
**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
MEETING ATTENDEES**

July 20, 2022

VIRTUAL MEETING

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT

Pamela Sebesky, TPB Chair – Manassas
Christina Henderson – DC Council
Ella Hanson – DC Council
Heather Edelman – DC Council
Sakina Khan – DC Office of Planning
Dave Emerine – DC Office of Planning
Lezlie Rupert – DDOT
Mark Rawlings – DDOT
Reuben Collins – Charles County
Patrick Wojahn – College Park
Denise Mitchell – College Park
Jan Gardner – Frederick County
Mark Mishler – Frederick County
Kelly Russell – City of Frederick
David Edmondson – City of Frederick
Neil Harris – Gaithersburg
Dennis Enslinger – Gaithersburg
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
Caneq Aguirre – Alexandria
Dan Malouff – Arlington County
Takis Karantonis – Arlington County
Walter Alcorn – Fairfax County Legislative
James Walkinshaw – Fairfax County Legislative
David Snyder – Falls Church
Adam Shellenberger – Fauquier 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 Marsden – Virginia Senate
John Lynch – VDOT
Allison Davis – WMATA
Mark Phillips – WMATA
Sandra Jackson – FHWA
Dan Koenig – FTA
Julia Koster – NCPC
Tammy Stidham – NPS

MWCOG STAFF AND OTHERS PRESENT

Kanti Srikanth
Chuck Bean
Lyn Erickson
Mark Moran
Tim Canan
Andrew Meese
John Swanson
Andrew Austin
Leo Pineda
Stacy Cook
Sergio Ritacco
Deborah Etheridge
Kim Sutton
Rachel Beyerle
Ashley Hutson - CAC
Matt Arcieri – City of Manassas
Kari Snyder - MDOT
Rebecca Schwartzman – DC Office of Planning
Corinna Sigsbury – Loudoun County
Amir Shahpar – VDOT

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

Chair Sebesky called the meeting to order. She said the meeting was being conducted virtually and she reiterated the procedures for conducting virtual meetings.

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 June 2022 TPB meeting and noon on Tuesday, July 19, the TPB received two comments. All comments were submitted via email. A memo with a summary of the comments, as well as each comment themselves, can be found on the TPB meeting page. She briefly summarized each of the comments.

2. APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 15, 2022 MEETING MINUTES

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

3. TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT

Referring to the posted material, Mr. Arcieri said that Technical Committee met on July 8 and reviewed material related to the TPB's May agenda, including Car Free Day, the Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside for Maryland, Equity Emphasis Areas, and the proposed bylaws amendments. The committee also received briefings on the 2022 Congestion Management technical report and an update on grant opportunities that are coming out of the federal infrastructure bill.

4. COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORT

Chair Sebesky introduced the item, noting that the CAC meeting in July had been a special joint meeting between members of the CAC and the TPB members. She thanked vice chairs Collins and Henderson for participating.

Ms. Hutson gave the CAC report. She said the special joint meeting on July 14 began with presentations from each of the TPB officers in which they described the unique challenges that each of their jurisdictions face. After a full-group discussion, the meeting broke into three state-based breakouts, giving all participants the chance to discuss regional transportation issues that pertain to their own states. When the group came back together, representatives from each state reported on the discussion points from the breakout session. Ms. Hutson reported on those points.

Chair Sebesky thanked for the CAC for the invitation to attend the meeting and for the very interesting discussion. She encouraged TPB members to reach out CAC members.

Mr. Collins expressed his appreciation to the CAC. He said the meeting was a good opportunity to increase his understanding of the CAC and how it works with the TPB.

Ms. Henderson also thanked the committee. She said the meeting provided a good opportunity for cross-jurisdictional information-sharing.

Ms. Kostiuk, who also attended, said the meeting was a great opportunity to think about how the TPB and CAC can work together better.

Mr. Harris noted that Ms. Hutson indicated in her remarks that participants from Virginia expressed interest in an additional river crossing. He asked about the nature of that part of the discussion.

Ms. Hutson said there was consensus in the Virginia breakout session that a bridge is needed. She said there was a lot of excitement around the concept, including discussions of potential endpoints for a new bridge.

5. STEERING COMMITTEE ACTIONS AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Referring to the posted material, Mr. Srikanth said the Steering Committee met on July 8. He said the committee approved a letter to the Virginia Department of Transportation in support of a list of transportation projects in Northern Virginia that the Northern Virginia TPB member agencies submitted for Virginia Smart Scale funding.

Mr. Srikanth said the posted materials also included a letter from the TPB the Federal Highway Administration which conveyed information from MDOT related to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study (MLS).

Mr. Srikanth thanked Vice Chair Collins for conducting the Commuter Connections Employers Awards ceremony on June 28.

Mr. Srikanth said the final document for Visualize 2045, as approved in June, is currently being printed.

Mr. Srikanth gave the board advance notice that large amendment to the Transportation Improvement Program would be coming through the Steering Committee in September.

Mr. Snyder asked if Mr. Srikanth knew the date of publication for Visualize 2045.

Mr. Srikanth said the digital version of the plan is already posted online, and the printed version should be available this summer.

Mr. Snyder asked if there is a schedule for follow-up activities related to the plan, including additional discussion at the TPB.

Mr. Srikanth said staff was working to develop follow-up initiatives, including reporting on greenhouse gas emissions. He said he would be reporting back to the TPB on proposed work. He said it appeared that staff would have adequate resources to conduct this work.

Mr. Srikanth said that an email had been received during public comment that forwarded a letter that had recently been sent by Maryland's U.S. Senators to MDOT. The Senators' letter suggested that after the new Nice Bridge is constructed, the old Nice Bridge should be retained as a facility exclusively for bicyclists and pedestrians. He invited Mr. Lewis to respond to this suggestion.

Mr. Lewis said that MDOT was preparing a letter in response to the suggestion regarding the Nice Bridge.

Ms. Kostiuk asked what the timeframe would be for the next update of Visualize 2045, which is planned to be an early update.

Mr. Srikanth said the most recent update took two and a half years. He said the next required update is four years away, but prior to the next update, the TPB has directed staff to develop an additional update. He said that staff is working to develop a schedule for the updates.

Following up on the comment regarding the Nice Bridge Mr. Korman asked if MDOT's response to the senators would be shared with the TPB members.

Mr. Lewis said he was unsure about when the response would be sent, but when it is sent, he said it likely would be publicly released.

Mr. Srikanth said TPB staff would work with MDOT to be sure the letter is provided to TPB members as soon as possible.

6. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Chair Sebesky that she and the two TPB vice chairs had been invited to attend the annual retreat of the COG board of directors later in July. She said she looked forward to the opportunity.

ACTION ITEMS

7. REGIONAL CAR-FREE DAY 2022 PROCLAMATION

Referring to the posted material, Mr. Ramfos gave a briefing on Car Free Day, which is going to be happening on September 22. He described the program's origin, its impact in our region and world-wide, and activities that the TPB undertakes to promote it.

Chair Sebesky acknowledged the importance of this event and noted that in the outer jurisdictions, opportunities to go car-free are limited, but they are increasing as teleworking becomes more common.

Mr. Ramfos thanked Chair Sebesky for signing the proclamation declaring September 22 Car-Free Day.

8. FY 2023 TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES SET-ASIDE PROGRAM FOR MARYLAND TPB JURISDICTIONS

Referring to the posted material, Mr. Swanson briefed the board on the recommendations that a selection panel had made for the use of funding that is suballocated to the TPB from the Maryland portion of the federal Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program. He described the program background and the project selection process. He said that seven applications were received for our region. He said a selection panel reviewed the applications.

Mr. Swanson said the TPB's suballocation for Maryland is \$5,169,000. He said the selection panel recommended expending the entire amount this year on one application, which is for construction of the Frederick and Pennsylvania Line Rail Trail in Frederick County. He said the panel agreed that this is an excellent project. He also noted that MDOT rules prohibit funding for projects on a partial basis, which limited the panel's ability to fund other applications instead of this one. He noted that the selection panel urged the TPB to encourage MDOT to fund four other projects that the TPB would not be able to fund with its suballocation.

He said the staff was requesting that the TPB approve R1-2023 to provide funding for the Frederick and Pennsylvania Line Rail Trail and to encourage MDOT to use the statewide TA Set-Aside funding to fund four projects: the Twinbrook Safe Routes to School project in Rockville; the West Seventh Street Protected Bicycle Lane project in the City of Frederick; Traffic Calming at the Catocin Furnace District in Frederick County; and a connectivity study in the City of Frederick.

Ms. Gardner moved approval of the resolution and said she was excited about the project to be funded. The motion was seconded by Ms. Russell.

Mr. Wojahn said he was pleased to see that all the Transportation Alternatives funding for Maryland would be spent this year, unlike in previous years. He also said he was glad to see a great project moving forward. He noted that last year's infrastructure bill included an allowance for states to set aside five percent of TA Set-Aside funds for technical assistance. He asked if the TPB or the state DOTs could comment on how they are planning to use that allowance. He said he would be interested in learning whether those technical assistance funds could be used to ensure that a broad range of project submissions are received.

Mr. Srikanth noted that some enhanced flexibilities were being provided to existing programs through the Infrastructure Investment Jobs Act. He said that staff would be following up on this. He asked the DOT representatives if they had comments.

Mr. Lynch said the office of the Virginia Secretary of Transportation was investigating various opportunities of the new legislation and would be following up.

Ms. Rupert said that DDOT was also in the of determining how to respond to these kinds of questions related to the new legislation.

Mr. Swanson said that he had spoken with MDOT and VDOT staff about the funding allowance that Mr. Wojahn mentioned. He said that at MDOT, he knew that there are discussions about using the funds to do more training and outreach earlier in the TA Set-Aside solicitation process.

Ms. Kostiuk said she wondered about the effectiveness of the MDOT rule prohibiting the partial funding of projects. She said that this year, the outcome was good and she strongly supported the recommended project, but she said she could imagine a situation in the future where this rule could be really limiting. She said she would like to learn more about the origin of the rule and whether it is helping the program meet the goals that it should be seeking to achieve.

Mr. Lewis was still unavailable due to technical difficulties, so Chair Sebesky asked that the vote proceed and that a response to these questions be supplied at a later date.

The motion was passed unanimously.

INFORMATIONAL ITEM

9. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ANALYSIS PHASE 1: UPDATE EQUITY EMPHASIS AREAS

Mr. Ritacco presented an overview of the informational item on the Environmental Justice Analysis Phase I for the long-range transportation plan, which consists of an update to the Equity Emphasis Areas (EEAs). Mr. Ritacco explained that EEAs are small geographic areas with higher concentrations of low-income, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, and Asian populations. He said that the primary purpose of the work is to support the federally required environmental analysis of the long-range plan and to understand the impact of the transportation improvements in the plan. He stated that the actual analysis of the plan is covered in Phase 2.

Mr. Ritacco said that the 2020 update designates 364 of the region's 1,330 tracts as EEAs, which represents a four percent increase in the number of tracts over 2018; although it's a similar share to all tracts because the U.S. Census Bureau has increased the number of tracts in the region by nine percent. He said that TPB planners did not see a dramatic change in the composition of population groups within the EEAs.

Mr. Ritacco discussed the EEAs map, noting that the East West Divide is still predominant, and there are clusters of EEAs in the inner and out suburban parts of the region.

Mr. Ritacco shared a link to an interactive EEAs map that includes layers and activity centers, and the actual EEA index scores and information about income levels and population groups are available in the map's layer tables. He said that map includes data tables for users who want to download the information and conduct their own analysis.

Mr. Ritacco shared additional information from the agenda item and presentation about census tract population figures and changes in the EEAs since 2018. He addressed frequently asked questions using a series of FAQ slides.

Mr. Ritacco said that the next step in the process is Phase 2 which will include analysis of the 2022 Visualize 2045 update and an examination of disproportionately high and significantly adverse impact on low-income and traditionally disadvantaged racial and ethnic population groups. He said that if impact is found, TPB staff would need to look into developing mitigation measures to limit disproportionate and adverse impact. He stated that the results of the analysis will be presented to the TPB in early to late fall 2022.

Chair Sebesky asked Mr. Ritacco to email the interactive map link to the board.

Ms. Sakina Khan said that it is great to see ongoing work with respect to the EEAs, and she looks forward to the next phase of analysis and implications for the District of Columbia. She said that the District uses EEAs as part of planning work to help target certain communities and think about the relationship to the variety planning being conducted and other opportunities such as linkages to infrastructure. She thanked the TPB for continuing to work on EEAs.

Mr. Lewis asked if the TPB had taken any action to develop the screening tool with the University of Maryland Department of Environment.

Mr. Ritacco confirmed that Mr. Lewis was speaking of the EPA's environmental EJ screen, which is a national product. He stated that the TPB screening tool is tailored for the region even though it uses similar data.

Mr. Srikanth added that in addition to the EEAs being drawn from region-specific data for Environmental Justice analysis purposes, the TPB uses it in other ways. As an example, he said the TPB examines the region's roadway safety crash data by overlaying it with the EEAs. He also noted how TPB and COG have a productive partnership where COG has adopted EEAs for other regional planning efforts such as land use, housing, public health, food, and other aspects.

Ms. Russell asked whether it is possible to have the 2018 and 2022 data so that one could see how things have changed.

Mr. Srikanth responded that there is a technique available within the GIS tool to depict those changes. He cautioned that with the 2020 census updates, the tract boundaries could have changed, so it might not be the exact boundary as in 2018. He stated that a second caution is that even though a geographic area may be identical, it is possible within the new data sets that the population has changed, as a result, in the 2018 set, a tract might be identical to 2022 in shape and area, but the densities could have changed.

Mr. Erenrich asked TPB staff to clarify which road network was used for the GIS layers. He asked that TPB check that the latest network layer is being used.

Mr. Ritacco said that that actual analysis is what was approved for the 2022 update to the Visualize 2045 long-range transportation plan. He said that he would confirm that the road network used reflects the latest dataset.

Mr. Srikanth stated that there continues to be confusion that in the 2022 Visualize 2045 update that the TPB adopted construction of managed lanes on the Maryland portion of the Capital Beltway east of I-270. He said that this is not true. The 2022 plan update does not include managed lanes on the Beltway in Maryland east of I-270; however, the 2018 long-range transportation plan did include that. He stated that the EEAs analysis of 2018 did show the 2018 network; the 2022 EEAs will show the 2022 network.

Ms. Kostiuk asked about the federally required environmental justice analysis occurring after the plan was adopted and what the mitigation steps are if an issue is found. She asked if issues are found, will that information be rolled into the next TIP or long-range plan and how does it help in terms of creating the plan itself.

Mr. Srikanth responded that large projects that require federal approval that rise to the level of requiring environmental impact statements, generally involve analysis and identification of mitigation at the project level. He said that the environmental justice analysis of long range transportation plans looks at all planned projects for highway, transit, and nonmotorized use combined and examines the combined impact on mobility and accessibility for low-income and racial and ethnic minority population groups and whether that impact is disproportionate to that experienced by other population groups.

Mr. Srikanth said that most projects in the plan are not yet built, and as such, assessing the impact of the plan will provide a sense of potential disproportionate impacts on underserved communities before the various projects are implemented so they can be mitigated. He added that the TPB has not yet had a finding to date of disproportionate impacts of the combined plan and that this indicates that the 23 member jurisdictions and their agencies are mindful of this and perhaps projects are conceived with consideration for inequities and addressing inequities.

Mr. Srikanth commented that if the TPB does find disproportionate impacts from this updated plan based on the analysis, the TPB will have a collective discussion on mitigation.

NOTICE ITEM

10. TPB BYLAWS UPDATE

Chair Sebesky announced that the TPB is giving notice of intent to approve updated bylaws at its September meeting and introduced Lyn Erickson, TPB Plan Development and Coordination Program Director, to provide an overview.

Ms. Erickson said that the TPB staff initiated an update to the Bylaws to reflect the virtual options available for the TPB to conduct business after a public health emergency. She said that TPB staff is taking the opportunity to update the Bylaws language to reflect current laws and practices, including referencing the TPB master planning agreement, which covers invoicing, referencing the currently adopted public participation plan, and the TPB's continued use of Robert's Rules of Order, as well as minor editorial updates to bring the Bylaws into the 21st century.

Ms. Erickson referred to the Bylaws memorandum shared with the TPB, stating that the substantive changes pertain to virtual participation options. She said that many members of the board have expressed an interest for in-person meetings based on the view that in-person gatherings build familiarity and better working relationships among members from a geographically diverse region who would otherwise have limited opportunities to meet, interact, and get to know each other's viewpoints better.

Ms. Erickson stated that the complexities of policy matters discussed by the board have periodically led to the need for additional TPB meetings.

Ms. Erickson said that the proposed revisions to the Bylaws state that the TPB shall give preference for in-person meetings over virtual meetings and that when an in-person meeting is scheduled, members may attend the meeting virtually on no more than two occasions in a year. She said that the TPB chair may propose, or upon request from board members, schedule up to three all-virtual meetings in a year. She stated that this means a member may now be able to participate in up to five of 11 meetings virtually.

Ms. Erickson stated that the board has been presented with two versions of the Bylaws to review, one marked with changes and a version with draft changes incorporated. She requested that TPB members send comments to her or Mr. Srikanth by August 26. She said that the current TPB Bylaws state that all amendments must be introduced at one meeting and can be acted on at the next meeting; therefore, the TPB is scheduled to act on changes to the Bylaws at the September 2022 board meeting.

Chair Sebesky said that she travels to the meeting from an outer jurisdiction and travel to TPB meetings becomes a whole day commitment due to the distance. She said that she has found the value of collaboration in being able to get to know people in the District and Maryland and other Virginia jurisdictions. She commented that she is glad that the TPB is looking at the Bylaws and updating them similar to what many organizations and employers are doing.

Ms. Kostiuk said that she shares Chair Sebesky's perspective that it is more effective to be in person and build connections, yet she has concerns about requiring members in the outer jurisdictions whose primary livelihood is not their elected role to travel for in-person meetings because of the time commitment required. She said that she would like to find a solution that is a little more allowable for those who would like to attend virtually if needed. She asked that the TPB look at the time of meetings to potentially allow for an

earlier or later meeting during the day.

Ms. Kostiuk asked whether the chat at virtual meetings becomes part of the public record and part of the minutes.

Mr. Srikanth said that when there are comments and questions as part of the discussion, the TPB staff reflects what is in the chat or follows up by email if a question comes up in a chat.

Mr. Harris said that one of the goals of the TPB is to enable and encourage people to commute less and work virtually. He said that he would prefer to meet in person when possible but does not think it should be a requirement because the commute can be challenging. He said that the TPB should do its best to accommodate members by following the TPB's precepts to not over tax the transportation system when possible.

Mr. Snyder stated that the Virginia Freedom of Information Act language on the topic is complicated. He asked whether the topic has been vetted with a Virginia law expert to make sure that Virginia participants are in compliance with applicable law.

Mr. Snyder asked about public input and how the TPB is receiving input from virtual meetings as well as live meetings. He asked what the public participation rights are for each type of meeting and whether a member of the public can appear virtually and make a presentation or will comments be accepted by email only.

Mr. Snyder stated that he tends to agree with members who want—consistent with applicable law—the maximum degree of flexibility with how people participate virtually or in person.

Mr. Srikanth responded that TPB's attorneys are engaged and part of the review to make sure that the Bylaws are consistent with District, Maryland, and Virginia laws.

11. ADJOURN

Mr. Srikanth stated that there will not be a TPB meeting in August. He said that the COG Board is going on an annual retreat at the end of July and that transportation is part of the discussion. He said that TPB staff have been asked to facilitate a session in coordination with COG's environmental program staff on advancing clean fuel or electric vehicle deployment in the region.

Mr. Lewis said that the Maryland Commission on Climate Change mitigation work group has a similar objective as the TPB to set an aggressive goal, particularly with light-duty vehicle technology. Chair Sebesky stated that the next TPB meeting will be virtual and held on September 21.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 PM.