

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
ITEM #1**

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of
July 10, 2015

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Meeting

Technical Committee Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from June 5, 2015 Technical Committee Meeting

The minutes were approved as written.

2. Briefing on the Transportation Planning Certification Review of the Metropolitan Transportation Planning Process for the Washington DC-VA-MD Transportation Management Area

Mr. Srikanth briefed the committee on the report of the federal certification review. He said the committee received a briefing on the draft report in June. He said the report, which had not substantively changed since June, was finalized on June 8. He said that Mr. Lawson from the Federal Highway Administration was expected to present the report to the TPB at the board's July 22 meeting. He said the report certifies the TPB process and that this certification is valid for four years. He said the report had no corrective actions.

Mr. Srikanth described TPB activities that were commended in the report, including the performance analysis of the CLRP, the development of the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, the development of the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, and the Congestion Management Process, including its data clearinghouse and data delivery efforts. He also said that the Fredericksburg MPO, which was included in the TPB's review, was commended for its evaluation of public involvement activities.

Mr. Srikanth also spoke about the report's recommendations, including suggestions for improved documentation of the TPB's financial planning activities and the federally required annual "listing of obligated projects," which is a component of the TIP that lists prior year expenditures. He also said the review recommended the TPB establish a formalized process to evaluate the TPB's public involvement activities on a regular basis. He said that TPB staff had already taken steps to make improvements responding to these recommendations.

Mr. Srikanth encouraged Technical Committee members to review the report. He said the format of the report provides a good overview of the core activities that the TPB is required to conduct.

Mr. Rawlings asked if Chairman Mendelson had been briefed on the report.

Mr. Srikanth said that the chairman had been briefed.

3. National Capital Region Passenger Rail Safety and Preparedness Initiatives

Mr. Meese presented, referring to a handout. The handout contained an outline of the presentation on this topic planned for the July 22 TPB meeting. TPB Chair Phil Mendelson had requested that the TPB look into the May 12, 2015 Philadelphia Amtrak derailment from the lens of the National Capital Region (NCR), including (1) steps to implement Positive Train Control Technology (PTC), (2) the capability of 911/first responders to handle such a derailment, and (3) potential contingencies for alternative travel modes in the NCR should passenger rail be disrupted for several days.

Staff worked with the COG Regional Emergency Support Function #1 (RESF-1) Committee, also known as the Emergency Transportation Committee, to identify potential speakers and the best format for such a presentation. The plan was to have the region's railroads cover transportation operations issues at the July 22 meeting. Staff was to work with COG's public safety staff and committees to develop a first responder preparedness presentation at a future TPB meeting. It was thought to be too lengthy for a single TPB meeting to cover both the transportation operations and first responder issues.

Four speakers had been identified and agreed to participate at the July 22 meeting: Robert Giorgio, Amtrak Emergency Operations Manager; Erich Kolig, Director of MARC Train and Commuter Bus, Maryland Transit Administration; Doug Allen, Chief Executive Officer, Virginia Railway Express; and R. Earl Lewis, Jr., Deputy Director of Emergency Preparedness for the Maryland Transit Administration and Co-Chair of the COG Emergency Transportation (RESF-1) Committee. Mr. Meese would also introduce the topic and speakers on July 22.

The July 22 introduction would include an overview of the NCR's passenger rail system, noting the complexity of inter-railroad operations such as MARC trains running on Amtrak tracks or VRE trains running on CSX-owned tracks. The introduction would also provide an overview of Positive Train Control (PTC), hopefully with sufficient information in the advance mailout packet because PTC is technologically complicated. As noted in the media recently, delay in deploying PTC is a national issue, though the agencies in this presentation are actively working toward installing PTC. The introduction would end with a note that the NCR has a number of longstanding or ongoing activities in addition to future PTC that bolster safety, as well as plans in place and previously utilized for contingencies for service interruptions.

Next on July 22 would be speakers in a panel format. It was planned to invite the four panelists to be seated for the duration of this item at staff table, with name cards provided; staff and the committee chairs seated at the table would be asked to step away temporarily to audience seats. This would facilitate question-and-answer

discussions among the TPB members and the panelists. Each panelist will have a handful of slides, limited to a few key points including that they have emergency management as part of their missions, communications issues, inter-railroad coordination, exercises, experience in real-world events, and status and timeline for installing PTC. The RESF-1 Chair will not have prepared comments but will add his perspective. Slides and the pre-meeting mailout (likely to be an overview memorandum) were still under development. The goal was to have sufficient information in the mailout to provide background so time will not have to be taken at the TPB meeting for technological details to be explained.

Mr. Meese noted that staff had reached out to the region's freight railroads (CSX and Norfolk Southern) to invite their participation in the July 22 presentation, and had been advised that the two railroads would submit written testimony in lieu of participating at the meeting.

Ms. Soneji stated that VRE was thankful to be included in the conversation.

Mr. Srikanth noted the complexity of passenger rail in the region, with multiple players, multiple agencies, thus the panel format for the presentation. Mr. Srikanth had shared the plan for the panel format and the topics to be covered with TPB Chair Mendelson, and was awaiting any further feedback. The TPB Steering Committee also was scheduled to review this plan at their meeting.

In response to a question from Ms. Erickson regarding of the order that panelists would speak, Mr. Meese replied that was still open to discussion. Ms. Erickson recommended considering an order of speakers that would best share information, and not put any of the speakers in an uncomfortable position. Additionally, Ms. Erickson recalled the recent COG infrastructure report presentations, where each agency (DDOT, MDOT, and VDOT) used the exact same set of slides, inserting the same information, keeping the conversation at the same upper level. Mr. Meese agreed to take that information under advisement. He had been advised that Mr. Kolig had a set of slides from previous briefings on this topic that we wanted to reuse, and that the situation for each agency was fairly different.

Ms. Erickson recommended that the speakers themselves have an opportunity to recommend the order of speakers, and Mr. Meese agreed.

Mr. Lake recommended starting the presentation with a clear one-minute definition of PTC, because this is the bottom line for all the railroads. He noted delays in software development by the freight railroads, meaning that commuter railroads such as VRE can only be partially ready. Mr. Meese agreed, and noted that speakers on the panel have expertise on PTC to address any of the TPB's questions. PTC installation complexities include equipment along waysides, in locomotives, and in dispatching centers; software development; communications connections; historic impact reviews for the installation of antennae; crew training; and numerous other issues that factor in to how long it will

take to install PTC nationally. Mr. Meese recommended including the message that the railroads are undertaking many safety-related activities even before PTC is available. In response to a question from Mr. Davenport, Mr. Meese noted the federal deadline for installing PTC was the end of 2015, but that a number of entities such as the American Association of Railroads and the American Public Transit Association had called for an extension of that deadline, documenting the reasons for needing such a delay in several detailed publications.

Mr. Davenport asked whether the panel would discuss the consequences of not meeting the PTC deadline. Mr. Meese was aware of the possibility of commuter railroads being subject to Federal Railroad Administration fines for not meeting the PTC deadline even if the delay was beyond their control on the part of their host railroads; he would further confer with the panelists to see how they wished to discuss this topic.

Mr. Rawlings concurred with the proposed format of the panel, and asked that slides or other materials that are received in advance from the agencies be shared in advance with Chairman Mendelson. Mr. Rawlings anticipated that this would be a time-consuming but important item.

4. Briefing on Recommended Technical Assistance Recipients under the FY 2016 Transportation Land Use Connections (TLC) Program

John Swanson of DTP staff presented the recommendations for the FY 2016 Transportation/Land-Use Connections Program. TLC provides technical assistance for projects that address both transportation and land use issues. The program supports the TPB's goals in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan, as well as COG's Activity Centers initiative. Since 2007, the program has funded 83 planning and design projects across the region for almost \$3 million in assistance. Fifteen applications were received this year, and nine were recommended for funding.

Ms. Davis asked whether the TPB would complete an evaluation to investigate the efficacy of the program.

Mr. Swanson said that staff is planning to conduct an evaluation. He said that in the past, staff conducted a somewhat informal telephone survey, which was useful. He agreed that conducting a more extensive evaluation would be important.

Ms. Soneji asked if staff had looked through existing projects to identify any lessons-learned to share with other jurisdictions. She also asked about how it is determined whether and how projects budgets will be scaled.

Mr. Emerine of the Office Planning mentioned that the District of Columbia had conducted TLC projects related to parking that could be similar to projects recommended for FY 2016. He said that he could share the results of those projects with anyone interested as an opportunity to coordinate research and policy efforts.

Mr. Swanson said that staff continues to look for ways to share project results and studies among jurisdictions. He also said that TLC program applicants note on their applications whether or not projects can be scaled.

Mr. Srikanth described the funding for the TLC program. He noted that out of the total \$420,000 in TLC program, Maryland provides \$160,000 from its technical assistance fund in the UPWP for projects from that state. He also stated that the TLC Program cannot fund capital projects as other MPOs do. The Program can only fund planning and 30% design projects. He noted that TLC projects influence planning policy among local jurisdictions and that TLC was favorably highlighted in the recent review of the TPB's work by the federal government.

Ms. Erickson asked whether there was a change in how regional funds were distributed to Maryland projects this year and if applicants who received less funding than requested would be contacted.

Mr. Swanson noted that all applicants would be debriefed about their funding recommendations for FY 2016. He noted that this year, staff received more applications from Virginia than in previous years. Staff worked with a selection panel to rank projects and make funding recommendations. Mr. Swanson said he encouraged members to consider geographic spread and the additional funding for Maryland projects.

Mr. Thomas said he was glad to see more projects across the region, but was concerned about the amount of regional funding going toward Maryland projects.

Mr. Srikanth noted that staff would discuss the process for selecting TLC projects, and that changes would be made so that funding allocations better reflect the funding sources.

5. Briefing on Projects Recommended for Funding under the MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Program for FY 2016 in Maryland

Mr. Cobb gave a presentation on the TPB's FY 2016 funding recommendations for Maryland jurisdictions of the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). TAP is a federal formula program under MAP-21 that allows states and MPOs to provide reimbursable aid to projects that are considered alternative to highway capacity expansion. The TPB collaborates with the Maryland State Highway Administration in a competitive selection process, evaluating projects through several criteria. The TPB was sub-allocated \$3.2 million and recommended full funding to five projects, and partial funding to two. The projects included improvements related to the Safe Routes to School program, as well as Trail/Path connections.

6. Briefing on Regional Car Free Day 2015

Mr. Ramfos briefed the Committee on Car Free Day to be held on Tuesday September 22nd. Mr. Ramfos gave background information on the world-wide event that was initially held in 2007 in the District of Columbia and then expanded to the rest of the region in 2008. The event originated in Europe in the mid 1990s and some European cities close down streets and set aside areas for bicyclists, pedestrians, and public transit vehicles. Mobility Week in Europe also encompasses Car Free Day. Car Free Day is currently held in about 1,500 cities in 40 countries.

Mr. Ramfos stated that the region's Car Free Day event is coordinated through Commuter Connections. COG/TPB staff provides support to local jurisdictions and organizations promoting the event. Alternative forms of transportation are promoted to all residents in the region and encouragement is given to use transit, bicycling and walking for any type of trip made that day. Mr. Ramfos also explained that the regional event also promotes "car-lite" travel options that allow event registrants to pledge to use carpools and vanpools. Teleworking is also encouraged as another alternative for commuters.

Mr. Ramfos showed event photos from different parts of the world. Media coverage is also very good for the region's event and in 2014 there were several major media outlets that covered the event. Those interested in pledging for the event need to do so at the designated event web site which is www.carfreemetrodc.org. The primary target market includes residents who ordinarily drive alone by car for any purpose and secondary groups would include those already in car free travel modes.

Mr. Ramfos then described the marketing and advertising materials which will be used for the 2015 event. He explained that the Car Free Day Steering Committee had been working on the creative messaging along with COG/TPB staff and the marketing and advertising consultant for this year's event. Mr. Ramfos then showed the Facebook and Twitter social media pages used in 2014. Posters will also be sent to employers so they can be displayed at worksite(s) to promote the event. The posters will also be made available electronically to employers and the public for promotional purposes.

Email blasts to employers will also be used to remind employers to promote the event. Opt-in text messaging service for those already pledging will be assessed and radio advertising will definitely be part of the advertising mix for the 2015 event. COG/TPB staff have also partnered with local transit agencies including Arlington, Fairfax, Frederick, and Montgomery counties to promote the event through transit signage. Metro also promotes the event on Metrobus signage and through donating space on their home page.

Mr. Ramfos stated that one of the goals of the event in this region is to use street closures as part of the event. Some jurisdictions such as Arlington, Montgomery

counties as well as Southern Maryland have used street closures as part of the event's promotion. The National Park Service has also promoted the "Feet in the Street" program during Car Free day and International Park(ING) Day has also been promoted in conjunction with the event. There are also many local events that will be held on Car Free Day that can be used as a conduit to promote the event. There is also a region-wide College Campus Challenge that is a friendly competition between universities to determine the most Car Free Day pledges for both faculty and students. There are corporate sponsors for the event. In 2014, each person who pledged to go car free or car-lite was entered into a raffle for a chance to win any of the following donated prizes. A press release was sent out which mentioned sponsors who donated prizes. Prizes in 2014 included everything from complimentary commuter rail passes to gift cards from various merchants and a \$250 bike shop gift certificate.

Mr. Ramfos stated that last year the region recorded 4,656 residents who pledged to go Car Free or Car-Lite on Car Free Day and pledges increased 13 percent over 2013. In 2013, the event was on a Sunday. Mr. Ramfos stated that this year's goal is to obtain 10,000 pledges. A proclamation will be presented to the TPB for review and signature this month and members will be asked to pledge and provide information on their activities for the event through social media outlets. The overall goal is to gain additional media coverage for the event that would lead to additional residents pledging.

Mr. Roseboom asked whether or not the event fell on September 22 each year. Mr. Ramfos stated yes, the event was held on September 22 each year. Mr. Ramfos also reported that closer coordination is being sought with VDRPT on promoting Car Free Day as part of the Commonwealth's Try Transit Week promotion. There was a question as to whether or not there was participation from PRTC on Car Free Day. Mr. Ramfos stated that during the last Car Free Day Steering Committee meeting a representative from PRTC was in attendance.

7. Briefing on the Implementation of the TPB Regional Priority Bus Project under the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Program

Mr. Randall briefed the committee on the progress of the TPB's TIGER Grant, awarded in 2010 and ongoing for the past four years. Mr. Randall spoke to a presentation on the grant projects and their status. Only a year remains for the implementing agencies to complete project work, with time also needed to complete invoicing and get reimbursed from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) before the grant funds expire on September 30, 2016.

Mr. Holloman asked if there work had begun on the performance measurement requirements of the grant.

Mr. Randall elaborated that the performance reports for the before condition of the sixteen project corridors were submitted some time ago. Sets of reports are then due

one year and two years respectively after completion of each of the sixteen project corridors, the first of which will be due soon for the US 1 Transitway in Alexandria. In the meantime, data is collected on an ongoing basis every six months so that it will be ready for analysis in support of the reports.

Mr. Emerine asked if performance measurement requirements were taken into account by the implementing agencies.

Mr. Randall responded that they have been briefed repeatedly on these requirements. However, almost all of the required data will come from WMATA based on bus ridership, travel time, reliability, and other observed operational performance; relatively little is required of DDOT or other agencies implementing the capital components.

Mr. Emerine also asked a clarifying question on DDOT's transit signal priority procurement, to which Mr. Randall responded. He also asked about enforcement of the Georgia Avenue bus lane, and Mr. Randall referred him to DDOT for a response.

Mr. Srikanth emphasized the Board's interest in these projects being completed on time. Any funds not expended will not be available for programming by the TPB or even FTA, and would lapse. The implementing staffs are working hard, but any assistance needed within their agency should be prioritized. Mr. Srikanth also noted that the Army Navy Bus Bays project requires the rest of the funding plan to be developed; otherwise WMATA cannot proceed with issuance of the construction procurement for bids. To use up all the TIGER funding, this project must be 25% complete by next summer to get full reimbursement.

Mr. Griffiths asked for clarification on what the "red flags" were for completing the grant.

Mr. Randall referred to the projects listed on the slide regarding the Transit Signal Priority technological project and the Army-Navy Drive Bus Bays project at those at greatest risk.

8. Draft National Capital Region Freight Plan 2015

Mr. Schermann briefed the Committee on the first draft of the National Capital Region Freight Plan (the Plan). He noted that the Plan is not yet complete and that the Committee will be receiving additional presentations on it later this fall.

Every year hundreds of millions of tons of freight valued in the billions of dollars move over the National Capital Region's (NCR) roadways and railways and pass through its airports. Historic and projected growth in employment, population, and household income in the NCR drive demand for goods which in turn drives demand for freight transportation. The Transportation Planning Board (TPB) as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the National Capital Region has an important role to play in ensuring that the regional transportation system continues to be responsive to and

supportive of the freight demands placed upon it by its residents, businesses, and visitors.

The Plan supports MAP-21 requirements, describes the role freight in the region's economy, provides an overview of the multimodal freight transportation system, discusses the drivers of freight demand and analyzes regional freight flows, identifies significant freight issues, and provides recommendations for future freight planning actions.

The multimodal freight transportation system includes roadways, railways, marine facilities, cargo airports, and intermodal connectors. The regional freight-significant network was developed in consultation with the TPB Freight Subcommittee and includes roadways particularly important for goods movement. Its primary purpose is to facilitate performance measurement.

Recommendations in the draft plan focus on activities that TPB staff can do to improve freight planning in the region and include raising the profile of freight within local and regional planning processes as well as developing and communicating helpful information about accommodating freight within regional activity centers, among many others.

In response to questions from Mr. Brown, Mr. Schermann stated that no one from Loudoun County has participated in recent Freight Subcommittee meetings. Mr. Meese added that efforts have been made to reach out to local jurisdictions, including Loudoun County, to request participation in the Freight Subcommittee.

In response to further questions from Mr. Brown, Mr. Meese noted that TPB freight staff had met with Loudoun County officials two years ago as part of the freight around the region project and that the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority is on the mailing list and participates occasionally in freight subcommittee meetings.

Mr. Meese added that the information in the Freight Plan would be largely reflective of what is in the Air Cargo Element being developed by Mr. Roisman. Also, given that we have a few months before we finalize the plan, we could review the materials and perhaps have another meeting.

In response to Mr. Brown's statement, Mr. Schermann noted that it would be helpful to include in the Plan a discussion on how I-81 impacts distribution in our region in general and air cargo at Dulles in particular.

Mr. Griffiths noted that another impediment to growing air cargo at Dulles is the lack of manufacturing in our region.

Mr. Thomas noted that while the draft Plan does a great job of providing technical analysis, it should also include more discussion about raising the profile of freight within

local and regional planning processes as well as developing and communicating helpful information about accommodating freight within regional activity centers. In addition, it would also be helpful to include case studies highlighting how this has been done in DC and in other areas. We should also show how we are using the bottleneck information to inform the planning process.

Mr. Srikanth added that this presentation is not going to the Board yet but our plan is to try and finish it this year. It is important to think about freight in activity centers. DDOT is making extensive efforts to address the issue of freight in urban areas. It impacts everybody, but it particularly impacts transit buses. According to the CLRP, 74 percent of future jobs will be focused in activity centers and freight will be a big part of this. Also, MAP-21 will require freight performance measurement and target setting.

In response to a comment from Mr. Weissberg, Mr. Schermann said that the Plan would include a special dedication to the late Karin Foster.

9. Update on the Work of the Activities of the Transportation Sector Group of the COG Multi-Sector Working Group (MSWG) to Examine Greenhouse Gas Reductions

Mr. Griffiths briefed the committee on the activities of the working group. He said the group started its work in January, hired a consultant in March, and identified 22 strategies in May for more detailed research. In June, the MSWG consultant presented information on activities in other regions to promote greenhouse gas reductions. He said the Transportation Sector Group of the MSWG would meet on July 17 to review the potential transportation and land-use strategies, and discuss to what degree these strategies are viable and implementable. He said the full MSWG would meet on July 31. He said an interim report would be prepared for discussion and consideration in the fall.

Mr. Srikanth encouraged members of the Technical Committee to attend the meeting on July 17. At that meeting, he said, jurisdiction staff would have the opportunity to provide input on which of the 22 strategies should be considered viable and which should be identified as “stretch” strategies.

Mr. Brown noted that he would not be able to attend the July 17 meeting but he was interested in providing input. He further noted that support for various strategies would ultimately be a political decision that, in his case, would need to go through the Loudoun Board of Supervisors and could not simply be based upon the comments of county staff.

Mr. Griffiths answered that at this point, the MSWG is simply looking for jurisdiction staff to provide a general assessment of the “reasonableness” of the strategies. He said they would not be asked to explicitly support or reject strategies.

10. Status Report on the Development of a Regional List of Unfunded Transportation Projects

Mr. Austin spoke to a memorandum outlining the development of the list of unfunded transportation projects and the challenges faced therein, and to the draft list of projects which had been posted online. He explained the methodology of assigning cost ranges to projects in the list, and spoke briefly to the mapping of projects that had been completed to date and information still needed.

Mr. Srikanth stated that a working group had been proposed that would include two board members serving as a chair and vice chair, a member of the Citizens Advisory Committee, and representatives from each of the three DOT and WMATA. He added that the working group would be open to any board member that wished to participate. Mr. Srikanth stated that the list and associated mapping was expected to be complete and provided to the working group in September. He outlined the proposed tasks for the working group to address, including scenario modeling, determining if there are cross-jurisdictional projects that could have a significant impact, or championing priority projects and/or funding sources.

Mr. Austin asked for comments on the funding levels to be submitted by July 17.

Mr. Brown asked if the maps were available to review online. Mr. Austin said he would coordinate with Ms. Howard and provide access to that when it was available.

11. Briefing on the 2015 Annual Transit Forum

Mr. Randall spoke to a memorandum distributed to the Committee on the 2015 Annual Transit Forum. He noted that this is an annual event to which private providers of transportation (e.g., commuter bus, paratransit, and taxi operators) are invited as well as jurisdictional representatives from the region. The event features keynote speakers, which this year included Mr. Art Guzzetti from APRA speaking on microtransit and how technology will affect public transportation and Mr. Christian Kent from WMATA on the long-term sustainability of MetroAccess. He noted that this was an event of the Private Providers Task Force, but that at the forum he did speak about the reconstitution of the Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee as a venue through which private providers of transportation can communicate their issues to the Board. Highlights from the forum are available on the website.

12. Other Business

None.

13. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – July 10, 2015**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Dan Emerine
 Tamara Vatnick

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick County -----
City of Frederick -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County John Thomas
Prince George’s County Victor Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery County -----
 Prince George’s County -----
MDOT Lyn Erickson
 Matt Baker
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County Mike Lake
 Malcom Watson
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
NVTA Sree Nampuothiri
NVTC Karen Finucom Clarkson
Prince William County James Davenport
PRTC -----
VRE Sonali Soneji
 Jon Howard
VDOT Norman Whitaker
 Dan Painter
VDRPT Tim Roseboom
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

Allison Davis

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

FHWA-DC -----
FHWA-VA -----
FTA -----
NCPC -----
NPS -----
MWAQC -----
MWAA -----

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Nick Ramfos, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Lamont Cobb, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Bryan Hayes, DTP
Jessica Mirr, DTP
Erin Morrow, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Jon Schermann, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Sophie Mintier, DCPS

OTHER

Alexandra Kremasanka, Maryland
 Department of the Environment
Rick Rybeck, Just Economics LLC