

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE  
ITEM #1**

# **TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD**

---

## **Technical Committee Minutes**

For meeting of  
**April 4, 2014**

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES  
ATTENDANCE -April 4, 2014**

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DDOT                    Mark Rawlings  
                             Maurice Keys  
DCOP                    Dan Emerine

**MARYLAND**

Charles County        -----  
Frederick Co.         Ron Burns  
City of Frederick     Tim Davis  
Gaithersburg         Dennis Enslinger  
Montgomery Co.      Gary Erenrich  
Prince George's Co.  -----  
Rockville             -----  
M-NCPPC  
  Montgomery Co.    -----  
  Prince George's Co. -----  
MDOT                 Lyn Erickson  
                             Dami Kehinde  
                             Matt Baker

MTA  
Takoma Park         -----

**VIRGINIA**

Alexandria            Pierre Holloman  
Arlington Co.        Dan Malouff  
City of Fairfax        -----  
Fairfax Co.            Mike Lake  
                             Malcolm Watson  
Falls Church         -----  
Loudoun Co.          Robert Brown  
Manassas             -----  
Prince William Co.  Monica Backmon  
NVTC                  Claire Gron  
PRTC                  Nick Alexandrow  
VRE                    Christine Hoeffner  
VDOT                 Kanathur Srikanth  
                             Norman Whitaker  
VDRPT                Tim Roseboom  
NVPDC                -----  
VDOA                 -----

**WMATA**

WMATA                Danielle Wesolek

**FEDERAL/OTHER**

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

**COG Staff**

Gerald Miller, DTP  
Robert Griffiths, DTP  
Chuck Bean, COG  
Ron Milone, DTP  
Andrew Austin, DTP  
Jane Posey, DTP  
Andrew Meese, DTP  
Elena Constantine, DTP  
Eric Randall, DTP  
Rich Roisman, DTP  
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP  
John Swanson, DTP  
Sarah Crawford, DTP  
Ben Hampton, DTP  
William Bacon, DTP  
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP  
Jessica Mirr, DTP  
Jon Schermann, DTP  
Charlene Howard, DTP  
Paul DesJardin, DCPS

**Other Attendees**

Tom Hichey, VRE  
Bill Orleans

---

## TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

### Technical Committee Meeting

---

#### Technical Committee Minutes

#### 1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from March 7 Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

#### 2. **Briefing on Regional Bike to Work Day 2014**

Mr. Ramfos distributed a PowerPoint presentation regarding upcoming activities for the region's Bike to Work Day event. He stated that Bike to Work Day will be held on Friday, May 16th and the event was implemented regionally by Commuter Connections in 2001. Participation in the event had over 14,650 event participants last year and 17,000 participants were expected for this year's event.

Next, Mr. Ramfos stated that a regional survey is conducted of Bike To Work Day event participants every three years as part of the Commuter Connections Mass Marketing TERM Analysis. The purpose of survey is to measure impacts of event participation and to assess use of bicycles for commute travel before and after event. Mr. Ramfos stated that survey results are used in the regional TERM Analysis Report. The last survey was administered in 2013 via e-mail to 14,653 event participants and there were 4,255 completed questionnaires were received, representing a 29% response rate.

Mr. Ramfos reviewed additional results from the survey including that 2013 was the first Bike to Work Day event for 26% of the respondents. Seventeen percent of the respondents had never commuted by bike before participating in Bike to Work Day. Eight percent of participants started riding to work after the event and 21% started riding more often.

Next, Mr. Ramfos stated that there are several elected officials, including TPB members, who participate in the regional Bike to Work Day event and showed photographs of some of those participating at the pit stops from last year's event.

Mr. Ramfos stated that Bike to Work Day coincides with National Bike to Work week. The event participation goal set for 2014 is a 10% increase from last year and translates to about 17,000 event participants. The TPB is slated to review and approve a Proclamation during their meeting this month. There will be a record 79 "pit stop" celebrations throughout region. There are seven new pit stops throughout the region this year including: the Metro station at Fort Totten in the District of Columbia, the Del Ray neighborhood in the City of Alexandria, Columbia Pike in Arlington, Meigs Park in Georgetown, McLean. Fair Lakes, and the US Census in Suitland.

Next, Mr. Ramfos showed a chart of the event's progression since 2002. The chart showed the dramatic increase in the number of event participants. He then reviewed the marketing collateral as well as the social media pages.

Bike to Work Day is free and open to all commuters in the region. This year there were a large number of corporate sponsors that were recruited to support the event. Interested participants can register at [www.biketoworkmetrodc.org](http://www.biketoworkmetrodc.org). Participants will receive free t-shirts, refreshments, and a chance to win free donated bicycles.

Mr. Ramfos also stated that there is also an employer focus to the event. The event encourages the business community to support a bicycle-friendly environment and participating bicyclists collectively work for over 1,000 various employers throughout region. He stated that bicycling to work benefits employers through reduced parking overhead and better employee health and fitness by lowering absenteeism and health care costs. He also stated that an "Employer Challenge" luncheon will be held for one of five employers that have the highest amount of participants. The winner will be selected through a prize drawing after the event. The purpose of the event will be to honor those employees from that employment site that participated in the event with the luncheon. There is also a donated bicycle rack that will be raffled off to an employer in the region.

Next, Mr. Ramfos stated that the Washington Area Bicyclist Association (WABA) forms Commuter Convoys led by experienced bicyclists to help empower commuters to try bicycling to work. Free Bike to Work guides are also available from Commuter Connections as well as free Confident City Cycling classes offered by WABA. He said that those biking to work are also covered under Commuter Connections' Guaranteed Ride Home program.

Mr. Erenrich asked about how sites are chosen to be pit stops for the event. Mr. Ramfos stated that the event needs to be open to the public and that food and beverages need to be made available to those visiting the pit stops. Mr. Erenrich stated that he had concerns with the close proximity of the pit stops to one another. Mr. Ramfos stated that as the event has grown there has been more interest, particularly from employers, to host their own pit stops. TPB staff has been successful in negotiating with pit stops in close proximity to one another to hold their events at opposing times. For instance there will be two pit stops in East Falls Church and one will be open in the morning and the other will be open in the afternoon for returning cyclists.

Mr. Erenrich stated that County staff spends an awful lot of time and resources on the event and it would be good to know all of the pit stop locations ahead of time. Mr. Ramfos stated that the Bike to Work Day Steering Committee is made aware of all new pit stop locations and that all locations can be found on the Bike to Work Day web site. Chair Srikanth asked that these concerns be relayed back to the Committee. Mr. Holloman asked if the Bike to Work Day survey had a question on how participants are

commuting to work. Mr. Ramfos stated that participants are asked how they typically commute to work on days they do not bicycle and the results are available. The average commute distance for bicycling is about 9 miles.

### **3. Update on Project Submissions for Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP**

Mr. Austin spoke to the distributed hand out detailing the major changes for the 2014 CLRP. He noted that these along with the project submissions listed in the Air Quality Conformity Inputs table and the draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment would be released for public comment on March 13. The memo introducing the major changes stated that two elements of the Metro 2025 plan would be included in the projects released for public comment; 100% eight car trains, and core station improvements. These two projects would be released as an alternative to a “no-build” scenario that did not include these elements. The memo went on to state that WMATA and its funding agencies would continue work to identify funding for those elements, prior to the TPB’s scheduled approval of the project submissions on April 16. If funding was not identified by that time, then WMATA would likely request that both alternatives be modeled for conformity purposes.

Regarding two projects in the District of Columbia that DDOT proposed to remove, Mr. Erenrich asked what “pending further study” meant. Mr. Austin said that their status in the Conformity Table would be changed from “implement” to “study/not coded.”

While discussing the description for VRE’s System Plan, Mr. Austin asked if the amount given reflected only improvements in the Washington region. Ms. Hoeffner answered that it was restricted to the Washington region. Mr. Miller asked about the time frame for the VRE System Plan and MARC’s Growth and Investment Plan (MGIP). Ms. Hoeffner replied that the plan extended out through 2040, but that some components beyond 2020 are still not funded, so they’re not included in the CLRP. Mr. Erenrich remarked that there should be more clarification of what elements from these plans are being included in the CLRP. Ms. Erickson stated that the MGIP CLRP elements included everything in Phase I through 2029, and not the elements out to 2050. Answering how statewide elements were handled, Ms. Erickson stated that they were divided equally between the Washington and Baltimore regions to avoid double counting. She also stated that all components that need to be modeled are either included in the Conformity Table or in the transit assumptions. Chair Srikanth added that since this year both the air quality and the financial analysis elements of the CLRP are being updated, part the purpose of this document is to point out large financial commitments that aren’t necessarily tied to or proportional to capacity expansion projects.

Mr. Miller asked if the widening project on US 1 in Virginia was related to BRAC. Mr. Srikanth responded that they were looking into if there is any DOD funding for the project.

After discussing the alternative options suggested for the two elements of WMATA's Metro 2025 plan, Ms. Erickson inquired about the funding amount shown, stating that the amount shown was not reflective of the full amount of WMATA's request. Mr. Austin replied that the cost shown is what WMATA has identified as the cost for the 100% eight car trains and core station improvements. Ms. Erickson remarked that additional information on the full amount WMATA was requesting for all of Metro 2025 would be helpful for the sake of comparison. Ms. Jia agreed that language to that effect could be added.

Mr. Erenrich asked if the inclusion of these elements eliminated the Red Line turn-backs. Ms. Wesolek responded that the Red Line turn-backs had been eliminated from future transit assumptions during last year's CLRP update, without the addition of 100% eight car trains. Mr. Erenrich encouraged more detailed summaries pertaining to the MARC, VRE and Metro rail plans.

Chair Srikanth suggested that language pertaining to WMATA focus on highlighting the cost of baseline operations and maintenance, state of good repair, in addition to the inclusion of the two new elements. He said that discussions on the financial analysis had left very little possibility that any elements beyond those two could be funded. Ms. Hoeffner emphasized that the amount shown for the VRE System Plan was only for the elements for which funding had been identified, noting that the full cost of the plan was \$3.2 billion. She said it was important for the materials being released for comment to make that clear so there wouldn't be any misconceptions about parts that are not included in the CLRP.

Ms. Posey addressed the Conformity Table that was distributed. She asked for any corrections to the table by the end of the following Tuesday.

#### **4. Update on the Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment of the 2014 CLRP and FY 2015-2020 TIP**

Ms. Constantine provided an update on the draft scope of work for the 2014 Air Quality Conformity Determination, which was previously presented during the March meeting. The schedule remained unchanged and it was expected to be approved by the TPB at the April 16, 2014 meeting.

The key elements of the Scope of Work are: new regional land use assumptions (i.e. Round 8.3); the same TAZ system and in the previous cycle of air quality conformity; MOVES2010a as the emissions forecasting model; and the 2011 Vehicle Identification

Number (VIN) database, which will be used for conformity for the last cycle.

Ms. Constantine Committee told the that staff received unofficial notification that the direct PM2.5 and precursor NOx the motor vehicle emissions budgets (i.e., MVEBs) submitted to EPA for approval as part of a PM2.5 Redesignation Request and Maintenance Plan were found adequate and suitable for use in conformity determinations upon publication in the Federal Register in the weeks ahead.

Mr. Srikanth asked whether these MVEBs were from the June 2013 PM2.5 Maintenance Plan submittal to EPA. Ms. Constantine confirmed it and reminded the committee members that this submission contained Tier 1 and Tier2 MVEBs.

Ms. Erickson inquired whether Ms. Constantine knew if the state of Maryland had received its official letter of the MVEBs adequacy finding from EPA. Ms. Constantine stated she was only aware of Virginia's receipt of such letter because earlier in the morning she had received an email from VaDEQ acknowledging receipt of its adequacy finding letter from EPA. For clarification purposes, Chair Srikanth stated that even though the MVEBs apply to all three states, each one was obligated to submit separately and as a result each state would be notified of its MVEBs adequacy finding individually.

## **5. Briefing on the COG Cooperative Forecasting Process**

Mr. DesJardin briefed the Committee on the Cooperative Forecasting process and, specifically, the new Round 8.3 Forecasts for this year's Air Quality Conformity Analysis of the TIP and CLRP. He stated presented a PowerPoint which included a flow chart showing the process for preparing the Forecasts, as well as summaries of the new Round 8.3 projections. He noted that for the TPB modeled region the 8.3 Forecasts have a better balance between job and household growth when compared to prior Rounds. He also noted that the Round 8.3 Forecasts show that the region continues to concentrate more employment and population growth in the new Activity Centers. Chair Srikanth noted that, in addition to their use in Transportation modeling, the Forecasts are widely used in other areas such as water quality planning.

Mr. DesJardin noted that next year would be the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary for the Cooperative Forecasting program. Mr. Griffiths noted that the process began after the local planning directors had reviewed and rejected the results of "Empiric" – a land use forecasting model.

Ms. Wesolek asked about the comparisons of growth within Activity Centers between Round 8.0 and Round 8.3. Mr. DesJardin stated that the new boundaries were used to analyze the Round 8.0 Forecasts for a valid comparison. Mr. Griffiths noted the importance to the process of local governments making different assumptions to their

forecasts as land use plans change and evolve. Chair Srikanth noted the significant changes to Tysons based upon the new plan and its impact on the Silver Line.

Mr. Emerine asked about the relationship between transportation investments and Activity Centers. Mr. Griffiths stated that local land use and transportation plans are coordinated in the development of the Forecasts and noted, as an example, the integration of planning and development along the Red Line. Mr. Emerine suggested that the public should be informed about the impacts of development approvals without transit investments.

## **6. Briefing on an Initial Assessment of the 2014 Update of the CLRP and the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP)**

Referring to a handout, Mr. Swanson told the committee that staff was working on an initial comparative assessment of the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) and the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). He said the draft initial assessment would be completed for the TPB mailout on April 10 and the TPB would be briefed on the document at its April meeting.

Chair Srikanth thanked staff for their work on this project. He asked Mr. Swanson when Technical Committee members should send comments.

Mr. Swanson asked that comment be sent by close of business, Monday, April 7. Chair Srikanth noted the importance of land use and regional Activity Centers. He also noted that the initial assessment will use the 2013 performance analysis.

Ms. Backmon said she understood the assessment would not be used to screen projects. She asked how it would be used to evaluate the CLRP.

Mr. Swanson said that it would not be used to screen CLRP projects. He said the assessment was being constructed to identify the degree to which relevant strategies and objectives in the RTPP are being supported by the CLRP.

Chair Srikanth said the assessment would be used to examine the degree to which the CLRP is moving the region toward the goals of the RTPP. He noted that staff may be conducting outreach regarding the RTPP with individual jurisdictions.

Mr. Orleans noted that the RTPP had highlighted the lack of public confidence in the ability of the region's leadership to address transportation problems. He asked how that would be addressed in the assessment.

Mr. Swanson said that progress on that challenge is difficult to evaluate, especially as it relates to the CLRP.

Ms. Backmon asked if the TPB staff would be updating the CLRP Aspirations Scenario. Mr. Swanson said staff has informally discussed this, but there are no specific plans for such an update.

Chair Srikanth spoke favorably about the value of scenario planning. Mr. Swanson noted the innovative outreach to local jurisdictions' staff, which informed the land-use inputs for the original Aspirations Scenario. But he noted that those land-use inputs were based upon the old Activity Centers designations. Mr. DesJardin said it would be interesting to compare the Round 8.3 Cooperative Forecasts with the Aspirations Scenario's land-use inputs.

## **7. Briefing on Steps for Fauquier County, Virginia to Become a Member of the TPB**

Mr. Griffiths gave a PowerPoint presentation on the steps for Fauquier County to become a member of the TPB. This presentation informed the members of the Committee that based on the results of the 2010 Census, a portion of Fauquier County, including the Town of Warrenton and areas adjacent to Route 29 northeast of Warrenton has been designated as part of the Washington DC-VA-MD urbanized area. Consequently, transportation projects in this portion of the County now must be included in the TPB's Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) in order to receive federal funding and the interest of residents of this portion of the County must be represented in the TPB's transportation planning and programming process. Mr. Griffiths stated that at its April 16<sup>th</sup> meeting, the TPB would be asked to formally invite Fauquier County to become a member of the TPB.

Mr. Roseboom of VA DRPT asked if the transit service in this portion of the Fauquier County would also be reported to the National Transit Database and be eligible to receive Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding.

Chair Srikanth responded that currently there was not any transit service in this portion of the County, but if transit service was expanded into this area in the future it could then be reported.

Mr. Griffiths responded that he was not sure how the expansion of the Washington DC-VA-MD urbanized area into Fauquier County would impact FTA funding for the region, but would look into this issue.

## **8. Briefing on the Virginia Railway Express (VRE) Systems Plan**

Mr. Hickey from VRE briefed the Committee on the VRE System Plan for 2040. He spoke to a PowerPoint presentation that was distributed to Committee members and meeting attendees. His presentation provided an overview of VRE, the challenges it will face in

coming decades, and the phased approach to improvements and capacity that are included in the System Plan.

Mr. Milone asked whether the freight railroads that own the tracks on which VRE runs were onboard with the agency's expansion plans. Mr. Hickey said that development of the System Plan had been a collaborative process involving the railroads and other partners. He said that the railroads are carrying more freight, and that makes them open to capacity improvements like third tracks and other efforts to alleviate bottlenecks.

Mr. Davis asked whether VRE allows passengers to bring bicycles on trains. Mr. Hickey said they do. Ms. Hoeffner confirmed that VRE allows bicycles on the last three trains in the morning and in the evening. She said that more details are available on the VRE website.

Mr. Holloman asked whether VRE sees coordinating more with WMATA as VRE becomes more of a regional railroad. Mr. Hickey said that he does. He said that regional coordination is fundamental.

Mr. Malouff asked whether running more frequent trains on VRE might require operating different equipment, like diesel multiple units (DMUs). Mr. Hickey said VRE isn't opposed to DMUs, and that as ridership grows it will have to look at options to provide more flexible service to meet demand.

Mr. Emerine asked whether VRE thinks demand for off-peak and reverse-commute trips exists now. Mr. Hickey said that looking at highway volumes during evening and off-peak times shows that the demand exists now, and that the only obstacle to meeting that demand is finding the capacity and capital resources to run more and longer trains.

Mr. Miller asked about the degree to which passenger fares cover operating expenses, especially for long trips coming in from outside the region. Ms. Hoeffner explained that the railroad overall is at a 60-65 percent fare recovery ratio. She said that VRE is required to cover at least 50 percent of its operating costs with fares. She said the remaining amount is covered by state operating assistance and by local jurisdiction subsidies, apportioned based on ridership. She said that the majority of funding comes from end-of-the-line stations in Prince William, Spotsylvania, and Stafford counties, and that the subsidy for trips made by people living beyond those counties is shared across all of the counties in which VRE operates.

Chair Srikanth asked whether the service and capacity expansion improvements in Phase One of the System Plan were included in the CLRP. Ms. Hoeffner confirmed that they were.

He also asked whether the local comprehensive plans for the jurisdictions in which VRE operates show elements of the System Plan. Ms. Hoeffner said that they do to

varying degrees. She said Prince William and Fairfax counties have extensive transportation plans which reflect VRE's expansion plans.

Chair Srikanth also asked whether VRE will be able to keep up with forecast population growth in Virginia's outer jurisdictions.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that the slides in today's presentation don't reflect the funding amounts that are noted in the CLRP project descriptions that VRE submitted for the 2014 CLRP update. Ms. Hoeffner explained that the System Plan materials show the costs in current-year dollars, while the CLRP requires year-of-expenditure amounts. Ms. Erickson said that the same was true with the numbers for MARC—that the plan and the CLRP project descriptions don't match. Mr. Erenrich requested that the VRE presentation specifically note what has been included in the CLRP, and include the year-of-expenditure amounts shown in the CLRP alongside the current-year amounts in the presentation.

Ms. Wesolek noted that the CLRP description form shows a completion date of 2040 for the components of the System Plan that have been included in the CLRP, but that the presentation shows a completion date of 2020. Ms. Hoeffner explained that the CLRP project description is of the entire System Plan, which runs through 2040, even though funding has not been identified for all components of the plan. Ms. Posey said that the table of inputs for the air quality conformity assessment shows individual project components with specific completion dates earlier than 2040. Ms. Hoeffner said that there are improvements beyond 2020 that meet the financial constraint of the CLRP, but that several big-ticket items do not. Chair Srikanth recommended that the memorandum for the Board better clarify what's in the CLRP and what's not.

Ms. Wesolek asked how VRE expects to fund the capital improvements included in the System Plan. Ms. Hoeffner explained that VRE assumes most of the funding will come from federal formula funds, with much smaller amounts coming from local jurisdiction contributions and state capital funds. Mr. Hickey added that the costs of some capital improvements on the Fredericksburg line will be shared with high-speed rail improvements in the corridor.

Mr. Lake noted that local jurisdictions are often responsible for contributing to local capital improvements, like station enhancements. He said Fairfax County uses CMAQ and RSTP funds to build garages, expand parking lots, and make other improvements. He said the county turns to these other funding sources because it has to spend all revenues collected from gas taxes on WMATA. Ms. Hoeffner added that one other piece of funding for VRE is new funding through the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority. But, she said, those funds are not included as part of VRE's financial analysis because there's still some uncertainty about how much money will be available through NVTAA.

## **9. Update on the Development of MAP-21 Performance Measures**

Mr. Randall gave a presentation on the schedule for release of the MAP-21 performance provisions. The anticipated date of release for the draft rulemaking for Statewide and Metropolitan Planning is now the third week of April. There is no date announced for the transit agency representation on MPO board rulemaking, but it will still be required by October 1, 2014.

Mr. Meese then presented on the newly released proposed Safety Performance rule, as well as the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) rule. He spoke to the requirements for target setting and reporting by MPOs, and the necessary relationship with State DOT target setting and reporting. FHWA will monitor State DOTs for progress against their targets, which could affect funding for safety projects, and he explained an illustrative target-setting example. He also reviewed the request for comments on how USDOT could address separate non-motorized safety performance measures, and spoke to the role of the TPB Safety Subcommittee and needed communication with the State DOTs in potentially providing written comments on the proposed rulemaking.

Chair Srikanth emphasized that the MPO will have to work with the State DOTs and particularly their operations folks, both in future application of the rule but also in developing any comments. Involvement on the Safety Subcommittee may need to be revisited and planning folks may need to get their operations folks involved.

Mr. Brown requested that VDOT staff come and brief Loudoun County on the new rulemaking to bring them up to date. Chair Srikanth responded that VDOT is currently assessing available data and what might be needed in the future, as well as new requirements for the local jurisdictions.

Mr. Meese noted that safety performance could involve not just planners and engineers, but also police agencies, motor vehicle administrations, and local traffic enforcement organizations.

## **10. Update on the Development of Applications for TIGER Discretionary Capital and Planning Grants in the Washington Region**

Mr. Randall spoke to announcement of the FY 2014 TIGER Discretionary Grant Program, as discussed at the March Technical Committee meeting. He reminded members that TIGER grant applications require demonstrating that a project is in the TIP or will be added to the TIP, including planning studies due to their use of federal funds. He noted three applications that had requested letters from the TPB: DDOT for a Long Bridge study planning grant; MDOT, along with Montgomery County, for construction of the Capital Crescent Trail alongside the Purple Line; and City of Alexandria for additional capital funding for the Potomac Yard Metrorail station.

Members were then asked if they were aware of other planned applications. Mr. Brown stated that Loudoun County was preparing an application for construction of three transit hubs, and that Supervisor Scott York would be contacting the DTP Co-Directors shortly for a letter. Mr. Erenrich then stated that Montgomery County was working on two planning grants, one for affordable housing transportation access along the Purple Line and one for BRT in White Flint.

It was noted that the FY 2014 TIGER Program had \$600 million available, and that the region had previously received the TIGER I grant for Priority Bus, a TIGER II TIFIA loan in Northern Virginia, and a TIGER 2012 grant for the Anacostia River Trail in Maryland and DC.

#### **11. Other Business**

Mr. Austin asked the Committee members to review the roster and let him know if it has the right members listed. He asked members to make sure he had their e-mail addresses.

Ms. Erickson and Ms. Hoeffner both said that they no longer receive the e-mail notification of the meeting since the system changed.

Mr. Austin said he would look into that and try to fix the problem.

#### **12. Adjourn**