

TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ITEM #1



National Capital Region  
**Transportation Planning Board**

---

Technical Committee Minutes

For meeting of  
October 7, 2016

---

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD  
Technical Committee Meeting

---

**Minutes**

**1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the September 9 Technical Committee Meeting**

The minutes were approved as written.

**2. Overview of the Draft 2016 CLRP Amendment and FY 2017-2022 TIP**

Ms. Erickson introduced the first three presentations that would cover the project inputs for the CLRP Amendment, the FY 2017-2022 TIP, the air quality conformity analysis, and the CLRP performance analysis.

Mr. Austin spoke to the presentation included in the meeting materials. The presentation covered the basic requirements of the CLRP, a summary of new major projects and changes to major projects already included in the Plan, the relationship between the CLRP and the TIP, and a brief financial report on the draft FY 2017-2022 TIP.

During the presentation, Mr. Srikanth spoke to a set of requirements pertaining to the I-395 Express Lanes project that the TPB had requested when it approved the project submissions for inclusion in the Air Quality Conformity Analysis in March 2016. These conditions required VDOT to complete a transit/TDM study and to identify a guaranteed amount of funding to implement any proposed transit and TDM projects. Mr. Srikanth stated that the transit/TDM study was nearing completion and that the TPB could be briefed on it in the upcoming months. He also said that an agreement had been reached to annually contribute \$15 million each year to implement and fund transit and TDM programs in the I-395 corridor. He noted that discussions were ongoing as to whether and how this amount would be adjusted with regard to inflation. Mr. Srikanth said that staff felt comfortable recommending to the board that VDOT had met the conditions of the resolution passed in March.

Mr. Roseboom added that the draft study had been presented to PRTC and would be presented to FAMPO soon, with a final draft being released in November and approved in December 2016.

Mr. Whitaker referenced a letter that had been released that day reaffirming the commitment to funding transit and TDM programs and acknowledging the need for adjustments according to inflation.

Mr. Erenrich asked how a \$2-3 billion price tag could be justified under the “constraint” of the CLRP. Mr. Srikanth noted that the 2014 CLRP Financial Analysis included significant amounts of revenue (including NVTAF funding) that had not been allocated to specific projects at that time, and this cost variation was covered by that surplus. Mr. Srikanth also noted that a significant portion of funding for the project is expected to be covered by private contributions through the PPTA.

Mr. Weissberg asked about the funding for the MD 4/Suitland Parkway Interchange project. Mr. Austin said that the funding shown was only that programmed between fiscal years 2017 and 2022, and would not reflect any funding shown previously or beyond 2022. Ms. Snyder

responded that she would look into the funding for the project in the CTP and get back to Mr. Weissberg.

Mr. Austin stated that the materials for the CLRP Amendment and the draft TIP would be out for public comment between October 13 and November 12. He said that comments would be posted online and that significant comments received would be passed along to the appropriate implementing agencies, as necessary, to begin developing responses.

Mr. Erenrich asked what the board would be asked to approve in November. Mr. Austin stated that the TPB would be asked to approve the Air Quality Conformity Analysis, the projects included in the 2016 CLRP Amendment, the draft FY 2017-2022 TIP, and the self-certification document.

Mr. Srikanth asked agency staff to monitor comments as they are received and begin developing responses as necessary. He also commented on a request that had been made at the Public Forum on the draft FY 2017-2022 TIP to use graphs to better explain the funding breakdown between jurisdictions, etc. He noted the difficulty with this request due to the staggered schedule of inputs to the TIP and suggested that committee members be prepared to respond to questions about funding levels in the TIP. He asked for any comments on the presentation that might help make this point clearer. Mr. Whitaker offered to provide some talking points as to the status of the Virginia inputs to the TIP.

### **3. Briefing on the Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the 2016 CLRP Amendment**

Ms. Posey mentioned that there were four documents with the item: 1) the summary conformity report, 2) the conformity project input table, 3) a memo to the TPB about the revocation of the 1997 fine particles standard, and 4) a copy of the slide presentation. She noted that the pollutants included in the analysis are ozone season VOC and NO<sub>x</sub>. She stated that EPA revoked the 1997 standard for fine particles and explained that the implication of the revocation is that the region no longer has to do air quality conformity determinations for fine particles pollutants, and that all the charts and graphs related to fine particles pollutants would be removed from the conformity report. She noted that her memo to the TPB on the subject gave more details. She reminded the group that the region also does not need to analyze Winter CO anymore, since the 20-year maintenance period ended in the Spring of 2016. Ms. Posey reviewed the key technical inputs, including new Round 9.0 Cooperative Forecasts, new project inputs, the Version 2.3.66 travel demand model, 2014 VIN data, and use of EPA's MOVES2014a emissions model. She listed the analysis years, and showed a map of the geographic areas involved in the analysis. She showed vehicle and transit trips and VMT through time, and noted that even with the increase in VMT there is a slight decrease in VMT per capita. She also reviewed emissions graphs and noted that emissions levels for ozone season VOC and NO<sub>x</sub> are below mobile budgets and showed a table of emissions reductions associated with TERMS. She noted that the public comment period runs from October 13 to November 12, and that the TPB would be asked to approve the conformity analysis, along with the TIP and the CLRP at its November meeting.

Ms. Posey mentioned two additional activities that would affect future conformity analyses. The first was that MWAQC is developing a maintenance plan for the 2008 ozone standard that will contain mobile budgets, which, once approved by EPA, will have to be used in the conformity analyses. She noted that the budgets are scheduled to be set next Spring. The second is that the state air agencies have just submitted recommendations to EPA regarding geography and non-attainment designations for the 2015 ozone standard. She noted that MDE (possibly) and DDOE have recommended expansion of the non-attainment area, to

include Baltimore's MPO and possibly a larger area. She indicated that staff has concerns, similar to those expressed related to the MPO planning rule that expands MPO boundaries, about increasing the non-attainment area.

Mr. Lake asked why MDE wants to expand the area. Ms. Posey responded that it is partly related to ozone transport. She also mentioned that MDE has made this recommendation in the past and it has been ignored by EPA.

Mr. Erenrich asked why there was no greenhouse gas analysis. Ms. Posey responded that greenhouse gas levels would be discussed in the performance analysis in the next item.

Mr. Srikanth invited Mr. Walz to comment. Mr. Walz noted that MDE explained that they were interested in increasing the non-attainment area to address equity in ozone transport concerns.

#### **4. Briefing on the Performance Analysis of the Draft 2016 C:RP Amendment**

Mr. Swanson and Mr. Ritacco briefed the committee on a performance analysis of the Draft 2016 CLRP Amendment. The analysis included a review of CLRP inputs as it relates to overarching strategies in the TPB's Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP), including maintenance, transit improvements, targeted congestion relief, and activity centers. Then, the analysis reviewed indicators on the following information: transit accessibility and connectivity, mode share and travel demand, roadway congestion, job accessibility, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions.

Mr. Weissberg and Mr. Erenrich asked if a breakdown of delay, specifically Total Daily Vehicle Hours of Delay or Average Minutes of Delay per Vehicle Trip, is available, or, if a total distance measurement is available at the sub-regional level. Mr. Vuksan responded that for the CLRP analysis, that level of detail was not typical, and may require a significant amount of resources to collect figures with high level of confidence. Mr. Erenrich noted, with agreement by Mr. Weissberg, that the geographic specificity would be helpful at core, inner, and outer geographic areas because of the variability one may experience across the region. He also said this might provide better information about the effectiveness of some transit projects.

Mr. Weissberg noted the importance of highlighting the regional differences noted in the Access to Jobs by Auto within a 45-minute trip in order to gain a better understanding of these difference and to potentially identify solutions.

Ms. Davis asked why is there such a marked difference between the access to jobs by auto within a 45-minute trip between Arlington County and City of Alexandria compared to the District of Columbia. Mr. Milone noted the importance of bridge congestion.

Mr. Holloman asked if teleworking was captured in the employment projections. Mr. Sivasailam noted that this is captured indirectly through model validation of current conditions. Mr. Srikanth added that the region's employment projections are captured through an in-depth econometrics model of total employment of the region. He also said that the 2007-2008 Household Travel Survey gets into detail on how people work and is used to calibrate the model. The new Household Travel Survey will be started next year.

Mr. Emerine asked to what degree the commitment funding to maintenance in the 2014 CLRP financial analysis is consistent with the current challenges faced by Metro. Mr. Srikanth noted that any level of maintenance may have elements of subjectivity. However, he

said the analysis for the 2014 CLRP was based on financial inputs provided by the TPB's members jurisdictions that look at cost estimates and associated revenue projections.

Mr. Erenrich asked for clarification on the time period, either peak-period or peak-hour, on certain indicators. Noting that presenting peak-hour traffic delay or congestion is likely not the best approach as it may not be the goal or objective for the region's transportation network to solve a peak-hour challenge.

Mr. Davenport asked for clarification on HOV & Carpool mode-share for all trips and work trips. He said this seemed to be mislabeled. Mr. Ritacco clarified that HOV & Carpool refers to any auto trip with two or more individuals.

Mr. Weissberg stressed the importance of drilling down deeper to the issues associated with the geographic differences noted in the Access to Jobs with a 45-minute trip indicator. Mr. Srikanth noted how that will not be part of the CLRP Performance Analysis and noted that previous scenario analysis looked at this issue. He said it may be worthwhile to bring back this past work to explore this topic further. Mr. Weissberg stressed the importance of the connection between land-use changes and the region's transportation network.

Mr. Srikanth noted that there would not be a pre-work session at the TPB to review the Performance Analysis of the 2016 CLRP Amendment. He said that the time allocated on this TPB agenda to the presentation would not be long.

## **5. Briefing on Federal Planning Regulations**

Mr. Randall updated the committee on developments in federal rulemaking, including that for performance planning and programming. He referred to the memorandum included in the mail-out, which covered the items that will be presented to the TPB at their October 19 meeting, specifically focusing on the transit asset management rulemaking. The committee was briefed on this rule at their September meeting, so it would not be repeated. However, he would be providing an overall update, using a presentation.

Mr. Randall started with an update on the proposed rulemaking on MPO planning area reform. The committee was briefed about this in July and in September, including the submission of formal comments by the August 26 deadline. Due to many responses, the comment period has been re-opened by USDOT, along with a request for more information in response to three questions. TPB staff expect to submit a letter in response to this extended request, which will be developed in time for submission by October 24.

He gave the latest schedule for publication of the proposed and/or final rulemakings for the five categories of performance rules. The final Statewide and Metropolitan Planning rule was published in May and the System Performance draft rule was published in April. The transit asset management (TAM) was final in July and the transit safety rule should be coming out in final form later this month. He then displayed a slide with a calendar for 2017 and 2018, with the months that DOTs and Transit Agencies would set targets in each of their respective PBPP areas, followed within 180 days by the MPO. Targets would thereafter be set annually for transit assets and for safety, highway and transit, and biennially for highway condition and system performance. The dates shown are still preliminary for the highway conditions and system performance, pending the final rules. The only targets that will have to be set by the TPB in 2017 are the transit asset targets, but then early 2018 will require setting targets in many more PBPP areas.

Mr. Randall explained the coordination that is required between transit agencies and MPOs on transit assets, and eventually transit safety, including how projects are reported and added to the TIP and CLRP. The TIP and CLRP will have to be restructured to collect data on how each project will affect PBPP performance, which will then have to be reported on. Agreement on written responsibilities is also required, and TPB will have to work with all stakeholder agencies to develop this; next step is a formal letter to invite participation.

Mr. Roseboom noted for the Virginia jurisdictions with transit systems that the Governor's Transportation Conference would take place October 19 and 20. DRPT will have a grantee workshop and will also cover asset management requirements for grant recipient systems.

A committee member asked how much staff time would be needed to comply with the PBPP requirements. Mr. Randall responded that the UPWP lays out the estimate for TPB staff time in FY 2017. For transit agencies, the Federal Register notice included discussion of the anticipated time and resources required to comply.

## **6. Update on the Regional "Street Smart" Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Education Campaign**

Mr. Farrell spoke to a PowerPoint. He briefed the committee on the outcomes of the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 campaigns, and on the plans for the Fall 2016 and Spring 2017 campaigns.

Mr. Farrell said the Annual Report for FY 2016 has been posted on the web site. The budget was \$750,000 in federal FY 2016, and is expected to be \$760,000 in FY 2017. The Fall press event was held in Alexandria, and the Spring press event at Silver Spring Transit Center. One new element in Spring 2016 was Enforcement Activations, which were scheduled enforcement actions. The press was given notice of these actions and encouraged to cover them.

Mr. Farrell said the pre- and post-campaign survey, held in Spring 2016, is the main evaluation tool for the campaign. He said the project has been using the same creative for four years, with nearly the same messaging, so the project is able to show the increase in message awareness from year to year. He said the campaign may be approaching saturation levels of awareness with this particular creative.

For Fall 2016 he said the program will emphasize visibility, with the change to daylight savings time. Tentative date for the press event is November 4. Suggested enforcement dates are October 31–November 27. The press event will be held in the United Medical Center on Southern Avenue in SE DC.

Mr. Farrell played a three-minute video summarizing the FY 2016 campaign.

Mr. Malouff asked if it would be possible for the TPB Technical Committee to review the creative materials before they are released. He expressed concerns about the "Don't be Caught Dead Wearing Black – When it's dark wear something light or reflective" message. He asked that this message not be used again in the new creative. He said it is not reasonable to ask people to use special equipment for the normal behavior of walking, which gives the impression that walking is unsafe.

Mr. Farrell suggested that Arlington send a representative to the advisory group to provide input. He said that staff invites everyone to send a representative to the advisory group. He said the "Don't be caught Dead" message is one of a menu of different messages that will be used. He promised to convey the concern to the advisory group.

Mr. Malouff said that the message was very unpopular with pedestrian safety groups and harmed the credibility of the Street Smart campaign.

Mr. Srikanth said that visibility when walking at night is a legitimate safety issue, and there needs to be some way to convey that. Mr. Malouff said that it was unacceptable to ask someone to wear a reflector to walk at night. Ms. Snyder said that wearing black next to a dark roadway, and not paying attention or wearing headphones, might be dangerous.

Mr. Farrell said that given the number of funding agencies and stakeholders in this program, the best way to avoid getting contradictory feedback from different agencies was for all interested parties to provide input at the advisory group. Mr. Malouff agreed and asked to be notified about the next advisory group meeting.

#### **7. Briefing on Phase 1 of the Proposed Enhancements to the Title VI / Environmental Justice Analysis of the CLRP**

Ms. Klancher briefed the committee on the overall purpose and phasing of the proposed enhanced Title VI and Environmental Justice (EJ) analysis of the CLRP using a PowerPoint presentation. A memorandum to the Technical Committee with more details about the EJ analysis was distributed. Phase 1 of the analysis identifies “Communities of Concern” to be used to analyze the 2016 CLRP amendment for disproportionately high adverse impacts on low-income and minority populations. Ms. Klancher described the stakeholder meetings with local land use planning directors held before this item was brought to the Technical Committee, and that a presentation was made on September 16 to the COG Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee for vetting of the methodology and map of “Communities of Concern.” She said the feedback from these meetings has been positive and there is a general consensus around the methodology used, in that it identifies areas in the region that have the greatest concentrations of traditionally disadvantaged population groups. Ms. Klancher stated that the Planning Directors had until October 7 to comment, and that no comments had been received to date. The “Communities of Concern” will be presented to the TPB in November or December. Phase 2 of the project will begin after the TPB concurs with the “Communities of Concern.” She said that Phase 2 will include the analysis of the 2016 CLRP amendment for disproportionately high and adverse impacts on low-income and minority populations in 2040.

Mr. Ritacco presented the key enhancement to the new EJ analysis of the CLRP: the identification of “Communities of Concern,” also using the PowerPoint presentation for this item. Mr. Ritacco stated that the “Communities of Concern” are small geographic areas that have significant concentrations of low-income or minority populations identified using an index based on tract-level demographic data from the U.S. Census 2010-2014 American Community Survey. The methodology used to identify these areas is based on regional averages for four population groups: Low-Income, African-American, Asian and Latino-Hispanic. Mr. Ritacco then reviewed an interactive web-based map that shows the concentrations of these four populations, the Communities of Concern, major CLRP transit and highway improvements and the COG Activity Centers. Individual maps and Census data tables were created for each TPB member jurisdiction to facilitate the review.

Mr. Weissberg questioned the inclusion of communities without a concentration of low-income persons and recommended including additional factors like single-vehicle households. Mr. Roseboom noted that including racial or ethnic groups are required by Title VI. Ms. Klancher responded that the methodology uses the Title VI populations Mr. Weissberg recommended, and that the map was vetted with M-NCPPC Prince George’s County, and that

there was a comfort level with the revised methodology that places greater weight on low-income populations in determining if an area is considered a “Community of Concern.” Mr. Weissberg clarified that maybe minority status alone should receive the same weight as low-income, and stated that planners from Prince George’s County had concerns about the methodology.

Mr. Srikanth stressed to the committee that they would have access to all the data and information used to develop the Communities of Concern, and that each jurisdiction’s Planning Director was asked to comment on the methodology and the associated results in the vetting meetings. Mr. Srikanth noted that, based on input from vetting meetings with Planning Directors, the current methodology places a greater weight on low-income populations in determining if an area is considered a “Community of Concern.”

Mr. Weissberg stated that the methodology should consider households with no vehicles. Ms. Klancher responded by saying that those households are represented. She said that staff did an informal analysis looking at travel characteristics from the Census data and found that the Communities of Concern include many of the places with limited access to vehicles.

Mr. Skiles noted that in some instances examining the concentration of a single minority group may be important, noting examples of discrimination and adverse impact of projects in North Carolina and Florida. Mr. Skiles also added that some high-income minority communities could be subject to negative impacts. Mr. Ritacco responded by describing that the methodology tries to take some of that into consideration.

Mr. Erenrich asked why the housing and transportation index was not used for the identification of areas. Ms. Klancher responded by noting that staff had reviewed and considered using it but focused on data sources directly from the U.S. Census. Ms. Klancher suggested overlaying the index with the Communities of Concern to see to what degree there are similarities. Mr. Erenrich noted that the impact could be different, that is, the amount of transportation disadvantage may change if someone is living near transit and activity centers, reducing one’s overall transportation cost. Ms. Klancher stressed the overall objective of the Communities of Concern which is to analyze the impact of the CLRP in 2040 on Communities of Concern on a variety of indicators, including forecast travel measures such as “accessibility to jobs” and travel times.

Mr. Weissberg stated that the inclusion of additional factors, like housing and transportation costs, may be useful and stressed that certain minority groups may be impacted more negatively than others and that it would be important for the methodology to capture that. Ms. Klancher noted the many different methodologies tested prior to the final one, and many others identified more than 50% of the tracts in the region a “Community of Concern” and that the current method focused on significant concentrations of traditionally-disadvantaged population groups.

The committee was encouraged to submit comments to Ms. Klancher on the proposed enhancements to the EJ analysis by the deadline of October 21.

#### **8. Briefing on Transportation Strategies in the Proposed Action Plan of COG’s Climate, Energy, and Environmental Policy Committee (CEEPC)**

Mr. Sivasailam provided the background on his memo and the attachments detailing the proposed transportation sector strategies under consideration by the Climate Environment and Energy Policy Committee (CEEPC). The climate action plan is updated every three years and the strategies are under consideration for inclusion in the 2017-2020 climate action



plan. There is an annual progress report prepared by staff using a survey of local agencies. He shared the link for the 2014 action plan and the last progress report. He also introduced Mr. Walz and Ms. Davis of COG's Department of Environmental Programs and asked them to comment. Mr. Srikanth and Mr. Walz said that in the past, the strategies were developed without input from the TPB Technical Committee and this time they want to work with The Technical Committee by holding a joint session with CEEPC's Technical Committee in November or December as they finalize the action plan. Mr. Srikanth also clarified that many of the strategies in the attachment are in the current action plan and would could be added to the action plan.

Mr. Emerine wanted clarification that if a jurisdiction wants to implement Strategy A and not Strategy B it does not mean Strategy B will be removed from the list. Mr. Walz agreed it is voluntary and jurisdictions are encouraged to implement strategies but not necessarily all of them. In response to Mr. Brown who questioned one of the strategies which called upon jurisdictions to "adopt anti-idling policies for public fleets," Mr. Srikanth clarified that it is one way of achieving efficiency of public sector fleet and there are other approaches to achieving the same results that are included in the list of options.

#### **9. Update on Long-Range Plan Task Force**

Mr. Srikanth provided a brief update on the work of the Long-Range Plan Task Force. He said that work on Phase I activities had been completed, including analysis of an All-Build Scenario, which was presented at a work session on September 21. He said that staff was developing a report for Phase I, which would be released in draft form in November and would be presented to the TPB in December. He said the contents from this Phase I report would be used for the development of an unfunded portion of the 2018 long-range plan. He said that after Phase I was completed, the task force would determine an approach for Phase II, which will identify a limited set of high-priority projects. Work under Phase II will occur in calendar year 2017.

Mr. Davenport asked if Mr. Srikanth thought agreement could be reached on a limited set of projects.

Mr. Srikanth said that one approach might be for member jurisdictions to nominate projects.

#### **10. Briefing on the TPB Traffic Incident Response Conference on November 2**

Mr. Meese reported on this upcoming conference. He said this TPB-requested event had now been set to take place at COG on Wednesday, November 2, 2016 (updated from a previously announced tentative date of October 25). Tentatively, the conference would run from 9:00 AM to 12:00 Noon, but this was still to be confirmed pending speaker availability.

Conference planning was being coordinated closely with the MATOC Steering Committee and MATOC Operations Subcommittee. Mr. Meese noted that the state department of transportation representatives who are involved in planning the event are largely MATOC contacts. He said they are different from the TPB Technical Committee's state department of transportation participants. He said they include Mr. Dey of DDOT, Mr. Sagal of MDOT-SHA, and Mr. Sripathi of VDOT. Discussions have also been held with the National Park Service, which will be involved, as well as MATOC staff.

Mr. Meese said the event was envisioned to be structured in three sessions – a panel on traffic incident management success stories and challenges in the National Capital Region; a panel featuring speakers from other states or metropolitan areas on interesting or innovative

practices in those areas; and a session on opportunities for follow-on action. The event was envisioned to focus on the policy level, including TPB board members and other senior managers. He said it is not intended to be a practitioner conference that would get into details of on-scene practices. He said that conference planning was on the agenda of the TPB Steering Committee meeting later that day (October 7) for further discussion. It was hoped that loose ends in the event planning would be resolved by the time of the TPB mailout, in order to get a brochure into that mailout.

In response to a question from Mr. Malouff on outreach to attendees, Mr. Meese stated that they would be reaching out to the TPB Board members themselves as a target audience, along with other senior managers, noting that this is not a practitioner/field personnel-oriented conference, since MATOC had just conducted one of those in April 2016. A focus would be on future agreements or future funding opportunities.

Mr. Srikanth added that it has been noted that 50 percent of congestion on a given day is related to incidents. So the question is in this multi-state, multi-jurisdictional region, is how we can be more efficient in managing and clearing those incidents. The practitioners will have an opportunity to describe how they manage and clear an incident, but they will also have an opportunity to say what challenges they are facing.

In response to a question from Ms. Snyder, Mr. Srikanth stated there would be a webinar option for the conference.

#### **11. Briefing on GSA Central Business Areas (CBA) Designation**

Mr. DesJardin stated that the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) has been working with COG and local planning departments to identify Central Business Areas (CBAs) for locating future federal facilities. Mr. DesJardin stated that transportation service— with preference for transit— is among the GSA criteria for determining the suitability of individual CBAs. Mr. DesJardin mentioned that local planning department staff may be contacting Technical Committee members/local transportation planning staff to assist with the transportation service measures. Mr. Emerine noted the importance of this work and suggested that the Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee may be useful in helping determine regional local and regional transit service levels for the CBAs.

#### **12. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 noon.

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE – October 7, 2016**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings  
DCOP Dan Emerine

MARYLAND

Charles County -----  
Frederick County David Whitaker  
City of Frederick -----  
Gaithersburg -----  
Montgomery County Gary Erenrich  
Prince George's County Victor Weissberg  
Rockville -----  
M-NCPPC  
Montgomery County -----  
Prince George's County -----  
MDOT Kari Snyder  
Ted Yurek  
David Rodgers  
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman  
Arlington County Dan Malouff  
City of Fairfax -----  
Fairfax County Mike Lake  
Falls Church -----  
Fauquier County -----  
Loudoun County Robert Brown  
Manassas -----  
NVTA Sree Nampoothiri  
Harun Rashid  
NVTC -----  
Prince William County James Davenport  
PRTC -----  
VRE Christine Hoeffner  
VDOT Norman Whitaker  
VDRPT Tim Roseboom  
NVPDC -----  
VDOA -----  
WMATA Allison Davis

FEDERAL/REGIONAL

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

COG STAFF

Kanti Srikanth, DTP  
Lyn Erickson, DTP  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Andrew Meese, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Bill Bacon, DTP  
Anant Choudhary, DTP  
Michael Farrell, DTP  
Ben Hampton, DTP  
Bryan Hayes, DTP  
Charlene Howard, DTP  
Ken Joh, DTP  
Wendy Klancher, DTP  
Nicole McCall, DTP  
Jessica Mirr, DTP  
Mark Moran, DTP  
Erin Morrow, DTP  
Dzung Ngo, DTP  
Jinchul Park, DTP  
Jane Posey, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Sergio Ritacco, DTP  
Jon Schermann, DTP  
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP  
John Swanson, DTP  
Dusan Vuksan, DTP  
Feng Xie, DTP  
Abigail Zenner, DTP  
Greg Goodwin, DCPS  
Steve Walz, DEP  
Sunil Kumar, DEP  
Maia Davis, DEP  
Paul DesJardin, DEP

OTHER

Alex Brun, MDE  
David Jordan, VDOT  
Bill Orleans  
Dan Painter, VDOT  
David Skiles