

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
April 18, 2007**

Members and Alternates Present

Stan Alster, City of Gaithersburg
Deborah R. Burns, FTA/Wash. D.C. Metro Office
Nat Bottigheimer, WMATA
Andrew Fellows, City of College Park
Patricia Gallagher, NCPC
Jason Groth, Charles County
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
Charles Jenkins, Frederick County
Timothy Lovain, Alexandria City Council
Michael May, Prince William County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Sam Minnitte, MDOT
Emeka Moneme, DDOT
David Moss, Montgomery County
Harry Parrish II, City of Manassas
Kathy Porter, City of Takoma Park
Thomas D. Rust, Virginia House of Delegates
C. Paul Smith, City of Frederick
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
JoAnne Sorenson, VDOT-NOVA
Kanti Srikanth, VDOT
Mick Staton, Loudoun County
Patsy Ticer, Virginia Senate
Harriet Tregoning, DC Office of Planning
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County
Robert Werth, Private Provider's Task Force
William Wren, Manassas Park

Chris Zimmerman, Arlington County Board

MWCOG Staff and Others Present

Ron Kirby	
Michael Clifford	
Jim Hogan	
Bob Griffiths	
Nick Ramfos	
Wendy Klancher	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Andrew Meese	
Andrew Austin	
John Swanson	
Sarah Crawford	
Erin Morrow	
Darren Smith	
Dusan Vuksan	
Daivamani Sivasailam	
Jazmin Marie Casas	
Dave Robertson	COG/EO
Naomi Friedman	COG/EO
Jeff King	COG/DEP
Makeda Saggau-Sackey	COG/OPA
Heather Mueller	COG/OPA
Paul DesJardin	COG/HSPPS
Rick Canizales	Prince William County
Tamara Ashby	Arlington County
Jim Maslanka	Alexandria
Ian Beam	MDOT
Alex Verzosa	City of Fairfax
Randy Carroll	MDE
Allen Muchnick	Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation
Megan Fratcher	Transurban
Famarz Mokhtari	M-NCPPC/Prince George's
Gary Groat	Fluor – Virginia
Michael Leviton	Citizen
Mary Ellen Schehl	Citizen
Peter Harnick	Citizen
Roger Dietrich	Sierra Club
David Zaidain	NCPC

Eric Gilliland	Washington Area Bicyclist Association
Jill Switkin	Cooley Rodward Kronish LLP
Betsy Massie	PRTC
Harry Sanders	Action Committee for Transit
Dr. T. Viles	Citizen
Angelica Betts	Prince William County BOCS
Elizabeth Rodgers	NVTC
Tom Biesiadny	Fairfax County/DOT
Stephanie Yanovitch	SHA/MDOT/VHB
Larry Cloyed	VDOT
Tim Young	Transurban
Bob Owolabi	Fairfax County DOT
Audrey Clement	Green Party of Virginia
John Peterson	Greater Washington Board of Trade
Sarah Vilms	Citizen
Michael Nardolilli	Arlington East Falls Church Civic Association
Robert Morgan	Citizen
Ronald Bethea	Sedan Services Plus
Tracy Sharpe	Commuter
Fred Millar	Friends of the Earth
Bill Lecos	Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce
Lon Anderson	AAA Mid Atlantic
Kimberly Collins	Citizen
Stewart Schwartz	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Mike Hoarty	Citizen
Bob Chase	NVTA
Eric Gilliland	WABA
Michael Replogle	Environmental Defense

1. Public Comment on TPB Procedures and Activities

Chair Hudgins asked the speakers to take two minutes when presenting their comments because of the large number of speakers present.

Ms. Clement of the Green Party of Virginia spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the I-66 Spot Improvements in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and the FY 2008-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Copies of her remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Peterson of the Greater Washington Board of Trade's Transportation and Environment Committee spoke in support of two projects on the agenda for inclusion in the air quality

conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and the FY 2008-2013 TIP: the I-95/I-395 HOT Lane Project and the I-66 Spot Improvements. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Ms. Vilms of the Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation urged the TPB to reject inclusion of the I-66 Spot Improvements project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP.

Mr. Nardolilli of the Arlington East Falls Church Civic Association urged the TPB not to include the I-66 Spot Improvements project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Leviton of North Arlington urged the TPB to reject the proposed widening of I-66 and not to include the I-66 Spot Improvements project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Morgan, an Arlington resident, urged the TPB not to include the I-66 Spot Improvements projects in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and the FY 2008-2013 TIP. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Ms. Sharp asked the TPB to be skeptical about converting successful HOV lanes to HOT lane operations. She urged the TPB to further question VDOT and Fluor/Transurban about the I-95/I-395 HOT Lane project before including this project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and the FY 2008-2013 TIP. Copies of her remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Dietrich of the Sierra Club asked the TPB to consider the recently adopted COG Board Climate Change Initiative and not include the I-66 Spot Improvements project and the I-95/I-395 HOT Lanes project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP.

Mr. Millar of the Friends of the Earth urged the TPB to consider a western orientation for rerouting rail freight cargo when listening to the presentation from the National Capital Planning Commission on the reconfiguration of the mainline freight railroad through the Monumental Core. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Bethea of Sedan Service Plus detailed his concerns about the limited funding available under the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan for the acquisition of wheelchair accessible taxicabs in the Washington, D.C., area. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Muchnick of the Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the I-66 Spot Improvements project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and the FY 2008-2013 TIP. He referred to his letter submitted during the public comment period.

Mr. Harnick of the Maywood Community Association asked the TPB not to include the I-66 Spot Improvements project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and the FY 2008-2013 TIP.

Mr. Lecos of the Fairfax County Chamber of Commerce spoke in support of including the I-95/I-395 HOT Lanes project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and the FY 2008-2013 TIP.

Mr. Anderson of AAA Mid-Atlantic requested that the TPB include the I-66 Spot Improvements project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and the FY 2008-2013 TIP, but delay the inclusion of the I-95/I-395 HOT Lanes project until safety issues can be addressed. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Ms. Collins, a resident of Fredericksburg, VA, who commutes to Rosslyn, VA, spoke in support of the inclusion of the I-95/I-395 HOT Lanes project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP. Copies of her remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Schwartz of the Coalition for Smarter Growth urged the TPB to defer the inclusion of all projects in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP until the transportation planning process can be improved.

Mr. Hoarty, a commuter from Alexandria, VA, spoke in favor of including the I-66 Spot Improvements project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and the FY 2008-2013 TIP.

Mr. Chase of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance spoke in support of including the I-95/I-395 HOT Lanes project and the I-66 Spot Improvements project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and the FY 2008-2013 TIP. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Gilliland of the Washington Area Bicycle Association thanked the TPB for their support of Bike to Work Day and encouraged the TPB to approve the Bike to Work Day 2007 Proclamation under Item 10. He also spoke in opposition to including the I-66 Spot Improvements project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP. Copies of his remarks were submitted for the record.

Mr. Replogle of Environmental Defense spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the I-66 Spot Improvements project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP. He also urged the TPB to delay action on including the I-95/I-395 HOT Lanes project in this analysis to allow for more public comment.

Ms. Schehl, an Arlington resident, spoke in opposition to the inclusion of the I-66 Spot Improvements project in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and the FY 2008-

2013 TIP.

Chair Hudgins thanked the speakers for their comments.

Chair Hudgins asked for approval to amend the Agenda so that Items 9 and 10 be moved ahead of Item 7.

Ms. Ticer made a motion to amend the Agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Snyder and unanimously approved.

2. Approval of Minutes of January 17, 2007 Meeting

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the March 21, 2007 meeting of the TPB. The motion was seconded by Mr. Zimmerman and passed unanimously.

3. Report of the Technical Committee

Mr. Harrington provided the TPB with a summary of the Technical Committee Meeting held on April 6, 2007. He directed the TPB to the meeting highlights and reported that the Committee reviewed the following items on the TPB Agenda:

- Item 7: Staff briefed the Committee on public comments received to date on major projects submitted for air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP. Staff also updated the Committee on activities to develop a TPB response to the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization resolutions presented to the TPB on September 20, 2006.
- Item 8: Staff briefed the Committee on a draft response to comments expected to be submitted by MWAQC on the draft scope of work for the air quality conformity assessment.
- Item 11: The Committee was supportive of the 2007 spring Street Smart campaign and the proposal for funding the FY 2008 campaign presented by staff.
- Item 12: The National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) staff briefed the Committee on the Draft Freight Railroad Realignment Feasibility Study, which was sponsored by DDOT and NCPC and funded under an Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grant.
- Informational Items: Staff updated the Committee on Changes to the “beta” version of a visualization program for the projects in the 2006 CLRP. The Committee was briefed on the version 2.2 travel demand model currently under review. Staff briefed the Committee on an outline of a report that will summarize the travel trends and changing community patterns in the Washington region. Staff briefed the Committee on initial results of the consultant study for enhancing consideration of freight in regional transportation

planning.

4. Report of the Citizen Advisory Committee

Mr. Larsen, the Chairman of the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC), briefed the TPB on the April 12 CAC meeting. He detailed CAC discussion about the projects submitted for air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and FY 2008-2013 TIP. He said discussion focused not on the projects themselves, but the CAC's concerns about the public involvement process related to CLRP submissions. These concerns are reflected in a resolution attached to the monthly report. The resolution refers to the recommendations the CAC made in January of 2006, calling for improvements in CLRP information and analysis.

He said the CAC passed a second resolution strongly supporting the expansion of the Street Smart Campaign. Specifically, the CAC urged the TPB to adopt a staff proposal for funding of the FY 2008 campaign to include, for the first time, two phases, one in the fall of 2007 and one in spring of 2008. He said the CAC also urged TPB member jurisdictions to meet or exceed their suggested contributions for this campaign.

He said the CAC also discussed the process for developing a new TPB participation plan during the spring and summer of 2007. He noted that the Committee looks forward to being part of the development of the Plan, and will continue to discuss it in more detail. He also addressed staff's efforts in scheduling more outreach presentations on the Regional Mobility and Accessibility Scenario Study, and asked that TPB members contact staff if they are interested in sponsoring these events in their jurisdictions.

5. Report of Steering Committee

Mr. Kirby discussed highlights from the Steering Committee meeting on April 6. The Committee approved an amendment to the FY 2006-2011 and FY 2007-2012 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Virginia projects that are exempt from the air quality conformity requirement.

Referring to the letters packet, Item 5, Mr. Kirby reviewed the status of the Metropolitan Area Transportation Operations Coordination (MATOC) Program, which has recently been signed off by the three states and WMATA, thus formalizing the program. MDOT Secretary Porcari suggested the formation of a high-level Advisory Committee to oversee this program.

Mr. Kirby announced that the TPB received a letter from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) approving the conformity analysis that the TPB adopted in October of 2006 and that the 2007 CLRP and FY 2007-2012 TIP are now approved. He noted the inclusion of the final TPB submittal to VDOT for the multi-modal

planning grant program, in which TPB seeks to fund additional projects under the Transportation/Land-Use Connections program.

Mr. Mendelson asked Mr. Kirby to detail the type of involvement MDOT Secretary Porcari recommended for the MATOC Program.

Mr. Kirby said that Secretary Porcari recommended that an executive level committee composed of the state secretaries of transportation and general manager of WMATA oversee this program. Mr. Kirby said he saw this as an indication of the importance MDOT places on this effort.

Mr. Snyder spoke in support of the MATOC Program, adding that it will provide cross-agency, cross-jurisdictional coordination that was lacking in this region on September 11, 2001, and will assist the functioning of the regional transportation agencies should a large scale transportation emergency occur in the future.

Mr. Mendelson asked what the next step was in the development of the MATOC Program.

Mr. Kirby said staff expects to re-advertise for contractor support in April and that he anticipates the first official meeting of the MATOC Steering Committee will occur in May or June.

Mr. Mendelson asked if it would be possible for the MATOC Steering Committee to meet by the next TPB meeting, noting the importance of establishing a multi-jurisdictional committee for the purpose of disaster coordination.

Mr. Kirby said he would take this message back to the MATOC Steering Committee.

6. Chairman's Remarks

Chair Hudgins welcomed Mr. Rust from the Virginia House of Delegates and Mr. May from the Prince William Board of Supervisors, each of whom is a new member of the TPB.

Chair Hudgins acknowledged the role that the Access for All (AFA) Committee has played in the TPB participation process and the progress that has been made in reaching out to diverse communities. She said she feels privileged to serve as the chair of the AFA Committee, now that Ms. Porter has assumed the role of Chair of the Human Services Transportation Coordination Task Force. She said the AFA Committee was honored to have Mr. Catoe, General Manager of WMATA, attend the March meeting and listen to comments and concerns about WMATA from the AFA members.

9. Approval of the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan for the National Capital Region

Ms. Porter thanked the members of the Human Services Transportation Coordination Task Force for their participation in the development of the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan for the National Capital Region. She thanked TPB staff Wendy Klancher and Beth Newman for the great deal of work they put into developing the Plan.

Ms. Porter informed the TPB that the call for applications for the Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC) and New Freedom funding will be issued in May and the application will be due at the end of June.

Ms. Klancher reviewed comments received from WMATA and Community Support Services of Montgomery County. She mentioned that comments were generally positive and supported items in the plan or had additional suggestions for other kinds of coordination opportunities. She highlighted some of the comments:

- WMATA raised a concern regarding the same day service pilot for Metro Access users and mentioned the importance of having accessible taxis in place within the jurisdiction when the pilot begins.
- WMATA also commented that there should be transportation providers represented on the selection committee. Ms. Klancher said that three provider representatives will be on the selection committee, one representative each from a non-profit, a private and a public transit provider. There will be a total of ten members comprising the selection committee.

Ms. Klancher explained that the resolution is quite long because it addresses all of FTA's requirements for the plan.

Ms. Porter made a motion to adopt Resolution R22-2007 to approve the Coordinated Human Services Transportation Plan for the National Capital Region. Mr. Fellows seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

10. Approval of Regional Bike to Work Day 2007 Proclamation

Mr. Ramfos announced that the Commuter Connections Program is again teaming with the Washington Area Bicycle Association (WABA) to host one of the nation's largest Bike to Work Day events, with over 6,000 people expected to participate. He said elected officials are encouraged to bike to work and speak at the local Bike to Work events. He mentioned that Mayor Adrian Fenty has confirmed his participation in this event. He recommended approval of a proclamation establishing May 18, 2007, as Bike to Work Day.

Mr. Zimmerman made a motion to approve the Bike to Work Day 2007 Proclamation. This motion was seconded by Ms. Smyth and passed unanimously.

Chair Hudgins was joined by Mr. Gilliland, Executive Director of WABA, to sign the Bike to Work Day 2007 Proclamation.

7. Review of Comments Received and Approval of Project Submissions for the 2007 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2008-2013 TIP

Mr. Kirby explained the various items that were distributed to the TPB as part of the mailout packet and at the meeting. He said that the mailout item, Item Seven, included a resolution for consideration by the Board that would approve the inclusion of the described project submissions in the air quality conformity analysis for this year's update to the CLRP and TIP. He said that the mailout item also included agency comments received by the time of the April 11 mailout, though the public comment period did not end until three days after the mailout occurred. He distributed at the meeting a packet that included all of the comments received by the April 14 public comment deadline, as well as a memorandum that summarized and grouped the comments and included recommended TPB responses. The memorandum also included an attachment with VDOT responses to agency comments on the I-95/395 High Occupancy/Toll (HOT) Lanes project, plus an attachment with the project submission form for the I-66 Spot Improvements project updated by VDOT to show the responses to agency comments. He noted that all of the comments on the projects had been posted on the Web as they were received.

Referring to his memorandum, Mr. Kirby summarized the comments received about each of the project submissions, including a tally of public comments received in support of and in opposition to the inclusion of each project. He noted that some comments were received in opposition to the Manassas National Battlefield Bypass project, but said that this project was going to remain in study status for this year's planning cycle because there was no identified funding source for the project at this point. He said that the same applied to comments on the proposed US 301 Waldorf Bypass in Maryland, which also remains in study status. He said that there would accordingly be additional opportunities to comment on these projects in the future when they are actually put forward for inclusion in the CLRP and TIP as projects. He said that there were also comments about the 11th Street Bridge and South Capitol Street Bridge projects in the District of Columbia, and that while DDOT had assisted in responding to those comments, there is no action on those projects proposed for this year's planning cycle as they were acted on last year.

Mr. Kirby said that the revised project descriptions for the Virginia projects that were included as attachments to the memorandum reflect changes made by VDOT in response to comments, and were transmitted to TPB staff on Monday the 16th, and forwarded to the Board on Tuesday the 17th, so they are relatively new. He noted that the revised descriptions clearly show text added to or deleted from the previous versions, to aid Board members in understanding the changes made.

Mr. Kirby summarized the 15 comments about the I-95/395 HOT lanes project in Virginia, and said that he would ask Ms. Sorenson to describe the responses. He noted that there has been quite a lot of discussion about the project over the past two months and expressed appreciation for the work that VDOT and the Fluor/Transurban private sector project team have done in providing more details about the project in response to comments. He said that comments have focused on issues of development of the transit plan, possible degradation of service levels on the facility, continued eligibility of the corridor for FTA formula funding, the method of estimating transit operating costs, incident management planning, safety issues in regard to shoulders, traffic mitigation during construction, treatment of traffic at the terminus at each end of the facility, and the relation of the facility to Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) planning. He also said that in response to comments, modeling analysis would be done that includes a third lane restricted to transit vehicles only.

Mr. Kirby said with regard to the I-66 project that a significant change to the project description was its classification as a capacity enhancement project. He said that additional issues raised during the comment period included coordination with the Metro rail extension to Tysons Corner, the NEPA process, and impacts on the Custis Trail.

Mr. Kirby asked Ms. Sorenson to discuss in more detail the VDOT responses to comments about the projects in Virginia.

Ms. Sorenson first addressed the I-66 Spot Improvements project, saying that a VDOT feasibility study had yielded recommendations for some short-term signage and spot improvements along with a recommendation for an environmental impact statement (EIS) to look at all the possibilities for improving I-66 inside the Beltway. She said that VDOT is currently seeking funding for that EIS through the Commonwealth Transportation Board. Referring to the project description form included in Mr. Kirby's memo, Ms. Sorenson addressed the six points of clarification requested by the TPB when it approved preliminary engineering work for the project on January 18, 2006. She summarized the status of VDOT's work in dealing with each issue.

Ms. Sorenson circulated a two-page packet with additional revisions to the project description forms for the two Virginia projects. She described the two changes to the I-66 project description form, which dealt with the process of getting feedback from NVTVA and local jurisdictions on the engineering design drawings for the project, especially in relation to the Metrorail extension and the Custis Trail.

Ms. Sorenson then referred to Attachment B to Mr. Kirby's memorandum, which details VDOT's responses to comments on the I-95/395 HOT Lanes project received from NVTVA, NVTC, PRTC, and Arlington County. She summarized the VDOT responses to each of 15 comments, noting that the comments received from the four agencies were very similar and had been grouped accordingly, with each comment attributed to the corresponding agency or

agencies that submitted it. She also discussed the additional revisions to the project description form for this project listed on the two-page packet distributed at the meeting. These revisions dealt with preservation of the statutory allowance of HOV 3+ vehicles on the facility, review of transit and park-and-ride recommendations, maximum flow rate, reimbursement of FTA revenue in the event of exclusion from FTA fixed-guideway formula funding, and incident and congestion management planning.

Ms. Sorenson moved to adopt Resolution R21-2007 to approve the submissions for inclusion in the air quality conformity analysis for the 2007 CLRP and the FY 2008-2013 TIP.

Mr. Rust seconded the motion.

Mr. Zimmerman asked to clarify that the motion included the revisions Ms. Sorenson had just circulated, and noted a typo in the first revision.

Chair Hudgins said that the motion included all of the revisions and fixes to any typos.

Mr. Zimmerman said that efforts had been made to make the comments from Northern Virginia agencies as consistent as possible, though there were some individual agencies with unique concerns. He said that this reflects how closely the professional staffs from the agencies work together on such matters. He said that many of the points made come down to a fundamental concern about tampering with the most successful HOV facility in the country and whether conversion of this facility into an HOT facility will preserve effectiveness that the facility currently has in serving a high level of demand. He said that in this way, the facility is different than the HOT conversion examples cited in Southern California where the HOV lanes were not heavily used. Mr. Zimmerman said that the facility is effective at moving more people in fewer vehicles, not just in HOVs but on transit, and noted that it was initially built as a transit facility.

Mr. Zimmeman said that he appreciates the revisions made by VDOT in an attempt to address the concerns raised by Northern Virginia agencies, but that he had lingering questions about a couple of issues he did not think were fully addressed. He said that the emphasis placed on free flow conditions helps alleviate some concerns about degradation of transit service, but that the commenting agencies are essentially seeking recognition by the project consortium of the primacy of public transportation on this facility. He said that would require not only assurances of free flow but that the overall interests of transit users are not damaged, and that this includes ensuring that the facility continues to qualify for federal transit funds in the long term. Related to that issue, he said he was still seeking a response to the suggestion of making the additional third lane to be added to the two-lane facility a transit-only lane. He pointed out that this would ensure that the facility would meet federal criteria for transit funding, and noted that the conversion was initially described as BRT/HOT but that the BRT has kind of been lost along the way.

Ms. Sorenson said she had missed going over that point in her remarks, and said that the project

consortium partners had agreed to examine a scenario in which the new lane would be reserved for buses.

Mr. Zimmerman suggested that the transit-only lane scenario provision be included as a condition of approval of the item.

Chair Hudgins said that the issue was addressed in the VDOT response to comment number 12 from the Northern Virginia agencies.

Mr. Zimmerman said that the response indicated agreement by VDOT and the project consortium but that he was seeking to include as part of the approval of the motion a commitment on the part of the consortium.

Mr. Zimmerman said that Ms. Sorenson had also failed to address concerns about the northern terminus of the facility at the 14th Street Bridge. He said that simply assuming the facility will funnel on to the bridge without problems was not acceptable, and while he understood VDOT's stance that the bridge is outside their authority, he thought the TPB, as the regional body, should be on record calling for coordination between jurisdictions on the 14th Street Bridge terminus. He proposed the addition of the following text on page 6 of the action item at the end of the first paragraph: "The project will consider the extension of the HOT lanes across the 14th Street Bridge and will work with the District of Columbia, FHWA, and Northern Virginia jurisdictions to evaluate the benefits of the extension."

Chair Hudgins asked for concurrence on Mr. Zimmerman's additions and found no objection.

Ms. Ticer spoke in favor of the HOT lane project and said that she saw an enormous potential for addressing congestion, and the problems it causes in the region, through the use of variable pricing. She noted that the region has been discussing congestion pricing for many years and that finally there is the prospect of really implementing it. She said that given the tight funding situation in Virginia, officials can not turn away from the revenue that the project offers. She said that transit service will not be degraded and that the issue has been adequately addressed by the consortium. She said that the project will add capacity to the HOV lanes, help address choke points, assist in the development of park-and-ride lots, improve conditions for slug users, and improve incident response through advanced technology. She said that it was time for the TPB to actually move forward with a congestion pricing project after talking about it for so many years.

Ms. Smyth asked in regard to the I-66 Spot Improvements project for clarification on the issue of possible impacts on development of a third Metrorail track. She noted that while one VDOT response indicates that extension of Metrorail to Tysons Corner would not be precluded, a separate response says that the design of a third rail may require portions of the roadway to be relocated or require design exceptions for narrow shoulders. She asked if such designs would also be shown to NVTVA.

Ms. Sorenson said that the current project deals only with taking care of choke points and does not address the issue of adding a third rail to Metro, which would be considered in the broader environmental impact study. She said that VDOT would not be precluding a third rail addition in the spot improvements work.

Ms. Smyth noted that the statement only says that extension of Metrorail to Tysons Corner would not be precluded.

Ms. Sorenson said that a third rail would not be precluded.

Ms. Smyth asked for clarification of the responses to comment number four from the Northern Virginia agencies regarding shoulder width, in relation to comment number six about not degrading safety on the corridor. She said that the agencies would like assurances in writing that the level of safety and incident management will be the same and will not be degraded by shoulder reductions.

Ms. Sorenson said that VDOT has committed to looking at making sure there are adequate shoulders along the entire route, although there may be a location or two for which VDOT may have to seek a design exception for slightly narrower shoulders. She said that such information will be available for review when design work is completed.

Ms. Smyth asked if that information would also be presented to NVTA.

Ms. Sorenson said it would be.

Ms. Smyth asked if some kind of statement to that effect could be added to the text.

Ms. Sorenson said she would add mention of adequate shoulders to the text indicating that engineering drawings would be shared with NVTA and local jurisdictions to demonstrate that adjacent parkland and the trail will be maintained.

Mr. Snyder noted that he and Mr. Kirby had started discussion of HOT lanes in the region about a decade ago and faced opposition from many angles, but that happily the TPB was now at a point of considering a very serious option for implementation. He said that maximizing the safe use of the transportation system for multiple modes is crucial for maintaining credibility with the public, and that he views the two Virginia projects as efforts to do so. He said, however, that it is very important that there not be a cost in safety, and that he therefore strongly supported Ms. Smyth's previous request for such assurances. He asked for similar language for the I-95/395 project to include that adequate shoulders shall be assured and overall safety improved. He asked if Ms. Sorenson could agree to this assurance, parallel to what was just agreed to for the I-66 project.

Ms. Sorenson said that the issue of shoulders for the I-95/395 project was still unresolved. She said that some design exceptions may be necessary and she would not want to preclude flexibility in treatment of shoulders on the corridor, as some stretches may have to be narrower for short distances. She suggested language that would state that information on design will be made available and comments solicited. She said that FHWA would not grant design exceptions if safety would, in their view, be compromised.

Mr. Snyder asked if Ms. Sorenson could agree to the same language for the I-95/I-395 project as for the I-66 project, in response to Ms. Smyth's questions.

Ms. Sorenson said that she was not sure she could make a similar assurance as there will be places where the shoulders will have to be narrowed and design exceptions sought.

Mr. Snyder said he simply wanted a statement that adequate shoulders shall be assured, and that if VDOT was not prepared to commit to that, he could not vote for inclusion of the project. He said he thought the issue was important to safety and that while some flexibility in width may be appropriate, he was seeking the same assurance provided for the I-66 project of adequate shoulders.

Ms. Sorenson suggested using the phrase "adequate shoulders or other means of providing safety."

Mr. Snyder said that such a statement was not sufficient for him to be able to support the project. He said that while having narrower shoulders is one thing, having no shoulders at all is something quite different.

Ms. Sorenson said that she wasn't saying there would be no shoulders at all, but that she did not want to imply that they would be 12 foot shoulders for the entire length of the facility.

Mr. Snyder said it was fine to say that they may not be 12 feet everywhere, but he would like a commitment to adequate shoulders, with the understanding that they may not always be 12 feet.

Ms. Sorenson said she could make such an assurance.

Mr. Snyder thanked Ms. Sorenson for that assurance. He also said that he agreed with Mr. Zimmerman's comments, and said that he thought there would be environmental benefits from the project in that it will use existing corridors and capacity more efficiently as opposed to building new highways.

Ms. Tregoning asked for clarification with respect to the environmental impact studies being contemplated for I-66. She said that there seemed to be contradictory language in another part of the project description form saying that VDOT was essentially pursuing a categorical exclusion. She said she wasn't certain if that was only pertaining to a certain part of the project.

Ms. Sorenson said that the project being proposed at the time, limited to the spot improvements, is covered by a categorical exclusion. She said that a full EIS, however, would look at the entire corridor including suggestions for various transit options.

Ms. Tregoning asked if, given the uncertainty about funding for the full EIS, it would certainly take place of if it was only an option if the money is found.

Ms. Sorenson said that the EIS was one of two recommendations by the feasibility study, the first of which was the interim improvements included in the project submission. She said that the Commonwealth Transportation Board had only funded the interim improvements at this point. She confirmed that the full EIS was just an option at this point and was not certain to move forward.

Ms. Tregoning said that while she appreciated the work done by VDOT and TPB staff in addressing comments and preparing materials for the meeting, she was a bit overwhelmed by all of the different pieces of information, including the relevant points in Mr. Larsen's report of the Citizens Advisory Committee. She said that given the importance of the decisions and the extensiveness of the public comment, she would like more time to consider all the information. She said that she remained uncertain about the entirety of what was being voted on. She asked Mr. Kirby what the consequences would be of delaying the vote by a month to provide more opportunity for review of all the information presented.

Mr. Kirby said that a delay of the vote by a month would delay the approval process later in the year. He said the current schedule is for the process to be completed with final approval in November, but a delay would push that back by a month, along with federal approval of the plan.

Mr. Rust asked for clarification of whether an EIS was required for the I-66 interim improvements proposed or if it would only be required in advance of some additional phase which might involve rail or bus or highway widenings.

Ms. Sorenson said that additional future improvements could not be made without an EIS.

Ms. Erickson asked if there would be another process of reviewing the projects in the fall after the conformity process. She asked if specific text approved now could potentially be changed again later on.

Mr. Kirby said that there would be another decision point later on to review the analysis and act on it to move forward. He said, however, that this particular point was important because if the Board changes its mind later on a project or aspects of a project that affect the air quality conformity analysis, the analysis would have to be started over again. He said that it is preferable to spend a little extra time now to get issues resolved than to end up backtracking later on.

Chair Hudgins sought to clarify that Mr. Kirby was saying that the greater risk lies in moving forward without clarity versus delaying a month in order to get clarity on the projects in question.

Mr. Kirby said that if the TPB gets to a point in the fall when all the analysis is done, and then decides to exclude or significantly change a project, the analysis would have to be done again, which would take several months and be a waste of resources.

Mr. Lovain said that he appreciated the clarifications on the I-95/395 project and said that moving ahead with it would be appropriate. He said he especially appreciated consideration of incident response concerns and that the project could end up being a model for the region in that regard. He said he had one additional concern about access at the Seminary Road exit. He noted that it is listed as bus only access, but the response indicates that the ultimate configuration will be based on the outcome of the NEPA process and further operational studies. He said he would appreciate further assurances that the option of a general purpose lane exit at Seminary Road is not on the table.

Ms. Sorenson said that option is not on the table.

Mr. May said that this was just his second TPB meeting and he is already having to deal with an issue that is very controversial in his jurisdiction. He said that the Prince William County Board of Supervisors, of which he is a member, passed a unanimous resolution on February 20, 2007 expressing serious concerns about the I-95/395 HOT Lanes project. He thanked the project consortium for its attempts to resolve some of the concerns of the Northern Virginia jurisdictions but said that he continued to have concerns about the circularity of how some of the questions have been addressed. He said an example was the concern about the project not harming HOV users, with the response being simply an assurance that the project will not adversely affect HOV users. He also asked if there were any more details about the number of spaces and locations of two park-and-ride lots in Prince William County that are part of the project.

Ms. Sorenson said that the total number of spaces for the project was 3,000, but she could not say how many would be in each location.

Mr. May asked if connections to the facility proposed in Prince William County would be slip ramps or flyovers.

Ms. Sorenson said that the item information reflects the current proposal for those connections, but that the issue is open to suggestions and comments.

Mr. May said that his Board continued to have concerns about how the level of service on the facility will be maintained and asked if that may involve at some point in the future a change from HOV-3 to HOV-4.

Ms. Sorenson said that Virginia state law currently mandates HOV-3.

Mr. May asked for clarification on the construction timeline, specifically if it was possible that the project might not begin until late 2008 or even 2009.

Ms. Sorenson said that the latest information she had indicated that construction would begin in early 2008.

Mr. May said that he was constrained in his vote by the resolution passed by his Board, which still has concerns it feels have not been addressed. He said that his Board would continue to work to get those concerns resolved, but for now would be withholding its support for the project.

Mr. Staton asked what the current traffic volume is on the I-95/395 HOV lanes, especially in relation to the assumption of 1,600 vehicles per lane per hour for free flow on the converted HOT lanes.

Ms. Sorenson said that the latest figures indicate about 1,900 vehicles per lane per hour.

Mr. Staton pointed out that the current level already exceeds the free flow assumption. He asked what entity would be collecting the revenues generated by the HOT lanes.

Ms. Sorenson said that the revenues would be collected by the private-sector project consortium.

Mr. Staton noted that all of the new transit infrastructure including buses and park-and-ride lots are to be paid for by the HOT lane revenues. He asked how such revenue could be generated if the assumed capacity of the lanes is already exceeded by the current volume of HOV customers, who would continue to be able to use the facility for free.

Ms. Sorenson pointed out that an additional lane was being added to the facility, enforcement will be more stringent, and hybrid vehicles will no longer be allowed to use the facility for free, so the number of vehicles using the facility for free is expected to be much lower than the current volume.

Mr. Staton said that his larger point was that the facility is already heavily used and that it can be expected given current volumes that the converted facility would continue to have a lot of free users. He said he wondered how it could still generate enough revenue to pay for the planned infrastructure, and asked how much the facility is estimated to generate each month.

Ms. Sorenson said she did not know what the estimate was for monthly revenue, but that the private consortium believes it can pay debt service, pay for transit infrastructure, and continue to turn a profit.

Mr. Staton asked how it would be determined if a car is or is not HOV-3, given that toll

collection will be completely electronic.

Ms. Sorenson said that the consortium is considering three different electronic means of tolling, but that some degree of police enforcement would probably be necessary.

Mr. Staton asked if there was any plan for determining if a car is HOV-3 or not before it enters the facility in the first place. He asked if the proposal was to charge everyone at first and then sort out later which vehicles were HOV-3.

Ms. Sorenson said that a vehicle would have to have a transponder to use the lanes, and one method being used at other HOT facilities is to allow for the transponder to be disabled or set to a different mode if the vehicle is claiming HOV-3 status.

Mr. Staton asked if drivers of single-occupant vehicles would not just be able to do the same in order to avoid tolls.

Ms. Sorenson said that such a driver would then take the risk of being caught, just as many drivers are caught in violation of the current HOV system.

Mr. Staton said that he had heard much discussion about the potential benefits of the revenue stream to be generated by the facility, and simply wanted to raise possible reasons why revenues may fall below expectations.

Chair Hudgins said that she agreed with Mr. Staton's desire to make sure the expectations for the benefits of conversion are realistic, but that the discussion needed to be brought to a close in the interest of time.

Mr. Kirby noted that in keeping with the federally-mandated financial constraint of the CLRP, the TPB will be carrying out its own analysis to demonstrate that the project is financially viable. He said that preliminary study has indicated that the facility should perform quite well financially. He said that while the facility may have high volumes of free users at peak periods, it is a 24-hour facility and will generate revenues throughout the day. He said that it will likely be expensive to travel on the lanes as an SOV during peak periods. He also noted that the private consortium is drawing upon lessons in tolling technology and enforcement from existing HOT facilities in California.

Mr. Moneme said that the District of Columbia is generally supportive of moving forward with value pricing alternatives and new technologies. He said that it is important to look at the facility as a regional facility that facilitates travel into and out of the urban core, and to consider not just how people get to the edge of the core but how they get to their destinations. He said that he agreed with Mr. Zimmerman's focus on bus service and noted that bus service is one cost-effective way of getting people on into the core. He said that accordingly, the District of Columbia is looking forward to being actively involved in the process of planning for the

northern terminus of the project at the 14th Street Bridge.

Mr. Mendelson thanked VDOT for being responsive and seeking to make assurances and clarifications in response to questions and concerns. He said that as the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the region, TPB members have a duty to ensure that the transportation plans and the projects to be added to the plans are safe as well as efficient. He said that his sense was that many Board members are not satisfied with the assurances made about some of the projects, and that given the consequences cited by Mr. Kirby of making changes to the projects after the air quality conformity analysis is complete, it would be appropriate to take some extra time to get issues resolved now. He said that he would be more comfortable if he could see all the assurances and changes together in one document, and that he had lingering concerns about the commitment to HOV-3 in the HOT lane project, safety issues related to the presence of shoulders on both the I-66 and I-95/395 facilities, and the connection of the HOT lane facility with the 14th Street Bridge.

Mr. Mendelson moved to postpone action on Resolution R21-2007 to the May TPB meeting.

Mr. Snyder raised a point of order, noting that a motion was already on the floor, making another motion out of order.

Ms. Porter said that a motion to table, as she understood Mr. Mendelson's motion to be, is always in order.

Mr. Fellows seconded the motion.

Mr. Zimmerman said he understood the discomfort expressed by other members, and said that because this process is the most important reason for the existence of the TPB, it is important that everyone is comfortable that the Board is being sufficiently deliberative. He noted that only four days had passed since the close of the public comment period, and that many members did not get to see comments until just recently, with some new information distributed just in the last couple of hours. He said he supported the motion to postpone action.

Ms. Ticer said she disagreed with the motion to postpone action, and encouraged Board members with remaining concerns to be specific in the questions they would like to see addressed further. She said that previous questions were well addressed by VDOT and noted that a delay of a month can mean a large increase in costs for a transportation project.

Mr. Rust said he concurred with Ms. Ticer, and asked Ms. Sorenson if she would even be able to provide any more definitive answers next month given that there still will not be detailed design information by that time.

Ms. Sorenson said she supported the comments from Mr. Rust and Ms. Ticer, and said while she may be able to provide a little more information next month related to some of the issues raised, the project is where it is. She noted that one of the recent amendments to the projects allows for

further review by NVTA of engineering drawings upon their completion. She said that VDOT had tried to answer all of the Board's questions, and recommended that the Board move forward with the action.

Mr. Staton said that he would vote against postponement because he did not think his questions could be answered any further in a month's time.

Mr. Smith said he was satisfied that all of the concerns that were raised had been addressed and that he opposed the motion to postpone action.

Ms. Smyth said that her concern was having so much new information presented to the Board at the last minute, and not having something comprehensive in writing that could be understood and voted on. She said that there might be a larger procedural issue to be dealt with in that the Board was being asked to make important decisions without getting crucial information until shortly before the meeting.

Mr. Fellows called the question.

Chair Hudgins took a voice vote on the motion to table the item until the May TPB meeting. The voice vote was inconclusive and voting was conducted by a show of hands. The result was 13 votes in favor of the motion to table, and 12 votes against.

Ms. Sorenson asked for the tally to be repeated as she had not heard the count.

Mr. Kirby repeated the results of the vote – 13 in favor of the motion to table, and 12 opposed.

Ms. Sorenson asked for a weighted vote to be taken on the motion.

Mr. Kirby said that such a vote could be taken, and that Ms. Sorenson's request was in order.

Chair Hudgins recognized the request for a weighted vote.

Mr. Mendelson asked if there was any advance notice required for a weighted vote.

Mr. Kirby said that TPB bylaws allow for a weighted vote at the request of any voting member at any time during the meeting. He said that he would take a roll call vote and a computer program would calculate the weighted vote. He explained that under the weighted voting procedure, there are five votes each for the District of Columbia, Suburban Maryland, and Northern Virginia, and that WMATA is nonvoting. He said that in the District of Columbia, one vote is for DDOT, one for the Office of Planning, and three for the three Council representatives. In Suburban Maryland MDOT gets one vote, the House and Senate representatives each get one-half of a vote, and the remaining three votes are allocated in shares among the local jurisdictions based on population, with the same applying to Northern Virginia. He said that the total votes for each

state are weighted up to five if not all the voting members are present.

Mr. Kirby conducted a roll call vote on the motion to table, with the results as follows:

DC Department of Transportation:	Yes
DC Office of Planning:	Yes
DC Councilmember Mendelson:	Yes
DC Councilmember Graham:	Absent
DC Councilmember 3 :	Vacant

Maryland Department of Transportation:	No
City of Bowie:	Absent
Charles County:	Yes
College Park:	Yes
Frederick County:	No
City of Frederick:	No
City of Gaithersburg:	Yes
City of Greenbelt:	Absent
Montgomery County Executive:	No
Montgomery County Legislative:	Absent
Prince George's County Executive:	No
Prince George's County Legislative:	Absent
City of Rockville:	Absent
City of Takoma Park:	Yes
Maryland House of Delegates:	Absent
Maryland Senate:	Absent

Virginia Department of Transportation:	No
City of Alexandria:	No
Arlington County:	Yes
City of Fairfax:	Absent
Fairfax County Legislative (Hudgins):	Yes
Fairfax County Legislative (Smyth):	Yes
City of Falls Church:	Abstain
Loudoun County:	No
City of Manassas:	Yes
City of Manassas Park:	No
Prince William County:	Yes
Virginia House of Delegates:	No
Virginia Senate:	No

Mr. Kirby repeated the votes to ensure they had been recorded correctly.

Chair Hudgins asked Mr. Kirby if any other agenda items could be addressed while the weighted vote was being calculated.

Mr. Kirby suggested that the Board could proceed with Item 13.

NOTICE ITEM

13. Notice of Proposed Amendment to the 2006 CLRP and FY 2007-2012 TIP to Include Construction of an Interchange at US 340 and Jefferson Technology Park in Frederick County, as Requested by the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT), and Notice of Draft Scope of Work for an Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the Amendment.

Ms. Erickson said that Mr. Minnitte had to leave the meeting and that she would be summarizing the item. She said that MDOT was proposing an amendment to the 2006 CLRP and FY 2007-2012 TIP for a project that would trigger the conformity requirement, so they were also proposing a draft scope of work for the air quality conformity assessment. She said that the notice given today announces the release at the CAC meeting on April 12 of the plan amendment and draft scope of work for a 30-day public comment period, which will end May 12. She said that the TPB would be asked to act on moving ahead with the conformity analysis at its May meeting, be briefed on the conformity results at its June meeting, and then review public comment and formally adopt the amendment at its July meeting. She said that a representative from the Maryland State Highway Administration was present to give a more detailed presentation, but in the interest of time she said that presentation would be omitted and she referred members to the handout on the item for more information. She asked Board members to contact her with any questions.

ACTION ITEMS continued

7. Review of Comments Received and Approval of Project Submissions for the 2007 Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and FY 2008-2013 TIP continued

Mr. Kirby announced that the result of the weighted vote was 7.81 in favor of the motion to table, and 7.19 opposed. He said that copies of the calculation would be printed and made available (see attachment).

Chair Hudgins thanked VDOT for the responses they provided to the concerns raised, and asked Board Members to submit any additional questions or concerns quickly so that staff could combine them into a single document that would be available well in advance of the next TPB meeting.

Ms. Sorenson said she agreed with Chair Hudgins and said she hoped that next month's meeting would not be a repeat of this meeting, with Board members raising new issues at the last minute. She said that VDOT would work with TPB staff to make information available in advance of the next meeting.

Chair Hudgins deferred Items 8, 11, and 12 to the next TPB meeting with the consent of the Board.

15. Adjourn

Chair Hudgins adjourned the meeting at 2:55 pm.

Motion to delay adoption of TPB Resolution R21-2007

April 18, 2007

District of Columbia		Yes	No
Department of Transportation	Yes	1.67	0.00
Office of Planning	Yes	1.67	0.00
City Council	Yes	1.67	0.00
City Council	Absent	0.00	0.00
City Council	Absent	0.00	0.00
District of Columbia Total		5.00	0.00

Maryland		Yes	No
Department of Transportation	No	0.00	1.25
Bowie	Absent	0.00	0.00
Charles County	Yes	0.18	0.00
College Park	Yes	0.09	0.00
Frederick County	No	0.00	0.27
City of Frederick	No	0.00	0.09
Gaithersburg	Yes	0.09	0.00
Greenbelt	Absent	0.00	0.00
Montgomery County			
Executive	No	0.00	1.55
Legislative	Absent	0.00	0.00
Prince George's County			
Executive	No	0.00	1.37
Legislative	Absent	0.00	0.00
Rockville	Absent	0.00	0.00
Takoma Park	Yes	0.09	0.00
Maryland House of Delegates	Absent	0.00	0.00
Maryland Senate	Absent	0.00	0.00
Maryland Total		0.46	4.54

Virginia		Yes	No
Department of Transportation	No	0.00	1.00
Alexandria	No	0.00	0.21
Arlington County	Yes	0.29	0.00
City of Fairfax	Absent	0.00	0.00
Fairfax County			
Legislative I	Yes	0.75	0.00
Legislative II	Yes	0.75	0.00
Falls Church	Abstain	0.00	0.00
Loudoun County	No	0.00	0.36
City of Manassas	Yes	0.07	0.00
City of Manassas Park	No	0.00	0.07
Prince William County	Yes	0.50	0.00
Virginia House of Delegates	No	0.00	0.50
Virginia Senate	No	0.00	0.50
Virginia Total		2.36	2.64

Yes: 7.81

No: 7.19