

**New River Valley  
Metropolitan Planning Organization  
755 Roanoke Street  
Christiansburg, VA 24073**

**Minutes**

**August 7, 2014**

**MEMBERS**

**PRESENT:** Craig Meadows -Montgomery County  
Anne McClung -Town of Blacksburg  
Steve Ross -Town of Blacksburg (Blacksburg Transit)  
Michael Sutphin -Town of Blacksburg  
Michael Barber -Town of Christiansburg  
Adam Carpenetti -Town of Christiansburg  
Mike Barger -Town of Christiansburg  
Steve Mouras -Virginia Tech  
Kevin Byrd -NRV PDC  
Danny Wilson -Pulaski County  
Josh Baker -Radford Transit  
Annette Perkins -Montgomery County  
Jim Hurt -City of Radford  
Chris Arabia -VA Department of Rail and Public Transportation  
Dan Brugh -NRV MPO  
Randal Gwinn -Recording Secretary

**ABSENT:** Rob Cary -VDoT  
Tammye Davis -FHWA  
Ranny O'Dell -Pulaski County  
Bruce Brown -City of Radford  
Gary Heinline -Pulaski Transit  
Fritz Streff -New River Community College  
Tony Cho -Federal Transit Administration-Region 111  
Michael St. Jean -VA Tech/Montgomery Regional Airport Authority  
Jimmy Quesenberry -Radford University

**OTHERS**

**PRESENT:** Nick Donohue -Deputy Secretary of Transportation  
Erik Olsen -MPO  
Catherine Howe -Blacksburg Transit Intern  
James Perkins -Radford University  
Thomas DiGiulian -VDoT  
Michael Gray -VDoT

## **DECLARATION OF QUORUM AND CALL TO ORDER**

This being the meeting for the annual election of officers Executive Director Dan Brugh declared a quorum and called the meeting to order at 2 P.M.

## **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Dan asked for comments on the proposed agenda. Hearing none he asked to hear a motion for approval.

**On a motion by Michael Barber seconded by Jim Hurt and carried unanimously, the proposed meeting agenda was approved.**

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 5, 2014 MEETING**

Dan asked for comments on or corrections to the meeting minutes from the June 5, 2014 Policy Board meeting. Hearing none he then called for a motion to approve the minutes.

**On a motion by Danny Wilson seconded by Michael Barber and carried unanimously, the minutes dated June 5, 2014 were approved.**

## **ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 2014 -2015**

In accordance with the bylaws of the MPO, officers are elected for a one year term. Officers are eligible for re-election and each of the officers must be from different jurisdictions.

Current officers are: Craig Meadows, Chairman  
Anne McClung, Vice Chairman

Dan announced that the floor is open to receive nominations for Chairman. No seconds are required for nominations.

**Adam Carpenetti nominated Craig Meadows.**

There were no other nominations made.

Dan then asked for a motion to close nominations.

**On a motion by Michael Barber seconded by Danny Wilson and carried unanimously, nominations for MPO Chairman were closed.**

Dan then called for a vote for re-election of Craig Meadows for Chairman. The vote was unanimously in favor and Craig will be Chairman for 2014-15.

Craig then assumed control of the meeting and after expressing appreciation to the group he announced that the floor is open to receive nominations for Vice Chairman.

**Michael Barber nominated Anne McClung.**

There were no other nominations made.

Craig then asked for a motion to close nominations.

**On a motion by Michael Barber seconded by Danny Wilson and carried unanimously, nominations for MPO Vice Chairman were closed.**

Craig then called for a vote for re-election of Anne McClung for Vice Chairman. The vote was unanimously in favor of Anne remaining Vice Chairman for 2014-15.

### **SELECTION OF REGULAR MEETING DATE**

Selection of a regular meeting date was next discussed. All were in consensus to continue the practice of meeting on the first Thursday of each month at 2 PM in the County Admin Conference Room of the Montgomery County Government Center.

### **PRESENTATION BY NICK DONOHUE, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION**

Craig next introduced Mr. Nick Donohue to the group.

Nick offered the following comments on the major initiative currently getting underway with the Commonwealth Transportation Board as a result of House Bill 2 (or HB 2).

Effectively HB 2 is a new legislative requirement that the Commonwealth Transportation Board develop a statewide prioritization process for the allocation of transportation funds by July 1, 2016. The prioritization process will improve upon the current six year planning process which is no longer considered adequate.

In 2013 the General Assembly voted to raise taxes to help support our transportation system however due to time limits during that session they did not have the opportunity to discuss how to administer the transportation funds. In the latest session more scrutiny was given to how the distribution of funds for transportation projects worked and the Governor felt that improvements could be made in the present system. Development of a new process and decisions on how we are going to spend the transportation revenues that the Commonwealth currently has will have strong dependencies on input from stakeholders and decision makers across the Commonwealth. In an effort to gather and distribute information for and about the developing process Nick will be visiting these groups across the state numerous times in the next eighteen months.

Three items are considered to be critical to the success of the new prioritization process: Transparency, Accountability and Certainty. For Transparency a project scoring process must be developed that definitely explains the reasoning behind a given project being funded. Having a statewide scoring process will inherently lead to Accountability as project sponsors will be able to view project scores in the draft programs and challenge the CTB to explain the logic behind the selection of projects to be funded. Insofar as Certainty, project sponsors will gain a greater confidence that once their project has been identified for funding it will remain in the program until completion.

In general terms, this new process will need to be largely implemented in late 2015 in order use it to develop the 2016 Six Year Plan. Implementation will consist of soliciting candidate projects from local governments, regional governments and transit agencies. Each candidate project will then be screened to determine if it meets one or more of the capacity needs identified in the Statewide Long Range Plan and, assuming it does, then it will move into the scoring process. Scoring factors that would be considered in this area are: congestion mitigation, economic development, accessibility, safety and environmental quality. Each factor will be weighted in terms of relative importance for a given region, with solicitation of guidance from the decision makers in that region on what is most important to them. The CTB will review a regions guidance and determine weights for each factor within that region. The possibility does exist for the CTB to make adjustments where deemed appropriate should they disagree with the regional guidance on the importance of a factor. Once the factors are

weighted projects will be scored by each factor and the overall project score will be the sum of the factor scores. The project and its score then gets added to the overall list of statewide projects.

The CTB is not required to fund projects from the statewide list in a particular order, instead they are tasked with screening for acceptable candidate projects, scoring them, publishing the scores and then choosing projects generally based on the scores. The CTB does have some latitude to choose projects by using subjective analysis that may not be easily reflected in an objective scoring process. The possibility exists that a project with a lower score gets funded ahead of one that has a higher score, however the CTB would have to explain why they did so should someone challenge the decision. Ultimately the CTB has the final decision however the Legislature may come back and add additional operating parameters for the CTB if they deem it appropriate.

This process should have a leveling effect on project funding as factors other than traffic congestion come into play. The selections will now be based on relative costs, this process will look for the highest benefit per dollar spent therefore the project with the greatest benefit that also costs the most will not necessarily be the highest scoring project.

The Secretary of Transportation has formed an executive workgroup consisting of myself as Chairman, the VDoT Deputy Commissioner, the VDoT Chief Engineer, the VDoT Bristol District Administrator and the Director of the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation. This group will be working on several processes moving forward including soliciting candidate projects from local communities, working with regional leadership to better understand what factors are most important to them, and how to measure the benefits of projects. Also a peer group consisting of experts from outside of Virginia who have implemented prioritization processes in different regions and states will be brought in to serve in an advisory capacity to the workgroup as they move forward in their efforts. It is hoped that the overall process can be put before the CTB and finalized in mid to late 2015 so that work can begin on the six year program for 2016 which must by law be completed by June of 2016.

Be assured that you will be seeing me again as your input is critical to this being a successful process. I am and will be happy to answer and questions you have.

Dan began a brief Q&A session by asking when comments on the weighting of factors would be needed. Nick replied that he would like to complete his first round of visits to insure that everyone understood the process before starting to gather input so four to six months from today would be a good estimate of when to submit comments.

Steve asked for a clearer definition of the term region, in our case would that be the MPO Study Area? Nick responded that there probably will be some flexibility in what would be defined as a region. There will probably be a few different types of weightings across the state such as two or three different urban versions as well as two or three different rural versions that MPO or PDC areas could choose from. Then number of versions will be limited for the purpose of manageability however there should be some options otherwise an area such as the New River Valley would find itself using the same weighting as Northern Virginia and that would not be appropriate. By the same token an areas such as Mecklenburg probably would not want the same weighting as the New River Valley.

Steve then asked if the localities will submitting input or the MPO. Nick responded that the localities will not be asked for input, instead the MPO's and PDC's will be expected to speak on their behalf.

Steve's next question concerned the five scoring factors to be used, will these be well defined so that those considering their relative value in a given area will have a clear understanding of what they entail rather than assuming what general terms such as "economic development" or "congestion mitigation" actually are intended to address? Nick replied that factor definitions have not yet been created however that will be one of the tasks undertaken by the executive workgroup with the assistance of the peer group who has prior experience with

looking at these types of measures and understands their shortcomings and the benefits of using one versus another. We will probably have a candidate set of measures that we are considering that we can provide prior to locking down. We may not have specifics but should have enough of a range to give you a good sense of what the potential universe is.

Steve then inquired about reviewing the metrics which the items will be scored against; how much participation are we to have in that process? Nick replied that that process will probably be centrally managed in order to keep everyone comfortable that they were scored in the same way as the other regions and that the metrics were applied the same way without showing favor or disadvantage to any given region. The hope is that the measures we end up using will be easily understood and simple enough to prevent confusion on how projects were scored.

Steve's final question concerned the MPO's role when a locality proposes a candidate project directly to the CTB. Currently localities submit project requests to the MPO who then submits them to the CTB if they approve of them. Will this six year planning process continue in some fashion and if so does the MPO still need to do some weighting and measuring of project requests from the localities in order to advance them? Nick replied that the intent is to solicit projects from the communities not just VDOT and DRPT however we realize that there a lot of legitimate issues that can result from doing this and that we need to take these into account. Today we don't know exactly how this will work and we are going to have to develop some constructs and come back for feedback before we finalize the process.

There were no more questions and Nick closed with a final comment on funding use. A number of projects in the six year program are exempt from the prioritization process. A lot of funds for things like bridge repair, pavement rehabilitation, highway safety improvement funds from the federal government and the revenue sharing program are exempt from this process. We will be focusing on capacity and expansion projects that are not already fully funded. Later this fall we are going to be publishing a revised six year program and what we will be doing is removing money from partially funded capacity expansion projects and deleting them from the program. We are not going to add any money to any projects until we can use the new process. Fully funded projects will be exempted from that process. We are still uncertain how much money will be available for use in the next few years but in the next few months we hope to give everyone a better sense of how much funding there is to compete for.

Craig thanked Nick for today's visit and also expressed the appreciation of the MPO and the jurisdiction's standpoint for restoration of the funding for the Southgate Interchange and the responsiveness of VDOT and DRPT in addressing the issues surrounding the Exit 118 Park & Ride Lot.

## **PUBLIC ADDRESS**

There were no members of the public wishing to address the Policy Board at this meeting.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### **APPROVAL OF THE NEW RIVER VALLEY MPO BICYCLE – PEDESTRIAN MASTER PLAN**

Dan reported that the New River Valley Planning District Commission, under contract to the MPO, has developed a Master Plan for the MPO using the Multimodal Design Guidelines developed by VDRPT. The PDC has worked with localities throughout the process and has also held public involvement meetings. The last was held in May on the final draft and was received very well by the public. The TAC has reviewed and recommends approval of the plan. Also a proposed resolution is included in the meeting materials.

Following Dan's introduction Kevin Byrd gave a PowerPoint presentation that explained the process used by Eli Sharpe to develop the plan. Eli was the project manager for the study and invested a great deal of time and

effort in gathering information from the localities, analyzing the data, creating heat maps and summarizing the plan. During the development of the draft plan an online multimodal transportation system planning tool was created and will be available for future use on the PDC's website along with an interactive story map. The entire plan will be published on the MPO website once approved.

Following Kevin's presentation Craig expressed appreciation to the PDC Staff for the effort expended on preparing the plan. Craig then asked for discussion on the topic and hearing none asked for a motion on the proposed resolution to accept the final report.

Danny made a motion to accept the final report and Adam provided the second. The resolution passed and follows in its entirety:

## ***New River Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization***

***August 7, 2014***

**Resolution accepting the final report prepared by the New River valley Planning District Commission for the development of the New River Valley MPO Bicycle – Pedestrian Master Plan.**

**On a motion by Danny Wilson seconded by Adam Carpenetti and carried unanimously,**

WHEREAS, the localities that comprise the MPO all have approved bicycle plans, and

WHEREAS, the MPO has not had a consolidated bicycle and pedestrian plan, and

WHEREAS, the MPO contracted with the New River Valley Planning District Commission to develop a plan for the MPO, and

WHEREAS, the PDC has worked with the localities and the public to develop a consolidated plan, and

WHEREAS, the TAC has reviewed and recommends approval.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the New River Valley MPO approves the New River Valley MPO Bicycle Pedestrian Plan.

---

F. Craig Meadows, Chairman

### **Update on the Transit GIS project**

Craig next asked Erik Olsen, MPO Transit Planner to give an update on the Transit GIS project that he has been working, with assistance from several interns. The purpose of the project was to gather GIS information from the transit providers and establish a web location where information from the various services can be viewed for planning purposes.

Erik gave a PowerPoint presentation on the process used to complete the project. The goal of the project was to improve connectivity and coordination of transit in the area. The primary tasks were gathering static data on bus routes and stops in the entire region, inventorying the data,

creating a method to update it periodically and finally displaying it using GIS maps for the sake of consistency. One hundred forty-six individual data sets were collected from the regional transit operators and localities during the discovery process. Once the data had been collected it was placed in layers in a map that uses a single coordinate system and also converted to KML format for use with search engines such as Google. An FTP site for offering the data to those who wish to download it and a web tool for map display are currently being developed, both to be hosted on the PDC website. Addition functionality is being added to the overall map to increase its usefulness as a tool for transit users to determine routes, stops, schedules and so forth in the future and techniques for dynamic updates are being pursued.

## **NEW BUSINESS –**

### **Request from the New River Valley Passenger Rail Committee to fund a feasibility study for extension of passenger rail to the New River Valley.**

Dan reported that a Committee has been established with the goal of extending passenger rail from Roanoke to the New River Valley. This Committee is comprised of elected people from the region as well as representatives from the Universities and the business community. Currently VDRPT's Statewide Rail Plan contains a recommendation in the long range rail resource allocation plan for the extension of passenger rail from Roanoke to Bristol however there are no provisions listed for shorter routes between the two points. The Committee, through the NRV PDC, has requested the MPO to conduct a high level study to determine demand, conduct an operational analysis, and evaluate potential station locations for service between Roanoke and the New River Valley. VDRPT has agreed that the MPO can conduct the study using FTA 5303 planning funds and will assist the MPO during the study. The study would be done under contract with the New River Valley Planning District Commission at a cost of \$65,000. The TAC has reviewed this request and recommends approval and a suggested resolution is included in the meeting materials.

Kevin commented that leadership across the region has shown a lot of interest in getting this project to happen. Discussions on how to accommodate the request led to the opinion that the best approach would be for the PDC to conduct a study if the MPO could supply funding. Dan contacted Chris at VDRPT and cleared using FTA 5303 planning funds for this purpose so now what we need to get started is the Policy Board's approval. The Passenger rail committee has a meeting coming up next week and the VDRPT Director Jennifer Mitchell will be in attendance to hear more about the project.

Steve asked who would actually manage the study. Dan replied that the MPO would manage the study with the intent of delivering a finished product to the passenger rail committee. The MPO TAC probably will do the bulk of managing the study however if it is determined that a subcommittee needs to be formed within the TAC then that is something that can be done.

Anne asked how the expense of the study would be spread across multiple years to which Kevin replied it would 50/50 across two years. The PDC costs will be \$60K and Dan commented that the additional \$5K would be to pay the expense of having Erik Olsen oversee the project as it is 5303 funding. The MPO has adequate funding available in the VDRPT 5303 allocations to conduct the study and at this time there are no other project requests that would use those funds. Our PL

special studies allocations are not involved in this effort.

Discussions having ended Craig asked for comments on the proposed resolution and hearing none asked to hear a motion on the resolution. Anne made a motion for approval and Michael provided the second. The resolution follows in its entirety:

***New River Valley  
Metropolitan Planning Organization***

***August 7, 2014***

**Resolution to approve conducting a Passenger Rail Study for possible extension from Roanoke to the New River Valley.**

**On a motion by Anne McClung seconded by Michael Barber and carried unanimously,**

WHEREAS, the New River Valley Passenger Rail Committee through the New River Valley Planning District Commission has requested the MPO to conduct a high level study for possible extension of passenger rail from Roanoke to the New River Valley; and

WHEREAS, VDRPT has concurred that this study can be done by the MPO using FTA 5303 planning funds, and

WHEREAS, the NRV PDC can conduct this study for the MPO, and

WHEREAS, the Executive Director has obtained a proposal from the NRV PDC for this request; and

WHEREAS, the funding will come from FTA 5303 Planning Funds in the 2014-15 and 2015-16 UPWPs, and

WHEREAS, the TAC has reviewed and recommends approval.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that:

The Policy Board approves this requested study; and

FURTHER, the NRV MPO authorizes the Executive Director to execute a contract on behalf of the NRV MPO with the NRV Planning District Commission to accomplish this work.

---

F. Craig Meadows, Chairman

## **EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

### **Update on VDOT Projects**

Tommy reported the following items:

The temporary Exit 118 Park & Ride lot is in full operation and it is hoped that construction on the permanent lot will begin sometime next summer. VDOT will be having a public hearing on the permanent location this fall and intends to work closely with VDRPT, the County and the Town of Christiansburg on the project.

Two ongoing projects are nearing completion; the Peppers Ferry Bridge on RT. 114 is almost done and the bicycle bridge for the Huckleberry Trail is hoped to be completed before Thanksgiving.

Work has started on the Research Center Drive project and completion is anticipated next spring.

Work on RT. 603 should start this fall, currently we are working on setting up temporary sites for use by emergency services during construction. It is anticipated that RT. 603 will be shut down about ten months during construction.

The Southgate Interchange project is going to advertisement in December. If all goes well we will be starting construction next spring.

The replacement northbound bridge over New River on I-81 near Radford is anticipated to have a start date of June 2016. Currently we are starting right of way acquisition for both bridges however the southbound bridge still lacks adequate funding so construction will be for one bridge only unless more funding is located for the second. We are developing plans and acquiring right of way for both bridges in order to be ready should adequate funding become available for the second bridge.

The bridge replacements for I-81 over RT. 8 near Christiansburg are progressing through the planning process. We will host a citizens information meeting on them this fall, probably in September.

The RT. 8 turn lanes in Riner are constrained by funding so we are looking at downsizing the project back to what it was initially in an attempt to reduce the cost and move forward on getting the turn lanes in with the funding that is available.

### **Transit Planning Projects update**

Erik reported the following:

The final report on the Transit Funding Split for transit operators in the MPO was completed in June.

The Blacksburg Transit MMTF Operations Plan is in house and almost complete. The deadline was extended and additional funds added to allow Wendel to complete the plan.

The Blacksburg Transit Regional Cost Model Upgrade has been advertised for RFP's. The cost model is utilized to prepare annual budgets and predict the impact of requests for new services. It is hoped that work will begin on this project sometime this fall.

The VA Tech Campus Transit/Bike/Pedestrian Study startup has been delayed due to the inability to

find a suitable consultant group that would work within the constraints of the proposed budget. Consideration is being given to increasing the budget and advertising again.

The Regional GIS Study we covered earlier in the meeting.

The Regional Connection Study is awaiting the completion of five other studies due to having dependencies on their results. May launch late this fall or early in the spring.

## MPO Planning Projects update

Dan reported on the following:

The Western Perimeter Road Study (funded by VA Tech) is awaiting the return of the students prior to conducting traffic counts however the final report should be completed in October.

The Long Range Plan Update project continues to progress on schedule, must be completed in June of 2015. WRA has completed meetings with the localities and VDOT and now are working with the information they gathered. We may be able to hold an initial public meeting this fall.

VDOT is also doing a project for the MPO, the North Main & RT. 460 Traffic Improvement Study. A scope of work has been developed and is currently being reviewed by VDOT's on call consultant.

## Rideshare update

Dan reported that the dramatic drop in the number of participants shown in the last quarterly report that we sent out was due to housekeeping. It was time to clean out the database to remove those who were no longer participants. The program is still healthy.

Kevin added that in the NRV relies heavily on employers reaching out to their employees, encouraging them to participate and offering incentives to those to do. At this time the pool of employers is in a steady state and growth has slowed until there are upticks in the employment growth in the area. A number of events are being considered in the future in an attempt to gather in additional participants who for whatever reason may not be aware of the program.

## Other Items

There were no other items discussed.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

### **INTO CLOSED MEETING**

Craig announced that there was one item of business needing to be discussed and asked to hear a motion to enter into a closed meeting.

**On a motion by Michael Barber seconded by Anne McClung and carried unanimously,**

BE IT RESOLVED, The MPO Policy Board hereby enters into Closed Meeting for the purpose of discussing the following:

Section 2.1-3711      (1)      Discussion, Consideration, or Interviews of  
Prospective Candidates for Employment;  
Assignment, Appointment, Promotion,  
Performance, Demotion, Salaries, Disciplining or  
Resignation of Specific Officers, Appointees or  
Employees of Any Public Body

Personnel Matter

### **OUT OF CLOSED MEETING**

Business concluded, Craig asked to hear a motion to end the Closed Meeting.

**On a motion by Michael Barber seconded by Jim Hurt and carried unanimously,**

BE IT RESOLVED, The MPO Policy Board hereby ends their Closed Meeting to return to Regular Session.

### **CERTIFICATION OF CLOSED MEETING**

Craig next asked to hear a motion to certify the Closed Meeting.

**On a motion by Michael Barber seconded by Michael Sutphin and carried unanimously,**

WHEREAS, The MPO Policy Board has convened a Closed Meeting on this date pursuant to an affirmative recorded vote and in accordance with the provisions of the Virginia Freedom of Information Act; and

WHEREAS, Section 2.2-3711 of the Code of Virginia requires a certification by the Policy Board that such Closed Meeting was conducted in conformity with Virginia law.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, The MPO Policy Board hereby certifies that to the best of each member's knowledge (i) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the closed meeting to which this certification resolution applies, and (ii) only such public business matters as identified in the motion conveying the closed meeting were heard, discussed or considered by the Policy Board.

VOTE

AYES:

Craig Meadows, Anne McClung, Michael Sutphin, Michael Barber, Adam Carpenetti, Jim Hurt, Danny Wilson, Tommy DiGiulian.

NAYS:

None

ABSENT DURING VOTE:

Annette Perkins, Bruce Brown, Ranny O'Dell.

ABSENT DURING MEETING:

Bruce Brown, Ranny O'Dell.

**ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND AMENDMENT TO EMPLOYMENT AGREEMENT**

Based on Dan's annual performance review a 2.5% increase in salary, retroactive to July 1, 2014, was recommended.

Craig asked to hear a motion to authorize the salary increase.

**On a motion by Michael Barber seconded by Anne McClung and carried unanimously,**

BE IT RESOLVED, By the MPO Policy Board that Section (4)1 of the Employment Agreement between John Daniel Brugh and the ~~Blacksburg/Christiansburg/Montgomery Area~~ New River Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization dated July 22, 2003 is hereby amended effective August 7, 2014 as follows:

(4) COMPENSATION

1. Salary

The MPO shall pay Brugh an annual salary rate of ~~\$48,000 \$48,960 \$51,408 \$53,464 \$55,600 \$58,380 \$59,548, \$61,334, \$66,057~~(5.7% retirement adjustment, 2% performance), ~~\$68,039~~, **\$69740** annual salary shall be paid to Brugh in a manner applicable to the fiscal agent for the MPO. The MPO and Brugh may mutually agree to adjust the salary of Brugh during the term of this Agreement. Any adjustment made during the life of this agreement shall be in the form of an amendment and become part of this agreement, but it shall not be deemed that MPO and Brugh have entered into a new agreement. It is agreed that MPO shall review Burgh's performance June of each calendar year.

---

F. Craig Meadows, Chairman

Craig then had Dan return to the meeting, informed him of the results of his annual performance review and asked Dan to continue in the role of Executive Director of the BCMA MPO for another year.

**NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING**

Craig announced that the next scheduled meeting is September 4, 2014 at 2:00 PM in the Montgomery County Government Center.

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further agenda items to discuss, Craig adjourned the meeting at 4:00 PM.

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_

**F. Craig Meadows, Chairman**