



Northern Virginia Transportation Authority
The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia

Thursday, July 23, 2015
6:00pm
3040 Williams Drive, Suite 200
Fairfax, VA 22031

MEETING MINUTES

I. Call to Order Chairman Nohe

- Chairman Nohe called the meeting to order at 6:19pm.

II. Roll Call Ms. Speer, Clerk

- Voting Members: Chairman Nohe; Chair Hynes (arrived 6:28pm); Chairman Bulova; Chairman York; Council Member Rishell; Council Member Snyder; Senator Ebbin; Delegate Rust; Delegate Minchew; Miss Bushue; Mr. Garczynski.
- Non-Voting Members: Ms. Cuervo; Ms. Mitchell.
- Staff: Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Michael Longhi (CFO); Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator); Sree Nampoothiri (Program Coordinator); Camela Speer (Clerk); various jurisdictional staff.

III. Minutes of the June 25, 2015 Meeting

- Chairman York moved approval of the June 25, 2015 minutes; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried with six (6) yeas and four (4) abstentions [with Chairman York, Council Member Snyder, Senator Ebbin and Delegate Minchew abstaining as they were not at the June 25 meeting].

Consent Agenda

IV. Project Agreement for Fairfax County–Regional Funding 059-90691 (West Ox Bus Garage)

V. Project Agreement for Fairfax County–Regional Funding 059-30531 (VA Route 28 Widening – Prince William County Line to Route 29)

VI. Project Agreement for Prince William County–Regional Funding 153-30481 (Route 28 Widening from Route 234 Bypass to Linton Hall Road)

VII. Project Agreement for Prince William County–Regional Funding 153-80401 (Route 1 Widening from Featherstone Road to Marys Way)

- VIII. **Project Agreement for Virginia Railway Express–Regional Funding 997-60681 (Manassas Park Station Parking Expansion)**
- IX. **Project Agreement for Virginia Railway Express–Regional Funding 997-80641 (Franconia-Springfield Platform Expansion)**
- X. **Project Agreement for Virginia Railway Express–Regional Funding 997-80651 (Rippon Station Expansion and Second Platform)**
- XI. **Project Agreement for Virginia Railway Express–Regional Funding 997-80701 (Slaters Lane Crossover)**
- XII. **Project Agreement for Virginia Railway Express–Regional Funding 997-80711 (Crystal City Platform Extension Study)**

- Chairman York moved approval of the consent agenda to include the specific motions in items IV - XII; seconded by Council Member Snyder. Motion carried unanimously.

Action

- XIII. **Project Agreement for Fairfax County–Regional Funding 059-90661 (Connector Bus Service Expansion)** Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

- Ms. Backmon stated that this Project Agreement has an adjustment to the number of buses that were approved as part of the FY2015-16 Two Year Program. She noted this adjustment is being made to match the funding request, adding that 16 buses were approved, but that based on the total cost, only 12 buses can be purchased with that funding amount.
- Chairman Nohe asked for clarification that the dollar amount makes sense for only 12 buses. Ms. Backmon responded that it does.
- Chairman Bulova moved approval of the proposed Standard Project Agreement 059-90661 (Connector Bus Service Expansion), in accordance with the NVTA's approved Project Description Sheet for this project to be funded as appended by the Standard Project Agreement; and that the Executive Director sign it on behalf of the Authority; seconded by Chairman York. Motion carried unanimously.

- XIV. **Approval of TransAction Update Contract Award** Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

- Ms. Backmon stated that this will be the first update of the Authority's Long Range Transportation Plan since the implementation of HB 2313. She noted that the Authority had advised advancement of the update at the December meeting. Ms. Backmon asked Mr. Jasper to brief the Authority on this item.

- Mr. Jasper noted that this is an exciting time for the NVTA. He highlighted:
 - ✓ NVTA staff has been working with a subcommittee of the JACC on the update of TransAction.
 - ✓ The Authority approved the scope of work for the update in April.
 - ✓ A selection panel was established from the subcommittee.
 - ✓ The selection panel reviewed the four responsive proposals and short listed two firms.
 - ✓ The selection panel interviewed and negotiated with these two firms.
 - ✓ The selection panel unanimously selected AECOM to recommend to the Authority for the update to TransAction.
- Mr. Jasper stressed that the entire process was very collaborative and expressed appreciation for the efforts of the staff and jurisdictions that supported this process.
- Chairman York requested that the staff report be amended to show the agreed contract dollar amount for complete transparency.
- Chairman York moved approval to award the contract to update the TransAction 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan to AECOM Technical Services Inc.; and authorize the Executive Director to sign the agreement on behalf of the NVTA, in a form approved by legal counsel; seconded by Chairman Bulova.
- Chairman Nohe clarified that the motion includes the request that the meeting minutes reflect the specific dollar amount of the contract.
- Senator Ebbin asked for the explicit dollar amount of the contract. Mr. Longhi responded that the approved budget amount was \$2.5 million, and that after negotiations the contract amount is \$2,135,473, leaving a 17% contingency.
- Motion carried unanimously.

XV. Appointment of Additional Members to the Bylaws Committee

Chairman Nohe

- Chairman Nohe noted that Chair Hynes was appointed Chairman of the Bylaws Committee a few months ago.
- Chairman Nohe appointed Delegate Minchew, Mayor Euille and Mayor Silverthorne as additional members of the Bylaws Committee.
- Chairman Nohe noted that the Committee will be coming back to the Authority in late fall with Bylaw update recommendations.

XVI. Approval of Executive Director's Compensation Package

Mayor Parrish, Chair, Personnel Committee

- Chairman Nohe deferred item XVI to the next Authority meeting.

Discussion/Information

XVII. Monthly Revenue Report Mr. Longhi, CFO

- Mr. Longhi reported that the Authority will end the year very positively.

XVIII. Operating Budget Report Mr. Longhi, CFO

- No verbal report.

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

- Ms. Backmon stated that the State has requested that the Authority submit the I-66 Outside the Beltway project to the HB 2 process. She noted this will be presented to the I-66 Outside the Beltway Committee at its August meeting and that direction will be requested from the Authority at its September meeting regarding willingness to submit this project for HB 2. She added that the Call for Projects for HB 2 opens August 1, 2015, with a deadline of September 30, 2015.

(Chair Hynes arrived.)

- Senator Ebbin asked for clarification on when the projects are due. Ms. Backmon responded projects are to be submitted for HB 2 consideration by September 30, 2015.
- Senator Ebbin questioned if projects are being submitted by the jurisdictions. Ms. Backmon responded that projects are submitted by jurisdictions or transit agencies.
- Senator Ebbin asked if jurisdictions are limited, or if they can submit as many projects as they want and then may be evaluated as to which get rated. Ms. Backmon clarified that the State is facilitating the HB 2 process. She noted that projects on Corridors of Statewide Significance will need a resolution of support from the NVTA. She explained that the HB 2 guidelines require localities or transit agencies that have projects in one of the Corridors of Statewide Significance provide a resolution of support from the relevant entity, and in our case the NVTA is the relevant entity. She added that if transit agencies have projects that are in the regional network, they also require a resolution of support from the Authority. Ms. Backmon stated that the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) staff have conveyed that while the deadline for project submission is September 30, 2015, the deadline for resolutions is December 1, 2015. She added that NVTA staff is preparing resolutions to be vetted through the JACC and bring to the Authority for approval regarding support of these projects.

- Chairman Nohe asked if the Authority can submit projects to HB 2. Ms. Backmon responded affirmatively. Chairman Nohe clarified that while the Authority must sign-off on projects submitted by localities or transit agencies, the Authority can submit projects even if they not submitted by localities. Ms. Backmon responded affirmatively and added that that State would like the Authority to submit the I-66 Outside the Beltway project.
- Senator Ebbin asked if projects being submitted by September 30, 2015, will be included in the NVT A FY17 Program or the Six Year Plan. Ms. Backmon clarified that this is the State's evaluation for HB 2 and the State's Six Year Program. She added that NVT A endorsement of a resolution does not necessarily mandate that the Authority is going to fund said project with HB 2313 revenue, as we have a defined process of how Authority projects will be evaluated.
- Council Member Rishell asked what the time table is after the submission deadline. Ms. Backmon responded that the State's Six Year Program is scheduled to be adopted in June 2016 and that currently there is a training session regarding submission of projects to HB 2 through the on-line process.
- Ms. Mitchell stated that while it may not be required that the Authority received jurisdictional support for a project it submits, it might not be a bad idea. Chairman Nohe noted this would certainly strengthen the argument. He added that while the Authority is not a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), for these purposes we are an MPO.
- Mr. Garczynski added that the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) discussed that although applications are welcomed from individual jurisdictions, the CTB will be looking to the MPO's/NVT A to submit projects. He suggested that it would be simpler this way. He noted that it is unknown how many projects will be submitted to the process and that there is a limited amount of money, especially according to HB 1887.
- Chairman Nohe noted that the submission for projects date is September 30, 2015. If a jurisdiction submits a project, the Authority has to endorse the submission of the project. He asked when the endorsements must be submitted. Ms. Backmon responded that the deadline for receipt of the resolutions is December 1, 2015. Chairman Nohe clarified that the Authority can take action on this in October or November. Ms. Backmon responded affirmatively.
- Council Member Rishell asked when funding will be awarded. Mr. Garczynski responded that this will be for the next Six Year Plan to be adopted in June 2016.
- Delegate Rust asked if the jurisdictions will send projects to the Authority for endorsement. Ms. Backmon responded affirmatively. Delegate Rust asked if the Authority is under any obligation to endorse the project. Ms. Backmon responded that the Authority is not under any obligation and that the JACC has been discussing the possibility of two resolutions. One would be for projects that have been previously vetted by the Authority, for example are in TransAction or the 2010 CLRP, or have been approved as part of CMAQ/RSTP programming allocations. The second resolution would be for

projects the Authority has not vetted. She added that the current discussion is whether to have two resolutions, or whether the Authority should only endorse projects that have been previously vetted.

- Ms. Dominguez clarified that Authority endorsement is only necessary for projects that are considered Corridor of Statewide Significance projects, which is for long range. HB 2 and HB 1887 also have other projects that would qualify. She noted that projects submitted by localities that are a part of the regional network projects do not need a resolution of support. She added that transit agencies submitting projects that are regional network projects do need a letter of support from the relevant entity regardless of what type they are. Ms. Dominguez stated that localities can submit under the regional network, the Urban Development Area, or under safety, and these projects will not need resolutions of support from the Authority.
- Chairman Nohe stated that if a jurisdiction submits a project that requires the Authority's consent, we are not obligated to grant consent. He added that whether the Authority might withhold consent is a separate question. He suggested there might be three categories:
 - ✓ Projects in TransAction and/or been through a vetting process.
 - ✓ Projects that are more subjective that have not vetted, but that the Authority might not have any objection to.
 - ✓ Projects requested by the region that do not require endorsement.
- Chairman Nohe suggested this information is relevant to the TransAction update and the NVTA Six Year Plan funding.
- Ms. Backmon noted that VDOT staff has suggested that if a project is on a Corridor of Statewide Significance and does not receive a resolution of support from the Authority, the State will not consider the project for funding.
- Council Member Snyder requested staff prepare a document that sets forth the conclusions, after vetting with NVTA Council of Counsels, to ensure we are entirely in sync and have a common "play sheet" from which to work.
- Chair Hynes asked for a diagram as well as words, suggested layers are significant and the points of intersection are multiple. She added that what the CTB is looking for in our involvement may be entirely different than what we need. She suggested pictures are necessary to be able to identify whether the Authority can satisfy everyone and to have each different agency's needs laid out. Chair Hynes stated it seems like there are a lot of necessary sign offs that may or may not matter, but could get confusing.
- Delegate Rust wondered if the NVTA should review the process of doing HB 599 and HB 2, noting that the tax payers are spending a lot of money on HB 599. He suggested that the NVTA should take the position of putting these two processes together and make a recommendation to the General Assembly.
- Chairman Nohe requested Ms. Backmon introduce a topic that had been discussed at the Project Implementation Working Group (PIWG) meeting.
- Chairman Bulova suggested that the various requirements and processes make transportation complicated. She stated that the processes are convoluted making it difficult for anyone to understand. She agreed that the Authority

should see if there is a way to streamline and simplify the way projects are evaluated to eliminate separate policies.

- Chair Hynes added that what's being proposed is good and can work, as long as it is fair across modes. If it is not, as we think HB 2 does not have as much sensitivity in it as HB 599.
- Ms. Backmon stated that there was a discussion at the last PIWG meeting to use the two performance measures that the CTB approved as the congestion reduction measures for the HB 2 congestion reduction process, for the Authority's HB 599 congestion reduction measures. She noted the two measures are person throughput and person hours of delay. She added that that the Authority could use these measures and still use the TRANSIMS model, which VDOT used for the HB 599 analysis. She suggested this might better streamline the process. Ms. Backmon concluded that after a lengthy discussion at the PIWG, there was consensus to prepare some test runs, running both highway and transit projects through TRANSIMS with these two performance measures. This would give the group an idea of how the projects would fair in comparison to the HB 599 scoring
- Chairman Nohe stated that HB 599 is a process to measure congestion and that refeeding that data into a larger algorithm helps us to make decisions for project selection. He noted that what percentage each category takes on is different and that there are other performance measures that we are required to consider, that the HB 2 process does not use. He added that both HB 2 and HB 599 have a congestion relief measurement, but there are two major differences. One is that HB 2 uses only person throughput and person hours of delay, whereas the NVTA uses seven different measures. He suggested that it stands to reason that it would be simpler and easier to understand if the NVTA used only those two measures. He added that we do not know what the impact of this would be or how it would change things, but it is worthy of consideration. He stated that the second difference is that the metric VDOT will be using for HB 2 congestion relief is a less robust analytical tool than the tool (TRANSIMS) used in HB 599. Chairman Nohe suggested that if the Authority were to use just the two measures in HB 2, but keep the same robust metric tool, we still would not have an apples to apples comparison of congestion reduction. He noted that if the NVTA gives up the robustness of the HB 599 process, we might be losing valuable data.
- Ms. Backmon added that the Authority wants to ensure it meets the letter of the law regarding HB 599. She noted that HB 599, coupled with the long range transportation plan, is utilized to prioritize and fund the projects under HB 2313. She stated that at the September 16, 2015 PIWG meeting, the data for the test runs using TRANSIMS for the two HB 2 congestion reduction performance measures will be available. She added that VDOT and the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) are also evaluating test transit projects as part of the HB 599 process and that analysis will be available prior to the FY2017 Program Call for Projects.

- Ms. Backmon stated the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment is seeking comments from local officials, agency staff and the general public on the draft 2025 Needs Assessment for the VTrans2040 Multimodal Transportation Plan. She noted that VTrans feeds into the HB 2 process as the planning side. A stakeholder meeting and work session is scheduled from 1-4pm and will be followed by a public open house from 5-7pm on July 29, 2015 at VDOT Fairfax.

XX. Chairman's Comments

- Mr. Garczynski noted that at the July CTB meeting, Deputy Secretary Donahue made a presentation on origins and destinations of river crossings from the 301 bridge to the American Legion Bridge. He stated the study pointed out that the American Legion Bridge is going to have a capacity issue in the fairly short term and that there will be a resolution proposed to the CTB to enter into a dialogue between the Secretariats' of Virginia and Maryland regarding the expansion of the American Legion Bridge, which would include the possibility of HOV/HOT lanes on the Maryland side. He added that there was also discussion about the corresponding need for dialogue regarding a western crossing, not a specific site, but somewhere between the American Legion Bridge and Point of Rocks to connect the two major employment areas of the I-270 corridor around Shady Grove and Tyson's to Dulles.
- Mr. Garczynski suggested that the NVTA may want to comment on this, but that this resolution will come up at the September CTB meeting in Bristol and will spur Deputy Secretary Donohue to enter that dialogue. He further suggested that the dialogue should be for the American Legion Bridge as well as a western crossing. He added Mr. Dyke and he would feel more comfortable if the NVTA supported the discussion of both options.
- Chairman Bulova stated that she is planning to present this report to the Fairfax Board on July 28, 2015. She noted that her recommendation will be to endorse the recommendation regarding improvements to the American Legion Bridge and also the concept of HOT lanes. She added that she is not including another bridge crossing in her recommendation, noting that she understands there is some question as to what a western crossing might resolve as far as travel patterns and that this was somewhat ambiguous. She stated it was absolutely clear that the American Legion Bridge needs to be dealt with. Mr. Garczynski clarified that part of the answer was the expansion of the bridge, if Maryland will agree to expand the beltway on their side of the river. He added that in correlation to that expansion, the population growth of Loudoun, Fairfax, Montgomery and Frederick Counties is such that when looking at 2040 and beyond, connecting these two hubs, I-270 and Rt. 7 on the Silver Line, would certainly help all jurisdictions and Dulles Airport. He noted that this reasoning was behind the impetus to try to include a western river crossing in the dialogues. He stated that this is now all about trying to get Maryland to the table, adding that right now they are focused on the Purple Line and have not been enthusiastic about talking about bridge crossings.

- Chairman Bulova suggested that the NVTA weigh-in on the study and, in particular, the American Legion Bridge recommendation. Mr. Garczynski stated that the CTB and the Deputy Secretary are looking for an indication that we agree, on our side of the river, to a dialogue on bridge crossings. He added that the CTB is not being specific about a site for the bridge crossing, just talking about whether a dialogue can be started.
- Chairman Nohe asked for clarification that the Authority has existing policy on this and that there are references to additional western capacity within TransAction, in some form. Ms. Backmon responded that that is correct and that she believes the Potomac River Crossing is in TransAction. She requested that NVTA staff be permitted time to review this and come back to the Authority with exactly what is in the long range plan.
- Delegate Rust stated that he would support this recommendation and asked when the CTB is meeting about this. Mr. Garczynski responded that it is in Bristol on the third Wednesday of September. He indicated that timing is a challenge and that they might be able to get the resolution postponed, but then it would go to the Governor's Transportation Conference at the end of October.
- Chairman Nohe directed staff to draft a letter to the CTB, for circulation to the NVTA membership, which is based on existing policy guidance in TransAction. He stated that he does not want to create new policy on this.
- Council Member Snyder noted that TransAction 2040 was a highly balanced approach with individuals agreeing and disagreeing about particular projects, but supporting the entire plan. He expressed concern about pulling one particular item out when other projects have not been pursued. He also expressed interest in a discussion of transit enhancements on the American Legion Bridge, as well as other elements. Chairman Bulova suggested that HOT lanes, which include rapid bus, provide a transit component. Council Member Snyder suggested that specific reference to transit enhancements needs to be part of the overall look.
- Chair Hynes expressed concern, based on conversations about the I-66 improvements and bridge crossings, about how this all flows into long term benefit. She suggested caution to be certain we do not end up with something that is very focused on the western side of the region. She asked staff to review this and provide reference to the Authority as we look at these projects which seem to be long term.
- Chairman Bulova expressed strong agreement about the need for dialogue with Maryland. She suggested that many improvements that have been done in Fairfax end at the American Legion Bridge. She noted that there have been previous conversations with Maryland and it is clear that we need to work together. She clarified that when she uses the term "HOT lanes" she means transit, because this is something that has been provided by the I-495 HOT lanes project.
- Delegate Minchew stated that the concept of needing to expand capacity on the American Legion Bridge has been needed for years. He expressed concern that an endorsement of capacity expansion on the Bridge might support the notion that this has addressed and fixed the problem of cross river passage. He

suggested there is a need for a bridge crossing between the American Legion Bridge and Point of Rocks.

- Chairman Bulova stated that she believes the study demonstrated that another river crossing would serve a different traveling public than those using the American Legion Bridge, therefore, expanding the American Legion Bridge will not fix all the problems because other travel patterns that would be addressed by another river crossing. She suggested that nothing will happen unless the dialogue is begun. Mr. Garczynski agreed that the bottom line is to get a dialogue started about the possibilities, challenges and benefits of another crossing with a transit component. He suggested the opportunity provided by the study of origins and destinations would be a good point to begin a dialogue with Maryland.
- Chairman Nohe noted that there is time to circulate a draft letter and receive comments. There was consensus to draft a letter to the CTB for circulation.
- Delegate Minchew asked if Authority members will have time to review the letter and take action on it prior to the CTB meeting. Chairman Nohe stated that the practice for letters has been consensus compiled over email is sufficient, action is not necessary if there is not explicit objection from members.
- Mr. Garczynski stated that the CTB action meeting will be on the third Wednesday in September.
- Chairman York asked if there was an August Authority meeting. Ms. Backmon clarified there is not. Chairman York announced there would be no Finance Committee meeting in August. Chairman Nohe clarified there was no PIWG meeting in August.

XXI. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 7:03pm.