MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA
COMMUTER CONNECTIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

District of Columbia
Bowie
College Park
Frederick County
Gaithersburg
Greenbelt
Montgomery County
Prince George's County
Rockville
Takoma Park
Alexandria
Arlington County
Fairfax
Fairfax County
Falls Church
Loudoun County
Manassas
Manassas Park
Prince William County

Tuesday, March 16, 2004
10:00 a.m. - Noon
Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
777 North Capitol Street, N.E.
Third Floor, COG Board Room
(Please note meeting room change)

Chairperson: Robin Briscoe, Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland
Vice Chairperson: Sharon Affinito, Loudoun County
Staff Contact: Nicholas Ramfos 202/962-3313
Note: If you cannot attend this meeting, please call 202/962-3327.

ITEM #			ACTION
1.	Introductions		
2.	Minutes of February 17, 2004 Meeting		APPROVE
3.	TDM Evaluation Project Update	**(40 min)**	APPROVE
	Lori Diggins will update the group on the TDM Evaluation Project Evaluation Framework draft document *(enclosed)* and the FY04 Placement Rate Survey draft report *(enclosed)*. She will also give a status report on the State of the Commute survey, GRH applicant survey, and Telecommuting surveys.		
4.	Employer Outreach Update	**(10 min)**	APPROVE
	Mark Hersey will give an update from the 2nd quarter conformity analysis verification for the Employer Outreach TERM.		
5.	Commuter Operations Center Update	**(15 min)**	INFORMATION
	Christopher Arabia will brief the Group on recent Operation Center activities.		

| 6. | Telework Resource Center Update | **(15 min)** | INFORMATION |

Danette Campbell will brief the
Subcommittee on recent activities of
The TRC including an update on the
Expanded Telecommuting TERM.

| 7. | Mass Marketing TERM Update | **(15 min)** | INFORMATION |

Douglas Franklin will brief the Subcommittee
on the status and recent activities of the
mass Marketing TERM.

| 8. | Bike To Work Day 2004 | **(10 min)** | INFORMATION |

Mark Hersey will update the Subcommittee
On the recent planning activities for the
2004 regional Bike To Work Day event.

| 9. | 2004 Employer Recognition Awards Program | **(10 min)** | INFORMATION |

Douglas Franklin will update the Subcommittee
on the progress of the regional Employer
Recognition Awards program for 2004.

| 10. | Other Business/Set Agenda for Next Meeting | **(5 min)** | |

This is an opportunity for Commuter Connections
Subcommittee members to bring up other business
and to request agenda items for the next meeting.

NOTE: **The next meeting of the Commuter Connections Subcommittee will be held on Tuesday, April 20, 2004 at 10:00 a.m.**

Upcoming Meetings	*Date*	*Time*
Bike To Work Day Steering Committee	*March 12*	*10 a.m.*
Commuter Operations Subcommittee	*March 16*	*12 noon*
Employer Outreach Ad-Hoc Group	*March 16*	*2 p.m.*
Regional TDM Marketing Group	*April 6*	*10 a.m.*
Telecommuting Ad-Hoc Group	*April 7*	*10 a.m.*

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

Commuter Connections Subcommittee

MEETING MINUTES

Tuesday, February 17, 2004

CHAIR: Robin Briscoe, Tri-County Council for Southern Maryland
VICE CHAIR: Sharon Affinito, Loudoun County
STAFF CONTACT: Nicholas Ramfos (202) 962-3313

Item #1   Introductions

Ms. Briscoe started the meeting by introducing herself and affiliation and all who were in attendance did the same. Ms. Briscoe asked that everyone in attendance sign the attendance sheet. *(See attached attendance sheet).*

Item #2   Minutes of January 20, 2004 Meeting

Ms. Briscoe then proceeded to review last months meetings minutes dated January 20, 2004. She asked if everyone had an opportunity to review the minutes and if there were any changes or additions and there were none. The Subcommittee approved the minutes as written.

Item #3   FY05 Work Program Approval
Mr. Nicholas Ramfos hilighted the changes made to the draft of the FYO5 CCWP and the draft Appendix document based on comments and suggestions from the Subcommittee and the TPB Technical Committee. Both documents are being submitted to the Subcommittee for discussion and final approval.

Mr. Ramfos began by apologizing to the committee for the delay in posting of the meeting materials. COG had been experiencing some computer network and software problems.

He went on to discuss the FYO5 CCWP draft and the changes made to it. The draft had been previously presented to the Subcommittee in the meetings held in December and January. The draft was presented to the TPB Technical Committee in February. That committee set a "comment period" deadline so any suggestions could be submitted before finalization. The draft is also being submitted to the TPB Technical Committee in a meeting scheduled later in the week. In that meeting, Mr. Ramfos will highlight Commuter Connections programs impacts over the last year and review some of the new TERMS that have been implemented. Some of the numbers in the Mobile6 emissions model changed because of input updates. The new model introduced to the program impacted the numbers for all measures. The new vehicles in the fleet run cleaner. This is the primary reason the emissions numbers were impacted. The transportation impacts for vehicle trips and vehicle miles of travel have stayed the same. The benefits are congestion impacts, although air quality is still important.

Mr. Ramfos moved along in his discussion to a display of a series of maps that showed the distribution of applicants for the various programs. The TPB Technical Committee members wanted to see a graphic of the Guaranteed Ride Home participants versus actual users of the program. Christopher Arabia and Giovanni Balsamo created these maps that plot out in detail where actual participants live. The maps are in draft form because some changes need to be made to account for the total MSA.

Mr. Arabia displayed the maps and gave a brief explanation about the graphics in the maps. The maps plot out the home location of all the participants in the Rideshare database and cover the entire non-attainment area. The maps give an idea of where program participants actually are located and how far reaching the Commuter Connections program is.

Mr. Balsamo then spoke about more details in the maps. The maps will be converted to PowerPoint for future presentations.

> *Q:* *A suggestion for maps for future purpose is that it would be helpful if the counties were color coded and have coding represent population density because some registrants are coming from high population areas and some are not, the same thing with the businesses. Some businesses are in very dense areas of the counties and some are not. I was looking at it for a visual picture of what is really going on and I couldn't make that out. So I am wondering if there is a way to color code the densities in terms of the maps. The other area of caution is that we be careful that there is a possibility a participant can be in Guaranteed Ride Home and not be registered in the database as an applicant that wants ridesharing assistance. The Guaranteed Ride Home program users are scattered throughout the area versus the applicants in the database, and it would be easy to make that assumption.*

> *A:* *We do require all Guaranteed Ride Home applicants to be in the in the CCRS database so all the GRH applicants should be shown in the Rideshare database too.*

> *Q:* *Is there a difference between the applicants for Guaranteed Ride Home and applicants for ride finding information and can we color code them?*

> *A:* *In the future we can show the difference on the maps. We don't have the time to do it to meet the current deadline.*

Mr. Ramfos noted how far out some of the commuters on the maps live. Some of the participants are coming from as far as the Richmond, VA. Mr. Arabia pointed out some of the additional far out commute origin areas. Ms. Briscoe commented that the members of TPB realize these people are in the database, and their jurisdictions pay to use the database.

> *A:* *Do you think it will be helpful to show the actual numbers. There are a lot of people in Stafford so if we are just looking at the dots on the maps is that relative to the dots that are stacked on top of each other?*

> *Q:* *We talked about putting dots on the maps that showed greater than 25, greater than 50 but it was decided not to do that, because it wouldn't be as effective, and because some jurisdictions may have less than 25 and would not be represented on the map.*

> **A:** *When this map is presented to the TPB, is it going to be presented as a draft or presented as what we have represented now in the database?*

> **Q:** *What will be discussed in the meeting are highlights of the program, how many applicants are in the database, how many participants for Guaranteed Ride Home, Telecommuting in the region, Mass Marketing, and Employer Outreach accomplishments.*

Mr. Ramfos stated that we have a number of new board members this year that may not be abreast of what we are doing in Commuter Connections, so we are giving them the highlights and background of what our programs offer.

Comment: *Since we have a lot of new board members we should make an opportunity to show them and make it clear that the numbers shown do not reflect the total results of the program, because there are so many transit and rideshare options out there, and these people do not have to go through our rideshare database to do so. Outreach is broader than what is displayed in the maps and the rideshare database.*

Mr. Ramfos then explained the difference in some of the budget numbers on the spreadsheets for funding. The $25,000 for the kiosk maintenance will come from VDRPT. It will be explained in the funding commitment letter to VDOT.

Subcommittee members still have time to comment on the draft report, and Mr. Ramfos would like to get the Subcommittee to approve the document, but added that there will be an additional comment period for the Technical Committee and the Board so if anyone sees something in the draft that needs to be addressed, please contact Mr. Ramfos. The TPB will not adopt this document until their March 17 meeting, so we have additional time to make any corrections to the document.

> **A:** *Is this still a working document?*

> **Q:** *For the Technical Committee and the TPB yes, but it will not be brought back formally to this group, because it has been reviewed in depth since December, but the group will be kept notified of any developments from any of the other groups reviewing and approving the document.*

This document will be released for public comment by the TPB on February 18, 2004, so anyone from the general public can make commentary on this program in the next 30 days. The document was approved by the Subcommittee.

ITEM #4   FYO3 Bike To Work Day Report
Mr. Mark Hersey presented the Bike To Work Day Draft Report that has been approved by the Bike To Work Day Subcommittee.

Mr. Hersey began by asking the Subcommittee if they had any questions about the report. He talked about the report which was reviewed at the last months meeting and stated that the necessary corrections were made. Ms. Briscoe asked if there were any comments or additions to the report. Mr. Ramfos added that the final draft of the Bike To Work Day Report would be sent to the Bike To Work Day Steering Committee and if anyone in this group, not on that committee, would like a final draft copy, let Mr. Hersey know. The report will be in PDF format, so it can be sent electronically. The report was approved by the Subcommittee.

Item #5   Best Workplaces for Commuters Briefing
The Subcommittee was briefed by Douglas Franklin on the Best Workplaces for Commuters initiative in the greater Washington DC region.

Mr. Franklin began talking about the Best Workplaces for Commuters list which will be displayed for the second time at the June Employers Recognition Awards event. This program recognizes companies who have strong alternative commuter benefit programs in place, essentially to encourage commuters to use their cars less to contribute to cleaning the air pollution through auto emissions.   The program consultant ERG will be managing the program list and sending out the certified employers once the list is complete.

Last week we had our first kick off meeting with the Best Work Places coalition group. The GSA, WMATA, U.S. DOT, NCPC, Board of Trade, Metropolitan Washington Work Life Coalition, and EPA are some of the organizations working together to add credibility to this list. There may be a friendly competition amongst the jurisdictions to sign up employers on the list. The jurisdictions are different sizes, so we are not looking at individual numbers of employers who sign up as much as we are looking at percentages of additions to the list based on a jurisdictions current base of employers already signed up. We want to see the impact from the quantified number of employees that work for these various companies that are added to the list. Best Work Places is a nationwide program and this is the second year that the DC region has participated. The EPA is looking to begin a national list with Fortune 500 companies. Some of the companies in the DC area may be part of that national list. The list is sponsored by the EPA and should receive national media recognition. The EPA will be pitching the national list to various magazines. Mr. Franklin explained that magazines love to print nationwide lists which can offer employers an opportunity to be part of a bigger list which will recognize that company as being a leader in commuter related issues.

At this point we are trying to sign up as many companies as possible to the Best Work Places program. It is easy for companies check to see if they qualify for program. All a company has to do is go to the website, commuterchoice.gov, check off some boxes and they will know in an instant if they qualify. If they qualify then they can go on further and fill out the application more in depth. That is one of the positives about this years program, because employers don't have to spend an enormous amount of time filling out long applications to find out they don't qualify, so we have a strong effort to get the word out to many of the employers that are already qualified, but for some other reason don't know what the requirements are. There might be some employers who fall short of all the requirements necessary. Those employers just need to add one or more options to their location, in order to become qualified for Best Work Places. It could be something relatively simple like adding a secure Bike Rack to the facility, opening up Telework as a benefit to the employees, or something along those lines. It doesn't have to be an expensive alternative. The employers who have strong programs but are not on the list should be encouraged to get on the list by the local jurisdictions.

The coalition will send out a letter through COG to the employers informing them of the program. There will be a featured article about Best Workplaces for Commuters in our newsletter which is one of the tools being used to create awareness for the program but encouragement from the local jurisdictions will have the strongest impact.

Q: *What are the dates as far as sending out the letters?*

A: *The awards ceremony is on June 24th, that is when the list will be unveiled and we will be sending out the letter by late April*

Q: *Will the letters include a list of last years Best Work Places?*

A: *Yes it will. We will be sending out a list of the current employers.*

Q: *Do we have some type of follow-up flyer to send to the local jurisdictions?*

A: *Yes. There are all types of information on the EPA website, which is commuterchoice.gov that can be downloaded and printed out. Part of the letter will also include a flyer that talks about the program, so there are materials that can be downloaded and printed and sent out to the employers.*

Mr. Franklin went on to say that the letters will be sent out to the employers and followed-up with a phone call to some of the bigger employers in the area that are not currently part of Best Workplaces. The sign-up deadline for the list is June 15th. At the awards event, there will large blown up lists of the participating employers. In order for a company to make that displayed list they will have to register by around June 1st, but employers will be able to sign up for the program up to a couple of days prior to the event and those companies will be recognized through a press release that day.

The Best Workplaces coalition group met last week and discussed the possibility of a friendly competition that will take into account each jurisdiction's base size of employers to make the competition fair, because we are looking at percentages more than numbers. Mr. Ramfos added that we probably would not be adding a new award, but rather look at the sales team achievement award and incorporating the two.

Q: *What makes a work place a Best Workplace?*

A: *There are 8 categories which are all listed on the website that touch on everything that a company can offer its employees that can make them eligible. 14 percent of employees must be participating in some kind of rideshare program. 6 percent of the employees need to telecommute, etc. It's formatted by, listing a number of things participants can do to qualify for a particular category. If a participant is doing three out of the 10 items listed then they qualify for that particular section. There is a verification process to see if employers meet the requirements which will continue up until the actual release date. The employers have to offer several commuter benefits to be noted as a Best Workplace as well.*

Q: *Does a participant have to add something like a bike rack, or have the item in place for a year in order for a company to qualify to meet the requirements?*

A: *The company only has to prove that they have the item in place before the lists are produced.*

> *Q: Is there a way to know if a major national company is on that list from another location?*

> *A: All the companies are listed on the EPA website.*

Mr. Franklin ended by giving his email information (*dfranklin@mwcog.org*), so Subcommittee members can obtain information about the program the consultant contact information. No members had anything further to add to the discussion.

Item #6   Vanpool Legislative Update
Jon Martz with VPSI National briefed the Subcommittee on the national and local Vanpool legislative measures and initiatives with a PowerPoint presentation by conference phone.

Mr. Martz began by listing the six agenda discussion items: Van Rollover Publicity, Safety of commuter vanpooling, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA), recent Bills, TEA-21 Reauthorization, and Federal legislative priorities.

Mr. Martz first spoke about the attention over the last 5 years and possibly dating back to as much as 10 years ago with certain type of long haul passenger vans such as the "Camianetta." Mr. Martz detailed the number of governmental studies by the NTSB and the NHTSA on rollovers and accidents related to passenger vans. Mr. Martz stated that these types of accidents have increased primarily because those types of vans are over-loaded carrying passengers from Mexico to California and driving sometimes 24 hours or more to their destinations.

Mr. Martz then referred to his PowerPoint presentation and the government reports from the NTSB and the NHTSA. The reports focused on the use of 15-passenger vans for school bus situations and whether they met school bus safety regulations. According to Mr. Martz, these reports trigger media responses. There were reports on *60 Minutes* and the *ABC News* about van rollovers and articles in newspapers like the *New York Times*. A lot of this publicity has been fueled by Ralph Nader's organization Public Citizen. This organization basically makes arguments to the effect that riding in a van is not safe, and Mr. Martz did not agree.

He spoke about the safety history of Vanpooling and how rollover accidents and fatalities can be reduced. Using the National Transit Database over a 10 year period, he compiled numbers from the largest private, public, and public/private partnerships across the U.S. Using those numbers, he displayed a chart detailing fatalities per 100 Million Vehicle-Miles traveled and fatalities per 100 million passengers with respect to the different kinds of public transportation options in particular areas. According to the statistics, Vanpooling had the lowest number of fatalities.

Next he talked about the situations that could cause Vanpool accidents and how the Vanpool operating environment differs for a typical van rollover situation. People who Vanpool, especially in urban areas, largely experience heavy traffic congestion and low rates of speed, versus rural areas with one and two-lane roadway where high speeds often become a factor. Vanpools are primarily operated on multi-lane highways vs. long single lane highways in rural areas with soft shoulders and where off-road tripping mechanisms like a ditch can cause a roll over type accident. Another factor is that, Vanpool drivers tend to be more experienced than the novice van drivers.

Mr. Martz stated that the majority of the Vanpools in operation around the country are considered a safe transportation option. They are in the largest cities in the U.S. and they are primarily operated by the public sector or private entities. There are very few individual Vanpool owner/operators. Washington D.C. and San Francisco are the only areas where they are found in significant

numbers. Guidelines for Vanpool drivers included minimum age requirements, 21-25, at least two back-up drivers per van in operation, minimum two year driver experience eligibility requirement, safety orientation before becoming a driver and requirements for all passengers and drivers wearing seat belts are procedures in place that seem to make Vanpooling a safer option.

He then detailed the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's actions regarding commercial motor vehicles. The Interstate Commerce Commission in 1978 exempted interstate vanpools from regulation. Later in 1995 the ICC Termination Act redefined Commercial Motor Vehicles based on the size of the vehicle and this excluded Vanpools. TEA-21 redefined Commercial Motor Vehicles but also excluded commuter Vanpools. The initiative increased the number from 6 passengers to 8 passengers per vehicle while taking a look at the Cammianetta issue. In August 1998 the Federal Highway Administration of Motor Vehicle Safety did an advanced notice of proposed rule making where they were considering classifying any vehicle that seated 8-15 passengers in the commercial motor vehicle category. The Association for Commuter Transportation (ACT) got involved and the measure was shot down. According to ACT, it would have made it extremely harder to find commuter Vanpool drivers, because it would have required those drivers to have a CDL. He also touched on the FMCSRs definition of commercial motor vehicle, the FMCSRs final rule and proposed rule, the FMDSR Final rule in 2003 and the recent meetings between the FMCSA office of Business and Truck Standards and Operations and the ACT Vanpool Council.

There have also been some recent bills introduced. In March and April of 2003 two identical bills, House Bill 1641 and Senate Bill 717 were introduced by Representative Mark Udall, CO, and Senator Olympia Snowe of ME; The Passenger Van Safety Act of 2003. The bills were designed to do two things, enhance general vehicular safety, and to look at the applicability of school bus safety to vans and their use. This Act didn't do much to hurt or help vanpooling, however, it did help overall vehicle safety with respect to the manufacturing of safer vehicles. There were two comments made by Senator Snowe during her introductory remarks of Bill 717 and they were the advance of widespread use passenger vans for airport shuttles and Vanpools and the overall focus of cutting down on number of fatal accidents. ACT lobbied with Senator Snowe's staff and they found that those remarks did not account for much. They were just added in and had no real bearing on the intent of this Bill.

Mr. Martz then discussed the TEA-21 Reauthorization with respect to the actions of the Senate Commerce Committee. The slide in the presentation had bolded the names of the Senators whose transportation staff they talked to about issues with the Passenger Van Safety Act of 2003. Vanpooling was not the target of this bill, but they are going to continue with the lobbying efforts to seek an exemption to make sure Vanpooling is not adversely impacted by the legislation. There is no intention to regulate Vanpooling, so issues like affordable insurance should not be a problem in the future.

Mr. Martz then moved along in his presentation to the federal legislative priorities. The focus is to exempt commuter Vanpools from the recently expanded FMCSRs that regulate operation of commercial motor vehicles. The primary reason to avoid regulating Vanpooling is the excessive cost that would be associated with trying to do that. In addition, the van rollover publicity is making it difficult to find insurers who will sell high levels of coverage and extend insurance policies. The second priority is to expand the federal fuel excise tax to include smaller transit vehicles. Currently there are three types of vehicles that meet the standard for exemption and they are intercity, school and local buses with 20 or more passenger seating capacity. Third, make a local match allowance for use of Capital Cost for Contracting for Vanpooling. More than 50 percent of the nation's Vanpools are financed with private money. The private sector has the

willingness and ability to assist in the growth of Vanpooling across the country. Private capitol reduces the need for larger federal financial assistance.

> **Q:** *Is your group working on a letter to make Vanpools exempt?*
>
> **A:** *As far as the FMCSA is concerned Vanpools are exempt, but we are working to get the letter so they can waive that to insurers*
>
> **Q:** *Many human service agencies use 15-passenger vans for the type of services you mentioned in the latter part of your presentation, is your group working to get an exemption to include those agencies?*
>
> **A:** *No. If you have a professional driver for your service, it is clear what has to be done, but for drivers on the public side there are very few regulations.*
>
> **Q:** *What would it take for the ACT Vanpool Council to look into the issue of lack of competition for Vanpool insurance and come up with some recommendations on how we might stimulate more competition in that area? Can you come up with some kind of insurance pool?*
>
> **A:** *We have had this discussion with the Council before, but it has not been addressed over the past year in any depth. The insurance pools pretty much have to be done at the state level. The FTA stated they have no interest in doing that.*

There were no other questions about the Vanpool legislation.

Item #7   Web-Based Ridematching Project Update
Giovanni Balsamo briefed the Subcommittee on the status of the Commuter Connections Web-based ridematching system.

Mr. Balsamo began by summarizing the project and its objectives which are to migrate the current Ridematching and GRH systems to an intranet based application. The goal is to move away from the remote configuration and bring it over to a web configuration so requests and updates happen in real time for client members. This will eliminate the need for uploads and downloads and web site maintenance.   During this project it is expected to integrate the Rideshare database with the GRH database so there is one database. There is no need for two separate databases. This project should allow us to use the latest in GIS database and web technology so the applications will be in a scaleable format for easy future updates.

There are several tasks that were identified in order to complete the project. The first task is to put together a high level system design. There are some general hardware and software requirements for the project and some data requirements as well. Task two, which is in progress, is to investigate the current systems and collect documentation. Mr. Balsamo has interviewed some the operations staff to see their daily processes. This task also includes a duplication effort and an inventory of all the functional steps. Task 3 would consist of defining the functional specs in the data model for the new applications. What is discovered in task 2 will define the functional requirement specs for the new application. Task 4 and 5 will require us to configure some hardware and software, and configure a database server along with the necessary software for the application. Some installation and configuration of software was completed for the mapping web site. Once there is a testing environment put together, Mr. Balsamo and his group will begin the migration and deflating of the current databases and define a migration strategy for the two databases. The databases will

be migrated to a temporary location and then combined into one database. After the database work is complete, in Task 6 they hope to develop the Ridematching portion of the application. They will create some Web forms based on specifications of the functional requirements gathered in Task 3. There will be only one application, but two different goals. Task 7 will also involve developing code for the GRH portion which is a little different than the rideshare portion. After everything is built, Task 8 will consist of the debugging phase. The system needs to be tested before its deployed, so a testing plan will be defined to test the system for errors. Security checks will be run once the debugging phase is complete. This is to ensure that system can't be hacked from outside. Task 9 configuring involves the whole live induction production environment. A separate database server will be configured with a separate web server in addition to installing all the necessary software. A backup system will also be set up utilizing the testing system as the backup system in the future. Once the equipment is built and running smoothly a disaster recovery plan will be defined. This plan should have a logical as well as physical testing environment.

> *Q: What about hackers. Will people from the outside be able to go in a sabotage the database?*
>
> *A: Staff is very good with tracking and implementing security systems and we are planning on using our in house consultants to try to hack the system to make sure there are no holes in the system.   Members will be able to input the applications and review them in real time through the intranet. The public will have a verification process which will have a disconnect between the live database and the website for security reasons. The public will be able to get the business results a day later and there is only one database.*

Item #8   2004 Employer Recognition Awards Program
Douglas Franklin updated the Subcommittee on the progress of the regional Employer Recognition Awards program

Mr. Franklin began by talking about the seventh annual Employer Awards Recognition ceremony that is to be held June 24th at the National Press Club in Washington D.C. The application deadline for award nominations has passed and staff is in the process of reviewing the applications for completeness, and they're being packaged for the selection committee. Mr. Franklin thanked everyone who filled out an application on behalf of an employer in their area, or encouraged an employer to do so. There were a total of 12 nominees.

He also said that later this month the Awards Work Group will be selecting speakers for the event. Typically the individuals selected to speak have some correlation to the particular award they are presenting.

Mr. Franklin said that the Selection Committee for the awards benefit has been established, and includes a panel of twelve evaluators representing different employment sectors from both public and private sectors and also includes winners from the previous year.   The Selection Committee will be meeting on March 23rd to determine winners for the three categories- Telework, Incentives or Marketing. The chair for this year's Committee is Phil Mendleson from the District. Mr. Franklin asked were there any questions and there were none.

Item #9   Bike to Work Day 2004

Mark Hersey updated the committee on the recent planning activities for the 2004 regional Bike To Work Day event.

Mr. Hersey spoke briefly about planning activities for the upcoming Bike To Work Day Event May 7th 2004. There will be 18 pitstops. Pitstops were added in Gaithersburg, Bowie, Rockville and Silver Spring, and one dropped in Falls Church.

He then went over sponsors of the event and the levels of their contributions. Platinum sponsors contributed $5,000 in either funds or products, gold $2,500, silver $1, 000 or more and bronze 500 or less. The next meeting is Friday February 20, in the COG Board room. Mr. Hersey asked if there were any questions and there were none.

Item #10   Other Business/Set Agenda for Next Meeting

This is an opportunity for Commuter Connections Subcommittee members to bring up other business and request agenda for the next meeting.

There was no other business or agenda item requests. The meeting adjourned at 12:00 Noon.

The next meeting of the Commuter Connections Subcommittee will be held on Tuesday, March 16, 2004.