



Northern Virginia Transportation Authority
The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE

Monday, March 28, 2015, 10:00 am

Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

3040 Williams Drive, Suite 200

Fairfax, Virginia 22031

SUMMARY NOTES

I. Call to Order/Welcome

Chairman Nohe

- Chairman Nohe called the meeting to order at 10:09 am.
- Attendees:
 - **PPC Members:** Chairman Nohe; Chairman Bulova (Fairfax County); Chair Randall, Board Member Fisette (Arlington County); Council Member Rishell (City of Manassas Park).
 - **NVTA Staff:** Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Mike Longhi (CFO); Sree Nampoothiri (Program Coordinator), Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator).
 - **Staff:** Rick Canizales (Prince William County); Tom Biesiadny, Karyn Moreland, Noelle Dominguez (Fairfax County); Joe Kroboth, Bob Brown (Loudoun County); Sarah Crawford (Arlington County); Mark Duceman (Town of Herndon); Maria Sinner (VDOT); Kate Mattice (NVTC); Rich Roisman (TPB); Sonali Soneji (VRE); Cynthia Porter Johnson (PRTC); Mark Phillips (WMATA).
 - **Other Staff:** Kimberly Bibbee (Prince William County).

Action

II. Meeting Summary Notes of November 6 and December 2, 2015, PIWG Meetings

- The November 6 and December 2, 2015, Project Implementation Working Group (PIWG) meeting summaries were unanimously approved by PIWG members who attended the respective PIWG meetings.

III. Adoption of the 2016 Meeting Calendar

- PPC members confirmed the next PPC meetings are scheduled for April 18, May 4, and June 28, 2015.
- PPC members requested NVTA staff prepare a regular PPC meeting schedule starting in September 2016, for approval at a subsequent PPC meeting.

Discussion/Information

IV. **FY2017 Program Update**

Mr. Jasper

- Ms. Backmon reported that the FY2017 Program call for projects resulted in a list of 24 candidate projects recommended for evaluation.
- Mr. Jasper provided an overview of the project selection process and the quantitative score criteria weighting adjustments previously agreed upon by the Project Implementation Working Group and approved by the Authority.
- In response to Board Member Fisette's questions regarding the project selection process, Mr. Jasper provided an overview of how the projects are analyzed and scored. He explained that the output from the HB 599 evaluation (conducted by VDOT) will be used for the congestion reduction criterion, and the other criteria are evaluated by NVTa staff based on information provided by the jurisdictions and agencies responding to the call for projects. He added that the NVTa part of this process is essentially completed for all the projects and the scores have been reported to the jurisdictions and agencies.
- Chair Randall questioned the weightings adopted for the FY2017 Program. Ms. Backmon explained that the increase from 35 to 45 percent (compared to the FY2015-16 Program) for congestion reduction was in part to align with the congestion component of Commonwealth's HB 2 process, which is weighted at 45 percent. Chairman Nohe further stated that HB 2 uses the same criterion statewide, however the HB 2 criteria weightings vary from region to region. The components that make a transportation project a good project differ depending on which region of the State is under evaluation. In Northern Virginia, congestion reduction is our highest priority. He explained when the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) adopted their congestion weighting at 45 percent, it made sense to increase our weighting to 45 percent.
- Chairman Nohe pointed out that an imbalance still exists between the HB 2 and NVTa processes for HB 599 in that congestion relief is measured differently. While the HB 599 model (TRANSIMS) is robust and provides irrefutable analysis, this model is expensive and doesn't work well without a baseline of high congestion. Therefore, the State uses a simpler approach that applies to Statewide conditions more appropriately. He noted this could lead to discrepancies in results.
- Ms. Backmon reminded the committee that the project score is based on the universe of projects that the project is evaluated against; a universe of 24 projects is being evaluated for the FY2017 Program, whereas the State is evaluating a different universe of projects.
- Chairman Nohe observed that projects submitted for the FY2015-16 Program that are being resubmitted for the FY2017 Program will inevitably score differently because the universe of projects has changed; he specifically pointed out the inclusion of transit projects and mega-projects like the I-66/Route 28 interchange. He cautioned the possibility of failing to advance good projects (e.g., smaller, cost-effective projects) because they are submitted into the wrong pool of projects.

- Ms. Backmon stressed the importance of ensuring the HB 599 process is incorporated into the updated TransAction. She explained, with an updated long-range transportation plan, there will be no need for a separate HB 599 process when adopting the future Authority Six Year Program because congestion reduction, along with other performance measures, would have already been vetted through the TransAction process.
- Chairman Nohe pointed out that the law states we must give priority to projects that achieve the greatest congestion reduction relative to cost. He expressed that, ideally, we would have a universe of congestion relief scores and reliable cost estimates to evaluate; however, he cautioned that costs are always a variable.
- In response to Chair Randall's question about what constitutes "Connectivity" under quantitative scoring, Mr. Jasper clarified that the two criteria for Connectivity are connecting jurisdictions and connecting activity centers.
- Mr. Jasper reminded the group of two related policies associated with the FY2017 Program established to encourage project readiness and project advancement:
 - Jurisdictions must complete Standard Project Agreements (SPAs) for selected projects within 6 months of the adoption of the FY2017 Program (anticipated deadline is January 2017).
 - Submittal of first drawdown requests are due by June 30, 2019, by sponsors of approved projects.
- Mr. Jasper provided an overview of the schedule and upcoming milestones for the FY2017 Program. He reported completion of the project evaluations and HB 599 evaluations in April 2016 and NVTA approval of the project list for public comment (possibly all 24 projects) on May 12, 2016, which will allow the public the opportunity to comment on all 24 projects between May 17 and June 17, 2016, subject to Authority approval.
- Mr. Jasper announced that the public comment period along with town halls within the jurisdictions must take place during the public comment period. He requested that jurisdictions planning to host a town hall provide details to NVTA staff by April 29, 2016, for inclusion in NVTA's public outreach. Chairman Nohe encouraged jurisdictions to hold town halls and summarized the format of previous town halls he helped to conduct.
- Committee members expressed appreciation for Chairman Nohe's willingness to participate at their upcoming town halls.
- Mr. Jasper noted that the TransAction 2040 public outreach will also be underway during this same timeframe but he is optimistic that this will be an efficient use of resources and publicizing the two efforts in tandem will reinforce the linkage between long-range transportation planning and programming.
- Mr. Jasper reported that the PPC will be requested to recommend a date (anticipated June 9, 2016) for the FY2017 Program Public Hearing at the upcoming April PPC meeting. He added that the PPC will review project evaluations and recommend the project list for public comment at the May PPC meeting. In late June/early July (currently scheduled for June 28), the PPC will review the public comments and updated project evaluations and recommend the draft FY2017 Program to the

Authority. The Authority is anticipated to adopt the FY2017 Program on July 14, 2016.

- Mr. Jasper provided a summary of the 24 candidate projects and reminded the committee that the project details can be found on the NVTA website.
- In response to Council Member Rishell's question regarding how the Authority will fund the \$667,949,000 million requested for projects, Ms. Backmon explained that the Authority may choose to fund all 24 projects, which would require the need for bonds, or the Authority could choose to fund \$266,700,000 (estimated pay-go) or more; it will depend on the project list adopted by the Authority.
- Mr. Jasper reported that 19 of the 45 Northern Virginia projects that submitted requests for HB 2 funds are currently recommended for funding and 9 of these projects are requesting both HB 2 and FY2017 Program funds (specifically, 4 of these 9 projects are currently recommended for HB 2 funds).
- Ms. Backmon informed the committee that the State intends to fund to fruition all projects that are part of the CTB's Six Year Improvement Program under the new HB 2 process. She stated that there are some overlapping projects under consideration for the Authority's FY2017 Program in addition to the State's Six Year Improvement Program and she emphasized the importance of avoiding the over-funding of projects.
- In response to Chairman Nohe's inquiry regarding the intent of the nine projects that applied for funding from both the FY2017 Program and the State, Mr. Canizales explained that Prince William County asked for the same amount of money from both entities in order to complete the Route 1 project while, for the Route 15 project, the County asked for \$20 million from the Authority and \$25 million from the State to ensure \$45 million in funding for the project.
- Similarly, Mr. Biesiadny explained that Fairfax County requires funding from both HB 2 and the FY2017 Program to move the Route 28 project forward; however, he added that Phase 1 of the Route 7 Project appears to be fully-funded through the State, thus may not require Authority funding for completion of the first phase. (Committee members noted this could potentially "free-up" \$10 million in FY2017 funding requests.)
- Ms. Maria Sinner reported that there is a question included in HB 2 application process that queries whether funding is coming from another source; thus, the CTB will take this information under consideration prior to making their project selection for the Six Year Improvement Program on June 15, 2016.
- Chairman Nohe observed that there is a distinct likelihood that the Prince William County Route 1 project and Fairfax County Route 28 and Route 7 projects will be funded in the Six Year Improvement Plan and the five other projects for Fairfax County, Prince William County, and Town of Dumfries will not be recommended for HB 2 funds. The committee explored the possibility of, and how to address, increases and decreases in NVTA funding requests that arise as a result of State HB 2 funding determinations.
- Ms. Backmon pointed out the importance of ensuring there are no substantive changes to the projects, especially after completion of the Public Hearing and public comment timeframe. Thus, if any changes arise in the size and/or nature of the

request, this information needs to be relayed as soon as possible for PPC analysis and prior to subsequent recommendations to the Authority for release.

V. TransAction Update

Mr. Jasper

- Mr. Jasper provided a summary of the TransAction schedule, which includes many technical and public engagement tasks. He provided an overview of the TransAction activity that has led to the public outreach anticipated to start in Spring 2016.
- Mr. Jasper commended the level of effort and commitment provided by jurisdiction and agency staff who have participated in the TransAction Subcommittee and he expressed his appreciation for all the support given.
- Mr. Jasper explained that, instead of a call of projects, TransAction 2040 will utilize a comprehensive database containing all eligible regional projects that is under development in conjunction with jurisdiction and agency staff. He noted that the database currently captures about 500 candidate regional projects. He noted that filtering will be required to narrow this down to a reasonable number of projects that can be evaluated.
- In response to Council Member Rishell’s question regarding a deadline for project submissions, Mr. Jasper requested that sufficient project data be submitted by the end of the month (March 2016). Ms. Backmon further confirmed that the database of projects needs to be completed by the end of the month; however, specific project-level components not yet submitted will be required for implementation into the model for analysis prior to August 2016.
- Chairman Nohe pointed out that there are projects that will be submitted that were not included in TransAction 2040 and also acknowledged that jurisdictions do not always agree whether projects should be submitted; he questioned whether there is a vetting process by which the Authority will determine if these projects are chosen.
- Ms. Backmon responded that projects are not be required to be in the locality’s comprehensive plan/agency long-range plan in order to be considered. She emphasized that the Authority will ultimately be assessing the needs of the region in order to choose recommended projects.
- Chairman Nohe emphasized that the more alternatives we have in the plan, the more opportunity we have to find the most congestion-relieving/cost-effective projects to fund when the time comes.
- Mr. Jasper agreed and stated that TransAction is specifically exploring packages of projects that identify the transportation needs of the region; thus, after taking the “bottom-up” approach of understanding what projects are of interest to the jurisdictions and agencies, there will be a separate assessment to ensure the needs of the region are being addressed. Based on this analysis, he stated the Authority may intervene and additional “top-down” projects may be recommended for consideration in order to meet these needs.
- Chairman Nohe added that jurisdictions are required to notify the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and the NVTAA of any changes made to the jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan so there is at least an understanding of any changes

that could affect facilities within TransAction. He pointed out that the Authority may amend the comprehensive plan to align with these changes but is not compelled to do this. Thus, the removal of a facility from a jurisdiction's comprehensive plan does not preclude it from being funded; the Authority would have to subsequently remove the facility from the long-range plan as well.

- Mr. Jasper provided an overview of the upcoming public outreach activities and summarized the two primary means of public outreach for TransAction: five workshops and ten pop-up events (event schedule provided to committee).
- Chair Bulova suggested the inclusion of a display that would capture the public's attention and provide an interesting way to show the results of improving our roads and corridors. Mr. Jasper and members of the committee agreed a visual representation of resolving our transportation challenges would be an excellent tool for public outreach.

VI. NVTA Update

Ms. Backmon

- Ms. Backmon informed the NVTA is hosting an event for the Intelligent Transportation Society of Virginia entitled "Planning for Tomorrow's Transportation, Today" on April 6, 2016, from 8:00 a.m. to 12 noon at the NVTA offices and confirmed registration is still open if members of the group are interested in attending.
- Ms. Backmon also reminded the group of the interactive strategic planning work session to be held on Monday, April 11, 2016, to address "What Does the Authority Want to Be When It Grows Up" from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Adjournment

VII. Adjourn

- The meeting adjourned at 11:53 am.