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SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENT PERIODS

The TPB held a total of three 30-day public comment and inter-agency review periods during the development of Visualize 2045. The first comment period was held, according to the schedule set forth in the Technical Inputs Solicitation document between December 14, 2017 and January 13, 2018. This comment period was focused on the projects being submitted for inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis of Visualize 2045 and the FY 2019-2024 TIP. Comments were received from 166 individuals, non-profit organizations, or governmental representatives during this period. These comments and the responses provided by TPB staff and the implementing agencies are summarized in the memorandum dated January 17, 2018 on page 3. A compilation of all comments received during this period follows that memo.

A second 30-day comment period on the inputs to the conformity analysis was held from January 19 – February 17, 2018. This comment period was held to include the New Hampshire Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project along with the other BRT projects that Montgomery County had previously submitted. Comments were received from five individuals and two governmental representatives. The comments and responses are summarized in the memo dated February 21, 2018 on page 63. The memo is followed by a compilation of those seven comments.

The Technical Inputs Solicitation schedule called for a final comment period to be held from September 13 – October 13, 2018 on the plan, its performance, and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis. In March 2018, the TPB Steering Committee reviewed and approved a TPB staff recommendation to change the dates of the fall public comment period to September 7 – October 7, 2018. The purpose of this change in dates was to give TPB staff and member agencies more time to review, consider, and respond the comments received prior to the TPB’s scheduled action to approve Visualize 2045 on October 17, 2018.

During this final comment period, 109 comments were received from individuals, governmental representatives, and non-profit organizations. A summary of these comments and the responses provided by TPB staff and the implementing agencies, are presented in the attached memo dated October 11, 2018. A compilation of all comments received during this period follows that memo.
DECEMBER 14, 2017 – JANUARY 13, 2018
COMMENT PERIOD
MEMORANDUM

TO: Transportation Planning Board
FROM: Lyn Erickson, TPB Plan Development and Coordination Program Director
SUBJECT: Summary of Comments Received and Proposed Responses on the Project Submissions for Inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the constrained element of Visualize 2045 and the FY 2019-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
DATE: January 17, 2018

At the December 20, 2017 meeting the board was briefed on the draft project submissions to be included in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the constrained element of Visualize 2045 and the FY 2019-2024 TIP. The project submissions were released for a 30-day public comment and interagency review period at the TPB Citizens Advisory Committee meeting on December 14, 2017. This comment period closed on January 13, 2018.

Comments submitted by individuals, organizations and businesses have been posted on the TPB’s website at www.mwcog.org/TPBcomment. This memorandum provides a summary of the comments received and responses provided by TPB staff in consultation with the implementing agencies. A compilation of the comments received as posted is provided separately from this memorandum.

The TPB will be briefed on the comments received and responses provided. Following that briefing, the board will be asked to approve the project submissions for inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the constrained element of Visualize 2045 and the FY 2019-2024 TIP. The comments and responses will be included in the documentation of Visualize 2045.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Comments were received from 166 individuals, non-profit organizations, or governmental representatives. TPB staff have reviewed each comment and summarized their main points in this memo. Where comments pertain to the TPB’s processes and procedures, TPB staff have provided responses. For comments that are project-specific in nature, the implementing agencies have provided responses. Comments were received on the following projects and topics:

A. I-270 and I-495 Toll Lanes
B. I-95 Southbound Auxiliary Lane
C. MD 201 Widening
D. US 301 Widening
E. MD 97 Widening
F. US 15 Widening
G. New Hampshire Ave. BRT
H. Development, structure and content of the constrained element
I. Other Comments
A. I-270 AND I-495 TOLL LANES

Two sets of comments were received on MDOT’s proposal to add two new managed lanes in each direction on I-270 between I-495 and I-70, and on I-495 from the American Legion Bridge to the Woodrow Wilson Bridge.

1. **Comment:** The portion of I-495 from the American Legion Bridge to I-270 and of I-270 from the split north should be prioritized and completed first.

   **MDOT Response:** The Hogan Administration’s proposed Traffic Relief Plan would add new managed or toll lanes to I-270 and I-495 (Capital Beltway), leaving the existing lanes un-tolled. These managed lanes will provide drivers with the choice to pay for a quicker trip, simultaneously reducing delays for those who choose to stay in the existing free lanes. During the development process, MDOT and the private concessionaire will be looking at the best way to phase these improvements.

2. **Comment:** These projects will only benefit private partners and roads will remain crowded.

   **MDOT Response:** The Hogan Administration’s proposed Traffic Relief Plan would add new managed or toll lanes to I-270 and I-495 (Capital Beltway), leaving the existing lanes un-tolled. These managed lanes will provide drivers with the choice to pay for a quicker trip, simultaneously reducing delays for those who choose to stay in the existing free lanes.

   These improvements to our most congested roadways are critical to spur increased economic development and restore quality of life for countless Marylanders who have been negatively affected by years of traffic congestion, both in the Baltimore City and Washington, D.C. metropolitan areas. Maryland has the second-longest commuting times in the country, and the Washington metropolitan region is the most congested region in the nation based on annual delay and congestion cost per auto-commuter data. More information on the Traffic Relief Plan is available on the Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) website at www.roads.maryland.gov/trafficreliefplan.

   The Hogan Administration will continue to pursue a balanced approach to address transportation demands. In addition to the Traffic Relief Plan, the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) is moving forward with Purple Line construction in Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties and the recently revamped Baltimore’s transit system BaltimoreLink launch. We have pledged more funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) with Virginia, Washington, and the federal government matching Maryland’s offer.

3. **Comment:** The Coalition for Smarter Growth and co-signatories oppose the 76-mi Maryland Express Toll Lanes proposal for the Beltway and I-270. Unlike the Virginia HOT lanes, the Maryland proposal doesn’t guarantee that HOV users will travel free, and doesn’t use the revenues to fund express bus service or build park and ride lots for carpoolers and transit users.

   **MDOT Response:** The Express toll lanes projects along Maryland’s portion of 1-495 and I-270 is currently under development under a public private partnership program. The project scope as currently proposed is preliminary and likely to evolve further as alternative private sector proposals are evaluated. Maryland Department of Transportation will be considering all proposals including special toll treatment for HOVs, toll exempt transit services along the express lanes and other rideshare and transit supportive investments in the corridor. The TPB will be
notified and briefed on any further evolution of the scope of work and services for these two projects.

These improvements to our most congested roadways are critical to spur increased economic development and restore quality of life for countless Marylanders who have been negatively affected by years of traffic congestion, both in the Baltimore City and Washington, D.C. metropolitan areas. Maryland has the second-longest commuting times in the country, and the Washington metropolitan region is the most congested region in the nation based on annual delay and congestion cost per auto-commuter data. More information on the Traffic Relief Plan is available on the Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) website at www.roads.maryland.gov/trafficreliefplan.

The Hogan Administration will continue to pursue a balanced approach to address transportation demands. In addition to the Traffic Relief Plan, the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) is moving forward with Purple Line construction in Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties and the recently revamped Baltimore’s transit system BaltimoreLink launch. We have pledged more funding for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) with Virginia, Washington, and the federal government matching Maryland’s offer.

**B. I-95 SOUTHBOUND AUXILIARY LANE**

Five sets of comments were received in support of VDOT’s proposal to add an auxiliary lane on I-95 between VA 123 and VA 294.

1. **Comment:** The terminus should extend to VA 234

   **VDOT Response:** While the comment supports the project, any extension would require further project development and collaboration between VDOT, Prince William County, Fairfax County, Metro and Trans Urban.

2. **Comment:** The project should be implemented sooner than the projected 2028 completion date.

   **TPB Staff Response:** Staff have forwarded this recommendation to VDOT.

3. **Comment:** The intersection with VA 123 should be improved by converting the I-95 southbound lane to an exit lane ramp to VA 123 northbound, shifting VA 123 exit ramp from I-95 southbound to west of the I-95 entrance ramp from US 1 (removing merging point), removing the ramp from VA 123 to I-95 southbound, adding dual left-turn lanes to provide access from VA 123 to I-95 southbound, and adding an auxiliary lane on southbound I-95 from US 1 to VA 294.

   **VDOT Response:** The comment supports the I-95 South Bound Auxiliary Lane between Route 123 and Route 294 proposed by Prince William County. The county has developed a funding plan that would meet the TPB’s Fiscal Constraint standard. The wide range of additional projects suggested would require further project development and collaboration between VDOT, Prince William County, Fairfax County, Metro and Trans Urban.
C. MD 201 WIDENING

Two sets of comments were received on MDOT’s proposal to widen MD 201 from I-495 to north of Muirkirk Road.

1. **Comment:** The project should include a separated bicycle/pedestrian path.

   **MDOT Response:** Bicycle and pedestrian access will be considered as part of the project. However, the manner in which bicycles and pedestrians will be accommodated would need to be determined as part of the project development process.

2. **Comment:** The project should also improve the Sunnyside Road bridge over Indian Creek and the Powder Mill road bridge over the railroad tracks.

   **MDOT Response:** Should the MD 201 improvements move forward, bridge improvements on Sunnyside Road and Powder Mill Road will not be a part of the scope of the project since they would not help to remedy the congestion issues along the MD 201 corridor. Further, Sunnyside Road is a Prince George’s County road, and is not a part of the State roadway system. MDOT SHA will not be providing improvements to bridges along Sunnyside Road as part of the MD 201 improvements.

3. **Comment:** The project will increase pollution and encourage further development.

   **MDOT Response:** The MD 201 project is being considered with input from Prince George’s County to address traffic generated by the existing and planned development in the area. All transportation improvements will go through a rigorous planning process that will include the environmental impacts of all proposed alternatives. Transit accommodations will be examined through this process as well and will allow for significant public outreach and involvement. This project is not currently funded for planning and is slated to be completed in 2045. The purpose and need for this project will be the first step in the process and will not be started for some time.

D. US 301 WIDENING

Three sets of comments were received on MDOT’s proposal to widen US 301 from the Governor Harry Nice Bridge to US 50.

1. **Comment:** The project should include provisions for future transit accommodations.

   **MDOT Response:** Transit accommodations along the US 301 corridor in portions of Prince George’s County and Charles County have been under consideration for some time. As part of MDOT MTA’s Southern Maryland Rapid Transit (SMRT) study, MDOT MTA has worked with MDOT SHA to develop transit alternatives that are compatible with planned MDOT SHA projects along the US 301 and MD 5 corridors in Prince George’s County and Charles County. In August 2017, MDOT MTA released the SMRT Alternatives Report, which consists of a summary of LRT and BRT alternatives that were developed. Currently, MDOT SHA has been focusing on a subset of the larger MD 301 Transportation Corridor project; the MD 5 (Mattawoman-Beantown Road) and US 301/MD 228/MD 5 Business intersections. MDOT SHA is currently exploring various improvements and strategies to best address the safety and operation needs at these two intersections.
2. **Comment**: The facility should be upgraded to a limited-access highway without stop lights and with highway speed limits throughout.

3. **Comment**: Effective alternatives to the proposed expansion of Route 301 from Route 50 to the Henry Nice Bridge from 4 to 6 lanes throughout the corridor have not been studied.

   **MDOT Response**: The large-scale US 301 South Corridor Transportation Study (I-595/US 50 to the Potomac River) has been on hold awaiting funding for the completion of planning and subsequent phases. For a significant portion of this corridor, MDOT SHA has developed an overarching vision for the US 301 corridor between US 50 and the MD 5 Split at T.B./Brandywine in the 1999 Access Management Plan for US 301. The plan envisions a six-lane, fully access-controlled freeway, with service roads on one or both sides. However, as an immediate measure to address operations and safety on US 301, MDOT SHA has been focusing on a subset of the larger MD 301 Transportation Corridor project, the MD 5 (Mattawoman-Beantown Road) and US 301/MD 228/MD 5 Business intersections. MDOT SHA is currently exploring various improvements and strategies to best address the safety and operation needs at these two intersections.

**E. MD 97 WIDENING**

One comment was received in opposition to MDOT’s proposal to widen MD 97 at the interchange with I-495.

1. **Comment**: Enhanced transit service would serve the area better than widening this facility.

   **MDOT Response**: MDOT SHA is conducting a study, funded by Montgomery County, to address MD 97 (Georgia Avenue) safety and traffic operations between MD 390 (16th Street) and MD 192 (Forest Glen Road). This study’s purpose and need is not focused on traffic capacity improvements to MD 97, which in most segments between MD 390 and MD 192 already has seven or eight lanes including the existing dynamic center lane. Currently, MDOT SHA is working to identify a selected alternative and complete the study in line with the federal transportation planning process. Montgomery County prioritizes the identification of design funding for MD 97 improvements in its 2017 transportation priorities letter, submitted to MDOT in June 2017. Currently, full design funding remains to be identified.

**F. US 15 WIDENING**

Six sets of comments were received in opposition to VDOT’s proposal to widen US 15 between Battlefield Parkway and Montresor Road.

1. **Comment**: The project circumvents an underway Loudoun County public process by local stakeholders for improvements to this road. The stakeholders group has not reached consensus. Requested analyses by stakeholders (of induced traffic, environmental and safety impacts) have not been conducted.

   **VDOT Response**: The Loudoun County Board of Supervisors has gone on the record in October 2017 as supporting the widening of Route 15 from two to four lanes from Battlefield Parkway to Rte 661 Montresor Road. The scope of work for the county’s stakeholders group is to provide...
recommendations for specific elements of the widening (i.e. configuration of some of the intersections, and to provide input on the continuing study of how much farther north the widening should extend.

2. Comment: The project does not meet criteria to achieve Goal 4: Maximize operational effectiveness and safety, or Goal 5: Protect and enhance the environment, as stated.

VDOT Response: The corridor is experiencing severe congestion on a daily basis and elevated instances of severe crashes. See the study Route 15 Congestion Report dated May 2017 and revised through October 2017, prepared for the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors by Kimley Horn.

3. Comment: The project is being forwarded before the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors has voted to approve the Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change the designation of the road from a 2-lane local access rural arterial to a 4-lane median-divided controlled access rural arterial.

TPB Staff Response: Including this project in the air quality conformity analysis does not preclude Loudoun County from changing the functional class in its documentation of the transportation system. Similarly, a change to the functional class of the roadway at the County level would not preclude the TPB from including the project in the analysis.

VDOT Response: When the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors endorsed a four lane Route 15 from Battlefield Parkway to Montresor Road in October 2017, they also requested VDOT to utilize all existing SYIP funds allocated to the Route 15 corridor north of Leesburg to initiate preliminary engineering.

4. Comment: The entire length of Route 15 between north of Leesburg to the Potomac River at the Point of Rocks Bridge needs to be considered in this project

Loudoun County Response: Route 15, between Whites Ferry Road and the Maryland state line, is the subject of the Route 15 Safety and Operations Study which is in progress. That project will determine how far north the widening needs to be extended. Traffic counts were recently captured; the analysis is ongoing.

According to VDOT’s traffic data, the traffic counts decrease on Route 15 as you head north from Whites Ferry Road because drivers are turning onto local roads.

The Point of Rocks bridge over the Potomac River, crossing into Maryland, is only 2 lanes. It doesn’t make sense to widen Route 15 all the way to the Maryland line if the bridge is going to remain 2 lanes. We are planning to meet with representatives from the Maryland State Highway Administration and Frederick County, MD as part of the Safety and Operations Study to find out if there are any planned improvements to Route 15 in Maryland.

5. Comment: The project should not be included in the constrained element until a roundabout or traffic-calming alternatives have been fairly studied.

Loudoun County Response: The Route 15 Congestion Report, which is on-line at www.loudoun.gov/Route15 studied roundabouts at both Route 15/King Street and Route 15/Whites Ferry Road.
The report concluded that a roundabout would not work at Route 15/King Street. A roundabout at the intersection of Route 15/Whites Ferry Road could work, but there is some public opposition to it. Since the analysis determined that a traffic signal will perform as effectively as a roundabout at that intersection, County staff intends to recommend that the signal be retained for now (we understand that the signal will have to be modified to support widening of Route 15).

In August 2016, Loudoun County initiated the Route 15 Congestion Study and presented the Report to the Board on May 18, 2017, which recommended the widening of Route 15 from Battlefield Parkway to Montresor Road and identified improvement alternatives at the intersections of King Street and Whites Ferry Road.

Following the presentation to the Loudoun County Board on May 18, 2017, the Board directed the staff from the Department of Transportation and Capital Infrastructure (DTCI) to the following actions items:

1. Expand the Report to include a Safety and Operational Analysis of Route 15 from Whites Ferry Road to the Maryland State Line.
2. Conduct additional public workshops, including two rounds of two meetings, to present the Report and obtain feedback on the concepts for the Corridor Improvement Plan resulting from the Whites Ferry Road to Maryland state line corridor study;
3. Coordinate directly with the District Supervisors to conduct the public workshops and to establish a Stakeholders Committee. The purpose of the Stakeholder Committee is to gain feedback and public opinion on the Report and provide input for the development of the Safety and Operational Analysis;
4. Upon completion of the public workshops, return to the Board at a future Board Business meeting to obtain further direction regarding the Route 15 Congestion Report; and
5. Initiate a Comprehensive Plan amendment (CPAM) to modify the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) to extend the limits of the four-lane section of Route 15 from Tutt Lane to Montresor Road.

The first round of public engagement for the Route 15 Congestion Report and the Safety and Operations Study consisted of three public input meetings; an online interactive survey; establishment of a website for the Route 15 project; and creation of a dedicated email address (Route15@loudoun.gov) to receive input. A total of 239 people attended the public input meetings which were held on the following dates: June 26, 2017; July 8, 2017 and July 15, 2017.

A website was established for the Route 15 project (www.loudoun.gov/Route15), which provides the public with access to materials from the public input meetings and general project progress information. Through this website, individuals who were not able to attend one of the public input meetings can view the information that was presented including maps, presentations and the Report.

The County also conducted an internet based interactive survey between July 12, 2017, and July 24, 2017, which was linked through the project website. The survey provided input exercises that were similar to those given during the public meetings. The survey collected 2,006 unique responses. The County received 29 comments that were submitted through the Route 15 email address.
Key statistics from the public engagement process were as follows:

- **Route 15 Widening to Montresor Road:** 76% were in favor, 13% were in favor if certain conditions were met, and 11% were opposed;
- **Route 15 and King Street Intersection Modifications:** 52% favor grade separation, 34% favor a roundabout, and 14% favor a traffic signal;
- **Route 15 and Whites Ferry Road/Raspberry Drive Intersection Modifications:** 57% favor a roundabout, 22% favor a traffic signal, and 21% favor a bowtie roundabout.

The result of the Route 15 public engagement process demonstrate that the majority of the public have expressed desire for Route 15 to be widened to four lanes to Montresor Road.

The Route 15 Stakeholder Committee has been established; there are 19 representatives from homeowner associations, business and civic groups located along the Route 15 corridor from the Town of Leesburg to the Maryland state line. The Stakeholder Committee has met three times; the documents are available on the County’s Route 15 web site www.loudoun.gov/Route15.

Additionally, the County has initiated a Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPAM) to amend the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP), as directed by the Board of Supervisors, to show the Ultimate Condition of Route 15 to be a 4-lane median divided roadway north of Leesburg to Montresor Road. Staff presented at the Loudoun County Planning Commission public hearing on December 19, 2017. A recording of the meeting is available here. 23 members of the public spoke during the Planning Commission public hearing; 10 were in favor of the Route 15 CPAM; 9 were against; and 4 did not express support or opposition to it. Many of the concerns that were expressed by those who were opposed to the Route 15 CPAM concerned access issues that would be handled during design, not during the CTP amendment process.

The County has initiated a capital improvement project to widen Route 15 to 4-lanes to Montresor Road and we have submitted an application to the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority seeking funds for the project.

**Additional VDOT Response:** The need to widen Route 15 to four lanes is documented by Loudoun County’s recent studies prepared by Kimley Horn. Impacts of the no-build alternative are also documented. The proposed transportation improvements will reduce congestion, thereby increasing accessibility and mobility for travelers. The County has worked with stakeholders and is in the process of preparing and adopting appropriate Comprehensive Plan amendments addressing Route 15.

The project will address traffic operations and safety. Currently, because of narrow lanes, lack of adequate shoulders, turn lanes and passing areas, and traffic significantly higher than the facility's capacity create conditions a driver's error can result in a crash that closes the facility for extended periods. It appears the commenter may be confusing controlled access with limited access, neither of which is contemplated at this time. The comments seemed to be centered on a potential median divided facility, details of which can be addressed during preliminary engineering.

VDOT is required to implement Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) on all of its projects included in the Six Year Improvements Program (SYIP). The CSS approach seeks a realistic and practical balance between traditional transportation objectives and preservation of scenic, aesthetic,
historic, and environmental resources, and other community values and needs. It is also VDOT policy to incorporate provisions for non-motorized traffic on all SYIP projects. Widening the roadway will also improve water quality because current storm water management regulations require addressing water quality for existing pavements as well as increases in impervious surfaces.

The project will improve the local as well as regional economy by providing more reliable access and reductions in major disruptions of the facility when there are severe crashes. The decrease in traffic congestion and the reduced disruption to mobility caused by crashes in the corridor will decrease travel time between Leesburg, VA and Maryland.

G. NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE. BRT

Two sets of comments were received urging that the New Hampshire Avenue BRT be included in the constrained element.

1. **Comment:** There is high density and demand for BRT service on New Hampshire Avenue and it has been identified as a priority project. This project should be included in the constrained element.

   **TPB Staff Response:** Montgomery County has reviewed this project and determined that it can be included in the constrained element for construction. Please see the public comment notice included with this item for more details.

H. DEVELOPMENT, STRUCTURE, AND CONTENT OF THE CONSTRAINED ELEMENT

Two comment letters were received from the Coalition for Smarter Growth and Just Economics on a variety of topics. Project-specific comments have been included elsewhere in this memo. These comments pertain to the development, structure and content of the constrained element. An additional 110 comments were received echoing the Coalition for Smarter Growth’s comments.

1. **Comment:** The CLRP does not incorporate at its core the findings of the Transportation Planning Board’s (TPB) Long Range Plan Task Force (LRPTF) findings. Specifically, it does not frame the CLRP around Balanced Land Use, Transportation Demand Management, Bus Rapid Transit, and Metro Core Capacity which performed best in the analysis and the voting by the task force.

   **TPB Staff Response:** The TPB’s financially constrained long-range transportation plan is framed around its policy goals as described in its Vision and Regional Transportation Propertie’s Plan documents. The proposed constrained element includes projects and reflects programs that support these policy goals and are reflective of the findings of the Long-Range Plan Task Force. In an effort to better achieve its transportation goals and priorities, beyond the levels its current transportation plan was anticipated to provide for, the TPB examined the types of projects, programs and policies that its member jurisdictions and agencies could implement beyond those already included in its financially constrained long-range plan. Based on this work, the TPB endorsed a set of concepts represented by five improvement initiatives it endorsed. These five initiatives are also rooted in the TPB’s Goals and priorities, and specifically focus on better addressing the challenges the region faces in achieving its goals and priorities. In its resolution endorsing these initiatives, the TPB has issued a call to its member jurisdictions and agencies to “commit to fully explore the initiatives to identify specific implementation actions that could be
taken, individually and collectively, to make them part of TPB’s future fiscally constrained long-range plans.” An assessment of the proposed new projects against these endorsed initiatives has been undertaken for this update and will be considered by the Board.

2. **Comment:** The CLRP has never been explicitly structured to incorporate and support TPB’s goals including those that are examined under scenario analysis.

**TPB Staff Response:** The TPB has adopted a comprehensive set of multi-modal goals and objectives to support the socioeconomic and environmental development of the National Capital Region. These are explicitly documented in the TPB’s Vision document. Additionally, the TPB, based on its Vision goals, developed a specific set of transportation priority principles reflected in its Regional Transportation Priority Plan document. The solicitation of inputs to the CLRP issued by the TPB explicitly notes these documents and calls for projects, programs and policies proposed to be added to the long-range plan to be consistent with and advance these policy goals and priorities. The various scenario analysis examined by the TPB are intended to better inform each successive edition of its CLRP of its policy goals and priorities.

3. **Comment:** We would like to see the dates of all transit projects (including MARC) moved up to as early an implementation year as possible.

**TPB Staff Response:** The anticipated completion dates of all projects are based on the agency’s estimate of the project readiness for implementation. This includes development of project details, needed local, state and federal approval and funding availability. It is not unusual for project implementation dates to be advanced in response to any acceleration in any of these aspects of project development and implementation.

4. **Comment:** Visualize 2045 largely fails to include regionally significant measures that can help achieve the balanced land use scenario. Measures such as pricing curbside and off-street parking; pricing all roadway travel, more infill development; comprehensive policy reform that would reduce sprawl should be undertaken in the region.

**TPB Staff Response:** The region’s jurisdictions and their planning offices have fully adopted the Regional Activity Centers concept to help plan the future growth in an efficient and sustainable manner. The long-term land use forecasts represented by MWCOG’s cooperative forecasts Round 9.0 has a majority of the new growth in jobs and households located in regional Activity Centers. The TPB continues to promote a balanced and optimized distribution of jobs and housing in this region. One of the five improvement initiatives endorsed by the TPB is focused on this concept. The proposed update to his forecast, cooperative forecast Round 9.1, will be examined relative to previous forecasts to determine the extent to which it advances the optimize regional land use balance initiative endorsed by the TPB.

I. OTHER COMMENTS

- Thirty comments were received in opposition to the implementation of a Potomac River bridge crossing. Two comments were received in support of such a crossing.

**TPB Staff Response:** A project of this nature has not been proposed for inclusion in the constrained element of Visualize 2045 or as a study by any agency and is not a subject of the Board’s action at this time. A Potomac River crossing was included in a menu of items that
the Long-Range Plan Task force reviewed as part of a separate exercise, but was not advanced as a part of the recommended initiatives that the TPB endorsed in December 2017.

- One comment was received in opposition to the conversion of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway to an expanded tolled interstate style highway.

**TPB Staff Response:** This project is not being proposed to be added to the long-range plan update at this time.

**MDOT Response:** Currently, the Baltimore Washington Parkway is owned by the National Park Service (NPS), and the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) has begun discussions with them and the Secretary of the Interior to transfer ownership of the facility to the Maryland Transportation Authority (MDTA). However, the project is in the 2018 long range plan as a study only. The proposed 4 Express Toll Lanes (ETL), 2 in each direction, will provide drivers with the choice to pay for a quicker trip, simultaneously reducing delays for those who choose to stay in the existing free lanes, similar to the I-95 ETLs in Baltimore.

- One comment was received in opposition to the inclusion of the Manassas Battlefield Bypass and Bi-County Parkway (Route 234 Extended North) in the constrained element due to its environmental impacts

**TPB Staff Response:** The FHWA’s Planning Department and VDOT will conduct an environmental impact study. Consistent with the requirement for such studies we expect all environmental impacts to be examined and every effort made to minimize the impact and mitigate any impact. Should the scope of the project change during this process the TPB will be notified of such changes

- Four comments were received in support of the bicycle lane projects proposed by DDOT.
- Four comments were received in support of the Montgomery County BRT projects.
- Individual comments were received suggesting the following projects or operational strategies be included in the constrained element in the future:
  - I-95 northbound auxiliary lane from VA 294 to VA 123
  - Metrorail on I-95 to Fredericksburg
  - a 4th Lane on I-95 throughout Prince William County
  - HOT Lanes on I-95 from I-495 to MD 100
  - a pedestrian mall crossing Potomac River
  - extension of the Purple Line connecting the ends of all Metro lines
  - light rail link to Baltimore Washington International Airport
  - replacement of timed traffic signals with on-demand signals
  - elimination of all “no turn on red” restrictions
  - planning for on-demand transportation service and autonomous vehicles
Compilation of Comments Received on the Project Submissions for Inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the Constrained Element of Visualize 2045 and the FY 2019-2024 TIP

Draft project submissions for the Visualize 2045 Constrained Element

Submitted by: A Business

Rybeck, Rick  
Just Economics LLC  
Washington, District of Columbia  20009

Subject: Visualize 20145 - Public Comment

See attached document - page 11

Submitted by: A Governmental Body

Surovell, Scott  
Virginia General Assembly Members  
Mt. Vernon, Virginia  22121

Subject: Letter on Visualize 2045

See attached - page 14

Submitted by: A Non-profit Organization

Grymes, Charlie  
Prince William Conservation Alliance  
Prince William County, Virginia  20

Subject: comments on project submissions to be included in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the constrained element of Visualize 2045

See attached. - page 17

Schwartz, Stewart  
Coalition for Smarter Growth and partners  
Washington, District of Columbia  20002

Subject: Comments on draft CLRP

See attached sign-on letter by 8 organizations - page 19, additional supporting comments on page 41

Submitted by: An Individual

Polkey, Martha  
The Catoctin Coalition  
Leesburg, Virginia  20176

Subject: US 15 Widening from Battlefield Parkway to VA 661

The Catoctin Coalition strongly opposes the proposed project. 1. It circumvents an underway Loudoun County public process by local stakeholders for improvements to this road. The stakeholders group has not reached consensus. Requested analyses by stakeholders (of induced traffic, environmental and safety impacts) have not been conducted. 2. It does not in fact meet criteria to achieve Goal 4: Maximize operational effectiveness and safety, or Goal 5: Protect and enhance the environment, as stated. 3. It is being forwarded before the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors has voted to approve the Comprehensive Plan Amendment to change the designation of the road from a 2-lane local access rural arterial to a 4-lane median-divided controlled access rural arterial. 4. It circumvents an underway County process revising the comprehensive and transportation plans. I have attached a document that addresses, point by point, concerns with this transportation project. - page 40

Appendix J: Summary of Public Comment Periods | 14
The Project "US 301 WIDENING From the Governor Harry Nice Bridge to US 50/I-595" is a good start, but it is insufficient to siphon East Coast through traffic from I-95/The Beltway. Through traffic will still be dissuaded from bypassing the Beltway route because US 301 will still be slowed by stoplights and community reduced speed limits. What is needed is to make US 301 a limited access highway with no stoplights and with full highway speed limits throughout. Compared to the proposed widening, adding limited access interchanges would be relatively cheap and would be far more effective than merely widening.

Attached please find my 2-page comment letter about the draft Visualize 2045 Plan.

See attached - page 25

Please see comments submitted to my (Selma Estates) Homeowners Association Stakeholder Committee Representative. The entire length of Route 15 between north of Leesburg to the Potomac River a the Point of Rocks Bridge needs to be considered in this project. This Project as described does not address the major congestion problem of daily traffic coming from Maryland and Pennsylvania by way of the Point of Rocks and Brunswick MD river crossings. It addresses northbound traffic leaving Leesburg only. Congestion relief and safety priorities for the entire length of Route 15 in Virginia north of Leesburg are listed in the attached document.

Here are my comments: * Regarding the proposed I-270 Toll Lanes from I-495 to I-70/US 40. All these new toll lanes are a fad congestion relief. I-270 should not be widened in Montgomery County and south. Adding a lane in each direction north of Montgomery County may be in order. The real Traffic Relief Plan for this region comes from the Brunswick Line MARC Expansion Plan, which should be implemented before any widening is done on I-270. * Regarding the proposed I-495 Toll Lanes from American Legion Bridge to Woodrow Wilson Bridge. Before anything is done on this plan the Purple Line should be completed and it's impact assessed first. If the impacts from the Purple Line on congestion are positive, then extension of the Purple Line should be considered before any I-495 widening is done.

Draft project submissions for the Visualize 2045 Constrained Element
considered. * I can't comment on the other road proposals in MD, as I am not familiar with them. I do support the list of transit projects, that is where our major efforts need to go.

Boles, Margaret A.  
Prince George's County, Maryland  0

Subject:  Comment on multiple topics

Document attached - page 31

Berger, Trent  
Clifton, Virginia  20124

Subject:

I strongly support the following project:  1) Adding HOT lanes on I-495 in MD from the American Legion to Woodrow Wilson bridges. 2) Extending the HOT lanes in VA to the American Legion bridge. 3) Adding the auxiliary lane on I-95 in Woodbridge. 4) Adding HOT lanes on I-270. Unfortunately, a few projects that are much needed I do not see here. These include:  1) Adding a 4th lane on I-95 throughout ALL of Prince William County 2) Adding HOT lanes on I-95 between the Capital Beltway and exit 43 in Maryland.

Brune, David R.  
Woodbridge, Virginia  22192

Subject:  I-95 Southbound Auxiliary Lane from VA 123 to VA 294

Absolutely essential improvement project BUT it should not stop at VA 294 â€“ this improvement needs to continue to VA 234 which will make a much more meaningful impact. If at all possible â€“ this needs to happen sooner than 2025. Ideally, the extension to VA294 would be completed by 2020 with further extension to VA 234 by 2022.

Finnegan, Eileen  
Silver Spring, Maryland  20903

Subject:  Comments on Visualize 2045 Constrained Element: Missing New Project

See attached - page 32

Blankinship, Brian  
Woodbridge, Virginia  0

Subject:  I-95 Southbound Auxiliary Lane Comment (in favor)

See attached - page 33

McCoy, Kristina  
Woodbridge, Virginia  22192

Subject:  I-95 Southbound Auxiliary Lane Comment (in favor)

The Visualize 2045 plan includes a potential I-95 Southbound Auxiliary Lane. Since this region is the most congested traffic area in the US, the project should be moved up earlier than the 2028 expected completion date. There is rarely a time day or night that this area is not congested. This is a safety hazard as the area looses a lane and effectively loses two lanes as traffic from Lorton/Rte-1/Ft. Belvoir merge from what becomes the Rte-123 merge lane. The effective loss of two lanes slow commuters and through traffic to a halt creating a dangerous mix of widely differing approach speeds. The constant traffic jam also increases pollution of both the air and the water below the bridge (Occoquan, a Chesapeake Bay tributary). Additionally it impacts the dynamic activity centers in the commercial realm, the DC commuter bedroom communities, and museums (Quantico Marine Corps Museum and pending American Military History). Thank you for this opportunity to comment. Regards

Chisholm, Kevin  
Arlington, Virginia  0

Subject:  Visualize 2045 Comment

Funding (near term and long term) heavily favors (1) automobile usage and (2) suburban projects or projects for citizens outside the beltway. Very little funding is projected to be used to encourage or support non-automotive transportation.

Scheufler, Mark  
Manassas, Virginia  20111

Subject:  Draft project submissions for the Visualize 2045 Constrained Element - "I-95 Southbound Widening from VA 123 to VA 294"

Draft project submissions for the Visualize 2045 Constrained Element
I have comments regarding several of the projects on the long range plan:

1. For widening MD 201, this project should include a separated bike/ped path that also continues along the existing multi-lane section of road between Cherrywood Ln and Crescent Rd. Improvements to the Sunnyside Rd bridge over Indian Creek and the Power Mill road bridge over the RR tracks should be considered as part of the project, with enhanced bike/ped facilities.

2. Any widening of route 301 should include provision for a future transit way (rail or BRT) of some kind.

3. I strongly support the BRT routes in Montgomery County and the bike lanes in DC.

4. For the proposed toll lanes in MD, the priority should be for re-building the American Legion Bridge and creating toll lanes from there to the 270 split and north along 270.
Submitted by: A Non-profit Organization

Cameron, Diane  
Conservation Montgomery  
Kensington, Maryland  20895

Subject: Thank you for voting NO on Outer Beltway Bridge.

As a member of the Board of Conservation Montgomery, and as a member & former staffer of Audubon Naturalist Society, I’m writing to thank the Board for voting NO on the proposed Outer Beltway Bridge. And, thank you for voting YES on improved funding for transit and bus service in our region.

Submitted by: An Individual

Rushing, Kathryn  
Silver Spring , Maryland  20904

Subject: Proposed Outer Beltway

Please, no outer Beltway! Protect our region’s drinking supply and water quality and do the right thing! Long-term solutions to traffic issues should never compromise public safety and the safety of our natural resources. Thank you.

Lindholm, Martin  
Bethesda, Maryland  20814

Subject: Do not build an outer beltway bridge

We are lucky to live in a region that is seeing rapid growth, but we all know this presents its own set of challenges. It has been shown that roads lead to increased sprawl and more car trips. The outer beltway is just such an initiative, more likely to exacerbate our transportation issues in the long term than to solve them. It also poses serious environmental issues, not just in the loss of green space and habitats, but also a substantial risk to the water that 5 million area residents drink. It is time for our region to focus on a more sustainable model of growth, with higher density areas accessible by public transportation. Our public transportation desperately needs a more ambitious vision and a commitment that stretches across jurisdictions and past the next fiscal year. If you aim to support our growth while reducing congestion, please focus on opportunities like tying together Montgomery County with Tyson's Corner using public transportation, not another beltway.

Bush, Elizabeth  
Bethesda, Maryland  20816

Subject: outer beltway, new bridge

I am NOT in favor of a new outer beltway/Potomac River crossing. There is too much chance of harming the entire region’s water supply, which comes from the Potomac River, downstream of the proposed River crossing.

Todd, Cindy  
SILVER SPRING, Maryland  20904

Subject: NO new bridge over the Potomac

No new bridge over the Potomac. This is STILL a bad idea and jeopardizes our water supply.

Chevy Chase, Frank  
Chevy Chase, Maryland  20815

Subject: Potomac River bridge

Thanks for not pursuing another bridge across the Potomac. Our water supply will be in much better shape if this bridge is not built.

Cochran, Clayton  
Kensington, Maryland  20895

Subject: Proposed New Bridge for the Potomac River

I am writing as former Conservation Chair of the Potomac Chapter of the Appalachian Mountain Club, a current volunteer Trail Ranger for Montgomery County, and a volunteer with the Audubon Naturalist Society, and a nearly 50-year resident of Montgomery County. The LAST thing that Montgomery County needs is to again bridge the Potomac River. Catering to the business interests of Virginians (who have turned over their countryside to massive road systems
and dreadful sprawl), and to a few parochial Mont. Co. business interests will do great damage to the general public. We depend on good water from the Potomac. The massive traffic that will inundate our county via a new bridge will forever change the character of our area. Please do not allow this monstrosity to proceed and think of people, not special interests. Thank you, Clayton E. Cochran

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greene, Mitch</td>
<td>Silver Spring, Maryland</td>
<td>Thank you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for not advancing the Northern Potomac bridge crossing. While I firmly believe that more ways across the Potomac are necessary to improve traffic flow in the area, building a whole new bridge--in a sensitive area!--is not the answer. Perhaps I live in a fantasy world but I love stacked highways and bridges. They're complicated, but they use the (mostly!) unused vertical space. Thank you again for keeping our drinking water safe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goldberg, Robert</td>
<td>Germantown, Maryland</td>
<td>Outer Beltway - northern Potomac bridge crossing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See attached - page 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whittfield, Paula</td>
<td>Silver Spring, Maryland</td>
<td>strongly against outer beltway bridge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am strongly, vehemently opposed to the propose beltway bridge. Not only would it put our drinking water supply in danger it would continue to fragment and destroy habitat even more than it already has been in this area.. enough is enough.. NO to this bridge! Thank you, Paula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liotta, Marilyn</td>
<td>Silver Spring, Maryland</td>
<td>Potomac bridges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No more bridges across the Potomac..think about pollution please. And fix the metro and it's parking facilities so it's appealing enough to transport more people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambler, Anne</td>
<td>Silver Spring, Maryland</td>
<td>Thanks for prioritizing drinking water: no new highway bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for not including another highway crossing of the Potomac in the long range transportation plan. The focus should be on providing comprehensive mass transit as a large part of improving quality of life while preserving our forests and farms. Another bridge and the highway that would connect it would have seriously degraded our water supply, through both the construction itself and the development and traffic it would bring. Sincerely, Anne Ambler Silver Spring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartolomeo, Kathy</td>
<td>Greenbelt, Maryland</td>
<td>Potomac Bridge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for protecting our water by not voting for the new Potomac Bridge. Sincerely, Kathy Bartolomeo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goldberg, Robert</td>
<td>Germantown, Maryland</td>
<td>Thank you for not recommending the additional bridge crossing of the Potomac River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for not recommending the additional bridge crossing of the Potomac River. Your decision will help to protect our drinking water, farms, and Agricultural Reserve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bailey, Joyce</td>
<td>Barnesville, Maryland</td>
<td>outer Beltway Bridge across the Potomac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Planning Board Members, I am writing to encourage you to NOT PURSUE plans to build a second bridge across the Potomac River. This is not a viable solution to our areas transportation needs. It has been shown repeatedly that Other Regional Transportation Issue
building additional roads and bridges simply stimulates more far flung development and road congestion. We need to protect our drinking water and the source of that water is the Potomac River. Our River is already challenged by upstream pollution and at times, low flow rates due to longer periods of drought in our area brought on by Climate Change. We need to keep traffic away from the river so that any spills and accidents occurring on our roadways do not spill over into the Potomac River. We all know that despite our best efforts, accidents and spills do happen all too frequently. We need to protect our drinking water by protecting our River. We are counting on you to abandon any plans to build another bridge across the Potomac. Thank you.

Witherel, Jeff and Linda

Is there any consideration in the plan for Metro down/up I 95 ILO HOV lanes?. I feel that by relying on Metro to/from Fredericksburg vice HOV we will be taking vehicles off of this congested avenue.

Suvarna, Shreenivas

Hello, I had an idea that might be a way to get people out of their cars and use public transportation more. A lot of people work in one state and live in another, but many of those do not deal with DC. The current transportation issue with the area is that it takes longer to commute using public transportation vs drive by a lot of time. In my case, I live in MD but work in N. VA and it would take over 2.5 hours to commute from the metro plus time getting to the Metro, where as if I drive, I can make the drive in 45 min on normal traffic. I would suggest that a second crossing be created, but let us be better about it and create something to get people out of their cars. Seeing this, I would suggest a Mall across the Potomac that would connect VA and MD together. There would be parking lots and buses from the location, but the only way to cross would be to walk. In addition the mall could have restaurants and stores to spur the economy. Regards, Seenu Suvarna

Lane, June B. and Edward S.

Before the meeting today, I want to weigh in on the idea of a new Potomac bridge. After having been active in local transportation issues for many years, my husband and I want to register our opposition to any further consideration of a bridge anywhere in Loudoun County. We have seen no actual scientific studies (as opposed to that commissioned by the group that wants the bridge based on either best practices in traffic management or the will of the people. Once people understand the issues involved, they realize that a new bridge anywhere in Loudoun (or perhaps anywhere other than supporting the upgrading of the American Legion Bridge) will cause more problems than it solves. The financial cost would be ghastly. If the bridge is supported by tolls, it would cost so much that people would avoid it. If it is supported by taxes, that expenditure will drain money from other, more effective projects. DROP THE BRIDGE FROM THE PLANNING DOCUMENTS!!!

Agarwal, Nitin

The proposed northern Potomac bridge would create a new and unnecessary risk to this already fragile drinking water supply. Four of the region’s drinking water intakes are downstream from the most frequently proposed northern bridge crossing, and an accident which leads to a major spill of gasoline or other toxic chemicals would directly threaten drinking water for the majority of the region’s residents. If the intakes need to be shut down, we will have only 48 hours of drinking water supply without the Potomac. Accidents are common, and a study of data from 1991-2000 found that the likelihood of a spill in the event of a crash was 50% higher for hazardous materials than non-hazardous.

Sterling, Diana

Hello, I’m writing to ask that you vote no to a new Potomac bridge in Loudoun county. It will generate new traffic, by as much as 85% according to one VDOT study. Loudoun will become a mainline for big rigs carrying freight. Route 28, Route 7 & the Dulles Toll Road will turn into a parking lot (again). A second crossing will divert taxpayer dollars from critically needed projects such as Metro and improvements to east/west corridors that could ease our already congested roadways. The bridge will bring more pollution, noise and lowered home values. It will destroy a large chunk of the

Other Regional Transportation Issue
Potomac River watershed, wetlands and our dwindling green spaces. A bridge in this location also threatens our drinking water supply. Please do not include such a crossing in the plan. sincerely, ~D Diana Bendit

Benjamin, Katherine
Garrett Park, Maryland 20896
Subject: Potomac bridge crossing for outer beltway

No to the bridge. Protect our drinking water!

Schubert, Richard
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
Subject: Outer beltway

Ladies and Gentlemen: Just because there is an undeveloped piece of land does not mean it needs to be destroyed. I strongly encourage you to REJECT any proposition that would lead to furtherance of an Outer Beltway. There are already more than enough roads traversing Montgomery County; enough trees have been cut; enough watersheds polluted; enough rocks blasted; enough concrete and asphalt poured. Try to take a longer view: someday your children and grandchildren will need to deal with the results of the destruction such a road would bring-- please don't do it. Thank you. Richard Schubert Bethesda MD

Henderson-O'Keefe, Parrie
Washington, District of Columbia 20010
Subject: Additional Northern Potomac Bridge Crossing

DO NOT ADD AN ADDITIONAL BRIDGE ACROSS THE POTOMAC. We can not continue to pave every piece of precious land in service to the almighty automobile! Find alternatives that DISCOURAGE car use, not encourage it. When you start putting automobiles ahead of safe water and green spaces you've made a deal with the devil. You don't raise our region, you lower it. Our quality of life goes down, our safety goes down, and we destroy our environment. This is insane.

Padgett, Philip & Mary
Kensington, Maryland 20895
Subject: No Outer Beltway Bridge

Dear Chairman, No, do not approve the building of an outer beltway bridge. This is a bad idea that only would exacerbate the bad decisions of the past. When we fly into Dulles Airport, we often approach first over Maryland. Looking down, we see a verdant land of balanced, smart growth. As soon as the plane crosses the Potomac into Virginia, we are over a World War I battlefield of rapacious development. When oh when did "Virginia Mother of Presidents" become "Virginia Panderer to Developers?" Enough is enough. Our region must find and take a better alternative path to the future. If a shock to the system is needed to start that, then saying no to an outer beltway bridge is the right action at the right time - now! Sincerely, Philip and Mary Padgett, Kensington, MD

Wayne, Barbara
Sterling, Virginia 20165
Subject: Additional Northern Potomac River Crossing

In addition to promoting sprawl, increasing congestion and competing with the new metro stations in eastern Loudoun, the Northern Potomac Crossing project will present a clear threat to the region's drinking water supply. The Potomac River in this area is a sole source aquifer depended on by about five million of your neighbors. A bridge in the area will provide an opportunity for disaster which could result in leaving those millions without any drinkable water for an undetermined period of time. Without the river, we have 24-48 hours of drinking water. One spill amounting to one tanker truck could contaminate intakes for Fairfax, Montgomery, Prince Georges and Loudoun Counties, Rockville and the District. All this for a "developer's dream." Please ensure this project does NOT make it onto your plans in any form. It should never see the light of day.

Ambler, Anne
Silver Spring, Maryland 20902
Subject: NO to another Potomac River crossing

I am a resident of Montgomery County who values what this area offers. That includes relatively clean air and water and a nationally recognized agricultural reserve that contributes greatly to preserving that clean air and water. Another bridge and highway do not compensate for their degradation. A major highway bridge increases the likelihood of a chemical spill that could contaminate our drinking water. Accidents are common, and a study of data from 1991-2000 found that
the likelihood of a spill in the event of a crash was 50% higher for hazardous materials than non-hazardous. One tanker truck of hazardous material can contaminate an entire drinking water system. Remember Charleston? The amount equivalent to one tanker left 300,000 Charleston WV residents without water for over 10 days in 2014. Is this the future for the DC Metro area? Clearly Third World. Please focus on transit and stop planning more highways as a First World country that values its future should do.

Browne, Janice  Silver Spring, Maryland  20910
Subject:  Say NO to another Potomac bridge

The proposal to build another Potomac crossing is extremely ill-advised. As this area's primary source of drinking water, the risk of contamination -- both from construction and operation -- is simply too high. The many reasons NOT to do this are the same as the previous times this proposal was defeated. Please refer to the testimony of the Audubon Naturalist Society.  http://conservationblog.anshome.org/blog/action-alert-outer-beltway-bridge-still-threatens-our-drinking-water-supply-regional-vote-weds-12-20-17/ Thank you.

Brown, Doug  unknown, District of Columbia  0
Subject:  

Once again a new Potomac bridge crossing is being evaluated, and once again the studies show as they always do what a bad idea this is in so many different ways from air and water quality to increased traffic congestion and volume. Please remove this study from your list of projects for the future and focus on the ones that show they have the merit to be implemented, mass transit, land use and fixing existing roadways and bridges that are in poor shape and outdated.

Miller, Kristie  Washington, District of Columbia  20008
Subject:  Outer Beltway Bridge

Please do not even consider building this bridge. It could seriously imperil the DC area drinking water supply in the event of a toxic spill. As we have learned to our cost, such accidents are all but inevitable. Do not gamble with our community's health and safety!

Gravitz, Michael  Chevy Chase, Maryland  20815
Subject:  Opposing the outer bridge crossing of the Potomac

Dear Commission members,  In an era of increasingly worse summer heat, bad air pollution that comes mostly from transportation sources, a need to protect Potomac River water intakes and Montgomery County's Ag Reserve, it seems silly to have to urge your committee to oppose this idea for another Potomac River crossing and highway. The State of Maryland is already losing money on the Intercounty Connector, we don't need an outer Beltway, and this proposed plan for another Potomac River crossing looks lined up to compound these mistakes.  As a taxpayer in Montgomery County and Maryland, a breather of air, and supporter of the Ag Reserve, I wish to register my strong opposition to this idea. There are many, many alternatives to this idea --all of them a better use of resources and greener solutions.  Mike Gravitz

Farb, Anna  Columbia, Maryland  21044
Subject:  Outer Beltway Bridge

The proposed northern Potomac bridge would create a new and unnecessary risk to this already fragile drinking water supply. Four of the region's drinking water intakes are downstream from the most frequently proposed northern bridge crossing, and an accident which leads to a major spill of gasoline or other toxic chemicals would directly threaten drinking water for the majority of the region's residents.

Keenan, Linda  Silver Spring, Maryland  20901
Subject:  Proposed North Potomac Bridge

I am writing to urge you to oppose any new bridges across the Potomac River. We should not be planning to accommodate more auto traffic and increase runoff, we should be planning projects that encourage other modes of transportation that do not increase impervious surfaces. I will urge all of my elected officials to oppose new bridges and Beltway widening.  Thank you.
I am opposed a new outer beltway bridge. A major highway bridge increases the likelihood of a chemical spill that could contaminate our drinking water. In 1997, 1 out of 10 trucks in the US was transporting hazardous material. About half of those carried flammable liquids, such as gasoline, diesel fuel, and fuel oil. Accidents are common, and a study of data from 1991-2000 found that the likelihood of a spill in the event of a crash was 50% higher for hazardous materials than non-hazardous. One tanker truck of hazardous material can contaminate an entire drinking water system. Water intakes for Fairfax County, the City of Rockville, Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties, and the District of Columbia are all downstream from the most likely crossing.
Comment on Visualize 2045
January 12, 2018

To the Transportation Planning Board & Staff:

The Washington Metropolitan Region (Region) suffers from very bad traffic congestion. Yet congestion arises from land use patterns as much as it arises from particular transportation facilities. This was recently demonstrated by modeling the "Balanced Land Use" scenario as part of the Long Range Plan Task Force. **Visualize 2045 largely fails to include regionally significant measures that can help achieve the balanced land use scenario.**

During the 1900s, many people believed that congestion was caused by land use density. It was assumed that spreading out homes and businesses through suburbanization would reduce density and congestion. Although there is generally more congestion in high-density places than in low-density places, it turns out that low- to medium-density, single-use development patterns (often referred to as “sprawl”) create the most traffic congestion. In high-density places with diverse land uses, walking, biking, transit and other forms of shared transportation are often an option. In places characterized by sprawl, almost every activity outside the home requires a private vehicle trip.

Cars take up lots of space when parked – and even more space when moving (1 car-length between it and the next vehicle for every 10mph of speed). Additionally, while we tolerate homelessness for people, we do not tolerate “homelessness” for cars. Zoning and other development regulations often require that cars have dedicated parking spaces at home, at work and at shopping and entertainment venues. Thus, there are more than 2 dedicated parking spaces for each vehicle. Space dedicated to parking (much of it vacant much of the time) creates additional distance between trip origins and trip destinations. The space requirements associated with auto parking and travel combined with the necessity for using a car for almost every activity ensure that sprawl will generate worse traffic congestion than higher-density areas that permit walking, cycling, transit and other forms of shared transportation.

Many of the highway projects in the draft updated constrained long-range plan (Visualize 2045), seek to **accommodate sprawl by adding new lanes.** History shows that this approach encourages more sprawl development that will soon overwhelm the improved facilities. More balanced land use (placing houses, jobs and shops closer together in a mixed-use environment) performs better in terms of reducing congestion, energy consumption and pollution. **But key actions required to move toward more balanced land use are omitted from Visualize 2045.**

With the exception of a few tolled HOV lanes, most of the Region’s roads and highways are free
to use regardless of the distance travelled and regardless of the level of congestion. This encourages many households and businesses to locate at the periphery of the Region, where land prices are lower. Unfortunately, lower land prices are offset by increasing traffic congestion, energy consumption and pollution. But these negative effects become apparent to households and businesses only indirectly. If these effects were more apparent directly, in terms of transportation and land use costs, many households and businesses would make different and more beneficial land use choices.

The jurisdictions that comprise the Region can help achieve the “balanced land use scenario” by adopting an integrated set of policies including the following:

- Parking (curbside and off-street) should be priced according to demand.
- All roadway travel should be priced according to distance and congestion. Additional surcharges can be added for heavy and/or heavily polluting vehicles. NOTE: Metrorail already charges users according to distance and congestion. Distance- and congestion-based roadway prices encourage households and businesses to locate closer to daily activities and to the people that they regularly engage.
- Development Impact Fees should be assessed only in those areas where infrastructure is lacking or where infrastructure would need to be expanded to accommodate new development. This discourages sprawl development;
- Property taxes should be transformed into public service access fees. This is accomplished by reducing the property tax rate applied to privately-created building values and increasing the tax rate applied to publicly-created land values.
  - The lower rate on building values makes buildings cheaper to construct, improve and maintain;
  - The higher rate on land values moderates land prices. It also creates an economic incentive to develop high-value land (typically infill sites near existing infrastructure). Increased infill development reduces the demand for sprawl development.
- Zoning regulations should be changed to:
  - Replace parking minimums with parking maximums in activity centers; and
  - Permit greater density and mixed-use development in tightly-defined activity centers.

To some people, the “balanced land use” scenario seems like an unattainable ideal. Balanced land use is attainable. Sprawl is not natural or inevitable. Sprawl has been (and is being) subsidized by incentives embedded in existing tax, regulatory and roadway pricing policies. Every jurisdiction within the Region can benefit from a comprehensive set of policy reforms that will reduce sprawl. Just Economics is prepared to assist the Region’s jurisdictions (individually or collectively) to implement these and other measures that can simultaneously:

- Enhance opportunities and incentives for walking, cycling, transit and other forms of shared transportation, thereby reducing SOV trips and congestion;
- Reduce rents for both housing and business space, enhancing housing affordability and job creation;
- Enhance infill development and thereby reduce demand for expensive infrastructure extensions (reduced public expenditures);
• Enhance land value return and recycling to make infrastructure financially self-sustaining to a greater degree than today (enhanced public revenues);
• Enhanced equity because roadway and transit users pay for public goods and services in proportion to the benefits that they receive or the costs that they impose upon others;
• Enhanced equity because landowners will pay in proportion to the public benefits that they receive.

The transportation departments of the District, Maryland and Virginia, the transportation staff at the Transportation Planning Board, and the Transportation Planning Board members themselves have played an important role in making the Washington Metropolitan Region one of the most prosperous and desirable metropolitan regions in the country. At one level, congestion is a symptom of success. Congestion arises from people going to work, to school, to shop and to visit friends and entertain themselves. Cities where the factories and stores have closed generally don’t suffer from traffic congestion. But, while some congestion is unavoidable, it is like friction. And too much friction can cause the Region’s economic machine to under-perform or even decline.

The Washington Metropolitan Region is at a pivotal moment. Climate change and urban sprawl did not happen in an instant. Neither can they be remedied in an instant. But a failure to take meaningful action now will have inevitable and unavoidable consequences in the future. TPB has a track record of stepping beyond its transportation silo and working with MWCOG’s and the member jurisdictions’ planning, environmental, housing and economic development departments to create a regional vision and to address some of the Region’s most pressing challenges. Therefore TPB, MWCOG and the Region’s jurisdictions can do this again. They can design and implement a “balanced land use” program as outlined above. The elements of this program have been used successfully in communities in the United States and around the world. If we are successful, our children and grandchildren will praise us for our courage and foresight. If we fail this challenge, they will curse us for timidity and ignorance. Let us act and be praiseworthy.

Thank you for considering my remarks. Please let me know if you have any questions or if I can provide any assistance regarding the design and implementation of a “balanced land use” approach to transportation solutions, affordable housing and sustainable, equitable prosperity.

Sincerely,

Rick Rybeck, Director
January 13, 2018

Chairman Charles Allen  
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board  
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20002-4239

RE: MCOG Draft Project List for Air Conformity Inputs

Dear Chairman Allen:

We are writing to submit public comment regarding the Metropolitan Council of Governments’ Draft Project List of Air Conformity. The list includes the U.S. 1 Bus Rapid Transit System (Project 808) with a completion date of 2030.

I am not familiar with that completion date. The elected officials representing the U.S. 1 Corridor have endorsed completing the project as soon as possible and are endeavoring to complete it by 2022 or 2024 at the latest.

Additionally, consistent with the U.S. 1 Multimodal Alternative Analysis, we have also pledged to achieve a two-stop extension of the Yellow Line in the next 15 years. If the list is intended to cover project through 2045, then the Yellow Line Extension should likewise be included with a completion date no later than 2032.

We are elected officials who represent U.S. 1 and we have repeatedly stated that we want to construct this project much sooner than 2030. We have been committed to completing this project ever since we endorsed the Route One Multimodal Alternatives Study in October of 2014. Please change the expected completion date for Project 808 to 2022 and add the Yellow Line Extension.

Sincerely Yours,

Senator Scott A. Surovell  
36th District

Delegate Paul E. Krizek  
44th District

CC:  Chairman Sharon S. Bulova  
Supervisor Daniel G. Storck  
Supervisor Jeffrey C. McKay  
Mr. Thomas P. Biesadny
January 13, 2018

Chairman Charles Allen  
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board  
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20002-4239

Dear Chairman Allen,

I urge you to reconsider the list of projects for inclusion in Visualize 2045 and to include bus rapid transit (BRT) on New Hampshire Avenue between the Colesville Park and Ride Lot (north of Randolph Road) south to Eastern Avenue (at the border with the District of Columbia). Ideally, with the support of the District’s Mayor and Council, this route would continue south to the Fort Totten Metro station, connecting eastern Montgomery and northern Prince George’s commuters with the Purple Line at the Takoma/Langley Station, and to the Red Line and Green Line at Fort Totten.

For the following reasons, New Hampshire Avenue BRT should be added to the Visualize 2045 plan:

- We know there is already very high demand for bus service in this corridor. The implementation of Metro K9 limited stop bus service (between FDA and Fort Totten) in 2013 resulted in a 25% increase in ridership, followed by a 61% increase in 2014. As of June, 2017 K9 ridership has leveled off but is still steadily strong; there was a 5% increase in 2017 with over 320,000 riders on this route in the Metro FY17 fiscal year.¹

- There is very high existing residential density on New Hampshire Avenue that could support BRT. And significant new development is underway in Hillandale, all of which will rely heavily on transit.

¹ Metrobus Monthly Ridership - June 2017:  
- It will connect Fort Totten and the Takoma-Langley Transit Center directly with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), campus, already the largest employer on the eastern side of Montgomery County, and one that is rapidly growing. According to the FDA Master Plan update, nearly 9,000 additional employees will be added at the FDA’s White Oak campus on New Hampshire Avenue.

- The Montgomery County Council has identified BRT on New Hampshire Avenue as a priority transit project. In 2013, the Council approved a long term transit priorities plan, the Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan, which listed BRT on New Hampshire Avenue as a priority BRT project for study and eventual construction. Since then, we’ve invested further in BRT on New Hampshire Avenue; by allocating $2 million in 2015 for a New Hampshire Avenue BRT study.

- The Takoma-Langley Crossroads is the highest trafficked transit hub outside of the reach of a Metro station and must continue to be a focus of mass transit enhancements.

- The cross-jurisdictional nature of the project would also make it eligible for funding from other local Maryland governments, the state of Maryland, the District of Columbia, and the federal government.

Thank you for including other important Montgomery County BRT corridors, like Randolph Road, Viers Mill Road, 355 and the Bethesda Transitway, in Visualize 2045. However, New Hampshire Avenue BRT should not be left behind. It has long been a stated priority for BRT expansion in Montgomery County BRT and should be reflected as such in Visualize 2045.

Sincerely,

Tom Hucker
The Prince William Conservation Alliance supports improving mobility in our region. That includes upgrading our highway network, in addition to expanding the network of bike/pedestrian paths.

We need to expand the number of live-work-play communities, places where people can get “from here to there” without using a car.

The Prince William Conservation Alliance supports converting VRE from a rush hour commuter rail system into a two-way transit system. That will incentivize transit-oriented development, which will improve mobility and minimize costs to taxpayers over the long run.

We support the proposed Virginia Railway Express (VRE) Service Improvements on the Fredericksburg and Manassas lines (ConID 504 in the inputs for the Air Quality Conformity Analysis at https://www.mwcog.org/assets/1/28/12202017_-_Item_9_-_Visualize_2045_Conformity_Input_Table.pdf).

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on Route 1 (ConID 808) will also support mobility in a corridor where new housing and jobs should be concentrated.

The region also needs to increase the capacity for moving people in cars and buses.

Building interchanges on VA 234 Bypass (ConID 678 for Balls Ford Road, ConID 727 for Sudley Manor Drive, and ConID 739 for University Boulevard) are appropriate investments. They will help spur the growth planned at Innovation, and will smooth traffic flow between Route 28 and I-66.

The improved traffic flow resulting from those interchanges should eliminate the need to build a new Route 28 bypass around Manassas. The ongoing study (ConID 656) is considering Option 2B, but that would damage Bull Run Regional Park and affect historic sites associated with the First Battle of Manassas in 1861.

In contrast, proposals for building a Bi-County Parkway in Prince William-Loudoun counties (ConID 286) are a waste of money. That road would not improve safety, reduce traffic congestion, or facilitate transit-oriented development. It would simply encourage more sprawl.

ConID 853 appears to be mis-labeled. If that project involves new ramps located 1.5 miles west of Route 15, then the “University Boulevard Ramps” are on the other side of Haymarket from University Boulevard. Those ramps are an inappropriate inducement for extending suburban sprawl into the Rural Area of Prince William County.

Those ramps were never included in the public hearing for I-66 Outside the Beltway. When they were revealed along with a new parking lot and bridge over I-66 *after* the public involvement process, Prince William officials made their opposition clear - see http://www.pwconserve.org/landuse/i66/main.html for more details.

ConID 853 should be dropped. If ConID 785 (Heathcote Boulevard Extension) is associated with those ramps, then it too should be deleted.
The proposed I-66 flyover ramps .65 miles east of VA Bus 234 were also proposed after completion of the public involvement process. Their impact on Manassas Battlefield National Park is not appropriate. Those ramps (with no ConID number) should be deleted.

- Charlie Grymes
Chair, Prince William Conservation Alliance

[www.pwconserve.org](http://www.pwconserve.org)
January 13, 2018

Chair Charles Allen  
Transportation Planning Board  
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments  
777 N. Capitol Street, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20002

Re: Joint Sign-On Letter re Draft Constrained Long Range Plan

Dear Chair Allen and members of the Transportation Planning Board:

The undersigned organizations write to express our strong concerns about the draft Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) because it does not incorporate at its core the findings of the Transportation Planning Board’s (TPB) Long Range Plan Task Force (LRPTF) findings. Specifically, it does not frame the CLRP around Balanced Land Use, Transportation Demand Management, Bus Rapid Transit, and Metro Core Capacity which performed best in the analysis and the voting by the task force (see our comment letter of Nov 30, 2017). We don’t mention Express Toll Lanes here because this coalition continues to support transit and transit-oriented development as the framework for regional growth and transportation, offering the best long-term transportation performance, and the best approach for social equity, sustainability and economic competitiveness.

While the TPB has on many occasions developed scenarios that have shown the benefits of land use, demand management and transit solutions, and frequently called on the jurisdictional transportation planners to address climate change, the east-west economic divide, and “access-for-all” in their submissions, the CLRP has never been explicitly structured to incorporate and support these goals.

We have another global concern, and that is the overwhelming number of highway and arterial road expansion projects across suburban Maryland and Virginia in this draft plan. Certainly a number are necessary but over the long term if we don’t change the pattern and design of development and achieve the TPB goals of focusing more growth in activity centers in a pedestrian and bicycle friendly, and transit-accessible environment, then we will not achieve a sustainable and effective transportation system. We have long argued that the CLRP should be focused on investing in TOD packages which combine local streets, bike/pedestrian and transit, along with rail and BRT connections between centers.
Time does not permit us to comment on every project or to sign on all of our partners, so please accept the following comments as not being all inclusive:

1) We would like to see the dates of all transit projects moved up to as early an implementation year as possible.
2) We are strongly supportive of all bicycle infrastructure projects.
3) We are strongly supportive of all bus rapid transit projects that meet at least Gold Standard BRT for the maximum extent of their routes (i.e. minimal time in mixed-traffic, and maximum incorporation of features such as level-boarding, all-door boarding, off-board fare collection, real time information, dedicated lanes, and traffic signal priority.
4) We support Metrorail and bus investments.
5) We support deletion of the VRE extension to Haymarket in favor of more rail cars and more frequent service, station platform expansions throughout the system, and a station closer to Godwin Drive to be closer to the Innovation center.
6) We support the MARC investment plan and want the dates for implementation of MARC projects moved up.
7) We recommend that the Long Bridge, American Legion Bridge, and Rosslyn Metro tunnel be your top big-project investment focus, after the Metro capital rehabilitation. We do support extension of the Virginia HOT lanes across the American Legion Bridge to the I-270 spur to address the most significant need, provided that significant investment is made in express bus service including connecting Red Line and Silver Line job centers.
8) We strongly oppose the 76-mile Maryland Express Toll Lanes proposal for the Beltway and I-270 and we oppose conversion of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway to an expanded tolled interstate style highway. Unlike the Virginia HOT lanes, the Maryland proposal doesn’t guarantee that HOV users will travel free, and doesn’t use the revenues to fund express bus service or build park and ride lots for carpoolers and transit users. The tight right-of-way on a long stretch of 495 means massive tree loss. The 495 proposal ignores the fact that a big cause of outer loop traffic in the morning and inner loop traffic in the evening is the east-west jobs imbalance. Addressing that imbalance with Maryland incentive investments in TOD in eastern Montgomery and Prince George’s, combined with a Purple Line extension to Virginia would be a more effective long-term solution. I-270 expansion to Frederick will fuel more sprawling development in the absence of better land use policies. A combination of land use, HOV and bus extension on I-270, MARC investment, and Route 355 BRT would be a more effective approach.
9) We continue to oppose inclusion of the Manassas Battlefield Bypass and BiCounty Parkway (Route 234 Extended North) in the CLRP. Both have been the source of broad opposition and have been shown not to address area congestion. Rather, they open up rural land to development, harm the historic battlefield, put the Bull Run watershed and Occoquan drinking water supply at risk, and add to traffic. Many of our organizations have offered a range of more
effective alternatives including roundabout near the battlefield, and the investment in I-66 and Route 28, along with VRE, meets most of the needs in the area.

10) Proposed expansion of Route 301 from Route 50 to the Henry Nice Bridge. We are concerned that effective alternatives to this expansion from 4 to 6 lanes throughout the corridor have not been studied, including land use, targeted interchange investments, and local parallel road networks that reduce demand in the key bottleneck areas of 301.

11) Another project may seem small but is symbolic of the problems we see with local and state transportation planning. This is the Loudoun/VDOT proposal to widen a 3.6 segment of Route 15 north of Leesburg -- a prelude to widening it all the way to the Potomac. However, the agencies never fairly studied a roundabout solution like the one proven successful at Route 50/Route 15 in Loudoun. Roundabouts with a two-lane Route 15 will move traffic better, make the road safer, and save money. Widening from two to four lanes while keeping traffic lights will mean continued traffic delays, and only lead to future proposals for costly interchanges. If this end-to-end expansion were to be built, VDOT will have spent hundreds of millions of dollars, fueled more sprawling development, and compromised another rural landscape. We recommend rejection of this project in the CLRP to allow for a thorough study of a roundabout and traffic calming alternative.

Thank you for consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Stewart Schwartz
Executive Director
Coalition for Smarter Growth

Caroline Taylor
Executive Director
Montgomery Countryside Alliance

John Sutherland
President
Arlington Coalition for Sensible Transportation

Christopher G. Miller
President
Piedmont Environmental Council
John Campagna  
Executive Director  
1000 Friends of Maryland

Lauren Greenberger  
President  
Sugarloaf Citizens Association

Trip Pollard  
Senior Attorney, Director Land and Community Program  
Southern Environmental Law Center

Charlie Grymes  
Chair  
Prince William Conservation Alliance
January 13, 2018

Chair Charles Allen
Transportation Planning Board
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 N. Capitol Street, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002

Re: Draft Visualize 2045 Long Range Plan

Dear Chair Allen and members of the Transportation Planning Board:

As a past member of the TPB’s Citizens Advisory Committee, and a current member of Purple Line NOW!, Action Committee for Transit, and Montgomery County Sierra Club, I pay attention to transportation issues and especially want to see our region develop more transit, better land use, and fewer highways. I have listed below some items that I see as supporting/incorporating core findings of the TPB’s Long Range Plan Task Force, while other items (also mentioned below) do not. Visualize 2045 should emphasize Balanced Land Use, Transportation Demand Management, Bus Rapid Transit, and Metro Core Capacity. The TPB should push the jurisdictional transportation planners to address climate change, the east-west economic divide, and access for all in their submissions.

In that regard, the number of highway and arterial road expansion projects across suburban Maryland (and Virginia) in this draft Visualize 2045 plan cause concern. Certainly a number are necessary but over the long term, if we don’t change the pattern and design of development and achieve the TPB goals of focusing more growth in activity centers in a pedestrian and bicycle friendly, and transit-accessible environment, then we will not achieve a sustainable and effective transportation system. Smart growth advocates have long argued that the Long Range Plan should be focused on investing in TOD packages of local streets, bike/pedestrian and transit, along with rail and BRT connections between centers.

Here are some comments I hope you will consider:

1) Transit project dates should be moved up to as early an implementation year as possible.

2) Strongly support all bicycle infrastructure projects.

3) Support all bus rapid transit projects that meet at least Gold Standard BRT for the maximum extent of their routes (i.e. minimal time in mixed-traffic, and maximum incorporation of features such as level-boarding, all-door boarding, off-board fare collection, real time information, dedicated lanes, and traffic signal priority.

4) It is imperative that our region support Metrorail and bus investments.
5) The MARC investment plan is good; dates for implementation of MARC projects should be moved up. This, plus implementation of BRT on Rt. 355 in Montgomery County could go a long ways towards relieving current traffic congestion on I-270.

6) The Long Bridge, American Legion Bridge, and Rosslyn Metro tunnel should be the next top big-investment projects. Extending Virginia HOT lanes across the American Legion Bridge to the I270 spur will address the most significant need, provided that significant investment is made in express bus service including connecting Red Line and Silver Line job centers.

7) Please do not support the 76-mile Maryland Express Toll Lanes proposal for the 495/Beltway, I-270 and the conversion of Baltimore-Washington Parkway to an expanded tolled interstate style highway. Unlike the Virginia HOT lanes, the Maryland proposal doesn’t guarantee that HOV users will travel free, and doesn’t use the revenues to fund express bus service or build park and ride lots for carpoolers and transit users. The 495 proposal has an extremely tight ROW, would involve taking of many homes, massive tree loss and simply ignores the fact that a big cause of outer loop traffic in the a.m. and inner loop traffic in the p.m. is due to the east-west jobs imbalance. To address this, Maryland should incentivize investments in TOD in eastern Montgomery and Prince George’s. This, combined with mobility relief provided by the upcoming Purple Line (which could be extended to Virginia), would be a more effective long-term solution. Note also that I-270 expansion to Frederick will fuel more sprawling development in the absence of better land use policies. A combination of land use, HOV and bus extension on I-270, MARC investment, and Route 355 BRT would be a more effective approach.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,
Tina Slater
From: Marc Brenman <mbrenman001@comcast.net>

Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 10:47 PM

To: TPBcomment

Subject: Comments on Visualize 2045 CLR P

1. Tolling and pricing have economically regressive effects on low income people. If these solutions are pursued, means must be found to reduce the adverse effects on low income people.
2. Right now, all the North-South truck traffic on the East is forced onto the Beltway. An Outer Beltway is the obvious solution.
3. The current MetroRail system is hub and spokes. The ends of the spokes need to be connected.
4. Bus Rapid Transit is an obvious and low cost solution to many public transit commuter problems.
5. All timed traffic signals should be replaced with on demand signals. A huge amount of time and energy is wasted waiting for cross traffic that isn't there.
6. All "no right turn on red" rules should be ended.
7. Telecommuting and other virtual transportation initiatives should be encouraged.
8. Planning should include transportation on demand services such as Uber and Lyft.
9. Planning should include the imminent arrival of autonomous vehicles.
10. Metro needs a dedicated funding source.
11. There should be a direct light rail link to BWI, unlike the current convoluted system.

Marc Brenman
4917 Flanders Av.
Kensington, MD 20895
mbrenman001@comcast.net
240-676-2436

Author of The Right to Transportation and Planning as if People Matter: Governing for Social Equity
Transportation Planning Board (TPB) member—

Thank you for serving our region on the all-important TPB. I realize that the important decisions facing you are not easy and often controversial. Many competing interests need to be considered before arriving at the best long-term solutions.

I am writing to you in response to VDOT’s/Loudoun County’s project submission to the Washington Council of Governments’ (COG) TPB’s Visualize 2045: A Long-Range Transportation Plan for the Nation Capital Region. The specific project name is: Route 15 Widening.

Who am I? My name is Peter G. Gustafson. My wife Mary and I live along US Route 15 near Lucketts in an old log home (circa 1800) overlooking the Potomac River Valley. We’ve lived and farmed here for 36 years. My formal education is in environmental science and biology. We’re partners in a small graphic design business and give generously of our time to local community organizations. I’ve been a member of the Lucketts Ruritan Club since 1986. Presently, I’m serving at the pleasure of the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors as a citizen stakeholder representative on US Route 15 improvements for the Ruritan club. After two recent fatalities, I have also recently worked alongside several others to encourage VDOT to facilitate specific safety improvements to the road (Citizens for a Safer Route 15). The first phase of this work is now complete.

The Problem: As I’m sure you’re aware, right now US Route 15 is a hot issue in Loudoun and amongst its many users: local residents, commuters, tourists, travelers and commercial traffic from adjoining jurisdictions and beyond. Emotions are running high within our local community—we’re becoming increasing polarized over congestion, safety and access. In spite of discussions going back 20 years or more, it has, of late, become a political ‘pressure point’ as daily backups—both morning and night—waste countless man-hours, disrupt people’s schedules, use costly and finite fuel resources, lower air quality, decrease land values, and threaten people’s safety. Local officials have responded by instructing staff and the VDOT to make progress. Now, you are, as a TPB member, also being asked to play a role—entrusted with helping to determine the future of our US Route 15—or James Monroe Highway as its sometimes called—in VDOT’s project application: Route 15 Widening.

The Context: This is not just any ribbon of asphalt. As a transportation corridor, it predates history. Beginning as a game trail, then followed by native peoples tracking that game, it was to become a critical North-South route in colonial America and our new nation—far enough west for the rivers to be forded, and east of the mountains. This “Old Carolina Road”, a.k.a. “Rogues Road” saw “Mad” Antony Wayne travel south to join Lafayette and later Robert E. Lee’s Army of Northern Virginia headed north to invade Maryland. These events, among many others and the beautiful and historic homes situated along the route, have contributed to it being recognized Federally as part of the Journey Though Hallowed Ground (www.hallowedground.org), part of the Mosby Heritage Area (www.mosbyheritagearea.org), exclusively as the Catoctin Rural Historic District (https://www.dhr.virginia.gov/registers/Counties/Loudoun/053-0012_Catoctin_Rural_Historic_District_1988_FINAL_Nomination.pdf) and a Virginia Scenic Byway
In addition, the area through which this road passes is unique geologically. To quote from a recent report prepared by the State*:

(It is a) "...unique region of the Mid-Atlantic Piedmont that is underlain by the Leesburg Limestone Conglomerate of the Balls Bluff Formation. This unique rock has been locally called 'calico marble' or 'Potomac marble' but is actually a limestone conglomerate composed of limestone and other rock fragments from previously existing rock formations cemented together by calcium carbonate. The rocks were formed about 210 million years ago. The local names are derived from the rock's use as decorative stone for the columns in the U.S. Capitol Statuary Hall and for agricultural lime. This is a unique geological formation for the Piedmont. Car-sized to room-sized outcrops and boulders of the conglomerate are well exposed along and east of US Rt. 15..."

It is unique, sensitive and irreplaceable.

The unprecedented growth of the last several decades have led to the present situation of rush hour congestion and and unsafe conditions. Adding to the problem are the limited alternatives with US Route 15 being sandwiched between the Potomac River on the East and Catoctin Mountain to the West. The stretch from Leesburg to the Maryland State Line also terminates at the only river crossing in the 42 miles north of the Cabin John Bridge on Interstate 495!

**An Attempt at a Solution:** The Loudoun County Board of Supervisors (BODS) has put forth a concerted effort to solving the problems of congestion and safety once and for all—all the while retaining local access and the road's significant scenic, cultural, historic assets through "context sensitive" improvements. A scheduled process was put in-place engaging a paid consult (Kimley-Horn), county staff, local elected officials, VDOT, and a Stakeholders Committee of local community representatives. Stakeholders were tasked at representing their respective communities and arriving at a consensus on solutions and phased implementation of improvements (https://www.loudoun.gov/index.aspx?nid=3997). Unfortunately, jumping ahead of this process, has been an amendment (CPAM) to the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) to 4-lane a significant portion of the road to Route 661 or Montresor Road (www.loudoun.gov/documentcenter/view/130389). The CPAM was approved by the planning commission with little debate and remains unapproved by the County Board of Supervisors.

In the rush for a “fix”, there has been insufficient and or inaccurate information, unsubstantiated solutions, and competing interests. The process involving citizen input, county staff, elected officials and VDOT working together needs to run its course. To summarize:

- A Loudoun County BOS-appointed citizens Stakeholder Committee is currently evaluating transportation improvements for this section of the roadway. The “Committee” was not informed of VDOT’s application for advancement of this project—nor was it placed on the agenda at any stakeholder’s meeting.
- This project has leapfrogged Loudoun County's comprehensive county land use and transportation planning processes currently being updated.
- VDOT has submitted this project prior to Loudoun County BOS' approval and vote scheduled for February 14, 2018.
- The citizens’ Stakeholder Committee disproportionately represents several newer and larger suburban communities with Home Owner’s Associations (HOAs) to the detriment of the larger proportion of rural residents. In addition, the Stakeholder Committee has yet to reach consensus on solutions.
- Requested studies on alternates to 4-lanes of less expensive, intrusive, and safer congestion-reducing intersection treatments such as roundabouts have not been performed. Cost-benefit analyses of those solutions need to include not only construction cost but accident reduction, emissions and noise reduction, and improved fuel efficiency data.
- Widening a 3.6-mile portion of a scenic byway, which will still funnel traffic volumes onto an existing 2-lane highway. Five miles further north is the 2-lane Potomac River bridge into Maryland.
- The $33 million project cost for 4-laning a 3.6-mile of highway that according to current induced-traffic estimates will be equally congested in 5 years without truly comprehensive transportation planning incorporating additional solutions and alternatives—a huge waste of scarce transportation dollars.
• Cost estimates are likely underestimated, given the karst geology of the project area, (with sinkholes that have opened up on Route 15 twice within the past decade) and at least one cave entrance within feet of the current two-lane highway just north of Whites Ferry Road.
• A large portion of the road is within floodplain.
• VDOT’s “Route 15 Widening” is a flawed response to congestion and safety in response to political pressure. This application is premature given it’s timing in the ongoing planning process. Exploration of alternatives, a comprehensive resource inventory and analysis and environmental safeguards have not been performed and remain insufficient and incomplete, contrary of the visionary planning necessary.
• The recent endorsement of the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board’s five initiatives found to have the most potential to improve the region’s transportation system has not been considered.

At present, VDOT’s application to 4-lane Route 15 from Battlefield Parkway to Montresor Road should be rejected. It would be premature to approve.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

*Survey Report: Stumptown Vernal Woods Property. Loudoun County, Virginia; Gary P. Fleming and Karen D. Patterson, Vegetation Ecologists, Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, Division of Natural Heritage, January 11, 2018

Peter G Gustafson
42230 Black Walnut Lane, Leesburg, VA 20176
(h) 703 777-6368
(c) 571-239-7030
peterggustafson@me.com
Dear Sirs:

As a resident of Loudoun County who relies upon Rt 15, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the Project Submission for widening 3.6 miles of Rt 15 north of Leesburg.

This is an ill-conceived and extraordinarily wasteful proposal that ignores the needs of residents, threatens the safety and access of local residents to Rt 15, imperils the scenic amenities that our rural businesses depend upon to attract vitally needed tourism revenue, and worst of all short-circuits existing processes to examine and recommend sensible solutions the problems of Rt 15.

It is premature to rush forward with a piecemeal project when an existing Stakeholders Committee appointed by Loudoun County has not even had a chance to study and weigh in on proposed solutions.

The assertions in this Project Submission that widening from 2 to 4 lanes a tiny segment of Rt 15 will improve Homeland Security, International Travel and Commerce, Economic Vitality, and Accessibility are frankly laughable — and reflect no study whatsoever.

I ask you to reject this slapped together proposal and allow serious studies to go ahead without premature action that make a mockery of any sensible process.

Stephen Budiansky
Chapel Lane
Leesburg, VA
A fourth lane extending Southbound from the Occoquan Bridge/Route 123 Interchange to the Prince William Parkway will; (1) reduce traffic congestion on the Occoquan bridge where commuters transit southbound on I-95 from 4-lanes to 5-lanes (including the overpass from HWY-1) back to 3-lanes over a 1000’ stretch of road as they approach and cross the Occoquan bridge, (2) better handle the southbound Route 123 traffic coming from Fairfax county onto I-95, and (3) improve the quality of life for residents in Lake Ridge and the Town of Occoquan.

I moved to Lake Ridge in 2003 (lived in Springfield during the” mixing bowl” project) and over the years watched VDOT begin work to widen I-95 over the Occoquan River and widen HWY 123 on the Occoquan bridge as valves for easing the I-95 traffic coming from Fairfax County. While VDOT might have eased traffic congestion in Fairfax County, their planning efforts appear to have merely pushed more of the congestion towards Prince William County’s (one of the fastest growing counties in VA).

In addition, while the I-95 express lane project created more highway capacity, it did nothing to reduce congestion at two major gateways into Prince William County (PWC Parkway and HWY-123). Moreover, the agreement with TransUnion also revealed a lack of judgement and long-range planning by signing a contract that did not allow for I-95 expansion without additional costs to the taxpayer; “… if there is the talk of widening I-95, Transurban gets the first crack at adding new lanes to Interstate 95, which it would operate as toll lanes. If the company opts not to add new lanes, VDOT may add additional lanes as a department project...such Additional Lanes will constitute a compensation event, according to a copy of the agreement McCord shared with Potomac Local.” http://potomacllocal.com/2017/01/13/virginia-wont-consider-widening-i-95-blames-express-lanes/

VDOTs own Environmental Assessment of the I-95 express lanes project concluded that, “while the project would improve the overall situation, several currently failing road segments would remain at failing levels.” The Occoquan Bridge/HWY-123 sector on/near I-95 is one such example. It further concluded that “after completion, the merge areas at the northern and southern ends of the HOT lanes would still operate at failing levels.” So, “while this billion-dollar project was primarily aimed at moving commuters through the corridor...it did not address the need to connect emerging urban nodes in the two counties...or to the surrounding region.”

VDOTs mandate should be to address the Occoquan Bridge/HWY-123 interchange congestion by adding an additional lane leveraging better engineering designs. Please don’t wait until 2028 to address the issue.
**Proposed bike lanes:**

This is a wonderful use of taxpayer funds, offering better safety for riders and more transit options for people going to and from work in the city. Plus, this will relieve motor vehicular traffic and pollution in the city. All noble goals! Thank you for this proposal.

**Toll lanes:**

While toll lanes sound like a good option, they seem to only benefit the private partner who will be taking the tolls. The roads will remain overcrowded until we can dedicate our transportations funds to enhance the public transit options such as: more multi-passenger commercial vans like some hotels have that could be used to transport workers to their jobs; more buses; more and better funding of the Metro system so that it could be cleaner, safer, and more appealing to more of the public. I use the Metro any time I go into the city and it is a much better option than driving into the city at any time of day for me, an over 70 woman.

**Widening 201:**

The widening of 201 is a complete waste of public transportation money and would increase the pollution in an area that never should have been developed anyway. It would only encourage the foolish future development of other lands that are far outside the reach of public transit by a county that should have known better than to develop this land for commercial and residential use. There were many other options for development or redevelopment available at the time, but the Prince George's County Counsel, Planning Board, and the County Executive were too shortsighted to realize or explore them. The citizens held meetings to Envision Prince George's County and proposed more development near public transportation, but our recommendations fell on deaf ears. This is a perfect example of poor planning and it should not be rewarded with a wider road to increase the pollution in that area of the county when public transit could be an excellent option and would create more jobs and increase private entrepreneurship as well.

**Georgia Ave.-16th St.:**

Are you kidding me, 7 or 8 lanes of traffic going through an already developed area? No, no, no, a thousand times NO, where are the planners that want to make a toll lane here to alleviate traffic; or the people who could devise a public transit option for this area? We do not need a major highway in the middle of residential dwellings just because too many people are not being trained to use public transit as an option, or no one is far sighted enough to develop a mini bus system to serve that area properly...

**Randolph Rd. BRT:**

Yes, this is a very good idea and it will work well for that area and address all of the goals that you have sighted. This is a good use of Transit Funds and Planning.

**MetroRail Capacity:**

Yes, yes, yes, we must increase the capacity and comfort on the Metrorail especially during the rush hour times. Anything that we can do to make Metro more inviting is a good plan and will help us be a better Metropolitan area, more viable, more modern, more open to better development.
Dear Transportation Planning Board Chair Allen, all TPB Board Members & TPB staff,

There is a serious omission in the Montgomery County transit submission for new projects to be included in the Visualize 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan for the National Capital Region. The omission is the New Hampshire Avenue Bus Rapid Transit project (NH BRT), part of the larger Montgomery County BRT system.

Although submitted as a "study" by MC DOT, this particular transit facility is integral to the regional transportation network, and should have full "for construction" status in this major TBP update, just as the 4 other BRTs submitted. Please amend the draft plan to add this critical new project.

High-density development is being approved in the New Hampshire corridor based on this BRT line being in place in the near future. Here are a few added reasons to gain your support for adding this important transit facility to the Visualize 2045 Plan:

- The NH BRT, part of the County's Transitway Master Plan, is a keystone element to the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan, connects the Montgomery-Prince George's bi-county area to the Purple line at Takoma-Langley Crossroads, and will service the growing FDA campus on New Hampshire Ave in White Oak.
- The NH BRT line has been identified by County Council as the next BRT to move forward after the three lines currently underway, i.e. US29, MD 355 and Viers Mill Road.
- The NH BRT is an acknowledged priority of the County Executive and the Montgomery County Council as detailed in the Joint Priorities letter to the Maryland Department of Transportation on June 29, 2017. The letter is attached; see item 4 under the BRT section on page 3/4.
- The NH BRT is critical to achieving the Non-Auto-Driver-Mode-Share (NADMS) goals of the 2014 White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan. This WOSG plan, approved without achieving transportation balance, is based on greatly increasing the person throughput on New Hampshire Ave with BRT transit.
- GSA is moving forward with the Food and Drug Administration Master Plan update for this growing federal agency in White Oak. An additional 9,000 employees are anticipated on the FDA headquarters campus on New Hampshire Avenue in the coming years. For more information on this pending update see: https://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/166346
- The NH BRT will provide high-quality transit for underserved communities along the Montgomery and Prince George's county line.
- The New Hampshire corridor is currently problematic. Given the additional density being approved with more anticipated, advancing this transit service in the TPB's CLRP process is critical.

I urge the Transportation Planning Board to request the Montgomery County Department of Transportation to amend the submission and add this necessary project to the 2045 vision for the region.

Thank you for your consideration.

Eileen Finnegan
10404 Sweetbriar Parkway
Silver Spring, MD  20903
301-439-2263
The Visualize 2045 plan includes a potential I-95 Southbound Auxiliary Lane to be built in 2028. It certainly should be funded for construction by 2028. Considering this is the most congested traffic area in the United States, it should be moved up earlier.

There is almost no time day or night that this area is not congested. This is a safety hazard as the area loses a lane and effectively loses two lanes as traffic from Lorton/Rte-1/Ft. Belvoir merge from what becomes the Rte-123 merge lane which ends at Rte-123. The effective loss of two lanes slow commuters and through traffic to a halt creating a dangerous mix of widely differing approach speeds.

The constant traffic jam also increases pollution of both the air and the water below the bridge (Occoquan River, a Chesapeake Bay tributary). Additionally it impacts the dynamic activity centers in the commercial realm, the Washington DC commuter bedroom community, and museums such as the Quantico Marine Corps Museum and the soon to be open Museum of American Military History.

Again I suggest since this area is rated the most congested traffic area in the United States, the I-95 Southbound Auxiliary Lane should be moved up earlier to as soon as possible.

Brian Blankinship
Woodbridge, VA
Please consider modifying the scope of the “I-95 Southbound Widening from VA 123 to VA 294” project. The current scope as written will do little to resolve this safety/congestion bottleneck.

Please consider modifying the scope to: "I-95 Southbound Widening from US 1 to VA 294 with VA 123/I-95 interchange configuration changes"

General Recommendations:

- Convert I-95 Southbound lane to an exit lane ramp to VA 123N
- Shift VA 123 Exit Ramp from I-95S around/west of the I-95S Entrance Ramp from US 1 (Removes Merge point )
- Remove Ramp from VA 123N to I-95S
- Add Dual Left Turn Lanes to provide access from VA123N to I-95S
- Add I-95S Auxiliary Lane from US 1 to VA 294

More detailed recommendations for this project are linked/attached.

https://www.google.com/maps/d/edit?mid=zQQBCxHd6New.kPg56RYdjMTU

http://novarapidtransit.org/I95_VA123_US1_Interchange_Improvement_12152016.pdf

While this project will not reduce traffic volume congestion during peak periods in the long run, it will improve safety, reduce accidents, provide better access to Prince William County, and reduce congestion during off-peak hours (Reason it is the worse bottleneck in DC metro area)

This project needs to be completed ASAP. With the completion of the fourth I-395 Southbound lane from Duke Street to Edsel Road, the I-95 FredEX Express Lanes and the I95S Rappahannock River Crossing projects this may become the biggest bottleneck in the United States.

Also, please consider adding the "I-95 Northbound Widening from VA 294 to VA 123" as well. This is also a top ten congestion point in the DC Region.

Thank you for considering these comments,
Mark Scheufler
Manassas, VA 20111
novarapidtransit.org
## TOP 10 BOTTLENECKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank (Last Quarter Rank)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Average duration</th>
<th>Average max length (miles)</th>
<th>Total duration</th>
<th>Impact factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)*</td>
<td>I-95 S @ VA-123/EXIT 160</td>
<td>8 h 09 m</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>31 d 05 h 50 m</td>
<td>136,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>BALTIMORE-WASHINGTON PKWY N @ POWDER MILL RD</td>
<td>7 h 17 m</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>27 d 23 h 07 m</td>
<td>94,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (14)</td>
<td>DC-295 S @ EAST CAPITOL ST</td>
<td>10 h 46 m</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>41 d 06 h 49 m</td>
<td>78,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (3)</td>
<td>I-495 CCW @ MD-97/GEORGIA AVE/EXIT 31</td>
<td>4 h 11 m</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>16 d 02 h 08 m</td>
<td>74,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (8)</td>
<td>I-66 E @ SYCAMORE ST/EXIT 69</td>
<td>7 h 14 m</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>27 d 18 h 15 m</td>
<td>72,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (5)</td>
<td>I-495 CW @ CLARA BARTON PKWY/EXIT 41</td>
<td>4 h 40 m</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>17 d 22 h 31 m</td>
<td>72,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (4)</td>
<td>I-495 CW @ I-270 SPUR</td>
<td>2 h 25 m</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>9 d 06 h 20 m</td>
<td>71,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (9)</td>
<td>I-95 N @ VA-123/EXIT 160</td>
<td>4 h 21 m</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>16 d 16 h 40 m</td>
<td>70,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (6)</td>
<td>I-495 CW @ MD-214/CENTRAL AVE/EXIT 15</td>
<td>3 h 06 m</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>11 d 22 h 31 m</td>
<td>62,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (10)</td>
<td>I-66 W @ VADEN DR/EXIT 62</td>
<td>4 h 55 m</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>18 d 20 h 34 m</td>
<td>59,729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See “Bottlenecks” section in the “Background” chapter for ranking variability from quarter to quarter.
I-95/VA123/US1 Interchange Improvements
(with No new General Purpose Lanes)

Flexible Lane Delineators (Separates General Purpose Lanes and the Route 1/Route 123 Merge area)

Route 123 Exit Ramp (Avoids Merge with I-95 Entrance Ramp from Route 1)

Removal of Fourth Lane (Add Emergency Rest Area)
I-95/VA123/US1 Interchange Improvements
(with No new General Purpose Lanes)

I-95 Southbound Auxiliary Lane from US Route 1 to the Prince William Parkway

I-95 Northbound Auxiliary Lane from Prince William Parkway to VA123

Shifted Exit Ramp from VA123N/S to I-95S with extended merge lane

Dual Left Turn Lanes from 123N to I-95S

Closure of Cloverleaf Exit Ramp from VA123N to I-95S

Shifted VA123/I-95 Express Entrance/Exit Ramp

Commuter Parking Exit Only (Restricted Access from I-95N Cloverleaf to VA123N)

Ramp from I-95N to VA123N (Two Left Turn Lanes)

12/15/16
COMPREHENSIVE AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE I-95 HOV/HOT LANES PROJECT DATED AS OF JULY 31, 2012

• “Additional Lanes will constitute a Compensation Event.”

• **Additional Lanes** means any additional GP Lanes along the I-95 Corridor within the Project Right of Way to the extent the plans for such improvements have not been included in (i) the CLRP and the SYIP as of November 30, 2011 or (ii) the Technical Requirements; provided however, that the addition of a fourth general purpose traffic lane travelling southbound on I-395 between Seminary Road and Edsall Road will not be an Additional Lane.

• **Interpretation:** Auxiliary Lanes between Entrances and Exits can be added without a Compensation Event.
December 18, 2017

Dear Sir/Madam:

I wish to state my opposition to the northern Potomac bridge crossing that is being proposed as part of the proposed "Outer Beltway". My reasons follow:

A major highway bridge increases the likelihood of a chemical spill that could contaminate our drinking water. In 1997, 1 out of 10 trucks in the U.S. was transporting hazardous material. About half of those carried flammable liquids, such as gasoline, diesel fuel, and fuel oil. Accidents are common, and a study of data from 1991 to 2000 found that the likelihood of a spill in the event of a crash was 50% higher for hazardous materials than non-hazardous.

- One tanker truck of hazardous material can contaminate an entire drinking water system. A chemical spill in the amount equivalent to one tanker left 300,000 Charleston WV residents without water for over 10 days in 2014.
- We could have less than a day to react before a spill contaminates municipal water intakes serving nearly 5 million area residents. Water intakes for Fairfax County, the City of Rockville, Montgomery and Prince George’s Counties, and the District of Columbia are all downstream from the most likely crossing.
- A spill requiring cleanup lasting longer than 48 hours could result in most of the Washington Metro Area being without water. We currently have only 24 to 48 hours of water supply without the Potomac.
- Climate change could make backup water supplies less reliable during spill events. Droughts are predicted to be more frequent and longer, resulting in backup supplies being used more extensively and potentially running out.
- The construction of the necessary connecting roads to the proposed bridge could do irreparable harm to the Montgomery County Agricultural Reserve and lead to extensive development in the Reserve.

Sincerely,

Robert N. Goldberg
21404 Davis Mill Road
Germantown, Maryland 20876-4422
Telephone: 301-540-2915
E-mail: r.n.goldberg@att.net
Basic Project Information

1. Submitting Agency: VDOT
2. Secondary Agency: Loudoun County
3. Agency Project ID:
4. Project Type: ☐ Interstate ☒ Primary ☐ Secondary ☐ Urban ☐ Bridge ☐ Bike/Ped ☐ Transit ☐ CMAQ
   ☐ ITS ☐ Enhancement ☐ Other ☐ Federal Lands Highways Program
   ☐ Human Service Transportation Coordination ☐ TERMs
5. Category: ☒ System Expansion ☐ System Maintenance ☐ Operational Program ☐ Study ☐ Other
6. Project Name: Route 15 Widening
   Prefix Route Name Modifier
   US 15 James Madison Highway
   Battlefield Parkway
   VA 661 Montresor Road
8. From (☐ at):
9. To:
10. Description: Reconstruction with added capacity. This two lane road will be widened to four lanes.
11. Projected Completion Year: 2025
12. Project Manager: James Zeller
13. Project Manager E-Mail: James.Zeller@VDOT.virginia.gov
14. Project Information URL: www.loudoun.gov/Route15
15. Total Miles: 3.6 miles
16. Schematic (file upload):
17. State/Local Project Standing (file upload):
18. Jurisdictions: Loudoun County
19. 2018 Baseline Cost (in Thousands): $33 million cost estimate as of 10/17/2017
20. Amended Cost (in Thousands): cost estimate as of MM/DD/YYYY
21. Funding Sources: ☒ Federal ☒ State ☒ Local ☐ Private ☐ Bonds ☐ Other

Regional Policy Framework

Questions 22-27 address the goals identified in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan. Question 28 should be used to provide additional context of how this project supports these goals or other regional needs identified in the Call for Projects.

22. Provide a Comprehensive Range of Transportation Options
   Please identify all travel mode options that this project provides, enhances, supports, or promotes.
   ☒ Single Driver ☐ Carpool/HOV
   ☐ Metrorail ☐ Commuter Rail ☐ Streetcar/Light Rail
   ☐ BRT ☐ Express/Commuter bus ☐ Metrobus ☐ Local Bus
   ☒ Bicycling ☐ Walking ☐ Other
   ☐ Does this project improve accessibility for historically transportation-disadvantaged individuals (i.e., persons with disabilities, low-incomes, and/or limited English proficiency?)
   
   RESPONSE: VDOT accepted the bike trail proposal in order to advance this road widening project.
23. Promote Regional Activity Centers
☐ Does this project begin or end in an Activity Center?
☐ Does this project connect two or more Activity Centers?
☐ Does this project promote non-auto travel within one or more Activity Centers?

24. Ensure System Maintenance, Preservation, and Safety
☒ Does this project contribute to enhanced system maintenance, preservation, or safety?

RESPONSE: The project will degrade preservation and safety.
Preservation: Route 15 is a National Scenic Byway in a National Heritage Area (Journey Through Hallowed Ground Region). The project will degrade the historic and scenic attributes of an otherwise-pristine two-lane rural highway in the Catoctin Rural Historic District that has remained the same for many decades. Substantial land from historic properties (Rockland, on the National Register of Historic Places) and one contributing structure to the Catoctin Rural Historic District (the Old Limestone School, now a private home), will be taken as part of the highway expansion.

Safety will be reduced. The project, which changes the designation from a rural 2-lane local access arterial to a 4-lane divided controlled access rural arterial, will reduce safe access for all private drives, roads and entrances along the section of highway. Impacted are working farms which to retain viable need to move farm machinery across and up and down the section of roadway (which will, subsequent to the lane additions, need to negotiate two extra lanes of traffic), visitors to wineries, breweries, regional parks, and equestrian facilities on Limestone School Road—which have no other close access to the highway.

Most traffic from the eastern side of Route 15 makes left-hand turns onto Route 15 toward Leesburg. A controlled access designation eliminates property owners and visitors’ ability to make left-hand turns. Property values and business profitability are adversely affected. Affected property owners were not notified of the impending change in designation. It was not a topic of an ongoing, Loudoun County Route 15 Stakeholders Committee group deliberating about improvements to this roadway, nor was its description provided to them.

Where “controlled access” points are located, drivers will have an additional lane of traffic to negotiate to make a left-hand turn off of Route 15 onto a side road/drive/entrance, and two additional lanes of traffic to negotiate to make a left-hand turn onto the highway;

The proposed widening does not include analysis of whether intersection controls such as roundabouts would eliminate the need for expensive widening (because of the increased capacity and multimodal safety that RAB provide).

25. Maximize Operational Effectiveness and Safety
☐ Project is primarily designed to reduce travel time on highways and/or transit without building new capacity (e.g., ITS, bus priority treatments, etc.)?
☐ Does this project enhance safety for motorists, transit users, pedestrians, and/or bicyclists?

RESPONSE: A focus of citizen efforts for decades, with repeated requests to VDOT by citizens, local, and state officials, has been to increase safety along this National Scenic Byway in the Journey Through Hallowed Ground Region. The project ignores these goals. It will not reduce travel time and does not enhance safety for motorists, pedestrians, and/or bicyclists. It will reduce access for property owners, park visitors, and customers along roads, drives, and business entrances, who will have left-hand turning access reduced or eliminated.

26. Protect and Enhance the Natural Environment
☒ Is this project expected to contribute to reductions in emissions of criteria pollutants?
☒ Is this project expected to contribute to reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases?
RESPONSE: It will induce traffic (no studies requested by citizens have been performed) and increase cut-through traffic to adjacent rural areas on narrow two-lane and unpaved roads, including through historic villages already overwhelmed with such traffic documented in local studies. It includes no intersection treatments (such as roundabouts) which would increase safety, access, and congestion reduction—and no study has been done to evaluate whether similar congestion reduction (without inducing traffic) could be achieved for millions less by installing roundabouts (particularly at Montresor Road) instead of a four-lane median-divided controlled access highway. The project is being forwarded without any comprehensive transportation plan for the area and county (a process currently underway). No studies of environmental impacts (emissions, noise, vibrations, reduced fuel efficiency)—requested by stakeholders committee members since September—have been performed by the consultant or Loudoun County or VDOT.

27. Support Interregional and International Travel and Commerce

Please identify all freight carrier modes that this project enhances, supports, or promotes.
☒ Long-Haul Truck  ☒ Local Delivery  ☐ Rail  ☐ Air

Please identify all passenger carrier modes that this project enhances, supports, or promotes.
☐ Air  ☐ Amtrak intercity passenger rail  ☐ Intercity bus

RESPONSE: It will facilitate regional delivery at a direct cost to local delivery for rural businesses including parks, wineries, breweries, pick-your-own farms, and equestrian facilities.

28. Additional Policy Framework Response

Please provide additional written information that describes how this project further supports or advances these and other regional goals or needs.

The project will improve regional north-south mobility between Virginia and Maryland.

RESPONSE: The project ends 8 miles south of the Potomac River and the Maryland State Line. Maryland has no short or long-term plans to increase capacity south to the river, particularly at the location of the current 2-lane bridge. There has been no planning or coordination with either Frederick County or the state of Maryland on improvements to the arterial.

Federal Planning Factors

29. Please identify any and all planning factors that are addressed by this project:

a. ☒ Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.

RESPONSE: The project will degrade the economic vitality of the rural economy of the area, by reducing safe access to wineries, breweries, equestrian facilities, and other local businesses whose customers require safe and expedited access onto and off of Route 15.

b. ☒ Increase the safety of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users.

i. Is this project being proposed specifically to address a safety issue? ☐ Yes; ☐ No

ii. If yes, briefly describe (in quantifiable terms, where possible) the nature of the safety problem:

RESPONSE: It will decrease the safety of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users. Safe access will be reduced because of the “4-lane, divided, controlled access” redesignation.

c. ☒ Increase the ability of the transportation system to support homeland security and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.

RESPONSE: Four-laning for 3.6 miles further north on a 2-lane highway, and to rural road that becomes a two-lane unpaved road in a rural area does nothing to “increase Homeland Security.”

d. ☒ Increase accessibility and mobility of people.

RESPONSE: Four-laning up to a rural road that becomes a two-lane unpaved road in a rural area does little to “increase accessibility and mobility of people.”
e. ☒ Increase accessibility and mobility of freight.

RESPONSE: The route is plagued by freight hauled in overweight and unsafe trucks that are avoiding inspection stations on other routes. Enforcement is sporadic and ineffective.

f. ☒ Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.

RESPONSE: The project, by any measure, degrades, instead of protecting and enhancing, “the environment, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.” It is being advanced prior to the underway process of revising the county’s transportation and land use plan, with no comprehensive analysis of its impact. The project lies in a fragile geologic area, a karst region characterized by sinkholes, voids, and cave entrances, one within feet of the current roadway in the project area. Sinkholes have closed portions of the highway in the past decade. Large sections of the project area are adjacent to streams and are within the floodplain area. Massive mitigation efforts will be required with little return for the investment.

g. ☒ Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.

RESPONSE: The project will degrade the local transportation system across and between modes, for people and freight. It will reduce safety and access for local residents and businesses.

h. ☒ Promote efficient system management and operation.

RESPONSE: Given the actual impacts of 29a through g, it does NOT promote efficient system management and operation.

i. ☒ Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

RESPONSE: It will substantially degrade the preservation of the existing transportation system because of reduced access and induced demand.

j. ☒ Improve resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation.

RESPONSE: Induced traffic will push congestion further north onto the 2-lane road, reducing reliability of the system at huge cost. Large sections of the project area are adjacent to streams and are within the floodplain area. Massive mitigation efforts will be required with little return for the investment.

k. ☐ Enhance travel and tourism.

RESPONSE: The project will destroy the setting of a National Register of Historic Places property, Rockland, a working farm that has been in the same family for centuries, with acreage on both sides of the road. A mature arbor and trees that protect the site from the roadway will be bulldozed. Another contributing property to the Catoctin Rural Historic District further north in the project zone, the Old Limestone School (now a private residence), 80 feet from the current two-lane rural highway, will either be taken or have a 4-lane highway just feet from its front door. It will reduce safe access for visitors to two regional parks, and numerous wineries, a brewery, pick-your-own farms, and equestrian facilities that are part of the area’s growing rural economy and rely upon the rural and scenic setting to attract tourists to their venues.

Environmental Mitigation

30. Have any potential mitigation activities been identified for this project? ☒ Yes; ☐ No

a. If yes, what types of mitigation activities have been identified?

☒ Air Quality; ☒ Floodplains; ☐ Socioeconomics; ☒ Geology, Soils and Groundwater; ☐ Vibrations;

☐ Energy; ☒ Noise; ☐ Surface Water; ☐ Hazardous and Contaminated Materials; ☒ Wetlands

RESPONSE: Surveys of impacted properties have not yet been conducted; their costs may be substantial. The project lies in a fragile geologic area, a karst region characterized by sinkholes, voids, and cave entrances, one within feet of the current roadway in the project area. Sinkholes have closed portions of the highway in the past
decade. Large sections of the project area are adjacent to streams and are within the floodplain area. Massive mitigation efforts will be required with little return for the investment.

Congestion Management Information

31. Congested Conditions
   a. Do traffic congestion conditions necessitate the proposed project or program? ☑ Yes; ☐ No
   b. If so, is the congestion recurring or non-recurring? ☑ Recurring; ☐ Non-recurring
   c. If the congestion is on another facility, please identify it:

RESPONSE: The project does not designate intersection solutions and so does not evaluate to what degree congestion reduction could be achieved at substantial cost savings by simply redesigning intersections (for example, replacing the Route 15 bypass/Business Route 15 merge area with a roundabout, replacing the Whites Ferry signal with a roundabout and realigning Limestone School Road with Montresor Road with a roundabout.) Loudoun County requested as early as 2004 that VDOT study the latter alternative. It has not.

32. Capacity
   a. Is this a capacity-increasing project on a limited access highway or other principal arterial? ☑ Yes; ☐ No
   b. If the answer to Question 32.a was "yes", are any of the following exemption criteria true about the project? (Choose one, or indicate that none of the exemption criteria apply):
      ☑ None of the exemption criteria apply to this project – a Congestion Management Documentation Form is required
      ☐ The project will not use federal funds in any phase of development or construction (100% state, local, and/or private funding)
      ☐ The number of lane-miles added to the highway system by the project totals less than one lane-mile
      ☐ The project is an intersection reconstruction or other traffic engineering improvement, including replacement of an at-grade intersection with an interchange
      ☐ The project, such as a transit, bicycle or pedestrian facility, will not allow private single-occupant motor vehicles
      ☐ The project consists of preliminary studies or engineering only, and is not funded for construction
      ☐ The construction costs for the project are less than $10 million.
   c. If the project is not exempt and requires a Congestion Management Documentation Form, click here to open a blank Congestion Management Documentation Form.

RESPONSE: This project increases capacity on a segment of a principal arterial. Requested studies on the induced traffic that the increased capacity will invite or the subsequent adverse effects on side roads or points further north have been conducted. Multiple studies note that capacity additions reach previous congestion levels within 5 years. Is $33 million on a project that will fail in 5 years worth the cost?

Record Management

33. Completed Year:
34. Project is being withdrawn from the CLRP: ☐ Yes
35. Withdrawn Date: MM/DD/YYYY
36. Record Creator: Cina Dabestani
37. Created On: 10/30/2017
38. Last Updated by: Regina Moore
39. Last Updated On: 12/12/2017
40. Comments:
Hello Transportation Planning Board,

I write to register my concerns about the draft Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP). This is a massive list of projects, which lists an overwhelming number of road widening and interchange projects in Maryland and Virginia. Since new and wider roads fill up so quickly, it will add to traffic, and not make conditions better. More traffic and massive roads like those found in LA will harm our quality of life, and chase people and companies away.

You studied new approaches to the problem and found that balanced land use, demand management, bus rapid transit, and Metro core capacity solutions worked better than road expansion for our transportation network and our environment. Yet, these solutions are not the basis of this latest draft CLRP. Why?

I recommend that you immediately do a major amendment to this long-range plan, one that puts balanced land use (transit-oriented development, more housing closer to jobs, etc), demand management, and transit first. Doing so is essential to preserving the character of our communities and our quality of life, and for reducing air pollution and the greenhouse gas emissions that fuel climate change.

Thank you,

Naomi Engle
23417 Peach Tree Rd
Clarksburg, MD 20871

Christopher Richter
17447 Macduff Ave.
Olney, MD 20832

Ross Simons
502 Robinson Court
Alexandria, VA 22302

Liz Craver
2521 Ross Street
Alexandria, VA 22306

Stephen Ashurst
14401 Hollyhock Way
Burtonsville, MD 20866

Peter German
11612 Hunters Green Ct
Reston, VA 20191

Elizabrth Willis
7074 Hanover Pkwy Apt C1
Greenbelt, MD 20770
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Janis Brunson
2007 Connor Ct Unit D
Bowie, MD 20721

Ana Sobalvarro
12033 Devilwood Dr.
Potomac, MD 20854

Jan Skelton
528 N. Oxford St.
Arlington, VA 22203

Geoffrey Ogden
23347 Potts Mill Rd
Middleburg, VA 20117

Abigail Adelman
3206 University Blvd. West
Kensington, MD 20895

Michael Wiencek
1814 N St NW
Washington, DC 20036

Matthew Bank
5432 Connecticut Ave NW Apt 401
Washington, DC 20015

Ruth von Fleckenstein
3109 14th St NE
Washington, DC 20017

Angel Braestrup
1320 19th Street, NW Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036

Brian Lutenegger
1845 Summit Pl NW #704
Washington, DC 20009

Alex Horowitz
919 6th Street NE Apt 4
Washington, DC 20002

Evelyn Fraser
2724 28th St NE
Washington, DC 20018

Jenefer Ellington
641 Maryland Ave. NE
Washington, DC 20002

Hannah Martin
4621 4th St NW
Washington, DC 20011

Matt Vanderwerff
507 Sheridan St nw
Washington, DC 20011

William Boteler
627 Longfellow Street NW
Washington, DC, MD 20906

Jeffrey Norman
5410 Connecticut Avenue, Apartment 717
Washington, DC 20015

Patrick Revord
950 25th St NW
Washington, DC 20037

Paula Hirschoff
4020 Reno Rd
Washington, DC 20008

Walter Tersch
224 Adams St. NE
Washington, DC 20002

Reuben Snipper
705 Erie Ave
Takoma Park, MD 20912

Reinaldo Germano
3500 13th Street NW apt 204
Washington, DC 20010

Louis Thomas
1682 Irving St NW Apt. 3
Washington, DC 20010

Jacob Janzen
1800 N. Oak St. #1201
Arlington, VA 22209

Howard White
7611 13th St NW
Washington, DC 20012

Allen Greenberg
1526 17th Street, NW Apt. 310
Washington, DC 20036

Gregory Matlesky
1215 Linden Place, NE #406
Washington, DC 20002

Melisa Krnjaic
3226 Broad Branch Ter NW
Washington, DC 20008

John Fay
12505 Kuhl Rd
Wheaton, MD 20902

David Lindgren
6437 Rockshire St
Alexandria, VA 22315

Sofie Rhoads
5801 Berwyn Road
Berwyn Heights, MD 20740

Mark Rodeffer
3636 16th Street NW Apt. B1243
Washington, DC 20024

Jeanette McDonald
2853 Ontario Rd NW
Washington, DC 20009

Niels Pemberton
Links Drive
Reston, VA 20190
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Udit Minocha  
#(address.address1) #  
Arlington, VA 22201  

Brandi Eng-Rohrbach  
7923 Eastern Ave  
Apt 501  
Silver Spring, MD 20910  

Matthias Hess  
412 3rd St NE  
Washington, MD 21202  

Don Allen  
4400 East West Hwy  
Apt 512  
Bethesda, MD 20814  

Maxime Devilliers  
1459 A St NE Apt E  
Washington, DC 20002  

Daniel Flatow  
Evan Handy  
1507 Massachusetts Ave SE  
Washington, DC 20003  

Joseph Jakuta  
4113 29th St  
Mount Rainier, MD 20712  

Rachel Lawal  
Ingleside Terrace NW  
Apt 2  
Washington, DC 20010  

Denise Curry  
1238 Evarts St  
Washington, DC 20018  

Aaron Parrott  
738 Longfellow Street  
Washington, DC 20011  

Shirley Levesque  
503 Niven Court, SW  
Leesburg, VA 20175  

Raymond Martin  
1817 Rupert St  
McLean, VA 22101  

Garrett Hennigan  
1031 Newton St. NE  
Washington, DC 20017  

Zach Ferguson  
2712 Ordway St NW Apt 5  
Washington, DC 20008  

Yvette White  
4543 Ravensworth Rd  
Annandale, VA 22003  

Irwin Flashman  
1327 Buttermilk Lane  
Reston, VA 20190  

Benjamin Owen  
1408 A St SE  
Apt 302  
Washington, DC 20003  

Fred Ordway  
4514 Gladwyme  
Bethesda, MD 20814
JANUARY 19 – FEBRUARY 17, 2018
COMMENT PERIOD
At the January 17 meeting, the board approved the project submissions and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis scope of work for the financially constrained element of Visualize 2045. The board was also briefed on a request from Montgomery County to include the New Hampshire Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project, which was not in the set of projects described during the initial public comment period. The board opened an additional 30-day public comment period that began on January 19 and closed on February 17.

Comments submitted have been posted on the TPB’s website at www.mwcog.org/TPBcomment. This memorandum provides a summary of the comments received and responses provided by TPB staff. A compilation of the comments received as posted is attached to this memorandum.

The TPB will be briefed on the comments received and responses provided. Following that briefing, the board will be asked to approve the additional project submission for inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the constrained element of Visualize 2045 and the FY 2019-2024 TIP. The comments and responses will be included in the documentation of Visualize 2045.

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Comments were received from five individuals and two governmental representatives. TPB staff have reviewed each comment and summarized their main points in this memo. Comments were received on the following projects and topics:

A. New Hampshire Ave. BRT in Montgomery County
B. US Route 15 widening in Loudoun County
C. Bicycle/Pedestrian connections between Montgomery and Loudoun counties

A. NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE. BRT IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Five comments were received in support of Montgomery County’s proposal to include the New Hampshire Ave. BRT project in the air quality analysis. The comments make the following points:

1. **Comment:** The project will reduce pollution, increase access to jobs and services, and benefit lower-income communities.

   **TPB Staff Response:** The collective impacts of this and the other projects included in the financially constrained element of Visualize 2045 on air pollution and access to jobs will be
modeled and projected in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis and the Performance Analysis that will be published in September. The analyses will not break out the impacts of individual projects.

2. **Comment:** The project is critical to achieve the goals of the White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan, and the segment from White Oak to Eastern Avenue should be prioritized for completion before 2030.

**TPB Staff Response:** Staff have forwarded this recommendation to Montgomery County Department of Transportation. The project is currently planned for implementation in 2045, but this does not preclude Montgomery County from advancing the completion date of some or all of the project in future updates to the long-range plan.

**B. US ROUTE 15 WIDENING IN LOUDOUN COUNTY**

One comment was received in support of VDOT’s proposal to widen US 15.

1. **Comment:** The project will improve safety and reduce congestion.

**TPB Staff Response:** The board approved the inclusion of this project in the air quality analysis at its January 17 meeting. The impact of this and all other projects included in the financially constrained element of Visualize 2045 on travel demand and congestion will be modeled and projected in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis and the Performance Analysis that will be published in September. The analyses will not break out the impacts of individual projects.

**C. BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN CONNECTION BETWEEN MONTGOMERY AND LOUDOUN COUNTIES**

One comment was received suggesting a bicycle/pedestrian crossing of the Potomac River between Montgomery County and Loudoun County.

1. **Comment:** Such a project would alleviate concerns about development and congestion while providing healthy alternatives and improvements to traffic.

**TPB Staff Response:** A project of this nature has not been proposed for inclusion in the constrained element of Visualize 2045 or as a study by any agency and is not a subject of the board’s action at this time. A bicycle/pedestrian facility would not be included in the travel demand modeling used to perform the air quality conformity analysis.
Comments Received on the Additional Project Submission for Inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the Constrained Element of Visualize 2045 and the FY 2019-2024 TIP

Submitted by: A Governmental Body or Representative

Ludlow, Suzanne
City of Takoma Park, Office of the City Manager

Attached please find comments from the City Manager of Takoma Park regarding the New Hampshire Avenue BRT proposal. (see page 3)

Kostiuk, Kacy

I am writing to support the inclusion of Montgomery County's New Hampshire Avenue Bus Rapid Transit Project in the Air Quality Analysis for the constrained element of Visualize 2045. The City of Takoma Park has strongly supported the County's plans for Bus Rapid Transit on New Hampshire Avenue for many years. This could serve an important role in connecting Takoma Park residents and residents throughout the region with jobs, shopping, recreation, and other opportunities, making it possible to travel more easily and smoothly in the region while providing a more environmentally friendly and cost-effective alternative to driving. Sincerely, Kacy Kostiuk, Councilmember, City of Takoma Park, Member, COG Transportation Planning Board

Submitted by: An Individual

Landy, Gail

The Rapid Transit Bus sited to run on the Route 29 corridor in Eastern Montgomery County will reduce pollution, and give residents access to sustainable jobs. Lower income people live in Eastern Montgomery County, and are limited in employment due to lack of vehicles for transit. Cars and trucks are the major source of air pollution in Montgomery County. As a Gaithersburg, resident I know that public transportation is a benefit to people in Upper Montgomery County. We depend on Metro and the Marc commuter train for cheaper and convenient transit to jobs in the county and DC. We also rely on Ride On and Metro Buses for daily transit. Why shouldn't Eastern Montgomery County have the same advantage.

Finnegan, Eileen

The New Hampshire Bus Rapid Transit segment proposed by Montgomery County Department of Transportation is necessary to achieve the goals of the recent White Oak Science Gateway Master Plan. The first segment from White Oak to Eastern Ave/Fort Totten should be prioritized for completion before 2030. The balance of the route to Colesville should follow. The New Hampshire BRT route will serve a growing FDA, high-density development in New Hampshire corridor, the Purple Line at Langley Park and the heavy ridership from Takoma/Langley. It adds to the high-quality transit services in the Eastern Montgomery/Northern Prince George's county area. Please approve this late submission request of MoCo DOT to the Visualize 2045 long-range plan

Ditzler, Barbara

More routes on the planned MoCo BRT Transit System is a big plus for the community. We need better and more transit to improve our daily lives, the air we breathe and our general environment. New Hampshire Ave line is a natural to help join our BRT system together and minimize congestion
Goodrum, David  
Leesburg, Virginia  20176  
2/7/2018 3:56:05 PM

Subject:  Rte 15 widening: Thank You!

Thank you for the inclusion of Rte 15 in Visualize 2045, and the FY 2019-2024 Transportation Improvement Program. As a resident who lives on the section of Rte 15 along the stretch of road that this plan affects, I'm delighted to finally see that action is going to be taken after years and years of unsafe roads and the worst congestion in Loudoun County. The end result of this project will save lives and make the daily lives of people who live here, as well as the surrounding communities that are impacted, much better. Let me say it again: Thank You!!!

Eckstein, Michelle  
Sterling, Virginia  20165  
1/31/2018 2:45:29 PM

Subject:  Potomac River Bridge

We need more effective transportation solutions between Montgomery and Loudoun counties. There is a lot of debate about creating new bridges north of the DC. To combat concerns of cost, sprawl, traffic, and pollution, I recommend a building "foot/bike only" bridge across the Potomac. This would allow environmentally friendly transportation which utilizes the existing C&O canal towpath and W&OD trail. People have flocked to other cities that have invested in a strong bike and pedestrian culture. For the health of DMV residents, improvements in traffic, and the future growth of the area please look towards adding bike paths and bridges which can be used for daily commuting. Michelle Eckstein
February 16, 2018

Transportation Planning Board
777 North Capital Street, NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002-4239

RE: New Hampshire Bus Rapid Transportation Project, Visualize 2045

The City of Takoma Park supports Montgomery County’s request of the addition of the New Hampshire Bus Rapid Transit Project to the Montgomery County inputs to the constrained element of Visualize 2045.

This project provides for design and construction work related to the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) line on New Hampshire Avenue from the Colesville Park and Ride Lot to Eastern Avenue. Activity centers are located at Takoma/Langley Crossroads and at White Oak. Corridor recommendations, from north to south, include a mixed traffic transitway from Colesville Park-and-Ride to Lockwood Drive, and dedicated lane(s) from Lockwood Drive to the District line at Eastern Avenue.

The County Council approved the Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan, an amendment to the Master Plan of Highways and Transportation, on November 26, 2013. The New Hampshire Avenue Corridor Bus Rapid Transit project is a priority for both the City and County.

The City of Takoma Park has strongly supported the County’s plans for BRT on New Hampshire Avenue for many years, along with other key investments in transit for the area such as the Purple Line, the Takoma/Langley Transit Center, and the K9 MetroExtra service improvements. The New Hampshire Avenue Corridor Concept plan was adopted by the City in 2008 to convert a 1.25-mile segment of New Hampshire Avenue into a pedestrian-friendly, multi-way boulevard. The plan specifically calls for “a rapid bus route with limited stops and frequency” for New Hampshire Avenue, reiterating the WMATA 2003 rapid bus priority corridor that identifies the New Hampshire Corridor for BRT. As noted in the Transit Corridors Master Plan, New Hampshire Avenue in Takoma Park is a prime candidate for early implementation of the BRT network and the City supports the County’s effort to move forward on this initiative.

Sincerely,

Suzanne R. Ludlow
City Manager
SEPTEMBER 7 – OCTOBER 7, 2018
COMMENT PERIOD
MEMORANDUM

TO: Transportation Planning Board  
FROM: Lyn Erickson, Plan Development and Coordination Program Director  
SUBJECT: Summary of Comments Received and Proposed Responses on Visualize 2045, the FY 2019-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis  
DATE: October 11, 2018

On September 7, 2018, the draft Visualize 2045 long-range transportation plan, the draft FY 2019-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and the draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis were released for a 30-day public comment and inter-agency review period. The board was briefed on Visualize 2045, the FY 2019-2024 TIP, and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis at its September 21 meeting. The comment period closed on October 7. The board will be briefed on the comments received and recommended responses and asked to accept the comments for inclusion in the documentation of Visualize 2045, the FY 2019-2024 TIP, and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis at the October 17 meeting.

This memorandum provides a summary of the comments and feedback received on Visualize 2045, the TIP, and the draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis, and provides recommended responses for the board’s consideration. This memo presents this summary in three parts.

Part A summarizes comments and feedback received on Visualize 2045 and the TIP from the following: TPB members including Fairfax County, the City of Falls Church, and the National Capital Planning Commission; the TPB’s Access for All Advisory Committee (AFA); 97 individuals; and 8 advocacy organizations. Where appropriate, responses to comments are provided.

Part B summarizes the comments received from the Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) on the Air Quality Conformity Analysis and provides a response from TPB staff.

Part C provides responses to questions posed and comments made by board members during the presentation of Visualize 2045 at the board meeting and work session held on September 21.

All comments received have been made available for review online at mwcog.org/TPBcomment. While this memo contains a summary of the comments, a separate compilation of every comment received has been made available to TPB members in both hardcopy and online formats.
PART A: COMMENTS RECEIVED ON VISUALIZE 2045 AND THE FY 2019-2024 TIP

In a departure from comments received on previous TPB-approved plans, many of the comments received on Visualize 2045 were not project-specific and did not focus on the Visualize 2045 Constrained Element. Instead, commenters focused on other elements of the plan, including the long-range planning process itself and the aspirational initiatives.

Comments were received from TPB members including Fairfax County, the City of Falls Church, and the National Capital Planning Commission; the TPB’s Access for All Advisory Committee (AFA); 97 individuals; and 8 advocacy organizations. The letters from Fairfax County, the City of Falls Church, and the National Capital Planning Commission and the memo provided by the TPB’s Access for All Advisory Committee (AFA) are found in Appendix A of this memo.

Staff have summarized comments received into two categories: those that provide general feedback on the plan and TIP; and those comments that focus on specific projects, locations, or issues. Category 1 comments do not warrant a response, rather this information is being provided on behalf of the commenters to the TPB members. Category 2 comments refer to specific projects, the need for improvements in specific locations, or to specific issues. TPB staff have prepared a set of draft responses to these comments, consulting with staff from member agencies where necessary. In both categories, the comments are summarized and grouped together by topic area.

CATEGORY 1: General Comments and Feedback on Visualize 2045, the TIP, and the TPB’s Long-Range Transportation Planning Process (no response needed)

Comments on Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

1. Comments emphasized the importance of dedicated lanes for BRT and that BRT provides the opportunity for innovative solutions to be implemented in areas.
2. There will not be enough usage of BRT to make up for the loss of travel lanes for vehicular traffic.

Comments on Commuter Rail and Metro

1. Service levels on the region’s commuter rail systems should be increased.
2. Express lines for both Metrorail and commuter rail should be implemented.
3. The Purple Line should be extended into Virginia or a circumferential Metrorail line should be added near the Capital Beltway.
4. Rather than a new Metro station in Rosslyn, a new Silver/Orange line transfer station at East Falls Church should be built.
5. Metrorail should be extended to Prince William County (Haymarket, Manassas).

Comments on Toll Facilities

1. Support was indicated for the I-270 and I-495 Managed Lanes projects in Maryland and the I-495 HOT Lanes expansion project in Virginia.
2. Toll facilities can be a burden to low and even middle-income populations.
3. Comments opposed tolling outright.
4. Comments supported tolling, but on existing facilities only and were opposed to additional capacity.

**Comments on Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure**

1. Visualize 2045 doesn’t do enough to provide options for bicyclists and pedestrians.
2. TPB planning efforts should be cognizant of new and emerging technologies such as electric bikes and powered scooters.
3. A dedicated funding source should be established for bicycle and pedestrian projects.
4. There is a need to prioritize funding for accessible bicycle and pedestrian options.
5. Barrier or parking-separations are essential for the success of bicycle lanes. Implementing agencies should consider separate facilities each for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles and scooters.
6. The funding in the Maryland portion of the TIP for bicycle and pedestrian improvements should be redirected to badly needed road and transit projects.

**Comments on the TPB’s Role in Land Use Planning**

1. The region is not only divided by race and income but by access to jobs.
2. The TPB should play a bigger role in land-use planning.
3. The TPB should do more to encourage people to live close to their jobs, increasing the job-housing proximity rate.
4. Concentrating residential development in Regional Activity Centers will increase housing prices and force more people to move outside of those centers.
5. The data assumptions made in COG’s Regional Employment Monitoring System have produced a jobs-to-population ratio that seems high.
6. A socio-economic analysis should be conducted to make sure that development in regional activity centers does not have adverse impacts.
7. Development should be incentivized in underutilized activity centers and around underutilized Metrorail and transit stations, particularly on the eastern side of the region, and greenfield development should be limited.
8. Corridors should be identified that are appropriate for housing.
9. Following the 2020 U.S. Census, the definitions of the region’s activity centers should be revisited.
10. The TPB should work with COG and others to develop regional housing programs and address the need for affordable housing.

**General Comments on Visualize 2045 and the FY 2019-2024 TIP**

1. Comments were received both in favor of and in opposition to expanding capacity on the region’s highways.
2. The TPB should make assessments of progress on the seven Aspirational Initiatives whenever the plan is updated.
3. The TPB should strive to promote increased service and provide more affordable options on the region’s public transportation systems.
4. Visualize 2045 should allocate resources for investments that may be required to accommodate Amazon’s new headquarters.
5. The plan should give greater consideration to the impacts of emerging technologies and automation.
6. Visualize 2045 should show planned improvements mapped against large traffic-generators (military bases, campuses, etc.).
CATEGORY 2: Comments on Specific Projects, Locations or Issues (response provided)

Comments on Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

1. BRT should be implemented on Virginia’s Route 7.

Response: According to the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission, the Envision Route 7 has completed the Phase II Study and determined that BRT from Mark Center to Tysons via the East Falls Church Metro Station is a viable transit solution for the corridor. The next step is a Phase III Conceptual Engineering Study to refine the project cost and identify right-of-way that could be utilized by the BRT and guide jurisdictions on how to preserve that right-of-way. This study is expected to continue through 2019. Once funding for construction of the project has been established, the project will be eligible to be submitted for inclusion in the constrained element of the TPB’s long-range plan.

2. BRT should be implemented between the Branch Avenue Metro Station and Charles County in Maryland.

Response: Transit accommodations along the US 301 corridor in portions of Prince George’s County and Charles County have been under consideration for some time. As part of MDOT MTA’s Southern Maryland Rapid Transit (SMRT) study, MDOT MTA has worked with MDOT SHA to develop transit alternatives that are compatible with planned MDOT SHA projects along the US 301 and MD 5 corridors in Prince George’s County and Charles County. The completed SMRT Alternatives Report included a summary of LRT and BRT alternatives that were developed. MDOT MTA recommended a specific BRT alternative, and any further advancement to 30% design would require a preferred alternative, available and dedicated funding, and a funding partnership with the participating counties. Currently, MDOT SHA has been focusing on a subset of the larger US 301 Transportation Corridor project; the MD 5 (Mattawoman-Beantown Road) and US 301/MD 228/MD 5 Business intersections. Since early 2018, MDOT SHA has been engaged in the ongoing re-evaluation of the US 301/MD 5 intersection to further develop flyover concepts for that location. For both the US 301/MD 5 Flyover and US 301/MD 228/MD 5 Business Interchange, MDOT SHA anticipates hosting a public workshop in December 2018 to present refined options to stakeholders. Advancing design and subsequent phases for these projects as funds become available will happen after a preferred alternative is selected.

Comments on Commuter Rail and Metro

1. Commuter rail routes should be expanded in both Maryland and Virginia and service levels should be increased, including more run-through service.

Response: Visualize 2045 includes the MARC Growth and Investment Plan and the VRE System Plan which both plan for increases in service and expanded stations.
2. Visualize 2045 should include the construction of a second entrance to the East Falls Church Metro Station.

**Response:** Implementation of this project has been delayed by Arlington County due to a reduction in funding.

3. WMATA should expand the number of routes and improve service levels on all routes. Where possible, buses should run in dedicated lanes.

**Response:** WMATA’s Regional Bus Transportation Project Study is currently underway to examine some of these issues and more. Dedicated bus lanes are planned and implemented at the discretion of each jurisdiction.

Comments on Potomac River Crossings

1. A number of comments were received both in favor of (13) and in opposition to (8) new Potomac River bridge crossings.

**Response:** No project of this nature is included in the constrained or aspirational elements of Visualize 2045.

Comments on Specific Roadway Projects

1. The completion date of the Battlefield Bypass in Prince William County should be advanced earlier than the current estimate of 2040.
2. Virginia Route 28 in Loudoun County should not be widened.
3. Maryland Route 5 in Prince George’s and Charles counties should not be widened.

**Response:** These comments have been shared with the TPB members and the respective implementing agencies.

Comments on Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure

1. The Capital Trails Network should be included in lieu of the National Capital Trail in the Aspirational Element. The views in this comment were echoed by more than 50 commenters.

**Response:** The National Capital Trail included in Visualize 2045 is the initiative approved by the Long-Range Plan Task Force and subsequently by the TPB. TPB member agencies have been called upon to develop and implement projects to advance the endorsed initiatives. Consistent with this call to action, one request is to expand the National Capital Trail strategically to include trails from all member jurisdictions. The TPB staff anticipates this work activity to be completed and to be included in the next update of Visualize 2045. It is to be noted that the TPB has a regional bicycle and pedestrian plan which includes all of the bicycle and pedestrian improvements within the member jurisdictions. It will be updated in FY 2019. The strategic expansion of the National Capital Trail could draw from projects in this regional bicycle and pedestrian plan.
General Comments on Visualize 2045 and the FY 2019-2024 TIP

1. The TPB should employ a scoring system to prioritize projects in the TIP and to discourage bad investments and promote its goals.

Response: The TPB acknowledges that the region’s major implementing agencies each have their own project scoring, selection, and prioritization systems. The TPB has been briefed on many of these systems (such as Virginia DOT’s SMART SCALE) and believes them to be consistent with its own goals.

2. Visualize 2045 should provide a breakdown of transportation infrastructure investment by the core, inner, and outer jurisdictions.

Response: Visualize 2045 is a regional plan and is intended to look at regional mobility and accessibility. Decisions on where to invest in infrastructure are made based on demonstrated needs for movement, not on population distribution.

PART B: COMMENT AND RESPONSE ON THE AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS OF THE VISUALIZE 2045 PLAN AND FY 2019-2024 TIP

The Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee (MWAQC) provided comments to TPB in its October 1, 2018 letter, which is included in this memo as Attachment B.

MWAQC Comments Summary:

1. Concurs that the transportation sector emissions associated with the proposed transportation plans meet the motor vehicle emissions budgets (Tier 2) in the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard Maintenance Plan.

2. Expresses concerns about the use of the Tier 2 emissions budgets and wishes to stress that the future transportation plans should account for air emissions so that future conformity analyses would not need to use Tier 2 MVEB buffers.

3. Acknowledges that the Tier 2 emissions budgets were provided to account for conditions where the conformity analysis is based on different data, models, or planning assumptions, including, but not limited to, updates to demographic, land use, or project-related assumptions, than were used to create the emissions budgets in the maintenance plan.

4. Mentions that the region has made significant progress in reducing emissions but emphasizes the need to continue its efforts to further reduce emissions to meet the 2015 ozone NAAQS, in particular from on-road mobile sources.

5. Notes that the emissions graphics in the Visualize 2045 plan document only include the Tier 2 budget lines and suggests that the Tier 1 budget lines should also be shown.

6. Pledges to work with TPB to help members implement new measures to further reduce air pollution. Comments that since on-road emissions play a significant role in the overall ozone problem in this region, it is important that the transportation sector plays its role in resolving this problem.

7. Is encouraged to learn that the region is achieving reductions in VMT per capita, but urges the TPB’s continued investment in public transit, ride-sharing, bike and pedestrian infrastructure, and other alternative modes.
8. Appreciates the joint TPB/MWAQC/CEEPC comment letter regarding the federal proposal to modify the emissions standards for model year 2021-2026 light-duty vehicles.

TPB Response:

The TPB appreciates MWAQC’s review and concurrence that the regional emissions estimates from the Visualize 2045 Plan and FY2019-2024 TIP conform to the motor vehicle emissions budgets contained in the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard Maintenance Plan and found adequate for use in air quality conformity analyses by the US EPA.

The Board notes MWAQC’s concern about the use of Tier 2 emissions budgets. The TPB appreciates MWAQC’s acknowledgment that the Maintenance Plan provided two tiers of emissions budgets for use in transportation conformity analyses. The EPA’s determination of adequacy of the emissions budgets for use in conformity, published in Federal Register on August 6, 2018, explicitly noted the ability to use the Tier 2 emissions budgets and the conditions for their use. Tier 2 emissions budgets are to be used when a conformity analysis is “based on different data, models, or planning assumptions, including, but not limited to, updates to demographic, land use, or project-related assumptions, than were used to create the MVEBs in the maintenance plan”, and if estimated emissions are higher than Tier 1 levels.

The air quality conformity analysis of the Visualize 2045 plan and FY2019-2024 TIP is based on different data, models and planning assumptions than were used to create the MVEBs. Specifically, the conformity analysis contains a new round of land activity forecasts, updated vehicle fleet data, a modified travel demand model, and new project inputs. These changes are documented in the conformity report and were discussed in briefings provided throughout the consultation and comment period. Additionally, the TPB’s sensitivity analysis on the changes in inputs, also documented in the conformity report (Appendix C of the Visualize 2045 Plan document), indicates that the changes in the vehicle fleet data are a significant contributor to emissions exceeding Tier 1 levels.

The TPB notes that transportation emissions from the Visualize 2045 plan and FY2019-2024 TIP are below the Tier 2 budget levels and are significantly below the levels needed to attain the 2008 ozone standards in 2014. The Visualize 2045 plan analysis estimates that by 2019, mobile source VOC emissions at 42.5 tons/day and NOx emissions at 72.9 tons/day are already significantly below the 2014 levels of 61.3 tons/day for VOC and 136.8 tons/day for NOx.

The TPB agrees with MWAQC regarding the significant progress the region has made in reducing emissions. It is worth noting the substantial reduction in mobile source emissions projected for the 2014-2030 timeframe (the 2008 Ozone standards maintenance period). Estimates of NOx emissions are 70% lower in 2025 and 80% lower in 2030 relative to the mobile source emissions levels in 2014. Similarly, estimates of mobile source VOC emissions, relative to 2014 levels, are 46% lower in 2025 and 61% lower in 2030.

In addition to federal emissions control programs, the projects, programs, and policies reflected in the Visualize 2045 plan contribute to reducing emissions by decreasing levels of congestion forecast in the previous plan and promoting alternative modes of travel. Examples of congestion reducing projects include doubling the amount of tolled facilities in the region, an almost 50% increase in high capacity transit miles, and concentrating about three fourths of job and two thirds of household growth in regional activity centers. The Visualize 2045 plan forecasts transit, walk/bicycle, and
ridesharing modes of travel to all increase at a higher rate than single driver trips. Additionally, relative to the 2016 CLRP, the Visualize 2045 plan is forecast to reduce future (2045) daily vehicle hours of delay and congested lane miles by about 33% while reducing the amount of VMT per capita.

MWAQC noted that the emissions graphics used in the in the Visualize 2045 plan document do not depict the two tiers of emission budgets and suggested that both tiers be shown. The TPB has updated the graphics in the main Visualize 2045 plan document to include both tiers. The graphics showing both mobile budget tiers, as well as detailed information about the use of the Tier 2 budgets have always been a part of the primary air quality conformity report.

The TPB agrees with MWAQC on the need for continued investment in public transit, ridesharing, and other programs to reduce emissions. In support of this, Visualize 2045 includes an additional $5.4 Billion in dedicated funding for the region’s Metro system. Additionally, the TPB remains committed to transportation emission reduction measures and travel demand management (TDM) strategies. The TPB continues to implement and enhance its regional Commuter Connections (TDM) program. The TPB has made enhancing TDM strategies one of its top endorsed initiatives to reduce congestion, increase mobility, and reduce emissions.

The TPB agrees that there should be a continued effort in the region to reduce emissions across all sectors to be able to meet the tougher 2015 Ozone standards. The TPB appreciates MWAQC’s pledge to work together to help implement new measures to further reduce air pollution. The Board looks forward to continuing its collaboration and cooperation with its member agencies and those of MWAQC in the development of plans and actions to reduce emissions from all sources to improve the region’s air quality and protect public health.

**PART C: RESPONSES TO WORK SESSION AND BOARD MEETING QUESTIONS**

Part C provides responses to questions posed and comments made by board members during the presentation of the Visualize 2045 long-range plan at the board meeting and work session held on September 21.

1. The title of the 2nd endorsed initiative has been narrowed to only include BRT. It should be broadened “back to the way it was adopted by the board”.

   *Response*: The text in the Draft Visualize 2045 Plan document has been revised as “Regionwide Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Transitways” to account for others forms of rapid transit and match the text from TPB’s December 2017 resolution.

2. How has the proportional allocation of system expansion funding between highway system and transit system changed over the past several long-range transportation plans?

   *Response*: Prior to 2014, the long-range plan financial plan did not distinguish between capital funding for system expansion and capital funding for state of good repair. However, information is available that allows a reasonable estimate of system expansion funding. Table 1, below, summarizes the available information for Visualize 2045 and the preceding three long-range plans, completed in the years specified. Note that dollar amounts are not
comparable, as the year of expenditure and the period of each long-range plan differs. However, relative modal allocation is comparable.

Table 1. Long Range Plan - Expansion Funding by Mode (Millions $ YOE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Visualize 2045</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway</td>
<td>$27,082</td>
<td>$24,736</td>
<td>$26,137</td>
<td>$40,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of all Expansion Dollars</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$8,705</td>
<td>$12,386</td>
<td>$15,486</td>
<td>$24,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of all Expansion Dollars</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How does the planned Visualize 2045 investments quantitatively reflect each of the endorsed aspirational initiatives?

Response: Table 2, below, shows the result of an assessment of project funding in the Visualize 2045 project database, for the applicable endorsed aspirational initiatives. Overall, close to half of the funding proposed for capacity expansion can be identified as directly supporting the initiatives, and this figure certainly undercounts the total funds being invested by the region’s transportation agencies. This is so since the projects included in Visualize 2045 Plan are limited to those that are programmed to receive federal funds and / or federal approval. Transportation agencies implements projects and programs that support one or more endorsed initiatives which do not use federal funds and/or need federal approval and are thus not reflected in the Visualize 2045 Plan.

It is also important to note that the following analysis looks only at funding for highway and transit expansion projects. Two of the initiatives, Optimize Regional Land-Use Balance and Employer-Based Travel Demand Management Policies are not included, as they are not funded through expansion projects in the Visualize 2045 Plan. Furthermore, many of the larger multi-modal projects in Visualize 2045 that would support the initiatives for Improve Access to Transit Stations and Improve the Trail Network do not discretely identify the funding for those components in the long-range plan.

Table 2. Visualize 2045 Expansion funding for the Endorsed Aspirational Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Endorsed Aspirational Initiatives</th>
<th>Visualize 2045 Funding for Expansion ($ Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and Transitways</td>
<td>$4.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move More People on Metrorail</td>
<td>$8.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the Express Highway Network</td>
<td>$14,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Walk and Bike Access to Transit</td>
<td>$1,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete the National Capital Trail</td>
<td>$212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expansion Funding Supporting Endorsed Initiatives</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,341</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of Total Expansion funding ($64.3 B)</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 5, 2018

Mr. Kanathur Srikanth
Executive Director
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002

Reference: Comments on Visualize 2045

Dear Mr. Srikanth:

Thank you for providing an opportunity to comment on the draft Visualize 2045 Plan. On behalf of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, I am writing to provide the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) comments regarding the Draft Plan that were discussed by the Board on October 2, 2018.

Overall, the Board supports the plan and recommends the Transportation Planning Board adopt Visualize 2045 on October 17, 2018. The Board supports and encourages this new kind of long-range planning effort by the TPB, which now includes aspirational projects, programs, and policies that go beyond financial constraints. The Board appreciates the multi-modal approach to accommodate anticipated growth in population and employment. Also, the Board is pleased that Visualize 2045 highlights bicycle and pedestrian projects, freight planning, and other transportation programs aimed at reducing congestion and improving air quality, as well as, presenting and analyzing key land-use issues facing the region, including the links between land-use, economic vitality, and transportation.

The Board is especially pleased to see two highway projects in the Plan that will greatly benefit the region: 1) Maryland’s I-95/495 Traffic Relief Plan, and 2) Virginia’s I-495 – construct 4 HOT lanes project. Together, these two projects will address one of the region’s major congested bottlenecks – the American Legion Bridge. The County believes that the capacity needs across the Potomac River must be addressed to alleviate the existing congestion and to ensure that the region remains economically vibrant.

The Board also appreciates the inclusion of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority’s plans for expanding capacity on Metrorail by running all eight-car trains during peak hours, making capacity improvements to stations in the system core, and planning to construct a new Rosslyn tunnel under the Potomac River.

The Board requests that this letter be made a part of the public comments record, and that full consideration be given to these comments in adopting the Final Visualize 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan at the TPB’s October 17, 2018, meeting.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Plan. If you need any clarification or further information, please call Mike Lake at (703) 877-5666 or me at (703) 324-2321.

Sincerely,

Sharon Bulova
Chairman

cc: Members, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
    Bryan J. Hill, County Executive
    Robert A. Stalzer, Deputy County Executive
    Catherine A. Chianese, Assistant County Executive
    Tom Biesiadny, Director, Department of Transportation
Mr. Charles Allen  
Chair, National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board  
777 North Capitol Street, NE, Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20002-4239

Transmitted via email: TPBcomment@mwcog.org

RE: Visualize 2045 Plan Update Community Plan

Dear Mr. Allen:

The City of Falls Church is pleased to continue our partnership with COG and our regional partners in the development of the vital regional long-range transportation plan. Thank you for the strong regional staff planning efforts and community input opportunity. This letter serves as the City’s comments for the 30-day public comment period. We request that the following core principles and key projects be included in the final Visualize 2045 plan:

**Core Principles Integrated into Plan Update (not in priority order):**

- City supports continued investment that supports economic development and the needs of tomorrow’s economy
- City supports continued investment in regional activity centers, as called for in the Region Forward plan
- City supports the vision of a multimodal transportation network, as that has been demonstrated to be equitable and sustainable
- Continue monitoring advances in technology for innovation and cybersecurity and advise on policies as well as requirements that enhance quality of life

**Key Projects Integrated into Plan Update (not in priority order):**

- Continued investment in regional bike and pedestrian network – both within and among activity centers
- Invest in underutilized transit stations, such as West Falls Church Metro
- Route 7 high-capacity transit, i.e., Rapid Bus Transit
- East Falls Church Metro Station second entrance
October 5, 2018
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Please do not hesitate to contact Cindy Mester, Deputy City Manager, at cmester@fallschurcva.gov if you have any questions or if we can provide additional details.

Sincerely,

Wyatt Shields
City Manager
IN REPLY REFER TO:
NCPC FILE No. 8025

October 10, 2018

Chairman Charles Allen
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002-4239

RE: NCPC Comments on draft TPB Visualize 2045 Plan: A Long-Range Transportation Plan for the National Capital Region

Dear Mr. Allen:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Visualize 2045 plan. As the federal government’s central planning agency for the National Capital Region, the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) has a shared interest in a multi-modal regional transportation system that meets the travel needs of the region’s workers, residents, and visitors. NCPC prepares a comprehensive plan that guides federal development, and reviews federal master plans and projects in the region based on the comprehensive plan’s policies. Our interest in Visualize 2045, and the comments in this letter, reflect the plan’s use as a helpful resource for developing our policies and in our review of regional federal development.

First, we commend you on creating a plan that combines the aspirational, feasible, and required aspects of a long-range regional transportation document. The draft plan reflects the significant work of the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) to adopt aspirational projects, programs and policies that reflect the region’s shared development goals, as well as the projects that are financially feasible.

In addition, the plan takes a technical, complicated subject and makes it clear and easy to understand. The plan and related documents provide useful, well-researched contextual information that links transportation to the region’s demographic and land use characteristics, as well as trends and emerging issues. It is also clear that the TPB made a serious commitment to connect with the public in this process.

NCPC supports the aspirational ideas of Visualize 2045 and notes that they are generally consistent with the policies in the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements. Regional federal facilities, and the workers and visitors that travel to them, rely on an efficient, interconnected, and sustainable transportation system. The Comprehensive Plan supports a multimodal transportation system and maintaining the region’s transportation assets in good repair. Many federal workplaces and campuses are located in or in close proximity to Regional Activity Centers and Metro stations, reflecting the shared development history and continued recognition of the importance of transit in getting federal employees to work. Listed below are summaries of select policies that support the aspirational initiatives identified in Visualize 2045.
Transportation Element:
- Support an integrated network of complementary regional transit services.
- Support the efforts of local jurisdictions to design and implement new, expanded, and innovative transit services that supplement existing transit and fill unmet transit needs.
- Create partnerships with federal agencies and local governments that support multi-modal commuting and shorter commute times through federal facility location decisions and Live-Near-Your-Work programs.
- Work with local jurisdiction bike coordinators, the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Commuter Connections, cycling organizations, such as the Washington Area Bicyclist Association, and others, to promote bicycle commuting among federal employees.
- Support transit-oriented development at Metrorail stations, within Regional Activity Centers, and at other transit nodes.
- Support multimodal connections and transportation alternatives in the regional system.
- Encourage ridesharing, biking, walking, transit, and other non-SOV modes of transportation for federal commuters and visitors.

Workplace Element Policies:
- Locate federal facilities within walking distance of existing or planned fixed route transit services.
- Locate new federal facilities to support regional and local agency objectives that encourage compact forms of growth and development and support local and federal goals to increase local and regional transit system ridership.
- Locate federal workplaces near a variety of housing options to benefit employees.
- Encourage telework and Alternate Work Schedules for federal employees where it benefits the federal government and the public.
- Support local agency efforts to create new housing options where federal workplaces exist, or area planned.
- Promote Live-Near-Your-Work initiatives for a variety of housing options close to public transit and/or federal facilities.

NCPC is currently working on updates to the Comprehensive Plan Transportation and the Federal Workplace policy elements. Visualize 2045 will serve as an important resource to help us understand how these policies, which guide federal development in the region, can leverage and support the region’s transportation objectives.

Many federal installations and campuses in the region have mission and security needs that can affect public access and other transportation issues. NCPC is committed to working with federal and regional stakeholders to identify strategies that successfully address security and promote access, mobility and connectivity.
Pursuant to our authorities, NCPC also reviews transportation projects on federally managed lands and other areas of federal interest, and participates in other reviews, including NEPA and Section 106 compliance. NCPC has or may participate in the future review of a number of Visualize 2045 projects. Examples include the Purple Line, Corridor Cities Transit-way, the Arlington Bridge rehabilitation, and Long Bridge capacity improvements. NCPC may also review projects occurring at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, Washington Dulles International Airport, Metrorail, stream valley parks acquired through the Capper-Cramton Act, and development within the Central Area in the District of Columbia, among others. For example, the I-270/495 Managed Lane Study could impact federal facilities including the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, NSA – Bethesda, and National Park Service and Capper Crampton parks. We look forward to working with regional project proponents on these important projects.

NCPC works closely with federal applicant agencies during our review of master plans and projects to consider and address transportation-related issues. NCPC requires Transportation Management Plans for federal campuses and installations as part of the master planning process that establish transportation goals consistent with the comprehensive plan policies and agency missions. The information in Visualize 2045, regarding proposed projects, as well as aspirational goals, will be helpful for NCPC and applicants during the review process.

Several federal agencies manage regional transportation assets, most notably the National Park Service (NPS). NPS will shortly release its National Capital Region Long Range Transportation Plan. This document sets a 20-year vision for the important transportation assets NPS manages that provide access to the region’s iconic destinations, including several parkways, major bridges, and highly used trail systems. We encourage the TPB to continue working with the NPS to understand the mission, issues, and opportunities that guide these federally managed resources, and how best to incorporate them into larger regional plans.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on Visualize 2045. We look forward to our continued participation on the TPB, and working together to improve the region’s mobility and sustainability. Please contact Julia Koster at julia.koster@ncpc.gov for any further information.

Sincerely,

Marcel Acosta
Executive Director
MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles Allen, Chair, Transportation Planning Board
FROM: Kacy Kostiuk, Chair, Access for All Advisory Committee
SUBJECT: AFA Comments on the Visualize 2045 Draft
DATE: October 5, 2018

At the September 13, 2018 Access for All Advisory (AFA) Committee meeting, the committee received a series of presentations on the region’s long-range metropolitan transportation plan, Visualize 2045. The committee discussed the plan elements and provided comments on transportation-related concerns for the populations the AFA represents. The AFA comments are organized in two categories: comments specific to Visualize 2045 draft and other general transportation concerns.

Overall, the AFA stressed the importance of affordable, reliable, and accessible rail, bus, and paratransit for people with disabilities, those with limited incomes, minority communities, people with limited English skills, and older adults. The AFA had eight summary comments with additional detail under each comment provided in the following pages.

- The AFA recommends that Visualize 2045
  - include additional and more affordable public transportation options throughout the region;
  - prioritize transportation funding for accessible pedestrian and bicycle options critical for people with disabilities’ and older adults’ safety, access, and mobility;
  - consider and accommodate the impact of technology and automation;
  - recognize the additional burdens that managed lanes may place on low-income populations; and
  - note that the “Access to Jobs” measure shows an East-West divide, and that the region is not only divided by race and income, but also by access to jobs.

- The AFA wanted to stress to the TPB that
  - accessibility for people with disabilities and those with limited-English skills should be considered throughout the planning, design, construction, and implementation stages of transportation projects or services;
  - front-line transit employees and transportation network company drivers, such as Uber and Lyft drivers need diversity and sensitivity training; and
  - the region should ensure MetroAccess has the resources to serve additional demand while maintaining service quality and provide more alternative options.
COMMENTS SPECIFIC TO THE VISUALIZE 2045 DRAFT

THE AFA RECOMMENDS THAT VISUALIZE 2045 INCLUDE ADDITIONAL AND MORE AFFORDABLE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS THROUGHOUT THE REGION.

- The committee noted a need for expansion of bus service, including more interjurisdictional service and restoring bus service cuts made in the last few years.
- The AFA is concerned about Metrorail remaining both affordable and available to residents and low-income workers. It continues to be concerned about reductions in rail and bus service and the impact on those who are transit-dependent. The committee supports incentives for people with limited incomes; incentives could include user-side subsidies or reduced fare programs.
- The AFA also recognizes Metro’s current challenges and expressed strong support for it to continue efforts to improve safety, maintenance, and service quality.
- The AFA is concerned about transit-dependent populations being priced out of high-density areas, such as activity centers and near Metrorail stations. Some people are unable to live in these areas well served by transit and other public services because the housing costs are out of reach, so they are forced to find housing that is farther away from these critical services.

THE AFA RECOMMENDS PRIORITIZING TRANSPORTATION FUNDING FOR ACCESSIBLE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE OPTIONS IN VISUALIZE 2045, WHICH IS CRITICAL FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES’ AND OLDER ADULTS’ SAFETY, ACCESS, AND MOBILITY.

- Implementation agencies should consider the safety concerns of people with disabilities and the need for education and awareness of pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers as these agencies maintain, build, and propose bike lanes.
- The AFA recommends greater coordination between jurisdictions on creating standards for a high-quality, uniform enhanced auditory signaling system for visually-impaired pedestrian travel.
- Bikeshare programs should increase the availability of accessible bikes (e.g. hand bikes, side-by-side bikes, electric bikes and tricycles) to promote adaptive cycling in the region.

VISUALIZE 2045 SHOULD CONSIDER AND ACCOMMODATE THE IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY IN REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION.

- The TPB should more explicitly plan to accommodate the expected increase in electric and autonomous vehicles and estimate impact on regional air quality.
- The plan should be flexible and consider how to accommodate the expected increase in app-based services (and associated accessibility challenges), technology-oriented jobs, teleworking and the impact on regional congestion. Solutions include supporting policies for federal, state and local governments on app-based and automated vehicle accessibility standards and improved telework policies for both public and private sector employees.
THE AFA EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT THE ADDITIONAL BURDENS THAT MANAGED LANES MAY PLACE ON LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS.

- The plan includes managed lane facilities on I-495 and I-270 which require users to pay fees for use of the facilities when driving alone. The AFA commented that tolled facilities tend to place additional burdens on low-income workers, people with disabilities, and those with limited English skills, and asked if the project would have affordability and accessibility provisions.

- The AFA committee questioned if low-income populations can fully participate in the benefits of these new facilities and from the benefits of purchasing a transponder as well as pre-paying tolls with a credit card.

THE AFA EXPRESSED CONCERN THAT THE REGION IS NOT ONLY DIVIDED BY RACE AND INCOME, BUT ALSO BY ACCESS TO JOBS.

- The AFA received a presentation on the performance analysis of the Visualize 2045 draft, including Figure 1 showing changes in “access to jobs by auto” with the greatest losses on the eastern side of the region and that the greatest gains are on the western side of the region.

- The AFA supports actions to address the East-West divide, such as an increase in all modes of transportation to connect the eastern part of the region to the job-rich western portion.

Figure 1: Changes to Access to Jobs by Auto in 45 Minutes, 2019 to 2045
COMMENTS ON OTHER TRANSPORTATION CONCERNS

ACCESSIBILITY FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AND THOSE WITH LIMITED-ENGLISH SKILLS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED THROUGHOUT THE PLANNING, DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPLEMENTATION STAGES OF TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS OR SERVICES.

- When implementing agencies consider the needs of people with disabilities early on, as well as throughout the planning stages of a project, the accessibility and usability of the transportation improvement can be greatly improved for everyone.
- The AFA noted that people using mobility devices have difficulty in finding accessible parking options in D.C. as well as the need for more accessible transportation options in general.
- Regarding language access, the AFA recommends that WMATA as well as the District Department of Transportation (DDOT), the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) provide greater language access to limited English speakers to ensure that they can comment on proposed service changes and/or transportation projects. WMATA’s efforts to build partnerships with language access advocacy organizations should continue.

FRONT-LINE TRANSIT EMPLOYEES AND RIDE-SHARING COMPANY DRIVERS NEED DIVERSITY AND SENSITIVITY TRAINING.

- The committee recommends that transportation providers augment sensitivity training of front-line employees and transportation network company drivers so that they know how to appropriately communicate and assist all customers; such training should include awareness of and sensitivity to different types of disabilities, the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community, and a diverse set of cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

THE REGION SHOULD ENSURE METROACCESS HAS THE RESOURCES TO SERVE ADDITIONAL DEMAND WHILE MAINTAINING SERVICE QUALITY AND PROVIDE MORE ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS.

- Demand for ADA paratransit will increase due to the aging population and requirements to transition people with intellectual and developmental disabilities to community-based independent living. AFA members expressed concerns that MetroAccess may not have the resources to serve this additional demand and maintain service quality at the same time; not all human service agencies will be able to afford to provide the transportation for the people they expect to serve, as many have done in the past.
- The AFA noted that some people with severe disabilities need a greater level of service than what ADA paratransit can provide. Pilot programs directly funding human service agencies to provide transportation to their clients rather than using MetroAccess have shown good results and resulted in cost-savings for jurisdictions.
- The AFA recommends that the region continue to support alternatives to MetroAccess, such as taxi pilots, and the use of transportation network companies or other providers, to the extent that these options can provide fully accessible service for people with a wide range of disabilities and are less expensive to the jurisdictions than MetroAccess.
October 1, 2018

The Honorable Charles Allen, Chair  
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board  
777 North Capitol Street, NE, Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20002

Dear Chair Allen:

Thank you for providing an opportunity to comment on the air quality conformity analysis in the draft Visualize 2045 plan. MWAQC has reviewed the above analysis and concurs that the transportation sector emissions associated with the proposed transportation plans meet the motor vehicle emissions budgets (MVEBs) in the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard Maintenance Plan.

However, the Visualize 2045 plan results in having to use Tier 2 transportation buffers for some of the future years, so MWAQC urges TPB to redouble efforts to reduce air pollution emissions from the transportation sector so that future mobile emission budgets remain within Tier 1 MVEBs to fully protect the health of our residents.

The Washington region has made significant progress in reducing emissions of ozone precursors such as, volatile organic compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) from both transportation and non-transportation sectors over the years. As a result, the region has been able to meet all but the 2015 ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). The region has met the 2008 ozone standard of 75 parts per billion (ppb) since 2014 and submitted a request in early 2018 to EPA to redesignate the area to attainment for the 2008 ozone standard along with a required demonstration to maintain compliance in the future (maintenance plan).

The Washington region developed two sets of MVEBs (Tier 1 and Tier 2) for VOC and NOx as part of the maintenance plan for the 2008 ozone standard using EPA’s latest MOVES2014a model. The Tier 1 MVEBs together with Tier 2 MVEBs, which included a conformity buffer, were developed for 2025 and beyond. These MVEBs replaced the previously used MVEBs, which were developed earlier using Mobile6.2 model based on the 1997 ozone NAAQS. EPA, on August 21, 2018, found these budgets were adequate for transportation conformity purposes.

MWAQC notes that the air quality conformity assessment shows that transportation emissions are below the Tier 1 MVEBs for most of the analysis period. However, transportation emissions are above the Tier 1 MVEBs for 2025 and 2030. Therefore, TPB had to use the Tier 2 MVEBs buffers for demonstrating conformity in those two years.

The Tier 2 MVEBs buffers were provided for in the 2008 ozone NAAQS maintenance plan to account for conditions where the conformity analysis is based on different data, models, or planning assumptions, including, but not limited to, updates to demographic, land use, or project-related assumptions, then were used to create the MVEBs in the maintenance plan. Nevertheless, MWAQC is concerned about the use of the Tier 2 MVEBs buffers and wishes to stress that the future transportation plans should account for air emissions so that future conformity analyses would not need to use Tier 2 MVEBs buffers.
MWAQC notes that the draft Visualize 2045 plan document does not address the reliance on the Tier 2 buffers in 2025 and 2030. On pages 54 and 55, the Tier 1 MVEBs for NOx and VOCs are not included and the budget is shown to reflect solely the Tier 2 buffer. Any acknowledgement of the Tier 1 MVEBs and why emissions are projected to be above the Tier 1 MVEBs should be addressed specifically in the primary document and not relegated only to an Appendix.

This is particularly important as the Washington region faces continuing challenges related to air quality. The region needs to attain the 2015 ozone standard of 70 ppb by August 2021. The draft data for the period 2016 through 2018 shows the region’s design value for ozone at 72 ppb. Additionally, the region’s design value has been above the current standard since 2016. Also, the region had its first Code Red air quality day this summer since 2012. Source apportionment modeling conducted separately by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the Ozone Transport Commission has shown that on-road mobile sources are a primary driver of ozone formation in the region. This evidence shows that even though the region has made significant progress in reducing emissions, it needs to continue its efforts to further reduce emissions to meet the 2015 ozone NAAQS, in particular from on-road mobile sources.

MWAQC is working on the “What We Can Do” scenario project to identify local actions that will help the region both attain the above ozone standard and eliminate future unhealthy air days. We pledge to work with TPB to help our members implement new measures to further reduce air pollution. Since on-road emissions play a significant role in the overall ozone problem in this region, it is important that the transportation sector plays its role in resolving this problem.

MWAQC is encouraged to learn that the region is achieving reductions in per capita VMT, even with an increase in employment. However, due to population and job growth, the region is experiencing an increase in total VMT. Therefore, we urge TPB’s continued investment in VMT and emission reduction strategies such as public transit, ride-sharing, pedestrian and bike infrastructure, other travel demand management strategies, and Transportation Emission Reduction Measures (TERMS) to reduce future growth in vehicle emissions.

Our local and state efforts in the Washington region may become even more important in the future if less stringent emission standards for light-duty motor vehicles for the model years 2021-2026 are enacted as proposed, especially since the region is experiencing an increase in the market share of light and heavy-duty trucks. If these standards are approved, there will be further increase in emissions of ozone precursors which would lead to even higher ozone levels in the region, resulting in more difficult emissions reduction efforts for the region in the future. MWAQC appreciates TPB joining MWAQC in requesting continuation of the existing light-duty vehicle emission standards.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the draft conformity analysis in the Visualize 2045 plan.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Hon. Hans Riemer
Chair, Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee
MEMORANDUM

TO: Transportation Planning Board
FROM: Andrew Austin, TPB Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: Compilation of Comments Received on the 2016 Amendment to the Financially Constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (CLRP), the FY 2017-2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis
DATE: October 11, 2018

Attached to this memo is a compilation of all comments received Visualize 2045, the FY 2019-2024 TIP, and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis during the public comment and inter-agency review period held by the TPB from September 7 through October 7, 2018.

The comments are organized into the following groups:

1. Comments submitted by TPB member jurisdictions, TPB committees and COG Committees
2. Comments submitted by non-profit advocacy organizations
3. Comments submitted by individuals
## Comments Received on Visualize 2045, the FY 2019-2024 TIP, and the Air Quality Conformity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted by: TPB/COG Member Jurisdiction or Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acosta, Marcel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Capital Planning Commission</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: NCPC Comments on draft TPB Visualize 2045 Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See comments in attachment on page 20.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bulova, Sharon</th>
<th>Fairfax, Virginia</th>
<th>Comment ID: 111</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>County of Fairfax</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: comments on Visualize 2045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See comments in attachment on page 23.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kostiuk, Kacy</th>
<th>Washington, District of Columbia</th>
<th>Comment ID: 113</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TPB Access for All Advisory Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: AFA Comments on the Visualize 2045 Draft</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See comments in attachment on page 25.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riemer, Hans</th>
<th>Washington, District of Columbia</th>
<th>Comment ID: 63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: MWAQC Transportation Conformity Comment Letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See comments in attachment on page 29.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shields, Wyatt</th>
<th>Falls Church, Virginia</th>
<th>Comment ID: 100</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Falls Church</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: City of Falls Church's Comments on Visualize 2045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See comments in attachment on page 31.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submitted by: Non-profit or Advocacy Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grymes, Charles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prince William Conservation Alliance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: Visualize 2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Prince William Conservation Alliance supports the focus on mobility. Jurisdictions need to integrate land use planning more effectively with transportation planning. Housing density needs to be highest near transportation nodes such as Virginia Railway Express (VRE) stations in places such as Prince William County, and in the long run VRE needs to be upgraded from a commuter rail system into a transit system with service throughout the day and on weekends. That upgrade will be more realistic if more people live/work within walking/biking distance of VRE stations, such as the soon-to-be-expanded station at Broad Run. While the Transportation Planning Board has traditionally minimized involvement in land use planning, it can not achieve its goals unless it is more effective in shaping land use. The transportation challenges for short-distance commuters also need to be prioritized. Many service workers depend upon local bus service; do not ignore those opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A successful long range plan needs to put biking, walking, and transit at its core. If we want to achieve our environmental, air quality and sustainability goals as a region, we need to be much more forward-thinking in planning for people who bike and walk. Visualize 2045 needs to include a plan for a regional paved trail network, like the one that the Capital Trails Coalition has defined. This coalition, composed of government agencies (including many TPB members), non-profit organizations, business improvement districts, civic associations, and many more, has done extensive research on the existing and planned trail network. The coalition has also collaboratively defined criteria for trail network inclusion. The TPB should adopt both the criteria, and the trail network, as the aspirational trails initiative in the long-range plan. See also comments in attachment on page 33.

McCary, Richard
Committee for Dulles
Subject: Visualize 2045 Comment
See comments in attachment on page 34.

Meurlin, Keith
Washington Airports Task Force
Subject: Visualize 2045 Comment
See comments in attachment on page 36.

Paschall, Daniel
East Coast Greenway Alliance
Subject: Comments Made at September 21, 2018 TPB Meeting
See comments in attachment on page 37.

Swift, Susan
Suburban Maryland Transportation Alliance (SMTA)
Subject: Visualize 2045 and TIP Comments
See comments in attachment on page 38.

Taylor, Caroline
Montgomery Countryside Alliance
Subject: Visualize 2045 - the right mix
On behalf of Montgomery Countryside Alliance, a registered 501(c)(3) in Maryland with over 9000 members and supporters, I would like to thank the Transportation Planning Board and staff for their work on developing a long range plan that combines land-use, transit, etc. to address our regional transportation needs. The seven items in the aspirational section are properly highlighted and we look forward to working with Montgomery County to ensure that we achieve these goals. We will continue to focus on those solutions that can achieve demonstrable success for our region, while defending against projects that would promote sprawl development and induced traffic such as the outer Potomac highway crossing. Respectfully,

Whitfield, Rob
Fairfax County Taxpayers Alliance
Subject: Comments Made at September 21, 2018 TPB Meeting
See comments in attachment on page 40.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comment ID</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abeles, nancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Comments Made at September 21, 2018 TPB Meeting</td>
<td>See comments in attachment on page 41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, Daniel</td>
<td>Alexandria, Virginia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please put more effort into de-emphasizing the automobile and supporting safer, healthier alternative transport such as cycling, walking and (working) public transportation. The region remains biking unfriendly which is a determent if we want to continue to attract and maintain a young, talented population and keep our citizens safe. Work more with the Capital Trails Coalition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer, Nathan</td>
<td>Washington, District of Columbia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>We need additional bike infrastructure</td>
<td>I'd like to make my voice heard that more bike and pedestrian infrastructure should be added to the Visualize 2045 plan. With the roll-out of more docked and dockless bikes as well as the recent inclusion or electric scooters, it is clear that our city is moving in a different direction beyond just automobiles. In 25+ years and considering the current growth rate of our city, we will continue to face significant traffic challenges and no amount of car infrastructure is going to change that. I think we need to prioritize green, safe, dedicated and PROTECTED bike/scooter lanes so that more people can feel comfortable using these alternative (and non-polluting!) sources of transportation. We need to work to get more cars off the road and not add to the automobile congestion that leads to dirty air and climate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Scott</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Oppose Toll Lanes</td>
<td>Toll lanes discriminate against average Americans in favor of the wealthy. I strongly oppose toll lanes. If people want to avoid traffic, then they can use the train and subway system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badgley, Ashley</td>
<td>Washington, District of Columbia</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Bikes</td>
<td>Hello, the plan falls short when it comes to protected bike lanes and trails. For the safety, health and happiness of dc residents, we need less cars and buses and more bikes. However, until there are more PROTECTED bike lanes, people won't ride. Cyclists are dying because of drivers believing they own the road and not looking. Take more action to curb emissions and get more people on bikes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baroody, Marie</td>
<td>Sterling, Virginia</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Visualize 2045</td>
<td>Please stop the crazy talk about a bridge over the Potomac in the Sterling area. I vehemently oppose this proposal and am all with Montgomery County's opposition! Keep the environment safe!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baroody, Marie</td>
<td>Sterling, Virginia</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Visualize 2045 Comment</td>
<td>As a new resident of Loudoun County I have come to realize that MORE is not always best. By more, I mean cars, trucks, motorcycles, trailers, etc. I am vehemently opposed to another Potomac crossing bridge in our county and feel it will only bring MORE of the above, sacrificing our environment, our way of living and getting around, &amp; our pockets. Montgomery County SHOULD be opposed, as they are the only sensible ones if they hold their ground. Fairfax County has already been overbuilt and I don't feel we need even more, particularly when it involves the community vs. just politicians with their visions for all. All means their friends, rick developers, and sponsors; it does not mean the every day person who lives here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bell, Lissa

Subject:

This plan needs to do much more and invest much more money in the areas of walking and biking infrastructure. Please fully adopt the Capital Trails Network as part of the long-range transportation plan.

Bethesda, MARK

Subject: Biking/walking

I strongly urge you to adopt the Capital Trails Network initiative as part of your long-term plan. I drive, I ride Metro, I bike, and I walk. We need all those things and we need to do a better job with all of them. But please don't put biking and walking on the back burner. These are critically important parts of our area's transportation network. Be bold! Incorporate the full Capital Trails Network into your long-term plan! Thanks.

Bonanno-Watson, David Allen

Subject: Future of transportation

I love bicycling. I fix bikes for a living. I commute by bike. I would really love to see more and better cycling infrastructure.

Boxerman, Josh

Subject: more bike and transit infrastructure and less highways

This plan doesn't go far enough to get people out of their cars and onto bikes and transit. We should be talking about adopting the full Capital Trails Network, for starters. We should be talking about removing highways, not expanding them. This is for the sake of our air, our health, our climate, and our cities.

Callaghan, Clare

Subject: Input

We need to improve cross region transit. Not everyone wants to get into DC. More frequent MARC to Frederick, extend its service hours, and consider running metro from Grosvenor to Dulles. An elevated line across the Potomac to Dulles would connect the 270 biotech corridor with the Dulles IT corridor.

Ciminio, Andrea

Subject: Visualize 2045 and bike infrastructure

I encourage the TPB to fully adopt the Capital Trails Network as a key part of the long-range transportation plan, and invest in trails and bicycling and walking projects. We need more investment in cycling and walking and less investment in infrastructure for cars. I bike commute every weekday from Montgomery County to Washington DC and everyday I am reminded of what a small fraction of our transportation dollars are spent to make our roads safe for the people trying to get to their destination in the most eco-friendly, healthiest, and cheapest way. Let's change that with Visualize 2045 so we can reduce traffic fatalities, help the environment and help people who can't afford to have cars.

Clark, James

Subject: Transit 2045

Focus on carbon reduction by all services and modes. True BRT, be brave instead of cowards. Multiple river crossings between Virginia and Maryland at Montgomery County. Extend the Purple Line into Virginia. More speeding cameras and more traffic enforcement. Automobile drivers are horrible dangers to our society. True bike lanes that are safe and physically separated from autos. Establish large multi-block woonerfs. Strongly encourage business to allow teleworking or simply pass legislation to require it of them. We should work from home 3 days a week and only commute 2 days a week. There should be more MARC and VRE trains and service. It should be simple and fast to ride a train from Richmond to Baltimore.
Can you please add ferry as a Transportation Demand Management alternative to the plan? Simply the potential for it as an alternative, denoted by the growth of the system in New York, City, means there is a value for its inclusion. Further, reports such as TRB's TRCP 102 and forthcoming research from the TRB AP085 Ferry Committee will further show its value as a stand-alone mode but notably as part of any multimodal trip - commuting or recreational.

Comeaux, Noel
Alexandria, Virginia
Comment ID: 105

Can you please add ferry as a Transportation Demand Management alternative to the plan? Simply the potential for it as an alternative, denoted by the growth of the system in New York, City, means there is a value for its inclusion. Further, reports such as TRB's TRCP 102 and forthcoming research from the TRB AP085 Ferry Committee will further show its value as a stand-alone mode but notably as part of any multimodal trip - commuting or recreational.

Corris, Kirstin
Washington, District of Columbia
Comment ID: 42

In spite of the lack of bike infrastructure currently in DC, more and more people are choosing cycling as transportation. This will only continue to grow. Failing to increase the infrastructure for cyclists will only gum up the roads as cyclists will ride in the road where there is no convenient bike accommodations. Please consider getting ahead of the problem instead of trying to catch up after the fact. Our city is falling behind other major urban areas. If New York can build cycling infrastructure, any city can. Additionally, I support a closed-off section of the heart of downtown where only bicycles and pedestrians can go. Many cities have done this and the economic benefits are clear. These areas boom with consumers strolling, enjoying, shopping. Sincerely, Kirstin Corris

DeMaio, Paul
Washington, District of Columbia
Comment ID: 47

We deserve the future we plan for and this future should be one with biking and walking representing a significant portion of trips in our region. Visualize 2045 needs to envision a bolder future for people who walk and bike. It doesn't plan for the transportation future that we need. The TPB could encourage more biking and walking by adopting the Capital Trails Network as the aspirational trail initiative in the long-range plan. This trail network has been researched, defined, and mapped by the Capital Trails Coalition, a group of public agencies representing TPB member jurisdictions, non-profit organizations, and other stakeholders. The TPB needs to fully adopt the Capital Trails Network as a key part of the long-range transportation plan, and invest in trails and bicycling and walking projects.

derleth, james
Washington, District of Columbia
Comment ID: 20

To whom it may concern, as you develop the 2045 plan, please focus on people friendly transportation options (pedestrian and bike lanes, public transportation). More roads are not the answer. They isolate communities, increase pollution and congestion, and weaken neighborhoods. Sincerely, Jim Derleth

DesJardins, Zachary
Alexandria, Virginia
Comment ID: 51

Please include the Capital Trails Network within your plan and fully fund it. It is included as an aspiration goal but lacks funding unlike highways. Please omit all highway expansions because they will only make congestion worse, not better. Your organization's previous support for highway expansion has made congestion worse time and time again, how much more money must we waste before this stops?
Ditzler, Brian  
Silver Spring, Maryland

Subject: Comments on Visualize 2045

The 4 points in the Call to Action to regional leaders are well reasoned. However, one cannot achieve all 4 goals if the aspirational initiative of "expand express highway network" is adopted. The later would inevitably increase single occupant travel ("induce demand") and lessen usage of Metrorail and other transit options. Expanding express highway network also would exacerbate the region's existing significant problem of not meeting Federal air quality standards. The public's unfortunate preference for SUVs and aversion to buying electric vehicles will make it difficult to meet vehicle-related emissions budgets for ozone, and this problem would be magnified by expansion of an express highway network. I strongly support the major transit projects listed on p. 40, but would find it totally unacceptable to have no increase in commuter rail, as shown on p. 36. MARC expansion would help manage peak period travel demand without the problems of highway expansion.

Silver Spring, Maryland

Dooling, Robb  
Washington, District of Columbia

Subject: Adopt the Capital Trails Network and place people at the top of the transportation hierarchy

More than ever, Greater Washington needs a transportation hierarchy placing people above automobiles to ensure a sustainable and equitable future. Visualize 2045 needs to envision a bolder future for people who walk and bike. The TPB should fully adopt the Capital Trails Network as a key part of its long-range transportation plan, and invest heavily in trails and bicycling and walking projects.

Upper Marlboro, Maryland

Dorch, Rosalyn D

Subject: 2045 Visual

I would love to see more bike trails in their DC MD and VA area with safe bike street lanes for street biking. Thank you

Arlington, Virginia

Dunbar, Henry

Subject: Bike/Ped Planning

Visualize 2045 needs to envision a bolder future for people who walk and bike. It doesn't plan for the transportation future that we need. The TPB should encourage more biking and walking by adopting the Capital Trails Network as the aspirational trail initiative in the long-range plan! This trail network has been researched, defined, and mapped by the Capital Trails Coalition, a group of public agencies representing TPB member jurisdictions, non-profit organizations (including WABA), and other stakeholders. The TPB needs to fully adopt the Capital Trails Network as a key part of the long-range transportation plan, and invest in trails and bicycling and walking projects. Additionally, Visualize 2045 should encourage localities to build out as much bike and pedestrian infrastructure as possible within the street grid. Trails are great, but they don't take people everywhere they need to go.

McLean, Virginia

Dye, Martha

Subject: Bike/Ped Planning

The TPB could encourage more biking and walking by adopting the Capital Trails Network as the aspirational trail initiative in the long-range plan! This trail network has been researched, defined, and mapped by the Capital Trails Coalition, a group of public agencies representing TPB member jurisdictions, non-profit organizations (including WABA), and other stakeholders. The TPB needs to fully adopt the Capital Trails Network as a key part of the long-range transportation plan, and invest in trails and bicycling and walking projects. If our Transportation Planning Board refuses to be bold, to think big, and to develop new transportation solutions, then we will be stuck with the same transportation problems (congestion and traffic fatalities to name a few).

McLean, Virginia

Dyer, Charles

Subject: TPB comments

Dear Madam/Sir  Please make provisions for biking and walking for the health of our populace and planet. Thank you.

Charles Dyer M D
The Visualize 2045 Plan does not go nearly far enough to provide robust, safe infrastructure for bikers and walkers. It overly heavily favors car infrastructure which the region should be moving away from for reasons of health, affordability and combating climate change. The current plan is not acceptable for our region. Please do more to have biking and walking emphasized or at least on par with existing car infrastructure instead of being an afterthought.

I bike almost everywhere in Arlington and DC, although I also increasingly find myself incorporate mass transportation, walking, bike-sharing, and scooters. There is a clear trend of city dwellers not wanting to have a car, but to have ready access to convenient alternatives. I'd like to encourage you to think hard about making the region more accessible for cycling and pedestrian access (as well as mass transit) and recognize the need to deemphasize the role of cars. We need clean air and walkable neighborhoods, as well as pleasant ways to get there. As population increases in the area, making it easier to drive will only exacerbate current problems with traffic. As we have seen when gas prices spike, commuters will change their behavior when the alternatives look comparatively better. Imagine a future with better air quality, less traffic, and healthier residents getting exercise as they explore the area!

The plan doesn't go nearly far enough for people who bike and walk. The plan invests in automobile infrastructure to the detriment of people who walk and bike. Why do regional planners think it is OK to continue to make bicyclists and pedestrians fight for scraps at the bottom of the barrel? Visualize 2045 needs to envision a bolder future for people who walk and bike. It doesn't plan for the transportation future that we need. The TPB could encourage more biking and walking by adopting the Capital Trails Network as the aspirational trail initiative in the long-range plan. This trail network has been researched, defined, and mapped by the Capital Trails Coalition, a group of public agencies representing TPB member jurisdictions, non-profit organizations (including WABA), and other stakeholders. The TPB needs to fully adopt the Capital Trails Network as a key part of the long-range transportation plan, and invest in trails and bicycling and walking projects.

I am in favor of anything to improve traffic flow and am in support of the funding of all the initiatives to widen I270, I495 and to build the several improved interchanges on US-29 north of the beltway. I also want to see a new road bridge over the Potomac (basically a new beltway continuing from each end of I200). There also needs to be the completion of the Purple line and it needs to be extended at the West end to Tysons Corner.

See comments in attachment on page 42.
Please prioritize pedestrian and bicycle lanes over cars. Only 40% of people in the metro area use cars daily yet over 85% of the space is assigned to cars. This is unfair and unsustainable. With the advent of electric scooters and bike rentals the crowding on sidewalks will only be exacerbated. Please democratize the plan to serve the majority of people: those NOT in cars.

Harchik, Suzanne
Arlington, Virginia
Comment ID: 94

Subject: 2045 Transportation Plan

1. Stop punishing car owners and single drivers; circumstances don’t always allow carpooling or public transportation. 2. More Potomac and Anacostia crossings needed: 2a. Create separate crossings for pedestrians, bikes and scooters, and vehicles. This keeps traffic moving at appropriate speeds. 2b. If tolls are to be charged, charge ALL who cross, don’t let non-vehicle traffic cross gratis. 3. Create new laws in metro region to hold pedestrians and bike/scooters accountable for their safety; ie crossing a street while on a cell phone. 4. Artificial city/urban creation will be disastrous if economy tanks. Be prepared for when income drops and include that in development plans.

Hartnett, Maureen
Brookeville, Maryland
Comment ID: 104

Subject: Visualize 2045 Comment

See comments in attachment on page 43.

Henke, Lee
Sterling, Virginia
Comment ID: 101

Subject: Bridge Connecting Maryland and Virginia

I would like to express my family’s OPPOSITION to the proposed bridge from Maryland to Virginia. We live in the Broad Run Farms community, which is on the Potomac River and is a unique and tranquil enclave of homes with a close-knit and supportive environment. We work hard to preserve the rural-like setting, prevent erosion and other environmental damage to the river, and love the life we have made here. We feel strongly that the bridge, which would come right down/over our road (Broad Run Drive used feeds directly to Route 28) would not only diminish our home value (significant investment) but destroy the peaceful and oasis-like setting we have in Broad Run Farms with noise pollution, and additional environmental damage to the river and surrounding areas brought about by increased traffic. We, as a community, will fight the proposed bridge cohesively and with all of our energy.

Hovland, Erik
Falls Church, Virginia
Comment ID: 16

Subject: Bike Pedestrian

I would like to see more resources devoted to Bike/Pedestrian paths and lanes. They do not only improve transportation, but improve the regions health. Bike trails and running paths have repeatedly been reported as one of the most valued assets of the region by those who work and live here. I think expanding this network and connecting existing trails would make for a safer, healthier, and more effective transit system. I especially think a WO&D like trail down I-66 to Gainesville would be great! But also connect this trail with north and south routes to the WO&D along Route 28 and down to Springfield via FFX County Pkwy.

Humphreys, Richard
Chevy Chase, Maryland
Comment ID: 22

Subject: Vision 2045

This plan doesn’t go far enough to get people out of their cars and onto bikes and transit. we should be talking about adopting the full Capital Trails Network, for starters. we should be talking about removing highways, not expanding them, and reducing the social costs of car based transport. This is for the sake of our air, our health, our climate, and our cities.
As a bicycle commuter that bikes from Arlington to DC to get to work, I want you to think big with regard to cycling and pedestrian access. With the advent of electric-assist bikes, bike sharing, and electric scooters, getting around town without a car is more popular than ever. Young people don’t want to drive, they don’t want a car. We need to build our infrastructure to support future needs. To maintain a beautiful city, breathable air, and pleasant walkable neighborhoods, we need massive investments in public transit, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure. With an exploding population, we’ll never be able to have a pleasant driving experience if everyone is driving.

Husband, Sarah
Arlington, Virginia
Comment ID: 18

Subject: Improved cycling and pedestrian paths

As a bicycle commuter that bikes from Arlington to DC to get to work, I want you to think big with regard to cycling and pedestrian access. With the advent of electric-assist bikes, bike sharing, and electric scooters, getting around town without a car is more popular than ever. Young people don’t want to drive, they don’t want a car. We need to build our infrastructure to support future needs. To maintain a beautiful city, breathable air, and pleasant walkable neighborhoods, we need massive investments in public transit, cycling and pedestrian infrastructure. With an exploding population, we’ll never be able to have a pleasant driving experience if everyone is driving.

Husson, Patrick
Camp Springs, Maryland
Comment ID: 110

Subject: Visualize 2045 Comment

See comments in attachment on page 45.

Irwin, Allen
Alexandria, Virginia
Comment ID: 85

Subject: Adopt the Capital Trails Network

I encourage MWCOG to endorse the aspirations of the Capital Trails Network in Visualize 2045. A metro Washington with an enhanced, connected pedestrian and trail network would be healthier, have increased non-motor transit share, and redundant transportation options in the event of systemic disruptions. Not everyone drives but everyone travels and including the Capital Trails Network in future plans would help all travelers get to where they need to go. Thank you

Isbell, Justin
Arlington, Virginia
Comment ID: 43

Subject: 

I am writing to encourage the Transportation Planning Board to fully adopt the Capital Trails Coalition Plan as part of the Visualize 2045 plan. The Capital Trails Coalition Plan is a forward thinking plan that reduces greenhouse gas emissions, reduces congestion and encourages healthy, active transportation that connects people to each other, the environment, their communities and to businesses.

Jones, Hunter
, 
Comment ID: 46

Subject: Public Comment on Visualize 2045 and the FY 2019-2024 TIP

See comments in attachment on page 49.

Jorge, Mike
Middlebrook, Maryland
Comment ID: 66

Subject: PLEASE pursue to add at least TWO new Potomac River bridge or the Bi-County Parkway

PLEASE pursue to add at least TWO new Potomac River bridge or the Bi-County Parkway it is one of the effective solutions for residents and commuters.

Karas, Matthew
Fairfax Station, Virginia
Comment ID: 78

Subject: New Bridge, metro line, and general comments

I hope this project considers two things: another bridge across the Potomac and a metro line following the tracks of Amtrack to Burke/Manassas. But, Metro will never become a stable cost-effective solution until metro’s labor costs are decreased or at least frozen for a while. I applaud Fairfax County's plans to improve the Fairfax County parkway! But more than anything, VA DC and MD need to work together. Be adults, negotiate, compromise, and get the job done.
Katz, Michael
Bethesda, Maryland

Subject: Strengthen cycling infrastructure in Visualize 2045

I avoid thousands of miles of car trips per year around Montgomery County, DC, and Virginia through the use of bicycles and bike+transit for transportation. Most of my cycling trips require that I ride on roads with substantial motor vehicle traffic, which is dangerous for my lungs and my safety. Please strengthen the infrastructure for cyclists and pedestrians in the Visualize 2045 plan. If you need an example of how fair things can be for cyclists and pedestrians, I recommend a field trip to Amsterdam!

Kelly, Laurie
Takoma Park, Maryland

Subject: We applaud this pragmatic, powerful plan for moving more people. We are fortunate to live in an Activity Center soon to be served by the Purple Line where driving is less essential. We’re not auto-dependent commuters, but we do need our car to regularly visit places where public transportation does not exist. We do hope infrastructure will in fact remain in a state of good repair.

Keltz, Melanie
Silver Spring, Maryland

Subject: Different idea to local transportation

I have always thought a transit system similar to a ski lift gondola would be a good choice in the Washington area. Poles to hold the cables could be put in the the center dividers on current roads. Cable transfer stations can be used to change the direction of gondolas to multiple other cables or as entry/exit stations. 4 or 6 person gondolas would be the default, large enough for a family or small enough for commuters. Having an option for individual use could be used for safety reasons. Destination would be set upon entry and computers would ‘read’ information at transfer points to guide gondola to correct direction. Electric power that could keep pace with technology and grow with new developments. I don’t believe AC or heat would be needed as everyone has a coat on in winter and windows could be opened in summer. As the system grows, cables can be expanded into neighborhood streets.

Klein, Grant
Washington, District of Columbia

Subject: More protected bike lanes, more bike laws, more bikes, more bikers

We should be envisioning a future where more people commute by bike than by personal vehicle. It fulfills many goals simultaneously and our policy should reflect that. We need less cars in and around cities and more opportunities for people to bike safely. Thank you.

Klein, Jim
Alexandria, Virginia

Subject: Visualize 2045 comment on bicycle and pedestrian goals

While I applaud the two aspirational goals of Visualize 2045 related to bicycle and pedestrian elements of the transportation system, they do not go far enough. Please expand the vision of the National Capital Trail to encourage more biking and walking by adopting the Capital Trails NETWORK as the aspirational trail initiative in the long-range plan! Build on the existing work that has been done to embolden the vision for a regional trail system. The Capital Trails Coalition spent a tremendous amount of effort to define a methodology and criteria for including trails in a regional trails plan that has been established collaboratively. Please adopt this specific methodology and criteria for inclusion in a regional trail network (http://capitaltrailscoalition.org/network-inclusion/) I would also recommend that a funding stream be established for bicycle and pedestrian projects meeting the criteria of the Capital Trails Network as a percent of transportation infrastructure.

Koch, Stefan
Prince William County, Virginia

Subject: Long Term Transportation Plan

Hello. I live in Prince William County and work in Fairfax County and I have little choice but to drive to most locations. I hope that the region will invest more in bicycle routes, sidewalks, as well Metro & VRE. Don’t build any new roads, just maintain the ones we have now and put $ into transit. Thank you.
As an avid biker and walker in the national capitol region, I am writing to encourage you to envision a bolder biking future as a part of Visualize 2045. The Transportation Planning Board could encourage more biking and walking by adopting the Capital Trails Network as the aspirational trail initiative in the long-range plan! This trail network has been researched, defined, and mapped by the Capital Trails Coalition, a group of public agencies representing TPB member jurisdictions, non-profit organizations, and other stakeholders. Thanks you in advance for thinking about an integrated plan that fully incorporates ALL forms of transportation including cyclists and walkers. Jim

Please do more to support bikes with bike lanes separate from traffic and a comprehensive system of trails connecting downtown with all of the city and suburbs. Advance Vision Zero! Thanks, Harry

The future of transportation is not in the personal automobile, it is in public transportation, biking, walking. I would love to see a drive, or focus, and this direction for the area. Thank you

This area needs 3 more crossings north of AL bridge. Nothing is more urgent than this.

Bus Rapid Transit on Rt 7 in VA should be included in this. The initiative will provide high quality bus service that connects multiple jurisdictions’ activity centers, including Tysons, Falls Church City, Seven Corners, Baileys Crossroads/Skyline, and Alexandria, with only two of the aforementioned activity centers currently having high capacity rapid transit (metro rail) available to them in walking distance. It fits within the vision of the document and studies for land acquisition are already being completed, so project completion should fall within the 45 year scope. Please add the Rt 7 BRT project to this document.

Reviewing the Visualize 2045 it is clear that the TPB has not fully embraced that walking & biking represent an increasing element of the transportation landscape, and most importantly, that they are fundamental to all solutions. For example, the TPB has ignored the impact of electric bikes which are relatively new to the landscape but appear to be revolutionizing bikes as transportation. By favoring car transportation in planning, the TPB is perpetuating a car centric culture rather than attempting to make a positive impact to increase alternatives. The TPB could encourage more biking and walking by adopting the Capital Trails Network as the aspirational trail initiative in the long-range plan! This trail network has been researched, defined, and mapped by the Capital Trails Coalition, a group of public agencies representing TPB member jurisdictions, non-profit organizations (including WABA), and other stakeholders.
Marcin, Daniel  
Silver Spring, Maryland  
Comment ID: 27

Subject: More transit, please

It's great that you've proposed a new transit loop line, and reorganizing Orange & Silver to go directly to Union Station on an alternate path. But honestly, that's the minimum of what we need today. I urge you to be even bolder and not to compromise on your stated goals. Additionally, I would hope that any road paving or track laying comes with protected bicycle lane or bicycle path accompaniment. If there is infrastructure, people will bike. Just look at how many people took out the electric Capital Bikeshare bikes on the first day, and how many people will ride on protected bike lanes in safe areas.

Maynard, Terry  
Reston, Virginia  
Comment ID: 83

Subject: Amazon's HQ2

The financially constrained plan makes no allocations for the possible location of Amazon's HQ2 in our area. Your own forecasts suggest that it will generate 390K jobs and, hence, a lot of traffic. I would recommend that you set aside a certain amount of money from this financially constrained plan to develop and allow funding for transpo improvements in the various areas where HQ2 might be located.

McDonald, Mike  
Arlington, Virginia  
Comment ID: 58

Subject: Orange Line Expansion

One of the things that I think is most notably missing in regards to the transit projects is any expansion of the Orange Line. The metro area extends west all the way to Haymarket which is 20 miles past the current end of the Orange Line. Given that the Silver Line will go all the way out to Ashburn, I don't understand why the Orange Line stops so short. I currently live in Arlington near Rosslyn but work out in Fairfax near exit 57A on I-66. I would much rather take the metro to work, however if I were to do that with the current metro, it would take me an additional 45 minutes to get to and from work with train and bus transfers. The current system doesn't cater much to those who reverse commute (commute west) along the I-66 corridor. Additionally, I think a metro loop mirroring the Capital Beltway is also something missing from this plan. The current metro plan makes travel cumbersome when going from the end of one spoke to another (i.e. Dulles to Bethesda).

Mendoza, Erik  
Washington, District of Columbia  
Comment ID: 50

Subject: Bicycle lanes in NE

With E-Bikes now becoming a growing mode of transportation, bike lanes from Woodridge/mt rainier in/near NE on Rhode Island avenue as this is the most direct route for commuting. In general, more bike lanes all over the city and connecting the city so that the people who live in the communities of DC can interconnect, bypassing car traffic for a relatively inexpensive, high efficiency network of lanes. E-Bikes are now enabling a wider group of people (age, physical ability etc.) to use bicycles and relieve car traffic stress. I personally do not ride e-bikes often, but see and hear from so many people that are either using or want to use them. If the city is going to allow companies to rent e-bikes or other forms of wheeled transportation, said city should provide adequate safe travel lanes. Thanks in advance.

Miller, Michael  
Alexandria, Virginia  
Comment ID: 96

Subject:

We need safe, protected cycling lanes. Cycle paths should be separated from pedestrian paths. The Mt. Vernon Trail, for instance, is not wide enough to safely allow for bicycle and pedestrian traffic. The paths should be separated. There is no safe bike path to the metro stations or train stations. Bike lanes should be located next to the curb with the car parking on the outside of the bike lanes to protect the bikes from traffic. Get ready for affordable electric bikes and scooters to hit the market. I would like to give up my car but I do not feel safe biking in the DMV. This six minute video is a good example of build it and they will come as it pertains to bicycling and safe bicycle paths. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XuBdf9Jy7o The video documents how The Netherlands became so bike friendly. It's a joy to go there and see how safely people from the young to the very old can cycle safely as a mode of transportation. It's a freedom that we do not enjoy here in VA.
Communities that work make active transport, particularly biking, safe and convenient. I strongly support transportation planning that provides bike lanes, bike stands, bike sharing. Cars and roads have ruined American cities and destroyed the environment. Please move into the 21st Century by making active and public transit the default.

Muchnick, Allen  Manassas, Virginia  Comment ID: 99
Subject: Visualize 2045 Comments

Visualize 2045 is far superior to the previous CLRPs, and the public education and outreach program for developing Visualize 2045 is commendable. The 7 aspirational elements MAY positively influence future transportation project submissions to better meet the TPB's objectives for a more effective, equitable, reliable, and sustainable transportation network. To do that, however, the TPB should at least annually assess the TIP and CLRP submissions against various benchmarks and performance measures, including the realization of the 7 aspirational elements. That said, the proposed National Capital Trail is far too geographically limited and should be expanded throughout ALL TPB jurisdictions, not just those covered by the proposed Capital Trails Network. Similarly, ped/bike access to Metrorail should be broadened to include other significant public transit nodes. The Express Lane element should focus on converting existing lanes, not adding more pavement, where feasible.

Neuringer, Jason  Rockville, Maryland  Comment ID: 44
Subject: Wrong on so many levels

This "report" is flawed on so many levels and makes a fairy-tale prediction of future growth. Future population growth will inevitably lead to vehicle traffic and this report makes no attempt to alleviate that. 1) Cars are here to stay and Cars will be a part of the future. Your presumption that housing should be focused around urban centers means values and prices for property will only increase thereby forcing more people to look further out for residence, forcing more to drive. The fact that this obvious oversight is never addressed is more alarming than humorous. 2) There are no successful implementations of Bus Rapid Transit anywhere in the United States. No matter how much you want BRT to work, it will not. Period. There is not enough bus usage anywhere in the region to make up for travel lanes lost to regular vehicle traffic. 3) The easiest way to alleviate Metro DC traffic? BUILD AN ADDITIONAL POTOMAC CROSSING! No other planning idea can solve traffic better.

Nordling, Courtney  Sterling, Virginia  Comment ID: 73
Subject: Comment on possible bridge spanning the Potomac

I do not support the proposal for a new Potomac river crossing in Loudoun County. It is not the responsibility of Loudoun County to bear the burden of Marylanders who choose to work in Virginia. Bringing in more traffic in the middle of the county will essentially divide the county in half and fill routes 28 and 7 with more traffic than they can handle.

Olesen, Andrew  Arlington, Virginia  Comment ID: 31
Subject: Human and Plant Friendly Transportation

Dear MWCOG, I am writing to urge you to consider a holistic transportation plan that looks beyond more roads and more cars as the solution. Considering the total cost, including land use cars are one of the most expensive ways to move people around an urban area like Greater Washington. They are also dangerous, polluting and killing pedestrians and cyclists who are just trying to get around their city. We are seeing the emergence of electric bicycles and scooters as smaller, lighter, more social ways of moving around our area. I strongly encourage you to consider the Capital Trails Coalition plan and invest in making DC a leading example for non-car transportation. Great things happen when there is a continuous and safe-from-traffic infrastructure for bicycle and other human-scale transportation. People are healthier, neighbors meet each other, local businesses do better. Let's make that how we Visualize 2045, not a mass of highways, parking, wide lanes, and toll systems.
A quick glance at the Visualize 2045 proposed transportation improvements reflects poorly on plans to increase interstate connectivity. No new crossing of the Potomac River have been built since the completion of the interstates (I-95 (1958), I-495 (1962) and I-66 (1955)). In 1960 the Washington, DC, Metro area had a population of about 2 million. Today our population is about 5.7 million. In 2045 it is estimated to be 6.9 million. It is imperative that the Visualize 2045 scope be enlarged to include additional Metro and roadway connectivity north and south of the current locations to support the existing and proposed increased populations.

**PARNES, JEFFREY**  
Oak Hill, Virginia  
Comment ID: 61

Subject: Lack of additional interstate connectivity

The TPB, Visualize 2045 and 2019-2024 TIP need to recognize that the nature of transportation is rapidly transforming in our region and the safety and needs of a population that does not move around in cars need to be lifted up as equal stakeholders. One way to do this is by adopting the Capital Trails Network as the aspirational trail initiative in the long-range plan! This trail network has been researched, defined, and mapped by the Capital Trails Coalition, a group of public agencies representing TPB member jurisdictions, non-profit organizations (including WABA), and other stakeholders. The TPB needs to fully adopt the Capital Trails Network as a key part of the long-range transportation plan, and invest in trails and bicycling and walking projects. If the Transportation Planning Board refuses to be bold, to think big, and to develop new transportation solutions, then we will be stuck with the same transportation problems, congestion and traffic fatalities on the rise.

**Pierson, Jennifer**  
Washington, District of Columbia  
Comment ID: 40

Subject: Be bold, think big, and elevate the needs of pedestrians and bicyclists

I believe we should further extend public transportation, i.e. metro system of sorts, to Prince William County. So many commuters from Washington all the way South down here. An article was just realized of how the commute from Washington to Stafford is considered one of the worse commutes on the east coast. Adding more options may lessen the load on the highways.

**Pizarro, Diego**  
Dumfries, Virginia  
Comment ID: 92

Subject: 

I applaud your focus on reducing road congestion and getting cars off the road. To that end, please do not consider adding another Potomac River bridge crossing. This would only created “induced traffic” and further crowd the already congested roadways in Loudoun County Virginia. Instead please focus on more environmentally friendly options such as improvements to the existing American Legion bridge and Point of Rocks bridge. Thank you!

**Pooley, Julie**  
Sterling, Virginia  
Comment ID: 98

Subject: No new Potomac River bridge

I urge you to fully adopt the Capital Trails Network as a key part of the long-range transportation plan, and invest in trails and bicycling and walking projects. This is important! Thank you. Bill Rapp

**Pritchard, Allen**  
Washington, District of Columbia  
Comment ID: 8

Subject: More bike infrastructure please

Please fully adopt the Capital Trails Network as a key part of the long-range transportation plan, and invest in trails and bicycling and walking projects. Be bold, think big, look beyond the automobile. Thanks, Allen
It seems that the way to handle traffic on the beltway is to constantly add more lanes or add tolls to those lanes (really a revenue generator not anything that reduces # of cars when there are non-toll lanes adjacent) or to build an outer beltway which just means more cars. I would advocate that we instead look at public railway along the beltway. More and more jobs are outside of Washington, DC city lines, yet all Metro lines are designed to get people in and out of DC. With FBI looking to move their headquarters outside of DC, even the federal government is doing so. Let's look to see that one can get from one point to another along the beltway using Metro without having to resort to going into DC to do so. This would also probably alleviate crowding issues at existing transfer station in DC. Thank you.

Rasheed, Aamir
Sterling, Virginia
Comment ID: 93

Subject: Public Transportation

If the lengthy study, and the elaborate graph put together is to be believed, then the 3% of residents who need to travel FROM Loudoun County TO Montgomery County DO NOT warrant a bridge that will put 67,000 more cars on Route 28 as they travel to Fairfax County. THREE PERCENT is not sufficient need, no matter how much money the developers have promised the Board of Supervisors. The citizens of Loudoun will pay for it with the impact on our quality of life for decades. If the study and resulting graph are legitimate then a bridge in Loudoun SHOULD NOT be a possibility in the plan, not if the plan honestly is trying to find solutions for the people who live in the communities that will be crippled by such a misuse of funds. Look at the results of the study, look at the graph -- there is no legitimate case for THREE PERCENT of the trips to make it possible for 67,000 cars to cut through our community to support Fairfax County's economy while damaging our community on the way by.

Raftner, Amy
Sterling, Virginia
Comment ID: 97

Subject: No Bridge ANYWHERE in Loudoun -- Rte 28 is already Gridlocked

Hello, I want to lend my support for continued funding and development of safe bike paths that are interconnected throughout the region. I have been a WABA member for many years and for environmental and health reasons, see biking as an excellent alternative to car commuting. I would like to see the TPB encourage more biking and walking by adopting the Capital Trails Network as the aspirational trail initiative in the long-range plan. This trail network has been researched, defined, and mapped by the Capital Trails Coalition, a group of public agencies representing TPB member jurisdictions, non-profit organizations (including WABA), and other stakeholders. I also suggest that biking supports (such as ample bus bike racks for the ride back home/uphill) be added and advertised so residents feel they are capable of a biking commute. Thank you, Kerry Grace Rice

Rice, Kerry G
Kensington, Maryland
Comment ID: 30

Subject: Visualize 2045 biking

I'm a longtime professional DC resident who has relied on DC's public transit system for over 2 decades. Using public transit is a lifestyle choice - for its ease, safety, and positive environmental impact. Being able to live without a car is among the top 5 reasons why I continue to reside here. (I do not consider for-profit rideshare companies like Uber as "public transportation"). I'm a major proponent of Metrobus, which I use more than Metrorail for a number of reasons. I would like to see robust bus service, and a transition to CNG buses as opposed to the hybrids, which are incredibly loud and pollute more. Dedicated bus lanes would be a good step. I am strongly opposed to cutting service by removing bus stops (or as the consultant calls it, "consolidation") as this poses a hardship to many riders and discourages people from using Metrobus. A balance of express buses and "local" service is a good compromise.

roberts, deborah
Washington, District of Columbia
Comment ID: 87

Subject:
This is a nice plan, but we need to do more to move things between the Constrained plan and the Aspirational plan. They read like a divide between "business as usual" and "things the experts recommend but the government has been unwilling to do". In particular, increasing density and access around transit stations should move to the Constrained plan, along with more of the BRT. In the timeframes in this plan, it is likely that BRT can operate without drivers (especially in the constrained environment of dedicated busway), reducing operating costs and headways. The Capitol Trail component should also indicate existing and recommended feeder trails, showing the geographic reach for those that will be able to access the trail and commercial areas served.

More bike lanes and trails are essential

Please keep up the good work!

Attached is my review of Visualize 2045. It is a very good document and considerably better than past federally-required four-year plans in large part because of its seven aspirational elements—particularly that which, "brings jobs and housing closer together." In fact, Visualize 2045 could turn out to be one of the more important COG and TPB documents in recent years.

Thanks for this comprehensive plan! As it pertains to transportation, I like the overall trend I'm reading of getting more cars off of the roads. However, I'm concerned at the pretty uninspiring initiative of improving walking/biking. First of all, I don't think the two belong in the same category - there are enough improvements to be made for each. Second, I would like to see more dedicated, protected bike infrastructure - more lanes that replace car lanes or parking. I bike to work/home, not to transit to then get to work/home. We don't want better paths to transit only, we want better paths everywhere. I would love to see whole streets closed to cars and given back to human beings. Unfortunately I don't find this plan bold at all. It will take a truly forward-thinking, gutsy set of ideas to visualize our world in 2045, and this plan does not encapsulate that. I see DC as being a transportation leader, and if this bike/ped plan stays as is, our city will be woefully behind.

Please include the Capital Trails Network as envisioned by the Capital Trails Network as a part of long range planning. This is a great opportunity to design our transportation around any form of transportation other than cars and it would be great to see more of a focus on walking and biking at the least. I bike commute and simply carving out a bike lane on a road isn't enough to provide safe infrastructure. Thank you.
Shehabi, Hisham  
Washington, District of Columbia  
Comment ID: 45

Subject:  Visualize 2045 - Comments by a new resident in DC area

See comments in attachment on page 50.

Silver Spring, Sebastian  
Silver Spring, Maryland  
Comment ID: 2

Subject:  Viz 2045

Great plan overall. One comment about BRT: it needs dedicated lanes, especially in congested areas. There are ways to provide dedicated lanes while minimizing property takings and lane repurposing. Montgomery County is currently designing a BRT on Route 29 without dedicated lanes in the most congested areas. In response, we proposed a plan that would extend dedicated lanes through some of the most congested areas within the existing curb-to-curb width while still keeping 6 lanes. It consists of narrowing the general purpose lanes to a safer width and using bidirectional or reversible busways in constrained areas. We call it "Better BRT" and you can read more about it at BetterBRT.growingeastcounty.com. I encourage you to emphasize the importance of dedicated lanes and provide innovative solutions to achieving them in the report. Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments.

Simpson, Keith  
Sterling, Virginia  
Comment ID: 74

Subject:

Money from the TIP and visualize 2045 associated with beltway widening and improvements and 270 improvements could be used for an additional river crossing to the West which could provide the same congestion relief and provide an alternate route in case of a disaster to one of our bridges providing better long term stability for the region.

Stanford, Jason  
Arlington, Virginia  
Comment ID: 67

Subject:  Comments Made at September 21, 2018 TPB Meeting

See comments in attachment on page 51.

Stanley, John  
Arlington, Virginia  
Comment ID: 14

Subject:  Future of cycling

I am disappointed to see that the Visualize 2045 plan seems more like "Visualize 1945." It's entirely too automobile-centered, and does not reflect today's emerging modern urban sensibility, which places cycling and walking at the center of how people in cities want to live. I urge you to substantially re-think the plan in light of how young people in cities today -- who will be dominant in 2045 -- actually want to live. Sincerely, John Stanley Arlington

Stenhouse, Jeb  
Washington, District of Columbia  
Comment ID: 41

Subject:  Please include Capital Trails Network in Visualize 2045

The most important long-term priority for regional transportation planning is to reduce reliance on the private automobile. Please include robust investment in all other forms of transportation, including the Capital Trails Network as well as significant increases in intercity and intracity bus and rail networks. I would also ask that if any Visualize 2045 planners have not biked or walked/run on the current trail network, they should be required to do so in order to understand the full breadth of the transportation experience they are planning to cover - and trust me, you will appreciate getting out from behind the wheel and enjoying the trail experience!

Stokely, Peter  
Arlington, Virginia  
Comment ID: 52

Subject:

See comments in attachment on page 52.
 Strauss, Steve
 Washington, District of Columbia
 Comment ID: 3
 Subject: Transit Elements in Visualize 2045

See comments in attachment on page 53.

 Szibler, Stephen
 Washington, District of Columbia
 Comment ID: 25
 Subject: Visualize 2045

The Transportation Planning Board needs to fully adopt the Capital Trails Network as a key part of the long-range transportation plan, and invest in trails and bicycling and walking projects. As it stands the plan is too car-centric.

 Thomson, Craig
 Springfield, Virginia
 Comment ID: 86
 Subject:

Jobs and housing need to be closer together so that working people who do not have cars can still get to their jobs. Mass transit and multi dwelling unit development are therefore really important. The disparity between market rents and median or average incomes for working people is so massive that affordable housing is part of that same solution.

 Versel, Malcolm
 Rockville, Maryland
 Comment ID: 12
 Subject: Importance of Cycling Routes and Separate Infrastructure for Bicycles and Motorized Vehicles

As someone who has ridden and continues to ride a bicycle regularly in all weather conditions over many years, I can attest to the now-more-important-than-ever importance of keeping bicycle traffic and motorized vehicle traffic as separate as possible. Motorized vehicles are more numerous than ever, given the vast growth explosion in the DC Metro area over the past couple of decades. That growth likely will continue to accelerate as more multi-family units are built on land once occupied by single-family homes. Another factor of concerns to cyclists is that many vehicles are larger and wider than before, as motorists opt for SUV and truck-like vehicles. This further disadvantages cyclists and increases the risks of cycling in lanes shared with vehicles. The TPB May encourage more biking and walking by adopting the Capital Trails Network as the aspirational trail initiative in the long-range plan! Trails are important for all! Thank you for considering my comments.

 Vias, Tyrone
 Brunswick, Maryland
 Comment ID: 77
 Subject:

See comments in attachment on page 54.

 Vorndran, John
 McLean, Virginia
 Comment ID: 84
 Subject: Express Rail Lines

New York City has express trains throughout its subway system. Have express trains been considered for Metro, VRE, and AmTrak? Even if they have, they should be re-considered. Perhaps creating large parking garages by Fredericksburg, Gainesville, Leesburg, Frederick, Waldorf, Annapolis/Bowie, Columbia/Ellicott City (or where land is cheapest) where express trains run directly into a Metro stop (Metro Center, Lâ€™Enfant Plaza, Stadium Armory, Fort Totten) where riders can transfer to multiple lines (or the end of one Metro line) as I believe that would ease 95/495/395/66/295/97 highway traffic because because people would drive to these express trains centers outside the city.

 Warner, John
 Waldorf, Maryland
 Comment ID: 88
 Subject: Bus rapid transit- Charles county

I was disappointed that there are no plans to build bus rapid transit lanes from DC to Charles County MD. There is currently a tremendous amount of traffic on route 210 and route 5 during rush hour. One single bus rapid transit lane would greatly inventivize bus ridership, as commute times would be vastly decreased for bus riders. This would address latent demand and be scalable over the coming decades (whereas adding highway lanes is not).
Wayne, Barbara  
Crossroads Jobs, Inc.  
Sterling, Virginia  
Comment ID: 80

Subject: Comments on Visualize 2045

I am happy to see that the new Potomac River Bridge, proposed for Loudoun County, did NOT make the plan. A new bridge would make traffic much worse by creating inappropriate regional bypass routes and increasing development in vehicle-centered areas. I also do not believe that additional widening and implementing HOV lanes on Route 28 from the Dulles Toll Road to Route 7 is the right thing to do. Circling communities with ever-expanding highways is very bad for local businesses, creating islands of socioeconomic decay hemmed in by un-crossable moats of speeding (or more likely idling), polluting vehicles. Eastern Loudoun will resemble a slum thanks to these tactics. Let’s support our new metro stations by not creating vehicle-based alternatives that will look good at first and soon fill up to make traffic worse. Create more ways to connect neighborhoods and local residents with businesses using bike and pedestrian trails. Fund new metro tunnels to improve reliability and safety.

Weinstein, Zachary  
Silver Spring, Maryland  
Comment ID: 36

Subject: Reword Aspirational Initiative 5

Visualize 2045 should reword Aspirational Initiative 5: Expand Express Highway Network to specify that governments should apply congestion pricing to existing highway lanes instead of adding new lanes. The plan should primarily aim to reduce congestion, not expand highways. Adding new lanes will not decrease congestion. Even if the new lanes have congestion pricing, the old lanes would have the same congestion due to induced demand. Additionally, the new lanes would cause environmental damage inconsistent with the region's climate commitments by increasing total vehicle numbers, covering more land with pavement, and encouraging sprawl. Applying congestion pricing to existing roads would decrease congestion, encourage road users to carpool or use public transit, and provide funding for transit improvements with no negative environmental consequences. Visualize 2045 should not seek to expand highways. Instead, make the goal solely about reducing congestion.

Wheeler, Ann  
Haymarket, Virginia  
Comment ID: 109

Subject: Prince William County Plan Lacking

Your vision for Prince William County is woefully lacking in better transportation infrastructure given that it is way behind its neighboring jurisdictions and the vast majority of its citizens travel to get to work. 1. The Battlefield bypass by the year 2040 seems too far out. 2. The expansion of the VRE in western PWC is missing. 3. The addition of Metro on the east end, given that’s the worse congestion in the state, should have been included. It appears the only option for the citizens of Prince William County is to buy their way down the road with the use of HOT lanes, for roads we have already paid for through taxes. Was anyone from PWC on this commission?
IN REPLY REFER TO:
NCPC FILE No. 8025

October 10, 2018

Chairman Charles Allen
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002-4239

RE: NCPC Comments on draft TPB Visualize 2045 Plan: A Long-Range Transportation Plan for the National Capital Region

Dear Mr. Allen:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Visualize 2045 plan. As the federal government’s central planning agency for the National Capital Region, the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) has a shared interest in a multi-modal regional transportation system that meets the travel needs of the region’s workers, residents, and visitors. NCPC prepares a comprehensive plan that guides federal development, and reviews federal master plans and projects in the region based on the comprehensive plan’s policies. Our interest in Visualize 2045, and the comments in this letter, reflect the plan’s use as a helpful resource for developing our policies and in our review of regional federal development.

First, we commend you on creating a plan that combines the aspirational, feasible, and required aspects of a long-range regional transportation document. The draft plan reflects the significant work of the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) to adopt aspirational projects, programs and policies that reflect the region’s shared development goals, as well as the projects that are financially feasible.

In addition, the plan takes a technical, complicated subject and makes it clear and easy to understand. The plan and related documents provide useful, well-researched contextual information that links transportation to the region’s demographic and land use characteristics, as well as trends and emerging issues. It is also clear that the TPB made a serious commitment to connect with the public in this process.

NCPC supports the aspirational ideas of Visualize 2045 and notes that they are generally consistent with the policies in the Comprehensive Plan for the National Capital: Federal Elements. Regional federal facilities, and the workers and visitors that travel to them, rely on an efficient, interconnected, and sustainable transportation system. The Comprehensive Plan supports a multimodal transportation system and maintaining the region’s transportation assets in good repair. Many federal workplaces and campuses are located in or in close proximity to Regional Activity Centers and Metro stations, reflecting the shared development history and continued recognition of the importance of transit in getting federal employees to work. Listed below are summaries of select policies that support the aspirational initiatives identified in Visualize 2045.
Transportation Element:

- Support an integrated network of complementary regional transit services.
- Support the efforts of local jurisdictions to design and implement new, expanded, and innovative transit services that supplement existing transit and fill unmet transit needs.
- Create partnerships with federal agencies and local governments that support multi-modal commuting and shorter commute times through federal facility location decisions and Live-Near-Your-Work programs.
- Work with local jurisdiction bike coordinators, the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments, Commuter Connections, cycling organizations, such as the Washington Area Bicyclist Association, and others, to promote bicycle commuting among federal employees.
- Support transit-oriented development at Metrorail stations, within Regional Activity Centers, and at other transit nodes.
- Support multimodal connections and transportation alternatives in the regional system.
- Encourage ridesharing, biking, walking, transit, and other non-SOV modes of transportation for federal commuters and visitors.

Workplace Element Policies:

- Locate federal facilities within walking distance of existing or planned fixed route transit services.
- Locate new federal facilities to support regional and local agency objectives that encourage compact forms of growth and development and support local and federal goals to increase local and regional transit system ridership.
- Locate federal workplaces near a variety of housing options to benefit employees.
- Encourage telework and Alternate Work Schedules for federal employees where it benefits the federal government and the public.
- Support local agency efforts to create new housing options where federal workplaces exist, or area planned.
- Promote Live-Near-Your-Work initiatives for a variety of housing options close to public transit and/or federal facilities.

NCPC is currently working on updates to the Comprehensive Plan Transportation and the Federal Workplace policy elements. Visualize 2045 will serve as an important resource to help us understand how these policies, which guide federal development in the region, can leverage and support the region’s transportation objectives.

Many federal installations and campuses in the region have mission and security needs that can affect public access and other transportation issues. NCPC is committed to working with federal and regional stakeholders to identify strategies that successfully address security and promote access, mobility and connectivity.
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Pursuant to our authorities, NCPC also reviews transportation projects on federally managed lands and other areas of federal interest, and participates in other reviews, including NEPA and Section 106 compliance. NCPC has or may participate in the future review of a number of Visualize 2045 projects. Examples include the Purple Line, Corridor Cities Transit-way, the Arlington Bridge rehabilitation, and Long Bridge capacity improvements. NCPC may also review projects occurring at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, Washington Dulles International Airport, Metrorail, stream valley parks acquired through the Capper-Cramton Act, and development within the Central Area in the District of Columbia, among others. For example, the I-270/495 Managed Lane Study could impact federal facilities including the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, NSA – Bethesda, and National Park Service and Capper Cramton parks. We look forward to working with regional project proponents on these important projects.

NCPC works closely with federal applicant agencies during our review of master plans and projects to consider and address transportation-related issues. NCPC requires Transportation Management Plans for federal campuses and installations as part of the master planning process that establish transportation goals consistent with the comprehensive plan policies and agency missions. The information in Visualize 2045, regarding proposed projects, as well as aspirational goals, will be helpful for NCPC and applicants during the review process.

Several federal agencies manage regional transportation assets, most notably the National Park Service (NPS). NPS will shortly release its National Capital Region Long Range Transportation Plan. This document sets a 20-year vision for the important transportation assets NPS manages that provide access to the region’s iconic destinations, including several parkways, major bridges, and highly used trail systems. We encourage the TPB to continue working with the NPS to understand the mission, issues, and opportunities that guide these federally managed resources, and how best to incorporate them into larger regional plans.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to comment on Visualize 2045. We look forward to our continued participation on the TPB, and working together to improve the region’s mobility and sustainability. Please contact Julia Koster at julia.koster@ncpc.gov for any further information.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Marcel Acosta
Executive Director
October 5, 2018

Mr. Kanathur Srikanth
Executive Director
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002

Reference: Comments on Visualize 2045

Dear Mr. Srikanth:

Thank you for providing an opportunity to comment on the draft Visualize 2045 Plan. On behalf of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors, I am writing to provide the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) comments regarding the Draft Plan that were discussed by the Board on October 2, 2018.

Overall, the Board supports the plan and recommends the Transportation Planning Board adopt Visualize 2045 on October 17, 2018. The Board supports and encourages this new kind of long-range planning effort by the TPB, which now includes aspirational projects, programs, and policies that go beyond financial constraints. The Board appreciates the multi-modal approach to accommodate anticipated growth in population and employment. Also, the Board is pleased that Visualize 2045 highlights bicycle and pedestrian projects, freight planning, and other transportation programs aimed at reducing congestion and improving air quality, as well as, presenting and analyzing key land-use issues facing the region, including the links between land-use, economic vitality, and transportation.

The Board is especially pleased to see two highway projects in the Plan that will greatly benefit the region: 1) Maryland’s I-95/495 Traffic Relief Plan, and 2) Virginia’s I-495 – construct 4 HOT lanes project. Together, these two projects will address one of the region’s major congested bottlenecks – the American Legion Bridge. The County believes that the capacity needs across the Potomac River must be addressed to alleviate the existing congestion and to ensure that the region remains economically vibrant.

The Board also appreciates the inclusion of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority’s plans for expanding capacity on Metrorail by running all eight-car trains during peak hours, making capacity improvements to stations in the system core, and planning to construct a new Rosslyn tunnel under the Potomac River.

The Board requests that this letter be made a part of the public comments record, and that full consideration be given to these comments in adopting the Final Visualize 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan at the TPB’s October 17, 2018, meeting.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Plan. If you need any clarification or further information, please call Mike Lake at (703) 877-5666 or me at (703) 324-2321.

Sincerely,

Sharon Bulova
Chairman

cc: Members, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors
    Bryan J. Hill, County Executive
    Robert A. Stalzer, Deputy County Executive
    Catherine A. Chianese, Assistant County Executive
    Tom Biesiadny, Director, Department of Transportation
MEMORANDUM

TO: Charles Allen, Chair, Transportation Planning Board
FROM: Kacy Kostiuk, Chair, Access for All Advisory Committee
SUBJECT: AFA Comments on the Visualize 2045 Draft
DATE: October 5, 2018

At the September 13, 2018 Access for All Advisory (AFA) Committee meeting, the committee received a series of presentations on the region’s long-range metropolitan transportation plan, Visualize 2045. The committee discussed the plan elements and provided comments on transportation-related concerns for the populations the AFA represents. The AFA comments are organized in two categories: comments specific to Visualize 2045 draft and other general transportation concerns.

Overall, the AFA stressed the importance of affordable, reliable, and accessible rail, bus, and paratransit for people with disabilities, those with limited incomes, minority communities, people with limited English skills, and older adults. The AFA had eight summary comments with additional detail under each comment provided in the following pages.

- The AFA recommends that Visualize 2045
  - include additional and more affordable public transportation options throughout the region;
  - prioritize transportation funding for accessible pedestrian and bicycle options critical for people with disabilities’ and older adults’ safety, access, and mobility;
  - consider and accommodate the impact of technology and automation;
  - recognize the additional burdens that managed lanes may place on low-income populations; and
  - note that the “Access to Jobs” measure shows an East-West divide, and that the region is not only divided by race and income, but also by access to jobs.

- The AFA wanted to stress to the TPB that
  - accessibility for people with disabilities and those with limited-English skills should be considered throughout the planning, design, construction, and implementation stages of transportation projects or services;
  - front-line transit employees and transportation network company drivers, such as Uber and Lyft drivers need diversity and sensitivity training; and
  - the region should ensure MetroAccess has the resources to serve additional demand while maintaining service quality and provide more alternative options.
COMMENTS SPECIFIC TO THE VISUALIZE 2045 DRAFT

THE AFA RECOMMENDS THAT VISUALIZE 2045 INCLUDE ADDITIONAL AND MORE AFFORDABLE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS THROUGHOUT THE REGION.

- The committee noted a need for expansion of bus service, including more interjurisdictional service and restoring bus service cuts made in the last few years.
- The AFA is concerned about Metrorail remaining both affordable and available to residents and low-income workers. It continues to be concerned about reductions in rail and bus service and the impact on those who are transit-dependent. The committee supports incentives for people with limited incomes; incentives could include user-side subsidies or reduced fare programs.
- The AFA also recognizes Metro’s current challenges and expressed strong support for it to continue efforts to improve safety, maintenance, and service quality.
- The AFA is concerned about transit-dependent populations being priced out of high-density areas, such as activity centers and near Metrorail stations. Some people are unable to live in these areas well served by transit and other public services because the housing costs are out of reach, so they are forced to find housing that is farther away from these critical services.

THE AFA RECOMMENDS PRIORITIZING TRANSPORTATION FUNDING FOR ACCESSIBLE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE OPTIONS IN VISUALIZE 2045, WHICH IS CRITICAL FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES’ AND OLDER ADULTS’ SAFETY, ACCESS, AND MOBILITY.

- Implementation agencies should consider the safety concerns of people with disabilities and the need for education and awareness of pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers as these agencies maintain, build, and propose bike lanes.
- The AFA recommends greater coordination between jurisdictions on creating standards for a high-quality, uniform enhanced auditory signaling system for visually-impaired pedestrian travel.
- Bikeshare programs should increase the availability of accessible bikes (e.g. hand bikes, side-by-side bikes, electric bikes and tricycles) to promote adaptive cycling in the region.

VISUALIZE 2045 SHOULD CONSIDER AND ACCOMMODATE THE IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY IN REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION.

- The TPB should more explicitly plan to accommodate the expected increase in electric and autonomous vehicles and estimate impact on regional air quality.
- The plan should be flexible and consider how to accommodate the expected increase in app-based services (and associated accessibility challenges), technology-oriented jobs, teleworking and the impact on regional congestion. Solutions include supporting policies for federal, state and local governments on app-based and automated vehicle accessibility standards and improved telework policies for both public and private sector employees.
THE AFA EXPRESSED CONCERN ABOUT THE ADDITIONAL BURDENS THAT MANAGED LANES MAY PLACE ON LOW-INCOME POPULATIONS.

- The plan includes managed lane facilities on I-495 and I-270 which require users to pay fees for use of the facilities when driving alone. The AFA commented that tolled facilities tend to place additional burdens on low-income workers, people with disabilities, and those with limited English skills, and asked if the project would have affordability and accessibility provisions.
- The AFA committee questioned if low-income populations can fully participate in the benefits of these new facilities and from the benefits of purchasing a transponder as well as pre-paying tolls with a credit card.

THE AFA EXPRESSED CONCERN THAT THE REGION IS NOT ONLY DIVIDED BY RACE AND INCOME, BUT ALSO BY ACCESS TO JOBS.

- The AFA received a presentation on the performance analysis of the Visualize 2045 draft, including Figure 1 showing changes in “access to jobs by auto” with the greatest losses on the eastern side of the region and that the greatest gains are on the western side of the region.
- The AFA supports actions to address the East-West divide, such as an increase in all modes of transportation to connect the eastern part of the region to the job-rich western portion.

Figure 1: Changes to Access to Jobs by Auto in 45 Minutes, 2019 to 2045
COMMENTS ON OTHER TRANSPORTATION CONCERNS

ACCESSIBILITY FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AND THOSE WITH LIMITED-ENGLISH SKILLS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED THROUGHOUT THE PLANNING, DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPLEMENTATION STAGES OF TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS OR SERVICES.

- When implementing agencies consider the needs of people with disabilities early on, as well as throughout the planning stages of a project, the accessibility and usability of the transportation improvement can be greatly improved for everyone.
- The AFA noted that people using mobility devices have difficulty in finding accessible parking options in D.C. as well as the need for more accessible transportation options in general.
- Regarding language access, the AFA recommends that WMATA as well as the District Department of Transportation (DDOT), the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) provide greater language access to limited English speakers to ensure that they can comment on proposed service changes and/or transportation projects. WMATA’s efforts to build partnerships with language access advocacy organizations should continue.

FRONT-LINE TRANSIT EMPLOYEES AND RIDE-SHARING COMPANY DRIVERS NEED DIVERSITY AND SENSITIVITY TRAINING.

- The committee recommends that transportation providers augment sensitivity training of front-line employees and transportation network company drivers so that they know how to appropriately communicate and assist all customers; such training should include awareness of and sensitivity to different types of disabilities, the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community, and a diverse set of cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

THE REGION SHOULD ENSURE METROACCESS HAS THE RESOURCES TO SERVE ADDITIONAL DEMAND WHILE MAINTAINING SERVICE QUALITY AND PROVIDE MORE ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS.

- Demand for ADA paratransit will increase due to the aging population and requirements to transition people with intellectual and developmental disabilities to community-based independent living. AFA members expressed concerns that MetroAccess may not have the resources to serve this additional demand and maintain service quality at the same time; not all human service agencies will be able to afford to provide the transportation for the people they expect to serve, as many have done in the past.
- The AFA noted that some people with severe disabilities need a greater level of service than what ADA paratransit can provide. Pilot programs directly funding human service agencies to provide transportation to their clients rather than using MetroAccess have shown good results and resulted in cost-savings for jurisdictions.
- The AFA recommends that the region continue to support alternatives to MetroAccess, such as taxi pilots, and the use of transportation network companies or other providers, to the extent that these options can provide fully accessible service for people with a wide range of disabilities and are less expensive to the jurisdictions than MetroAccess.
October 1, 2018

The Honorable Charles Allen, Chair
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
777 North Capitol Street, NE, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20002

Dear Chair Allen:

Thank you for providing an opportunity to comment on the air quality conformity analysis in the draft Visualize 2045 plan. MWAQC has reviewed the above analysis and concurs that the transportation sector emissions associated with the proposed transportation plans meet the motor vehicle emissions budgets (MVEBs) in the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard Maintenance Plan.

However, the Visualize 2045 plan results in having to use Tier 2 transportation buffers for some of the future years, so MWAQC urges TPB to redouble efforts to reduce air pollution emissions from the transportation sector so that future mobile emission budgets remain within Tier 1 MVEBs to fully protect the health of our residents.

The Washington region has made significant progress in reducing emissions of ozone precursors such as, volatile organic compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NOx) from both transportation and non-transportation sectors over the years. As a result, the region has been able to meet all but the 2015 ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). The region has met the 2008 ozone standard of 75 parts per billion (ppb) since 2014 and submitted a request in early 2018 to EPA to redesignate the area to attainment for the 2008 ozone standard along with a required demonstration to maintain compliance in the future (maintenance plan).

The Washington region developed two sets of MVEBs (Tier 1 and Tier 2) for VOC and NOx as part of the maintenance plan for the 2008 ozone standard using EPA’s latest MOVES2014a model. The Tier 1 MVEBs together with Tier 2 MVEBs, which included a conformity buffer, were developed for 2025 and beyond. These MVEBs replaced the previously used MVEBs, which were developed earlier using Mobile6.2 model based on the 1997 ozone NAAQS. EPA, on August 21, 2018, found these budgets were adequate for transportation conformity purposes.

MWAQC notes that the air quality conformity assessment shows that transportation emissions are below the Tier 1 MVEBs for most of the analysis period. However, transportation emissions are above the Tier 1 MVEBs for 2025 and 2030. Therefore, TPB had to use the Tier 2 MVEBs buffers for demonstrating conformity in those two years.

The Tier 2 MVEBs buffers were provided for in the 2008 ozone NAAQS maintenance plan to account for conditions where the conformity analysis is based on different data, models, or planning assumptions, including, but not limited to, updates to demographic, land use, or project-related assumptions, then were used to create the MVEBs in the maintenance plan. Nevertheless, MWAQC is concerned about the use of the Tier 2 MVEBs buffers and wishes to stress that the future transportation plans should account for air emissions so that future conformity analyses would not need to use Tier 2 MVEBs buffers.
MWAQC notes that the draft Visualize 2045 plan document does not address the reliance on the Tier 2 buffers in 2025 and 2030. On pages 54 and 55, the Tier 1 MVEBs for NO\textsubscript{x} and VOCs are not included and the budget is shown to reflect solely the Tier 2 buffer. Any acknowledgement of the Tier 1 MVEBs and why emissions are projected to be above the Tier 1 MVEBs should be addressed specifically in the primary document and not relegated only to an Appendix.

This is particularly important as the Washington region faces continuing challenges related to air quality. The region needs to attain the 2015 ozone standard of 70 ppb by August 2021. The draft data for the period 2016 through 2018 shows the region’s design value for ozone at 72 ppb. Additionally, the region’s design value has been above the current standard since 2016. Also, the region had its first Code Red air quality day this summer since 2012. Source apportionment modeling conducted separately by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the Ozone Transport Commission has shown that on-road mobile sources are a primary driver of ozone formation in the region. This evidence shows that even though the region has made significant progress in reducing emissions, it needs to continue its efforts to further reduce emissions to meet the 2015 ozone NAAQS, in particular from on-road mobile sources.

MWAQC is working on the “What We Can Do” scenario project to identify local actions that will help the region both attain the above ozone standard and eliminate future unhealthy air days. We pledge to work with TPB to help our members implement new measures to further reduce air pollution. Since on-road emissions play a significant role in the overall ozone problem in this region, it is important that the transportation sector plays its role in resolving this problem.

MWAQC is encouraged to learn that the region is achieving reductions in per capita VMT, even with an increase in employment. However, due to population and job growth, the region is experiencing an increase in total VMT. Therefore, we urge TPB’s continued investment in VMT and emission reduction strategies such as public transit, ride-sharing, pedestrian and bike infrastructure, other travel demand management strategies, and Transportation Emission Reduction Measures (TERMS) to reduce future growth in vehicle emissions.

Our local and state efforts in the Washington region may become even more important in the future if less stringent emission standards for light-duty motor vehicles for the model years 2021-2026 are enacted as proposed, especially since the region is experiencing an increase in the market share of light and heavy-duty trucks. If these standards are approved, there will be further increase in emissions of ozone precursors which would lead to even higher ozone levels in the region, resulting in more difficult emissions reduction efforts for the region in the future. MWAQC appreciates TPB joining MWAQC in requesting continuation of the existing light-duty vehicle emission standards.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the draft conformity analysis in the Visualize 2045 plan.

Sincerely,

Hon. Hans Riemer
Chair, Metropolitan Washington Air Quality Committee
October 5, 2018

Mr. Charles Allen
Chair, National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
777 North Capitol Street, NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002-4239

Transmitted via email: TPBcomment@mwcog.org

RE: Visualize 2045 Plan Update Community Plan

Dear Mr. Allen:

The City of Falls Church is pleased to continue our partnership with COG and our regional partners in the development of the vital regional long-range transportation plan. Thank you for the strong regional staff planning efforts and community input opportunity. This letter serves as the City’s comments for the 30-day public comment period. We request that the following core principles and key projects be included in the final Visualize 2045 plan:

Core Principles Integrated into Plan Update (not in priority order):

- City supports continued investment that supports economic development and the needs of tomorrow’s economy
- City supports continued investment in regional activity centers, as called for in the Region Forward plan
- City supports the vision of a multimodal transportation network, as that has been demonstrated to be equitable and sustainable
- Continue monitoring advances in technology for innovation and cybersecurity and advise on policies as well as requirements that enhance quality of life

Key Projects Integrated into Plan Update (not in priority order):

- Continued investment in regional bike and pedestrian network – both within and among activity centers
- Invest in underutilized transit stations, such as West Falls Church Metro
- Route 7 high-capacity transit, i.e., Rapid Bus Transit
- East Falls Church Metro Station second entrance
October 5, 2018
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Please do not hesitate to contact Cindy Mester, Deputy City Manager, at cmester@fallschurcchva.gov if you have any questions or if we can provide additional details.

Sincerely,

Wyatt Shields
City Manager
The following is a transcript of comments made by Katie Harris at the TPB meeting on September 21, 2018.

Thank you, Chairman Allen, and Board. My name is Katie Harris and I'm here on behalf of the Washington Area Bicyclists Association. I'm here in regards to the bicycle and pedestrian elements of Visualize 2045.

We're in full support of the two initiatives: the National Capital Trail and bike-ped access to Metrorail stations. Our concern is that these two initiatives don't go far enough for people who walk and bike. We see, in Appendix 1 from Visualize 2045, where the public feedback from the TPB-led public forums is shared, and one of the concerns that we see in that appendix about the National Capital Trail is that the National Capital Trail is too narrowly defined.

And I quote from the appendix: "Particularly outside of the regional core, it seems that participants could not directly relate to the limited geography of the National Capital Trail that was identified in the TPB-endorsed initiative." In some cases they wondered why specific trails in their jurisdiction have been left out.

And we agree with this concern. We also present a really promising opportunity, which is that the Capital Trails Coalition, a collaboration between public agencies, private nonprofits, business improvement districts, and many others – some of the agencies that are represented on the Transportation Planning Board – have created an extensive plan for a trail network that would be much more regional in scope than the National Capital Trail. It's called the Capital Trails Network, and we've spoken to some of you about this plan for the network and we urge the TPB to adopt this as the aspirational element for the long-range plan. Thank you.
Committee for Dulles  
45969 Nokes Blvd., Suite 100  
Sterling, Virginia 20166  

October 6, 2018  

Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments  
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board  
777 North Capitol Street N.E., Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20002-4239  

Re: Visualize 2045  

The Committee for Dulles is a unique organization dedicated to the issues concerning and wellbeing of Dulles International Airport. We have been in existence for over 50 years and represent groups and employers with over 10,000 people.

We are deeply concerned about the transportation mix of Visualize 2045. The current mix of funding between programmed transit and highway investments will not meet future needs. The current proposed funding of 68% for transit and 33% for roadways should be the exact opposite. The area needs more roads. It is critical to the economic viability of the area and Dulles International Airport.

Our support for transit is strong and historic. The Committee for Dulles was one of the first organizations to support mass transit in the Metropolitan Washington area. We were also one of the first organizations to support the Silver Line. And, we will continue to support commonsense solutions for transit.
With this in mind, a new Potomac Bridge Crossing, upriver from the American Legion Bridge is sorely needed and should be included in the plan. This need has been ignored for too long. The new bridge will provide improved access to Dulles International Airport and reduce congestion at the American Legion Bridge. It will also help Northern Virginians with air travel should they want to fly from the Baltimore Washington International Airport. Lastly, a new bridge crossing will create many business opportunities in Maryland and Virginia.

The Committee for Dulles, respectfully requests a change in the funding mix between transit and highway investments and the inclusion of a new Potomac Bridge Crossing in Visualize 2045.

Sincerely,

Rich McCary
Executive Committee Member
Committee for Dulles
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002-4239

To Whom It May Concern:

The Washington Airports Task Force (WATF), a Virginia 501 (c)(3) corporation whose mission is to enhance and expand aviation services for the National Capital Region, appreciates the opportunity to comment on the MWCOG Transportation Planning Board’s Visualize 2045, FY 2019-2045 Transportation Improvement Program and Air Quality Conformity Analysis. The WATF is acutely aware of the challenge that transportation presents to passengers and businesses that need access to our region’s airports.

Overall, the current Program presents what we believe to be a very unbalanced approach to regional transportation funding because it allocates 66% of total transportation funding to transit and only 33% to roads, when only 7% of the region’s trips are by transit. The Program assumes an almost 40% increase in ridership over the period of the study; however, in 2045 that will still account for only 7% of total trips. The WATF finds that the proposed funding allocation is unacceptable.

The WATF does not advocate significant cuts in transit; however, we cannot ignore the lack of investment in roads that handle over 80% of daily trips for our region’s citizens. Without significant increases in the surface network, regional congestion and delays will dramatically increase. This will have a significant impact on our region’s economy and citizens’ quality of life.

Further, one project that is conspicuous by its absence is an additional Potomac River Crossing between Loudoun and Montgomery Counties. Congestion leading up to and on the American Legion Bridge is an all day, every day occurrence, costing our citizens in terms of productivity and quality of life, and harming our environment. Even with proposed HOT lanes and improved capacity on the existing bridge, this major transit point will only get worse. A new Potomac River Crossing would be the single most impactful measure that could be taken to help relieve regional congestion, as it is proposed to handle an expected 100,000 trips per day.

A new bridge would provide improved access to the international air services at Washington Dulles International Airport for residents of Montgomery County, as well as for the entire region, due to the impact this Project would have on reducing overall congestion. A new bridge would also provide improved access to the low-fare air services at Baltimore Washington International Airport for residents of Northern Virginia. The bottom line is that a new bridge would provide more opportunity for residents and businesses to connect to cities and markets around the country and the world, and would provide airport and airline options for residents that they currently do not enjoy because of congestion.

The WATF supports greater funding to support our region’s roadway network and believes that it is imperative that a new Potomac River Crossing be included in Visualize 2045 Program.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Keith W. Meurlin
The following is a transcript of comments made by Daniel Paschall at the TPB meeting on September 21, 2018.

Thank you to Chairman and the Board for this opportunity. I'm Daniel Paschall. I'm with the East Coast Greenway Alliance. We represent a trail project that's going from Maine to Florida, so sort of an urban Appalachian Trail, but connecting all the major cities down the East Coast.

We are part of the Capital Trails Network and so I wanted to come down here, actually from Philadelphia. I'm the coordinator for the Mid-Atlantic Region, so I see trail networks not only in the D.C. region but in Philly, in Delaware, in Baltimore. So it's very important that we wanted to support the Capital Trails Network as being adopted as one of the aspirational elements of Visualize 2045. And also wanted to recognize that, you know, this network is -- it's not just the region and it's not just even our trail along the East Coast, but the Great Allegheny Passage and the C&O Towpath are part of this, and that will eventually be part of what was recently announced by Rails to Trails, the Great American Trail. So this idea, if you know the railroad project to connect both coasts back in the 1800s, this is a trail project to connect Washington state to Washington, D.C.

So there's more information coming out about that, and we have the American Discovery Trail, September 11th National Memorial Trail, another one to connect all the major crash sites of September 11th. These are regional trails and they basically provide a spine for other trails in the area.

And you wouldn't build, you know, a beltway without roads to get to it. There shouldn't be, you know, a beltway of a trail without trails to get to that to provide safety, but not only that, transportation and economic development and, you know, thinking about congestion in the area. If you provide more options, you'll basically get more people off the road and onto healthier ways of transportation. So thank you very much.
SUBJ: Suburban Maryland Transportation Alliance (SMTA) - Comments on Visualize 2045

Dear Mr. Allen,

SMTA appreciates the opportunity to comment on the draft Visualize 2045 Plan, and to highlight our support of the projects that are regionally significant and add meaningful capacity to the transportation network.

We agree that by bringing these elements together, the draft plan aims to help decision makers and the public “visualize” the region’s future by illustrating:

- What the region aspires to do if more resources were available,
- What the region can do with current levels of funding, and,
- What the region must do to meet federal requirements.

Toward that end, Visualize 2045 and the FY 2019-2025 TIP include important projects like the Purple Line and the Traffic Relief Plan that will add capacity to I-270 and I-495 with self-supporting express toll lanes. These is long overdue for those who waste 67,000 hours every day sitting in congestion and reducing air quality on Maryland’s interstates.

That being said, SMTA notes two major concerns with the draft of the 2045 Plan:

1) A second bridge crossing the Potomac River should be included in the Aspirational Initiatives. It is inconceivable that after 9-11, crippling snowstorms and Metro shutdowns, the draft 2045 Plan does not include a second bridge – not only for mobility goals but for homeland security.

In addition, another bridge would meet five of the six Performance Based Planning & Programming (PBPP) measures that address emissions, congestion, miles traveled and freight reliability.

2) SMTA supports all modes of transportation in order to create a truly connected, regional system serving commuting and non-commuting trips. Bicycle facilities are crucial, however, most of them do not rise to the level or regional significance nor can they compete with other improvements on a cost/benefit basis. Given the backlog of delayed road and transit projects
we urge the TPB to focus our limited resources on regionally-significant projects that will add meaningful capacity. As shown on Table 11 of the TIP, Maryland has submitted a disproportionate amount of bicycle/pedestrian projects – when compared to the District and Virginia’s. Funds for these projects should be redirected to long-overdue road and transit improvements such as Mid-County Highway and the Corridor Cities Transitway.

SMTA is appreciative of the TPB’s efforts to make this plan more integrated across jurisdictional lines, and more thoughtful. With the addition of the second bridge and a better balance in bike/ped projects, the draft plan will better address transportation initiatives for residents, workers and businesses in Maryland and the entire region.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Russel, Chair
Suburban Maryland Transportation Alliance

cc: SMTA Board of Directors and Advisory Board
The following is a transcript of comments made by Rob Whitfield at the TPB meeting on September 21, 2018.

Members of the TPB, thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm Rob Whitfield. Fairfax County Taxpayers Alliance looks at the cost-effectiveness of projects, both in transportation and other aspects of government spending.

I've been to two meetings of Visualize 2045 in Fairfax County. My estimate is that no more than 20 people attended either of the meetings. And, unfortunately, the agenda seems to be driven by minorities who advocate for bike and pedestrian trails, but we have very few advocates for the fundamental means of mobility, which is the highway network. The majority of the population and household and employment growth in the last 20 years has occurred outside the Capital Beltway, and the Council of Governments has projected that trend to continue.

I got this half an hour ago; I haven't found any details that show within the region the breakdown between the core, the inner jurisdictions, and the outer jurisdictions. So that overlay needs to be provided into here so that we can see where projected growth with COG's existing planning process projects that will -- I mean, I support the activity center concept but if in fact the majority of employment and household growth is going to be outside the capital beltway, that's where the primary funding needs to occur. Fairfax County is close to 1.2 million; Loudoun County is now 400,000 people; Prince William County is about 450,000 people. We have over 2.2 million people living in suburban Northern Virginia, and yet we don't even have a representative on the Commonwealth Transportation Board who represents "normal" interests. They're special interest appointees.

So I will have much more to say on this when I see the further steps being taken in this process, but I do advocate that you have to focus primarily over 81 percent of the people today use highways for commuting. And if you include those who commute by buses, we rely on the highway network for around 90 percent of commuting. So I'll have more to say at subsequent meetings. Thank you.
The following is a transcript of comments made by Nancy Abeles at the TPB meeting on September 21, 2018.

This year, our region selected seven new initiatives to improve transportation planning. Doing so, TPB finally acknowledged that land use and housing affordability are factors in travel woes. Now TPB must acknowledge that transportation is really about people, and that the public can be the best planning resource.

I'm Nancy Abeles. I've been a community representative on multiple transportation advisories, including TPB's Citizens Advisory. I'm here to say how deeper, more proactive engagement should be either an eighth initiative or a tool to amplify the seven.

Beginning with Houston, Texas, some transportation agencies now use these interactions to revamp failing systems. Houston asked a broad inclusive spectrum of direct stakeholders, including communities and system operators, to redesign their bus system from scratch, and they used "of the moment" planned use data to see actual densities of where people live and work. Planning time was short, the low investment primarily for outreach. New routes and timetables for existing assets were implemented literally overnight. Transit ridership significantly increased, road congestion lessened, travel time shortened, because homes and jobs connected better.

Continuing engagement will keep this system resilient. Houston's people now use more of all transit modes all week because work and personal needs are being addressed. They improved their region's overall transportation network, economy, and quality of life.

But usually, with a lot of rigmarole, communities are made either a project's victim or enemy. That's because too much happens behind closed doors, and politics interfere with whether a project is beneficial or cost-effective. We can see through legacy projects or have actually been told by project staff that a project's fate rests not upon merit or return on investment, but on who gets elected.

Better public involvement can correct or validate assumptions by on-the-ground knowledge to make planning both more effective and transparent. In summary, greater, deeper public engagement can improve planning by bringing together top-down and bottom-up thinking. With the next 20, ten, or even five years becoming less predictable, all kinds of experts believe that we've reached a major global pivot point that makes it harder to plan. There will be different, potentially unforeseen transportation options, kinds of housing, and even forms of cities.

Based on personal needs in the face of these unknowns, the public will make ongoing choices of where to live and work. How better than to make regular people into agents of culture change by their more integral involvement in the planning process. The public wants connection between long-range planning and here-and-now reality. Solutions don't come from roads or vehicles, but from people. We are here to connect if elected officials, planners, and transportation agencies will listen. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
A solution to the area's horrific weekend traffic would be for Congress to pass legislation declaring "single tracking" a high crime and misdemeanor. I travel the world over and our Metro is the only transit system that is so addicted to single tracking which results in unreasonable delays, not only for passengers traveling through the affected area, but throughout the system. Single tracking forces Metro to increase the already pitiful weekend headways and have trains wait unpredictably long times for clearance. With my bus running every 60 minutes, and single tracking, it can (and has) taken me 2 hours to travel from Dupont Circle to my home in Alexandria!

So I drive.

The solution is to close the area where track work is required in both directions and run a "bus bridge." By working on both tracks simultaneously, the total duration of the repair can be cut in half! It's safer for the workers too, and would allow "normal" service on the remainder of the line. The London Tube is a two track system and that's how they do it. Why aren't we as smart?

Thanks.

Bob Gronenberg
Hello, I have lived on both Maryland and VA suburbs and, a short time in DC so, I've experienced all sides of the Metro area, since moving here from St. Louis, in 1963. We now live on 2 acres, in a more rural landscape, near Olney, Maryland. But, we still daily contend with 2 very congested roads: New Hampshire Avenue and Georgia Avenue. I would like to see this congestion remedied and the roads made safer, if possible.

I have a huge interest in transportation and road improvements in the area. It affects what we do every day. And it even hinders my art school from growing, because parents don't want to get stuck in traffic. I used to have 30 students and due to congestion, I now only have ten.

In the 60s we used to be able to walk to DC or Georgetown from Alexandria and Arlington. We took trains to Baltimore and only took buses for college or work. Most folks had one car and, none had two vehicles, even though almost everyone had 3 or more kids. I never imagined a day when families would have more than one car and, I never owned one myself until five years after we had kids. We live in an entirely car-centered world now.

The area has shifted from pedestrian-friendly to a transport-needed area. I wouldn't recommend that anyone walk or stand at a bus stop. It just isn't the safest mode of transportation an more. Even if you put in more of these options, I doubt many will risk their lives using them. Even bicycle lanes may mostly be used on weekends when traffic on the roads is not as troublesome. Also, how can we give police protection on a beltway bicycle path? This is a different very society than we had in the 60s! Please don't implement anything inherently unsafe!

My suggestions are:

1. Build 2 or more bridges connecting VA to MD, above Great Falls. This has been needed since at least, the Civil War. (You can even add several more ferries in the interim.) The bridges will get the most traffic off our over-crowded main arteries.

2. Give tax incentives to people to live closest to their work places and give other incentives to people who actually work from home. There is a huge attraction to these work options.

3. Give more incentives to home school families. We would be in a world of hurt if we had those families on the roads during the rush hours. They should be monetarily thanked for their choice to stay off the roads!

4. Refrain from making any more toll roads and complex roads stacked on top of each other. We have enough of them and we don't want to turn DC into Houston, one of the worst cities I've even seen! Once you get 3 or more roads stacked-up GPS can't help you navigate them!

5. Please don't add any more lanes to existing highways. They reduce forestation and are wide enough...too wide, really..they are noisy, break-up communities and affect our quality of life.

6. If possible, find a way to charge tourists for the privilege of visiting this area..maybe big busses can be charged impact fees. Essentially, treat DC more like a National Park.
7. Finally, beautify the roads and intersections we have now or, we add in the future. America is a mature country and we need to work harder to encourage more public art and landscaping. The lack of it is an embarrassment to us, on the world stage. Without any effort, we are very good at making America more and more ugly. But, I believe we can do better...and, what better time, as we try fix absolutely horrendous traffic congestion. Plus, if we have to stand for hours of our lives at intersections, it would improve the experience, if they were clean and attractive!

8. Finally, one more suggestion would be to find a better way for local and state transportation groups to communicate. I've attended planning meetings in the past for road improvement in our area and I was told by the speakers that local and state authorities did not communicate...at all. Please encourage me that this is fixed now and there is a also good cross-pollination going on between counties and towns and across the DC border...and the State Transportation Department. That would make my day!

Blessing to you as you proceed with this very challenging but, needful activity.

Maureen Hartnett
Chair Charles Allen
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002-4239

Dear Chair Allen:

An article in today’s Washington Post¹ examined the economic outcomes for middle-class children born in the early 1980s in various jurisdictions. The map of the area clearly demonstrated the “east-west divide” mentioned in the Visualize 2045 report². A well-executed long-range transportation plan could help reduce this opportunity disparity by linking future workers with jobs at Regional Activity Centers throughout the region.

I appreciate the variety in the various road, transit, and pedestrian projects planned by the Transportation Planning Board (TPB). It was heartening to see an acknowledgement that we “can’t build our way out” of congestion problems and that the potential exorbitant cost of overbuilding “underscored the importance of supplementing any proposed system expansions with supporting land-use policies,...pricing mechanisms and other programs.”³ Several projects, such as improvements to MD-210 and improved connections to the Oxon Hill Farm Trail, would positively affect me.

My specific concerns relate to program priorities proposed in eastern portion of our region. Your report noted that Charles County is expected to grow in population by 44% compared to today. However, the map of “Major Transit Projects”⁴ shows a conspicuous gap in additional transit infrastructure in

²p.6
³p.32
⁴Figure 5.2 p.40
eastern and southern Prince George’s County and in Charles County. Major Highway Project #22, a proposed $790 million expansion of MD-5 with a planning horizon of 2035, would thus become the backbone linking new communities in that area with jobs and activities elsewhere.

Adding additional traffic to MD-5 concerns me because there are already several heavily congested portions of the roadway. I, like many commuters surveyed, consider reliability in choosing how I get around. Thus, I never use Branch Avenue to reach the beltway in the morning, despite living very close to it, because the stop-and-go traffic on the ramps to I-495 makes my travel times inconsistent. Adding traffic to MD-5 also seems inconsistent with planning goals calling for reduced automobile dependence and limiting future development outside of Regional Activity Centers.

“Appendix J: Public Outreach: Summary of Public Comment Periods” mentioned the 2017 “Southern Maryland Rapid Transit Study.” This report, produced by the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA), described a system connecting the Branch Avenue Metro station with Waldorf that could be built for $1.5 billion. I urge the TPB to consider adding this project to the financially-constrained list of projects proposed for 2045. Such a line would meet a majority of the aspirational initiatives created by the TPB. It would “expand bus rapid transit regionwide” and could induce demand for Metrorail and thus “move more people on Metrorail.” The system could “bring jobs and housing closer together” through redevelopment of underused properties at several proposed stations. Such concentrated new development would also “improve walk and bike access to transit.”

The major criticism of the project is that not enough demand exists to make it cost-effective to run outside of commute hours. However, a benefit of concentrating new development along this transit line, as opposed to spreading it out into more car-dependent areas, is that there would be a potential for more future riders. It is also possible that careful planning could reduce the capital outlays necessary to build the system. An earlier report, the “Southern Maryland Transit Corridor Preservation Study”, advocated for a beltway crossing using a tunnel. If the I-495 Managed Lanes project is built, a cut-and-cover tunnel box could be placed in the area for use by a future

5For instance, the Woodyard Crossing shopping center is a proposed station stop. It is currently underused after major tenants including K-Mart and Toys-R-Us have left.

6MTA Maryland. “Southern Maryland Transit Corridor Preservation Study.” August
transit corridor. Such construction is not unique. Traffic was shifted around construction of the Washington St overpass in Alexandria as it was built. In Edmonton, Alberta, constructing a stub transit tunnel under the site of a future office building saved $140 million Canadian dollars when the transit line was later constructed.

The focus on Regional Activity Centers fails to highlight the fact that some large employers can greatly affect local travel patterns. As a result of BRAC, Joint Base Andrews in Camp Springs, MD and Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling in Washington, DC have added jobs. Some proposed projects, such as the I-495 Managed Lanes project and the reconstruction of the I-295/Malcolm X Avenue interchange, directly support these large employers. It would be useful if large traffic generators were marked on planning maps.

One area I believe the TPB could improve in is public outreach. I did not know about this document or process until a WTOP story the other day mentioned the end of the public comment period. When I examined “Appendix I: Report on Phase 2 of Public Outreach: Public Forums and Open Houses,” I noticed that none of the hearings occurred in my area. The closest ones were in College Park, on April 18, 2018, and in Washington, DC on May 1, 2018. The only Charles County meeting occurred in La Plata on April 25, 2018. Considering the prevalence of Equity Emphasis Areas (EEAs) in this part of the region\(^7\), it is disappointing that it appears neglected in terms of both outreach and future investment.

My sincere hope is that our region’s long-range plans supports everyone, especially those of us residing in Prince George’s and Charles Counties. Infrastructure investment could help correct past inequities and enrich the Washington area as a whole.

---

\(^7\) CE 2023 in the “FY 2019-2024 Transport Plan” is allocated for roadway revitalization for inside-the-beltway communities in Prince George’s County. However, only $5 million is allocated through 2020.
Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Patrick Husson
To whom it may concern:

I envision a transportation system with hundreds of miles of paved trails, networks of protected bike lanes and laws that support and protect people who travel by bike.

There are some positive elements within Visualize 2045; however, the plan doesn’t go nearly far enough for people who bike and walk. The plan invests in automobile infrastructure to the detriment of people who walk and bike. Visualize 2045 needs to envision a bolder future for people who walk and bike. It doesn't plan for the transportation future that we need.

The TPB could encourage more biking and walking by adopting the Capital Trails Network as the aspirational trail initiative in the long-range plan! This trail network has been researched, defined, and mapped by the Capital Trails Coalition, a group of public agencies representing TPB member jurisdictions, non-profit organizations, and other stakeholders. The TPB needs to fully adopt the Capital Trails Network as a key part of the long-range transportation plan, and invest in trails and bicycling and walking projects.

If our Transportation Planning Board refuses to be bold, to think big, and to develop new transportation solutions, then we will be stuck with the same transportation problems (congestion and traffic fatalities to name a few).

Kind regards,
Hunter
Good morning,

Thank you for being so elaborate in explaining your vision for the transportation system going forward in the next decades. It is quite refreshing to be in a place where such a public consultation so far in advance is possible.

My wife and I just moved to DC, and are likely going to be here for some time. As such, I feel compelled to take up the opportunity to share my ideas on the Visualize 2045 plan.

Having moved here from Switzerland, where I commuted to and from work, did exercise and socialized on a bicycle on most days of the year, I was quite appalled at the state of the bicycle paths in the DC area. While I understand that cars reign supreme in the US, the Visualize 2045 is a chance to rethink the way an American city can contribute to the health and happiness of its residents and visitors.

In the past months leading up to my move to DC, I have followed quite closely the work of the WABA group on bicycle advocacy. Having joined their 50-state bike ride last week which criss-crossed across the beautiful city of DC, I couldn't help but feel that my presence on the road seemed like a nuisance to others, cars but also pedestrians. In turn, I did not feel safe. This problem is multi-pronged and goes back to the mentality and mindset of drivers, who also don't stop really for non-signalled pedestrian crossings!

The work you are presenting in Visualize 2045 around bicycle paths, is only about increasing the flow to metro stations for commute, but I suppose that a bicycle-friendly city is more than just about connecting people on bicycles to the closest metro stations. It is about making more trails available, dedicated and safe for people to commute. The Capital Trails Coalition has come up with such a plan, which I believe would be a huge oversight on your behalf not to include in your plans.

Having seen the collaborative and forward-thinking approach this group has put together, it would be a missed opportunity not to bring this group of stakeholders on board. The dedication of trails is but one element to consider. The policies behind cycling infrastructure need to also be considered, including bike racks, tire pumps around the city and other 'soft' support infrastructure (subsidies, events, education, awareness, etc). With such a coalition already in place, all this thinking has already been done and ready to be executed in line with your development plans.

I guess you are more than familiar with the host of benefits economic, social and health associated with moving to a more bicycle friendly city, but here are a few links below to further cement the concepts. Moreover, wouldn't it be cool to join the cities of Fyn, Denmark; Gelderland, the Netherlands; Heusden-Zolder, Belgium; Woensdrecht, the Netherlands and Yorkshire, Great Britain as officially acclaimed bicycle-friendly cities by the International Cycling Union?

The great thing about planning so far ahead is the opportunities for inclusion and collaboration that open up due to the long-term nature of the process itself.

Wishing you all the best in your planning for the future development of the city.

Best regards from a surprisingly-quick-to-call-DC-home resident.
Hisham
The following is a transcript of comments made by Jason Stanford at the TPB meeting on September 21, 2018.

Hi. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. Left to fester, the transportation challenges that have plagued our area -- congestion and delays -- will choke the economic development and quality of life that have been the cornerstones of our region for decades. Fundamentally, we need more transportation capacity to move more people throughout our region. We also need more transportation funding to ensure that existing and new funding are programmed in a manner that reduce transit and highway congestion and delay to the greatest extent possible.

The current divide between program, transit, and highway investment is dramatic. Currently, 66 percent of total transportation spending will be dedicated to transit while only 33 percent to roadways, despite transit only accounting for 7 percent of the total trips taken throughout the region. Even with the projected 38 percent ridership growth, the TPB's own analysis indicates that the transit trips will still make up around 7 percent of the total regional trips in 2045. This does not mean that we need substantial cuts for transit, but it does underscore the region's dramatic under-investment in a network upon which over 80 percent of all daily trips depend and why, absent significant greater investment in that network, regional congestion and delays will become dramatically worse.

To be clear, the Alliance is and has always been a strong supporter of increased investment in transit, ridesharing, transit-oriented development, mixed-use, and similar policies. However, it's hard to be confident that future programmed investments in Visualize 2045 draft best address actual future demands and needs. In short, Visualize 2045 makes clear that we as a region are falling far short of the targeted transportation investments required to improve mobility, to maintain prosperity, to improve our quality of life, and keep our region moving forward.

Meeting this challenge requires that Visualize 2045 and the TPB's subsequent actions embrace a far more focused approach on those transportation investments that best address the region's most pressing transportation needs. We can do better and we must. Thank you.
Comments of Peter Stokely

As a DC metro area resident, native, commuter and bicyclist, I urge you to incorporate the Capital Trails Coalition’s long-term trail vision into the Visualize 2045 plan. This is perfect opportunity to combine the two long range mobility plans which will have synergistic effects. Safe bicycle mobility is key to a modern thriving metro area and will keep the DC metro area competitive with other metro areas such as Denver, Seattle and Portland when trying to grow the economy and attract qualified workers. Automobile ownership trends are decreasing with the new generation, and other mobility options are becoming more popular, including cycling. The Capital Trails Coalition plan will unite DC with its surrounding counties and provide a safe stress-free network of trails which will improve mobility and access to jobs for all income groups, and will increase the attractiveness and property values in the connected neighborhoods. Increasing mode share to non-automobile options such as cycling will be a win-win for our community by reducing congestion, increasing public health and wellbeing, linking neighborhoods, increasing property values and the overall attractiveness and competitiveness of the Washington DC metro area. I urge you to incorporate the Capital Trails Coalition's long-term trail vision into the Visualize 2045 plan.
Comments on Visualize 2045

1. Visualize 2045 fails to consider the role that improved and expanded commuter rail could play in reducing traffic congestion, accommodating growth and connecting affordable housing in Baltimore with jobs in the DC area. Visualize 2045 should be revised to include capacity and reliability investments in the MARC Penn line -- 4 tracks to Baltimore with the center island platform constructed at BWI; investments in the Brunswick line to allow for two way service in the rush hours and some midday service; construction of additional trans-Potomac capacity to allow for more VRE service and MARC and VRE run-through trains. Commuter rail expansion is much more appropriate for the region, and cheaper, than Metrorail extensions.

2. Visualize 2045 fails to consider a cheaper and more productive option to a new stub-end station in Rosslyn. Build a new Silver line transfer station at East Falls Church with cross-platform transfers to and from Orange line trains. This is a much cheaper solution than a new underground Rosslyn station for the Blue line and it allows for shorter headways on the entire Silver line if demand along the 22 mile segment ever requires it.

Blue and Orange line trains would continue to operate in and out to the District. Rush hour Silver line trains would terminate at East Falls Church with cross platform transfers to Orange line trains for travel to Arlington and the District. The ratio of Orange line trains would increase (by replacing the Silver line train slots). During off-peak periods all three Virginia services could run through Rosslyn to the District. This is a cheaper solution than building a new Rosslyn stub-in terminal for the Blue line.

3. The region should give stronger consideration to managing its growth and limiting greenfield development requiring expensive highway development. More incentives should be provided for investment on the east side of the region. Greater development density needs to be allowed/promoted at underutilized Metrorail station on the east side of the region.

4. The Transportation Planning Board should use its control of the TIP to discourage bad transportation investments and more strongly promote projects in line with its objectives. States need to be encouraged to focus on demand management projects and transit more than highway widening. Projects in the TIP should be scored for performance against COG goals and low scoring projects should not be included in the TIP. TPB voting should be on a weighted basis to conform with one person, one vote.

Steve Strauss
Comments of Tyrone Vias

Visualize 2045 is an impressive blueprint for the future which must balance many significant challenges. Originally being a NYC resident and currently in Law Enforcement I will offer some global remarks since planning for a region is no simple task.

1. My roundtrip commute is 130 miles long from Brunswick to DC. As a first responder my schedule can be rather unpredictable. So thoughts based on this.
   a. Tolls seems to be the new talk to pay for everything but takes a very significant amount of disposable income out of the middle class' pocket, not to mention fuel and wear and tear on a vehicle. Toll roads easily adds anywhere from $100-$300 in additional costs which are not sustainable for a middle-class family on incomes that do not rise with the rising costs of everything else.
   b. Brunswick has the good fortune of having the MARC train. However, the MARC train schedule out of Brunswick to DC is rather limited and for a person with a crazy schedule almost unusable. I would love to take the train in but it is not a viable option. Though not perfect the NY/NJ/CT area has a far more robust and usable commuter rail system which the National Capitol Region so desperately needs. For the sake of brevity, I would also loop commuter buses as well. As far as I am concerned commuter buses in the NCR are non-existent in certain areas. Road repair and improvements are a great thing but if the roads are going to be too expensive to traverse for Middle class residents then a robust, reliable, flexible commuter bus and rail system should be given a far higher priority.

Thank you for your attention.
LETTERS RECEIVED AFTER CLOSE OF FINAL COMMENT PERIOD
Dear Chair Allen:

I am writing to reiterate our letter of January 9, 2018, in opposition to the proposal initiated by the Maryland Department of Transportation to widen the Capital Beltway (I-495) and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway (MD 295). As the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board (TPB) considers final passage of Visualize 2045 and, in particular, the financially constrained element, I also write to encourage the Transportation Planning Board to pass an amendment to reiterate and reinforce the requirements of the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) under the National Environmental Policy Act to consider the impacts on local communities that this project would have.

The City of College Park remains concerned about the impacts this project would have on our community. Although MDOT has stated that it intends to work within the existing State Highway Administration Right-of-Way, MDOT is currently considering options for expansion of I-495 that would add up to an additional four lanes of traffic around the entire stretch of I-495 within Maryland. It is difficult to understand how this could be accomplished within the existing right-of-way. Expanding the Beltway could have significant additional impacts on the communities surrounding I-495, including creating an additional traffic burden on local streets, creating additional noise and pollution, and further dividing communities already divided by the Beltway.

As expressed in our January letter, we are concerned that the harmful impacts created by Beltway expansion would outweigh minimal impact in reducing congestion. Significant studies have shown that highway expansion does little to address congestion in the long run—as development patterns follow highway construction, new traffic leads to further congestion. In order to ensure minimal impact on our community and the other communities surrounding the Beltway, College Park encourages MDOT to consider a more multi-modal approach including consideration of land use patterns. We are greatly encouraged by other strategies included within Visualize 2045.
Over the past several days, in close consultation with TPB staff, we have drafted proposed amendments to Resolution R5-2019, which would approve Visualize 2045, and now request that the TPB adopt these amendments. We crafted these proposed amendments in a way so that they would not disrupt the regional transportation planning or air quality conformity analysis processes. At the same time, the amended resolution would formally request that MDOT consider the impacts to local communities, abide by the state intent not to impact homes along the project right of way, and consider integration of multi-modal elements as part of the project. These provisions do not create any additional burden for MDOT beyond what is currently required by the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. section 4321 et seq., but would request that MDOT consider ways to reduce the impacts on local communities and report back to the TPB. Unfortunately, although the additional burden to MDOT in responding to these requests would be minimal, MDOT has not agreed to support these amendments.

We appreciate your consideration and the work of the Transportation Planning Board to address these important issues impacting our region, including congestion of our roads, while maintaining the high quality of life in our existing neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Patrick L. Wojahn
Mayor

Enclosures: Proposed Amendments to TPB R5-2019
January 9, 2018 letter to Charles Allen, Chair, TPB
January 9, 2018 letter to MDOT Secretary Pete Rahn

Copy: College Park City Council
MDOT Secretary Pete Rahn
County Council Member Dannielle M. Glaros
County Council Member Mary Lehman
District 21 Delegation
January 9, 2018

Charles Allen, Chair
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Chair Allen:

The College Park City Council is responding to the Transportation Planning Board’s (TPB) request for comments on the Maryland proposal to widen I-270, I-495, and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. The Council provides the comments below regarding I-495 and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway.

The Council opposes the proposed widening of the Capital Beltway (I-495) and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway (MD 295). While road widening often provides short-term congestion relief, studies have shown that in the long-term similar projects lead to more driving, trips, and sprawl. The 2012 Baltimore-Washington Parkway Feasibility Study concluded that additional lanes would accommodate more traffic, but also create more demand that would lead to similar levels of congestion to the level prior to the widening project.

Additionally, the Council is very concerned about the negative environmental impacts these widening projects would have, as well as the damage to neighborhoods adjacent to the roads. The Baltimore-Washington Parkway is an historic treasure and the character of the parkway should be protected.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on this proposal, and thank you for the TPB’s support of increased investment in transit systems and transit-oriented development as long-term solutions that create sustainable, healthy, and vibrant communities and economies.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Patrick L. Wojahn
Mayor

cc: The Honorable Rushern Baker, Prince George’s County Executive
The Honorable Jim Rosapepe, 21st District Delegation
The Honorable Barbara Frush, 21st District Delegation
The Honorable Joseline Pena-Melnyk, 21st District Delegation
The Honorable Ben Barnes, 21st District Delegation
The Honorable Dannielle Glaros, Chair and Prince George’s County Council
The Honorable Mary Lehman, Prince George’s County Council
Kanathur Srikanth, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments

Home of the University of Maryland
January 9, 2018

Secretary Pete K. Rahn
Maryland Department of Transportation
6 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202

Dear Secretary Rahn:

The City Council respectfully opposes the proposed widening of the Capital Beltway (I-495) and the Baltimore-Washington Parkway (MD 295). While road widening often provides short-term congestion relief, studies have shown that in the long-term similar projects lead to more driving, trips, and sprawl. The 2012 Baltimore-Washington Parkway Feasibility Study concluded that additional lanes would accommodate more traffic, but also create more demand that would lead to similar levels of congestion to the pre-widening level.

Additionally, the Council is very concerned about the negative environmental impacts these widening projects would have, as well as the damage to neighborhoods adjacent to the roads. The Baltimore-Washington Parkway is an historic treasure and the character of the parkway should be protected.

The City Council applauds your support for the Purple Line and for dedicated funding for our regions transit system. We respectfully request your administration to increase investment in the MARC Train and other mass-transit systems, as well as transit-oriented development as long-term solutions that create sustainable, healthy, and vibrant communities and economies.

Sincerely,

Patrick L. Wojahn
Mayor

cc: The Honorable Rushern Baker, Prince George’s County Executive
The Honorable Jim Rosapepe, 21st District Delegation
The Honorable Barbara Frush, 21st District Delegation
The Honorable Joseline Peña-Melnyk, 21st District Delegation
The Honorable Ben Barnes, 21st District Delegation
The Honorable Dannielle Giaros, Chair and Prince George’s County Council
The Honorable Mary Lehman, Prince George’s County Council

Home of the University of Maryland
Transportation Planning Board  
777 North Capitol Street  
Washington, DC 20001  

Members of the Transportation Planning Board,  

We are writing on behalf of the residents of Greenbelt to express concern over the inclusion of several MDOT roadway widening proposals for I-495, I-270 and MD 201 in the Vision 2045 constrained long range plan. These proposals would impact our quality of life, with potential degradation to our air quality, increases in our noise levels, and causing the induction of additional traffic near and through our community.  

Greenbelt continues to strongly support collaborative efforts to address regional transportation needs and encourages MDOT to thoroughly explore creative alternatives to the I-495, I-270 and MD 201 expansion proposals. We feel that sustainable investments in mass transit such as Metrorail, extended bus service, MARC train service, light rail, bus rapid transit, and path connections for bikes and pedestrians are the best long term uses for our transportation resources.  

Thank you for your consideration,  

Emmett V. Jordan, Mayor  

Judith F. Davis, Mayor Pro Tem  

Colin Byrd, Member of Council  

Leta M. Mach, Member of Council  

Silke I. Pope, Member of Council  

Edward V. J. Putens, Member of Council  

Rodney M. Roberts, Member of Council  

Cc: Greenbelt City Council
October 16, 2018

The Honorable Charles Allen
Chair, National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington DC 20002

Dear Chairman Allen:

The Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) would like to respond to concerns that we have recently heard regarding the I-495 and I-270 Managed Lane Study and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. The National Capital Region is one of the most congested in the nation, and Marylanders face some of the highest commuting times. We anticipate that the existing significant congestion within the Baltimore-Washington region will remain, and even worsen, in the future. A comprehensive transportation network, including highway and transit improvements, is needed to relieve congestion.

Previous studies, including the Capital Beltway/Purple Line Study, determined that both transit and highway improvements are needed to fully meet the travel demand and provide the necessary enhancements for the needed capacity and safety within the I-495 and I-270 corridors. Because of the I-495 and I-270 extensive highway linkage to other regional transportation facilities, severe congestion along these corridors has a region-wide effect on all transportation modes. Transportation improvements to provide congestion relief on I-495 and I-270 are needed to enhance existing and proposed multimodal transportation services.

The MDOT State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA) recognizes the unique and important community and environmental resources along the corridors and will develop the I-495 and I-270 Managed Lanes Study in an environmentally responsible manner. Our approach is to implement a solution within the existing highways rights-of-way, and we are committed to working with citizens, businesses, and federal, state, and local agencies to ensure that concerns related to property and environmental resources are addressed.

The I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study, initiated in March 2018, is in an early stage of planning. As part of the National Environmental Policy Act process, the study’s approach for alternatives analysis and development includes a three-phase, iterative process. The first phase is the development of a spectrum of potential alternatives, sometimes referred to as a preliminary range of alternatives. The MDOT SHA met with interested agencies and the public in July to seek input regarding this preliminary range of alternatives. The preliminary range of alternatives
includes fifteen alternatives including adding managed lanes, general purpose lanes, transit and the no-build.

Considering feedback from the public and our federal, state, and local partners, the MDOT SHA is evaluating the preliminary range of alternatives to determine which alternatives represent reasonable approaches that meet the study’s purpose and need. Only those alternatives determined to be reasonable and to adequately meet the purpose and need will be carried forward to the second phase of the alternatives analysis and development process, known as the alternatives retained for detailed study.

The MDOT SHA values public feedback on the I-495 and I-270 study and will continue to provide the public opportunities to be involved in this important environmental study. Multiple project workshops will be held throughout 2019 providing the opportunity for public feedback along with multiple other opportunities for feedback from our federal, state, and local partners resulting in the MDOT SHA recommended preferred alternative and ultimately Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Questions or comments on the study may be provided anytime via the I-495 and I-270 Public-Private Partnership (P3) Program email at 495-270-P3@sha.state.md.us. Updated information on the study and public involvement opportunities can be found on the I-495 and I-270 P3 Program website at www.495-270-P3.com.

If you need further assistance, please contact Lisa B. Choplin, DBIA, MDOT SHA I-495 and I-270 P3 Office Director, at 410-637-3320 or via email at lchoplin@sha.state.md.us. Ms. Choplin will be happy to assist you. You can also feel free to contact me directly.

Sincerely,

R. Earl Lewis, Jr.
Deputy Secretary for Policy,
Planning & Enterprise Services

cc:  Mr. Pete Rahn, MDOT Secretary
      Lisa B. Choplin, DBIA, Director, I-495 and I-270 P3 Office, MDOT SHA
      Mr. Gregory Slater, Administrator, MDOT SHA
October 15, 2018

Mr. Charles Allen, Chair Transportation Planning Board
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002

Mr. Allen,

The Planning Board for the Town of Cheverly respectfully submits this letter for consideration in the development of the Visualize 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan for the National Capital Region.

We are concerned about the draft recommendations CLR1182 and 3281 which call for the development of managed lanes on Interstate 95/495 in Prince Georges and Montgomery counties. We are supportive of sustainable transportation solutions that bring meaningful improvement to the region’s transportation issues. However, it is our understanding that the MD SHA study to evaluate different alternatives is still in process, and this recommendation presents a foregone conclusion that managed lanes are the only solution or even a preferred solution.

We would instead prefer to see a more generalized recommendation for I 95/495 Transportation Improvements that may include alternatives such as transit or High Occupancy Vehicle lanes.

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Margaret MacDonnell
Chair, Cheverly Planning Board

cc: Michael Callahan, Mayor, Town of Cheverly
    David Warrington, Town Administrator, Town of Cheverly
October 17, 2018

The Honorable Charles Allen, Chair
National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board
777 North Capitol Street NE, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20002

Dear Chair Allen:

Thank you for providing an opportunity to comment on the Visualize 2045 plan. The Greater Washington Partnership (the Partnership) is a team of civic-minded CEOs, drawing from leading employers and entrepreneurs, who are committed to making the Capital Region of Baltimore, Washington, and Richmond one of the world’s best places to live, work and build a business. The CEOs that make up the Partnership, employ nearly 200,000 people in the region, and include a wide range of innovative organizations across industries, including Exelon Corporation, Northrop Grumman, Monumental Sports, and Capital One.

Our transportation system, which has helped drive the region’s economic success, provides robust mobility options that connect residents to essential destinations and cultural assets. However, with nearly 50 percent of all commuters crossing a county line and 20 percent crossing a state border to access a job on a daily basis, multi-jurisdictional coordination of transportation plans and investments must keep pace with the demands of the region’s residents.

The Transportation Planning Board’s Visualize 2045 includes key projects that will bridge jurisdictional divides such as Maryland’s Traffic Relief Plan connecting to Virginia’s expanded I-495 Express Lanes, which will include a new American Legion Bridge – one of the region’s major congestion chokepoints that must be addressed for the region to remain economically competitive. The plan also includes aspirational components with benefits that can only be achieved through regional coordination and partnership with the public and private sectors, including efforts to reduce drive alone commute trips. We commend this forward-looking plan and urge the TPB to lean in on these plans to realize the potential benefits in the next 20 years.

Many of the projects and aspirational components of Visualize 2045 will be included in the Capital Region’s first employer-led Blueprint for Regional Mobility, a principles-based transportation agenda that cuts across jurisdictional boundaries and includes a range of solutions from capital projects to technology enhancements to operation and governance reforms that together will measurably improve the performance, reliability, and connectivity of our transportation system. This initiative is led by the Partnership’s mobility co-chairs of Tom
Ferrell of Dominion Energy, Ken Samet of MedStar Health, and Mark Weinberger of EY, and will be released in November.

The Blueprint focuses on four priorities: (1) connecting the super-region; (2) improving the consumer experience; (3) ensuring equitable access; and (4) integrating innovation to improve outcomes. Laying out an agenda for working together to make tangible progress on these priorities, with specific actions our region’s public leaders and private employers can take to address the unique challenges facing our region. Only through collective action can we ensure that when one wins, we all win.

The Partnership supports Visualize 2045 and recommends the TPB adopt it. The Partnership is committed to doing its part and working with the TPB to implement the initiatives specified in the long-range plan and forthcoming Blueprint for Regional Mobility.

Sincerely,

Jason S. Miller
CEO, Greater Washington Partnership