**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, September 21st, 2022, 7:00 pm**

**Northern Virginia Transportation Authority**

**Virtual Meeting held on Zoom**

**Live-streamed on** [**YouTube**](https://youtu.be/0239RzbfLt4)

**MEETING SUMMARY**

1. **Call to Order/Welcome**
   * Vice Chair Ciccarelli called the meeting to order at 7:06 PM over Zoom. Vice Chair Ciccarelli read a synopsis of the Policy 26 legislation that had recently passed by the Authority allowing for virtual meetings for the committees of the NVTA.
   * **Attendees**:
     + **TAC Members:** Karen Campblin, Michelle Cavucci, Armand Ciccarelli, Kerianne Masters, Amy Morris, Frank Spielberg, and Shangjiang Zhu.
     + **NVTA Staff:** Monica Backmon, CEO; Keith Jasper, Principal, Transportation Planning and Programming; Dr. Sree Nampoothiri, Senior Transportation Planner; Harun Rashid, Regional Transportation Modeler; and Ian Newman, Regional Transportation Planner.
     + **Others:** Tom Harrington (Cambridge Systematics), Meeting was also live streamed on YouTube.
2. **Summary Notes of June 14th, 2022, Meeting**

* Vice Chair Ciccarelli called for a motion to approve the June 14th meeting summary notes from a member who was present at the meeting. Motion to approve the summary notes of the June 14th meeting was made by Ms. Morris. Seconded by Dr. Zhu. The motion passed unanimously.

1. **Status of the TransAction Plan Update**

* Mr. Jasper started the presentation with an update on TransAction activities and schedule since November/December of 2021. He mentioned that over the Summer, the Public Comment period commenced. Staff are currently reviewing testimony from the TransAction Public Hearing held on September 8th, and comments received during the public comment period, which ended on September 18th. This public feedback will help to identify the need for any potential changes to the draft TransAction Plan and Project List prior to NVTA adoption in December. Potential changes may include both the need for additional analysis and identification of any opportunities to better communicate TransAction content. For example, we have identified that the scenario analysis work in the draft plan could be described more clearly in Section 7. We will be seeking feedback from our statutory and standing committees during September and October to accomplish this in the most transparent way possible. We will also update NVTA at its meeting on October 13th.
* Dr. Nampoothiri then reviewed the structure of the public comment avenues/methods including a structured online comment form, as well as the materials shared on the website for review, which included the draft Plan summary, project list (both PDF and a sortable table), online interactive map, as well as other supporting information. The draft summary and comment forms were made available in English, Korean and Spanish.
* Dr. Nampoothiri presented how many, and where, the public comments were received. He mentioned that 193 comments came through the web comment form, 21 from the public hearing (both in-person and virtually), six letters, two emails, and one voicemail. He mentioned that 222 comments were received in English and one in Korean, and there were 205 unique commenters meaning that 18 people commented multiple times. He shared that one-third of public commenters mentioned they heard about the survey from email, news or social media; one-fourth from community/interest groups; and the rest came from other sources.
* Dr. Nampoothiri then shared that the most common theme of the comments is focused against new roadway or roadway widening projects, but other common themes focused on improving bike-ped routes, the environment and increasing/improving transit. He then mentioned that overall, 65% of comments were negative, and 35% were judged as either neutral or positive. Of the total number of comments, about 75% of comments were just comments and about 25% were action-based suggestions.
* Ms. Campblin asked about the more commonly mentioned modes being transit/bike ped if the comments were in a favorable light. Dr. Nampoothiri answered that based on preliminary analysis, many people were against road projects, and in support of transit and bike-ped projects, but that more analysis would be necessary.
* Mr. Harrington then overviewed various model-based analyses conducted in support of TransAction update. First, he described the details of the build-network versus no-build network across the metrics of auto person trips, transit person trips, non-motorized person trips, total person trips, person miles traveled (PMT) and vehicle miles traveled (VMT). He pointed out that the number of transit trips increases by 12% due to significant investment in proposed transit projects in the build scenario and that total person trips remain almost the same between the 2045 Build and No-Build analyses.
* In addition, Mr. Harrington shared that there are big improvements on congestion, person-hours of delay, and job accessibility between the build vs. no-build analyses. He also mentioned that emissions and VMT impacts are highly dependent on the deployment/adoption of electric vehicles (EVs).
* Mr. Harrington mentioned that these metrics were also examined by sub-regions by central jurisdictions, inner suburbs and outer suburbs. Transit trips show the largest percentage increase in the outer-suburb; VMT changes vary considerably by sub-region; and reductions in person-hours of delay are distributed more evenly throughout the region. Mr. Harrington then showed two maps comparing traffic volumes and delay patterns between the build and no-build scenarios. He then showed two additional maps showing job accessibility gains throughout the region with the build versus no-build scenarios for auto and transit, respectively.
* He continued by noting the results of model runs for highway projects only and transit projects only. He noted that the findings show that the transit projects and highway projects appear to be serving different markets and are rarely in competition with each other, and that roadway projects have a bigger impact on reducing congestion in the region than other modes.
* Dr. Zhu asked if any project in TransAction contributes to the increase in EV adoption, to which Mr. Harrington responded that there are EV projects on the project list (investment in EV infrastructure). Dr. Zhu asked if there is a way to isolate the benefits or if this is a “mixed-bag” with the national trend to adopt to more EVs. Mr. Harrington mentioned that this is a more mixed-bag result. Dr. Zhu then made a comment that the maps should include units to which Mr. Harrington agreed.
* Mr. Jasper noted that scenario analysis is one of the more complex analytical components of TransAction and the most difficult to communicate in a simple but comprehensive manner. For example, the definitions for two of the three scenarios listed on page 20 of the draft TransAction Plan (‘Technology’ and ‘Incentives/Pricing’) should have mentioned that these scenarios included the assumptions related to the trip changes for the ‘New Normal’ scenario described on the same page. While the scenarios could have been clarified further, the outcomes remain the same.
* Mr. Harrington reiterated the three basic scenarios, alongside the standard forecast. These include the Post-Pandemic New Normal scenario, Technology scenario, and Incentives and Pricing scenarios. He gave a brief and high-level overview of what each one discusses.
* The New Normal scenario witnessed a decrease in VMT and emissions as well as person-hours of delay decreases. The Technology scenario witnessed significant person-hours of delay, congestion, transit trips, and emissions decreases. Incentives and Pricing scenario saw an increase in transit trips as well as decreases in VMT, person-hours of delay and severe congestion. All results were derived from the No-Build analysis.
* In the Build analysis, Mr. Harrington noted that the increase in transit trips in the New-Normal and Incentives and Pricing were greater than in the standard forecast. The projects have a similar impact on congestion in the alternative future scenarios. He also mentioned that TransAction projects have the biggest impacts in the Incentives/Pricing scenario, increasing transit trips by 21%, decreasing emissions up to 61% and resulting in the smallest increase in VMT of any of the four future scenarios that were considered.
* Dr. Zhu asked if the improvements in emissions reduction are not as significant as in the build scenarios because of the emissions reduction achieved through technology adoption in the no-build scenario. Mr. Harrington affirmed that that is correct as a percentage, due to EV adoption being considered in the No-Build analysis.
* Mr. Jasper mentioned that the draft public comment report is expected to be shared at the October Authority meeting. He noted that the same will be shared with TAC at the next meeting. He invited the members to provide the staff any suggestions and comments for things to do better, additions, reductions, and items to conduct further analyses.

1. **NVTA Updates**

* Ms. Backmon mentioned that NVTA is in the process of finalizing TransAction assuming the Authority adopts its update in December. NVTA anticipates conducting a Call for Regional Transportation Projects in May for the next Six Year Program update based on the adopted TransAction being worked on now. Lastly, the development of the draft 2023legislative program is underway. The protection and restoration of Authority’s revenues is anticipated to remain the top legislative priorities.

1. **Adjournment**

* The meeting adjourned at 7:53 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for October 19th at 7:00 PM in-person.