



Northern Virginia Transportation Authority
The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia

Thursday, September 11, 2014

7:00 pm

3060 Williams Drive (Ste 510), Fairfax, VA 22031

MEETING MINUTES

I. Call to Order Chairman Nohe

- Chairman Nohe called the meeting to order at 7:03pm.

II. Roll Call Ms. Speer, Clerk

- Voting Members: Chairman Nohe; Mayor Euille (arrived 7:15pm); Board Member Hynes; Chairman York; Chairman Bulova; Mayor Parrish; Mayor Silverthorne (arrive 7:05pm); Council Member Rishell; Council Member Snyder; Senator Ebbin; Delegate Rust; Delegate Minchew; Mr. Garczynski.
- Non-Voting Members: Ms. Cuervo; Ms. Mitchell.
- Staff: Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Michael Longhi (CFO); Denise Harris (Program Coordinator); Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator); Camela Speer (Clerk); Peggy Teal (Assistant Finance Officer); various jurisdictional staff.

III. Minutes of the July 24, 2014 Meeting

- Mayor Parrish moved approval of the July 24, 2014 minutes; seconded by Board Member Hynes. Motion passed with eight (8) yeas and three (3) abstentions [with Chairman York, Council Member Snyder and Mr. Garczynski abstaining as they were not at the July meeting].
- Delegate Minchew noted that Mayor Umstatted would have liked to have been in attendance this evening, but she was presiding over the 9/11 Memorial in Leesburg for the eleventh year.

(Mayor Silverthorne arrived.)

Presentation

IV. House Bill 2 (2014) Implementation Deputy Secretary Donohue

- Deputy Secretary Donohue thanked the Authority for the opportunity to speak this evening. He spoke to the Authority about HB 2, stating that he wanted to manage the Authority's expectations at the beginning of this process. He presented information about how the State will be moving forward and what

the legislation does and does not do. He added that at this time he does not have all the answers. Deputy Secretary Donohue explained that he is traveling to all the different regions in the State to get input about how they think the HB 2 process should work and to hear their concerns or suggestions about the concept as it stands today. The State will then use those initial recommendations to report to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB). Deputy Secretary Donohue stated that the Authority's input and insights are key to the State as it moves forward in developing this process. He went on to present information on HB 2.

(Mayor Euille arrived.)

- Chairman Bulova asked how projects that are funded through a multiple funding sources will be addressed and how this will effect prioritization and the selection system. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that this issue has been raised both by this region and Hampton Roads. He stated that it is something the State will have to take a further look at, that he does not have an answer yet. Will talk to regional staff more about this in coming months and is open to suggestions or thoughts on how this should be developed.
- Chairman Bulova asked how the State anticipates engaging staff in this process. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that he has already started meeting with staff and plans to interact on a regular basis. Anticipates meeting every month or so to talk through issues and get feedback. Will meet more often if necessary. The State is committed to making themselves more available to have discussions with staff across the state about these issues. He added that the State believes it is important to get this right and have something that can be in place, beyond this administration, that everyone understands how it was developed, and that there is consensus on how it works.
- Chairman Nohe commented that Deputy Secretary Donohue had stated previously that one of the topics the State wants to work with the Authority on is what the Authority considers to be its priorities in terms of the five criteria. Chairman Nohe added that the legislation already answers this to some degree, that congestion relief is the top priority and that the Authority agrees with that. He asked if there is a preconceived notion of how that piece of the law will tie into this conversation. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that he does not have a preconceived notion other than that he believes we need to demonstrate to the legislature that congestion relief, out of all the factors, has been given priority in this region. He believes this will be a fluid discussion with the legislature, the NVTa and the CTB. Chairman Nohe added that the Authority would like to see a nexus between the HB 599 process and the HB 2 process so that the Authority is not dealing with two separate processes. He also stated that the collective vision is to have more projects funded through multiple sources. He noted that revenue sharing already works and if you can get multiple sources to agree that a project is a priority, projects move really fast.

- Chairman Nohe suggested that this region is unique in that the legislation pre-establishes a priority for this region. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded Northern Virginia is unique, along with Hampton Roads. Chairman Nohe asked if in theory Hampton Roads could have a slightly different rating system than Northern Virginia has, therefore will there be three different rating systems or fifteen systems. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that he does not have the answer, but he hopes it will be closer to three than to fifteen for the sake of the staff running this and for the ability of the public and the legislature to understand. He added that one region has already asked if they could have one rating system for one part of one county and a different system for a different part of the county. He noted that his impression was that they were trying to influence the system so that they would have two projects that would score extremely high. He recommended strongly that the region not do that. Chairman Nohe added that he would like to see the system work in favor of Northern Virginia. If we can't have that, then he would like to be confident that the rest of the state isn't set up against Northern Virginia. Deputy Secretary Donohue noted that this is his fifteen stop in the last 6-8 weeks. Other areas are convinced that Northern Virginia or Hampton Roads will get their money, or when he talks to NVTVA and Hampton Roads staff, they are convinced the rest of the state will get their money. He added the good thing is that everyone is paying attention. At the end of the day, all parts of the Commonwealth have transportation needs and it is incumbent on the State, through the public input process, to come up with something that works for all parts of the Commonwealth. For a long time transportation has been a self-funding entity where we roll forward and build certain lines on a map and things of that nature. We are moving into a place where we have to start to tell more of a story about the projects we are funding, why we are funding them, what it is going to do for the taxpayers. Particularly with the passage of last year's revenue package, it is really important that we start to tell taxpayers what they are going to get for the projects we are funding with the additional revenues that we have. This process will allow us to do that in a way we have not been able to in the past.
- Delegate Rust asked if there were certain funds and priorities that would be exempt from the HB 2 process. He added that he is concerned that the Authority is now going through an elaborate evaluation of construction projects (HB 599), but we don't seem to have the same evaluation for maintenance projects and there is no rating system for maintenance. Delegate Rust stated that we know how much money is going to maintenance, but not necessary why and asked if the State has given any thought to this. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that the State has been having these same conversations. He added that the State started to take steps toward that in the 2007 legislation that required VDOT to develop a bi-annual asset management plan which highlighted that Northern Virginia's roads were in significantly worse condition than many of the roads in other parts of the state. This looked at a whole host of assets. The department has started to use that to try to reduce the discrepancy in condition between different VDOT districts across

the state. Now the State is looking for the next step to start to really prioritize where to do preventative maintenance versus capital replacement to extend the life of the system. This would result in a lower costs by avoiding some of the more heavy types of capital replacements.

- Mr. Garczynski asked Deputy Secretary Donohue to comment on how this process affects transit projects. Deputy Secretary Donohue stated that the prioritization process is a multimodal prioritization process. It does not apply to the State mass-transit account and the rationale for that is that most of the funds in the mass-transit account at the state level go to rehab of existing facilities, rolling stock, or replacement of old rolling stock. Those funds are used akin to bridge replacement and pavement rehabilitation. However, there have been instances, mostly in this region, where flexible state and federal highway funds have been used for transit purposes. The largest example is the Dulles rail project, where \$200-400 million dollars of federal surface transportation funds were flexed over in 2009 to support that project. Under this new rubric, transit can compete for these funds as can commuter rail, passenger rail, things of that nature. However, it will compete on a level playing field with highway and operational improvements. All capacity enhancing projects, regardless of mode, will be scored using the rubric the same way for this region and other regions across the state.
- Chairman Nohe stated that as it stands HB 599 does not require that transit projects be rated. He acknowledged that the Authority has discussed the need to develop some methodology by which to rate transit projects. If the State's model is going to be a single rating process, then ideally the Authority would do the same. He noted that for this current round of funding decisions, the Authority chose not to include transit projects because we have never done this (HB 599 analysis) before. He added that he does not think anyone has run transit and highway through the same model. As the Authority tries to determine whether the HB 599 process is truly appropriate for both modes, he asked Deputy Secretary Donohue what his thoughts are about taking some of the transit projects currently being considered for funding, and running them through the HB 599 process as a pilot. If the scores come back and intuitively make sense relative to the highway scores, we know this is a good process. If the scores don't make intuitive sense, we will know that the process needs to be tweaked or reinvented. Chairman Nohe asked Deputy Secretary Donohue if, from his perspective, does this work as a regional way to figure this out, or has the State found a better way to make sure that transit and highway are getting compared fairly. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that the types of projects put through the evaluation process depend on what you are trying to do at the beginning of the process. One of the really important things to do is to take a hard look at the types of measures already in place in any type of evaluation process and see what they actually measure. He cited an example of a travel time index measure that he saw while working on the Federal Transportation Bill for the last four years. He suggested that the Authority take a hard look at the measures to determine if they capture all the things that the Authority thinks are important and what really matters for this region to

determine the outcomes the Authority wants to achieve with its transportation investments. Once the process of picking projects with measures begins, what is being measured becomes a lot more important. To date these measures have been used to justify the need for additional money. Now we have the money so we need to make sure we have the right measures so that we start to pick the projects that are driving towards the outcomes that we want to achieve.

- Delegate Minchew noted that in HB 2, there is language that implies that prior to the prioritization process there is a pre-screen collaborative process with the CTB. He asked operationally how this work will. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that the State is in the process of developing the next long range plan for Virginia, VTrans 2040. It is currently developing a trends analysis that will be presented to the CTB at their meeting in October. This analysis will determine how to read future trends that the State is seeing and that could relate to transportation. The next phase will be to use various regional models and those trends to examine corridors of statewide significance, regional networks and the various locally designated growth areas to understand the transportation needs based on the model and other factors. This will help identify needs in those various areas so that when a local government or regional entity submits a candidate project for consideration, they will indicate which need they meet. He added that the needs assessment will be published. The State will then cross check it with the needs assessment which will be done and considered by the CTB as part of the long range planning process. Provided the project aligns with that need, it will be moved forward to be scored.
- Council Member Rishell asked if there will be any geographic requirements for funding. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that there are no geographic requirements in the legislation. Currently the transportation funds are being distributed through the CTB formula, which is on a statewide basis. He did note that the CTB is a body made up of individuals with geographic representation in districts so he expects that allocations will still need to be made by majority vote by that Board. He expects that geographic equity will be one of the non-quantitative factors, to a certain degree. Mr. Garczynski added that an advantage we have is that currently there are three individuals on the CTB from the Northern Virginia area. We also have a good working relationship with two other CTB members. There are five representatives who consider themselves in the Washington metro region.
- Council Member Snyder asked if Deputy Secretary Donohue could provide some recommendations as to what the Authority should look at in terms of its own work; examples from other states, countries or cities that the State might be looking at. He noted that this did not need to be provided this evening, but it would be helpful to know the kind of information that the Deputy Secretary thinks has credibility as the Authority studies things. He also asked, when we talk about congestion, are we talking about moving vehicles or people. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that the answer to the congestion question is a determination that will need to be made by the CTB and that he will be working with staffs to determine this. Initial feedback is that it may need to be

a mix of those two things. Deputy Secretary Donohue stated he would be happy to follow up with Ms. Backmon with regards to some best practices. He mentioned that as the Authority is starting the process to update its TransAction plan, one of the best practices that the State has seen, with regard to regional planning, is the use of scenario planning by regional entities. This recognizes that the future has not happened and is not set in stone. Regions look at both transportation and land use scenarios for the future, establish different ones based on consensus. They then develop multiple scenarios, analyze them, run them through different types of models to see their outcomes and then move forward with a preferred scenario that serves as a basis for the long range transportation plan. Other regions that are this size or a little larger have done this and it has been successful in looking at a coordinated transportation/land use strategy. He added that the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment, through the budget, does have funds available to assist regional entities with doing this. The assistance is monetary, the Office has no desire to engage in local land use decisions.

- Mayor Parrish thanked Deputy Secretary Donohue for speaking to the Authority. He stated that the Authority believes it will be significant in helping to reduce congestion in Northern Virginia and thanked Deputy Secretary Donohue for creating this friendship.
- Mayor Parrish shared his concern that since Northern Virginia has an additional tax that is not in other areas of the state, except for Hampton Roads, the thought process for some legislators and staff might be to suggest that Northern Virginia does not need as much money from the State. He added that he hopes and trusts this is not the case and asked that Deputy Secretary Donohue keep this in mind. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that he will.
- Chairman Nohe thanked the Deputy Secretary for coming to speak with the Authority. Deputy Secretary thanked the Authority and stated that he looks forward to updating the Authority as this process develops.
- Chairman Nohe asked for consensus as to whether the Authority is comfortable with running some transit projects through HB 599 as a pilot program, understanding that we will not have results for some time.
- Mayor Euille suggested members need to discuss this with their staffs. Chairman Nohe asked that members get back to the Authority with feedback.
- Chairman Nohe asked Ms. Mitchell if there is funding for this. Ms. Mitchell responded there have been some conceptual discussions about this in terms of the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment. She stated that the CTB would also like to see how the HB 599 model does in evaluating transit projects. She added that it recognizes that there are unique characteristics about the way transit projects are evaluated and that the outcomes are very different than highway projects. Also, there are lots of system-wide benefits of transit projects that may not be recognized when looking at a small incremental investment where you really need to look at what happens when the entire system is build out. The CTB is interested in working on these things with

VDOT and the consultant. She noted that the important priority now is getting the rating for the current projects in the study, as to not interrupt that process. Ms. Mitchell suggested that in the spring when the consultant has more time to work on this, there is interest from the CTB and VDOT to work on this on a pilot basis. She stated the goal would be to run some projects through the model to inform just this body whether or not the process, as it is established right now, has any negative bias, or whether everything is being evaluated on a level playing field. Also, to see if there is any need to define projects a little differently in order to be evaluated properly.

- Chairman Nohe requested that Ms. Dominguez and the JACC get word out to the jurisdictions to provide feedback. Ms. Dominguez responded affirmatively.
- Mayor Parrish suggested that in addition to the need for money to do a pilot model run for transit projects, there is also a question of whether staff time is available. Chairman Nohe agreed.
- Board Member Hynes asked for clarification that what is being suggested is not going to affect the projects that will be funded in the Authority's FY2015/16 program. Chairman Nohe responded that the Authority has already approved the schedule for FY2015/16, but when we start talking about FY2017-19 funding, the Authority is going to have to go the General Assembly and report what has been done to make this process more robust. He added the Authority will not change course on FY2015/16 Two Year Program. Board Member Hynes responded she was glad to hear that. She added that the Authority should be clear that it is making this decision to do a test run of transit projects in HB 599, and is not being told to do so. The Authority wants to explore this topic and see if there is a way forward. Delegate Minchew added that the concept of testing transit projects for congestion relief, efficiency and economic efficiency seems to be a good idea. Chairman Nohe added that we have to have a starting point for this process and we should determine if the tool we have (HB 599) works. Ms. Mitchell reiterated that this is about evaluating the tool to make sure it works correctly. She suggested that if transit projects are evaluated on an equal playing field, they will compete very well when it comes to congestion mitigation and benefits on a cost basis. Mr. Garczynski added that in the climate we are currently in and if the money is getting scarcer, then the cost benefit is going to be important to the CTB members.

Action Items

V. Project Agreement for Prince William County – Regional Funding Project 153-14-012-2-03 (Route 28 from Linton Hall Road to Fitzwater Drive)

Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

- Ms. Backmon requested the Authority approve the Prince William County Standard Project Agreement.

- Chairman Nohe moved to approve the proposed Standard Project Agreement 153-14-012-2-03 (Route 28 from Linton Hall Road to Fitzwater Drive), in accordance with NVTA's approved Project Description Sheets for each project to be funded as appended to the Standard Project Agreements; and that the Executive Director sign it on behalf of the Authority; seconded by Chairman York. Motion carried unanimously.

VI. Approval of Participation in the Virginia Retirement System and Group Life Insurance Program Chairman York, Chair, Finance Committee

- Chairman York presented three action items recommended for approval from the Finance Committee.
 - ✓ Approval of Participation in the Virginia Retirement System and Group Life Insurance Program.
 - ✓ Approval of Participation for Social Security Administration Related to the NVTA Joining the Virginia Retirement System.
 - ✓ Approval of Participation in the Virginia Retirement System Health Insurance Credit Program for Local Government Employees.
- Chairman York moved to approve participation in the Virginia Retirement System and Group Life Insurance Program through the adoption of resolution 15-01; he further moved to approve Resolution 15-02 for Obtaining Social Security Coverage for Employees of Political Subdivisions of The Commonwealth of Virginia; and he thirdly moved to approve Resolution 15-03 Health Insurance Credit Program for Local Government Employees; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried unanimously.

VII. Approval of Participation for Social Security Administration Related to NVTA Joining the Virginia Retirement System Chairman York, Chair, Finance Committee

VIII. Approval of Participation in the Virginia Retirement System Health Insurance Credit Program for Local Government Employees Chairman York, Chair, Finance Committee

IX. Approval of CMAQ Reallocation Requests for the City of Alexandria and Town of Vienna Ms. Dominguez, Chair, JACC

- Ms. Dominguez reviewed the requested CMAQ reallocation requests for the City of Alexandria and the Town of Vienna.
- Mayor Euille moved to approve the reallocation of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds for the City of Alexandria and Town of Vienna; seconded by Chairman York. Motion carried unanimously.

Information

X. TransAction 2040 Update-Listening Session

Chair Mr. Malouff, 2040 Update Subcommittee

- Ms. Backmon noted that it is time for the Authority to update its long range transportation plan. She introduced Mr. Malouff to present the TransAction 2040 Update listening session item.
- Mr. Malouff stated that the JACC, in coordination with the NVTA staff, has formed an NVTA TransAction 2040 Update subcommittee to work on updating the long range plan. He presented the TransAction 2040 Update-Listening Session report.
 - ✓ Listening session will be October 9 at 5pm, prior to the NVTA meeting.
 - ✓ Discussion will be on what worked and what didn't work during the development of the TransAction 2040 process. This is not a time to talk about projects, it is a process oriented discussion.
 - ✓ Subcommittee will provide a brief presentation on the TransAction's history and purpose.
 - ✓ Will then ask stakeholders series of questions.
 - ✓ Will ask for feedback in-person at the meeting and will provide an opportunity to provide written comments after the meeting.
 - ✓ Following the meeting staff will process the feedback and report back to the NVTA later in the fall.
 - ✓ Will incorporate suggestions, as appropriate, into the RFP which will be developed this fall and into early 2015.
 - ✓ Invited all NVTA members to attend.
- Mr. Garczynski asked for the definition of stakeholders. Mr. Malouff responded that the stakeholders are anyone who is interested, including the general public. Mr. Garczynski asked if the listening session would be amply advertised for the general public. Mr. Malouff responded that the subcommittee and the jurisdictions will be working with their PIOs to send the invitations to their own special interest groups. Mr. Garczynski asked for confirmation that the General Assembly members will also receive the invitation to send to their constituents. Mr. Malouff responded absolutely.
- Chairman Bulova asked if the subcommittee is looking for information from residents and citizens or elected officials. Mr. Malouff responded that it is fine if the elected officials attend, but that the listening session is more to hear what the citizens have to say so that the elected officials know what is important.
- Board Member Hynes asked for clarification that this is the process to define the process. Mr. Malouff responded affirmatively. Board Member Hynes suggested that sometimes it is less individuals that care about the process, but sometimes more organizations. She suggested that if the online feedback tool is only open for two weeks, most organizations only meet monthly so it will be harder for organizations to comment with a coordinated position. She suggested a 30 day comment period. She also encouraged the subcommittee to reconsider this and to use the invitation to encourage any group that is

interested to send a coordinated opinion because then we get the advantage of what their discussion and consensus was.

- Board Member Hynes added that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) reported today on their Public Participation Plan that has been developed over the last 18 months. The plan looks at many ways to interact with the public in the region and WMATA worked with jurisdictional staff to identify community based organizations who have networks that reach into hard to reach communities. She recommended this plan to the subcommittee as a potential resource. Ms. Backmon added that she has been coordinating with Ms. Sequeira at WMATA about this. She noted that the federal process requires certain things from a public participation plan and that she is currently working with Ms. Quintana to develop the Authority's Communication Plan. She also noted that we are working to incorporate some of the elements from the WMATA plan that fit for the Authority's needs from the federal public participation plan.

- Chairman York stated that while Loudoun County is supportive of the TransAction 2040 Update process. Loudoun, and he believes two other jurisdictions, currently have a challenge in that they have no construction projects in TransAction 2040 that are not already funded, under construction, or previously submitted to the NVT. Therefore, they will not have any projects to submit for the next request for projects (FY2017-19) for 70% funding. Chairman York noted that since the TransAction Update will take two years, Loudoun will not have any projects other than transit and trails to submit for 70% funding consideration. He added that in Loudoun the highway projects are very important. He proposed that the Authority consider a process similar to what the TPB is using to amend the Constrained Long Range Plan, noting that perhaps this proposal should go to the Finance Committee to work on with staff. Chairman York suggested that this process, running simultaneous to the TransAction Update, would allow jurisdictions to have the opportunity to get some of their projects into the process without having to wait potentially over two years. Ms. Backmon responded that the TransAction 2040 Update subcommittee has met and discussed this possibility. The subcommittee's concerns were that we are not sure of the time savings that would be afforded under amending the plan compared to updating the plan. Ms. Backmon highlighted the concerns/challenges of amending the plan versus updating the plan.
 - ✓ Still needs to be a robust public involvement process whether you amend or update the plan.
 - ✓ Review process will still need to involve the TAC, PCAC and JACC.
 - ✓ Undetermined who would pay for an amendment to the plan. As it stands, the approved Authority budget does not have the required funds for an amendment.
 - ✓ Data needs to be available for an amendment. The TPB does the CLRP on an annual basis. Some years the changes are more significant than others.

Would need to confirm that base line assessment is consistent with the best data available.

- Ms. Backmon noted that she is meeting with Cambridge Systematics, the firm that developed TransAction 2040 plan. If this is something that the Authority would like to explore, she could get a cost estimate. Ms. Backmon added that she does not know the process and the schedule. She also noted she was unsure how it would impact the scheduled update of the plan.
- Chairman Bulova asked if a plan amendment would require modeling. Ms. Backmon stated yes. She added that she is unsure of the cost to amend as there are externalities that would need to be considered. The modeling is significant because additional projects have to be added to the current network of projects that are identified in the TransAction 2040 plan. The model shows how the addition of each project affects the transportation network as a whole. The modeling effort is by corridor and individually by mode.
- Chairman Bulova stated that she would be supportive of exploring the feasibility of an amendment. She added that it would be unfortunate to freeze out the possibility of adding a project that might make everything go green.
- Chairman York asked that Loudoun staff be permitted to add additional information.
- Mr. Brown explained the TPB's CLRP amendment process. Every year projects are submitted and reviewed by the COG and many of the concerns expressed by Ms. Backmon are incorporated into the CLRP process. He noted the CLRP process includes public involvement, modeling and air quality considerations. He added that when TransAction 2040 was approved, the 2010 CLRP was the base. He stated that an amendment to TransAction 2040 would actually be looking at the CLRP process.
- Chairman York asked that the Authority explore the possibilities and options.
- Ms. Backmon thanked Mr. Brown for sharing this information. She added that the TPB has the resources in house to do an amendment to the CLRP. She reiterated that the Authority would have to decide how the funding of an amendment would happen. Chairman Nohe suggested that the TPB model is for the requesting jurisdiction to pay for the amendment. Ms. Backmon responded that usually the DOTs request that the TPB do an "off-cycle" amendment to the CLRP. The DOTs usually pay for the amendment.
- Board Member Hynes asked what the practical difference is if the two year update is going to happen in 2017 and the next cycle of projects gets decided in 2017. Chairman York responded that we will have the ability to submit projects in the next call for projects for the Authority's Six Year Program.
- Mayor Parrish suggested that it is important to be able to consider additional projects. He added that in addition to cost and other considerations, we need to know what the potential is to get an amendment done sooner rather than during the regular process.
- Delegate Rust asked if Loudoun had any projects that were previously submitted to the Authority, but were not funded, that could remain under consideration. Chairman York responded that those projects are in the current request for FY2015/16 Program and may or may not be funded. If the projects

are not funded, could be resubmitted in 2017. Mr. Brown stated that the next call for projects would be in December. This would put Loudoun in position where it would be another year or two before it could submit more projects. Mr. Brown noted that the Two Year Program is scheduled to be approved for funding in March. The new process will start in December of this year and will not end until the end of next year. He added that even transit projects have to be in TransAction 2040. Ms. Backmon responded that the Authority is scheduled to adopt the project selection criteria at the October meeting and if a project is in TransAction 2040 is one of the draft project selection criteria.

- Chairman Nohe stated that Chairman York is making an official request and that other jurisdictions have raised this question, as has Virginia Railway Express (VRE). It is relevant and anything can be done with enough time and enough money. He added that our legal defense in our bond validation suit was heavily based on the fact that TransAction 2040 was a robust process. It seems that whatever amendments we make to it would have to be similar to that process. The process would have to follow all the same steps so that those projects would be equally defensible. Chairman Nohe directed staff to meet with Cambridge, let them know what we are looking for, get a cost and bring data back to the Authority. Ms. Backmon responded affirmatively and suggested she could report back at the October meeting. She clarified that there is not a call for projects in December. She added that we need the opportunity to evaluate HB 599.

- | | | |
|--------------|---|---|
| XI. | Finance Committee Report | Chairman York, Chair, Finance Committee |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No verbal report. | |
| XII. | Update on Financing of Activities and Schedule | Mr. Longhi, CFO |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No verbal report. | |
| XIII. | FY2015/16 Regional Revenue Report | Mr. Longhi, CFO |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No verbal report. | |
| XIV. | Purchase of General Ledger System | Mr. Longhi, CFO |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No verbal report. | |
| XV. | NVTA Revenue Receipts Report | Mr. Longhi, CFO |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No verbal report. | |
| XVI. | NVTA Operating Budget Report | Mr. Longhi, CFO |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No verbal report. | |

XVII. Financial Working Group Chair Euille

- Mayor Euille reported that the FWG has been meeting regularly.

XVIII. Project Implementation Working Group Chair Nohe

- Chairman Nohe reported that the PIWG has developed a draft of the evaluation project selection criteria to be sent to the JACC, TAC, PCAC for review and comment. It will come to the Authority for approval in October.

XIX. Executive Director's Report Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

- Ms. Backmon presented the Executive Director's report. She highlighted:
 - ✓ The handout in the report shows the status of the twelve (12) FY2014 projects that are advancing. The PRTC bus purchase project is officially closed and completed. It came in \$20,000 under budget and that money is back in the 70% fund.
 - ✓ PCAC now has appointees from all jurisdictions and will meet on Monday, September 22 at 9:30am in the NVTA conference room.
 - ✓ State budget requires the Authority provide the JCTA an overview of how it spent the NVTA Fund, based on provisions in HB 2313. There will be a draft for the Authority in the October meeting packet.
 - ✓ NVTA is moving to the new offices on October 6. The October 9 Authority meeting will be held at the City of Fairfax City Hall to allow ample time for the AV component to be installed.
 - ✓ Fall CTB hearing on the FY2015-20 Six Year Improvement Program will be on Thursday, October 16 at the VDOT Northern Virginia District office. The Authority will have a display booth there highlighting its work. NVTA staff is working with the JACC and will have draft testimony for Authority review and approval at the October meeting.
- Chairman York asked for clarification as to whether the October Finance Committee meeting will be at NVTA or an alternate location. Ms. Backmon confirmed that the meeting would be at NVTA.

XX. Chairman's Comments

- Chairman Nohe noted that the Authority has completed its first project. He requested Ms. Quintana coordinate a ribbon cutting ceremony for the PRTC bus.
- Mayor Parrish moved that the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority convene a closed meeting, as authorized by Virginia Code section 2.2-

3711.A.1, for the purpose of discussing a personnel matter; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried unanimously.

- The Authority entered into closed session at 8:29pm.

Closed Session

- The Authority returned to open session at 8:37 pm.
- Chairman Bulova moved that the members of the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority certify: (1) that only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements under Chapter 37, Title 2.2 of the Code of Virginia; and (2) only such public business matters as were identified in the motion by which the closed meeting was convened were heard, discussed or considered by the Authority; seconded by Senator Ebbin. Motion carried unanimously.

XXI. Adjournment

- The meeting adjourned at 8:37pm.