NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

<u>Technical Advisory Committee</u> <u>June 18, 2014 at 7pm</u> NVTA Office – 3060 Williams Drive (Suite 510)

SUMMARY NOTES

I. Call to Order/Welcome

Chair Boice

- Chair Boice called the meeting to order at 7:02pm.
- Attendees:
 - ✓ Members: Chair Boice; Robert Dunphy; Agnes Artemel; Meredith Judy; Pat Turner.
 - ✓ NVTA Staff: Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator); Denise Harris (Program Coordinator).
 - ✓ Other Staff: Noelle Dominguez (Vice Chair, JACC).
- Chair Boice reported that, after polling Committee members, there is no alternative evening for scheduling the TAC meeting that works for everyone. Consequently the monthly TAC meeting will remain on the third Wednesday of the month.

II. Approval of Summary Notes – May 21, 2014

Ms. Artemel moved to approve the minutes of May 21, 2014; seconded by Mr.
 Dunphy. Motion carried unanimously.

III. NVTA Updates

Monica Backmon

- The Authority meeting scheduled for July 10, 2014 has been rescheduled to July 24.
 At the Authority's July meeting, VDOT will present the initial findings of the HB599 rating study.
- VDOT is scheduled to present these findings to the Committee at its next meeting on July 16.
- Chair Boice is unavailable to present the TAC report at the Authority's July meeting. Instead, Ms. Judy will present the report on behalf of the Committee.
- A process is underway for replacing former member Mr. Puentes, with a replacement expected to be appointed at the Authority's July meeting.

IV. TransAction 2040 RFP Discussion

 The Committee had a wide-ranging discussion about the previously issued (February 25, 2010) RFP for the TransAction 2040 long range plan. The purpose of this discussion is to provide inputs to the potential statement of work (and other content) for the upcoming RFP for the TransAction 2040 long range plan update. Key highlights/suggestions were:

Pricing

- ✓ Consider options for incorporating price into the selection process, e.g. professional services contract (negotiate price with most qualified firm), use a low weighting for price in the evaluation criteria (or as a tie-breaker), specify budget price in RFP, request a range of prices (to reflect uncertainty in scope), and request prices for optional items.
- ✓ Some otherwise qualified firms may be dissuaded from bidding if Task 1 addresses scope finalization this may place unacceptable risk on some consultants when pricing their proposals to be competitive.
- ✓ Inputs on scope from the Committee would enable staff to determine an appropriate budget recommendation for future Authority approval.

General

- ✓ Should the TransAction 2040 vision and goals be revisited? Given recent legislation (HB2313, HB599, and HB2) and associated objectives, the Committee considered it was appropriate to review and possibly update the vision and goals for the plan update.
- ✓ To what extent should the project selection and prioritization process for NVTA regional projects (funded with 70% revenues) reflect the requirement that each locality's total long-term benefit be approximately equal to the proportion of the total of the fees and taxes received by the Authority that are generated by or attributable to the locality divided by the total of such fees and taxes received by the Authority? The Committee considered this was a topic for the ongoing discussion on long term benefits.
- ✓ How should regional transportation projects be defined? The Committee agreed to discuss this in detail at the July meeting.
- ✓ What, if anything, should we attempt to learn about regional planning from other metropolitan areas, e.g. best practices? This could be addressed by making it a requirement for proposers to demonstrate that they bring relevant experience from other metropolitan areas.

Analytical Approaches

✓ Should the plan incorporate project selection and prioritization processes that reflect HB599 (and HB2) rating processes? Members would like to understand more about the different analytical requirements of each legislation, including

- how they would be applied to different funding streams (including leveraged funds) and for different types of project. The Committee considered it would be interesting to compare analyses required by each legislation, although the long range plan should be unconstrained. However it was noted that there is a practical limit on the number of projects that can be rated under HB599, which may have the potential effect of constraining the number of projects.
- ✓ What performance measures should be considered, e.g. travel times, delays, reliability, congestion duration, person hours of delay, person hours of congested travel in autos, person hours of congested travel in transit vehicles, transit crowding, connectivity to regional activity centers, accessibility to jobs, accessibility to labor, safety, air quality, emergency mobility? The Committee recognized the importance and complexity of this topic and agreed to discuss this in detail at the July meeting.
- ✓ Are alternative/additional/fewer measures or criteria needed? This will be addressed in concert with the preceding bullet.
- ✓ What level of sensitivity analysis is required, e.g. various VMT trend possibilities? The Committee noted the link between increased analysis and increased cost, but considered that making the appropriate investment decisions justified some level of sensitivity analysis.
- ✓ What level of cost/benefit analysis is required, e.g. "to move the most people in the most cost-effective manner?" This should be addressed at some level, to help make comparisons between projects. Proposers could be asked to suggest an appropriate methodology for doing this.

<u>Future Trends</u>

- ✓ Should the plan include scenario analysis? If so, what types of scenario? Again noting the potential impact on cost, the Committee considered it was appropriate to include scenario analysis, e.g. city-focus, activity center focus, and suburban sprawl focus.
- ✓ How should recent trends be investigated, e.g. Baby Boomers and Millennials?

 This could be included as part of the scenario analysis.
- ✓ What other trends or risks do you foresee that may influence transportation needs in the coming decades? Suggestions included housing prices, oil prices, driverless vehicles, biking, and car-sharing (and related impacts on vehicle ownership). Some or all of these could be incorporated into the sensitivity analysis discussed earlier. The Committee was uncertain how reliably these trends and risks could be incorporated into the analysis, and suggested that a qualitative approach may be more appropriate.
- ✓ To what extent should resiliency and emergency preparedness be addressed? The Committee considered that it was important to include these components as they relate to regional evacuations and mitigation of loss of infrastructure capacity.

Transportation Solutions

- ✓ The Committee agreed that projects should include infrastructure enhancements, e.g. new capacity, bottleneck mitigation; demand management, (pricing, managed lanes, trip reduction) and operational efficiencies including transportation technology.
- ✓ Out-of-the-box solutions, innovations, and telecommuting (non-federal) should be included where appropriate, and could be included in the sensitivity analysis.

Outreach and Communications

- ✓ How do we engage the public effectively? The selected consultant will be required to develop an overall plan, but it is hoped that jurisdictional and NVTA staff will be able to support this activity and create the potential for increased effectiveness at a reduced cost compared to previously.
- ✓ What is the role of social media in public engagement? The Committee agreed there is a role for social media. NVTA staff is currently exploring opportunities.
- At the conclusion of the discussion, the Committee agreed to revisit selected topics at the July meeting:
 - ✓ Vision and goals.
 - ✓ Definition of regional transportation projects.
 - ✓ Recommended performance measures.

V. Adjournment

• Meeting adjourned at 8:53pm.