

**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  
November 17, 2004**

Members and Alternates Present

Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board  
Phil Mendelson, D.C. Council  
Michael Knapp, Montgomery County Council  
Cicero Salles, Prince George's DPW&T  
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park  
Bill Wren, City of Manassas Park  
David Snyder, City of Falls Church  
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT-NOVA  
Rick Canizales, Prince William County  
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors  
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT  
Michelle Pourciau, DDOT  
Carol S. Petzold, Maryland House of Delegates  
Sandra Jackson, FHWA  
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt  
Patrice Winter, City of Fairfax  
Hilda Barg, Prince William County  
Ludwig Gaines, City of Alexandria  
Andrew Fellows, City of College Park  
Skip Coburn, DC Councilmember Sharon Ambrose  
Marsha Kaiser, MDOT  
John A. Giannetti, Maryland Senate  
Robert Dorsey, City of Rockville  
Jeff Jennings, DC Councilmember Jim Graham  
Lora Byala, WMATA  
Brian A. Glenn, FTA

---

Mick Staton, Loudoun County  
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate  
David Harrington, Prince George's County  
Wayne Cooper, Charles County Commissioners  
Edgar Gonzalez, Montgomery County, Executive Branch  
Stan Alster, City of Gaithersburg  
Ron Spalding, MDOT  
Joan DuBois, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	COG/DTP
Michael Clifford	COG/DTP
Bob Griffiths	COG/DTP
Andrew Meese	COG/DTP
Andrew Austin	COG/DTP
John Swanson	COG/DTP
Wendy Klancher	COG/DTP
Jane Posey	COG/DTP
Debbie Leigh	COG/DTP
Deborah Etheridge	COG/DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam	COG/DTP
Michael Farrell	COG/DTP
Jill Locantore	COG/DTP
Mark Moran	COG/DTP
Jim Yin	COG/DTP
Jinchul Park	COG/DTP
Paul DesJardin	COG/HSPPS
Steven Kania	COG/OPA
Joan Rohlfis	COG/DEP
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Howard Chang	Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Bob Grow	Greater Board of Trade
Sharmila Samarasinghe	DRPT – VA
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Lee Epstein	Chesapeake Bay Foundation
Roger Plaut	Longmead Crossing Community Services Association
Tom Biesiadny	Fairfax County Department of Transportation
Valencia Williams	FHWA-MD Division
Alex Hekimian	MNCPPC Montgomery County

---

Tim Nutter	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Ritch Viola	Arlington County
Keri Funderburg	Environmental Defense
Lee Schoenecker	TPB/CAC
Bill Dowd	NCPC
Harry Sanders	Action Committee for Transit
Monique Ellis	Montgomery County
Brian Henry	Audubon Naturalist Society
Amy Horner	SABW
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Jana Lynott	NVTC
Glen Burton	MNCPPC-Prince George's County
Jorge A. Valladares	MNCPPC-Montgomery County
Deborah Burns	FTA
Robert G. Yeck	Greater Colesville Citizens Association
Royal S. Buyer	Intercounty Master Plan Advocates
Ron Resh	Bethesda-Chevy Chase Chamber of Commerce
Michael Replogle	Environmental Defense
Stan Doore	Calverton Citizens Association
Gerald R. Cichy	MTA
Nancy Floreen	Montgomery County Council
John Contestibile	MDOT
Jerry Garson	Citizens for Better Potomac Roads
Thomas & Phyllis Durek	Citizens of Bethesda, MD (ICC Advocates)
Mona Sutton	MD SHA
Fatimah Hasan	MDOT
Scott Forrester	Greater Washington Board of Trade

## 1. Public Comment

Vice Chairman Knapp called the meeting to order. He said that Chairman Zimmerman would arrive shortly. He announced that because of the large number of people signed up for public comment, each speaker would have only two minutes.

Robert Jepson of the Gaithersburg Germantown Chamber of Commerce spoke in support of including the Intercounty Connector (ICC) in the 2004 Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP). Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Paul Yanoshik, member of the board of directors for the Gaithersburg Germantown Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support of including the ICC in the 2004 CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

---

Paul Summers spoke in support of including the master plan alignment of the ICC in the 2004 CLRP.

Jerry Garson spoke in support of including the ICC in the 2004 CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Scott Forrester, Greater Washington Board of Trade's Transportation and Environment Committee, spoke in support of including the ICC in the 2004 CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Roger Plaut, representing the community of Long Mead Crossing, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Thomas Durek spoke in support of including the ICC in the 2004 CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

John Parish, vice president of the Maryland Native Plant Society, spoke in opposition to inclusion of the ICC in the 2004 CLRP.

Michael Berman spoke in support of including the ICC in the 2004 CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Lee Epstein, Chesapeake Bay Foundation, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. He said the air quality conformity analysis has been conducted using a flawed methodology and an unreliable model. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Stan Doore, transportation chair for the Calverton Citizens Association, spoke in support of including the ICC in the 2004 CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

David Baron, Earth Justice, spoke in opposition to the approval of the CLRP. He said that federal law requires that transportation plans give top priority to fixing existing transportation systems, but the draft 2004 CLRP would invest billions of dollars for new roads without fixing the existing transit system. He said that before the TPB can approve billions of dollars for new roads, these problems must be fixed. Otherwise, he said, the Board will not be in compliance with federal law.

Andy Michaels spoke in support of including the ICC in the 2004 CLRP.

Andrea Arnold, Solutions Not Sprawl, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP. Copies of her remarks were distributed for the record.

Robert Yeck, Development Review Committee for the Greater Colesville Citizens Association,

---

spoke in support of including the ICC in the 2004 CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Tom Reinheimer spoke in support of including the ICC in the 2004 CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Brian Henry, Save Our Communities, spoke in opposition to inclusion of the ICC in the 2004 CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Michael Replogle, transportation director for Environmental Defense, urged the TPB not to approve the conformity finding for the 2004 CLRP because he said it was based upon flawed analysis using a flawed model. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Delores Milmo, Audubon Natural Society, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP.

Roland Davis spoke in support of including the ICC in the 2004 CLRP.

Tim Nutter, Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance, spoke in support of including the ICC in the 2004 CLRP. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Harry Sanders, Action Committee for Transit, said it was misleading to claim that transit would be consuming the lion's share of transportation funding in the future. He said the plan contained little real money for real transit projects. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Chris Carney, conservation organizer with the Sierra Club, spoke in opposition to inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP.

Richard Parsons, Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce, said he agreed with Harry Sanders that additional money must be identified for substantial transportation improvements. He spoke in support of inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP.

Stewart Schwartz, Coalition for Smarter Growth, said he resented accusations that the environmental community has not been factual. He spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the ICC in the CLRP.

Carroll George spoke about a roadway merge design proposal that he was proposing to reduce congestion. Copies of his remarks were distributed for the record.

Nancy Floreen, at-large member of the Montgomery County Council and chair of its Transportation and Environment Committee, urged the TPB to support actions under Items 14, 15 and 16. She noted that, under Item 14, the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee had

---

written to the TPB and had indicated that the proposed transportation plans meets the approved mobile emissions budgets. She spoke in support of including the ICC in the CLRP.

Vice Chairman Knapp thanked the individuals who spoke during the public comment period. He turned the meeting over to Chairman Zimmerman.

## **2. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of October 20, 2004**

Mr. Staton asked that the minutes be changed to reflect the fact that he was present at the October 20 TPB meeting.

Chairman Zimmerman asked that the minutes be so changed.

Ms. Ticer made a motion to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Knapp and was approved unanimously.

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

Mr. Rybeck said he had no comments to add to the written handout material.

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

Referring to the handout report, Mr. Jaffe said the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) met the previous week and discussed Disability Awareness Day and the CAC outreach meetings that will be held on December 7 in Fair Lakes, Virginia, and on December 8 in Gaithersburg, Maryland. He also said the CAC had elections to designate six individuals to serve on next year's CAC.

Mr. Jaffe said that Mr. Snyder had come to the CAC meeting to discuss emergency preparedness efforts. He said Mr. Snyder indicated that regional leaders have identified a number of gaps in emergency preparedness, including the need to improve communication and coordination among agencies in the event of emergencies. He said that regional transportation agencies have acknowledged that such improvements are needed, and over recent months, the agencies have joined together to develop an institutional approach to meet those needs.

Mr. Jaffe said the CAC passed a resolution in support of the plans to enhance the Capital Wireless Network (CapWIN) for the purposes of improving communications and coordination in the event of transportation incidents. However, he said the committee was extremely concerned that emergency management agencies would not be part of that effort. He said that the CAC passed an additional resolution unanimously urging that the TPB address the linkage issue between police,

---

fire and transportation in emergency management.

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

Referring to the mailout material, Mr. Kirby said the Steering Committee met on November 5. In addition to reviewing the agenda for the November meeting, the committee approved one resolution amending the FY 2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program to include four congestion-relief projects in the City of Alexandria, City of Fairfax, and Fairfax County; a secondary road project in Loudoun County; and a real-time transit information project in the City of Alexandria as requested by the Virginia Department of Transportation. Mr. Kirby said the only additional letter received was from Mr. George regarding his proposal.

## **6. Chairman's Remarks**

Chairman Zimmerman thanked everyone who spoke during the public comment period. He noted that many of the same people had spoken on the same subject at previous public comment periods. He said he believed there was something wrong with a process that requires the same people to come back and make the same speeches because the same decision essentially is being made over and over.

Chairman Zimmerman thanked Harry Sanders for his comments, which did not relate to the Intercounty Connector. Mr. Sanders spoke about transit-oriented development. He noted that Mr. Sanders had distributed an article from *USA Today* in which Mr. Zimmerman was quoted. He said that it makes a lot of sense to take advantage of infrastructure that is already in place, which is what Smart Growth is founded upon. He noted that the market has responded favorably to transit-oriented development. He said that what normally happens when something is in high demand is that the market produces a lot more of it. He said the region needs to find ways to produce more transit-oriented development.

Chairman Zimmerman also called attention to the statement by Carroll George who spoke about a roadway merge design proposal based on relatively simple concepts. He said it was important not to automatically discount relatively simple ideas that could possibly improve transportation efficiency. He asked staff to take a new look at Mr. George's proposal to see if it had merit.

Mr. Snyder asked this issue to be referred to the Management, Operations and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) Task Force.

Chairman Zimmerman noted that there appeared to be agreement with Board members to pursue this issue. He agreed that it would be appropriate to refer it to the MOITS Task Force.

---

Ms. Hudgins said she thought the USA Today article was on target, but she noted that a number of transit-oriented development projects are underway in Fairfax County.

#### **7. Appointment of Nominating Committee for Year 2005 TPB Officers**

Chairman Zimmerman announced the appointment of the Nominating Committee for year 2005 TPB officers: Senator Ticer from Virginia, Mayor Porter from Maryland and Ms. Pourciau from the District of Columbia.

#### **8. Approval of Funding and Transmittal Letter for the TPB 2005 Membership in the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO)**

Vice Chairman Mendelson moved approval of funding and a transmittal letter for the TPB 2005 membership in AMPO. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

#### **9. Approval of a Resolution Declaring Funding Must be Identified to Meet Preservation, Rehabilitation, and Capacity Expansion Needs of the Region's Highways, Local Transit, and Commuter Rail System**

Chairman Zimmerman said that this resolution had been suggested by Ms. Barg at the last meeting when the Board passed a resolution supporting funding for the Metro system. She had suggested that a resolution should be brought before the Board in support of other transportation funding needs in addition to Metro.

Ms. Barg thanked the staff for acting so quickly on this resolution. She moved approval of Resolution R5-2005. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ticer, and was approved unanimously.

#### **10. Approval of Amendments to the Fiscal Years 2004-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Draft FY2005-2010 TIP that are Exempt from the Air Quality Conformity Requirement to Fund Metrorail and Metrobus Rehabilitation and Maintenance Projects, Rail and Bus Fleet Expansion and Associated Facilities Upgrade, and a Security Program**

Chairman Zimmerman explained that this item essentially referred to the Metro Matters program.

Mr. Thomas explained that the Metro Matters Funding Agreement had been executed by all member jurisdictions of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA). He said that the WMATA Board had amended its Capital Improvement Program in October, and the action



---

before the TPB would amend the current TIP and the draft TIP to include this funding. He thanked all funding partners for their support. He said some of the details regarding Metro Matters were still be resolved, including federal funding.

Mr. Salles said he wanted to recognize the leadership of the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) regarding transit. He said that in December two new Metro stations would be opening in Prince George's County.

Ms. Kaiser thanked Mr. Thomas and WMATA for their leadership on Metro Matters. She said MDOT was pleased to be the first jurisdiction to sign the agreement.

Chairman Zimmerman said he looked forward to being at the opening ceremonies for the new Metro extensions. He also noted that it was an important accomplishment that the design for the Wilson Bridge is intended to accommodate transit, which was not part of the first version of the plan for that project.

Ms. Ticer added that they started advocating that 13 years ago.

Mr. Dorsey said he wished to remind Metro of the need to maintain its public image. He said he had twice recently witnessed cases of inexcusable behavior on the part of Metro employees. He said that the public image of Metro was especially important to maintain in this period when the system is seeking public support.

Chairman Zimmerman said that as a WMATA board member, he would like to get some specifics regarding these incidents after the meeting. He said that the previous night WMATA held its first town hall meeting. He said that customer service was an important topic of discussion. He said that Mr. Dorsey was right that now, of all times, the system cannot afford to let a few bad employees harm the system's reputation.

Mr. Thomas said that Mr. Dorsey's point was well taken. He said the next day WMATA staff would be presenting the WMATA board with a "1,000-Day Plan" that would outline immediate steps to improve system reliability and customer service.

Ms. Pourciau said the District of Columbia was pleased to have made its contribution to the Metro Matters program. She also called attention to the upcoming groundbreaking for the new New York Avenue Metrorail station. In addition, she noted that the previous Saturday, they had a groundbreaking on the first part of a light rail line in Southeast D.C.

Ms. Hudgins said she wanted to emphasize the importance of the comments made by Mr. Dorsey. She emphasized the importance of customer service.

Ms. Pourciau moved approval of Resolution R6-2005. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hudgins,

---

and was approved unanimously.

### **11. Approval of a TPB Letter of Support for the National Capital Planning Commission's Study of the Relocation of the CSX Rail Line within the District of Columbia**

Chairman Zimmerman introduced item 11, which was approval of a TPB Letter of Support for the National Capital Planning Commission's study of the relocation of the CSX Rail Line within the District of Columbia. Chairman Zimmerman noted that the letter was previously presented to the Board in October and subsequently redrafted to reflect comments made by Board members. Chairman Zimmerman invited Board members to comment on the redrafted letter.

Ms. Porter asked whether her understanding was correct that the second paragraph of the letter expressed support for a study of the entire region, not just the District of Columbia. If so, Ms. Porter stated that she was happy with the letter.

Chairman Zimmerman agreed that that was his understanding of the second paragraph.

Mr. Harrington concurred with Mayor Porter and expressed support for a regional approach to the study. He noted that in Maryland, particularly Prince George's County, several sections of the CSX Rail Line are of concern. If the letter called for a regional approach, Mr. Harrington stated that he would gladly support the letter, and thanked the Board for taking action on this matter. He further expressed gratitude to MDOT for taking leadership on the issue, particularly in the town of Bladensburg by funding an overpass. He noted, however, that additional issues regarding the rail line need to be addressed, and therefore he supports the letter.

Chairman Zimmerman noted that a regional approach was one of the central points raised during the discussion of the letter at the previous Board meeting, and that the intent of the letter was indeed to express support for a region-wide study.

Vice Chairman Mendelson expressed support for the comments of Mayor Porter and Mr. Harrington. He inquired about the necessity of the language in the letter's second paragraph that refers to "changing the operations of the railroads to divert hazardous materials." He noted that for the past several months the most hazardous materials have been diverted from the District of Columbia. Therefore it is already known that diversion is possible, and Vice Chairman Mendelson wondered whether it is necessary to ask the National Capital Planning Commission to study the feasibility of changing operations to divert hazardous materials.

Chairman Zimmerman said that he thought the intention was to suggest that in some cases, in addition to simply considering moving the rail line, the study should also consider operational changes. He noted that diverting hazardous materials might obviate the need for moving the rail line or some other more costly or difficult alternative.

---

Mr. Rybeck stated that the Technical Committee received a presentation on this topic, and that he has been working with NCPC on the study. He stated that he believes the intent of the letter is to support a comprehensive view of alternatives to the status quo, including both physical relocation and operational changes. The fact that CSX may be currently undertaking certain operational changes does not mean that those are necessarily the optimal or routine operational changes that should be implemented. Mr. Rybeck stated that he thinks the Board could endorse the intent of the letter that NCPC should take a broad view of the options.

Mr. Snyder noted that others have raised this issue as well. He stated that his understanding of what Vice Chairman Mendelson was saying is that CSX has already made operational changes, so it is known that operational changes are possible, but the study should examine whether further changes in operations and/or changes in track location are necessary. If this understanding is correct, Mr. Snyder suggested adding the word “further” before “changing operations” in the second line of the second paragraph of the letter.

Ms. Petzold stated that she has no objection to the addition of the word “further,” but that her belief is that the Board is asking for an evaluation of the impacts not only on the District of Columbia, but also on the rest of the region. She noted that even though diverting hazardous materials from the District of Columbia is highly desirable, where the materials go instead is of concern to many Board members.

Chairman Zimmerman agreed.

Mr. Gaines stated that this was precisely his concern, and suggested adding language to the letter that refers to mitigating the impacts on jurisdictions surrounding the District of Columbia, not just studying them. He noted that the CSX rail line runs through the Eisenhower Valley, which is the home of the new Patent and Trademark Office, the largest federal campus in the country, with millions of square feet of residential and office space. Mr. Gaines requested that the words “to mitigate the impacts on surrounding jurisdictions” be inserted after the words “The Board supports a study to address these concerns” in the third sentence of the second paragraph of the letter.

Chairman Zimmerman asked if the Board unanimously consented to the additional language requested by Mr. Gaines.

Vice Chairman Mendelson objected, on the grounds that Alexandria is part of the “core” area referred to in the letter. Vice Chairman Mendelson further stated that the focus should be on mitigating the impacts on the greatest population, such that the smallest proportion of the population is at risk, rather than on core jurisdictions or surrounding jurisdictions.

Mr. Gaines noted that the definition of the core may change over time, and he is not sure that the letter addresses this concern.

---

Vice Chairman Mendelson and Chairman Zimmerman noted that the current route of the CSX rail line passes through the District of Columbia, Alexandria, and Arlington, past the Pentagon and National Airport. Vice Chairman Mendelson stated that if a proposed alternate route is outside the Washington region he is not interested in asking NCPC to focus on mitigating the impacts outside the region.

Ms. Porter stated that she supports the inclusion of the word “further” in the letter, as suggested by Mr. Snyder, but does not support the language proposed by Mr. Gaines, because she would like the whole letter to emphasize a region-wide perspective.

Chairman Zimmerman quoted the portion of the letter that states "as the rail line goes through several jurisdictions outside of the District of Columbia, the impact of any relocation of this stretch, or of changing the operation... must be assessed for the entire region." He suggested that this language is consistent with all of the comments made by Board members. Chairman Zimmerman asked if Vice Chairman Mendelson approved the addition of the word “further.”

Vice Chairman Mendelson stated that he accepted the addition.

Mr. Gaines withdrew his recommendation.

Chairman Zimmerman asked if there was any objection to the letter with the addition of the word “further.” Hearing none, Chairman Zimmerman declared the letter agreed to by unanimous consent of the Board.

## **12. Endorsement of Actions to Improve Regional Transportation Communications and Coordination During Incidents**

Mr. Snyder, chair of the TPB’s Management, Operations, and Intelligent Transportation Systems (MOITS) task forces, introduced this item and noted the recent press article on the incident on the Metro Red Line and the road closures around the Capitol. He said the transportation system is under stress. He said that communications and coordination are important not only for addressing security issues, but also for improving the lives of commuters on a day-to-day basis. He recognized the continuing efforts to address the challenges by the departments of transportation in Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia, as well as WMATA and other agencies, including COG staff.

Referring to the handout presentation, Mr. Contestible briefed the Board on the proposed course of action for strengthening transportation communications and coordination in the region. The main thrust of the regional coordination plan is the designation of an agency responsible for shepherding the communications process for major incidents. The plan includes three phases. Phase one

---

involves the enhancement of current operations using existing tools; much of this phase has been completed or will be completed by the end of 2004. Phase two involves the development of funding, staffing and operations plans for the coordinating agency. Phase three involves the full operation and integration of all regional communications and coordination systems.

Chairman Zimmerman asked Mr. Snyder to address three points: 1) How the proposed plan relates to the model used by New York; 2) How the plan relates to concerns raised by the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC); and 3) What the plan would mean for a typical incident.

Mr. Snyder explained that when an incident occurs, the coordinating agency will assure that all transportation agencies are notified and coordinate their responses accordingly, making operational changes when appropriate. He further noted that the proposed system will facilitate communication between transportation and public safety agencies.

Regarding CAC concerns, Mr. Snyder stated that the MOITS task forces will commit to exploring the participation of the emergency management agencies. Mr. Snyder stated that the proposed system is similar in concept to the New York model called TRANSCOM. However, he said it will use a governance structure like that of CapWIN in this region. He said that if you go into the CAPWIN website, that board includes state transportation agencies, local agencies and police agencies. He said that the emergency management agencies will be less involved for day-to-day traffic incidents but must be involved when a big event occurs. He further noted that support from the Board of Trade has been critical to the communications and coordination planning process.

Mr. Snyder called for everyone involved to work together and not let funding be an obstacle. He noted that the cost will be several million dollars per year, and suggested that this is not a significant amount compared to the size of the potential payback.

Ms. Winter inquired about 511 operations.

Mr. Contestible explained that 511 is the telephone number the FCC has set aside for traveler information, similar to 411. He noted that a 511 system requires information to be compiled in real time, which is also an asset for emergency management.

Chairman Zimmerman inquired about how widely 511 has been implemented.

Mr. Constestible stated that North Carolina and Florida have 511 systems, but to his knowledge, Maryland does not.

Chairman Zimmerman suggested that the reason 511 systems have not been implemented yet is because the system is not useful unless a method for compiling relevant information is in place.

Mr. Contestible agreed.

---

Mr. Snyder moved to endorse the proposed actions. The motion was seconded by Vice Chairman Mendelson.

Chairman Zimmerman inquired if there was further discussion.

Ms. Pourciau noted that currently there is some integration between emergency management and transportation agencies through the Capital Wireless Integrated Network (CapWIN), and that adding to this system and making it more robust is a goal the TPB should pursue.

Chairman Zimmerman inquired about the next “major milestone” after the TPB endorses the proposed actions.

Mr. Kirby stated that CapWIN staff will develop a proposal for moving forward, including cost and staffing requirements, and will report back to the TPB at the January 19 meeting.

Chairman Zimmerman inquired whether his understanding was correct, that the plan will in fact move forward and be implemented by next year.

Mr. Kirby stated that that was the intention.

Chairman Zimmerman thanked Mr. Snyder for his diligent work on this matter, and noted the significance of the proposed actions.

Chairman Zimmerman called for a vote to endorse the proposed course of action. The Board voiced unanimous consent.

### **13. Review of Comments Received and Acceptance of Recommended Responses for Inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Assessment, the 2004 Constrained Long-Range Plan, and FY2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

Mr. Kirby said the mailout included a memorandum from him to the Board listing the process of receiving and responding to comments on the actions that were scheduled for the later part of the agenda. He said that almost 1,200 comments were received, approximately 500 in support of the CLRP amendments and 650 in opposition. He said that citizens were encouraged to submit comments electronically reflecting a recommendation by the Citizen Advisory Committee. He said the website was improved and almost all of the comments were received through the internet.

Mr. Kirby said that staff went through all the comments received and identified 34 key and distinct comments that were listed in his memorandum. He reviewed a number of the most important points and responses provided in the memorandum.

---

Ms. Porter asked about Comment 3 on Page 5 of the November 10 memorandum from Mr. Kirby. She noted that Mr. Kirby's memorandum referenced a letter from the Maryland Department of Transportation of March 12, 2004, which she said was out of date. She said that subsequent to the March 12 letter, the Maryland General Assembly took legislative action to limit the use of Grant Anticipation Revenue (GARVEE) bonds, but this action was not reflected in Mr. Kirby's memorandum. She said it appears that the ICC cannot be funded as previously proposed given the law as enacted by the General Assembly.

Mr. Kirby said that the material regarding the approval of the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP), which was provided under Item 15, included the same funding plan that MDOT had provided in March. He said that plan provides a range of \$900 million to \$1 billion for GARVEE bonds. He said that the most recent information from MDOT indicated that \$1 billion in GARVEE bonds will be available for funding the ICC. He asked Ms. Kaiser to comment further.

Ms. Kaiser said that when the funding plan for the ICC was presented in the spring, MDOT noted that the price of the project would change depending upon how the project proceeded through the environmental studies. She said the cost was based on a project description that was at least eight years old. She said the financial plan that MDOT provided had an upper limit of \$2.3 billion for funding. She said that the cost is different now for a number of reasons. First of all, the final cost of the project has not yet been decided. The final scope of the project will not be determined until the final record of decision is issued and the alternative is selected. Currently, two corridors are still under consideration and a number of different alternatives, including different environmental mitigation measures, are under consideration within those two corridors. She said that more than 100 alternatives were under consideration. She listed some anticipated environmental expenses that were already known to have raised the cost of the project from the earlier \$1.7 billion estimate. These costs include \$120 million for longer bridges to protect streams, \$50 million for environmental stewardship features, \$30 million for additional environmental mitigation above and beyond what is required for the project, \$20 million in advanced stormwater management techniques, \$50 million in community connections, \$30 million in additional Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) that will help traffic move faster, and \$100 million in construction contingencies.

Ms. Kaiser said that MDOT was not asking for ICC construction funding to be included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). It was only requesting that construction funding be included in the Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP). She said that when MDOT submits its project lists for the TIP next year, it will be closer to a specific alternative and a definitive cost for the project. She said that although the General Assembly did cap GARVEE funding, they also said they did not want to limit options for funding the ICC. She said the legislature wanted to continue discussions on this topic and in recent weeks, MDOT participated in House and Senate hearings on the GARVEE bond issue. She said she believed that during the upcoming legislative session they would be able to get over the hurdles associated with the GARVEE mechanism. If not, she said

---

they have additional funding in the other categories that they have put forward in the financial plan submitted in the spring. She said that the financial plan submitted in the spring will stand until they have a defined project because that plan has upper limits of \$2.3 billion dollars that will be sufficient to cover the cost of the project.

Ms. Porter noted that the CLRP must be constrained by available funding. She asked if a project could be put into the CLRP if part of the funding source identified for that project is contrary to existing law.

Mr. Kirby referred to formal public information materials that were just sent out by MDOT. He said these materials, which all the TPB members should have received, explicitly reference \$1 billion in GARVEE bonds. He said this was a current piece of information and was appropriate for the Board to be dealing with at the meeting.

Ms. Porter said it does not reflect current state law.

Ms. Kaiser said the upper limits of the financial plan are \$2.3 billion. She said there was enough funding to cover what is needed for the Constrained Long-Range Plan. She said that when the General Assembly passed the GARVEE bond limit, their very final comment on it was they did not intend to limit funding options for the ICC and they asked MDOT to continue working with them. She said that MDOT believes, based on the sessions they held the previous week with members of the legislature, that they will be able to get over this hurdle. She said she believed the funding was available in the package they submitted.

Ms. Porter said it remains true that the funding for this project in the CLRP is contrary to existing state law.

Ms. Kaiser said they have not changed the cost of the project as it was submitted in the spring. She said that project costs change all the time and agencies do not come back to the TPB to change those project costs until they are at a point where they have a definitive cost. She said that given where they currently are in the planning process, they do not have a final figure on what this project will cost. She said that if it is \$2.1 billion, they certainly have enough to fund it in the financial plan they submitted; if it is \$2.3 billion, they have enough in the financial plan they submitted. She said the project as it stands now is consistent with the conceptual plan as submitted in the spring, and it reflects the way any project moves along in the environmental process. She said that until the project goes into engineering and final design, and is put out for bid, they will not know what the cost of the project is going to be. She said they are saying that for the time being, the project should stay with what was submitted in the spring. She said the financial plan covers the cost as it was submitted. She said they will be coming back next year with a change to the cost when they know what the project is and they know better where they are with the state legislature.



---

Vice Chairman Mendelson said that regarding Comment #3, he felt that the answer provided by Ms. Kaiser was fuller than what was provided in the written response. He said he believed the response in the written material should reflect more fully what Ms. Kaiser said.

Chairman Zimmerman said he took Vice Chairman Mendelson's point. He said he never liked this exercise regarding the responses to public comment. He said the purpose of it is to solicit public comment and those comments must receive responses in the record. He said this is a sensible part of the process that is required federally. But on the other hand, the idea that the TPB is endorsing the responses is something with which he was never comfortable. He said that he understood the TPB vote on this item would basically recognize that the requirement has been met, but not necessarily endorse the responses.

Mr. Kirby said the language included for the action on this item asks that the Board accept these responses for inclusion in the CLRP document.

Chairman Zimmerman reiterated that he understood that to mean that the Board does not agree with each of the responses necessarily. He said that is the only way he could ever vote "yes" on these things because he knows he could find some responses that were inadequate.

Vice Chairman Mendelson repeated that he did not find the written response on Comment #3 to be satisfactory and he said it ought to reflect what Ms. Kaiser just said.

Chairman Zimmerman said he did not have any problem with that, but he was simply saying that editing the entire document would get cumbersome and could last a long time.

Vice Chairman Mendelson asked Mr. Kirby how the response might be edited.

Mr. Kirby said he would have no problem including Ms. Kaiser's remarks as they were recorded.

Chairman Zimmerman asked that the response be so revised.

Vice Chairman Mendelson asked about Comment #5 on pages 5-6 of the November 10 memorandum from Mr. Kirby, which was included in the mailout. He noted that the comments received were that the 1) ICC will reduce air quality in the region and 2) the ICC will improve air quality in the region. He said the response provided does not speak to those comments at all. He asked if there was any general sense regarding the air quality impact of the ICC. He said he knew this question was not explicitly part of the conformity analysis, but he asked whether there was any sense of its impact.

Mr. Kirby said the proposed CLRP had not been analyzed for air quality purpose in a way that would isolate the impacts of the ICC, i.e., an analysis with and without the ICC had not been performed. He said that the air quality conformity analysis that was performed showed that if

---

either alignment was included with all the other projects, the forecasted emissions would meet the emissions budgets. He noted that the Board has debated several times the desirability of isolating the ICC for that kind of analysis, and based on the Board's direction, that isolated study of the ICC was not included in the analysis under consideration in this item.

Vice Chairman Mendelson asked if the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Study included any indication of the air quality impacts of the ICC.

Mr. Kirby said no, the ICC was not included in the scenarios.

Mr. Harrington asked Mr. Kirby if his understanding was correct that the analysis of the ICC included a forecasted increase in employment in Prince George's County.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct.

Mr. Harrington asked if the study indicated the kinds of jobs that might result.

Mr. Kirby said the work was done by the Planning Directors Technical Committee at COG, including the planning director from Prince George's County. He said they developed the job forecasts and they concentrated the employment growth in the Konterra area.

Mr. Harrington said the Konterra development would occur regardless of whether the ICC is built. He asked what other jobs would be anticipated by building the ICC.

Mr. Kirby said that increases in Konterra were the only changes given to staff. He said the forecast shows the ICC would accelerate the rate of job development in the Konterra area.

Mr. Harrington asked how that conclusion was reached absent any kind of zoning adjustments that may have to be made relative to building the ICC.

Mr. Kirby said the planning directors operate within the current zoning. In contrast, he noted that MDOT's land use study, which used a separate land use panel, arrived at different estimates because they did not consider the current zoning to be a constraint.

Mr. Harrington asked if there had been any sectional map amendments, zoning map amendments or any kind of master plans in the area that would suggest a need to adjust any zoning to do the kind of job creation resulting from the ICC.

Mr. Kirby said that staff was relying on the Planning Director from Prince George's County to provide the information regarding employment.

Mr. Harrington asked if there has been analysis of which ICC corridor yields more jobs.

---

Mr. Kirby said the information provided by the Planning Directors was that the employment impacts would be the same for the two alignments that were studied.

Mr. Harrington asked Ms. Kaiser if the General Assembly indicated any preference as to which corridor it prefers.

Ms. Kaiser said the project has not been presented to the General Assembly in that level of detail. She said that when the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is released, more information will be available.

Ms. Porter said she did not believe there is any attempt to manipulate any output of the travel model. However, she said she knew that models are not a perfect depiction of reality. She asked if her understanding was correct that the additional jobs that would be produced by the ICC are included in the model but then other jobs are taken out to compensate for that.

Mr. Kirby said that was not exactly correct. He said that new jobs are added and then all the jobs are treated the same after that point. He said that if there are too many jobs in total, relative to the workers generated by the household forecasts, then effectively all of the jobs in the entire modeled area are reduced proportionately. A small sliver is taken off of all of them.

Ms. Porter asked whether her understanding was correct that the TPB's forecasts assumed that if the new jobs were added, other jobs across the region would be reduced as a whole, which would mean there would not be a net increase in new jobs. In contrast, she understood that the MDOT economic study seemed to indicate that there would be a net increase in jobs.

Mr. Kirby said that in effect, the TPB analysis assumed there would be an increase in jobs in those areas affected by the ICC relative to the remainder of the modeled area.

Ms. Porter said she understood that the model would pull those jobs away from other locations in the area.

Mr. Kirby said that was correct, given that there has been no information to identify increased household growth to go along with these jobs.

Mr. Roberts said he had concerns about air quality conformity. He said he was particularly concerned about the assumption that emissions reductions would be realized through cleaner vehicles. As a mechanic by trade, he said he knew that as long as people keep burning the fuels they are burning now, a real decrease in emissions would not be realized, at least in the next 10 years, unless everyone is willing to drive extremely small cars, which was contrary to current trends. He asked what the assumptions about cleaner vehicles were based on. He said he was also concerned that other environmental issues, including deforestation, were not examined.

---

Mr. Kirby said the analysis under this item looks only at mobile source emissions. He said the analysis included critical assumptions about emission controls and fuels for vehicles that will be coming in future years, and the fleet turnover that will bring those cleaner vehicles into service. In particular, he noted that new requirements would soon be required for larger vehicles, including sport utility vehicles and most importantly, diesel engines. He said the amount of vehicle miles of travel by all of these vehicles is growing, but the control technology would more than offset the growth in travel.

Mr. Roberts said he thought these reductions on paper would not be realized in reality because of the increase in traffic. He said real progress on emissions reduction over the past 10 years has not been achieved because the same type of fuel is being used. He said it was false to claim that the ICC would reduce emissions.

Mr. Kirby said that, getting back to Vice Chairman Mendelson's earlier point, the TPB analysis does not conclude that the ICC per se is going to increase emissions or decrease them. He said that kind of analysis specific to the ICC has not been performed. He said the analysis concluded that on a regionwide basis, forecasted emissions would be within the limits that have been set as part of the region's air quality plan.

Mr. Roberts asked how that conclusion could be reached when there were no hard facts to prove it.

Mr. Kirby said that analysis was based on data and analysis used in the travel demand modeling process.

Mr. Roberts said he thought the Board was fooling itself with this analysis.

Vice Chairman Knapp moved acceptance of the comments and responses for inclusion in the document. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Salles said he was glad to see the increased employment in Prince George's County. He said this might result in less driving for Prince George's residents who have long commutes.

Chairman Zimmerman emphasized that this was a vote to accept the responses and in no way should be perceived as a TPB endorsement of the responses to comments. He said this action was essentially a formality that is required by federal planning regulations. He said the question is on the motion as amended by Vice Chairman Mendelson with regard to the comments of Ms. Kaiser on Comment #3.

The motion was passed unanimously.

---

#### **14. Approval of the Air Quality Conformity Determination for the 2004 CLRP and FY2005-1010 TIP**

Vice Chairman Knapp moved approval of the air quality conformity determination.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Kaiser.

Ms. Porter said she would be voting against the approval of the air quality conformity determination. She said she continued to be concerned that efforts were not made to find out what the impact of the ICC is on air quality.

Ms. Snyder noted that many comments had asked for a study of the isolated air quality impacts of the ICC. He asked if this were a point at which that issue could be voted upon.

Mr. Kirby said the item before the Board deals with the entire plan and TIP and has not separated out the ICC. He said the Board has voted on previous occasions on whether or not to isolate the ICC.

Rather than making a motion to amend, Mr. Snyder said he would be voting against the air quality conformity determination on the basis that he believed the ICC ought to be separately studied.

Chairman Zimmerman said the question is on the motion to adopt Resolution R8-2005 finding that the 2004 CLRP and FY 2005-2010 TIP conform with the requirements of the Clean air Act Amendments of 1990.

The Board voted in a voice vote.

Ms. Porter called for a show of hands.

In a show of hands, the motion was approved, with 20 “yes” votes and 7 “no” votes.

The following voting members were recorded as “no” votes:

- Chairman Zimmerman
- Vice Chairman Mendelson
- Ms. Porter
- Mr. Snyder
- Mr. Fellows
- Mr. Roberts
- Mr. Harrington

---

Mr. Harrington asked that record reflect his support of the concerns of Ms. Porter and Mr. Snyder regarding the absence of an air quality analysis that would have isolated the effects of the ICC.

Chairman Zimmerman said he also associated himself with those comments.

### **15. Approval of the 2004 Constrained Long Range Plan**

Vice Chairman Knapp moved approval of the 2004 Constrained Long-Range Plan.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Kaiser.

Ms. Porter moved an amendment to the draft CLRP to remove the ICC. She said she had a number of concerns which had already been articulated.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Harrington.

Chairman Zimmerman asked Ms. Porter if she would like a show of hands.

Ms. Porter said she would like a show of hands.

The motion to amend the motion to approve the 2004 CLRP to remove the Intercounty Connector was defeated in a show of hands with 9 “yes” votes and 17 “no” votes.

The following voting members were recorded as “yes” votes:

- Chairman Zimmerman
- Vice Chairman Mendelson
- Ms. Porter
- Mr. Snyder
- Mr. Fellows
- Mr. Roberts
- Mr. Harrington
- Ms. Hudgins
- Ms. Ticer

Chairman Zimmerman returned the Board’s attention to the main motion, which was approval of the CLRP as presented.

Mr. Harrington reviewed a number of his concerns. He said he believed the Prince George’s job increases associated with the ICC were flawed. He said he was concerned about the over-

---

dependence on residential housing and not enough on commercial development. He said he was concerned about the issue of zoning and the lack of a master plan, which further cause him to question some of the analysis regarding job creation. He said he was deeply concerned there was no real zoning discussion on a regional level. He said that without that discussion the forecasts mean very little in terms of supporting job creation. He said he would like to support having a regional conversation on the kind of job creation that the ICC may support, including a discussion of zoning.

Vice Chairman Knapp said he appreciated Mr. Harrington's concerns. He said Mr. Harrington's predecessor, Mr. Shapiro, had raised similar concerns. He said he was willing on behalf of Montgomery County to sit down and have that discussion with Prince George's County.

Mr. Harrington said he appreciated that offer, but he emphasized that these were regional issues and this discussion regarding job creation should include all affected jurisdictions. He said he was not sure that the TPB was the appropriate place for this discussion. He said he was making this recommendation with some trepidation because he did not want anyone to think that the Council of Prince George's is in any way supporting the ICC. But to the extent that this project moves forward, he said he was very critical of models which suggest job creation without zoning.

Chairman Zimmerman said he sympathized with Mr. Harrington's point. He suggested that this discussion continue after the meeting to determine how best to proceed.

Mr. Kirby explained that the Metropolitan Development Policy Committee (MDPC) at COG approves the Cooperative Forecasts, which then go to the COG board for approval. The Cooperative Forecasts are developed by the planning directors who meet from all of the jurisdictions in the region and develop these forecasts. He said that TPB staff consults with the MDPC on the effects of transportation projects. In the case of the ICC, the planning directors revised their forecasts based on information regarding the ICC. He said that for further information and discussion, it would be most appropriate to go the MDPC and the planning directors.

Mr. Harrington said that Mr. Kirby did not answer his question. He said his concern was that the analysis of the project indicates that jobs would be created. Absent a discussion of zoning or development of a master plan, he did not believe that adequate information had been presented to support the claims of job creation. He asked that staff be directed to have a conversation with members who are concerned about this issue.

Mr. Kirby said that the Cooperative Forecasts, including the information regarding job creation, are developed through a collaboration among the planning directors of the jurisdictions. He said the participants in that process are responsible for zoning and forecasting in each jurisdiction. He emphasized that transportation staff at COG and the COG staff working on land use issues work cooperatively with the representatives from the local jurisdictions who are responsible for zoning and master plans.

---

Chairman Zimmerman asked that Mr. Harrington pursue this issue after the meeting.

Mr. Roberts commented on the ICC economic benefits that have been claimed by MDOT. He said he was concerned that there was no alternative against which to compare those benefits. He said it was inevitable that any investment of \$2-3 billion would produce jobs, but he said there should be a comparison with the job creation that would result if that much funding were put elsewhere in the region.

Mr. Roberts also said it was incorrect to say that the failure to build the ICC is the reason for congestion in the region. He said that as an elected official, he has repeatedly voted against developments that unnecessarily continue to overload the transportation system. He said he wanted to promote transit and transit-oriented development, not automobile-oriented development. He said an underlying problem continued to be the dominance of the automobile culture and the belief that only the automobile can bring economic development. He said that mind-set must be changed.

Ms. Porter thanked the people who had come to the meeting to comment. She said she appreciated hearing both sides of this discussion. However, she said she wanted to disagree with the suggestion that the TPB should not talk about these issues and should just go ahead and approve the plan. Furthermore, she disagreed with the notion that people outside a project's jurisdiction have no right to talk about that project. She emphasized that the TPB is a regional body and has a responsibility to discuss impacts of the transportation infrastructure on other jurisdictions. She said she would be alarmed to see something of the magnitude of the ICC go through the TPB with no discussion. She said that all elected officials on the TPB have a duty to their constituents to represent their communities' interests in these discussions. She said she believed the discussions under this item had been very productive and had reinforced the value of the TPB as a policymaking body.

Ms. Petzold said she was a great supporter of transit, but transit will not do the same thing that the ICC does. She said the ICC is needed for service providers and truck deliveries. She acknowledged that the ICC may have been delayed so long that it will not relieve Beltway congestion, but she said it would relieve congestion in neighborhoods like hers. She emphasized that the ICC would improve safety, including pedestrian safety.

Mr. Giannetti said the ICC should be called the Prince George's golden highway. He said it clearly would create jobs for Prince George's County. He said the ICC will terminate at the Muirkirk MARC rail station, which will be a multimodal transit hub. He emphasized that the ICC will benefit the region's airport in Maryland. He also said it would benefit the port of Baltimore. Overall, he said there was no question that the project would improve the region's economic vitality. He said that as a region it was important for jurisdictions to support projects in other jurisdictions and states. He said that what raises the economic vitality for the region overall will benefit everyone. He said that in Maryland, the highest numbers of technology jobs are in Montgomery



---

County and the second highest numbers of technology jobs are in Prince George's County. He said it would be very beneficial to link these two counties and would offer job opportunities for people in Prince George's County.

Mr. Fellows said there is not a lot of consensus in Maryland about the ICC. He said many people believe the project will exacerbate economic disparities. He said he was concerned that the report from the University of Maryland on economic benefits did not include supporting data. He emphasized that there is a finite amount of federal dollars for transportation. He said the TPB as a regional planning body should be constructing a narrative to the federal government, saying that the region wants more mass transit funding. He said the main reason he would be voting against the CLRP is that, in terms of air quality, the project would not provide congestion relief to the Beltway. He said he believed it would create more vehicle miles traveled in the region and therefore, more emissions.

Mr. Staton said there were different land use patterns throughout the region. He said that city living did not attract families with children, who instead generally choose to live in suburbs. He said that in the suburbs people need cars to get around. He said a combination of solutions is needed.

Mr. Snyder said he agreed with Ms. Porter's comments that it was very appropriate for the TPB as a regional body to be discussing this project. He also said he believed the issue of safety was very important and he appreciated Ms. Petzold's comments.

Mr. Snyder said he wanted to include in the record a statement in the mailout material from the Maryland Department of Transportation:

"The build options are designed to include convenient and reliable express bus service and convenient links to Metrorail, MARC, and park and ride facilities. Building the ICC therefore would increase the reliability and attractiveness of transit as a travel option and increase transit ridership in the study area."

Mr. Snyder said that if this project comes back to the TPB in the future and does not live up to that description, he would vote against it. He said he would be voting for the CLRP. He said his vote was based upon those commitments that were made by the Maryland Department of Transportation.

Vice Chairman Mendelson said he would be voting against the motion, which he would be doing with some regret. He said he was concerned about the lack of an air quality analysis to determine the impact of the ICC. He also said he was concerned about the loss of jobs in the core of the region that he believed would result from the project. Finally, he said he was concerned about funding. He said the state of Maryland appeared to be mortgaging its future transportation funding, and this could have negative implications for the region as it seeks to meet future needs, especially

---

for WMATA. He said he really did not want, as an elected official, to be voting against a project in Maryland. He said it would help if jurisdictions in Maryland were united on the project.

Ms. Hudgins said she would be voting for the motion, but she had concerns. She noted that the testimony over the past six months has been utterly divided. She was particularly concerned about issues of economic disparity raised on the side of Prince George's County.

Chairman Zimmerman said he agreed with Ms. Hudgins and was concerned about the process that has created this situation. He said he also agreed with the positions stated by Vice Chairman Mendelson. He said he would, like Ms. Hudgins, be voting for the motion. He said that he felt uncomfortable with this vote, but he believed it was important to move forward.

Chairman Zimmerman reiterated that he believed this process was unsatisfactory. He was particularly concerned that one project has become the only issue discussed regarding the approval of the 2004 CLRP, despite the fact that a number of other important projects are included in this year's amendments. He also said he was concerned about having to vote on this issue several times. He said the issue was settled a while ago, but it keeps coming up. He said he personally did not think this project was the best thing for the region, but at the same time he believed that the country had to be governed somehow. He said the process was highly flawed and the critics of the process were right. He said he also thought that the people who are for this project and say they won the election are also right. He said he did not like that fact, but they did. But he said that somehow the region has to be able to move forward and do things.

Chairman Zimmerman said the body cannot do much about the process because it is imposed by federal law. He said that people who are not in favor of something find themselves trying to fight through the process. He said that confidence in government is not encouraged when people who are trying to get something done see the process as something just in their way, and people opposed to it see that the measures taken to move it forward simply make a mockery of what the process is supposed to be. He said he did not know how we get out of this, but he believed it was one of the biggest problems facing the region and probably the country. But in the meantime, the region does need to move forward.

The motion to approve the 2004 CLRP was approved by voice vote.

Ms. Porter asked that the "no" votes be recorded. The following voting members voted "no":

- Vice Chairman Mendelson
- Ms. Porter
- Mr. Harrington
- Mr. Fellows
- Mr. Roberts

---

## **16. Approval of the FY 2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program**

Vice Chairman Knapp moved approval of the FY 2005-2010 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The motion was seconded by Ms. Ticer.

Ms. Porter moved that the motion be amended to remove the ICC from the TIP.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Harrington.

The motion to amend the motion to approve the FY2005-2010 TIP to remove the Intercounty Connector was defeated by a show of hands, with 8 “yes” votes and 17 “no” votes.

Ms. Porter asked that the “yes” votes be recorded.

The following voting members voted for the amendment:

- Chairman Zimmerman
- Vice Chairman Mendelson
- Ms. Porter
- Mr. Snyder
- Mr. Harrington
- Mr. Fellows
- Mr. Gaines
- Mr. Roberts

Chairman Zimmerman said the question was on the approval of the TIP as presented.

The motion to approve the FY2005-2010 TIP was approved by voice vote.

## **17. Certification of the Urban Transportation Planning Process for the National Capital Region**

Vice Chairman Knapp moved approval of the certification of the Urban Transportation Planning Process for the National Capital Region.

---

The motion was seconded by Ms. Ticer, and was approved unanimously.

**18. Other Business**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.