

---

**TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD  
MEETING MINUTES**

July 24, 2019

**MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT**

Kelly Russell, Vice Chair – City of Frederick  
Canek Aguirre – Alexandria  
Victor Angry – Prince William County  
Terry Bellamy – Prince George’s County Executive  
Paolo Belita – Prince Willian County  
Robert Brown – Loudoun County  
Ron Burns – Frederick County  
Reuben Collins – Charles County  
Gary Erenrich – Montgomery County Executive  
Libby Garvey – Arlington County  
Dannielle Glaros – Prince George’s County Evan  
Glass – Montgomery County  
Rene’e Hamilton – Virginia DOT  
Neil Harris – Gaithersburg  
Jason Groth – Charles County Commissioners  
Catherine Hudgins – Fairfax County  
Sandra Jackson- FHWA – DC  
Shyam Kannan – WMATA  
Julie Koster - NCPC  
Kacy Kostiuk – Takoma Park  
R. Earl Lewis, Jr. – Maryland DOT  
Dan Malouff – Arlington DOT  
Phil Mendelson – DC Council  
Denise Mitchell – College Park  
Mark Rawlings – DDOT  
Jim Sebastian – DDOT  
Pamela Sebesky – City of Manassas  
Linda Smyth – Fairfax County  
David Snyder – Falls Church  
Kristen Umstattd – Loudoun County  
Bridget Newton - City of Rockville

**MWCOG STAFF AND OTHERS PRESENT**

Kanti Srikanth  
Lyn Erickson  
Tim Canan  
Andrew Meese  
Nick Ramfos  
Tim Canan  
Mark Moran  
Brandon Brown  
Deborah Etheridge  
Jackie Sellman  
Abigail Zenner  
Jane Posey

---

---

Brandon Franklin  
Josh Holmes – Intern  
Andrew Austin  
Greg Grant  
Lynn Winchell-Mendy  
Matthew Gaskin  
Charlene Howard  
Michael Farrell  
William Bacon  
Stacy Cook  
Steve Kania  
Dusan Vuksan  
Jon Sherman  
John Swanson

Kate Mattice – NVTC  
Norman Whitaker – VDOT Northern Virginia  
Regina Moore – VDOT  
Mike Lake – Fairfax County DOT  
Mark Phillips - WMATA  
Sonya Breehey  
Anna Martin – Prince George’s County Council  
Victor Weissberg – Prince George’s County Council  
Jim Maslanka – City of Alexandria  
Kari Snyder – MDOT-TSO  
Kristin Calkins – DC Office of Planning  
Bill Orleans – Public Observe  
Malcolm Watson – FCDOT  
Patrick Wilby  
Rob Whitfield – Fairfax Taxpayers Alliance  
Annette Lam – WHS / Pentagon Transportation  
Chris Laskowski – DC Council  
John Townsend – AAA Mid-Atlantic  
Monica Backmon – NVTA  
Ashley Sharp – Prince George’s County

## **1. PUBLIC COMMENT ON TPB PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES**

Vice Chair Kelly Russell led the meeting in Chairman Nohe’s absence. Ms. Breehey, from the Coalition for Smarter Growth, spoke about the Nice/Middleton Bridge and the Bus Transformation Study. She said that her group is concerned that the TIP amendment for the bridge does not require protected bicycle and pedestrian access across the bridge. She urged the board to reject the amendment. Regarding the Bus Transformation Study, she urged the board to amend the TPB’s letter to provide a stronger endorsement of the major recommendations. She said that riders do not care who operates the bus system; they just want more buses that are more frequent, reliable, faster, and more affordable.

## **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE MAY 15, 2019 MEETING**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from the June 19, 2019 TPB meeting. The motion was approved.

---

### **3. REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**

Mr. Rawlings said that the Technical Committee met on July 12. At the meeting the committee reviewed the following items from the board agenda: Car Free Days; project inputs and air-quality conformity scope of work; Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program in Maryland and the District of Columbia; board comment on Bus Transformation Study; and a DDOT TIP amendment request.

Mr. Rawlings said the committee received additional briefings. The first regarded a TPB project to identify a set of regionally prioritized high-capacity transit station areas with deficient pedestrian and bicycle access. Next was a progress update on the TPB's transportation safety study and the Federal Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility grant solicitation process. Finally, he said that the committee was also briefed on a draft of the 2018 annual state of the public transportation report and the COG Title VI plan.

### **4. REPORT OF THE CAC**

Mr. Jackson said that the CAC met on July 18. At the meeting the committee was briefed on the MARC/VRE run-through service study and updates to the TIP and air-quality conformity analysis. He said that most of the meeting was spent discussing ways that the TPB might be able to make the aspirational element of Visualize 2045 easier to understand for the general public. Referring to his report, he listed some suggestions, including: demonstrating the cumulative impacts of the initiatives; using more graphics to show what implementation might look like; and using less jargon. He said that the committee feels that it is very important for staff to recognize the complexity and diversity of the region when engaging the public. He also said that too many TPB materials focus just on commuters and he suggested expanding the scope to include other trips. He also suggested showing how the region has changed in the last 25 years as a way to help emphasize how much change we can expect over the coming 25 years.

### **5. REPORT OF STEERING COMMITTEE ACTIONS AND REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR**

Mr. Srikanth said that the Steering Committee met on July 2. At that meeting the committee took three actions. First, it approved an amendment to the Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program process to permit the off-cycle transfer of surplus funds to projects that were previously approved by the TPB. Details can be found on pages 5 and 6 of the director's report. Next, the committee approved a pair of amendment requests from VDOT to re-appropriate money from cancelled Transportation Alternatives projects to projects that have been previously approved by the TPB. Details can be found on page 7 and 8 of the report. Finally, the committee approved a TIP amendment from Virginia to distribute federal funds allocated by the Commonwealth Transportation Board. Details can be found on pages 11 to 16.

Mr. Srikanth said that letters sent and received include a letter sent to WMATA seeking their \$150,000 contribution to the 2019 Street Smart safety campaign. Details are on page 19 and 27 of the report. Page 29 is a copy of a letter from the FHWA and FTA approving the TPB's budget and work activities for FY 2020. Pages 31 to 34 are a copy of a letter from TPB staff to VDOT providing some analysis of proposed changes to I-495. He said that page 35 is a letter from the TPB in support of the City of Manassas's application for a bridge grant. Pages 37 to 41 are a letter from the East Coast Alliance regarding the provision of a barrier-separated bicycle and pedestrian path on the Nice/Middleton Bridge.

Mr. Srikanth said that on page 43 there is a memo from Commuter Connections listing the names of employers in the region who received awards for promoting travel demand management activities. Page 45 is a memo announcing that the partnership between Commuter Connections and the University of Maryland will release a mobile app for travel demand management application later this summer. Page 47 is another memo applying for \$6 million in federal grants to deploy the mobile TDM app in the region and beyond. Pages 49 to 52 of the report is a memo providing a summary of the background information on a new initiative that aims at reducing greenhouse gases from the transportation sector. Page 53 is a memo informing the TPB that the EPA has approved the region's requested to be re-designated from a non-attainment area to an attainment area for the 2008 ozone standard.

---

Mr. Srikanth said that there are two additional items. The first is an announcement that the TPB will start its process to solicit applications for Enhanced Mobility Grant Funds. He said that \$5.6 million is available. Second, a letter from Montgomery County's executive, Mr. Elrich, to the TPB chair requesting that MDOT evaluate a specific alternative to the I-495/I-270 Traffic Relief Plan.

Mr. Lewis responded to Mr. Elrich's letter. He said that a version of the alternative will be analyzed as part of the NEPA process. He said that the purpose of the I-495/I-270 managed lane study is to determine if the alternative is reasonable and meets the purpose and need established for I-495 and I-270 project. He said that the analysis will be conducted at a level similar to how the other 15 alternatives were analyzed.

Mr. Erenrich said he appreciates MDOT's response. He said that this alternative is important because it avoids parkland and adding lanes between I-270 and I-95.

Mr. Glass asked for clarification about the differences between the proposed alternative and the one that will be analyzed.

Mr. Erenrich said that there are minor details that can be discussed in person at a different time.

## **6. CHAIR'S REMARKS**

No remarks were made in Mr. Nohe's absence.

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **7. REGIONAL CAR FREE DAYS 2019 PROCLAMATION**

Mr. Ramfos provided a brief history of Car Free Day, internationally and in the Washington region. He said that the focus of Car Free Day is to improve public health and quality of life through clean mobility and sustainable urban transport. He said that Car Free Day falls on Sunday, September 22. He said that Car Free Day will extend from Saturday, September 21 to Monday, September 23 to encourage more people to participate. He said that the goal is to have 10,000 people in the region pledge to go car free, or car-lite. He said that Car Free Day will cross promote with incenTrip and Metro. He said that there is a web site, [carfreemetrod.org](http://carfreemetrod.org), and encouraged board members to participate. He asked the board to approve and sing the proclamation.

Mr. Allen moved that the board approve the Regional Car Free Days 2019 proclamation. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hudgins.

The proclamation was approved and signed.

### **8. FY 2021-2024 TIP AND VISUALIZE 2045 UPDATES: INPUTS FOR THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS AND THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY SCOPE OF WORK**

Ms. Posey reminded the board that at the June meeting she briefed them on the transportation projects that have been submitted as changes to the plan and the scope of work for the air-quality conformity analysis. She said Attachment A covers the project changes and Attachment B covers the scope of work. She said that some minor technical corrections have been made since the June meeting. She said most of these changes were corrections to dates, but there were two projects added. One adds two segments to the Crystal City/Potomac Yards transitway. The other adds bike lanes and reduces automobile capacity in Prince George's County. She said that the air-quality conformity analysis will use Round 9.1A of the Cooperative Forecast. She said the board is being asked to take two actions. The first is to approve a resolution adding project inputs into the conformity analysis, and the second is to approve the air-quality conformity scope of work. She said that once the analysis is completed there will be a thirty-day public comment period before the board is asked to update the TIP and amend Visualize 2045 in March 2020.

---

Ms. Russell made a motion to adopt Resolution R1-2020 to approve the project submissions for inclusion in the Air-Quality Conformity Analysis of the FY 2021-2024 TIP and the 2020 Amendment to the Visualize 2045 Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Garvey and approved by the board.

Mr. Allen made a motion to approve the Scope of Work for the Air-Quality Conformity Analysis of the FY 2021-2024 TIP and the 2020 Amendment to the Visualize 2045 Plan. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mitchell and approved by the board. Mr. Roberts voted against the motion.

## **9. FY 2020 TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES SET-ASIDE PROGRAM FOR MARYLAND TPB JURISDICTIONS**

Mr. Swanson said that last year the board approved Visualize 2045 which, among other things, articulated the region's commitment to pedestrian and bicycle access and to safety for vulnerable populations, including kids, and to equity. He said that some of the projects that have been recommended for funding will take specific steps to implement these aspirations.

Mr. Swanson described the federal requirements for the Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program. He said that the program was set up in 2012 and is designed to provide funding to local jurisdictions to do small projects to enhance pedestrian and bicycle projects, including trails and access to transit. He said that large MPOs, like the TPB, are provided with sub-allocated funding in each state for project selection. He said this provides an opportunity for the TPB to fund regional priorities, like those in Visualize 2045. He said that the three states administer the projects in the program. They also administer the application process. He said that the TPB's role is to select projects that serve regional priorities. He shared the Maryland schedule for Transportation Alternatives and said that more details can be found in his memo.

Mr. Swanson said that this year's project recommendations will leave money unallocated, which will be rolled into selection for next year. He said that \$688,232 has been recommended for funding for this year. Referring to his memo he described the projects. The first project is a traffic study in the Town of University Park to identify key pieces of infrastructure for sidewalks, traffic calming, speed reduction, and pedestrian bike crossings to improve safety for kids. He said that in Takoma Park funding will continue for their Safe Routes to School programming, including a program called iCan Shine Camp which helps people with disabilities learn bicycle skills. He said that in Rockville there is a design project to improve access to transit. He said that the final project, in Capitol Heights, will narrow roads, widen sidewalks, and add bike lanes, pedestrian crossings, and light fixtures to make Chamber Avenue safer.

Ms. Kostiuk made a motion to adopt Resolution R2-2020 to approve projects for funding under the Federal Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program for Suburban Maryland for FY 2020. The motion was seconded by Ms. Newton and approved by the board.

## **10. FY 2020 TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES SET-ASIDE PROGRAM FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Mr. Swanson said that the history and details he described previously are also applicable to the Transportation Alternatives process in the District of Columbia. He did say that DC is different because it is considered both a local government and a state by FHWA. He said that there was more funding available than requested by applications. He said that all applications submitted were recommended for funding.

Mr. Swanson said that \$695,000 would be awarded to three projects. The first project plans to reduce the number of automobile lanes on M Street SW to create micro-mobility lanes for bicycle and scooters. This project covers the cost of design. The second project, in Prather's Alley, is a safety improvement project. The final project is the last installment in a major effort to rehab Union Station. This focuses on masonry improvements. He said that more details about the projects can be found in his memo.

Ms. Russell asked for clarification that the money leftover will roll over into the next year.

---

Mr. Swanson said that is correct.

Mr. Allen said that he enthusiastically supports these projects.

Mr. Allen made a motion to adopt Resolution R2-2020 to approve projects for funding under the Federal Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program for DC for FY 2020. The motion was seconded by Mr. Sebastian and approved by the board.

**11. FY 2019-2024 TIP AMENDMENT TO UPDATE PROJECT AND FUNDING INFORMATION FOR THE GOVERNOR HARRY W. NICE/SENATOR THOMAS “MAC” MIDDLETON BRIDGE PREPLACEMENT PROJECT, AS REQUESTED BY MDOT**

Ms. Erickson said that a letter from Mr. Brenner to Governor Hogan was shared with the board.

Ms. Russell said that the board has discussed this item extensively over the past few meetings. She said that after getting a motion and a second the item will be open for discussion. Following discussion there would be a vote. She said that this project will replace an important bridge connecting southern Maryland to eastern Virginia. The project will widen the bridge, adding four lanes. She said the project was first added to the TPB's long-range plan in 2010 and is part of Visualize 2045. She said that the project is expected to cost \$769 million, of which \$555 million has already been included in the TIP. She said the current action is to add \$186 million. She said that the TPB has urged MDOT to include barrier-separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the new bridge. At the June meeting MDOT said that a barrier-separated lane is one of the proposed design options. She said that at this time MDOT cannot guarantee that the final design will include barrier-separated facilities. She said that approving this amendment will help Maryland secure low-interest TIFIA loans to help fund the project.

Mr. Lewis made a motion to approve Resolution R4-2020 to amend the FY 2019-2024 TIP. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mitchell.

Mr. Lewis said that the TIFIA loans have low interest and can cover up to 32% of the project. He said that MDOT would not be able to pursue the loan unless this amendment is approved. He said that later this fall they will know whether the bridge will include a barrier-separated bike-ped path. He said that this bridge is important for southern Maryland, improving connectivity and safety.

Mr. Collins said that Charles County sincerely appreciates MDOT and the Maryland Transportation Authority for honoring their commitment to meet and discuss the bicycle/pedestrian lane on the Nice/Middleton Bridge. He noted that they are happy that the bridge project is being moved forward for design and construction in the state's consolidated transportation program ahead of the anticipated schedule to replace this 80-year-old dilapidated bridge. He noted that Charles County Commissioners have been in unanimous support of a barrier-separated bicycle and pedestrian path being built on the bridge since 2009. He said they believe that a separated lane will provide safe passage for regional bicycle tourism, health and fitness, as well as planning for non-motorized travel and commuting for the next 100 years. He said that Charles County is glad that the Maryland Transportation Authority has retained a separated bike lane through the bid alternative process and is hopeful those bids come in at an affordable level, making the separated bike lane possible. He appreciates MDOT and Maryland Transportation Authority's desire to have this TIP amendment passed in order to be eligible for the federal TIFIA loan that will likely make this significant infrastructure project affordable, including a bike path.

Ms. Hamilton said that Virginia has invested \$13 million on this project and supports the TIP amendment. She said it is an important regional project as Virginia is in the process of studying I-95 and improvements to Route 301 will be of interest as it is a parallel facility. She said that she respects Maryland's request to have the TIP amendment approved recognizing that they have committed to accommodating bikes along the bridge and hopes that through the creativity of contractors, they will find a way to make this a possible solution.

---

Ms. Garvey said she supports the amendment and wonders whether it was possible for a briefing of the design options in the future.

Mr. Collins said that he wanted to offer a friendly amendment that would include the condition that MDOT report back to the TPB in December 2019 with the results of their efforts to secure a barrier-separated path on the bridge.

Mr. Roberts said he wonders what good it would do to have MDOT report back on their decision once it is made. He said that Maryland has already broken its commitment to include the separated path.

Mr. Collins said that Charles County is hopeful that the best interests of county residents and the region will be secured.

Mr. Lewis said that the importance of the separated bike and pedestrian path is clear. He added that they also have to balance the importance of the path with the need that the bridge be affordable.

Ms. Russell asked if Mr. Lewis would accept this friendly amendment.

Mr. Lewis said he would.

Ms. Glaros said that she will support the motion and her colleagues in Charles County who also asked that the board support the motion. She said that this matter has highlighted how a procurement process for a project could drive policy priorities and where affordability gets in front of good policy. She noted that the TPB would need to be really clear as it moves forward what it means to accommodating its policy priorities particularly about what it means to accommodate bicycles because there is a full range of options on that.

Mr. Allen asked what has changed on this amendment over the past two months.

Mr. Lewis said that the only material change to the amendment is the requested language that MDOT report back to the TPB on the decision. He said that the TPB has been very clear about the importance that the bridge includes a separated path.

Mr. Allen said he was uncertain about the impact of the friendly amendment.

Mr. Lewis said that regardless of the decision that is made regarding the bridge, MDOT would explain the decision to the board. He said that the amendment guarantees the commitment to report back to the TPB.

Mr. Allen said that at past meetings representatives from the state of Maryland were clear that the decision about the bridge design would be made based on affordability. He asked if this is still the case.

Mr. Lewis said that he would let the previous comments stand. He added that because the process is a bid alternative, there will be two proposals, one with a separated lane, to consider.

Mr. Allen said that he had witnessed a number of pedestrians and cyclists wanting to use the existing bridge. He said he anticipates that there is a demand for a separated path on the new bridge. He said that this is a 100-year decision, and that it is important to think about connectivity needs of the future.

Ms. Hudgins asked for a clarification on what would happen if the TPB approves this amendment.

Mr. Srikanth said that in this instance, funding is going to be provided by the Maryland Transportation Authority through its toll and other revenues. He said that the TPB action will allow the agency to submit a federal loan application. He noted that whether they will receive the loan guarantee still remains to be seen, but MDOT can't submit the application without this TIP action by the TPB. He added that the issues that the TPB has had with the bridge is about the design of the facility. He said agencies do not need the MPO's approval on the design once the funding information has been included in the MPO documents for federal oversight projects. He said that in this instance with the friendly amendment to TPB's resolution, MDOT will be required to come back to the TPB with details of the design. If a barrier separated path is not included, then the TPB can ask for a rationale and the board could then provide comments to that agency providing design oversight.

---

Ms. Hudgins said that was a helpful description, but that she was looking to know whether or not there is some way to encumber the funds being added to the TIP.

Mr. Lewis said that the MDTA typically fully funds projects with toll revenue. He said that this project requires TIFIA funds, which are not always requested. He said that tolling revenue is subject to bondholder stipulations.

Mr. Pines said that the MDTA has leveraged TIFIA loans in the past. He said that loan payments come exclusively from toll revenue. He said that MDTA is limited for what it can spend based on its toll revenue. He said the purpose of the TIFIA loan is to have more money available sooner.

Mr. Lewis said that the other part of this is that the schedule has moved up. He said that the two important issues are the long-term functionality of the bridge and getting critical infrastructure upgraded quickly.

Ms. Russell asked about what would happen if the amendment does not go through.

Mr. Lewis said that they possibly would need to find another, more expensive financing option that might put the project in doubt.

Ms. Garvey said that she appreciated Ms. Glaros' comment about how these kinds of decisions might be made differently in the future, but she said she thinks that this particular project needs to move forward at this time, knowing that that MDOT has got to come back and justify their decision. She emphasized the importance of building trust, and that if MDOT was operating in bad faith on this project, their "feet would be held to the fire" in the future as they are going to come to the TPB for other projects.

Mr. Roberts said that he would not vote for this because it is unacceptable to create policy based on costs alone.

Mr. Mendelson said that he has been agonizing about this process and that the tonality of the discussions feels negative. He said that there is a sense of resignation among members here. He believes that the majority of board members feel that there should be a separated path, but it is pretty clear that that is not the likely outcome. He said that if that the board wants a separated path, then we have to vote against this resolution. He does not believe that would end the project because he believes that Maryland will come back because the bridge needs to be repaired.

Ms. Newton asked why the board is being forced to accept something when they have been stating from the beginning that it is a policy priority of the TPB that a grade-separated pedestrian and bicycle path be included. She said that based on previous experience with MDOT, she is confident that the separated path will be considered not affordable.

Mr. Harris said that he thinks it is reasonable that cost is a factor when making decisions. He said that when funding is limited, it is sensible to make decisions based in part on cost.

Ms. Smith said it was her experience that the discussions on modifying the designs continues and that there are ways the engineers can explore alternative and cheaper ways to accommodate the needs. She said that she would really like to hear from MDOT that the discussions, no matter what, will keep going on. She said the point is that there is a reasonable demand for this kind of facility, and people want to work toward implementing it.

Mr. Lewis said that Maryland has many stakeholders and that resources are limited. He said that customer service is a keystone approach and a value for all state agencies. He said that MDOT operates under that value and always shows up.

Ms. Russell called for a roll call vote. The following members voted against the amendment: Mr. Mendelson, Mr. Allen, Mr. Roberts, Ms. Kostiuk, Ms. Hudgins, Mr. Sebesky, Mr. Kannan. The following members abstained: Mr. Erenrich and Mr. Glass. The motion was approved.



---

## 12. BUS TRANSFORMATION PROJECT: TPB COMMENTS

Mr. Allen thanked Mr. Srikanth and TPB staff for their help drafting a letter summarizing TPB comment on the June presentation to the board on the Bus Transformation Project. He said that he was excited by the presentation and that it is important that the region think about the role that buses can and should play in the region's future. He thanked Ms. Russell for her reminder that the region is larger than the WMATA service area. He said he feels that many of the projects in the project overlap with existing TPB projects. As key TPB comments, he identified: expanding market efforts related to bus to enhance visibility of bus options and benefits; incentivize more employers to offer transit benefits; and adopting consistent bus priority guidelines for corridors across the region.

Mr. Srikanth referred to the letter and identified some requested changes. In particular, the addition of the word "efficient" to the sentence: "Planning to ensure convenient, efficient, and user-friendly travel experience to all."

Mr. Glass said he appreciates that the letter is written around ideas and values the whole region can support. He said he does have a concern about Strategy 4 and the reclaiming of WMATA services. He suggested language that asks for financial analysis to help jurisdictions better understand the cost implications.

Ms. Erickson read the suggested change, which was included in the handout.

Mr. Lewis said that MDOT shares the concerns voiced by Montgomery and Prince George's Counties.

Ms. Kostiuk asked for clarity about the body that will be acting to identify recommendations in the first three strategies.

Mr. Srikanth said that there are about 27 recommendations and the applicability of each of those varies. He said each member jurisdiction would have to determine the recommendations that they could act on. He noted that some of the recommendations could apply to a small number of TPB member jurisdictions and others to a larger number of jurisdictions. Depending on what the member jurisdictions need, various entities could assist, such as the NVTC or WMATA and even the TPB.

Ms. Kostiuk said that she is concerned the letter lacks mention of Strategy 6, in relation to centralized leadership and coordination. She wondered if the TPB has a role.

Mr. Srikanth said that the TPB focuses on planning, and that it has not gotten involved in operations of roadways, transit, or operational project-level planning. He said that there is some flexibility in how the recommendation for Strategy 6 is understood. He said that at the June presentation, Mr. Davey said that it would be helpful if the TPB could identify some recommendations and strategies that would provide quick wins. The letter attempts to do this.

Ms. Kostiuk said that she is concerned that without central coordination she has a hard time seeing some of these strategies being implemented.

Mr. Erenrich said that there is great need for a regional report on the status of the bus systems and how each of the operators is performing. He suggested mentioning the public transit subcommittee in the report and referencing the regular report on the performance of region's transit.

Mr. Srikanth read the suggested change to say: "The TPB's regional public transportation subcommittee's annual report on regional public transportation would work with member jurisdictions to include performance metrics as reported by the agency." He said that there may need to be an ongoing conversation if there is no consistent metric used.

Mr. Kannan thanked the board for their discussion. He said that the last exchange brought to bear for the TPB one of the interesting findings that the transformation project makes clear, which is that while there are numerous entities that have an interest in advancing bus service in the region, it is unclear which of these entities are empowered to act on some tough decisions that are required to make buses

---

better. Mr. Kannan referenced a survey of transit customers in the region. He said that as an observer, it was helpful to hear from the customers. He said the first takeaway is that people who do and do not ride the bus agree that bus service ought to be improved. The second takeaway is that improving the frequency of buses is not a problem that can be solved solely by adding more buses. He said the third takeaway is that in order to transform bus service, the region needs to transform attitudes, policies, and practices towards bus services.

Ms. Russell said that the board can adopt the letter now and send it to WMATA tomorrow, or it could continue to work on it and finalize it in September.

Mr. Srikanth said that the WMATA board is scheduled to be briefed about the recommendations at the meeting on July 25. He said it would be helpful to get the board's inputs to them now. He said that the project intends to develop an action plan and that there will be more opportunities for the TPB to continue to be engaged. He said that if the board accepts the letter, he will work with the TPB officers to finalize the changes that have been suggested today.

Mr. Snyder made a motion to approve the letter the added language. He also asked that the TPB continue to weigh in on this work. The motion was seconded and approved.

## **NOTICE ITEM**

### **13. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO UPDATE PROJECTS AND FUNDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SECTION OF THE FY 2019-2024 TIP**

Mr. Srikanth said that this is a request from DDOT to update funding information for all of their projects that are already in the TIP. He said that this is done annually and that the board will be asked to approve it in September.

Mr. Sebastian said that this is an update for DC's portion of the regional TIP. He said it consists of about 108 projects that will cost \$2.7 billion over the next six-years. More details on the amendment can be found in the notice item.

### **14. ADJOURN**

No other business was brought before the board. The meeting adjourned at 2:06 p.m.