only included Phase I.

Ms. Hamilton said the project that was included in the 2015 CLRP Amendment would include the entire preferred alternative, which goes from the Beltway to Route 15. She said that when VDOT introduces the project to their federal partners for a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI), the entire project would be submitted, just not Phase I.

Mr. Snyder said the letter sent on September 29 from the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) contained good news. He said that for three years running, the region has not had a single Code Red day. He said that MWAQC believes the region is in full compliance with the EPA’s

current ozone requirements. He said that MWAQC also believes the region is within reach of the toughened ozone requirements that were recently announced by the Administration. He did add, however, that there would likely be more exceedance days in the future, so the region needs to keep working on air quality at the federal, state, and local levels.

Mr. York said he had a question for Mr. Srikanth that would affect the way he would vote. He said that Loudoun County has some concerns regarding tolling on I-66 inside the Beltway. He asked if the project depends on tolling, as proposed by the state.

Mr. Srikanth said the project in the plan, as submitted by the state, is defined as a toll project and the travel demand modeling that staff has conducted assumes that it will be tolled. He said that if for any reason the tolling mechanism or the tolling framework should change, then it would have to be considered a revision to the CLRP, which would then merit a revision to the emissions analysis as well.

Mr. York asked if the tolling provision could be voted upon separately.

Mr. Srikanth said that the answer would have to be no, given the way the project was submitted and the scope of work that the TPB approved.

Mr. York said that based upon that answer he would have to vote "no."

Mr. Way asked why project funding was relevant if the matter before the board related to air quality.

Chair Mendelson said that the matter was related to more than air quality. He said that the "constrained" in CLRP, refers to financial meaning funding for projects trained," He explained that the CLRP also had to have air quality analysis performed and that the three items on the board's agenda – items 7, 8 and 9 – were all tied together as part of the process for approving the 2015 CLRP Amendment, which is guided by federal requirements for financial constraint and air quality conformity. He said that because these items are all integrated, the discussion at the meeting had overlapped among different topics.

A TPB member noted that for the record, the Prince William representatives associated themselves with the remarks of the representative from Loudoun. He said they have similar concerns about the project and its scope. He said their board had passed a resolution expressing such concerns, and so they would vote "no" on the 2015 CLRP Amendment.

Chair Mendelson emphasized that the resolution before the board related to the Air Quality Conformity Analysis. He said the next item would be approval of the 2015 CLRP Amendment itself.

A majority of the board voted to approve Resolution R2-2016 finding that the 2015 CLRP conforms to the requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

Mr. York and Mr. Schwartz asked to be recorded as "no" votes.

9. APPROVAL OF THE 2015 CLRP AMENDMENT

Chair Mendelson said that there likely would not be time for the briefing on Metro fundamentals at the meeting today.

Mr. Srikanth said that TPB staff could work with WMATA staff to schedule the briefing for the November meeting.

Mr. Kannan expressed displeasure that the presentation was postponed. He said that WMATA staff would do their best to accommodate the needs of the TPB to help the Board make more informed and educated decisions about the future of Metro's transit network.

Chair Mendelson turned to Item 9.

Mr. Srikanth said that the 2015 CLRP Amendment was up for consideration. He described the schedule for the 2015 CLRP process. He said that the results of Performance Analysis and Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the 2015 CLRP Amendment were released for public comments and presented to the TPB in September. He noted that the Board today in the two previous items reviewed the comments and staff's response to the comments and also approved the regional air quality conformity analysis for the 2015 CLRP as amended. He said that with this item the Board is considering formally accepting the proposed amendments to CLRP projects. He noted that the air quality and performance analyses done was for the full set of projects that is in front of the Board today for its approval. He reminded the Board that if they decide to change the project mix in the 2015 CLRP Amendment, then staff would have to revise the Air Quality Conformity Analysis. He noted that two changes have been made to Resolution R13-2016 since the mail out and a revised resolution had been districted to the Board with the changes in underlined font. He said that one of the changes, on page 2, was simply correction to an error. He said that the other change, on page 3, was suggested by VDOT, based on VDOT's ongoing engagement with the public and elected officials. This change added a reference to a framework agreement and a commitment from VDOT to bring more information to the TPB in January on the I-66 projects.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution.

Chair Mendelson opened the resolution for discussion. He said that as a TPB representative from the District of Columbia that he was uncomfortable that the action required him to vote on projects where there seems to be still some irresolution with regard to particulars, he also noted that he was generally aware that discussions about having a framework to provide some assurances with regard to with use of revenues are ongoing. He wondered whether we are ready, today, to be voting on the CLRP, or whether we should put this off for a month while some of this gets worked out.

Ms. Hamilton said that VDOT requested the change to the resolution on page 3 to address the ongoing work on the project. She said that what the added clause does is give that assurance that binds VDOT and commits VDOT to the two points related to how the funding, the revenues will be spent, as well as the widening on components of I 66 which are the key components in the framework agreement under development. She explained that the framework agreement had been written and is currently being reviewed by lawyers at each of the affected jurisdictions. She said that this framework agreement describes details of the proposed widening on I-66 and how revenue generated via new toll lanes will be used. She added that public input has helped to improve the I-66 projects. She said she hopes the TPB can move forward on the resolution. She added that both I-66 projects would be brought back to the TPB in January because they will have evolved since they were submitted in 2015. She reminded the Board that the I-66 projects are still conceptual and would continue to be developed over the next year.

Ms. Smyth said that she appreciates VDOT's work with the community. She thanked VDOT for the inclusion of the new clause in the resolution. She said that when evaluating the performance of I-66, it

is important to consider impacts on parallel roadways. She said she was prepared to vote on the CLRP today, and looked forward to hearing about VDOT's updates in January.

Mr. Herling said that he was not familiar with the proposed I-66 projects and that he would suggest postponing the vote one month.

Mr. York said that postponing the vote would not be detrimental. He said that Loudoun County is concerned about the tolling scheme for the project outside the Beltway and the impact on commuting residents.

Mr. Kannan asked Board members from Virginia if this is the first time that they are able to interact with the localities and discuss some of these specifics of the projects.

Ms. Hamilton said no.

Ms. Hudgins thanked VDOT for its work and said that she appreciated the comments from people from across the region. She said she looked forward to continued work with VDOT and the community on the discussion about the I-66 projects. She encouraged the Board to vote on the projects at the meeting.

Mr. Fisette said that since the projects were proposed, VDOT had led a constructive discussion among the stakeholders. He said the timing was unfortunate and that it would be better if the framework agreement were already approved. However, he said that with the inclusion of the new clause to the resolution, he was ready to conditionally approve the plan today.

Mr. Way said that the main issue with the 2015 CLRP Amendment is the tolling. He said that he would support deferring action another month in the hope of coming up with a better consensus.

Mr. York reiterated that he would like to delay the vote until the next TPB meeting. He said that if the vote were today he would vote against the resolution. He said that even though his community would benefit from many of the projects in the CLRP, the tolling would have a bigger impact on people from Loudoun who commute to the region's core.

Mr. Snyder said that a 30-day delay is not going to be enough to resolve the issues with the I-66 project. He said that his greatest concern is that widening I-66 will cost a lot of money, and if it does not change mode share, it will create more congestion. He said that he would vote on the CLRP today as long as VDOT continues to dialogue with stakeholders and brings refinements to the TPB in January.

Mr. Lovain said that Alexandria is pleased with the I-66 inside the Beltway plan. He said that the bus rapid transit (BRT) project from the Huntington Metro station is a great project. He said he saw no reason to delay the vote today.

Mr. Schwartz said that he could not support the 2015 CLRP Amendment that after a 25-year investment of \$244 billion would result in a system that would be 70 percent more congested than 2015. He said that once the 2015 CLRP is voted on, he would like the TPB to direct staff to come up with a way significantly reduce congestion by 2040. He submitted additional written remarks for the record.

Mr. Harris said that he agreed with Mr. Schwartz. He added that there was some good news. He said that the analysis of the Pope's impact on congestion in the region demonstrated that a small amount of reduction in traffic volumes can have a big impact on the system. He said he would vote against the

resolution to approve the CLRP. He said that the TPB members need to go back to various funding sources and find more funding for capital improvements that can reduce congestion and expand Metro.

Ms. Erickson encouraged everyone to vote on the plan today. She said that the plan has been open for public comment and that VDOT has worked with MDOT to make sure that Maryland jurisdictions are informed about the projects. She reminded the Board that CLRP approval enables federal dollars to flow to local projects.

Mr. Elrich said that he would be voting against the plan. He said that he is reluctant to tell his constituents that he voted to spend money on a future that is buried in traffic. He said that the TPB needs a serious discussion about how to develop a different approach to creating the CLRP.

Mr. Fisetto said that he believed that people are speaking out against this plan because its performance is inadequate. He said that a different approach is needed to guide the work. He offered an amendment to the motion to create a working group that would develop a points-based scoring methodology for ranking proposed CLRP projects according to the goals embedded in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan and Region Forward.

Mr. Mendelson asked that Mr. Fisetto's amendment be circulated to the Board and to staff. He clarified that a points-based scoring methodology would not necessarily mean that projects with a low score would be rejected, but that all projects would be scored.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the amendment.

Mr. Zimbabwe said that a new methodology could improve transparency of the CLRP process. He said that the current CLRP process makes it difficult to reject one project, because it requires rejecting the whole plan. He said everyone on the Board is frustrated because the process seems inadequate at solving the region's problems. He said that it is important to note that in addition to congestion, the performance analysis of the 2015 CLRP Amendment showed deficiencies in terms of equity, access, and greenhouse gas emission reductions. He said that future project evaluation efforts should look at all those deficiencies, not just congestion.

Mr. Kannan said that during the last hour he heard Board members air frustration about the current CLRP process and aspire to a better CLRP process. He said that Mr. Fisetto's proposal brings the TPB one-step closer to improving the planning process. He also encouraged transportation officials to talk more with land-use officials in the region.

Mr. Turner questioned whether the amendment proposed by Mr. Fisetto was germane to the resolution.

Chair Mendelson said he believed Mr. Fisetto's amendment was germane.

Mr. Turner suggested the vote on this amendment should be separate from the resolution. He that in essence, Mr. Fisetto's proposal was about future CLRPs and not about the CLRP Amendment that was currently before the board.

Chair Mendelson said that that Mr. Fisetto's amendment would not be attached to the CLRP itself. Rather it would be part of the resolution. He said he hoped this point would give Mr. Turner some comfort.

Mr. Elrich said that he appreciated the spirit of the amendment, but that evaluating projects in isolation can make it difficult to understand how the projects fit together as a system.

Mr. Weisberg said that a point system would not add anything to the process, though it would be worth convening a group to look into how to balance the east-west divide, and make the region more transit-friendly, walkable, and bikeable.

Mr. Wojahn said that the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan could be utilized as a measure for evaluating projects.

Chair Mendelson called for a voice vote of the amendment, which was inconclusive. A show of hands on the vote was held and the count was inclusive, before a recount of the show of hands vote Mr. Turner suggested that the amendment to the resolution on the CLRP be made as a separate motion.

Mr. Mendelson agreed and took the amendment off the resolution. He opened voting on Resolution R3-2016 to approve the 2015 amendments to the CLRP.

The motion to adopt Resolution R3-2106 approving the 2015 CLRP Amendment was seconded and approved, with nine board members voting against the resolution. Those nine members, who raised their hands, were: Mr. May, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. York, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Harris, Mr. Elrich, Mr. Way, Mr. Kannan, Mr. Herling.

Next, a motion was made and seconded to approve Mr. Fisetete's proposal to create a working group that would develop a points-based scoring methodology for ranking proposed CLRP projects according to the goals embedded in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan and Region Forward.

Mr. Srikanth clarified that Mr. Fisetete's motion would not apply to the 2015 CLRP Amendment. He added that the TPB's underlying policy document is The Vision, which could be used to inform the proposed working group.

Mr. Way said that Virginia already has two numerical scoring systems. He said that those should be shared with the proposed working group. He also expressed concern that a regional ranking system might re-rank projects that have already been ranked locally in Virginia.

Chair Mendelson said that the working group would rank projects in terms of regional criteria related to the TPB priorities, which might be different from the ranking criteria in Virginia.

Mr. Shaw expressed concern that a scoring system would prioritize some criteria over other priorities, like transportation equity and environmental justice.

Mr. Mendelson said that since board members were beginning to leave, the board needed to vote soon.

Mr. Schwartz said that the working group should come back to the TPB with findings and recommendations so that they can be considered by the board before being implemented.

Ms. Erickson said that she appreciated the desire for a working group. She said that she was uncomfortable with how a ranking system might affect the region. She referenced how the Baltimore area's ranking system does not always yield desired results.

Chair Mendelson said that Baltimore's experience with ranking might be helpful for the working group.

Chair Mendelson opened the motion for a vote.

Mr. Turner said that before moving forward the board should have more time to consider this motion.

A member of the board asked for the results of the vote.

Chair Mendelson said that because there was discussion among board members while the vote was occurring, he ruled that the vote was out of order. He said that if there was no objection, he would postpone the vote on the working group until the November meeting.

10. APPROVAL OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2015-2020 TIP THAT IS EXEMPT FROM THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY REQUIREMENTS TO INCLUDE NEW AND UPDATED FUNDING FOR EIGHTEEN PROJECTS, AS REQUESTED BY VDOT

Ms. Hamilton said that this TIP amendment includes projects from the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority.

A motion was made and seconded to approve Resolution R4-2016 approving the amendment requested by VDOT. The motion was approved unanimously.

INFORMATION ITEMS

11. BRIEFING ON METRO FUNDAMENTALS

This item was postponed due to lack of time.

12. REPORT ON THE TPB WORK SESSION ON POLICY ASPECTS TO INCLUDE IN THE REGIONAL FREIGHT PLAN

This item was postponed due to lack of time.

13. UPDATE ON THE REGIONAL "STREET SMART" PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE SAFETY EDUCATION CAMPAIGN

This item was canceled due to lack of time.

OTHER ITEMS

14. ADJOURN

No other business was brought before the board. The meeting adjourned at 2:37 p.m.