
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
June 15, 2022

HYBRID MEETING

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT

Pamela Sebesky, Chair – Manassas
Charles Allen – DC Council
Christina Henderson – DC Council
Ella Hanson – DC Council
Sakina Khan – DC Office of Planning
Mark Rawlings – DDOT
Anna Chamberlin – DDOT
Lezlie Rupert – DDOT
Mati Bazurto - Bowie
Reuben Collins – Charles County
Patrick Wojahn– College Park
Jan Gardner – Frederick County
Mark Mishler – Frederick County
Kelly Russell – City of Frederick
David Edmondson – City of Frederick
Neil Harris – Gaithersburg
Emmett V. Jordan - Greenbelt
Brian Lee - Laurel
Christopher Conklin – Montgomery County Executive
Gary Erenrich– Montgomery County Executive
Glenn Orlin – Montgomery County Legislative
Victor Weissberg – Prince George’s County Executive
Mel Franklin – Prince George’s County Legislative
Bridget Newton - Rockville
Kacy Kostiuk – Takoma Park
Marc Korman – Maryland House of Delegates
R. Earl Lewis, Jr. – MDOT
Canek Aguirre – Alexandria
Takis Karantonis – Arlington County
Walter Alcorn – Fairfax County - Legislative
James Walkinshaw – Fairfax County Legislative
David Snyder – Falls Church
Adam Shellenberger – Fauquier County
Corinna Sigsbury – Loudoun County
Kristen Umstattd – Loudoun County
Jeannette Rishell – Manassas Park
Ann B. Wheeler – Prince William County
Victor Angry – Prince William County
Paolo Belita – Prince William County
David Reid – Virginia House of Delegates
David Marsden – Virginia Senate
Amir Shahpar - VDOT
Allison Davis – WMATA

Mark Phillips - WMATA
Dan Koenig - FTA
Mykelle Richburg - MWAA

MWCOG STAFF AND OTHERS PRESENT

Kanti Srikanth
Chuck Bean
Lyn Erickson
Mark Moran
Tim Canan
Andrew Meese
Paul DesJardin
Tom Gates
John Swanson
Jane Posey
Steve Kania
Leo Pineda
Stacy Cook
Sergio Ritacco
Dusan Vuksan
Deborah Etheridge
Kim Sutton
Jon Schermann
Eric Randall
Rachel Beyerle
Ashley Hutson, CAC

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

Chair Sebesky called the hybrid meeting to order and said that the board will continue the practice of limiting the number of attendees in the board room. Public comments will continue to be received online due to limits on the number of people present in the board room.

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

Ms. Erickson said that between the May 2022 TPB meeting and noon on Tuesday, June 14, the TPB received one comment, which was submitted via email. A memo with a summary of the comment as well as the comment itself can be found on the TPB meeting page. She summarized the comment.

2. APPROVAL OF THE MAY 18, 2022, MEETING MINUTES

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

3. REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Referring to the posted report, Ms. Erickson gave the Technical Committee report on behalf of

Mr. Arcieri. She said the committee met on June 3 and reviewed material related to Items 7-9 on the TPB agenda. Information topics covered as information items included TPB bylaws, Continuous Airport Systems Planning (CASP), electric vehicles, NCPD's Pennsylvania Avenue Initiative, and the TPB's draft Congestion Management Process (CMP) technical report.

4. REPORT OF THE COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CAC)

Referring to the posted report, Ms. Hutson briefed the board on the June 9 meeting of the CAC. She said the committee received briefings and provided comments on the finalization of the Visualize 2045 update, as well as an overview of public engagement activities conducted for the plan update. She said that at the next committee meeting, the CAC will be joined by the TPB officers – Chair Sebesky, Vice Chair Collins, and Vice Chair Henderson, and she said the rest of the TPB is welcome to attend. She said the committee looks forward to the opportunity as a group to form relationships with the TPB leaders.

Chair Sebesky encouraged all members of the TPB to try and attend the CAC's meeting on July 14. She said she hopes this session will strengthen communication between the committee and the board. She said she finds it very valuable to have regular communication with Ms. Hutson, who has spoken to the Manassas City County about her role as CAC chair.

5. STEERING COMMITTEE ACTIONS AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Referring to the posted report, Mr. Srikanth said he would be happy to answer any questions regarding its content. He reiterated that the CAC would be hosting a joint meeting with the TPB officers on July 14 and encouraged all TPB members to attend. He also said that Bike to Workday, held on May 20, was a very successful event. Finally, he said that Jon Schermann of the TPB staff would be retiring in July. He thanked Mr. Schermann for his excellent work.

Chair Sebesky also thanked Mr. Schermann.

6. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Chair Sebesky gave some guidance regarding the remainder of the day's agenda. She said that all remaining items were action items, and items 7 and 8 were time-sensitive and tied to federal requirements. She further noted that items 7 and 8 were topics that been extensively discussed in previous meetings and two work sessions, and therefore, to ensure that the board is able conclude all of its business today on time she intended to keep a close watch on the time and requested members to keep comments within the time available..

7. APPROVAL OF THE 2022 UPDATE TO VISUALIZE 2045, THE FY 2023-2026 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP), THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS DETERMINATION, AND MPO SELF CERTIFICATION

Referring to the posted material, Ms. Cook gave a brief summary of the work that had been performed over the last two years to develop the long-range plan update. She described the three resolutions related to this item.

Chair Sebesky said the board would start with Resolution R15-2022, approving the 2022 Update to Visualize 2045 and the FY 2023-2026 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). She reminded the board that last summer, the board approved the projects, programs, and policies that would be included in the constrained element of the updated plan. She said the update currently before the board for approval included a comprehensive update to the plan's financial plan, changes to the scope and schedule of projects that were in the previous plan, and a few new projects. She said this federally

required update has to be first adopted by the TBP, and then submitted for federal review and approval by the FHWA, the FTA, and the EPA. All of these approvals must be completed by the end of this year in order for federal transportation funds to continue to flow to the region uninterrupted.

Chair Sebesky said that as part of this update, the TPB has extensively discussed the Maryland HOT lanes projects – or "Opportunity Lanes Project," which is the name currently given to the project. She noted that last year, the TPB approved inclusion of this project in the list of projects that were approved for air quality conformity analysis. She said that MDOT made commitments to support transit and transportation demand management (TDM) projects proposed by Maryland localities. As part of this approval, MDOT was asked to provide the TPB with an update on the status of project development and negotiations. She noted that a written update provided by MDOT, was included in the read ahead materials for this meeting. She said that she will ask MDOT's representative to briefly summarize their project update before proceeding with the resolution.

Mr. Lewis said the MDOT letter to the TPB restated MDOT's transit commitments. He said these include \$60 million funded for the development rights fees for designing and permitting Montgomery County's high-priority transit project – the MD 355 BRT – as well as \$300 million in transit investments from toll revenues over the operating term for the project's Phase 1 South. In addition, he said, MDOT remains committed to provide mitigation as part of Phase 1 South, including increasing the number of Shady Grove Metrorail station bus bays, expanding Westfield Montgomery Mall Transit Center's parking capacity and constructing and equipping the Metropolitan Grove operations and maintenance facility, including the necessary bus lead. He said the final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is expected to be published at the end of the week in the Federal Register. He said that all funding and future agreements are contingent upon a record of decision, which is expected later this summer. He said that MDOT will continue to update the TPB as this project advances.

Mr. Lewis moved approval of TPB R15-2022. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Conklin said the commitments to improving transit in concert with the traffic relief plan are of utmost importance to Montgomery County. He said that MDOT's coordination with Montgomery County on these items apparently stopped in January of this year. He proposed an amendment to the resolution that would make sure that the record of decision for this project reflects the TPB's actions to require these transit investments, and that MDOT report to the TPB on these items on a bi-monthly basis until the agreements are finalized with Montgomery County. He said he was offering this as a friendly amendment and that had provided the text of the proposed amendment to staff.

Mr. Conklin's amendment language was displayed on the screen for meeting participants to read:

“WHEREAS, MDOT made certain transit commitments associated with the I-270/I-495 traffic relief plan in Resolution R2-2022 and is required to brief the TPB on the transit commitments related to Phase One South of the I-270/I-495 Traffic Relief Plan, and the TPB will provide a formal statement for inclusion in the public docket of the FEIS for the I-270/I-495 Traffic Relief Plan referencing TPB's requirement that the transit commitments be met, and MDOT will be report to TPB on the status of the transit commitments to Montgomery County bimonthly until a transit commitment agreement is reached with Montgomery County for Phase 1 South of the project; and”.

Mr. Srikanth said he understood the amendment would ask the TPB, as the region's MPO, to notify the USDOT that the project has been included in the long-range plan with commitments from MDOT to include additional projects to go along with it. He said that, from the TPB's perspective, this was do-able.

Mr. Lewis accepted the amendment as a friendly amendment. As a caveat, he said he believed the

requirement for bi-monthly report was redundant and probably unnecessary. He said that MDOT has been consistently updating the TPB throughout the entire NEPA process over the last four years. He said he did not think it was necessary to include this language, but it would still be taken as a friendly amendment.

Chair Sebesky said that Resolution R15-2022 has been moved and seconded. An amendment was offered, which was accepted by the maker and seconder as a friendly amendment. The amendment could be seen on the screen both in the room and on line. She said she will direct staff to continue with the comments from members before proceeding towards the vote.

Mr. Weissberg said he supported the amendment.

Ms. Kostiuk said she had two amendments to the resolution.

Chair Sebesky asked if Ms. Kostiuk was intending to offer amendments that no one on the board has had the benefit of looking at.

Ms. Kostiuk apologized, but she noted that she had not previously seen the amendment introduced by Montgomery County that was previously discussed.

Chair Sebesky said that the board had held discussions on the Maryland HOT lanes projects and received commitments from MDOT which was the what the previous amendment was about. She expressed concern that last-minute amendments on something new could create confusion and, in particular, they do not allow the TPB members the opportunity to discuss the amendments with their colleagues on the bodies that they represent. However, she told Ms. Kostiuk to proceed.

Ms. Kostiuk said she appreciated the chair's concerns, but she said her intent was not to introduce new ideas, but rather to make sure that the actions regarding climate change that would be taken later in the meeting would be referenced in this resolution under consideration, as well as in the Visualize 2045 document.

Two "whereas" clauses, provided by Ms. Kostiuk as amendments, were projected for participants to read.

Ms. Kostiuk explained that the first whereas would add language specifying that
"WHEREAS, on June 15, 2022, the TPB passed Resolution R-18-2022, adopting on-road greenhouse gas reduction goal and strategies, to appended to the 2022 Update to Visualize 2045."

Ms. Kostiuk's second whereas clause specified that
"WHEREAS, the draft Visualize 2045 climate change section, page 133, states that 'informed by the TPB's past studies and the CCMS, the TPB is currently discussing adapting GHG reduction goals for the on-road transportation sector and a set of multi-pathway transportation strategies to reduce on-road GHG emissions.' This section will be updated to reflect TPB's action on June 15, 2022."

Mr. Srikanth said that the proposed additions would not impact any of the analysis or contents of the Plan and as such were acceptable. He did note that the text in the first Whereas clause assumes the outcome of TPB's action before the TPB has acted on it; as such he wondered if the text could be modified a bit.

Chair Sebesky agreed and asked whether, from a legal perspective, it would be acceptable to reference

an action that had not been taken yet.

Mr. Srikanth said Ms. Kostiuk's first whereas could be changed to "whereas, on June 15, upon the TPB adopting Resolution R18,"

Ms. Kostiuk agreed to this change.

Mr. Srikanth asked if the maker of the motion found this amendment to be friendly.

Mr. Lewis asked Ms. Kostiuk to explain the purpose of her amendments.

Ms. Kostiuk said it was important that the TPB recognizes its work on the climate goals. She said the new language points the TPB forward for the next revision of the long-range plan.

Mr. Lewis said his only concern was that the additions referenced agreements that had not yet been made.

Ms. Kostiuk said that the modified language in her first whereas clause actually references what will happen to the second one. Therefore, she said the second whereas clause could be dropped.

Chair Sebesky summarized by noting that there was now only one whereas clause in Ms. Kostiuk's proposed amendment. She asked Mr. Lewis, the maker of the motion, if he agreed to that.

Mr. Lewis said he agreed to it.

Mr. Harris said he was uncomfortable that the board was about to vote on a resolution that accepts something that the board had not voted on yet.

Chair Sebesky asked if legal counsel had provided any comments on this point.

Mr. Srikanth said the current language indicates that no presumptions were being made on what the outcome would be. Rather, it simply said that whatever is added to the Visualize 2045 plan will be captured in the official plan document. He said that from a staff perspective, this action was do-able, if it were the will of the board.

Ms. Newton said she supported both amendments presented by Ms. Kostiuk. However, she further noted that the City of Rockville stands opposed to the Op Lanes project on I-270 and I-495.

Mr. Korman said the friendly amendment offered earlier by Mr. Conklin was important. He said that MDOT has a history of making promises and later, not keeping them.

Ms. Bazarro said they were in favor of the amendments.

Mr. Collins said they were in favor of the amendments.

Ms. Gardner said they were in favor of the amendments.

Mr. Wojahn said they were in favor of the amendments.

Ms. Russell said they were in favor of the amendments.

Mr. Jordan said they were in favor of the amendments. He added that Greenbelt opposes the Op Lanes

project.

Mr. Lee said they were in favor of the amendments.

Mr. Lewis confirmed with Mr. Conklin that the language that was displayed was what he was proposing. He noted what he thought was a discrepancy between Montgomery County's written amendment and the description that Mr. Conklin provided.

Mr. Conklin said the written language that was displayed was the language they were proposing.

Mr. Karatonis said they were in favor of the amendments. He said the order of the approvals was unusual, but he thought it was appropriate to include the climate change-related actions in the resolution that goes with Visualize 2045.

Mr. Snyder said he supported the first amendment under the assumption that it would not delay any projects in the plan. He supported the second because it makes clear the linkage between greenhouse gas emission and the long-range plan.

Ms. Davis asked for clarification on what was being voted on.

Mr. Srikanth said the board would be voting on the entire resolution as amended, since all amendments were friendly.

Chair Sebesky said that for the vote on the resolution, she would begin by asking for nays and abstentions.

The motion to adopt Resolution R15-2022, as amended, was approved with Ms. Kostiuk and Ms. Newton voting "no."

Chair Sebesky made a motion to approve Resolution R16-2022, to approve the regional air quality conformity analysis that shows that the emissions from the long-range plan and TIP remain below the EPA-approved levels of ozone emissions.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Amir Shahpar.

The motion was approved with one abstention from Ms. Kostiuk.

A motion was made to adopt Resolution R17-2022 endorsing the certification from the three Department of Transportations that the TPB has followed federal regulations in its work on the long-range plan and the TIP.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Snyder noted that a lot of federal requirements were referenced in this item. He asked for assurance from staff that the TPB is in compliance with these requirements.

Mr. Srikanth said that every month for the past 18 months staff has been meeting with the three DOTs who are specifically charged by the federal agencies to oversee the TPB process to ensure requirements are being met. He also noted that early next year, the federal agencies will be conducting a certification review of the TPB's process.

The motion to approve Resolution R17-2022 was approved with one abstention from Ms. Kostiuk.

8. ADOPTION OF TRANSPORTATION-SECTOR-SPECIFIC GREENHOUSE GAS REDUCTION GOALS AND STRATEGIES

Chair Sebesky said that the TPB had been working on greenhouse gas reduction goals and strategies for almost two years, including two work sessions for members of the board, and it is time to conclude the current phase of work on mitigating the adverse impacts of climate change on the transportation sector. She said that work on climate change mitigation would be added to the TPB's policy element and that the Visualize 2045 plan document will include the goals and strategies adopted by the TPB, and the action that the TPB will take means that TPB members will consider how transportation projects approved locally and programs funded and implemented will reduce greenhouse gas emissions within the regional transportation sector.

Mr. Srikanth stated that the TPB has been sent three documents as part of an agenda package: Resolution R18-2022 sent to the TPB includes a proposal that the TPB resolve to voluntarily adopt GHG reduction goals for the on-road transportation sector at a level of 32 percent reduction from 2005 levels by 2030, and 80 percent reduction from 2005 levels by 2050. He said that the resolution also resolves TPB adoption of seven strategies to help reduce GHGs in the on-road sector and identifies seven additional strategies listed in Table 2 that have the potential to reduce GHGs but require a more detailed exploration and discussions.

Mr. Srikanth said that a second document is a June 19 memo that states that even though there is not a federal or state mandate for MPOs to include a climate change or GHG emissions as part of the long-range transportation plan, the TPB has been voluntarily tracking changes in GHG emissions as part of its long range transportation plan since 2010, and the memo refers to GHG reduction goals already adopted by the region and endorsed by the TPB, with the difference being that these regional goals are multisectoral. He said that the memo notes that while there are no sector specific GHG reduction goals in the region, the TPB in its action today was considering adopting GHG reduction goals specifically for the on-road transportation sector. He said that the memo notes that the 32% GHG reduction goal for 2030 listed in the proposed resolution is consistent with COG's 2030 Climate Action Plan; that achieving it would require the region implementing all seven strategies listed in Table 1 of the resolution, even as half of these strategies have substantive policy and fiscal issues with regard to implementing them that are yet to be discussed among a number of other entities from the local, state and potentially federal level.

Mr. Srikanth referred to a second memo that includes staff follow up on questions, comments, and requests for information that TPB staff received after the TPB work sessions. He said that the answers state that the GHG reduction goals would be at the regional level. He said that the memo addresses the question about how the different levels of GHG reduction goals compare to the regional goal of 50 percent by 2030. He stated that a 32-percent reduction goal by 2030 would match the expectations for on-road sector reductions for the region to achieve its multisectoral goal by 2030, and a goal of 23 percent or anything less than 32 percent within the on-road section would be less than what is assumed to be the contribution from the on-road transportation sector for the region to attain its multisectoral goal by 2030.

Mr. Srikanth said that the memo also notes how the TPB goals are not comparable with California's GHG reduction goals because California's goals are per capita and are for reducing vehicle miles traveled by light-duty vehicles only, whereas TPB is considering total VMT reductions and from all vehicles for all trip purposes.

Mr. Srikanth said that based on TPB consultant analysis, for a goal of 50 percent reduction of greenhouse gases by 2030, the region's vehicle miles traveled per capita by light-duty vehicles will have to be reduced by 53 to 57 percent; a goal of 32 percent reduction by 2030 would require the light-duty vehicle per capita VMT to be reduced between 22 to 26 percent; and if a goal of 23 percent reduction by 2030 is adopted, the light-duty vehicles per capita VMT in the region would have to be reduced between three and 10 percent.

Chair Sebesky asked for a motion to adopt R18-2022.

Mr. Snyder made a motion to adopt the resolution. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kostiuk. Chair Sebesky called for discussion on the item.

Mr. Conklin said that, speaking on behalf of Montgomery County, they do not have evidence achieving the reductions in other sectors will be easier than achieving reductions in transportation. He made a motion to amend the resolution to change the 2030 goal from the 32 percent below 2005 levels to 50 percent below 2005 levels, which is consistent with the overall regional goal. He said that Montgomery County thinks that the 50 percent level is needed to achieve the outcome that might be consistent with the 32 percent referenced in the analysis because not every strategy will yield all of the expected results.

The motion was seconded.

Mr. Snyder the maker of the original motion said that he did not accept the amendment as friendly.

Ms. Kostiuk who had seconded the original motion said that she accepted the amendment as friendly.

Given the split decision by the maker and seconder of the original motion, Chair Sebesky said that she would ask for a vote on the proposed amendment to the resolution and before that, she would ask Mr. Srikanth to explain what the board members would be committing to with the 50 percent GHG reduction goals as well as the 32 percent, and 23 percent levels.

Mr. Srikanth said that the TPB recent study does not identify a pathway to achieve a 50 percent level reduction even with the 14 different strategies analyzed as part of TPB's technical analysis. He said that the study indicates that if all 14 strategies analyzed are implemented at the levels assumed then a 32 percent level reduction by 2030 is achievable even though half of these are not being adopted for implementation at this time since implementation issues associated with them have not been addressed. Lastly, he said that the TPB's study indicates that based on the strategies that the TPB is ready to adopt and implement at this time, the region could achieve a 23 percent reduction in GHG in the transportation sector by 2030.

Chair Sebesky stated that the board will first need to vote on allowing the amendment for the 50 percent level, then the board can return to a discussion of 32 percent as voiced in the original motion. Delegate Reed asked if the goals and strategies in the resolution are aspirational or if the individual localities would be held to these goals. He stated that he is trying to understand how to reconcile with Virginia's Clean Economy Act, which has its own set of goals and strategies.

Mr. Srikanth stated that the goals are aspirational goals at a regional level and would serve to inform TPB's collective decisions on transportation planning. He said that as noted by Mr. Snyder earlier the GHG reduction goals when adopted would be added to the other goals in the TPB's policy element, such as congestions reduction, improving safety. He said that these goals are not binding and are intended to inform decision making.

Chair Sebesky stated that she would take a roll call vote on the amendment to change the resolution to 50 percent.

Mr. Allen asked for confirmation that the call for the vote is for the 50 percent level. Chair Sebesky confirmed that this was correct.

Mr. Allen said that the goals are aspirational and there are no penalties for not achieving it. He said that as the overall COG goals are to have a 50 percent reduction of GHG emissions by 2030, he thinks it would be consistent to have the levels at 50 percent. He said that we all full well know, across the region we're going to hit different parts of this target, yet it is a good thing to aim for as a region.

Mr. Angry asked for clarification as Mr. Snyder's original motion of 32 percent had a friendly amendment that was not accepted.

Chair Sebesky referred to Roberts Rules of Order that the TPB would vote on the 50 percent, and if that is voted down, the TPB returns to discussing the 32 percent level, and other amendments that may be brought forward for discussion.

Chair Sebesky said that she does not disagree with Mr. Allen's comment that all jurisdictions are going to fall in different levels based on what each jurisdiction it able to do. She said that her concern with the 50 percent reduction is about the TPB's credibility when the board is picking things that we know are not achievable.

Mr. Karantonis said that it is clear that any goal that the TPB sets has to be aspirational to a certain degree because the unknown path ahead and also because politically TPB members cannot assess how difficult it will be to push through certain things, and the TPB will have to be very careful about the feasibility of aspirational goals. He said that aspirational goals are to be taken seriously and that he would take it back to board colleagues and Arlington County constituents what the decision means in terms of investment in the transportation plan, changes to the capital improvement plan, and other changes.

Mr. Weissberg said that he agrees with Mr. Allen and others who have noted that the 50 percent level is aspirational. He said that he finds this aspirational goal similar to Vision Zero on traffic safety. He said that Prince George's County supports what is in the 32 percent level resolution; however, he thinks that the TPB needs to push a little harder, in particular on bringing housing and jobs closer together, and he wants to make sure that the TPB focuses attention on that in addition the elements in the resolution.

Ms. Newton said that she speaks in favor of the 50 percent reduction on behalf of the City of Rockville and will echo what Mr. Weissberg said about setting the bar and being as aspirational as possible.

Mr. Harris said that management science has shown that setting goals that are unachievable leads the effort down the wrong path because people do not take it seriously. He said that he thinks that 32 percent reduction is aspirational, ambitious, and a difficult to achieve goal. He said that he cautions the TPB from setting goals that are not feasible.

Senator Marsden said that the 32 percent is based on the considered judgements of staff in terms of what might be feasible and he agreed with Mr. Harris that setting goals are aspirational with limited value. He said that Virginia was unable to get federal funding grants for charging stations approved through the budget process and was unable to get purchasing of electric vehicle subsidies in place. He stated that he agrees with the 32 percent that is based on reasoned judgment and is aspirational in nature as well.

Chair Sebesky called for the vote.

Ms. Erickson conducted the roll call vote and explained that 50 percent is a yes vote and 32 percent is a no vote.

The following members voted 'yes' (50 percent) to approve the motion at the 50 percent level:

Ms. Hanson, Mr. Allen, Ms. Henderson, Ms. Khan, Ms. Chamberlin, Ms. Bazarro, Mr. Collins, Mr. Wojahn, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Conklin, Mr. Orlin, Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Franklin, Ms. Newton, Ms. Kostiuik, Mr. Korman, Mr. Aguirre, Mr. Snyder.

The following members voted 'no' (32 percent) to approve the motion to approve the resolution at the 50 percent level: Ms. Gardner, Ms. Russell, Mr. Harris, Mr. Lee, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Karantonis, Mr. Alcorn, Mr. Walkinshaw, Mr. Shellenberger, Ms. Sigsbury, Ms. Umstattd, Ms. Sebesky, Ms. Rishell, Mr. Angry, Mr. Belita, Mr. Reid, Senator Marsden, Mr. Jaffa.

The following member abstained in the motion: Ms. Davis.

The final vote was 18 members voted yes, 18 members voted no, two members were absent, and one member abstained. (During the meeting Mr. Srikanth incorrectly reported the vote count as 19 Yes and 18 No. The numbers reported above, 18 Yes and 18 No has been verified and the correct count.)

Mr. Walkinshaw asked for a proportional vote on the motion. Chair Sebesky asked staff to confirm a proportional vote requested.

Mr. Srikanth said that a weighted vote would apportion the votes of TPB members present proportional to their population relative to the total population of the TPB membership.

Mr. Srikanth said that the result of the weighted vote is 8.6 yes and 6.4 no. He said that the proposed amendment to change the 32 percent reduction below 2005 levels by 2030 stands amended to 50 percent below 2005 levels by 2030.

Chair Sebesky stated that Resolution R18-2022 now reads 50 percent below the 2005 level and she opened the floor for discussion.

Mr. Alcorn said that he thinks the seven strategies listed in Table 2 are not enough to meet the reduction and suggested that the TPB members need to come back as a body to explore additional strategies. He proposed a specific amendment for Strategy 7 in Table 2, the cordon fee or commuter tax, that would eliminate the phrase "in the core of the District of Columbia." He said that some of the largest and fastest growing activity centers are in the Dulles corridor, Arlington County and elsewhere and that it is important to understand the new reality, which is that not everybody is just driving into the District of Columbia.

Mr. Alcorn made a motion to amend Strategy 7 in the exploratory strategies to remove "in the District of Columbia" from the phrasing.

Chair Sebesky asked Mr. Snyder if he accepts the amendment to the resolution as friendly.

Mr. Snyder who had made the original motion accepted the amendment as friendly.

Ms. Kostiuik who had seconded the original motion accepted the amendment as friendly.

Mr. Lewis said that he thinks everything in Table 2 is reasonable and suggested setting goals for electric vehicles for 2030, 2035, and 2040. He said that various transportation sectors are in different places with EV technology and it might be a good idea to include that the TPB will work on EV-related incremental goals over the next 15 to 20 years.

Mr. Srikanth said that part of the exploration could be coordinated closely with COG's Department of Environmental Programs.

Mr. Srikanth stated that the TPB was returning to the resolution with two changes, one of the goals for 2030 has been changed from 32 to 50 percent, and the other one of the strategies is expanding the cordon fee for consideration not just within the District of Columbia. He said that the TPB could continue the amended resolution discussion or could go to vote on a final resolution.

Ms. Kostiuk proposed an amendment to change the language of Strategy 1 in Table 2 to remove the phrase "within jurisdictional boundaries" in consideration of the shifting location of jobs and housing throughout the region.

Mr. Snyder, maker of the original motion, accepted the amendment as friendly. Ms. Kostiuk, who had seconded the original motion, also accepted this amendment as friendly.

Ms. Gardner recommended describing the 50 percent goal as aspirational in the first sentence of the resolution. She said that as an outer jurisdiction, Frederick County is doing everything it can to achieve its climate goals. She stated that Frederick County has solar field-charged electric buses that are fare free, but there are challenges in meeting the goals. She said that she thinks it is incumbent on the TPB to define strategies at a future meeting that come close to achieving the 50 percent goal by 2030.

Ms. Rishell said that she found it difficult to support the 32 percent option and that some of the strategies did not seem to receive wide support among TPB members' survey responses, and there is an issue of having the legal foundation for implementation. She said that the 32 percent option would have required action that was unprecedented for the region, and the 50 percent would be even more unprecedented. She said that she would have supported the 23 percent option but not the 50 percent option.

Mr. Snyder noted that the word "aspirational" is highlighted in the resolution and asked if a motion had been made to determine if the word is a friendly amendment. He said that if that was the case that he would consider it a friendly amendment.

Ms. Kostiuk said she did not consider the word "aspirational" to be a friendly amendment.

Mr. Lee seconded the amendment to add the word "aspirational".

Chair Sebesky called for a vote on inclusion of the word "aspirational" in Resolution R18-2022. She clarified that a yes vote means that "aspirational" will be added, and a no vote means that the word will not be added.

The following members voted 'yes' to add the word "aspirational" to the resolution: Ms. Gardner, Ms. Russell, Mr. Harris, Mr. Lee, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Alcorn, Mr. Walkinshaw, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Shellenberger, Ms. Umstatted, Ms. Sigsbury, Ms. Sebesky, Ms. Rishell, Mr. Angry, Mr. Belita, Mr. Reid, Senator Marsden, Mr. Jaffa.

The following members voted 'no' to add the word "aspirational" to the resolution: Ms. Hanson, Mr. Allen, Ms. Henderson, Ms. Khan, Mr. Chamberlin, Ms. Bazurto, Mr. Collins, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Conklin, Mr. Orlin, Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Franklin, Ms. Newton, Ms. Kostiuik, Mr. Korman, Mr. Aguirre, Mr. Karantonis.

The following member abstained: Ms. Davis.

Mr. Srikanth reported that there were 18 yes votes, 17 no votes, three absent, and one abstention. A member requested for a weighted vote on the proposed amendment to add the work "aspirational".

Mr. Srikanth said that the proportional vote results are 6.2 yes votes and 8.8 no votes, which means the proposal to add the word "aspirational" is not accepted.

Chair Sebesky called for a proportional vote on the amended Resolution R18-2022. She clarified that the TPB is voting on the resolution including the 50 percent level below 2005 by 2030.

The following members voted 'yes' to Resolution R18-2022: Ms. Hanson, Mr. Allen, Ms. Henderson, Ms. Khan, Mr. Chamberlin, Ms. Bazurto, Mr. Collins, Mr. Harris, Mr. Jordan, Mr. Conklin, Mr. Orlin, Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Franklin, Ms. Newton, Ms. Kostiuik, Mr. Korman, Mr. Aguirre, Mr. Karantonis, Mr. Alcorn, Mr. Walkinshaw, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Davis.

The following members voted 'no' to Resolution R18-2022: Mr. Reid, Mr. Jaffa.

The following members abstained: Ms. Gardner, Ms. Russell, Mr. Lee, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Shellenberger, Ms. Sigsbury, Ms. Umstattd, Ms. Sebesky, Ms. Rishell, Mr. Belita, Mr. Angry.

Mr. Srikanth reported that the vote count was 22 yes votes, 2 no votes, 11 abstentions, and 4 absent.

The proportional vote results are 13.3 for yes and 1.6 for no (During the meeting Mr. Srikanth reported the vote count by rounding the numbers, as 13 Yes and 2 No).

The board approved Resolution 18-2022 at the 50 percent reduction level below 2005 by 2030 with the text amendments to Strategy 7 in Table 2 to remove the phrase "in the District of Columbia" and to remove the phrase "within jurisdictional boundaries" in Strategy 1 of Table 2.

9. PBPP: CMAQ PROGRAM 2022-2025 TARGETS

Referring to the agenda item memo, Mr. Randall asked TPB members for their approval of Resolution R19-2022 adopting performance-based planning and programming targets for the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program measures. He said that the TPB received a briefing on the draft performance measure targets at its May meeting and that no comments were received on the draft measures.

Mr. Randall said that the CMAQ target setting is a federal requirement, and the targets are data driven, not aspirational.

Chair Sebesky moved approval of R19-2022. The motion was seconded by Ms. Umstattd.

Mr. Srikanth stated that the targets are set for urbanized areas so the TPB will need to coordinate the same targets with the Baltimore and Fredericksburg MPOs. He said that TPB staff have been coordinating with those MPOs on the targets.

The motion passed unanimously.

10. REGIONAL ROADWAY SAFETY PROGRAM APPROVAL

Mr. Schermann referred to the meeting materials that include the Regional Roadway Safety Program project listing and maps and recommended the TPB approve the Regional Roadway Safety Program. He said that the program received \$640,000 in funding requests and ten applications. He said that the program has \$250,000 available, and the screening panel recommended four projects. He stated that with TPB approval, the projects are anticipated to be under contract by September, and the next round of safety program applications will open in January 2023.

Mr. Schermann said that the first project is in Prince George's County and is for consultant services to identify roadway issues faced by pedestrians and bicyclists along a segment of Wheeler Road and a segment of Brooks Drive. He said that the projects will include design recommendations for safety improvements as part of Prince George's County's high injury network and within Equity Emphasis Areas (EEAs).

Mr. Schermann described the next project from the Maryland National Capital Parks & Planning Commission in Prince George's County, which is also in an EEA. He said that the second project seeks consultant services determine pedestrian and bicyclist facilities near Walker Mill Regional Park. He said that the third project is in the City of Rockville, also in an EEA, and will involve identifying concept designs for safety countermeasures at the intersection of Beall Avenue/Maryland 355 intersection and the Beall Avenue/Maryland Avenue intersection.

Mr. Schermann stated that the fourth project is in the City of Alexandria for developing design improvements for the intersections of Duke Street at S. Patrick and S. Henry Streets, which are two of the highest crash locations in Alexandria.

Ms. Russell moved approval of the Regional Roadway Safety Program technical assistance projects for Fiscal Year 2023. The motion was seconded by Ms. Newton.

The motion passed unanimously.