



National Capital Region
Transportation Planning Board

Technical Committee Minutes

For the meeting of
JUNE 1, 2018

Transportation Planning Board
Technical Committee Meeting

Minutes

1. Welcome and Approval of Minutes from the May 4, 2018 Technical Committee Meeting

Attendees at the meeting introduced themselves. A motion was made to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously.

2. Performance Based Planning and Programming – Regional Targets for CMAQ Traffic Congestion and Emissions Reduction Measures

Mr. Randall briefed the Committee on requirements under the federal performance-based planning and programming (PBPP) rulemaking for MPOs to set targets for CMAQ Program performance measures for traffic congestion and emissions reduction. A draft set of targets developed by staff in coordination with the state DOTs was presented last month and the board was briefed on these. The board will be asked to adopt traffic congestion and emissions reduction targets for the region at their June meeting.

Mr. Randall spoke to a presentation that reviewed the three performance measures. There was a change from last month, in that on May 18, just before the May 20 deadline for the State DOTs to set targets, FHWA came out with new guidance on how the traffic congestion peak hour excessive delay measure is calculated. This has led to a change in the calculation for this performance measure and hence a change in the forecast target for the TPB region, from 26.5 hours to 26.7 hours. There was no change for the other two targets. Accordingly, the board will be asked to approve the slightly revised targets, and then staff will work with DOTs to have this final measure included in the reports due to FHWA by October 1. Staff will also work with BRTB and FAMPO for cross-approval of targets for the urbanized areas.

Mr. Brown noted that there were comments at the TPB meeting about the roads for which these performance measures apply, which is the National Highway System (NHS) network. Elected officials asked why we are only looking at these roads. Mr. Randall responded that this was correct, the NHS is the required performance network. He also noted that the data on which these performance measures are based is only available for highly used roadways.

Mr. Srikanth reviewed the requirements for BRTB and FAMPO to approve the Washington DC urbanized area targets, and that similarly the TPB Steering Committee will approve the targets for the Baltimore urbanized area.

3. Performance Based Planning and Programming – Draft Regional Targets for Highways Systems Performance and Highway Assets

Mr. Randall briefed the Committee on requirements under the federal performance-based planning and programming (PBPP) rulemaking for MPOs to set targets for highway system performance. A draft set of targets developed by staff in coordination with the state DOTs was presented. In July, the board will be asked to adopt a resolution for travel time reliability on the Interstate and the rest of the NHS in addition to truck travel time reliability targets for the region.

Continuing, he spoke to a presentation that reviewed the three performance measures. The National Performance Management Research Data Set (NPMRDS) is the data source for these measures. He noted the massive amount of data that is being collected into the NPMRDS. State DOTs had to set 2-year and 4-year targets by May 20, which they did. MPOs have up to 180 days afterwards to set 4-year targets, but the plan is to approve these in July so that the information can be included in Visualize 2045.

To set future targets, forecasts were developed using the same method as for the traffic congestion targets; an average of extrapolation of recent trends in the data and the application of a relevant factor from the TPB travel demand model, in this case congested VMT in the AM peak period. He then presented the historic information and the proposed draft targets. He noted a change in the contractor providing data in 2017 possibly led to a sharp change in the on-Interstate NHS travel time reliability measure. But this is the information contained in the database, so this is what is used in the performance calculation.

Mr. Randall also noted that there was a seventh performance measure initially included as part of the system performance area, to report on greenhouse gas emissions. Last fall the FHWA issued a notice proposing to delete this performance measure. On May 31, yesterday, FHWA issued a final ruling cancelling this performance measure.

Mr. Erenrich highlighted the improvement in performance in the measures over the past few years for both travel time reliability and mode share. He stated that it was important that this be recognized as in part the result of continued investments in transportation in the region.

Mr. Srikanth concurred, noting that the region continues to be congested, but the funded improvements are providing accessibility and providing for continued growth.

Mr. Meese cautioned that this data and the calculation of performance is still relatively new and will need to be monitored over the next few years to determine their accuracy. Mr. Srikanth noted the discontinuity in the non-Interstate 2017 data, and how this would have to be further assessed to determine the cause.

Mr. Brown asked about the extent of the NHS and which roads are on it. Mr. Randall noted that each state DOT designates the NHS in its state, which is adjusted over time. Mr. Li clarified that the 2015 NHS is the baseline version for which data is being collected in the NPMRDS. Mr. Baker, Mr. Whitaker, and Ms. Hill responded with information on how the NHS was expanded or “enhanced” under MAP-21 and is determined by the state DOTs. Bob Brown asked for more information on the NHS defined in each jurisdiction.

Ms. Hill noted that the NPMRDS provides a nationally-consistent basis for the performance measures but is being constantly updated. It’s a very powerful tool, but any reference needs to be defined and date/time stamped. Mr. Srikanth noted the benefit of the NPMRDS, but that the data needs to be reviewed for quality and accuracy.

Mr. Randall closed by noting that there was seventh performance measure initially included as part of the system performance area, to report on greenhouse gas emissions. Last fall the FHWA issued a notice proposing to delete this performance measure. On May 31, yesterday, FHWA issued a final ruling cancelling this performance measure.

He then moved on to another presentation to brief the committee on requirements to set targets for highway assets, through the measurement of pavement and bridge condition. There are six (6) performance measures, four (4) for pavement and two (2) for bridges. A draft set of targets developed by staff in coordination with the state DOTs was presented. In July, the board will also be

asked to adopt these targets for the region. He noted that ownership of a portion of the NHS by cities or counties is a basis for the request for many of the member jurisdictions to sign the PBPP letters of agreement (LOAs) discussed at previous meetings.

Mr. Randall opened a link from TPB work in April 2017 that included the NHS system pavement and bridge condition data at that time. This website is in the process of being updated with a new year's worth of data. He reviewed highlights of the past several years of data and the state targets. He then went on to explain that the draft targets for the TPB region have been calculated by applying the state targets of DC, Maryland, and Virginia to their respective lane-miles in the region. The TPB area targets simply add up the respective targets for the three parts of each state in the region. The same applies to the bridge targets.

Mr. Brown stated that pavement condition was likely to be of interest to elected officials. He also noted that the targets set by the states are declining, and that elected officials were likely to ask why this would be so. Eric responded that the DOTs are likely setting targets conservatively, working with sophisticated databases that incorporate age, condition, traffic, and projected budgets.

Mr. Srikanth agreed that the declining targets would be a possible issue at the board meeting, and that the state DOTs should be prepared to respond to any questions.

4. Virginia Smart Scale Requirements – Proposed Project Support Resolution

Lyn Erickson, COG/TPB Staff introduced Mr. Norman Whitaker/VDOT and his presentation regarding VDOT's Smart Scale initiative. She shared that the initiative is a grant opportunity for Virginia localities and that the TPB as MPO has a role in endorsing planning projects that come out of the Smart Scale Process.

Mr. Whitaker began in noting that the goal of his presentation is to help members understand why this resolution for state funding in VA is on the regional MPO policy plan.

Smart Scale is about investing limited tax dollars in the right projects that meet the most critical transportation needs across the commonwealth in the form of a competitive application process. It is performance based planning and programming at a system wide level to decide which plans to fund and to what extent they will be funded.

Smart Scale began in 2014 and has evolved in three grant rounds. There were 400 applications in the second grant round and the department is anticipating as many as 100 applications from Northern Virginia (NoVa) in the 3rd round.

In the past, for example in FY2018 NoVa was the recipient of \$367.3 Million over two years. This year there will be a 50/50 split between state funds for district and statewide competitions. Smart Scale's funding model is tied to cost estimates based on anticipated revenues. Currently the department is working on year 2024-2025 budget trajectories. Cost estimates that are submitted to the department are fixed budgets for grantees. In the case that projects require more funding, they are required to repeat the competitive grant application process. However, there is some flexibility for potential budget modifications if the scope of a project has changed. The evaluation and determination process is based on a scoring rubric that takes into consideration congestion mitigation, economic development, accessibility, safety, environmental quality and land use. NoVA's scoring is categorically different than other parts of the commonwealth. The weighted distribution follows as 45%, 5%, 15%, 5%, 10% and 20% respectively.

The evaluation process takes around 16 months and consists of consultation of local governments and then projects are screened against the state wide long-range plan called VTrans. Projects must demonstrate that they meet a need contained in the VTrans plan. Projects are scored using weighted measures. At the end of the scoring process data is validated for errors. A staff recommendation is then provided to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) who then makes the final funding decision. Most projects that receive funding are those that have been recommended by VDRPT and VDOT staff, however the TPB is not obligated to approve any projects.

Continuing, Mr. Whitaker noted that in the past there has been confusion as to the degree of MPO involvement where there was the assumption the NVTA has MPO authority to approve Smart Scale projects, however that is not the case given that the TPB is the MPO or the NoVA region. In VA, projects that are not in the most recent long-range plan require a resolution of support by the regional MPO in order to continue to the final application process.

A pre-application portal for projects will close on June 8th and then VDOT will have a better assessment of which projects will need TPB support. Applicants have until August 1st to submit a final application. Given the timeline and the fact that the TPB will not be meeting in August, VDOT would like to include the resolution in the June TPB Agenda. If the resolution is adopted, the TPB will not be committed to taking any action in the future and there is no guarantee that any project will be included in the Virginia CLRP however, if the project is funded, it will be able to begin the CLRP process.

The last plan adopted by the TPB is the 2016 CLRP and there are many new projects that have been submitted for Visualize 2045, but are not in the adopted CLRP and will be included in the Smart Scale list of projects in need of TPB support. More information about SMART SCALE is available at www.vasmartscale.org

Mrs. Erickson concluded that what will be presented to the TPB in June will be a resolution in addition to a master list of projects after the June 8th preapplication deadline. The list contains 78 projects, 20 of which are included in the long-range plan. There are also many projects that are not included in the long-range plan and many that would not qualify to be included in the LRP. The resolution will be a one-page documents with various caveats and to approve the master list of all highway and transit applications.

Mr. Srikanth, COG/TPB staff asked for more specificity as to what the resolution will imply. To which Mrs. Erickson responded that what will be resolved is the TPB support of the submission of the projects on the list. The board must determine if a project is in the LRP or not, the board's approval of the list does not infer or commit the TPB to include any project in its LRP.

All projects that are awarded must be treated as 'new projects' and for example must go through the technical input solicitation guide which references the TPB's regional priorities planned initiatives scoring in relation to TPB strategies for the for RTPB. VDOT will also supply a list of projects that have moved beyond the preapplication period ending August 1st. Once the projects are awarded in December or January, this list of awarded projects will be supplied to the TPB.

Mr. Whitaker noted that many of the projects do not require Air Quality conformity analysis.

5. Regional Travel Trends

Staff presented travel trends and other key factors influencing travel behavior in the Washington region. Approximately every two to three years, staff conducts an analysis on the recent demographic, economic, and other characteristics that influence regional travel to provide a

snapshot of travel trends in the Washington region. Staff last presented this information in April 2016. This latest analysis, *Travel Trends of the Metropolitan Washington Region, 2018*, entails a review of updated information on population and household growth, employment growth, income trends, the influencing role of the federal government in the region, commerce trends, and the roles these factors have on regional travel. The Travel Trends update also provides key indicators for regional travel, including information on the regional Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT), travel time, travel mode share, teleworking, and trends occurring on non-motorized vehicular travel modes. The report format has changed as well and is a web-based “story map” that will be accessible by any individual computer users.

There were several questions, including a question on whether the change in VMT that was shown for each of the jurisdictions in the TPB planning area could be shown for all jurisdictions within the TPB modeled area. This information is available and can be included. Another question was raised asking if trip length was considered in the analysis. At the time of this analysis, historical trip length data was not available. The travel trends analysis will be presented to TPB at its June meeting.

6. Implementing the Concepts of TPB’s Seven Endorsed Initiatives

Mr. Srikanth, COG/TPB Staff, drew the Committee’s attention to the diagram associated with the agenda item, that being a flow chart illustrating actions made thus far in the efforts to coordinate and promote Visualize 2045. He continued in providing background in that in December of 2017 the TPB endorsed 5 transportation improvement initiatives. Two additional non-motorized initiatives were added in January making a total of 7. Continuing Mr. Srikanth referenced a statement of TPB Chair Charles Allen, where he expressed great interest in encouraging fellow members as well as TPB staff to make concerted efforts to actualizing the Visualize 2045 goals.

Mr. Srikanth again referenced the flow chart associated with the agenda items which illustrated the various activities that TPB staff have been engaged which includes various methods of reaching out to MPO subject matter experts, integrating MPO activities, engaging member agencies and building awareness with public stakeholders. Mr. Srikanth made a call to action to committee members to consider the various ways in which the initiatives within the Visualize 2045 campaign can be actualized at the local jurisdictional level.

Mr. Srikanth provided an example of how he made a similar call to action to the Commuter Connections Subcommittee (CCSC), a component of the Transportation Operations Programs division, concerning Transportation Demand Management (TDM), and asked its members to collaborate on evaluating what more can be done to enhance TDM strategies throughout the region and how the TPB can aid in that process. He used the example from the previously discussed regional travel trends presentation provided by Tim Canaan COG/TPB which illustrated how telework can be practiced more popularly as a means of reducing congestion. He noted that the CCSC convened an ad-hoc working group which will address the TPB with their findings and recommendations during the October meeting of the TPB.

Similarly, TPB staff engaged the COG Planning Directors Technical Advisory Committee (PDTAC) in May concerning the optimization of regional land use and home to work distance focus. In meeting with the PDTAC, TPB staff acknowledged while there was work underway along the lines of this aspirational element, what additional projects, programs and policies can be recommended to the TPB for their consideration to help realize the full potential that the long-range plan task force analysis indicates can be achieved.

Continuing, Mr. Srikanth shared that TPB staff have also engaged the Housing Directors Advisory Committee, and that the Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee and Bicycle/Pedestrian

Subcommittee will also be approached for their assistance. Again, the goal is for the subject matter experts associated with these committees is to also brief the TPB in the fall of 2018 with their collective findings and recommendations towards tangible projects, programs and policies that the TPB can endorse and support.

The long-range plan has been completely redone to include both the constrained and aspirational elements. Through the technical committee, efforts have been made to highlight local initiatives that are consistent with and promote the Visualize 2045 initiatives for example the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project of Montgomery County, MD.

Regarding building awareness with public stakeholders Mr. Srikanth noted that TPB Chair Charles Allen provided an op-ed piece to the Washington Business Journal. Mr. Allen also met with the COG Board of Directors and briefed them on the endorsed initiatives and asked the COG elected officials to begin to consider what initiatives they can support and what policies they can enact. The Federal City Council invited TPB staff to brief them on the initiatives. TPB staff has reached out the Citizens Advisory Council (CAC) of COG and the Access for All (AFA) committee of COG, Fairfax County invited TPB staff to brief them on MPO activates and the opportunity was used to also discuss Visualize 2045. Nine (9) public forums were also conducted to gather public feedback on the campaign. Briefing materials have been prepared and will be provided to technical committee members.

Mr. Srikanth noted that TPB staff is engaging member agencies and made a call to committee members to consider within their own transportation planning and programming activities, how best members advance their own jurisdictional actions on implementing projects, programs and policies that will advance the seven initiatives. He noted that the TPB does not prioritize projects to be funded or select which projects to be included in the CLRP, although they provide policy priorities and facilitate the discussion. Much of the decision making happens at the local and sometimes regional levels.

Mr. Srikanth concluded in noting that the intent of his discussion was to highlight how TPB staff has been advancing Chair Allen's direction. The TPB will continue to focus on the endorsed seven initiatives and member jurisdictions will continue to be pressed to advance projects, programs and policies in to the CLRP that support Visualize 2045. He explained that any materials that committee members want on the subject or any opportunities that might exist for TPB staff to come and brief member agencies, that TPB staff will be more than willing to do so.

7. Visualize 2045: New Elements to the Long-Range Transportation Plan

Ms. Zeller shared that there are new elements of the long-range transportation plan which will be presented in this presentation. She said that there are new federal requirements that require the TPB to incorporate new things into Visualize 2045 in order to be compliant with the regulations.

Mr. Sivasailam presented the resiliency and reliability element first. He spoke about how the TPB supports state and local efforts in planning for resiliency against weather events and other potentially catastrophic events. He next presented the homeland security and public safety element which the TPB works on in coordination with COG's public safety program.

Ms. Koudounas presented the travel and tourism element next which calls for more regional coordination for transportation planning surrounding travel and tourism. She stated that TPB's Regional Public Transportation Subcommittee would be leading this effort as well as the intercity bus element. She then presented the intercity buses element of Visualize 2045 which focuses on buses traveling to and from the region that are not used for commuting purposes.

Mr. Brown said the disaster resiliency work of TPB could help Virginia jurisdictions come up with ideas for ways to fund disaster resiliency projects through NVT. Mr. Whitaker mentioned ways that funding can be used for projects that relate to disaster resiliency and homeland security. Mr. Sivasailam responded by pointing out that flood risk can be identified through studies, but for evacuation issues its unclear exactly how to plan for it because it is uncertain where and when it would occur. Mr. Meese added that a lot of this kind of planning happens at the state level and COG and the TPB bring it together at the regional level. Mr. Srikanth added that there is a flood study TPB staff is contributing to that will show transportation assets at risk in flood prone areas. A committee member asked if the area of study for that report was available and Mr. Srikanth said staff could find it if requested.

Ms. Calkins asked if the intercity bus study looks at all the bus locations or just Union Station. Ms. Koudounas responded that the study looked at 14 bus stations, but that Union Station has the largest volume by far.

8. Montgomery County Bus Rapid Transit Program

Ms. Conklin, Montgomery County's bus rapid transit (BRT) program manager, provided a presentation on the county's plans for implementing BRT. Ms. Conklin shared the history of planning for BRT in Montgomery County, including the 2013 Countywide Transit Corridors Functional Master Plan, which established future plans for a 102-mile network of BRT in the county. She explained how the Maryland DOT is leading the planning process for the Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT) and BRT on Veirs Mill Road, while the county DOT is now leading the planning process for US 29 (in design) and MD 355 (in alternatives analysis).

Ms. Conklin drew the Committee's attention to the TLC project the county was awarded by TPB to help with modular BRT station design and shared the design ideas. She also provided details about the BRT that will run on US 29, including plans for transit signal priority and new articulated buses, as well as the route and station locations, schedule and budget.

Ms. Conklin also provided some details about the planning process for studying alternatives for BRT on MD 355, a complex and long corridor. She noted that the CCT and Veirs Mill Road projects are not as active as the other two projects – funding for the CCT has been deferred, but the county recently won a TLC project to look at temporary transit solutions – for Veirs Mill Rd there is money in the county budget for FY 23 and they're looking to move it up as a priority.

Ms. Snyder complemented the BRT promotional videos that the county has put online. Ms. Conklin said other transit agencies or jurisdictions can use the promotional materials as long as they credit the county. The website to learn more is GetOnBoardBRT.com.

9. 2017 Regional Air Passenger Survey: General Findings

This item was deferred to a future meeting.

10. Virginia Transit Funding and Reforms

Mr. Horsley, Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, briefed the Committee on recent changes in transit funding and governance in Virginia, in addition to the dedicated funding for WMATA. Todd spoke to a presentation, highlighting the restructuring of the Commonwealth Mass

Transit Fund and the sources of the dedicated funding for WMATA. He emphasized that WMATA is now handled separately from other transit needs in the state, and that there should not be any competition for funding between WMATA and the rest of the state now that the share of available funding for each is fixed. However, he also noted that by 2020 or 2021 the need for new funding for transit in Virginia will reappear, after the current bond program expires. The recent legislation provided only a one-time patch for a couple of years.

Mr. Horsley went on to review the revised statewide transit capital prioritization process and recommended principles for allocation, funding all projects at a state share of 68%. He also reviewed changes in statewide transit operating funds and a new requirement for urban transit agency strategic plans, along with required contents. He closed by covering the WMATA reforms regarding board of director's membership, the cap on operating expenses, the requirements for the annual approval of a capital improvement program and the development of a strategic plan. There are also new requirements for NVTC oversight and reporting and changes for VRE funding and PRTC dedicated funding.

Mr. Erenrich noted that Montgomery County was surprised by the WMATA board reforms in reducing the role of board alternate members and wished that the region had been consulted first. Todd noted that the events at the recent WMATA board meeting were of concern to many, and that further discussions on this topic are likely. He noted the Ray LaHood report last October was context for the legislated reduction in the role of board alternate members. Bill Orleans asked some clarifying questions.

Mr. Brown also noted concerns in Loudoun County about the legislation. Mr. Whitaker noted that the NVT 30% local fund redirection of \$27 million was only part of the local fund, but that there would be further discussion of this in future meetings.

Ms. Snyder noted that Maryland is paying for the WMATA dedicated funding through general funds, not out of transportation funds.

11. Other Business

- **Visualize 2045 public forum update (John Swanson)**

Regarding other business John Swanson COG/TPB staff provided an update on Visualize 2045 public forum activity. He shared that 9 evening sessions have taken place throughout the region. An additional two sessions were held for the Citizens Advisory Council and the Access for All Committee. There have been over 250 community members who have participated and on June 6th the 12th and final session, an online forum, will be conducted. Results of the public forums will be presented to the TPB in July and included in the plan document for October. Next are 3 open houses that are planned for September. Ms. Zenner COG/TPB Staff added that the June 6th online forum will begin at noon and invited as many tech committee members as possible to attend. She reminded members of the email invitation that was sent out and asked members to spread the word within their regional jurisdictions.

- **Governor Harry Nice Bridge project update (Lyn Erickson)**

Mrs. Erickson COG/TPB staff drew the Committee's attention to the memo associated with the item and noted that all details are enclosed and in providing a brief overview she shared that in February the TPB wrote letter to the MTA asking for a status update on the Harry W. Bice Bridge Project as it came up in dialogue pertaining to the long-range plan amendment that took place in 2017. The MDTA replied and offered to send the project director to present on the subject. The MDTA was

invited to attend the Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee. There were three main issues of interest expressed by the TPB, one of which was the proposed modifications to the bridge's height. This issue was resolved. The two other issues were related to emergency breakdown shoulders and bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. The project status is that they are developing a design build project process with two alternatives that are being developed as part of the bid for the development contract. The bids will be open in October of 2018 with the final selection anticipated to take place one year following. She noted that the memo in question will be presented to the TPB on June 20th. She then opened the floor for questions.

- **Request for presentations on local projects which exemplify the seven endorsed initiatives**

Mrs. Erickson continued in making a request for volunteers to make presentations on local projects which exemplify the seven endorse initiatives. She then opened the floor for questions.

- **Updated Equity Emphasis Areas at June TPB meeting (Sergio Ritacco)**

Mr. Ritacco, COG/TPB staff provided an update regarding the Equity Emphasis Areas and that the board will be receiving a presentation at it upcoming meeting.

- **Update on "Lookout for Each Other: Montgomery County TLC Project to Develop Educational Materials for New Pedestrian and Bikeway Infrastructure" (Mr. Erenrich)**

Mrs. Erickson then introduced Mr. Erenrich of Montgomery County, who was to provide an update on the "Lookout for Each Other: Montgomery County TLC Project to Develop Educational Materials for New Pedestrian and Bikeway Infrastructure." He provided members and staff with copies of the campaign's promotional materials noting that the project's goals were to find an education program on the county's new bike and pedestrian infrastructure for which his staff worked with a consultant team who has recently completed the campaign's website and a draft version of a video for the campaign as well. He walked members through the website and presented the two-minute segment which is available here: <http://www.montgomerycountymd.gov/DOT-DIR/commuter/bikeshare/lookout.html> .

There is also a survey available on the website for community members to rate the perceived effectiveness of the campaign. He mentioned that more materials will be printed in the future as only 1000 copies have been produced thus far and that his team is still working on making the video segment easier to understand.

Mrs. Erickson made the announcement that the September TPB meeting date has changed due its previous coincidence with a non-secular holiday. The original date for the meeting was scheduled to be held on September 19th and will now be held on Friday, September 21st. A subsequent announcement will be made at the upcoming TPB meeting. All members and alternates have been notified by email.

Mr. Randall reminded all attendees that any jurisdiction or agency requesting an MPO endorsement letter for the federal or state grant application should contact him sooner rather than later. He noted two recently announced federal grant opportunities, one for TOD planning grants and one for transit security.

12. Adjourn

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE – June 1, 2018**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
DCOP Kristin Calkins

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick County Charles Freeman
City of Frederick -----
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery County Gary Erenrich
Prince George's County -----
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery County -----
 Prince George's County -----
MDOT Matt Baker
 Kari Snyder

Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Ramiro Rios
Arlington County Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax Chloe Ritter
Fairfax County Malcolm Watson
Falls Church -----
Fauquier County -----
Loudoun County Robert Brown
Manassas -----
NVRTA -----
NVTC Dan Goldfarb
Prince William County Paolo Belita
PRTC Betsy Massie
VRE Sonali Soneji
VDOT Norman Whitaker
 Regina Moore
VDRPT Ciara Williams
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
Tim Canan, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Brandon Brown, DTP
Anant Choudhary, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Matthew Gaskin, DTP
Charlene Howard, DTP
Martha Kile, DTP
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Arianna Koudounas, DTP
James Li, DTP
Mark Moran, 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
Lori Zeller, DTP
Abigail Zenner, DTP
Sunil Kumar, DEP
Greg Goodwin, DCPS
Nicole McCall, DCPS

OTHER

Joana Conklin, MCDOT
Chris Salzano, VRE
Alex Brun, MDE
Clinton Edwards, VDRPT
Meredith Hill, MDOT SHA
Bill Orleans