



Northern Virginia Transportation Authority
The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, October 12, 2016, 7:00pm

NVTA Office

3040 Williams Drive, Suite 200

Fairfax, Virginia 22031

SUMMARY NOTES

I. Call to Order/Welcome Chairman Boice

- Chairman Boice called the meeting to order at 7:10pm.
- Attendees:
 - Members: Randy Boice; Armand Ciccarelli; Bob Dunphy; Doug Fahl; Pat Turner.
 - NVTA Staff: Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Keith Jasper (Principal, Transportation Planning and Programming); Sree Nampoothiri (Transportation Planner); Harun Rashid (Transportation Planner).
 - Other: Noelle Dominguez (Fairfax County); Jason Mumford (AECOM); Douglas Stewart (Virginia Sierra Club); Stu Whitaker (Transiters).

II. Meeting Summary of August 17, 2016 Meeting and September 21, 2016 Chairman Boice

- Ms. Turner moved approval of the August 17, 2016 meeting summary; seconded by Mr. Dunphy. Mr. Boice moved approval of the September 21, 2016 meeting summary; seconded by Ms. Turner. Both motions 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 next Authority meeting is scheduled for October 13, 2016. She added that the agenda items include adoption of the Transportation Projects Reserve Policy, elimination of Contingency Reserve, a resolution supporting Smart Scale applications from jurisdictions, and appointment of a new Vice Chairman of the Authority.

IV. TransAction Update

Mr. Jasper

- Mr. Jasper introduced Mr. Mumford, the consultant project manager for the TransAction update. Mr. Jasper requested the committee deliberate on developing a recommended list of performance measures for plan evaluation.
- Mr. Mumford presented a summary of discussions from the August and September TAC meetings which included a desire to reduce the number of measures, revise/remove some measures and the difficulty in measuring the Goal 3 measures.
- In response to Mr. Dunphy's request to clarify the difference between Goal 1 and Goal 2, Mr. Mumford noted Goal 1 is more focused on capacity expansion, while Goal 2 is more focused on efficiency of existing facilities.
- In general, the members agreed that the congestion reduction and reliability measures were good.
- There was general agreement that the connectivity and access measures need to be revised. Mr. Dunphy pointed to the State of the Commute Survey results from the Transportation Planning Board (TPB) and suggested that the average distance/time/speed of trips from point A to point B would be easily understandable for the public. He added that the Baltimore metropolitan planning organization (MPO) looked at time taken to reach a certain percentage of jobs as a measure of access/connectivity. Mr. Boice noted that the percent of jobs/population within ½ mile of transit could be very low in the outer suburbs, while high in the core areas, due to the inherent development pattern. He suggested this can cause difficulty in comparisons.
- Mr. Fahl suggested looking at TPB's regional activity centers (RAC) to explore connectivity measures. He added that both inter- and intra-activity center connectivity are important. Mr. Dunphy noted that the measure of 45 minutes travel by auto/60 minutes travel by transit would be different for a trip from an outer jurisdiction to the core versus a trip within the core, since the number of jobs accessible could be vastly different for each case. He suggested looking at different time limits for inter- and intra-activity center connectivity measures.
- Mr. Fahl mentioned that the NVRTA should rise above the parochialistic mentality jurisdictions may fall into and address regional transportation solutions that can support land use planning in general. He suggested consistency with local comprehensive plans may not be an appropriate measure. Mr. Mumford noted that the projects considered in TransAction are already coming from comprehensive plans and other local plans, thus are consistent with local planning efforts. In general, the committee agreed to remove this measure. The members wanted to let other NVRTA committees know that while the objective of supporting and strengthening local land use objectives is important, consistency with the plans may not be the best way to measure it.
- In response to Mr. Dunphy's question regarding the difficulty of measuring household transportation cost, Mr. Fahl noted that people consider decisions on housing based on large periodic costs such as mortgage and taxes, while

transportation costs are metered out over time and therefore complicated to measure. In general, the members supported removal of this measure.

- Mr. Mumford noted that some TAC members and TransAction Subcommittee members considered safety a tricky measure, but it has direct impact on reliability. Mr. Jasper added that the NVTA staff will explore the possibility of discussing the safety data availability and analysis practices with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) staff. Mr. Fahl opined that all projects are expected to improve safety and therefore the measure may be unnecessary. Mr. Dunphy added that the impacts of safety might already be measured indirectly under other measures, such as reliability.
- The members opined that the objectives of integrating modes and giving travel options (2.2 and 2.3) are similar and could be measured with share of non-SOV travel.
- The members agreed to keep the measures for travel demand management and improving operations. Ms. Turner and Mr. Fahl noted that the travel time measure during a 10% increase in peak demand is important to understanding system reliability during an emergency.
- The members opined that the cost benefit analysis is important and staff should explore the best way to do this with the congestion reduction relative to cost (CRRC) ratio as the basis. Mr. Fahl added that the cost benefit score is important, but did not necessarily demand the highest weighting.
- On the notion of including operational cost for both roads and transit in the analysis, Ms. Turner asked if the two are considered different. Ms. Backmon noted that VDOT has certain responsibilities and plans for road maintenance, but transit operations are left to the transit agencies and jurisdictions.
- Mr. Fahl noted that some proposed measures, such as the amount of impervious area and right of way (ROW) impacts, are usually addressed at the project level and may not be appropriate at the planning level. Ms. Turner added that new technologies are expected to improve emissions and reduce the need for measuring the same at plan level. In general, the members felt that reduction of VMT could be a good proxy for all these measures.
- In general, the members agreed that the measures related to Goal 1 should get the highest weighting followed by Goal 2 and Goal 3, respectively.
- The members requested NVTA staff revise the list of measures based on the discussion and present the revision to the entire committee.

Adjournment

V. **Adjourn**

Chairman Boice

- Meeting adjourned at 9:30pm.