

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

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

**MINUTES OF THE  
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD  
October 15, 2003**

Members and Alternates Present

Peter Shapiro, Prince George's County  
Kate Hanley, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Kathy Porter, Takoma Park City Council  
Ludwig P.Gaines, City of Alexandria  
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT  
Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board  
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT  
Marsha Kaiser, MDOT  
David Snyder, City of Falls Church  
Karina Ricks, DC Office of Planning  
Edgar Gonzalez, Mont. Co. Executive Branch  
Steve Magoon, Charles County  
Art Smith, Loudoun County  
Julia Koster, NCPC  
Brian A. Glenn, FTA  
Tom Farley, VDOT  
Sandra Jackson, FHWA  
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate  
Jim Burton, Loudoun County  
Mike Knapp, Montgomery County Council  
Peter J. King, City of College Park  
Bruce L. Reeder, Frederick County  
Carol Petzold, Maryland House of Delegates  
Cicero Salles, Prince George's DPW&T  
Robert Dorsey, City of Rockville

---

Stan Alster, City of Gaithersburg  
Art Smith, Loudoun County  
Eric Olson, City of College Park  
Larry Marcus, City of Rockville

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Jim Hogan	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Andrew Austin	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Hailemariam Abai	COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam	COG/DTP
Robert Snead	COG/DTP
Dusan Vuksan	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Dave Robertson	COG/EO
Lee Ruck	COG/LEG
Joan Rohlf	COG/DEP
Paul DesJardin	COG/HSPPS
Greg Goodwin	COG/HSPPS
Lora Byala	WMATA
Fatimah Al-Anin Hasan	MDOT
Sharmila Samarasinghe	VDRPT
Deborah R. Burns	FTA
Valencia Thompson	FHWA – Maryland
Charles Baummer	MWAA
Alex Hekimian	M-NCPPC – Montgomery County
Grady Ketron	VDOT
Amy Horner	
Brian Henry	
Stewart Schwartz	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Lily Langlois	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Bob Grow	Board of Trade
Bob Chase	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax, DPW

---

Dolores Milmoie	Audubon Naturalist Society
Harriet Dietz	Arlington County, DPW
Tom Biesiadny	Fairfax County DOT
Krate Singa	WMATA
Greg Walker	WMATA
Chimere Lesane-Matthews	Morgan State University student
Deborah DeYoung	AAA Mid-Atlantic
Randy Carroll	MDE
Harry Sanders	Action Committee for Transit
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Rick Canizales	Prince William County
Betsy Massie	PRTC
John Rossomawde	Journal Newspapers

## 1. Public Comment

Bob Grow, Greater Washington Board of Trade, said that the recent report on nationwide congestion by the Texas Transportation Institute showed that there are steps that can be taken to reduce congestion, including traffic signal timing, incident management, transit use and other actions. He said the Board of Trade supports these kinds of improvements. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Jim Clarke, Action Committee for Transit, expressed concerns about the financing proposal of the State of Maryland to pay for the Intercountry Connector. He said the proposed funding plan would mean that other important transportation projects would go unfunded. He asked the TPB to ask its staff to investigate the experiences of other states in using grant anticipation revenue bonds, which have been proposed by the Maryland Department of Transportation. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Ms. George spoke about an innovative traffic pattern that she wanted to see tested at a site on the Capital Beltway that she said would eliminate altogether the merging of Route 1 traffic into Beltway traffic. Copies of her remarks were submitted for the record.

Stewart Schwartz, Coalition for Smarter Growth, spoke about the Texas Transportation Institute study finding that the benefits of transit and intelligent transportation systems reduce congestion significantly in the Washington region. He criticized the Intercountry Connector (ICC) amendment before the TPB, saying that the study process was beginning with a conclusion already determined. He said he believed the state already knew which right-of-way it intended to buy. He said a vote for this amendment was a vote for the ICC.

---

Bob Chase, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, noted that the TPB Vision, adopted five years ago in October 1998, had called for regional funding mechanism, which had not been achieved. He said that new facilities proposed in the latest CLRP tend to be a collection of local wants as opposed to projects that better connect the different parts of the region. Regarding air quality, he said that the TPB, the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee and COG must make it clear to those who set and enforce federal standards that it is unfair for this region to be penalized for emissions transported into the region from other parts of the nation. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Harry Sanders said that the statistic that 60 percent of future transportation funding would be spent on transit was overstated. One reason for this overstatement was that the figure includes \$12 billion in fares. He said it was more realistic to look at the annual element of the Transportation Improvement Program. He handed out a table illustrating that spending. He said he supported TPB efforts to quantify short-term unfunded needs for the next six years.

Dolores Milmo, representing the Audubon Naturalist Society, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, and Environmental Defense, said the resolution before the TPB regarding the Intercounty Connector was unlawful because it prejudged the environmental study process by permitting hardship and protective acquisitions. She urged the TPB to reject the resolution. If the TPB does approve the resolution, she said the Board should require the Maryland State Highway Administration to report to the TPB and to the public on any expenditures of the right-of-way funds at least 30 days before the expenditures are made, and include information to justify why the protective and hardship acquisition exception to the law applies. Copies of her remarks were submitted for the record.

## **2. Approval of the Minutes of September 17, 2003**

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

## **3. Report of the Technical Committee**

Referring to the mailout report, Ms. Byala said the Technical Committee met on October 3 and discussed the following items on the TPB agenda:

- The draft air quality conformity analysis for the 2003 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The committee recommended that the draft conformity analysis be released for public comment on October 15.
- The draft map and a list of projects for inclusion in the CLRP and TIP documents. The committee

---

also recommended that this go forward for public comment.

- The interim CLRP and TIP, which include projects that are exempt from air quality conformity and would be able to go forward in the event that a conformity finding is not made.
- The revised schedule for the State Implementation Plan (SIP) that will be submitted to EPA in early 2004.

The committee also discussed the following items:

- The forthcoming study to identify near-term unfunded transportation needs;
- The first report of the Transportation Research Board's review of the TPB's travel forecasting process;
- The analysis of the Census Journey-to-Work data;
- The status of the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study.

#### **4. Report of the Citizens Advisory Committee**

Referring to the handout report, Ms. Pope-Onwukwe said that Citizens Advisory Committee held two outreach meetings in October:

- A meeting on October 1 in Oxon Hill addressed transportation needs of southern Prince George's County.
- A meeting on October 7 in Washington near the Benning Road Metro station addressed issues of transit-oriented development as it relates to the eastern side of the Washington region.

The CAC's regular monthly meeting on October 9 focused mainly on the update to the Constrained Long-Range Plan.

Ms. Pope-Onwukwe said two more outreach meetings will be held this year: on November 18 in Northern Virginia and on December 3 in Arlington.

Ms. Salles thanked the CAC and TPB staff for the meeting on October 1, which he said was very well attended. He said the Prince George's staff had heard the message loud and clear that transit is important to the citizens of Southern Prince George's County.

Ms. Pourciau congratulated the CAC and said she was happy that these public meetings had been so successful.

Mr. Knapp said that he was impressed at the level of activity of the CAC. He noted that there had not

---

been an outreach meeting in Montgomery County recently, and he said he would like to work with the chair in putting together a future meeting.

Chairman Shapiro said that was a good idea.

## **5. Report of the Program Committee**

Referring to the mailout packet, Mr. Kirby said that the Program Committee met on October 3 and approved two resolutions:

- Amendment to the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) to provide funding for the near-term needs study.
- An amendment to the FY 2003-2008 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add a set of conformity-exempt projects at the request of the Virginia Department of Transportation.

Referring to the handout material, Mr. Kirby called attention to some letters:

- A letter to the Environmental Protection Agency transmitting the first report of the Transportation Research Board and TPB staff comments on the peer review of the TPB's travel forecasting process.
- A letter from the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) suggesting some specific improvements in the transit portion of the TPB's modeling process.

## **6. Chairman's Comments**

Chairman Shapiro had no comments.

## **7. Approval of Amendment to the Fiscal Year 2003-2008 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) That Is Exempt From Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Add Funding for Planning and Right-of-Way for Protective and Hardship Acquisitions for the Intercounty Connector Project, as Requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation**

Referring to the mailout material, Ms. Kaiser said that this item includes two actions. First, a study in the current long-range plan called the "East West Link Improvements" was being deleted. Second, a new project for the long-range plan, called the Intercounty Connector (ICC), was being added. She said the ICC is the Maryland governor's number-one transportation priority. It is on President Bush's

---

environmental streamlining program, and it is moving through the NEPA process right now.

Ms. Kaiser said this amendment would add funding for planning activities and protective and hardship right-of-way acquisition. She said there is no property that has been identified at this point for any kind of acquisition, but money would be put aside for the possibility that property might need to be acquired in the future. She said that any piece of property that comes to the department would be evaluated in consultation with the Federal Highway Administration in terms of it being a protective or hardship acquisition. She said that the funds could be used on the entire area of the study, not for any one specific alignment, which is why it is exempt from air quality.

Ms. Kaiser said the ICC is a long-planned transportation facility in Montgomery and Prince George's County. It was put on the books over 50 years ago to meet the demands of development that was planned and has happened in those 50 years. She said the project would ensure that the citizens of that area can have adequate facilities promised through their master planning.

Ms. Kaiser said the project would improve connections in the region and would provide opportunities for economic development. She said the University of Maryland is conducting a separate study on the economic outcomes of the project. She also said the project was being pursued as an opportunity to enhance the environment.

Ms. Kaiser said the project would be funded with innovative financing through Grant Anticipation Revenue (GARVEE) bonds. The protective and hardship acquisition is using GARVEE bond financing to test this process. GARVEE bonds will leverage future federal highway funds.

Ms. Petzold moved approval of Resolution R3-2004.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Knapp.

Chairman Shapiro asked what is the total cost estimate of the project.

Ms. Kaiser said that construction would be \$1.7 billion.

Chairman Shapiro said that a concern in Prince George's County was the negative impacts on the eastern side of the region, specifically the portions of Prince George's County inside the Beltway. He asked how those concerns would be addressed in the study.

Ms. Kaiser said that the study area would go to Route 1 in Prince George's County. She repeated that the University of Maryland is conducting an independent economic development study. She also noted that some economic impacts would be examined as part of the National Environmental Policy Act

---

(NEPA) requirements.

Chairman Shapiro asked why the study area was so limited, given the scale of the project. He asked if it would be possible to extend the study area inside the Beltway.

Mr. Gonzalez explained the Beltway was a logical southern boundary for the study because of the high traffic volumes it carries.

Mr. Salles said he hoped that the level of funding used for the ICC will not preclude needed projects in Prince George's County, such as the Bi-County Transitway.

Ms. Kaiser said that one of the main reasons that Grant Anticipation Revenue (GARVEE) bond financing would be used was so that existing revenue sources for other projects would not be diverted.

Chairman Shapiro asked what sources of funding would be tied up by the GARVEE bonds.

Ms. Kaiser said the GARVEE financing would give the state the authority to bond, backed by a promise of paying those bonds back through future federal funding.

Chairman Shapiro asked what that future federal funding would be otherwise spent on.

Ms. Kaiser said it would be spent on any highway or transit project. She added that they carefully considered what could be afforded and it was kept to a limit that they felt would be much less than 50 percent of any new funding they get under a reauthorization bill.

Mr. Zimmerman said that GARVEE funding is basically spending tomorrow's money today. He emphasized that this funding essentially meant that a decision was being made that this project was more valuable than other projects that might be pursued in the future.

Ms. Kaiser said that Governor Ehrlich has made it clear that he considers the ICC to be a priority.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the project would follow the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process.

Ms. Kaiser said that it go above and beyond the requirements of NEPA.

Ms. Zimmerman asked if the study would include a study of induced demand.

Ms. Kaiser said the project will include a land use component. MDOT is in the process of putting an

---

expert panel together. She added that this is not a project that would necessarily induce demand because it is intended to respond to development that already exists.

Mr. Zimmerman said that even if that were true, it would not change the fact that there will be induced demand from the facility.

Ms. Kaiser said there is induced demand from a new bus route.

Mr. Zimmerman said that was correct and so the questions are whether the induced demand is the type of demand that you wish to induce, how much is there, and what is the impact of the induced demand compared to other potential alternatives.

Ms. Kaiser said the study will include the managed lane concept, which can control some of that demand.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the study would include examination of land use impacts inside the Beltway.

Mr. Gonzalez said he was pleased at the interest of the Virginia jurisdictions in this Maryland project. He said a lot of the questions Mr. Zimmerman was asking would be addressed in the study that would be performed.

Mr. Zimmerman said that was precisely his question: Would these issues be addressed in the study?

Mr. Gonzalez said that MDOT should be allowed to do the study and it will provide the answers.

Chairman Shapiro said that Mr. Zimmerman has the floor and he wanted to be sure he was getting his questions answered.

Mr. Zimmerman said the issues he was raising did not seem to be addressed in the material that had been distributed to the Board.

Ms. Kaiser said the study would go above and beyond the process for a normal project.

Mr. Zimmerman said that these issues were not spelled out in the material distributed.

Ms. Kaiser said she would be glad to provide Mr. Zimmerman with the whole scope of the project.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if there was more to the scope than what was before the Board.

Mr. Kaiser said of course there was more.

---

Mr. Zimmerman said he would like to see it.

Mr. Gonzalez emphasized that the Capital Beltway was a logical boundary for transportation studies. He said the Beltway is also a boundary for the Bi-County Transitway. He emphasized that both these projects are consistent with the Montgomery County master plan, as is the Corridor Cities Transitway. He said a variety of projects, including roads, are needed to address the county's needs.

Ms. Pourciau asked if engineering, design and construction could take place before the environmental review is completed.

Ms. Kaiser said it could not.

Ms. Pourciau asked when the project would come before the TPB again.

Ms. Kaiser said it would come back at the preferred alternatives stage, although she said that MDOT could make additional presentations before that time.

Ms. Pourciau asked if there was any estimate of how many miles of acquisition were anticipated under the action before the TPB.

Ms. Kaiser said that MDOT had no idea; the funding would be made available if a need arose.

Ms. Pourciau asked if MDOT had any idea of how many miles of right-of-way were outstanding.

Ms. Kaiser she believed that there would not be much property to acquire because considerable right-of-way was already owned, but she added that property in this part of the region is very expensive.

Mr. Gonzalez said the county's master plan alignment is 18.7 miles, but other alignments were also under examination. He said when the alignments were combined, the total mileage under study could be roughly 60-70 miles.

Mr. Burton said that the debate appeared to be very unsettled, and therefore it appeared premature to be voting today.

Mr. Knapp said the ICC is a lot of things, but "premature" is not one of them.

Mr. Burton said he meant it was premature to be voting on the resolution before the Board.

---

Mr. Knapp said the Montgomery County Council has fully endorsed moving ahead on the ICC, taking into account the safeguards included in the study and the comments made by the public. He said the County Council took pains to endorse the Bi-County Transitway at the same time it endorsed the ICC. He said that further study is needed of the potential regional impacts of the project. He said he has spoken to Chairman Shapiro about these concerns, and he and other Montgomery County Council members are interested in working to address them. He urged the TPB's adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Salles congratulated MDOT for the study. He said that they would be looking to the study for answers to a number of questions before they determine whether to support the project.

Mr. Farley said the Commonwealth of Virginia would support the resolution. He said that the Virginia Department of Transportation understands the difficulty of performing such a study, but he said that until it was completed, the answers to many important questions will not be available.

Ms. Pourciau said she wanted to associate herself with the remarks of Mr. Farley and Mr. Gonzalez. She said that the District of Columbia is also concerned about land use implications of the project, and she hoped to hear more about this issue in the future.

Ms. Porter said she would be voting against the resolution. She said the arguments against the project have been around for nearly as long as the project has been around and there are good reasons why the project has not moved forward, including environmental and land use concerns, and concerns about the allocation of resources.

Mr. Reeder said that Frederick County is pressed very hard on land use issues, and he said he appreciated the comments that Mr. Gonzales has presented. He said Frederick County would be supporting the resolution.

Mr. Dorsey suggested that concurrent with the study there should be some discussion between the two county councils about this project.

Chairman Shapiro said that he had no doubt that the ICC represented a tremendous economic development opportunity for Montgomery County. He said he did not see it so much as a congestion relief opportunity. He said that the metropolitan area is a "region divided" along race lines and class lines, and he did not understand why the state should spend \$1.7 billion on a project that would only exacerbate that divide. He said he would be opposing the resolution.

Ms. Petzold said that opponents of the ICC in her district believed it would shift development toward Prince George's County. She also said that safety is an issue with the ICC because so many people are diverted to neighborhood roads to avoid congestion. She said that she had endured a dangerous trip from

---

BWI Airport the previous evening.

Chairman Shapiro said that if the jobs and housing were not so imbalanced in the region, then not so many people would have such long trips to places like BWI.

Ms. Kaiser said the project was a quality of life issue also. She said that her daughter has to travel one hour and twenty minutes to drive 12 miles every day.

Chairman Shapiro asked for a rollcall vote on Resolution R3-2004.

Mr. Kirby read the rollcall.

The Board members from the jurisdictions and agencies voted as follows:

- Prince George's County Council: no
- Maryland Department of Transportation: yes
- City of Bowie: absent
- Charles County: yes
- College Park: no
- Frederick County: yes
- Gaithersburg: yes
- Greenbelt: absent
- Montgomery County Executive: yes
- Montgomery County Council: yes
- Prince George's County Executive: yes
- City of Rockville: yes
- City of Takoma Park: no
- Maryland Senate: absent
- Maryland House: yes
- District of Columbia (Mendelson): absent
- District of Columbia (Ambrose): absent
- District of Columbia (Graham): absent
- District of Columbia Department of Transportation: yes
- District Office of Planning: absent
- Virginia Department of Transportation: yes
- City of Alexandria: no
- Arlington County: no
- City of Fairfax: absent
- Fairfax County (Hanley): absent

- 
- Fairfax County (Hudgins): absent
  - City of Falls Church: abstained
  - Loudoun County: no
  - City of Manassas: absent
  - Prince William County: absent
  - Virginia Senate: no
  - Virginia House: absent
  - Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority: absent

Mr. Kirby said that on the rollcall vote, 11 voted yes, seven voted no, one member abstained and 14 were absent.

Chairman Shapiro called for a weighted vote and asked Mr. Kirby to explain the procedure.

Mr. Kirby said the procedure is that under the weighted vote each state and the District of Columbia gets five votes, making a total of 15. Within each state, the department of transportation gets one of the five votes. One of the votes is evenly split between the two legislative members: the Maryland Senate and the Maryland House get a half a vote each, and the same in Virginia. The remaining three votes are allocated to the local jurisdictions in proportion to population, based on the most recent population estimates. In the District of Columbia, each of the five TPB members gets one vote. He said a computer program would calculate the weighted vote, which would take a few minutes.

Ms. Porter asked who has the prerogative to call for a weighted vote.

Chairman Shapiro said that any member may call for a weighted vote. Mr. Kirby confirmed this.

Ms. Petzold said she believed there was a provision in the bylaws for voting by proxy.

Mr. Kirby said that there was no proxy voting; the votes of those present are cast, and then the weights are applied. Each of the jurisdictions is factored up to a total of five. If some people are absent, those that are present will have a higher weight on their vote.

Mr. Shapiro said that he would like to move on with the agenda.

Later in the agenda, Mr. Kirby announced the results from the weighted voting: 10.32 “yes” and 4.68 “no.” These results were consistent with the outcome of the rollcall vote.

## **8. Approval of Amendment to the FY 2003-2008 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for**

---

**Components that are Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirement for the Anacostia Corridor Demonstration Project, as Requested by the District of Columbia Department of Transportation (DDOT)**

Ms. Pourciau moved approval of the resolution. The motion was seconded.

Referring to the mailout information, Ms. Pourciau explained that this amendment would begin the process of constructing a “jumpstarter line” in Anacostia, which would be the first demonstration of a light rail system that the District of Columbia and WMATA plan to develop. She said the elements of the project that are in the resolution under Item 8 are conformity-exempt as defined in the EPA regulations, which were attached to the mailout material. She said the full project is contained in the FY 2004-09 TIP. She said the project was scheduled to open in 2005.

Mr. Snyder said this is a great project. He asked that people from around the region be included in the project development process so that everyone can learn about it as it proceeds.

Ms. Pourciau said they have already had extensive outreach and she would be please to do more, including a presentation to the TPB.

The motion was approved unanimously.

**9. Release for Public Comment of the Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the 2003 Update for the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Clifford briefed the TPB on the results of the conformity assessment. He said staff was recommending the results be released for a 30-day public comment period. He noted that final approval of the conformity assessment will be linked to the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) approval of the new mobile emissions budgets contained in the State Implementation Plans (SIP). EPA received the SIPs in early September. EPA approval usually takes approximately 90 days.

Referring to details in the mailout material, Mr. Clifford described the inputs, methods and findings of the air quality conformity analysis. He said the documents provided to the TPB show that the results of the conformity analysis adhere to the mobile emissions budgets and provide a basis for conformity of the CLRP and TIP.

Mr. Burton commented that he did not believe the emissions levels for the outyears would get as low as projected in the conformity analysis.

---

Mr. King said he wished to offer an amendment related to the same project, which was included both in Items 9 and 10.

Mr. Kirby said the amendment would need to be offered for both items.

A motion was made to release for public comment the air quality conformity analysis. The motion was seconded.

Mr. King moved an amendment to delete the study of the University of Maryland Connector Road, which was included on Attachment A-1 under Maryland State Highway Administration Number 3.

Mr. Zimmerman seconded the motion.

Mr. Salles said this project was just a study and therefore it would be good to see the results.

Ms. Kaiser said that the projects in the capital program in Maryland go through a lengthy process. The program is the subject of the “Annual Tour” to the jurisdictions and then is put in final form before the General Assembly. She said the General Assembly approved the program with this project included, and therefore she would be voting against the amendment because it would go against the wishes of the General Assembly.

Mr. King said that he had requested the project’s deletion when the Annual Tour appeared the previous week in Prince George’s County. He said the project remains critically premature. He said that a letter from the City of College Park to Secretary Flanagan noted commitments had been made by the SHA administrator to a further discussion of the purpose and need for this particular project. He said that at the Annual Tour, SHA Administrator Neil Pedersen acknowledged that those consultations had not occurred. He said that this project had originally been framed strictly as a bus transitway study. It is no longer framed that way, and that has been part of the problem and part of the controversy. He said the two main stakeholders—the City of College Park and the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, upon whose land this proposes to run— have not been consulted as promised. He said the City of College Park opposes use of this alignment as a single-occupancy vehicle roadway. Furthermore, the head of the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC) has stated, in a letter, BARC’s opposition to the study of the corridor as a single-occupancy vehicle roadway. He said that because BARC is a federal agency, the land for a road could not be condemned. He said that in this period of budget constraints, it was wasteful to spend money even on a study of this project. He said that if anything, the redevelopment of Route One should take a priority over this project.

Mr. Kirby called a rollcall vote.

---

The Board members from the jurisdictions and agencies voted as follows:

- Prince George's County Council: yes
- Maryland Department of Transportation: no
- Charles County: yes
- College Park: yes
- Frederick County: no
- Gaithersburg: no
- Greenbelt: absent
- Montgomery County Executive: no
- Montgomery County Council: no
- Prince George's County Executive: no
- Rockville: no
- Takoma Park: yes
- Maryland Senate: absent
- Maryland House: no
- District of Columbia (Mendelson): absent
- District of Columbia (Ambrose): absent
- District of Columbia (Graham): absent
- District of Columbia Office of Planning: abstain
- District of Columbia Department of Transportation: absent
- Virginia Department of Transportation: no
- City of Alexandria: abstain
- Arlington County: yes
- City of Fairfax: absent
- Fairfax County (Hanley): yes
- Fairfax County (Hudgins): absent
- City of Falls Church: abstain
- Loudoun County: yes
- City of Manassas: absent
- Prince William County: absent
- Virginia Senate: abstain
- Virginia House: absent
- Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA): absent

Mr. Kirby said that seven voted "yes," nine voted "no," and three abstained. The amendment failed.

The motion to release the draft conformity determination was approved with one "no" vote.

---

## **10. Release for Public Comment of the 2003 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said this item followed on the release of the conformity analysis in Item 9. He said that final approval of the documents was currently scheduled for November 19. He said the next 30 days would be the last chance for comments, including any minor corrections.

Mr. Burton said he assumed that item 66 on page 2, which was the Middleburg Bypass, was included by mistake. He noted that this item had been deleted by the TPB at a previous meeting. He asked that it be taken out.

Mr. Kirby confirmed that its inclusion was a mistake. He noted that the project had been stricken from the list for air quality conformity under Agenda Item 9.

Referring to a handout memorandum, Ms. Porter summarized comments made by the Access for All Advisory Committee regarding the 2003 CLRP. She said these comments included concerns about transit for low-income communities; concerns about lack of emphasis on short-term improvements; concern about transit information for people who have limited English proficiency; concern about transit service for people with disabilities, and the link between Metro access and WMATA's short-term budget problems; and concerns about development by transit stations, and a concern that more steps be taken to mitigate the negative impacts from such development.

Mr. King said that because his amendment was defeated under Item 9, he would not be offering it again under this item. However, he said he would continue to work on the concerns he expressed.

Chairman Shapiro said he appreciated the work of the Access for All Advisory Committee. He said that in the future, the earlier these kinds of comments can be received, the better.

A motion was made to release the 2003 CLRP and FY 2004-09 TIP for public comment. The motion was seconded. The motion was approved with one "no" vote.

## **11. Release for Public Comment of the Project Information to Develop an Interim 2003 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby explained that the Interim CLRP and Interim TIP had been

---

developed as fallbacks in the event that either the emissions budgets are not approved by EPA or if federal agencies do not approve the CLRP and TIP. He said the Interim CLRP and Interim TIP only included projects that are conformity-exempt and would go forward in the event that a conformity determination is not forthcoming. He said that, in general, construction components were excluded in these interim documents. Projects that are already under construction, such as the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, would not be affected. He asked TPB members to carefully review the list of projects included in these documents.

Vice Chairman Hanley asked why the title of the project list was called “Projects to Be Excluded” if some projects had “no change” in parentheses.

Mr. Kirby said the list started with the same list that was released under Item 10, but parenthetical comments were added to indicate how they would be treated in the interim CLRP and TIP.

Vice Chairman Hanley said if that were the case, then the title on the document “Projects to Be Excluded” needed to be changed.

Mr. Kirby said staff would try to clarify the title so it is easier to understand.

Mr. Zimmerman expressed confusion about how the list for Items 10 and 11 corresponded.

Mr. Kirby explained that studies were not included in the listings for the Interim CLRP and TIP (Item 11) because studies are not affected by air quality. This did not mean, however, that studies would be excluded from the Interim CLRP and TIP.

Mr. Burton asked for a rough estimate of what the exclusions in the Interim CLRP and TIP would do for emissions levels.

Mr. Kirby said the exclusions will not do much for 2005 because most of the projects that will be completed by that time are already under construction. In the out years, he said it was very hard to tell without doing an analysis.

A motion was made to release the Interim CLRP and Interim TIP for public comment. The motion was seconded and was passed unanimously.

## **12. Status Report on the Region’s Revised State Implementation Plan (SIP) Submission to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)**

---

Ms. Rohlfs said a handout was being distributed that described the schedule for developing a severe area SIP for March of 2004. She said the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) expected to review a draft SIP at its November meeting. MWAQC is scheduled to release the draft revised SIP in December for public comment. Public hearings will be held in the month of January, and then in February MWAQC will vote on response to comments and on submitting the SIP to the EPA.

### **13. Report on Recent Regional Transportation Coordination Activities During Hurricane Isabel**

Referring to handout presentation materials, Mr. Snyder described the use of the regional coordination and communications system during Hurricane Isabel. He said this system was put in place through the Council of Governments following the 2001 terrorist attacks.

Mr. Snyder said the system was extensively used. He said the response and level of coordination was a breakthrough in local, state, federal and regional coordination, and coordination among functions to deal with a regional issue. He said that for a relatively small expenditure, the region has in place a very significant coordination and communication system that didn't exist three years ago.

Ms. Petzold thanked Mr. Snyder for this important work.

Ms. Pourciau also thanked Mr. Snyder. She said that the District of Columbia was one of the first states to be certified as being prepared for emergencies, and she said the regional coordination efforts have helped D.C. in this process.

### **14. Other Business**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 2:08 p.m.