
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
MEETING MINUTES
September 16, 2015

MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES PRESENT

Charles Allen, DC Council
Robert Brown, Loudoun County
Ron Burns, Frederick County
Rick Canizales, Prince William County DOT
Allison Davis, WMATA
James Davenport, Prince William County
Marc Elrich, Montgomery County
Dan Emerine, DC Office of Planning
Lyn Erickson, MDOT
Jay Fisette, Arlington County
Jason Groth, Charles County
Rene'e N. Hamilton, VDOT
Neil Harris, Gaithersburg City Council
Cathy Hudgins, Fairfax County
Sandra Jackson, FHWA
John D. Jenkins, Prince William County
Shyam Kannan, WMATA
Tim Lovain, City of Alexandria
Dan Malouff, Arlington County
Phil Mendelson, DC Council
Bridget Donnell Newton, City of Rockville
Mark Rawlings, DC DOT
Rodney Roberts, City of Greenbelt
Kelly Russell, City of Frederick
Peter Schwartz, Fauquier County
Elissa Silverman, DC Council
Linda Smyth, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
David Snyder, City of Falls Church
John Thomas, Montgomery County DOT
Jonathan Way, Manassas City
Victor Weissberg, Prince George's County/DPW&T
Robert Werth, Private Provider Task Force
Sam Zimbabwe, DDOT

MWCOG STAFF AND OTHERS PRESENT

Robert Griffiths
Andrew Meese
Eric Randall
Rich Roisman
John Swanson
Ron Milone
Daivamani Sivasailam
Wenjing Pu
Dusan Vuksan
Dan Sonenklar

Michael Farrell	
Andrew Austin	
Ben Hampton	
Bryan Hayes	
Sergio Ritacco	
Lamont Cobb	
William Bacon	
Debbie Leigh	
Deborah Etheridge	
Stuart Freudberg	COG/EO
Greg Goodwin	COG/DCPS
Bill Orleans	Resident
Faramarz Mokhtari	Prince George's M-NCPPC
David Koch	NVTC
Bob Summersgill	CAC
Nancy Abeles	CAC
Mike Harris	Kimley Horn
Allen Muchnick	Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation
Bob Chase	Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance
Stewart Schwartz	Coalition for Smarter Growth
Rob Whitfield	FCTA
Malcolm Watson	FCDOT
John Whitaker, AICP	Frederick County
Sonali Soneji	VRE
Sree Nampooltrin	NVTA

1. PUBLIC COMMENT ON TPB PROCEDURES AND ACTIVITIES

Allen Muchnick, of the Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation, expressed the group's support for VDOT's proposal to convert I-66 inside the Beltway into a high occupancy tolled facility during peak periods only with the addition of substantial bus and rail transit, traffic demand management, and pedestrian and bicycling improvements. ACST has concerns about VDOT implementing non-roadway multimodal improvements and about the agency not committing to daily durations of congestion pricing and HOV restrictions. The group generally supports VDOT's proposals but wants more information regarding the proposal and updates to the CLRP description list form.

Bob Chase of the Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance expressed the group's support for new I-66 lane and transit capacity outside and inside the Beltway. They endorse three conventional and two managed lanes in each direction with a median reservation outside the Beltway. Inside in the Beltway, Mr. Chase suggested toll revenue go toward additional lanes and transit in 2017, with lane construction by 2020. He said there is a need for increased circumferential suburb-to-suburb connectivity, including a new Potomac River crossing. He described the importance of the region's highways to the local economy, as driving remains the most prevalent mode choice for commuters. He stressed that road and bridge improvements should be included prominently in the TPB unfunded needs list.

Stewart Schwartz, of the Coalition for Smart Growth, gave comments on specific projects. The group endorsed the I-66 inside the Beltway approach from VDOT, with HOT lanes and peak hour charges in both directions. He also stated that VDOT should continue with HOT lanes outside the Beltway. He mentioned that past studies have not revealed a strong case for a new Potomac River bridge crossing, and that the real need was at the American Legion Bridge and Rosslyn Metrorail tunnel. Mr. Schwartz mentioned that climate issues should be addressed, and that the existing strategies from the

Multisector Committee on Greenhouse Gas Reductions do not go far enough in recommendations on the transportation sector.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 22 MEETING

A motion was made to approve the minutes of the March 18 meeting. The motion was seconded and was approved unanimously.

3. REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Rawlings reported that the Technical Committee met on September 4. The committee reviewed the following: the draft amendment to the 2015 CLRP, which will be released for public comment on September 10 and scheduled for approval at the October meeting; the draft conformity analysis of the 2015 CLRP Amendment; the performance analysis of the draft 2015 CLRP amendment; draft report of the Multisector Working Group on Greenhouse Gas Emissions; the District of Columbia's city-wide traffic signal optimization efforts; the establishment of the unfunded capital needs working group; the status of the draft freight plan development; the current status of the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project; and the latest developments regarding US DOT regulations on MAP-21 performance measures.

4. REPORT OF THE CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. Summersgill reported the committee met on September 10 and receiving briefings on the CLRP amendment, the CLRP air quality conformity analysis, the CLRP performance analysis, and the multisector working group on greenhouse gas emissions. They also discussed the regional unfunded capital needs working group and made recommendations on how to prioritize those projects.

5. REPORT OF STEERING COMMITTEE

Mr. Srikanth reported on three parts of the Steering Committee Actions and Director's Report. The first included committee actions on three TIP amendments: a request from MDOT for \$56 million in additional funds from FTA for transit operations and maintenance; a second request from MDOT including the balance of \$144 million for construction of a highway interchange at I-95 and I-495 at the Greenbelt Metrorail station, and \$3.3 million for bridge-widening projects; and, a request from VDOT for a road widening project in Prince William County, \$90 million for the Jones Branch connector road project in Fairfax County, and \$23 million in FHWA STP funds for VRE rolling stock acquisitions.

The second part of Mr. Srikanth's presentation included letters sent and received Mr. Carroll George's letter on improvements to handling freeway merge operations. TPB staff shared the suggestion with the three state DOTs. VDOT provided Mr. George a written response. VDOT's letter informing the Board of their tentative choice of alternative B for the I-66 outside the Beltway project for inclusion in the CLRP.

The third part of Mr. Srikanth's presentation included announcements and updates: One memo provided a status report on the various TIGER-funded projects. Mr. Srikanth also announced the upcoming Community Leadership Workshop, to be held October 7, 14 and 21. He stated that regional Car Free Day would be held on September 22. He also reported that TPB staff were testing live audio streaming of the TPB meetings, and have asked Citizens Advisory Committee members to listen in and provide feedback. TPB staff will tentatively offer live audio streaming to the public in October. He requested that speakers identify themselves by name to help listeners follow along.

6. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Mr. Mendelson remarked that staff is working to update the regional freight plan from 2010. He announced that staff would seek input from the Board on the policy elements of this regional freight plan during a work session on October 21 before the TPB meeting. The work session will address policy

concerns, including HAZMAT transportation, shared use of commuter and freight rail uses, as well as emergency response. He encouraged all of the members and their agency staffs to participate in the work session. He also noted that following up the Board's discussion regarding WMATA from the June meeting, staff has arranged for three monthly briefings to this Board starting in October on some of the challenges faced by WMATA. The intent of the briefings is to determine what constructive assistance the Transportation Planning Board can provide WMATA to address some of the challenges WMATA is facing. He also requested staff provide copies of a presentation to WMATA's finance and administration committee per the agency's FY 2017 budget development. He said that he believes this document contains some good information for us to be aware of as we begin the discussion with WMATA over the next three months.

Mr. Srikanth noted the presentation was not in the packet, but would be provided to Board members during the current meeting.

Mr. Srikanth provided more information on the three WMATA briefings. He said that the October briefing would focus on understanding how WMATA is structured in a tristate area, how they are operating funding flows, and how the decisions are made. In November there will be a much detailed presentation of the WMATA's capital needs, focusing on the safety aspects and operations and maintenance, state of good repair, and expansion elements of it, how their capital budget really affects the safety and reliability and the operations of the system. Having understood how WMATA is structured, what some of the challenges are and what the capital program is, the December briefing will be an open discussion about the ways in which TPB could assist WMATA meet those challenges.

Mr. Mendelson said that WMATA is critical to the region's transportation system, and it will be useful for the Board to take time to understand the challenges and what is going to be asked of the agency's member jurisdictions for future support.

Ms. Silverman thanked TPB staff for organizing the briefings. She asked Mr. Srikanth if the October briefing would include information on WMATA's financial picture.

Mr. Srikanth requested that Mr. Kannan answer the question.

Mr. Kannan mentioned that the October session would give participants a solid understanding of how WMATA gets and spends funds, as well as current operating and capital needs. The session will cover met and unmet financial needs.

Ms. Silverman said she wanted an update on WMATA's financial audit and how any of the agency's requests for more money would affect jurisdictions.

Mr. Kannan responded that the focus of the session would be funding and financing, but there can be discussion on the administration of the agency's actuarial obligations.

Ms. Silverman said she would appreciate a thumbnail sketch of those issues. She also asked how the WMATA work sessions would address safety issues in the context of capital needs. She referred to the American Public Transit Association peer review of WMATA safety operations, and how the agency's safety needs may differ from capital needs.

Mr. Srikanth commented that the three briefings will be focused on funding and financial, and that safety aspects of agency operations were not envisioned to be a part of the briefings. He mentioned that TPB staff could provide follow-up per the interest of Board members.

Mr. Kannan said that the purpose of the WMATA briefings is not for the agency to ask for money, but these sessions can create a level playing field of understanding regarding the agency's financial and transportation responsibilities and how those responsibilities may or may not be sustained with the agency's current funding.

Mr. Mendelson stated that he did not want WMATA to understate its needs. He mentioned that Board members represent jurisdictions that fund WMATA or participate with those that do. The discussion should give a robust picture of WMATA's financial need.

Ms. Hudgins commented that she hoped the briefings would result in an understanding of WMATA's transportation and funding needs, but also of its governance. She said the members of the Board have significant effects on WMATA as a driver of the regional economy and lifestyles.

INFORMATION ITEMS

7. OVERVIEW OF THE DRAFT 2015 CLRP AMENDMENT

Mr. Austin said that last year's financial analysis of the Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan found that the region plans to spend \$244 billion on transportation projects between now and 2040. He said that TPB staff have been working on the 2015 CLRP amendment and found that the plan meets air quality conformity and financial constraint requirements. He said that there are more than 500 projects in the plan that include 650 additional lane miles and 36 miles of transit by 2020. He said an additional 538 lane miles are expected by 2040. He described some of the projects already in the CLRP.

Mr. Austin said that there are new projects for the 2015 CLRP Amendment. In the District of Columbia there are approximately nine lane miles that will be converted to bicycle lanes. He said in Virginia there are two projects planned for I-66. One project, inside the Beltway will convert I-66 to a managed lanes facility with dynamic congestion-based tolling by 2017. He said that this project would also implement enhanced bus service and elements that improve bicycle and pedestrian access to the corridor. The other project will reconfigure I-66 outside the Beltway to have two managed and variably priced express lanes in each direction and three general-purpose lanes in each direction. Those toll lanes will be free to cars with three or more occupants. He said that two alternatives for the outside the Beltway I-66 project were submitted for the air quality conformity analysis. He said that the CLRP also contains a 15-mile bus rapid transit (BRT) project in Virginia that will connect the Hunting Metro station and the Woodbridge VRE station. No projects were submitted from Maryland.

Mr. Austin said that the District of Columbia is removing from the plan a one mile-long streetcar spur that would connect Minnesota Avenue Metro station to Benning Road. He said Virginia is removing the Columbia Pike streetcar project and the Crystal City streetcar conversion project.

Mr. Austin said that the public comment period for the CLRP will last 30 days between September 10 and October 10. He said advertisements announcing the public comment period had been placed in the Washington Post, Afro-American, and Washington Hispanic newspapers.

Mr. Srikanth said that the letters sent/received packet included a letter from VDOT that requested that the TPB select the second alternative, known as Alternative B, for the I-66 outside the Beltway project. He said that VDOT made this request after holding public hearings and stakeholder meetings. Additional public informational meetings will be held before the Commonwealth Transportation Board takes final action on this project at the end of October. He said that this Alternative B most closely matches the preferred alternative that VDOT is still developing, and that VDOT will amend the CLRP in the future to reflect any differences between Alternative B and the preferred alternative that is finally adopted.

Ms. Hamilton said the I-66 outside the Beltway project has been improved because of public input. She said that a video describing the differences between Alternative B and the preferred alternative was developed by VDOT and has been shared with TPB staff to be included on the TPB's CLRP website.

Mr. Snyder encouraged jurisdictions in Maryland and Virginia to be mindful of the District's mode-share goals. He noted that District plans to convert road lanes to bike lanes. He said that Virginia needs to realize that there will be a growing scarcity of the ability to put single-occupancy vehicles into the District

of Columbia and. He said that Virginia needs to make sure that the I-66 inside the Beltway project be able to accommodate shifting mode share to support transit, bike and pedestrians. He said that the District is engaged in policies that reduce the lane miles in the District of Columbia available for cars. Ms. Smyth asked for some clarification about which portions of I-66 inside the Beltway would be widened in this proposal.

Ms. Hamilton said that the proposed project would widen I-66 from the Beltway to Fairfax Drive.

Ms. Smyth asked about why one of the planning factors for this I-66 project is to "increase accessibility and mobility of freight inside the Beltway," when large freight trucks are currently banned from driving on I-66 inside the Beltway.

Ms. Hamilton said that she would look into that and report back.

Mr. Fisetto said that after working with VDOT and his community he is cautiously optimistic about this project because it is based on a multimodal study, it includes parallel roads, and it will generate revenue to fund multimodal improvements. He said that as he understands it, no road widenings are planned on I-66 inside the Beltway until 2024 or 2025.

Ms. Hamilton said that the project is divided into three groupings. The first focuses on multimodal improvements and tolling, the second group includes additional multimodal improvements by 2025, and the third group includes widening which could be completed by 2040.

Mr. Schwartz said that he is concerned that the conversation regarding changes to I-66 has gone too quickly and did not spend enough time focused on whether these changes are appropriate. He said that he encourages members of the Board to think seriously about whether the addition of the outside the Beltway project to the CLRP undermines the goals of the CLRP.

Ms. Hamilton said that she appreciates Mr. Schwartz's comments and said that VDOT took a multi-modal approach to the I-66 improvements that includes new transit, as well as additional park-and-ride facilities to make transit useful. She said that VDOT has also worked with jurisdictions to provide bicycle facilities that parallel I-66.

Mr. Elrich said that he agrees with Mr. Schwartz. He said that the region needs to set mode-share goals for activity centers and transit-oriented developments and limit parking to match those goals. He said that this is the cheapest way to make an impact. He added that it requires political will.

Mr. Emerine said he agrees that the region needs a managed approach to parking. He said a conversation on this subject would benefit all jurisdictions.

Mr. Roberts said that he is encouraged by this discussion and is glad to hear that there is a multi-modal plan for I-66. However, he also noted that other highways in Virginia are being widened. He said that the approach of multi-modal options and to get away from the single occupant cars to other modes should be applied to all of the highway, all the roadway planning and transportation planning.

8. BRIEFING ON THE DRAFT AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS OF THE 2015 CLRP AMENDMENT

Ms. Posey briefed the Board, directing members' attention to both the summary conformity report, which includes details about the Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the 2015 Amendment to the CLRP, and a copy of the slideshow being presented at the meeting.

Ms. Posey referred to her presentation and highlighted the pollutants that are required to be included in the analysis and the technical inputs to this year's emissions forecasts. She reminded Board members that this year's analysis used MOVES2014, EPA's newest emissions-forecasting model, which takes into account new federal fuel efficiency and fuel formulation standards promulgated by federal regulators in recent years. She said that, under the new model, forecast emissions for 2040 are about 50 percent

lower than what was forecast using MOVES2010, the previous version of the model. She highlighted the findings of this year's conformity analysis, which showed emissions of all pollutants dropping steadily through 2040 and remaining well below approved regional limits. She said that the results of the conformity analysis are available for public comment through October 10 and that the Board will be asked to approve the findings of the analysis at its meeting on October 21.

9. BRIEFING ON THE PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS OF THE DRAFT 2015 CLRP AMENDMENT

Mr. Griffiths briefed the Board, directing members' attention to a slideshow presentation distributed as part of the meeting materials. He explained that in the interest of time he would only highlight a few of the slides.

Mr. Griffiths presented on the key elements of the Performance Analysis. He said that a majority of the region's population and job growth through 2040 is expected to occur in Activity Centers, that trips by carpool, transit, walking, and biking are expected to grow at a faster rate than trips by single-occupant vehicles, that roadway congestion and transit crowding are expected to worsen considerably, and that job accessibility is expected to improve far more by transit than by automobile. He also pointed out that vehicle-related emissions of regulated air pollutants are forecast to remain below approved regional limits, and that greenhouse gas emissions, both in absolute and per-capita terms, are forecast to drop significantly compared to previous forecasts, thanks in large part to new federal fuel efficiency standards for cars and trucks. Finally, he reviewed the highlights of the Priorities Plan Assessment of this year's CLRP amendment, noting in particular the region's solid commitment to maintenance, operations, and state of good repair of the transportation system, but also its unfinished business in terms of maximizing use of its existing transit system.

Chair Mendelson opened the floor to questions.

Mr. Zimbabwe asked whether past forecasts of mode share for 2015 had been accurate, noting that current forecasts for 2040 show much less of a shift away from single-driving than some people might hope. He wondered whether an assessment of the accuracy of past forecasts might help Board members gauge the trustworthiness of the forecasts in the current Performance Analysis.

Mr. Griffiths said that no such analysis of the accuracy of past mode-share forecasts had been undertaken. But, he said, a retrospective study of population and job growth forecasts a few years ago showed remarkable accuracy at the aggregate regional level, though accuracy varied from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, with some over-predicting growth and some under-predicting it. He emphasized the importance of land-use and growth forecasts in accurately predicting future travel patterns and mode choice.

Mr. Lovain asked whether more funding for WMATA than has so far been identified and included in the CLRP would increase the share of trips being taken by transit in the region.

Mr. Griffiths said that additional investment would at least reduce congestion on the system, and would probably encourage more growth in transit ridership.

Mr. Weissberg called attention to the job accessibility maps in the Performance Analysis (Slides 21 and 22 in Mr. Griffiths' presentation). He expressed concern about the significant decline in accessibility by automobile on the eastern side of the region compared to the western side. He called for a task force to study what transportation and land-use changes it would take to achieve greater regional balance in terms of job accessibility and other measures.

Mr. Way asked how much of the decline in greenhouse gases highlighted in the Performance Analysis (Slide 25 in Mr. Griffiths' presentation) was attributable to new federal fuel efficiency standards and how much was due to changes in transportation and land-use policy at the local, state, and regional levels.

Mr. Griffiths said that the vast majority of the decline was likely to due to new federal fuel efficiency standards. However, he said, some portion of the decline is thanks to actions at the local, state, and regional levels.

Mr. Kannan stressed the importance of land-use decision-making in tackling the regional transportation challenges highlighted in the Performance Analysis. In particular, he highlighted the fact that under current land-use plans congestion is expected to get considerably worse by 2040, which he said would compromise economic development efforts and hurt the region's job market. He called on Board members and decision-makers to get serious about land-use planning and he emphasized that better land-use policies can help improve transportation in the region.

Mr. Griffiths agreed that land-use decisions play a very important role. However, he also noted that strategic transportation investments in specific corridors, whether highway or transit, can also relieve congestion. He said that usually the biggest improvements come through investments that are multimodal in nature. He said that corridors that lack multimodal options are those that are most likely to see the biggest increases in congestion between now and 2040.

Mr. Emerine echoed the desire to have a task force or other coordinated way of engaging land-use decision-makers in transportation planning. He also asked staff to include in future CLRP analyses some indication of how various measures have changed from year to year so that decision-makers can better understand whether the "regional needle" has been moving and by how much, and perhaps begin to understand what led to the change. He also called on the Board to take this year's CLRP Performance Analysis, identify areas the region is falling short, and make sure those points are emphasized in the Call for Projects for the next CLRP update.

Mr. Elrich said that other factors besides zoning and land-use planning have contributed to the east-west divide highlighted in the presentation and by Mr. Weissberg. He said that Prince George's County would need more than higher-density development near Metro stations in order to be competitive with other parts of the region. He also warned against painting too rosy of a picture of growth in Activity Centers, citing a major development in Montgomery County that is nowhere near transit or an Activity Center. In addition, he stressed the importance of measuring travel by car in terms of time as well as distance. He said that even though average distance traveled by car (vehicle-miles traveled, or VMT) may be decreasing on a per-capita basis between now and 2040, the amount of time people spend in their cars due to congestion is probably going up, resulting in a lower quality of life.

Mr. Kannan responded to Mr. Elrich's point about development in Prince George's County. He said that a politically driven permitting and development process in the county has scared away outside investors and that until that process is opened back up, the county will continue to lag behind the rest of the region in terms of growth and economic development.

10. BRIEFING ON ACTIVITIES OF THE COG MULTI-SECTOR WORKING GROUP ON GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Mr. Griffiths briefed the Board. He introduced COG Deputy Executive Director Stuart Freudberg, COG Environmental Programs Director Steve Walz, and COG Community Planning and Services Director Paul Desjardins, who attended to answer any questions pertaining to non-transportation aspects of the work of the Multi-Sector Working Group.

Mr. Griffiths provided an overview of the working group and its work and findings to date. He explained that the group recently finished examining the greenhouse gas reduction potential and costs of implementation of 21 "viable" and "stretch" emissions-reductions strategies across the four sectors primarily responsible for greenhouse gas emissions: land-use, transportation, energy, and the built environment. He said that the analysis showed that policies already in place at the local, state, and federal levels would help the region achieve approximately one-third of its overall goal of reducing

emissions 80 percent below 2005 levels by 2050. He said that the 21 strategies that were recently studied would achieve another third or so of the reduction. He said that additional strategies would be needed to achieve the remaining third of the desired reductions. His presentation also included details on many of the 21 strategies that were studied and he explained that many of them had overlapping benefits in other sectors.

Mr. Griffiths explained the next steps for the working group. He said that the group would develop a draft final report for November or December, present its final report to the COG Board of Directors in January, and then begin work on an action plan to implement key strategies from the report.

Chairman Mendelson opened the floor to questions.

Mr. Way asked about the potential reductions in emissions resulting from additional land-use strategies. He noted that the potential reductions shown on Slide 6 of Mr. Griffiths' presentation suggest that they will have little impact. He asked whether that makes them less important to focus on in working to achieve larger regional emissions-reduction goals.

Mr. Griffiths said that the additional land-use strategies would make a relatively small contribution to overall reductions. However, he said, that's partly because a majority of future growth is already expected to be located in Activity Centers, so any additional growth in those areas would have a more limited impact on emissions.

Ms. Hudgins noted the importance of housing affordability in discussions of land-use and Activity Centers. She expressed concern that many people cannot afford to live in dense, mixed-use Activity Centers near transit and said that the only way the region will focus most of its growth in Activity Centers is if there is a commitment to making them more affordable places to live.

Mr. Kannan expressed concern that the strategies that were analyzed by the Multi-Sector Working Group might not accurately reflect or capture the full contribution that the transportation sector can make to reducing emissions. He suggested that the working group go back to other bodies like COG's Climate, Energy, and Environment Policy Committee (CEEPC) to see if there are any other additional strategies to include in the analysis and final report.

Mr. Fisette asked about the timing of next steps for the working group. Specifically, he wondered whether the final report presented to the Board in January would identify additional steps to achieve the remaining one-third of reductions not already anticipated to be achieved through existing policies or strategies analyzed by the working group.

Mr. Griffiths said that the January report would indeed contain such strategies.

Mr. Fisette asked staff to draft a resolution for discussion at the January Board that gives the TPB the ability to have a conversation about what this body needs to do in terms of embedding into the TPB CLRP process the greenhouse gas emission targets. He said that he would like the resolution drafted to allow the TPB to have a conversation about how and if we choose to require some of the implementable strategies deemed to be attainable as requirements when we consider requirements in the CLRP. .

Chairman Mendelson suggested that the resolution be drafted in time to be discussed at the Board's December meeting, so as not to be too far removed from the discussion at today's meeting.

Mr. Srikanth said that staff would work with Mr. Fisette to draft such a resolution, possibly in time for the December Board meeting.

NOTICE ITEMS

11. NOTICE OF A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2015-2020 TIP THAT IS EXEMPT FROM THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY REQUIREMENT TO INCLUDE NEW AND UPDATED FUNDING INFORMATION

FOR EIGHTEEN PROJECTS, AS REQUESTED BY THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (VDOT)

Mr. Srikanth said that VDOT requested an amendment to the TIP that adds funding to projects overseen by the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA). He said that these projects are already in the CLRP and TIP, and that NVTA is providing funding so that those projects can move forward.

OTHER ITEMS

12. ADJOURN

The meeting adjourned at 2:10 p.m.