



NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia

Thursday, July 24, 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 7:02pm.

II. Roll Call Ms. Speer, Clerk

- Voting Members: Chairman Nohe; Mayor Euille (arrived 7:10pm); Board Member Hynes; Supervisor Letourneau; Chairman Bulova; Mayor Parrish; Mayor Silverthorne (arrived 7:05pm); Council Member Rishell; Council Member Duncan; Senator Ebbin (arrived 7:06pm); Delegate Rust; Delegate Minchew; Miss Bushue.
- Non-Voting Members: Mayor Umstatt, Mrs. Cuervo; Ms. Mitchell.
- Staff: Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Michael Longhi (CFO); Denise Harris (Program Coordinator); Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator); Camela Speer (Clerk); Peggy Teal (Accountant); various jurisdictional staff.

III. Minutes of the May 8, 2014 Meeting

- Mayor Parrish moved approval of the May 8, 2014 minutes; seconded by Board Member Hynes. Motion passed with seven (7) yeas and three (3) abstentions [with Delegate Rust, Council Member Duncan and Supervisor Letourneau abstaining as they were not at the May meeting].

Presentation

IV. VDOT HB 599 Ratings & Evaluation Study Mr. Srikanth, VDOT

- Mr. Srikanth presented the VDOT HB 599 Ratings & Evaluation Study preliminary findings.

(Mayor Silverthorne, Senator Ebbin and Mayor Euille arrived.)

- Mayor Umstatt asked for clarification that if a project, particularly in the outer jurisdictions, slipped from a high to a low rating from 2020 to 2040, is that because the assumption is that so much growth has occurred that more vehicles are on that facility. If this is the case, wouldn't congestion be even worse if that facility had not been improved? Mr. Srikanth responded

absolutely. These ratings are based on the difference between the projected congestion in 2040 without the project and with the project. All the projects have a positive difference, they are all reducing congestion. Study is capturing how bad it would be without the project and with the project what is the difference. When measuring the difference between 2020 and 2040, not just the growth in population happens, but also many more transportation improvement projects are scheduled to be done and may dampen the impact on congestion relief of the original project.

- Delegate Minchew stated that in HB 599 VDOT was charged to create an objective quantitative evaluation and study. He suggested VDOT did not need to take the extra step to create a three part qualitative analysis and that this is outside the ambit of the statute. Mr. Srikanth responded that VDOT was complying with the mandates of HB 599 and that the rating published in December will be a quantitative score. In January, VDOT presented the Project Evaluation Framework to the Authority and that work is continuing. The reason VDOT chose to take the quantitative scores and produce qualitative ratings was to enable NVTAs programming activity. If this was the end product, VDOT would be done with the HB 599 study. Because this is an intermediate step that uses results from a basic level that is not complete, VDOT did not want to have two sets of rating numbers for the same project. That would give a sense of false position or may give a false-positive as to whether to project is good or bad. Also, if the rating numbers were to change significantly, VDOT could technically explain the reason, but that may not add any value to the process.
- Delegate Minchew stated that the finished product will therefore be a number, not a word. Chairman Nohe explained that this is the first and last time that VDOT will do a preliminary rating through this process. The next time that the study is done, the only score that will come to the Authority is the final score. The unique circumstance this year is that we are currently in FY2015 and collecting FY2015 revenues. NVTAs needs to figure out how to properly allocate those revenues. It was decided that a preliminary score would provide some information for the staff to start working with, to save some time once the HB 599 rating is complete, to bring a strawman Two-Year, and ultimately a Six-Year, Plan to the Authority. We want to avoid getting to May and have not had a conversation about how to spend FY2015 money. This helps us get further down the road. The next time there will be a longer gap between the HB 599 process and the fiscal year for which we are considering expending revenues. This was a one-time tool so that PIWG can have something to start working on prior to the final rating results.
- Chairman Bulova asked for further clarification about a facility getting a high rating in 2020 and a lower rating in 2040. Mr. Srikanth responded that if there are other network improvements around that facility that impact the traffic and travel flow, then there may not be the same volume to capacity ratio. Also, there might be a larger growth population or employment in an adjacent travel district that would change the travel patterns and traffic distribution. Additionally, in the qualitative ranking, you start with the highest ranked

project. From there one-third of the projects are ranked high, one-third medium and one-third low. In 2040, the top performing project was a different project than in 2020, this might impact the ranking of all the projects.

- Chairman Bulova clarified that the lower ranking might be dependent on building other projects and other changes. If these projections did not happen, there might be a different score. Mr. Srikanth responded affirmatively. He noted that if the project being evaluated were not built and other projects in the area were built, if that scenario were run through the model it would show how bad things would be without that improvement. He added that this rating should not undermine the importance of the contribution of the project, just how the project rates relative to the contribution of other the other projects in the study. Mr. Srikanth stated that this thinking was a little counterintuitive even for VDOT, so they had to dig a little deeper to understand the results.
- Chairman Bulova asked for confirmation that this formula will not be used for the final ratings. Mr. Srikanth confirmed it will not.
- Delegate Rust asked what the definition of capacity is in the “PMT for capacity”. He asked if VDOT was using a standards like 2000 vehicles at 55mph per lane. Mr. Srikanth responded affirmatively, that VDOT is looking at link-by-link capacity. He added that if it is a roadway project that is adding a lane over two miles we would use that measure. If it is an intersection improvement, then through the intersection analysis – how many vehicles are getting through a green cycle – you use that difference. Delegate Rust asked for clarification that VDOT is using “standards” for this analysis. Mr. Srikanth responded affirmatively.
- Mayor Parrish expressed concern about the high, medium and low ratings. He added that he is appreciative that NVTA and VDOT worked together to create this preliminary set of ratings and that there is a next step in December. However, he is concerned about the public perception of this VDOT document showing the ratings and that public questions may arise as to why NVTA is funding a project with a low ranking. He asked that if members of the Authority hear concerns from the public like this, that they clarify the study rankings and next steps. He suggested that the Delegates may have a bigger challenge if their colleagues make statements to this effect.
- Chairman Nohe clarified that this is a planning tool, that the decision tool will be a numeric score and that numeric score is not the only decision tool NVTA will be using. There are other pieces of legislation that effect how we make decisions.
- Board Member Hynes suggested that some level of explanation about the preliminary rankings might be necessary wherever the document is presented or posted for the public. Mr. Srikanth agreed and responded that VDOT will be happy to work with NVTA staff to prepare an explanation that conveys the restraints and parameters for the use of these results and puts them in context with the on-going work. VDOT and NVTA can post the explanation on their websites.
- General public (Delegate LeMunyon) noted that all the projects selected for the HB 599 study seemed to be roadway projects. He asked for confirmation

that the model has the ability to handle transit projects as well. Mr. Srikanth responded that the model tool and the methodology are capable. He added that VDOT has not run the methodology developed, but he is sure they will.

- Council Member Rishell expressed concern that the project descriptions in the rating document lack specificity. Mr. Srikanth responded by presenting the detailed maps that will be available online for each project. Chairman Bulova asked for clarification that a map will be available on-line for each project and will include project details. Mr. Srikanth responded that is correct and suggested that the Authority could make suggestions as to other details that could be included in the maps.
- Supervisor Letourneau suggested that the maps not show the high, medium and low ratings. There was general agreement with this. Mr. Srikanth responded that VDOT could do this.
- Mr. Srikanth continued the presentation and explained the next steps in the study process.
- Chairman Nohe stated that at the Authority meeting in September Deputy Secretary Nick Donohue will be in attendance. He suggested that one topic of discussion at that time should be the ability for the Authority and VDOT to have a lessons learned process after December to evaluate the HB 599 measurements and determine if there are other measurements that would be better. A second topic of conversation should be that these specific measures may not be effective to properly compare transit and highway. He added that the next version of this needs to integrate highway and transit.
- Delegate Rust suggested that the CTB is beginning the same process under HB 2 which will rate everything in the state. Delegate Rust stated that he believes that the HB 599 system is already more detailed than the system for HB 2 will be. He suggested that NVTA may be at a disadvantage when Northern Virginia projects are ranked against projects in other parts of the state. Delegate Rust suggested that the Authority ask Mr. Donohue what the HB 2 system will look like compared to HB 599. He stated we are doing a good job of implementing HB 599 and he does not want it to become a disadvantage. There was general agreement with this.
- Ms. Cuervo stated that she had asked Mr. Donohue if they were going to take HB 599 results to use in HB 2 for Northern Virginia. At that time, he stated that he did not intend to do that. That we would have a level playing field and be measured in a similar fashion to all projects in the HB 2 study. Ms. Cuervo stated that the intent is to use HB 2 to rank all projects statewide, including Northern Virginia.
- Ms. Mitchell added that discussions have started about whether there should be a separate set of measures for urban vs. rural projects. This is more important for other districts that have urban centers and very rural areas. Another question is whether or not you can even impose a similar set of measures within a district.

- Chairman Nohe added that ultimately the HB 2 process and HB 599 process could be the same or strictly parallel, but not quite different.
- Mr. Srikanth added that on the HB 599 performance measures in the detailed analysis have seven ratings and two of them are explicitly for transit. Transit crowding is one of the measures. He added the VDOT is eager to learn the results of the study in December and review lessons learned.
- Ms. Mitchell commended the work that VDOT and Mr. Srikanth have done and added that this issue of cross modal comparison of projects is not done anywhere. This is new and is in many ways very much on the cutting edge of project evaluation. Being able to see the first set of results is going to be very important. Agreed that there should be feedback and lessons learned before determining that this is the exact set of methodology we are going to use moving forward.
- Ms. Backmon added that this is one of the reasons that while the PIWG had decided to do the next call for projects in December, that date is not being presented in the schedule tonight. The PIWG feels that we need to have the lessons learned discussion and evaluate what worked and what did not work before starting the next call for projects.
- Chairman Nohe noted that Mr. Srikanth is starting a new position as Director of Transportation Planning for Metropolitan Washington COG. He added that he can think of no one better qualified for the job, but that the Authority will miss him in his role with HB 599 and thanked him for his service.
- Mr. Srikanth thanked the Authority for the education he has received working with the Authority since it was Transportation Coordinating Council. He will look forward to working with the Authority members on different boards in the future.

Consent Agenda

- V. Project Agreement for VRE – Regional Funding Project 997-14-007-1-06 (VRE Gainesville – Haymarket Extension Project Development)**
- VI. Project Agreement for Loudoun County– Regional Funding Project 107-14-008-2-01 (Leesburg Park and Ride)**
- VII. Project Agreement for the Loudoun County – Regional Funding Project 107-14-009-3-03 (Route 28 Hot Spot Improvements – Loudoun Segment)**
- VIII. Project Agreement for the Loudoun County – Regional Funding Project 107-14-010-1-01 (Loudoun County Transit Buses)**
- IX. Project Agreement for Loudoun County – Regional Funding Project 107-14-011-1-02 (Belmont Ridge Road Route 659 North of Dulles Greenway Widening)**

- Ms. Backmon requested the Authority approve the items on the consent agenda.
- Mayor Parrish moved approval of the consent agenda to include the specific motions in items V - IX; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried unanimously.

Additional Action Items

X. Approval of Project Implementation Working Group FY15-16 Two Year Program Development Schedule Chair Nohe

- Ms. Backmon introduced Mr. Jasper as one of the Program Coordinators for the Authority and a new coordinator for the PIWG.
- Mr. Jasper stated that the PIWG had met and heard the more detailed version of the VDOT presentation. He introduced the draft FY15-16 Two Year Program Development Schedule that will help to develop the Authority's two year program. He noted this schedule is slightly more accelerated than the version discussed at the PIWG meeting as the money is available and the sooner this is done, the sooner we have an effect on congestion in Northern Virginia. He concluded that March 2015 is the target for approval of the Two Year Program.
- Chairman Nohe clarified that this is an aggressive schedule. He noted that the goal is to have the plan for approval in March, but that the schedule could slip. Ms. Backmon confirmed this and explained the steps necessary to get through this process.
- Board Member Hynes moved approval of the proposed FY2015-16 Two Year Program Development Schedule; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried unanimously.
- Board Member Hynes asked for the next meeting date for the PIWG. Chairman Nohe answered it is August 18.

XI. Approval of MOA Between NVTA, VDOT and DRPT Chair Euille, Financial Working Group

- Mayor Euille stated that it is the recommendation of the FWG that the Authority approve the MOA between the NVTA, VDOT and DRPT related to the use of the three regional transportation revenues. He explained the purpose of the MOA is to establish procedures and expectation, and define each agencies roles and responsibilities. The MOA is designed to accommodate changes if this situation were to change.

- Mayor Euille moved approval, in substantial form, the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the Authority, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) related to the collection and use of the regional transportation revenues.
- Miss Bushue asked about the meaning of the statement in the memo “VDOT and DRPT will include a request for appropriation of the funding in the NVTAF in the Commonwealth’s budgeting process and use their best efforts to secure General Assembly approval.” Ms. Backmon responded that HB 2313 revenues have to be budgeted and appropriated. This language is included that we work with VDOT to be sure those monies are included in the budget. Miss Bushue clarified that HB 2313 monies are appropriated. Chairman Nohe confirmed that monies are appropriated and that is why funding any SPAs was held up until the budget was approved.
- Board Member Hynes seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

XII. Approval of Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee Chair

Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

- Ms. Backmon stated that Ms. Dominguez of Fairfax County served as the Vice-Chair of the JACC and does legislative work with the Authority. She added that the JACC has recommended that Ms. Dominguez be elevated to the position of Chair of the JACC.
- Chairman Nohe asked for confirmation that the Authority does not need to approve the Vice-Chair of the JACC. Ms. Backmon confirmed that was true.
- Mayor Euille moved approval of Ms. Noelle Dominguez of Fairfax County as the Chairman of the Jurisdictional and Agency Coordinating Committee (JACC); seconded by Delegate Rust. Motion carried unanimously.

XIII. Approval of Technical Advisory Committee Member

Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

- Chairman Nohe stated that this item would be discussed in closed session.

XIV. Approval of RSTP Reallocation Requests for Prince William County

Ms. Dominguez, Vice-Chair, JACC

- Ms. Dominguez requested the Authority approve Prince William County’s RSTP reallocation request and Alexandria’s CMAQ reallocation request.
- Chairman Nohe moved approval of the Reallocation of Regional Surface Transportation Program funds for Prince William County; seconded by Senator Ebbin. Motion carried unanimously.

XV. Approval of CMAQ Reallocation Requests for the City of Alexandria
Ms. Dominguez, Vice-Chair, JACC

- Mayor Euille moved approval of the reallocation of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds for the City of Alexandria; seconded by Board Member Hynes. Motion carried unanimously.

Discussion/Information

XVI. Finance Committee Report Vice-Chair Hynes

- No verbal report.

XVII. Technical Advisory Committee Report Ms. Judy, TAC

- No verbal report.

XVIII. JACC Approval of Reallocation of RSTP Funds for the City of Falls Church
Ms. Dominguez, Vice-Chair, JACC

- No verbal report.

XIX. JACC Approval of Reallocation of CMAQ Funds for the City of Alexandria
Ms. Dominguez, Vice-Chair, JACC

- No verbal report.

XX. NVTAs Revenue Receipts Report Mr. Longhi, CFO

- No verbal report.

XXI. NVTAs Operating Budget Report Mr. Longhi, CFO

- No verbal report.

XXII. Financial Working Group Report Chair Euille

- No verbal report.

XXIII. Project Implementation Working Group Report Chair Nohe

- No report.

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

- No verbal report.

XXV. Chairman's Comments Chair Nohe

- Chairman Bulova 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 two personnel matters; seconded by Supervisor Letourneau. Motion carried unanimously.
- The Authority entered into closed session at 8:15pm.

Closed Session

XXVI. Closed Session

- The Authority returned to open session at 9:21pm.
- 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 Mayor Parrish. Motion carried unanimously.
- Chairman Bulova moved to approve Armand Ciccarelli of Arlington County as a member of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC); seconded by Delegate Rust. Motion carried unanimously.

Adjournment

XXVII. Adjournment

- The meeting adjourned at 9:28pm.