

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD
Technical Committee Meeting

Meeting Minutes
For December 4, 2015

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the November 6 Technical Committee Meeting

The minutes were approved as written.

2. Update on the Call for Projects and Schedule for the 2016 CLRP Amendment and FY 2017-2022 TIP

Mr. Srikanth provided a review of the TPB's comments and concerns about the draft Call for Projects document from the November 2015 meeting.

Mr. Austin spoke to the materials that had been provided. He pointed to a change on the Project Description Form that would ask agencies to include documentation of a project's standing in the local, state, or sub-regional planning process.

Mr. Swanson spoke to a memo that discussed providing a project-level assessment of how newly submitted CLRP projects support the goals outlined in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). This included a chart that visually laid out agency responses to regional policy framework questions that had been implemented on the CLRP form for the 2015 amendment, and a new project profile sheet that would provide greater detail and a narrative for each major project being proposed. This information would also be provided for responses to the MAP-21 Planning Factors, which are also included on the CLRP form. The 2015 project submissions were used as an example in the materials distributed.

Mr. Swanson said that for the 2016 amendment, these materials would be provided prior to the beginning of the initial public comment period in February. Mr. Austin added that this new information would only be requested and reported for new projects being submitted this year, not retroactively to projects already in the CLRP.

Mr. Srikanth spoke to how the questions in the Regional Policy Framework relate to the goals in the RTPP.

Mr. Malouff suggested that the Regional Policy Framework section of the Project Description Form could use some introductory language that references the RTPP. He also suggested that a disclaimer be placed on the Priorities Plan Response Matrix stating that the answers were provided by the agencies, and not evaluated by TPB staff or an independent agency.

Mr. Srikanth noted that the Call for Projects also referenced several other policy documents, including the TPB Vision, and Region Forward. He also explained that it was possible for agencies to indicate that a road-widening project supports transit if it enhances access to a transit station.

Mr. Brown stated that the RTPP response matrix looked good and would be useful to board members.

Ms. Erickson commended the inclusion of the information about project standing in local, state, or sub-regional plans, saying it would be a useful reminder for elected officials that projects are not being introduced at the CLRP level for the first time.

Mr. Emerine stated that he felt this approach was a good step towards addressing the concerns of some board members.

Mr. Davenport asked about the question shown at the bottom of the project profile sheet that asks, "What do you think about this project?" Mr. Austin replied that this would be used to advertise and promote the public comment opportunities for the CLRP.

Mr. Srikanth asked where the information regarding the project standing would be included, given that staff is asking for a separate memo to describe this. Mr. Austin said the intention would be to very briefly summarize the project standing in one sentence on the project profile page, but that the memo could also be included with the complete Project Description Form in the appendix for materials.

Mr. Whitaker asked if the memo for the project standing could use a standard template and how formal it needed to be. Mr. Austin said the memo could be very informal, even just a paragraph or bulleted list without the need for a from/to/date structure.

Ms. Davis noted that it might be beneficial for the committee to review and have a discussion about the project responses to the Regional Policy Framework and MAP-21 Planning Factors prior to their release for public comment.

Mr. Srikanth noted that Question 28 would allow for agencies to further explain why they checked some answers and not others. Mr. Austin noted that staff had discussed whether to make Question 28 required, but it had been left optional although agencies are strongly encouraged to respond. Mr. Emerine said that responses to that question could help staff develop the project profiles.

3. Discussion of a Proposal to Form a Working Group to Determine a Process for Evaluating New Project Submissions for the CLRP

Speaking to a memo, Mr. Srikanth said that board members in recent months have expressed dissatisfaction with the forecasted performance of the CLRP. He noted that the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group is working to address these concerns by identifying a limited set of projects that have potential to improve the performance of the region's transportation system.

Mr. Srikanth said that a couple of members of the board have suggested that the TPB establish a board task force to explore other enhancements to the TPB's CLRP development process and to recommend enhancements that the TPB would consider adopting for future updates to the CLRP. He said two board members have distributed draft resolutions on this topic. One of these resolutions had recommended the development of a point-based scoring system to evaluate projects.

Mr. Srikanth said a work session of the board has been proposed to be held on the morning of January 20. The work session would be intended to identify a consensus-based charge for a potential task force including specific problem(s) to address and the framework for any recommendations it would make to the board. Discussions from the work session would form the basis of a resolution for the TPB to adopt that would create a task force with a specific charge.

Mr. Brown questioned the timing of the proposed sessions, noting that January 20 will be the first meeting for many new TPB members and therefore it might be difficult to brief them beforehand on these issues. He asked if staff typically provides an orientation briefing for new members.

Mr. Srikanth responded that it was staff's understanding that this request was fairly urgent.

Mr. Rawlings supported the suggestion for an orientation session for new members.

Mr. Emerine suggested it might be beneficial to extend the work session invitation to past board members.

Mr. Griffiths said that participants would need to be current elected officials.

Mr. Emerine said that the meeting also could be conducted as an open invitation event.

Mr. Weissberg said that a "veteran" member could be invited to provide background.

Mr. Srikanth asked committee members to provide feedback on the draft resolutions that were distributed.

Ms. Soneji asked if this proposed new task force would replace the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group.

Ms. Erickson said it was a good idea to conduct this work session to get clarity on the activities of the TPB's various working groups. She said she hoped this session would be an efficient way to determine what activities should and can be undertaken, particularly given the limitations in the UPWP. She said she thought it was a good idea to have this session in January so that it is not put off.

Ms. Davis said it would be important to focus these discussions and potential new activities on the TPB's next big long-range plan update in 2018.

Mr. Whitaker said that federal regulations do not restrict MPOs to only develop a constrained long-range plan. He said long-range plans can also include unfunded projects. He said the TPB is the appropriate cross-jurisdictional body for identifying regional priorities.

Mr. Swanson said that the work plan for the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group, which had been tentatively agreed upon in November, called for the development of a Plan of Unfunded Regional Priority Projects. He said he thought that the group's work program was quite consistent with the proposals that had been suggested as the subject for discussion at the January 20 work session.

Mr. Brown said that the resolution presented at the November TPB meeting, which called for a scoring system for proposed CLRP projects, should have been distributed ahead of time. He asked if the TPB bylaws required advanced distribution. If such a bylaws requirement is not in place, he suggested that it possibly should be.

Mr. Malouff said the resolution had been proposed as an amendment to the CLRP amendment approval.

Mr. Srikanth said he was not sure if this is in the bylaws.

Mr. Griffiths said that it may not be in the bylaws, but it has generally been past practice to distribute such proposals ahead of time and ask that they be discussed at a future meeting.

Ms. Erickson agreed, noting that TPB members need time to discuss such proposals with their own boards.

Mr. Griffiths said that the Multi-Sector Working Group would have its own policy group.

Mr. Whitaker warned against establishing too many working groups that might have overlapping responsibilities.

Ms. Davis agreed and asked that staff inform participants at the January 20 work session that there are working groups already in place that are addressing many of the issues under discussion.

Mr. Emerine noted that the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group has evolved and has started to address some of the larger concerns of the TPB. He said it would be useful for TPB members to better understand various evaluation methodologies that are in place among different planning agencies.

Ms. Massie noted that if a project has gotten into the CLRP, it has already gone through an extensive selection and scoring process. She said she did not understand the problem that TPB members are concerned with. If the problem is with CLRP performance, she said that maybe there is a problem at the lower levels of project selection.

Mr. Malouff said that the goals and scorings systems that are used to select projects at the state and local levels may not be consistent with regional goals.

Mr. Davenport noted that mega-projects like I-66 had set off this discussion.

Ms. Davis said it is ironic that projects are derived from the local level but local officials on the TPB seem to be objecting to their inclusion in the CLRP.

Mr. Griffiths said these discussions present an opportunity to use the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group to look at projects from the regional perspective and identify projects that can help the region achieve its goals.

Mr. Brown said the CLRP is not a program and is not set in stone. The projects in the CLRP will change and will be further vetted.

Mr. Srikanth and Mr. Griffiths encouraged Technical Committee members to provide input and to invite their board members.

Mr. Brown said it would be helpful if an invitation or memo to the work sessions would come directly from TPB staff.

4. Update on Briefings regarding WMATA

Ms. Allison Davis, WMATA, provided an update for the WMATA presentation at the December 16 TPB meeting. She said that Harriet Tregoning, member of the WMATA Board of Directors, will speak for ten to fifteen minutes on specific roles the TPB and local jurisdictions can play to support WMATA now and into the future. Ms. Davis said that WMATA representatives hoped that TPB members would recognize this item as an opportunity for discussion rather than a question-and-answer session directed at Ms. Tregoning.

Mr. Srikanth encouraged committee members to review materials from the TPB November meeting on the WMATA presentations updating the TPB on Metro's capital improvement program, overall needs, structure, and challenges moving forward. Mr. Srikanth also asked members to focus on how funding challenges relate to service reliability and safety issues, as well as considering how board members – who have different responsibilities as TPB members, members of the WMATA board and as local jurisdiction representatives – can assist in addressing WMATA's challenges. He said examples could include local projects and strategies that maximize WMATA's services.

5. Update on a Draft Agreement between the TPB and the Calvert–St. Mary's Metropolitan Planning Organization (C-SMMPO)

Ms. Posey distributed a document that had been updated from that which had originally been posted for the item. She discussed a draft agreement between the TPB, the C-SMMPO, and Calvert Co., Maryland. She informed the group that there is a new MPO in southern Maryland. She indicated that Calvert County, which is a part of the new MPO, is also in the eight-hour ozone nonattainment area, which TPB includes in its conformity analysis. She noted that the TPB has always included Calvert County projects in its conformity analysis, and that the C-SMMPO would like to continue to have the TPB include Calvert County projects in the TPB conformity analysis. She said that TPB staff has drafted an agreement to formalize this procedure, which had been distributed in draft form along with a draft TPB resolution. She noted that the TPB would be asked to approve the resolution in January. Ms. Posey noted that Ms. Erickson had shared the agreement with the C-SMMPO.

Mr. Brown asked if the TPB would get any additional funds to include Calvert in this region's conformity analysis. Ms. Erickson indicated that the TPB already received funding for that purpose, and that there would be no increase.

6. Update on the Development of MAP-21 Performance Measures

Mr. Randall briefed the committee on updates to the US DOT regulations on performance measures under MAP-21, speaking to a presentation. He opened by stating that he would provide an overview, but that the committee would then hear from the folks actually developing the performance statistics for the region. He reviewed the schedule for publication of the proposed and/or final rulemakings for the five categories of performance rules. The final rulemaking of most interest to TPB staff, that for State and Metropolitan Planning, was scheduled to be published in May 2016. He specifically noted that if the rule does come out in that timeframe, the rule would become effective two years later, in May 2018, in which case the 2018 CLRP would have to meet all the new requirements under MAP-21 for the performance provisions.

Ms. Weissberg asked if there were any changes to the MAP-21 requirements in the new federal surface transportation reauthorization. Mr. Randall responded that there were almost no changes.

Mr. Randall noted that the Highway System Performance proposed rulemaking was expected at the end of November, but has yet to be published. He then spoke to the activities required to implement the performance provisions, including data collection from the three states, including the challenge of getting data for the sub-area of Fauquier County that is in the metropolitan planning area. He continued with comments on the activities of data analysis, forecasting trends, setting targets, and project programming. The projects in the TIP then

have to be linked to performance in system reports, which have yet to be developed or guidance received from the federal agencies.

Mr. Holloman asked about the number of performance measures. Mr. Randall clarified that these are specified in the rules and the board would have to set targets for each measure as specified, including the rules and measures yet to be released.

Mr. Schermann then spoke to the highway safety performance measures, recapping that they cover all public roads. He mentioned the target-setting process for the highway safety rules. He then covered the four performance rules for the highway safety area: number and rate of fatalities and number and rate of serious injuries. The sources of this data are specified in the rulemaking: the FARS database for fatalities, HPMS for VMT, and the serious injuries number from the states, in the near-term using the KABCO injury classification system. He spoke to the availability of this data, and the effort to collect for the planning area from the statewide data in the databases. Mr. Schermann then showed graphs of the fatality performance data for the region, by state and then with a five-year rolling average, and finally forecast through a straight line extrapolation. However, Maryland and Virginia use different methods to forecast fatalities and to set targets, and the challenge will be how to fit these different statewide techniques together for the metropolitan planning area. Mr. Schermann then spoke to next steps, including collecting all the required data and collaboration with the counterparts in each state on forecasting, target setting, and project programming.

Ms. Massie asked if safety projects in the TIP would have to match against respective safety targets in each state. Mr. Srikanth responded that not each project would need to be described, rather overall safety planning and the overall progress towards meeting safety targets.

Ms. McCall spoke to the performance measures for highway conditions, pavement condition and bridge condition. She opened by stating that these measure are quite complicated, and that more detailed information is in each handout, but for the presentation she would focus on just the Interstate data. The proposed rules came out in January, and described the process for states and MPOs to carry out the performance provisions. She showed the six performance measures, four for pavement condition (Interstate and National Highway System without the Interstate) and two for bridge condition, which has a complex set of sub-criteria on deck and structure. Data comes from HPMS and the National Bridge Inventory respectively.

Ms. McCall spoke to the data required for pavement condition, by extent, element, and measure. The 2014 data is the best available, with 2012 and 2013 data of lower quality with significant data elements missing. She shared some of the maps for data element availability in the region. For instance, significant lengths of the highway are not collected at 0.1 mile sections as required; nor, aside from in the District, is data collected in both directions on the Interstate.

Mr. Weissberg asked if the data came from jurisdictions, and she responded that the data is submitted by states in federal databases, but is available at a jurisdictional level. Mr. Randall added that the new rulemaking adds more extensive data collection requirements; hitherto the States have not needed to collect and report this data, so it's not that the States were not doing required data collection previously. Ms. McCall noted that much of the data was only collected on a sample basis in the past, but now the data is improving in quantity

and quality over time. Mr. Griffiths clarified that the States will be required to collect this more comprehensive data going forward under the rulemaking.

Ms. McCall then spoke to the pavement condition data, with a map showing that available and that missing for 2014, the latter in particular for Maryland. However, the regional measures are overall fairly good, with much of the pavement in the region rated good in 2014. She then showed the overall pavement rating, including figures for 2012 and 2013 as well as 2014. A considerable portion of data is missing, but for the data that is available, the percentage of pavement that is rated good has increased from 2012 to 2014.

Ms. McCall spoke to initial data for the bridge inventory, looking across all those on the NHS in the region. The rating is based on condition ratings as well as structural status and waterway adequacy. Only a small portion of data is missing, from 2012, so it's possible that data could be found. Overall, half the bridges in the region are rated good. She closed by repeating that detailed maps are included in the handout and asking if there were any questions.

Mr. Srikanth added his appraisal of the importance of the performance provisions, and that staff are now working on these mandated requirements, with staff experts working with those from each of the state agencies to further improve the data available. While primarily a state and MPO responsibility at this point, local jurisdiction staff should pay attention to these requirements and how the performance provisions will become part of the MPO required reporting and the 2018 amendment to the CLRP, which will authorize all projects in the region. The MPO will need to set targets across the areas of performance targets. Even though many of these areas are not new, for instance the States have long been required to establish state highway safety plans, but the work will be new for the MPO. Staff will be working with the regional agencies and learning from national best practices at other MPOs on how to best implement these new requirements.

7. Update on TPB TIGER Grant

Mr. Randall briefed the committee on the progress of the TPB's TIGER Grant, awarded in 2010. He spoke to memorandum distributed as part of the materials for the meeting. He noted that this memo is in response to the TPB's direction to provide an update on TIGER grant progress every other meeting, alternating between memos and presentations. The TPB received a memo update in September and then this memo for this month, with the board to be briefed again early next year. Just over half the grant funds have been reimbursed, with about \$25 million remaining, which means \$2.5 million needs to be expended and reimbursed each remaining month of the grant before it expires on September 30, 2016.

Mr. Randall said that slow but steady progress continues to be made on the projects of the grant, including the transit stations at the Pentagon, Franconia Springfield, and Takoma-Langley. A significant step forward has been made on the transit signal priority project, with initial testing having started at the beginning of November. One issue remaining is further proposed changes to the grant by WMATA and MDOT, which will need to be approved by FTA. WMATA will be requesting to remove the Army-Navy Drive Bus Bays project from the TIGER grant and MDOT will request to remove the TSP proposed for US 1 in Maryland, with funds from both projects being re-programmed for use at the transit centers, in the interest of the limited time remaining for expenditure and the cost-effectiveness of the projects.

Mr. Holloman asked about the performance reporting, and when this requirement starts. Mr. Randall clarified that each of the 16 projects needs a one year after and a two year after

performance monitoring report to be submitted to FTA. Work has been ongoing regarding data collection, and the first after report for the US 1 Transitway in Alexandria is now being prepared.

Mr. Griffiths asked about the time lag between expenditure and invoice reimbursement. Mr. Randall said that in many cases it takes months for invoices to be submitted. As the expiration of the grant draws near, the implementing agencies will be encouraged to get the invoices submitted as quickly as possible before the funds expire.

8. Draft Strategic Plan for Development of the Regional Travel Demand Model

Mr. Moran briefed the committee on both a strategic plan for development and improvement of the regional travel demand forecasting model and a short-term implementation plan, both of which had been included in the meeting materials. At the meeting, he distributed copies of his presentation slides. The strategic plan covers a seven-year period that includes both updates to the existing trip-based, four-step travel model (FSM) and an eventual transition to an activity-based travel model (ABM). Specifically, the strategic plan has three phases: 1) updates to the existing FSM (FY 16-17); 2) development of an ABM with existing data (FY 18-20); and 3) development of an ABM with new data, such as the new household travel survey (FY 21-20). The short-term implementation plan is focused on phase 1 of the strategic plan, namely on updates to the existing FSM to be made over the next two years.

Ms. Massie asked whether the FTA STOPS model, which is used for New Starts and Small Starts analyses, is an FSM or an ABM. Mr. Moran responded that it is neither of these, though it is most closely associated with a trip-based FSM. It is often used by regions that lack a formal FSM, but it is also getting used by regions that have a FSM (or potentially an ABM), because it reduces the need to supply model documentation to the FTA, since STOPS is already an FTA model.

Given the possible move to using parcel-level data in an ABM, or in a FSM to better model non-motorized trips, Mr. Brown asked whether COG would still use TAZs (Transportation Analysis Zones). Mr. Moran indicated that the trend seems to be to develop two sets of zones: small zones, derived from aggregations of parcels, and large zones (traditional TAZs). The small zones are often used for modeling non-motorized trips and the larger zones are used for other steps, such as traffic assignment. Mr. Moran noted that TPB staff does not plan to do parcel-level forecasting. Mr. Brown suggested that TPB staff could potentially make use of the smaller sized TAZs that many counties have already developed for their county-focused travel models. Mr. Moran indicated that that would be investigated. Mr. Weissberg noted that it would be useful to coordinate with the local governments in this area. Mr. Moran stressed the importance of learning from the work being done by the Baltimore Metropolitan Council (BMC), which is in year three of a three-year transition to an ABM. Mr. Moran noted that BMC models many of our jurisdictions (e.g., Maryland counties and the District of Columbia) in their model.

Mr. Thomas asked whether the funding levels proposed for the three phases of the strategic plan fit within the current planned funding levels for the TPB UPWP. Mr. Srikanth and Mr. Griffiths said that they expected the proposed funding levels could be accommodated. Mr. Griffiths also noted that, in the past, TPB staff had put together a parcel-level file, which could be good for simulating existing conditions, but there is no plan to forecast the future at the parcel level. He added that we would not have the Cooperative Forecasts done at the parcel level.

Mr. Orleans asked about how well taxi cab trips are modeled in the current TPB model. Mr. Moran said that taxi cab trips are represented in the existing model, as “exogenous” trips, based on previous survey data, but he noted that the data is old and that it is hard to conduct surveys that capture good taxi cab data. Mr. Moran noted that he did not know of any regions that do an exemplary job of modeling taxi trips, but he also noted that taxi trips represent a small share of overall trips, so it is a lower priority than some other areas identified for improvement. Mr. Moran mentioned that we are working on ways to improve visitor/tourist trips, which would include some taxi trips, by using new data sources, such as AirSage data, which is derived from aggregated and anonymized information about the movement of mobile phones and other similar devices. Lastly, Mr. Orleans asked whether TPB staff is working with the local jurisdictions to get better taxi cab data, including, possibly, obtaining data from ride-hailing companies such as Uber or Lyft. Mr. Moran noted that TPB staff has not yet obtained such data. He noted that though Uber has shared some data with Boston, he was not aware of any agreement yet to share such data with the Washington, D.C. area.

9. Washington-Baltimore Regional Air System Plan Ground Access Forecast Update and Ground Access Element Update

Mr. Roisman presented his information on the airport ground access forecasts and airport ground access element update. Significant growth is forecast for airport ground access trips (trips to and from the airport using the regional highway network and regional transit network), and that growth is forecast to be higher than corresponding growth in regional population, regional employment, and regional vehicle-miles of travel (keeping in mind that the air systems planning region is larger than the TPB surface transportation planning region). The airport ground access element is a synchronizing mechanism that links the air system planning process with the regional surface transportation planning process. There are linkages between the air systems planning activities and the TPB Vision and RTPP. Mr. Roisman reminded the committee of the importance of maintaining and improving access to the region’s three commercial service airports (Reagan National, Dulles, and BWI Marshall) as the Call for Projects for the 2016 CLRP is released. He also reminded the committee of the massive regional economic impact of the airports. Finally, he noted that he would be seeking airport input to the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group for landside improvements.

A committee member asked Mr. Roisman for information on his presentation comment regarding the parking situation at Reagan National. Mr. Roisman responded that parking at National is a known supply-side constraint at the airport and is increasingly scarce during times of peak operation; however, MWAA has embarked on a parking study at the airport to implement solutions.

A committee member asked about issues regarding western access to Dulles. Mr. Roisman responded that he is aware of a number of contentious issues surrounding recently proposed roadways to gain western access to the airport, but regardless of concerns about specific facilities, western access to the airport remains a known issue to be addressed.

A committee member asked if specific mode of access data for taxis was available. Mr. Roisman responded that he did and could provide them.

10. Update on the Transform 66 Multimodal Corridor Improvement Projects

Mr. Norman Whitaker, VDOT, provided an update on the “Transform I-66 Multimodal Corridor Improvement” projects, especially outside the Beltway. Since the adoption of alternative 2B, as part of the 2015 CLRP, there have been some changes to the new Preferred Alternative, especially due to the robust community involvement process, that will be part of future Air Quality Conformity and CLRP updates.

Mr. Whitaker guided committee members on two exhibits, to be presented at the December TPB meeting, indicating the significant differences between the 2015 CLRP adopted alternative 2B and the more recently adopted Preferred Alternative by the Commonwealth Transportation Board. These changes would be brought back for CLRP amendments. Changes include two additional access to express lanes (Route 234 and Route 50) and an additional slip-ramp at the Route 28 interchange. A regional model was used to identify differences in regional demand by three metrics between alternative 2B and the Preferred Alternative. The differences in person trips, transit modal share, and vehicle miles travelled between the two alternatives were insignificant at a regional level.

Mr. Whitaker also noted that many of the changes would not have impacts on the air quality conformity of the CLRP and would typically not need to be included. These include, as part of a revised alternative 2B, preservation of ride-a-way options for providing future transit services in western part of I-66 and lessening the footprint of the I-66 and I-495 interchange to have fewer impacts on surrounding neighborhoods.

11. Update on the TPB Working Group on Unfunded Capital Needs

Mr. Swanson briefly gave an update on the Unfunded Capital Needs Working Group. He said the group in November had preliminarily agreed to a work plan, which has three phases extending over the next three fiscal years. The first phase would use the TPB’s travel demand models to analyze an “All Build” scenario comprising the full inventory of unfunded projects (roughly 500 transit and road projects) along with a “No Build” scenario that would exclude all new projects (including the CLRP projects). The second phase would be the development of a Plan of Unfunded Capital Priority Projects that would feature a limited set of multi-modal projects that have potential to improve the performance of the region's transportation system. The third phase would focus on the development of the 2018 long-range plan, which would include the unfunded priorities as well as a constrained element.

12. Adjourn

To conclude the meeting, Mr. Srikanth thanked Mr. Rawlings for chairing the committee in 2015. He announced that Mr. Roseboom from the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation would chair the committee in 2016.

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – December 4, 2015**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County Ben Yakley
Frederick County David Whitaker
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
 Kari Snyder
 Samantha Biddle (SHA)
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax -----
Fairfax County Malcom Watson
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
NVTA Sree Nampoothiri
NVTC David Koch
Prince William County James Davenport
PRTC Betsy Massie
VRE Sonali Soneji
VDOT Norman Whitaker
 Andy Beacher
VDRPT Todd Horsley
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

Allison Davis

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Nick Ramfos, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Bill Bacon, DTP
Anant Choudhary, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Ben Hampton, DTP
Bryan Hayes, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Nicole McCall, DTP
Jessica Mirr, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Jinchul Park, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Wenjing Pu, DTP
Eric Randall, DTP
Sergio Ritacco, DTP
Rich Roisman, DTP
Jon Schermann, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Dusan Vuksan, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS

OTHER

Bill Orleans
Alex Brun (MDE)