



Northern Virginia Transportation Authority
The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, August 17, 2016, 7:00pm

NVTA Office

3040 Williams Drive, Suite 200

Fairfax, Virginia 22031

SUMMARY NOTES

I. Call to Order/Welcome Mr. Fahl

- Mr. Fahl called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.
- Attendees:
 - Members: Agnes Artemel; Armand Ciccarelli; Bob Dunphy; Doug Fahl; Kathy Ichter; Meredith Judy; Pat Turner; Shanjiang Zhu.
 - NVTA Staff: Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator); Sree Nampoothiri (Program Coordinator).
 - Other: Noelle Dominguez (Fairfax County); Jason Mumford (AECOM)

II. Meeting Summary of May 18, 2016 and June 15, 2016 Meetings Mr. Fahl

- Ms. Artemel moved approval of the May 18, 2016 and June 15, 2016 meeting summaries; seconded by Ms. Judy. Motion carried unanimously with abstention from those who were not present at the respective meetings.

Discussion/Information

III. NVTA Update Ms. Backmon

- Ms. Backmon informed the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members that the Authority approved 12 projects for the FY2017 Program at the July 14, 2016 meeting. The FY2017 Program includes the Leesburg Route 7/ Battlefield Parkway project and the Arlington Crystal City Streets project, in addition to the ten projects recommended by the TAC.
- Ms. Backmon also informed the Committee that the Authority will need to go to the bond market in order to fund the FY2017 Program in its entirety, but there is no urgent need based on the current cash flow requirements of the projects.
- In response to Mr. Fahl's question on the basis for including the Crystal City project, Ms. Backmon informed him that the project scored reasonably well on the Congestion Reduction Relative to Cost (CRRC) ratio. Ms. Backmon further noted that a project need not be large in order to be regional.
- In response to Ms. Ichter's question on the eligibility criteria, Ms. Backmon noted that the primary criteria for FY2017 Program were that the project being included in TransAction 2040 (though TransAction 2040 predates HB 2313)

and was evaluated under the HB 599 process. Project sponsors must commit to submitting a first drawdown request to the NVTA by no later than June 30, 2019.

Vice Chairman Fahl and the Committee members approved Mr. Jasper's request to move item V before item IV in order to have a logical sequencing of discussion.

IV. Development of Six-Year Program

Mr. Jasper

- Mr. Jasper presented the current process of advancing from planning to programming and the lessons learned from NVTA's past funding programs. Mr. Jasper also provided a path forward, which is being considered to be a part of the ongoing TransAction Update and the opportunity to develop a Six Year Program.
- In response to Mr. Fahl's comment that the projects can be improved if given a second chance to refine the scope after a first round of analysis, Mr. Jasper noted that the TransAction Update provides that opportunity.
- In response to Mr. Dunphy's question on the potential reuse of HB 599 ratings from subsequent programs, Ms. Backmon noted that projects are scored relative to the pool of projects within each program, which makes it necessary to evaluate projects in each program cycle.
- Mr. Fahl requested NVTA staff provide materials related to the TransAction Update, especially the performance measure and programming aspects, in advance of future TAC meetings in order to have enough time to understand the details.
- In response to Ms. Ichter's comment that by the time the FY2018-2023 Six Year Program is in place, it will already be well into FY2018, Mr. Jasper noted that there is precedent for such delay but that the intent is to have the program in place by early FY2018.
- In response to Ms. Turner's question on the synergy between the State's Six Year Improvement Program and the NVTA Six Year Program, Ms. Backmon mentioned that the NVTA is striving to bring synergy, though it is not required by law. Ms. Backmon added that the main difference is in the performance/selection measures for candidate projects. She also noted that the jurisdictions sometimes apply to the State and the NVTA for the same phases of their projects and NVTA will have to take decisions based on each situation.
- In response to Mr. Ciccarelli's question regarding the opportunity to consolidate 18 plus performance measures, Mr. Jasper noted that there will be multiple opportunities and that the TransAction Update presentation to follow will talk more about it.

V. TransAction Update

Mr. Mumford

- Mr. Mumford (AECOM) presented the draft needs assessment and performance measures being considered as part of the TransAction Update.

- In response to Dr. Zhu’s question regarding the difference between the TransAction needs assessment and that of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOG), if TransAction Update is using the MWCOG model, Mr. Mumford informed the Committee that while we are currently looking at the needs from public outreach and basic model understanding, we will be looking at the needs from multiple scenarios as well.
- Mr. Fahl stressed the need to link travel patterns, congestion and other issues. He requested that the Committee be provided with maps and other visual materials, such as the base Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) network, to help understand the dynamics better in the future. Ms. Backmon agreed that NVTA staff will provide as many materials as possible. She also noted that there are more than 100 Northern Virginia projects in the CLRP and mapping them all in detail could be a challenge.
- Ms. Artemel observed that there is congestion in many locations, even with all the projects from VDOT and NVTA in place.
- Dr. Zhu observed that the American Legion Bridge does not show any congestion in the maps and Mr. Mumford agreed to review the data.
- Mr. Dunphy observed that there is a spike in the trip length by purpose in the 10-15 miles region. Mr. Mumford agreed to check the data.
- Mr. Fahl suggested to ensuring outreach not only to the general public, but to all stakeholders. Ms. Backmon informed the Committee that NVTA is using all potential avenues for inputs, including social media.
- In response to Dr. Zhu’s question regarding how to address the down-stream effects from individual jurisdictional projects, Ms. Backmon noted that the TransAction Update will look into such aspects and develop top-down projects to address any such effects. She also noted that jurisdictions are encouraged to work collaboratively and the Regional Jurisdiction and Agency Coordinating Committee (RJACC) and TransAction Subcommittee provide the opportunity to start that collaboration.
- In response to Mr. Fahl’s comment on the need to reach out to jurisdictions outside Northern Virginia, Ms. Backmon noted that the NVTA is working with the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) and VDOT staff throughout the TransAction Update.
- In response to Ms. Turner’s question regarding the definition of activity centers, Mr. Jasper noted that it is the same as concentrated growth areas defined by MWCOG.
- Mr. Dunphy noted that concentrated growth areas defined by jurisdictions may not be truly regional. Mr. Mumford noted that the TransAction Subcommittee is having that discussion, but does not want to preclude potential new growth concentrations.
- Mr. Fahl suggested that travel within activity centers should be less important than between activity centers since the density of activity centers vary geographically (e.g. inner core vs outer suburbs).
- Mr. Jasper encouraged the Committee members to provide feedback on performance measures (particularly Tier 3 measures), ideas to reduce the number of measures and the plan evaluation process.

- Mr. Fahl requested a draft set of suggestions for the Committee to reflect upon. Ms. Ichter requested the measures and weightings used in the FY2017 Program for reference.

Adjournment

VI. Adjourn

Mr. Fahl

- Meeting adjourned at 8:50pm.