
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
November 16, 2016

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT

Bob Brown, Loudoun County
James Davenport, Prince William County
Allison Davis, WMATA
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Dan Emerine, DC Office of Planning
Gary Erenrich, Montgomery County DOT
Jay Fisette, Arlington County
Jason Groth, Charles County
Rene'e Hamilton, VDOT
Neil Harris, City of Gaithersburg
Konrad Herling, City of Greenbelt
Catherine Hudgins, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
John Jenkins, Prince William County
R. Earl Lewis, Jr. MDOT
Shyam Kannan, WMATA
Tim Lovain, City of Alexandria
Dan Malouff, Arlington County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
David Meyer, Fairfax City Council
Ron Meyer, Loudoun County
Jackson Miller, Virginia House of Delegates
Bridget Donnell Newton, City of Rockville
Martin Nohe, Prince William County
Mark Rawlings, DC DOT
Kelly Russell, City of Frederick
Peter Schwartz, Fauquier County
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
Todd M. Turner, Prince George's County
Jonathan Way, Manassas City
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County/DPW&T
David Whitaker, Frederick County
Sam Zimbabwe, DDOT

MWCOG STAFF AND OTHERS PRESENT

John Swanson
Eric Randall
Ronald Milone
Rich Roisman
Dusan Vuksan
William Bacon
Charlene Howard
Ken Joh
Mark Moran
Jane Posey

Wendy Klancher	
Andrew Austin	
Michael Farrell	
Ben Hampton	
Bryan Hayes	
Abigail Zenner	
Sergio Ritacco	
Arianna Koudoumas	
Ken Joh	
Lori Zeller	
Charlene Howard	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Chuck Bean	COG/EO
Steve Kania	COG/OC
Paul Des Jardin	COG/DCPS
Kari Snyder	MDOT
Gary V. Hodge	CAC – Maryland
Jeanette Tejada de Gomez	AAA Mid-Atlantic
Malcolm Watson	FCDOT
Kevin McNulty	Northern Virginia Chamber
Bobby Klancher	Loudoun Board of Supervisors
Debbie Spielberg	Montgomery County/Councilmember Marc Elrich
Patricia Happ	NVTC
Norman Whitaker	VDOT
Regina Moore	VDOT
Maria Sinner	VDOT
Monica Backmon	NVTA
Sree Nampoothin	NVTA
Stewart Schwartz	CSG
Nancy Smith	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Todd Horsley	VDRPT
Sonali Giovigi	Virginia Railway Express
Al Francese	Centreville Citizens for Rail
Sydney Hawthorne	DC Council/Chairman Mendelson
Mike Lake	Fairfax County DOT
Robert M. Whitfield	Fairfax County Taxpayers Alliance

1. PUBLIC COMMENT ON TPB PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES

Mr. McNulty from the Northern Virginia Chamber of Commerce spoke in favor of the new projects in the 2016 CLRP Amendment. He said his organization supports a regional transportation system that relieves congestion, spurs economic development, and is a good return on taxpayers' investments. He specifically supported the I-395 express lanes.

Mr. Shaw from the Prince William Chamber of Commerce spoke in support of the I-395 express lanes to help spur economic development and to reduce congestion.

Mr. Schwartz from the Coalition for Smarter Growth spoke in support of the DC projects, the Crystal City Transitway, and the VRE extension. He expressed concerns about the road projects and that Metro was not included in the CLRP. He asked that there be greater consideration of transit and Metro in the future development of an unconstrained long range plan.

Ms. Smith from the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance expressed support for the new projects in the 2016 CLRP Amendment. She specifically mentioned her support for the I-66 inside and outside the Beltway improvements.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 19 MEETING

A motion was made to approve the minutes from the October 19 meeting. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

3. REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Roseboom presented the report of the Technical Committee. He reported that the Technical committee met on November 4 and reviewed several items on the TPB agenda. The Technical Committee received reports on the 2016 CLRP Amendment and the TIP. They also received an update on the joint planning regulations from Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration. They also heard reports on Metro, the Climate Energy Policy Committee, and a recap of the Traffic Incident Management conference. All of these items are referenced in the report that was handed out at the meeting.

4. REPORT OF THE CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Stewart delivered the report of the Citizen Advisory Committee. The committee was briefed on the TPB's transportation safety activities and the TPB's regional environmental justice analysis. Within the transportation safety activities briefing there was an update on Vision Zero efforts that the CAC had previously supported. The CAC was also briefed on how staff has worked on designating communities of concern in response to environmental justice requirements, and how this analysis will figure into the CLRP.

5. STEERING COMMITTEE ACTIONS AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Mr. Srikanth delivered the Report of the Director and Steering Committee. He referred to the written report in the meeting materials and summarized it. He reported that the Steering Committee met on November 4 and there were no TIP amendments to approve. They did review the agenda for the TPB meeting. Within the letters sent/received he noted that there were copies of the comments that staff submitted to the Federal Highway Administration. He noted that these were a second set of comments submitted as requested by the federal agencies regarding MPO rules on planning areas and planning documents. The agencies specifically wanted to know how those changes would impact MPO functioning and budget. He also referred to a letter from WMATA regarding their continued support for the Street Smart safety program. He also referred to memos regarding the Traffic Incident Management conference, the Street Smart kick-off press event, and a report from the Associations of MPOs annual

meeting that was held in Texas the previous month. The last item he pointed out was the application process for the Citizens Advisory Committee and he requested that the TPB members help recruit new CAC members.

6. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Mr. Lovain began his remarks explaining that the tenures of the chairman and the two vice chairs expire at the end of the year and explained that he would be convening a nominating committee to bring back a slate of officers to the board. He explained that he will be reaching out to a board member from the District, Maryland, and Virginia who have served as chairmen of the board in the past to serve on this committee and that the staff will also assist the committee in their work in developing a slate of officers. He then spoke about the Traffic Incident Management conference, explaining that there was a good discussion and participation. He said that there are many important efforts related to incident management underway in the region. He said that after the conference he talked with the National Park Service to get them together with the Virginia DOT to discuss safety patrols on the George Washington Parkway. He also mentioned his two other priorities—Metro funding and the Long-Range Plan Task Force—that would be on the agenda later in the meeting. He finished his remarks by introducing a new member of the TPB from the Virginia House of Delegates, Delegate Jackson Miller.

INFORMATION ITEMS

7. REVIEW OF ALL COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE 30-DAY PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD AND ACCEPTANCE OF RECOMMENDED RESPONSES FOR THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS, THE 2016 FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN, AND THE FY 2017-2022 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

Referring to the mailout and handout material, Ms. Erickson explained that she would brief the board on Items 7-11, which included actions related to the federal requirements for the approval of the Constrained Long-Range Plan and Transportation Improvement Program. She said these items included a review of the comments received during the 30-day public comment period and acceptance of those responses, the air quality conformity analysis, the CLRP amendment, and the new TIP. She described the process for developing the CLRP over the past year.

Referring to the handout material for Item 7, Ms. Erickson said the TPB had received comments from more than 450 individuals, businesses, organizations, and governmental representatives. She said the staff memorandum grouped similar comments and provided responses. Most of the comments were grouped by individual projects. She separately described the groups of comments and staff responses.

Regarding I-66 improvements outside the Beltway, Ms. Smyth asked about a public comment that said that trucks should not be allowed on the facility because of noise. The staff response to this comment noted that VDOT had earlier found that allowing trucks would provide revenue and other benefits, and thus they would be permitted under VDOT's arrangement with the private contractor. Ms. Smyth said, however, that the environmental assessment for the facility was not complete, and in particular, she expressed concern that the analysis only seemed to be looking at through-traffic, not the impacts on neighborhoods when trucks use ramps.

Ms. Hamilton said that concerns about noise would be included in an environmental reevaluation that would be required at a later stage under the NEPA process. She said this would include new project details that were provided by the new project partners, including impacts on neighborhoods. She said that these issues would be part of the public process of a design public hearing.

Ms. Smyth said a description of these future steps should be part of the response.

Ms. Erickson suggested the comment could be changed to include the following: "And design public hearings, which will include a reevaluation of the environmental process."

Ms. Smyth agreed, adding that the language should also include: "including the impacts from the addition of trucks."

Chairman Lovain said that, without objection, this change would be included.

Regarding the I-66 inside the Beltway project, a question was asked about whether new capacity would be reserved for transit.

Ms. Hamilton answered that the project proposed for the CLRP would preserve 42 feet in the median for transit expansion, both in Fairfax and in Prince William counties.

Referring to a handout memorandum, Ms. Klancher briefed that board on comments on the CLRP that were issued by the TPB's Access for All Advisory Committee. She said that DC Councilmember Charles Allen, who is chairman of the AFA committee, was unable to attend the meeting to present the comments.

Ms. Erickson called attention to comments submitted by TPB member Mr. Schwartz, which were distributed separately.

In closing, Ms. Erickson said that staff recommended that the TPB accept the recommended responses to comments received for the air quality conformity analysis, the 2016 CLRP Amendment, and the FY 2017-22 TIP, with the changes that we made for Ms. Smyth.

A motion was made to approve the comments. The motion was seconded and was approved in a voice vote.

8. APPROVAL OF THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS OF THE 2016 CLRP AMENDMENT AND 2017-2022 TIP

Referring to the mailout and handout material, Ms. Erickson briefed the board on the air quality conformity analysis. She explained that the findings of the analysis, which were presented at the October board meeting, demonstrate adherence to all mobile source emissions budgets for ground level ozone precursors, volatile organic compounds, and nitrogen oxides, and meet all regulatory, planning, and inter-agency consultation requirements.

Ms. Erickson called attention to comments submitted by the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC), along with staff responses to those comments. She individually described those comments and responses. In summary, she said that staff recommends that the TPB adopt Resolution R3-2017, finding that the 2016 CLRP amendment and the 2017 to 2022 TIP conforms with the requirements of the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990.

Mr. Way asked to whether it is known to what degree the decline in emissions is due to federally imposed mandatory standards and how much was due to regional initiatives.

Mr. Srikanth said staff does not have a quantitative analysis of this question, but he noted that previous assessments found that most of the forecast reductions are due to federal rules mandating vehicle efficiency and fuel efficiency. He noted, however, that local transportation investments, land use investments, and land use policies also contribute to the reductions. As examples, he highlighted some transit investments included in the CLRP.

Mr. Gary Erenrich asked a question about standards for PM10 and PM 2.5. He said that in the past, those criteria were considered the most difficult to reach. He noted that this year, conformity for these criteria was not included in the analysis

Mr. Srikanth said the standard for particulates no longer applies to our region because the federal agencies have withdrawn it and also because the region has met the standard.

Mr. Snyder asked whether forecasts for transit trips assumed a Metro system that would continue to lose riders or a system that would be fixed and funded.

Mr. Srikanth said the CLRP assumes the level of funding that currently exists for Metro, which does not include 100% eight-car trains or additional capacity within the D.C. core beyond 2020.

Speaking as a member of MWAQC, Mr. Snyder read some sections of the MWAQC letter to the TPB. He read a portion that emphasized the need to continue efforts to meet the ozone standard. He also read a portion that urged the TPB's continued investment in strategies to reduce VMT and emissions, including public transit. He said that MWAQC agrees that the region is currently in compliance with conformity requirements, but the reality is that the standards are getting tougher and our ability to meet them requires continuation and enforcement of federal standards and continued activities in this region.

Mr. Snyder asked for a slight amendment to the last Whereas clause so that it would read: "this provided favorable comments and other comments relating to the region's air quality." In closing, he noted that it is important not just to focus on reducing congestion on our roads, but also to reduce congestion in our lungs and hearts.

Chairman Lovain asked if there were any comments or objections in response to Mr. Snyder's proposed addition. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to adopt Resolution R3-2017 as amended.

A motion was made to adopt the resolution and was seconded. It was passed unanimously.

9. APPROVAL OF THE 2016 CONSTRAINED LONG-RANGE PLAN (CLRP) AMENDMENT

Referring to the mailout materials, Ms. Erickson described the federal requirements and the development process for the CLRP. She said that staff recommended that the TPB adopt Resolution R4-2017, approving the 2016 CLRP amendment.

Ms. Smyth asked for a clarification regarding whether trucks would be permitted to use the future HOT lanes on I-66 outside the Beltway.

Ms. Hamilton confirmed that the project would go through additional review, and if there are significant changes, it might come back to the TPB as part of a CLRP action in the future.

Mr. Kannan said that last year, WMATA cast a "no" vote on the CLRP Amendment and would do the same this year. He said there are many good and important projects in the CLRP, but with regard to WMATA projects until the plan reflects the level of funding that is necessary, then WMATA would vote "no."

Mr. Meyer moved approval of Resolution R4-2017 approving the 2016 CLRP amendment. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Meyer highlighted the important projects in Virginia in the amendment. In particular, he called attention to a Loudoun County project, Shellhorn Road, which will provide capacity for motorized vehicles and transit.

Ms. Hamilton said that VDOT has undergone very deliberate processes for the I-66 projects and the I-395 project, and they are committed to continuing to work with the jurisdictions. She said that as these projects work their way through final approval, it might become necessary to bring them back to the TPB in revised form.

Mr. Schwartz said he would vote to oppose the resolution as he did last year when he challenged the board to do better in coming up with a CLRP that would result in an improvement in congestion in the region rather than a continuing deterioration. He said he understood there may be different ways to

measure congestion and he looked forward to exploring those, but he said he was focused on two things: quality of life and economic competitiveness. He said the discussion at the Long-Range Plan Task Force meeting that morning was quite good and robust and he looked forward to that process continuing. He said he did not expect the amendment to be defeated and he understood why the TPB does the hard work of keeping system moving. But he said it was important that some members register their frustration that the region has not worked more quickly to identify a set of analyses and methodology, along with the will, to develop a plan that actually reduces congestion.

Mr. Way said that any plan is essentially a photograph in time. He agreed that the CLRP is too constrained, but that does not mean it should not be used as a building block for the unconstrained long-range plan that was discussed at the morning workshop.

Ms. Hudgins said she would support the amendment. She said the amendment does include improvements that were not evident in the past. Responding to Mr. Schwartz's concerns about congestion, she noted that it was important not simply to reduce congestion, but also to ensure that plans are equitable.

Mr. Nohe associated himself with Ms. Hudgins's remarks. He said he agreed with much of what Mr. Schwartz said, but he said it is important to remember that the CLRP is not intended to be a plan that fixes problem, but rather is the plan that says "this is what we can do with the money that we have." He said he believes the region needs a bigger multi-jurisdictional regional plan that says, "this is what we can do if we had the money," but he reiterated this wider task is not the purpose of the CLRP.

Mr. Snyder said that a comprehensive, systematic plan for the entire region is needed. He said the absence of funding for Metro was a serious flaw. He noted the potential challenge, particularly for small jurisdictions, when funding needs for Metro compete with other basics needs such police and teachers. He said the planning process in the future needs to more fully consider the contributions of telework and technology.

Mr. Fisette said he would support the motion. He expressed gratitude for changes in project submissions that had been made during this process. He said that earlier in the year, some language was added to the resolution approving the project submissions that created some expectations of VDOT. He thanked VDOT for working collaboratively with the localities to meet their requests. He said the I-395 HOT lanes project is different now than when it was originally conceived. He described the differences, noting that: VDOT would be providing detailed information about neighborhood impacts; the project does not have a categorical exclusion from an environmental analysis; the Shirlington Interchange was removed from the project; and, as a base condition, a minimum level of funding would be provided to the corridor to promote transit and transportation demand management. He said he counted on VDOT to continue to negotiate with potential private sector partners to get the best deal for the taxpayers and for Northern Virginia. He said he agreed with Mr. Snyder's comments about the need to secure funding for Metro as part of future CLRP development processes.

Chairman Lovain associated himself with Mr. Fisette's remarks regarding I-395.

Mr. Elrich said he would support Mr. Schwartz by opposing the motion. He said he thought that the "no" votes were few enough that the motion would safely pass and projects would be funded. He said he shared the concern that the TPB is not where it needs to be analytically and in terms of looking at which projects make sense. He said a different level of thinking is needed and future planning needs to focus on metrics. He said the TPB needs to look at policy decisions, which can be much less expensive than concrete or steel rail.

Mr. Harris said he would oppose the motion. He said his vote was largely symbolic. He said it was important to proceed with the CLRP projects, but he said they were insufficient compared to the region's needs. He said that as a goal, the TPB needs to determine how large the region's fiscal need is and

what it will take to get to a point where things actually get better. He cited a story with the moral “if you don’t ask for it, you don’t get it.”

Mr. Lewis said he would approve the motion. He said that if the motion were defeated, several important projects in Maryland could be delayed. He said it was good to discuss the shortcomings of the CLRP, but he said that delaying projects would make conditions worse.

Chairman Lovain noted the potential damage that could result from delaying federal funding for transportation for the region, and therefore he urged a “yes” vote.

The motion was passed by a voice vote. In a show of hands, the following members asked that their “no” votes be noted for the record: Mr. Elrich, Mr. Harris, Mr. Kannan, and Mr. Schwartz.

10. APPROVAL OF THE FY 2017-2022 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

Referring to the mail out and handout material, Ms. Erickson briefed the board on a slide that provided a snapshot of the TIP.

Ms. Hudgins moved approval of the TIP. The motion was seconded. It was approved in a voice vote. Chairman Lovain noted the one “no” vote was from Mr. Schwartz.

11. CERTIFICATION OF THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING PROCESS FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL REGION

Ms. Erickson introduced the Statement of Certification. She explained that when an MPO submits a new TIP to the Federal agencies for approval, it must hereby certify that the transportation planning process is addressing the major issues in the metropolitan planning area and is being conducted in accordance with all the applicable requirements. She explained that board members all received a handout that lists all of the federal codes that must be followed and a description of how the MPO is meeting those requirements. She said that staff recommends that the TPB adopt Resolution R6-2017 endorsing the appended statement of certification.

Mr. Schwartz commented that though he understood why they needed to check the box that the TPB has met the requirements he felt he could not certify that the process is addressing the major issues in the metropolitan planning area.

Mr. Meyer responded by saying that while he understood what Mr. Schwartz was saying and that we need to address the unfunded projects in this region. He noted that the Board is doing that through other Committees and as such he feels comfortable checking that box knowing that some of the initiatives being worked on are going to better address some of the things the CLRP does not – weather it is Metro funding, unfunded projects and the rest.

A motion was made to approve Resolution R6-2017 and to endorse the appended statement.

The motion was seconded and was approved.

Ms. Erickson explained that there was a draft copy of the brochure for the 2016 CLRP Amendment which was passed around for board members to look at.

12. WMATA–COG TECHNICAL PLAN “INTERIM REPORT” AND METRO SAFETY COMMISSION UPDATE

Mr. Bean presented an overview of an interim report from the Metro Technical Panel and he also talked about the Metrorail Safety Commission. He said that the panel comprised of city and county managers of the jurisdictions in Metro’s footprint. They looked the value of Metro to the region, metrics around safety and reliability, project funding needs, and revenue options to address those needs. He mentioned

that in seeking to understand the value of Metro, they looked at property tax values within a half-mile of Metro stations. On the topic of metrics, he said they have been working with WMATA to show more public-facing metrics for safety, reliability, and customer experience. He said this is an ongoing discussion. In researching finances, he explained that that bonding the capital needs rather than going a year-to-year basis would be the most prudent public policy, but that it would require a dedicated funding source. He explained that this is an interim report. He said that the final report we will also be exploring revenue options. This was done previously by COG, Board of Trade, and Federal City Council in 2005, but we'll look at those options.

Mr. Bean then spoke about the Metro Safety Commission, which was included in the mailout and handout material. He explained that they have been working to design this legal entity so that the District, Maryland, and Virginia would all pass identical bills. They evaluated other safety entities, hired legal advisors, and sought FTA review and comments. The new commission would have broad enforcement authority. He explained that it would also coordinate with federal and state governmental authorities. He said legislation for this commission is a requirement, so it is absolutely important that the state legislatures and the D.C. Council pass identical "clean" bills that do not have attachments.

Mr. Fisette asked about the economic impacts outside of the region. He said that when he talks to the Virginia legislators they ask what the impact is in the rest of the state.

Mr. Bean explained that while property taxes were most applicable to the jurisdictions in the region, income taxes would go into the state budget and there are 2 million jobs in proximity to Metro.

13. LONG-RANGE PLAN TASK FORCE PHASE 1 REPORT

Mr. Srikanth informed the board that there is a draft report of the first phase of work for the long-range plan task force which is about the unfunded capital projects in the region. This was phase 1 of the Task Force's activities and the work is essentially complete. He said this item would be coming back to the board at next month's meeting so that the board can consider and accept the report. He explained that there is a Phase Two in the task force's work which will likely be to look beyond the Constrained Long Range Plan and look at how we can come up with a new transportation long-range plan for the region that can use investments that are available and provide positive outcomes in terms of mobility and accessibility.

OTHER ITEMS

14. ADJOURN

No other business was brought before the board. The meeting adjourned at 2:02 p.m.