

**Project Implementation Working Group  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority**

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Christopher Zimmerman, Chairman  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

Members  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**FROM:** Gerry Connolly, Chairman  
Project Implementation Working Group  
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

**SUBJECT:** Report of the Project Implementation Working Group

**DATE:** June 1, 2007

**Recommendations of Working Group:**

The Working Group recommends that the NVTA take the following actions on June 6, 2007:

1. Task the Interim Technical Committee to prepare a list of projects that are ready to be advertised for construction, along with the estimated amount of funding needed and recommended funding source (state funds, bond, NVTA funds, local funds). The list shall be submitted to the NVTA at its July 12, 2007, meeting.
2. Task the Interim Technical Committee to recommend, by November 1, 2007, a general project development process that can be tailored to specific projects. The process should include general considerations regarding the choice of project implementation methods (consultant, design-build, local jurisdiction staff, VDOT, DRPT, regional agency, PPTA, etc.) as well as requirements for design reviews, environmental reviews, permits, consultant selection, right-of-way acquisition and utility relocation, maintenance of traffic, public outreach, and project document archiving.
3. Task the Financial Working Group, in coordination with the Project Implementation Working Group, to identify the amount of funding available for bond sales and initial project implementation, and task the Project Implementation Working Group to recommend a process for funding projects. The process shall address such considerations as the percentage of estimated project cost to be available upon project advertisement, project payment schedule, maximum percentage of allowable project cost increase, a process for determining responsibility for project cost overruns, and project accounting requirements.
4. Consider including in the FY2008 Legislative Program a recommendation that the General Assembly pass legislation that will permit streamlining NVTA project implementation. Such legislation should raise the dollar limit on on-call consultant task orders.

Christopher Zimmerman, Chairman

5. Task the Interim Technical Committee to recommend a project prioritization process for projects in the adopted regional Constrained Long Range Plan and any long range plan adopted by the NVTA using previously adopted NVTA criteria for project evaluation and selection.
6. Task the Interim Technical Committee to recommend a six-year project implementation program not later than November 1, 2007. Such program will identify projects and phases to be initiated in each year of the program, along with estimated funding requirements, source of funding (NVTA funds, state funds, bond funds, local funds, PPTA), and the recommended approach for implementing the project (PPTA, consultant, local forces, VDOT, etc.). The Working Group recommends that this Six Year Program be coordinated annually with the Commonwealth Transportation Board.
7. Task the Interim Technical Committee to develop by November 1, 2007, based on coordination with VDOT, a list of highways that have already been "Federalized" through past use of Federal funds and therefore must comply with provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).
8. Task the Legal Work Group, in conjunction with the Interim Technical Committee, to draft a general project management agreement that can be tailored as needed for specific circumstances.
9. Based on the recommendation of the Organizational Work Group, include a small initial project implementation function within the NVTA organization. This function could be performed by hired staff or by a consultant, as the NVTA chooses.
10. While recognizing that PPTA proposals can be an effective project implementation tool, adopt a policy that until the NVTA has sufficient project management resources, in accordance with an organization plan approved by the NVTA, no unsolicited PPTA proposals will be accepted.

Response to Overarching Question. (*"How will NVTA implement projects once funding is available? In addition, how will earmarks for WMATA and VRE be handled?"*)

In order to take advantage of project development that has already occurred, the NVTA should first implement projects that are 1) already listed in the adopted Constrained Long Range Plan, 2) substantially complete in terms of designs and required Federal or state permits, 3) only need funding to proceed to land acquisition, advertisement, and construction, or 4) enhanced transit services that can be quickly implemented due to the availability of transit vehicles and support facilities. Such approach will take maximum advantage of work already completed and enable the NVTA to quickly show accomplishments. A six-year program of planned projects should be developed and updated annually to facilitate programming of funds, provide a blueprint of planned work to the public, and enable "cradle-to-grave" project development processes to be institutionalized. Depending on the specific project characteristics (complexity, modes involved, jurisdictional considerations, estimated cost, and other factors), different approaches will be needed (e.g. PPTA, contractor design-build, use of jurisdiction / regional agency / VDOT or DRPT staff, use of a general engineering consultant) since one approach will not be best for all situations.

Christopher Zimmerman, Chairman

Members, Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

June 1, 2007

Concerning annual earmarks for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) and the Virginia Railway Express (VRE), the Working Group recommends that the WMATA funding be transferred to the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC) to be held in trust for the WMATA jurisdictions, in an interest bearing account (with the interest retained by each individual account), to be used for capital improvements benefiting the area embraced by WMATA. These funds should first be used to provide such annual distribution as may be necessary under the requirements of Federal law for the payment of Federal funds to WMATA, but only if the matching Federal funds are exclusive of, and in addition to, the amount of other Federal funds appropriated for such purposes and are in an amount not less than the amount of such funds appropriated in the Federal fiscal year ending September 30, 2007. NVTC should allocate these funds to the WMATA jurisdictions' accounts based on the WMATA capital formula for the fiscal year in which the funds are received.

NVTA should allocate VRE funds to NVTC and the Potomac Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC) based on the percentage of ridership attributable to each VRE jurisdiction that is also a member of NVTA. NVTC and PRTC should hold these funds in trust for these jurisdiction, in an interest bearing account (with the interest retained by each individual account), to be used for VRE operating and capital improvements, including, but not limited to, track lease payments, construction of parking, dedicated rail on the Fredericksburg line, rolling stock, expanded service to Prince William County, and service as may be needed as a result of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission's action regarding Fort Belvoir. NVTC and PRTC should allocate these funds to VRE and NVTA jurisdiction's accounts based on the percentage of ridership attributable to the jurisdiction for the fiscal year in which the funds are received. VRE staff will meet staff from the NVTA jurisdictions that are also members of VRE annually while VRE's budget is being prepared to discuss how these funds could be spent during the upcoming fiscal year. The goal of this meeting is to prepare a recommendation for the VRE Operations Board, the local governments and NVTA that, if approved, can be included in VRE's budget.

#### Responses to Other Questions Submitted to Working Group

In response to a question from the Finance Committee ("how much money will be needed for business start-up?"), the Group believes that \$5 million is a realistic initial estimate for the first year or two of NVTA project implementation until annual financial requirements are determined and an annual budget is adopted. That amount should cover initial annual salaries (or consultant fees) for a small project implementation function, obtain office space / equipment / initial supplies, plus provide seed funding for one or more initial projects.

#### Responses to Additional Questions Asked by Working Group

What does Project Implementation mean to the group? Project implementation involves a policy / decision-making body, a project manager, a technical team, contractors, an advisory committee, and public involvement. These entities, however, may not necessarily fall under the responsibilities executed by NVTA. As an example, for local projects within one jurisdiction the NVTA role might be to oversee but

Christopher Zimmerman, Chairman  
Members, Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

not to implement and manage the project. For such projects, it may be appropriate merely to have a project management agreement between the jurisdiction and NVTA similar to, but possibly not as comprehensive as, the agreement between VDOT and jurisdictions for locally administered projects. In the case when the project site involves more than one jurisdiction, an option for project implementation is to have NVTA serve as the project manager on behalf of, and in coordination with, the participating jurisdictions.

Additional thoughts for NVTA consideration:

- In order to preclude creating a bureaucratic organization parallel to existing project implementing agencies, the Working Group envisions the NVTA to be more a skeletal organization that takes maximum advantage of existing expertise and capability at the level of local jurisdictions and state and regional agencies. In terms of technical involvement in projects and its decision-making role, the NVTA is seen as the regional body that approves a Six Year Program of projects, approves project funding requests and allocates funding to approved projects, and establishes processes for projects implemented under its aegis. While the NVTA may be involved with individual project details, design considerations, and contractor selection for projects it manages, its involvement in projects implemented by local jurisdictions or transit agencies may be more a funding and oversight role.
- The NVTA role will be different depending on whether the project is a single-jurisdiction or agency project, or involves more than one jurisdiction / agency. The NVTA may implement projects on a reimbursable basis for a member jurisdiction or agency, or provide coordination among jurisdictions / agencies implementing larger, more complex projects.
- State agencies (DRPT and VDOT) will continue to have a major role in project implementation. For NVTA or jurisdiction / agency projects, the role of these state agencies will likely include any necessary coordination with Federal and Commonwealth regulatory agencies and regional planning organizations, among other roles including right-of-way acquisition, use of Master Agreements for utilities, congestion management plan implementation / administration, financial planning, communications / public outreach, permitting, etc. For highway projects, VDOT will continue to have a construction inspection and street acceptance role to facilitate state maintenance (except in Arlington and the independent Cities).
- In order to minimize disruption resulting from project implementation, NVTA should make maximum practicable use of VDOT, DRPT and local jurisdiction practices to maintain traffic flow and minimize construction congestion. This is particularly true for very complex or multi-jurisdictional projects. The jurisdiction or agency managing the individual project should be responsible for implementing these congestion mitigation measures. The jurisdiction or agency should also seek to coordinate congestion management measures with other on-going projects, as appropriate, to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the mitigation measures.

- To receive funding from NVTA, a project must be in NVTA's short-term or long-range plan. This will ensure regional review of, and support for, those projects funded with the 60% funding from HB 3202 that is controlled by the NVTA. Each jurisdiction remains free to use its own revenues from HB 3202 (the 40% share) for projects it desires to implement. The NVTA Six Year Program should be updated annually, to account for project cost or scope changes as well as to accept new projects. The Program should be coordinated with VDOT and DRPT, and submitted upon adoption to the Commonwealth Transportation Board for information.

### Background and Discussion

This Working Group's charge was to discuss how projects might be implemented and recommend actions that the NVTA can take to successfully undertake transportation projects. A synopsis of the discussion points, grouped by topic, is:

Funding HB 3202 gives the NVTA the potential to receive more than \$300 million annually. Following a review of the NVTA bylaws (regarding voting provisions) the group reviewed the Northern Virginia package of potential fees and taxes. While the combination of NVTA-imposed fees and locally imposed taxes could provide about \$400 million annually, an amount in the range of \$160 million to \$200 million may be an appropriate amount for initial project planning purposes. The NVTA's TransAction 2030 Plan provided a roughly equal highway / transit balance, and it is felt that the NVTA may continue that balance, thus providing about \$80 - \$100 million for each mode (with the transit amount including the \$75 million earmarked for WMATA and VRE). An amount of \$10 million set aside for debt service might support a \$100 million bond sale. Development of a programming document will provide NVTA members and interested citizens a list of projects to be implemented in the near future, along with funding streams for those projects. To synchronize with the region's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and VDOT's Six Year Improvement Program, the recommended NVTA programming document should cover a period of six years.

Project selection There was agreement that the NVTA should focus first on projects that are already in the VDOT or local jurisdiction project development process and chiefly need additional funding to be advertised and constructed. Such a choice of projects will take advantage of work already completed, permits already obtained, design already completed, public hearings already conducted, and right-of-way already acquired. Additionally, such projects are already in the regional Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) and thus have regional acceptance and have undergone air quality conformity analysis. In addition to highway projects already in the project development process there should be a review of transit projects in the CLRP. There was recognition that the NVTA's funds will be "local", not Federal, and that may help expedite projects. However, projects providing a highway capacity increase or having regional significance will still need to be included in the Transportation Planning Board's (TPB's) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and air quality conformity analysis. At least for the near term, TIP activity (submitting new

Christopher Zimmerman, Chairman

projects or amendments to existing projects) should continue to be performed by VDOT since its staff already has that responsibility and an established working relationship with the TPB. Additionally, the process for implementing transit projects should be reviewed for ways to improve it. While the TransAction 2030 Plan provides an overall priority listing of needs, there was agreement that the NVTA should develop a near-term plan / programming document akin to the Commonwealth's Six Year Program that identifies projects proposed for funding over the next several years. To dovetail with the state's Six Year Program and the TPB TIP the programming document should cover a six year period and be available on the NVTA website. Such a document will also assist the NVTA in ensuring that individual jurisdictions receive their proportional share of revenues as mandated by HB 3202 as well as provide planning information to interested citizens.

Existing consultant contracts To aid in quickly implementing selected projects, the NVTA should make maximum use of existing on-call contracts. Staff discussions have found that local jurisdictions and agencies are currently making use of opportunities to engage consultants to supplement in-house staff. Some jurisdictions use only one or two consultants as their on-call resource while others use several, depending on the particular area of technical expertise needed (general engineering, surveying, geotechnical, environmental, and so forth). The current statutory limitation on on-call consultant task orders (\$200,000 or \$250,000, depending on the jurisdiction / agency with a total of \$1 million annually) should be increased to \$1 million per task order and a total of \$3 million annually to permit the NVTA to hire a General Engineering Consultant (GEC), when appropriate, that can organize and employ a team of sub-consultants on large projects. The current statutory limitation will limit the amount of project design and preparation that can be accomplished and lengthen the time needed for project implementation.

Project oversight Participants discussed the need for a project management and programming function within NVTA, with such staff or consultant hired by the Executive Director subject to NVTA's consent. Participants also discussed the need for increased responsiveness from VDOT's NoVA District (via increasing the District staff and giving the District more authority to make project level decisions rather than needing to obtain such decisions from VDOT's Central Office). Initially, the NVTA project implementation function may be a small group of NVTA staff or a consultant. In either case, the Executive Director, with the consent of the NVTA, would hire the resources for such a function. In addition to programming and consultant management functions, this function might also be involved in project scoping, writing project specifications, selecting and negotiating with consultants, reviewing project design plans, coordinating with appropriate agencies for needed permits, managing construction change orders, and inspecting construction or managing a project inspection contractor. There was also recognition that different levels of projects will require different degrees of management – no one approach will be optimal for all projects. For example, a turn-lane addition project, involving only one jurisdiction, may require a VDOT permit and might be managed by local jurisdiction staff. At the other end of the spectrum, a multi-million dollar multi-modal multi-jurisdiction project may require Federal (Corps of Engineers, FHWA and / or FTA) or state environmental agency approvals, air quality conformity analysis,

Christopher Zimmerman, Chairman

Members, Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

land acquisition and utility relocation, inclusion in the regional TIP, a dedicated project manager (or general engineering consultant to manage several sub-consultants and building contractors) and coordination with jurisdiction staff in addition to a VDOT permit.

Management processes Since “project implementation” implies cradle-to-grave planning and management, it was suggested that the NVTA develop a project management process to assist the project management function in identifying regulatory and local requirements that must be met in order to get a project to the construction stage, as well as identifying plans and other project documents that should be retained following construction completion. Such a process will assist project coordinators in recognizing the differences in regulatory requirements between small local projects and larger multi-jurisdiction projects. The VDOT concurrent engineering process can serve as a basis for such an NVTA process. Similarly, existing local project management agreements and memoranda of understanding (MOUs) can be modified for use by the NVTA and its jurisdictions for NVTA projects. A more detailed discussion of typical project management / construction processes available to the NVTA is provided at Attachment A but such processes include management by in-house staff, local jurisdiction staff, state agencies, regional agencies, use of a GEC, or by PPTA or design-build processes.

Streamlining project implementation Coordination with VDOT and DRPT, and support by those agencies, will still be needed to successfully implement projects. Based on local jurisdiction experience, a change to current VDOT practice that will provide greater authority for the Northern Virginia District to approve project actions might help expedite the project review, approval, and construction process. Additionally, other aspects of project implementation and management have been suggested that might help expedite NVTA projects. These suggestions are discussed in more detail in Attachment B.

Transit funding. While it has been recommended that “designated recipients” be established to receive and distribute funds to NVTC for WMATA and NVTC and PRTC for VRE, there are statutory complexities that must be considered in providing NVTA funds to those agencies for transit improvements. A discussion of funding for WMATA and VRE is provided at the beginning of this report.

#### Activities that Working Group is Still Undertaking

The Working Group will continue developing a project implementation process if the NVTA desires.

#### Members of the Working Group

The members of the Project Implementation working Group are listed on Attachment C.

## **Project Management Options**

The Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) may have an estimated \$160-200 million a year (not including the \$75 million earmarks to WMATA and VRE) to implement transportation projects in the region. These projects will need to be monitored by NVTA staff to make sure that they are being completed as proposed. As for how and who implements these projects, there are many choices for the NVTA to consider. Each unique project will lend itself to a project management option suited to its need. The following is a listing of viable options the NVTA may have when determining how a project will be managed.

- The Northern Virginia Transportation Authority – The NVTA could determine that the best way to handle a project is by managing it in-house. Although all projects done with NVTA funds should be monitored by NVTA staff, some projects could be managed by the NVTA itself, once staff has been established. This option may not be feasible with initial recommended staffing, but could be an option as the NVTA grows. Projects that would best be suited for NVTA management include large regional road projects and inter-jurisdictional projects.
- Local Jurisdictions – The NVTA could allow a member jurisdiction to manage projects through the local processes established by the jurisdictions. NVTA staff or management consultant would oversee the project to ensure that desired quality standards are met. Local jurisdictions could choose to either manage the project in-house or have a consultant / contractor (PPTA / design-build) manage the project. Projects that would best be suited for local jurisdiction management are those projects proposed by the NVTA which are located solely in the jurisdiction that would manage them.
- State Agencies – The NVTA could allow a Commonwealth agency to manage projects through the State / Federal processes. The Commonwealth agencies that could manage transportation projects in Northern Virginia include the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT). Both these agencies have extensive experience in managing both Commonwealth and Federal transportation projects. VDOT would best be suited to implement large scale Federal road projects, while DRPT would best be suited to manage large Federal transit projects. Both of these agencies would use consultant / contractor support, and both would be overseen by the NVTA to assure project quality. VDOT and DRPT also have experience with Public-Private Transportation Act (PPTA) projects, and could choose to implement a project through that method.
- Regional Agencies – The NVTA could allow a regional transit agency to manage projects through the processes established by those agencies. The regional transit agencies that could accomplish such project management include (1) The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), (2) The Virginia Railway Express (VRE), (3) The Northern Virginia Transportation Commission (NVTC), and (4) The Potomac-Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC). All of these agencies have experience managing Commonwealth and Federal projects and could be chosen to do regional and local transit projects. NVTA staff would oversee the projects to assure project quality. The agencies could choose to do the project in-house or seek consultant / contractor support. Projects best suited for these agencies are regional transit capital projects and / or local transit projects (when the project is located within the

agency's member jurisdiction).

- General Engineering Consultant (GEC) – The NVTA could allow projects to be managed by a GEC, under supervision of NVTA staff. This method of managing a project is not limited to the NVTA, but could be used by any of the project managers / implementing agencies mentioned above. A GEC is ideal when an agency is low on staff, but the contract and project need to be monitored closely by an accountable agency or governing body in order to assure desired project quality, so staff will still be needed to implement a project or an entire program through this method.
- Public-Private Transportation Act (PPTA) / Design-Build Processes – PPTA proposals and design-build contracts can be an effective tool for project implementation. The NVTA could allow for projects to be done through these state-established processes. Any PPTA proposals accepted or design-build projects that may be pursued in the future should respect the priorities established by the NVTA in its long range plan (currently TransAction 2030). The NVTA may wish to develop its own guidelines for considering PPTA proposals when it has the staff capabilities to do so. These guidelines should recognize the successes and concerns with recent PPTA projects. These processes could be used by any project managers / implementing agencies mentioned above. VDOT, DRPT and other some jurisdictions have experience in using these methods for project implementation. Although these methods have private consulting firms / consortiums managing the project, staff is needed to oversee the project and negotiate solutions to issues that may occur during the lifetime of the project. These methods can be used to complete an entire construction program or to do local, State, and / or Federal projects individually. Until staff or consultant resources identified in an approved organization plan are available, the Working Group recommends that NVTA choose not to accept any unsolicited proposals.

As outlined above, the NVTA will have many choices in who implements and how to implement its projects, but the NVTA needs to be aware that as it assigns projects to different agencies or consultants certain issues must be addressed. These issues include, but are not limited to: (1) clearly establishing the roles of the NVTA and agencies involved, (2) payroll reimbursements to the jurisdictions or agency managing the projects, (3) having project management agreements / MOUs in place, and (4) determining how the cash flow would occur for a project.

The NVTA needs to consider all of these and other factors before deciding on a project management team or method, but the above list gives the NVTA some available options. All of these options include the NVTA needing staff to oversee projects, so a minimal staff will be needed before initial project inception. Each NVTA project will be different and may need a different approach, but this initial list should help determine how and who is best suited to complete a project.

## **Suggestion for Streamlining the Project Implementation Process**

In 1998, Congress enacted the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21), which includes provisions that coordinate Federal agency involvement in major highway projects under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. According to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Center for Environmental Excellence, the provisions were intended to address concerns relating to delays in implementing projects, unnecessary duplication of effort, and added costs often associated with the conventional process for reviewing and approving surface transportation projects.

Section 1309 of TEA-21 directs the transportation entities to meet the goals of expedited transportation project delivery and integrate review and permitting processes that identify key decision points and potential conflicts as early as possible. Section 1309 also encourages full and early participation by all relevant agencies that must review a highway construction or transit project or issue a permit, license, and opinion relating to the project. This provision also promotes coordinating time schedules for agencies to act on a project and establishing dispute resolution procedures while furthering NEPA decision making.

The overall goal of this project implementation coordination is to continue to find ways to streamline the process between the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority members and Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). Listed below are a few recommendations and suggestions that could be explored during the establishment of NVTA processes and procedures:

### **Streamlining VDOT Approvals in Northern Virginia Region**

- Most construction projects within VDOT's Northern Virginia (NoVA) District need approvals from VDOT's Central Office at some point during the design review and permitting phases. This is particularly true when design exceptions are needed. Often, the Central Office staff have not seen the project site and are not familiar with the project details or the stakeholder concerns. It would be helpful if the Northern Virginia District Office could have more autonomy regarding project approvals and provide these approvals since NoVA District staff are more familiar with the projects and site conditions.
- Examine whether some final project approval authority may be delegated by VDOT's Chief Engineer, who is located in Richmond, to the NoVA District Administrator.
- Local jurisdictions have found staff in the Local Assistance Division very helpful in implementing projects expeditiously. A small branch of that Division should be established within the Northern Virginia District Office to provide such support to the NVTA as well as to local jurisdictions.
- Discuss with VDOT the possibility of changing the present permitting process (can the NVTA be exempted from paying for a permit, can blanket permits be issued for certain types of projects), jointly developing expedited project review and street acceptance processes, and jointly developing master project management agreements that would include multiple projects of the same type and complexity.

## **Granting Eminent Domain Powers to NVTA in the future**

The legislation establishing the NVTA authorizes the NVTA to acquire land by purchase, lease, or gift. NVTA has not been given eminent domain powers. Currently, VDOT, local jurisdictions and transit agencies have the power to condemn privately owned land that is needed for public projects. VDOT and local governments have the ability to execute “quick takes” for roadway projects only. Initially, the NVTA may prefer to rely on the ability of VDOT, local jurisdictions and transit agencies to acquire any right-of-way that may be needed for NVTA projects. However, without the power of eminent domain, NVTA may be at a disadvantage in negotiating with property owners to purchase their land. Land acquisition, by whomever accomplished, can have significant personnel staffing implications if performed in-house, or these typical tasks (appraisal, negotiation, sale and deed transfer) could be accomplished by using a consultant. While not essential initially, NVTA may find such powers necessary in the future since VDOT and local jurisdiction / transit agency right-of-way acquisition staff are already fully engaged. This opportunity should be evaluated in more detail in the future.

## **Considerations for NVTA Project Implementation Process**

- NVTA project coordinators should obtain a comprehensive list of documentation and develop a timeline of VDOT approval points at the start of the project. Some of the necessary material and information are listed on the VDOT website ([www.VirginiaDOT.org](http://www.VirginiaDOT.org)). However, since every project is slightly different, and project documentation / approvals can change while the project is advancing through preliminary phases, it would be helpful to the project coordinator to ensure that he / she has a clear understanding of necessary approvals and project documentation to enable smooth construction initiation.
- Establish, and adhere to, a firm deadline for comments during design review. Having all comments at the same time reduces the need for project coordinators to respond constantly to issues or changing plans. This adds time and extra expense to projects.
- Scope expansion (“scope creep”) should be minimized, both to control costs as well as permit adherence to initial project timelines. While unforeseen site conditions (soils or drainage issues, for example) may require scope changes, such changes can be reduced by thorough project scoping and site investigation during the project planning stages. Additionally, changes in scope on a multi-jurisdiction project could lead to questions regarding which jurisdictions should be responsible for any cost increase, or how such a cost increase should be shared. There should be some agreement about cost sharing when NVTA members fund improvements on VDOT roads.
- Explore financial mechanisms that help reduce the burden on local jurisdictions of carrying the cost of reimbursement funding on major projects. Many projects administered by local jurisdictions must have costs paid first and reimbursed later – this is the normal case when Federal funding is involved. This presents a hardship if the project is a costly major one.
- Obtain prorated authority for the NVTA for utility relocations.
- Establish authority, procedures and policies for procurement of architect/engineering service consultant contracts, and land acquisition building on existing documents already in use by the local jurisdictions, the state and regional agencies.

- Effort should be given to the new context sensitive design standards in the very urbanized areas. *Context Sensitive Solutions in Designing Major Urban Thoroughfares for Walkable Communities*, a proposed recommended practice from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), is an excellent guide document.
- Proposed projects that are not projected to affect the function of roadway segments or intersections should be allowed to proceed through an abbreviated or "fast-track" approval process coordinated with VDOT. Such projects may demonstrate any of the following characteristics:
  1. Sidewalk-only projects - Projects that involve the creation or expansion of pedestrian access along a roadway, with no proposed alteration to the vehicular travel way.
  2. Accessibility-only projects - Projects that expand / improve an existing pedestrian crossing to meet current VDOT or the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility guidelines.
  3. Curb & Gutter projects - Projects that include the creation or repair of curb & gutter along a roadway segment. (Must meet VDOT design requirements.)
  4. Bike lane projects - Projects that include the creation or expansion of bike lanes along roadway segments. (Must meet VDOT / AASHTO requirements.)
  5. Signal Modification projects- Projects that improve pedestrian and vehicular flow. Strong consideration to approval of modifications on state-system roadways in limited right-of-way urban areas. Since the highway signal system in Northern Virginia is coordinated to support major incident management or evacuation, any signal modification project will need to be coordinated with VDOT and adjoining jurisdictions before implementation.
- Additionally, below are other, smaller improvements that could also help the process:
  1. Continuity of contacts at jurisdictions and agencies. When project reviewers change throughout the course of a project, new review comments might be generated with each new person in the position, thus lengthening the project development process.
  2. A more transparent TIP / STIP (State Transportation Improvement Program) process. In the past year VDOT has switched from an allocation format to an obligation format for these documents, in response to Federal guidelines, and has coordinated more extensively with local jurisdictions and agencies regarding input to the TPB's TIP. It will help NVTA members and programming staff if real-time read-only access to these documents can be provided.
  3. Access by NVTA project coordinators to all VDOT / DRPT approved documentation. This will enhance NVTA record keeping and minimize confusion and project development delays resulting from state agency personnel turnover.

To further help the process, the AASHTO Center for Environmental Excellence Technical Assistance Program offers a team of highly qualified and experienced experts on-call and ready to assist transportation and environmental agency officials in improving environmental performance and program delivery. According to the Program, the team members individually, or as a team, supply strategic environmental analysis and focused environmental management technical advice through short-term assignments. Technical experts are currently available for assignments in a variety of subject matters. This may provide some additional assistance in the short-term as the NVTA matures its organization and functions.

**Attachment C**

**Project Implementation Working Group Members**

	<b>Role / Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Name</b>
<b>NVTA Members</b>	<b>Chairman</b>	<b>Gerry Connolly</b>
	<b>Vice Chairman</b>	<b>Judy Connally</b>
	<b>Member</b>	<b>Bryan Polk</b>
	<b>Member</b>	<b>Del Jeff Frederick</b>
	<b>Member</b>	<b>Sen. Jeannemarie Devolites-Davis</b>
	<b>Member</b>	<b>Dennis Morrison</b>
<b>Transportation Staff Appointment:</b>		
	ALEXANDRIA	Jim Maslanka
	ARLINGTON	Steve Del Giudice
	ARLINGTON	Bee Buerger
	DRPT	Corey Hill
	DRPT	Charles Badger
	FAIRFAX CITY	Alex Verzosa
	FAIRFAX	Kathy Ichter
	FALLS CHURCH	Wendy Block Sanford
	FALLS CHURCH	Cindy Mester
	LEESBURG	Jim Chandler
	LOUDOUN	Charles Yudd
	MANASSAS	Mike Moon
	MANASSAS PARK	Vanessa Watson
	MWCOG	Gerald Miller
	NVTC	Adam McGavock
	PRTC	Betsy Massie
	PRINCE WILLIAM	Tom Blaser/ Ricardo Canizales
	VDOT	Bob McDonald
	VRE	Christine Hoeffner
	VRE	Jennifer Straub
	WMATA	Shiva Pant
	WMATA	Nat Bottigheimer
	WMATA	Wendy Jia
<b>Public Works Staff Appointment if different from above:</b>	ALEXANDRIA	Rich Baier
	ALEXANDRIA	Eleonore Cox
	ARLINGTON	Terry Bellamy
	FAIRFAX	Ron Kirkpatrick
	FAIRFAX	Larry Ichter
	MANASSAS PARK	Kathy Gammell
	PRINCE WILLIAM	Dave Tyeryar