



**Northern Virginia Transportation Authority**  
*The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia*

**Thursday, October 9, 2014**

**7:00 pm**

**Fairfax City Hall**

**10455 Armstrong St**

**Fairfax, Virginia 22030**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**I. Call to Order** Chairman Nohe

- Chairman Nohe called the meeting to order at 7:06pm.

**II. Roll Call** Ms. Speer, Clerk

- Voting Members: Chairman Nohe; Board Member Hynes; Supervisor Letourneau (arrived 7:10pm); Chairman Bulova; Council Member Way; Mayor Silverthorne; Council Member Rishell; Council Member Snyder; Senator Ebbin; Delegate Rust; Delegate Minchew; Mr. Garczynski; Miss Bushue.
- Non-Voting Members: Mayor Umstattd; Ms. Cuervo.
- Staff: Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Michael Longhi (CFO); Denise Harris (Program Coordinator); Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator); Camela Speer (Clerk); Peggy Teal (Assistant Finance Officer); various jurisdictional staff.

**III. Minutes of the September 11, 2014 Meeting**

- Chairman Bulova moved approval of the September 11, 2014 minutes; seconded by Board Member Hynes. Motion passed with ten (10) yeas and two (2) abstentions [with Council Member Way and Miss Bushue abstaining as they were not at the September meeting].

**Presentation**

**IV. I-66 Corridor Improvements** Deputy District Administrator Rene'e Hamilton

- Ms. Shaw, project manager, gave a PowerPoint presentation on the I-66 Corridor Improvements from Route 15 to I-495.

*(Supervisor Letourneau arrived.)*

- Chairman Bulova asked for clarification that in addition to converting a High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane, an additional lane would also be added. Ms. Shaw responded that there would be.
- Delegate Rust expressed concern that Alternative 1 was no longer being considered and suggested that Alternative 2A continue to be studied. He added that Alternate 2B precludes any fiscally responsible extension of rail in this part of the county. Ms. Shaw responded that the study shows that the right of way impacts for Alternative 2A are minimal. She added that the National Environmental Protection Agency (NEPA) document requires that they continue to study Alternative 2A and it will be studied the full length of the corridor. This alternative will be brought to the public as part of the public vetting process.
- Delegate Rust expressed further concern that if Alternative 2B is selected, it will place a high barrier to overcome for rail in this corridor. Ms. Shaw suggested that members drive the corridor and take notice of what is currently in the median. In some areas in Prince William County there is no median due to environmental resources alongside the roadway. Ms. Shaw noted that these are the areas that everyone will be forced to look at closely when considering the best options.
- Mr. Garczynski reminded everyone that this project will still have to go through the HB 2 process. He added that in order to fund this project, which will be in the billions, the P3, the Federal Government, the Commonwealth and the Authority will have to participate. In all probability, the NVTa will be asked to make a contribution for the greater regional good that I-66 improvements will provide.
- Delegate Minchew asked if a site has been chosen for a transit facility that the study shows in Centreville. Ms. Shaw responded that they are working with Fairfax County to determine this and are looking at future rail stations that have already been identified. She added that they are also looking at some opportunities in Prince William County.
- Chairman Bulova asked Mr. Biesiadny if the Centreville site being considered is the one by the Fairfax County Government Center. Mr. Biesiadny responded that it is not, it is the Fair Lakes site on I-66 and Route 29. Chairman Bulova added that there is land that has been reserved by the Government Center for a transit center.
- Council Member Way asked if there are any sections of the roadway improvements that will narrow the lanes or shoulders enough to make it a problem for buses. Ms. Shaw responded that they have not studied this yet. She added that they expect to be able to keep the twelve foot minimum and that they are looking for opportunities to allow buses to pull off to the left in the event of a breakdown. At this time, do not expect any reduced lane widths.
- Board Member Hynes suggested that this seems like a very practical solution to a challenging problem. She noted that the inner jurisdictions are currently struggling with spaces to store buses and that while rapid bus is a good idea, we need to consider where the rapid buses will be stored. Ms. Shaw responded that she has passed this concern along to the Transit/TDM group.

- Council Member Snyder asked if the study has looked at the District of Columbia's transit plans. He noted that the District is making it difficult to get around by car. He expressed concern that we may make it possible for more vehicles to get to the city, but that they may not be able to get into city. He asked to what extent the study group is looking at the bigger picture and what percentage of vehicles are going all the way into the District. Ms. Shaw responded that they will be looking at origin and destination when they run the models. She noted that currently at the beltway and I-66 only 40% of the traffic goes through on I-66 to the District. She pointed out that the current model does not go through to District, but that they will have a good idea of this travel pattern.
- Council Member Snyder added that if the objective is to create real congestion relief, we need to do it and not create expectations, then not deliver. He noted that this underscores the importance of transit as well as highway improvement.
- Mayor Umstattd asked what the transition for transit riders might be in the sections where there is not enough space to place a median in the roadway. Ms. Shaw responded that the median would be for a future improvement and the study is not currently looking at this piece. She added that the goal is to put a median wherever possible to provide options for future transit improvements.
- Chairman Bulova asked for clarification that this is a shorter term project than extending the metro or rail lines, but that the goal is to preserve as much of the right-of-way as possible to accommodate future transit extension. She added that this project is to increase capacity from the beltway outward by having managed lanes and an additional lane. Ms. Shaw responded that the goal is to improve the transit corridor on I-66. She noted that I-95 has a slug culture and that I-66 does not because there is no incentive. Ms. Shaw suggested that as managed lanes make this a reliable trip, the goal will be to get drivers to consider carpools, vanpools, buses and slug options. She added that similar to the Beltway, this will not solve all travel problems, but the focus is to provide more reliable travel in the corridor.
- Mayor Silverthorne noted that he has appreciated the public outreach being done for this project, but added that he would appreciate the City Council being briefed prior to the study group meeting with the public and his constituency. Ms. Shaw responded that they would be happy to brief the City Council.
- Chairman Nohe expressed concern that there are currently three (3) lanes that are free and will become toll lanes. He added that this may be necessary to encourage ridesharing, but that this is a pretty big shift. He suggested that there will be a need for much community education about the toll lanes. Chairman Nohe stated that the slug community on I-95 appreciates that only HOV3 vehicles are currently using the express lanes, but are concerned that the new lanes will allow single occupant vehicles to pay to use them. He suggested there may be a similar cultural reaction to turning free lanes on I-66

to paid lanes. Chairman Bulova added that while they are toll lanes, they are also free to HOV3 vehicles.

- Chairman Nohe asked if there is anything about this study that will preclude the extension of Godwin Road, or the Tri-County Parkway, to I-66. Ms. Shaw responded that there is nothing currently in the study for this.

### **Consent Agenda**

- V. Project Agreement for Arlington County – Regional Funding Project 013-14-017-1-08 (Crystal City Multimodal Center)**
- VI. Project Agreement for Arlington County - Regional Funding Project 013-14-016-1-09 (Columbia Pike Multimodal Improvement)**
- VII. Project Agreement for Arlington County - Regional Funding Project 013-14-015-2-08 (Boundary Channel Drive Interchange)**
- VIII. Project Agreement for Arlington County - Regional Fund Project 013-14-014-1-08 (Blue/Silver Line Mitigation - Art Fleet Expansion - 4 Buses)**
- IX. Project Agreement for the City of Fairfax-Regional Fund Project 600-14-018-2-06 (Chain Bridge Road Widening/Improvements from Route 29/50 to Eaton Place)**
- X. Project Agreement for the City of Falls Church - Regional Fund Project 610-14-013-1-01 (Bus Shelters)**

- Chairman Nohe stated that there are six (6) project agreements on the Consent Agenda.
- Delegate Rust requested Item #9 be removed from the Consent Agenda.
- Council Member Snyder moved to approve the consent agenda to include the specific motions in items V – VIII & X; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried unanimously.
- Chairman Bulova moved approval of the proposed Standard Project Agreement 600-14-018-2-06 (Chain Bridge Road Widening/Improvements from Route 29/50 to Eaton Place), in accordance with NVTAs approved Project Description Sheets for each project to be funded as appended to the Standard Project Agreements; and that the Executive Director sign it on behalf of the Authority; seconded by Mayor Silverthorne. Motion carried with twelve (12) yeas and one (1) abstention [Delegate Rust].

### **Action Items**

**XI. Approval of Agreement Between the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority and the Arlington County Treasurer's Office**  
Chairman York, Chair, Finance Committee

- Mr. Longhi briefed the Authority on the agreement between NVTa and the Arlington County Treasurer's Office. He highlighted:
  - ✓ Local Government Investment Pool (LGIP) has imposed self-regulations that will make it difficult for NVTa to move HB 2313 funds to organizations that are not LGIP members.
  - ✓ This agreement allows NVTa to transfer funds to Arlington County and Arlington County will then forward the funds within minutes to the destination the Authority requests.
  - ✓ NVTa cannot do this itself as our operating bank account is kept at low levels.
  - ✓ Arlington County has reviewed the agreement and approves.
  - ✓ The Finance Committee has reviewed the agreement and recommend approval.
  - ✓ Arlington County will only charge the Authority for transaction costs.
- Delegate Minchew asked if there are other alternatives, if we did not want to use one of the member jurisdictions. Mr. Longhi responded that we are planning to work with LGIP to form agreements with Towns that have accounts with LGIP and use the LGIP process as much as possible, but we will not be able to reach 100% compliance with the regulations. He added that the other alternative is to move a substantial amount of money into a fund that allows NVTa to have a cash flow to fund these infrequent, but very large, transactions ourselves. There will be interest earned lost in this method.
- Board Member Hynes moved to approve the Agreement Between the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority and the Arlington County Treasurer's Office related to Funds Transfer Assistance; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried unanimously.

**XII. Approval of Standard Project Agreement Between NVTa & VDOT**  
Mayor Euille, Chair, FWG

- Mr. Biesiadny briefed the Authority on the Standard Project Agreement (SPA) between NVTa and Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT). He stated that this is a modification to the SPA the Authority approved in March because some aspects of original agreement did not work well for VDOT projects. This agreement will be for projects that are funded 100% by the Authority and are implemented by VDOT, or will ultimately be owned by VDOT. Mr. Biesiadny reviewed the major changes to the original agreement:
  - ✓ References to the governing body were changed to more accurate references for VDOT.
  - ✓ Added some clarifications of terms.
  - ✓ Discussed the concern that if VDOT misappropriates funds. Original SPA states that if a jurisdiction misappropriates funds, it must reimburse the

Authority plus interest. Given the State structure this was a problem, therefore, “to the extent permitted by law” was added.

- ✓ Modified the provision that if the Authority funds a project it must continue to be used for the purpose intended, to add a “meet and confer” provision to discuss individual situations.
- Mr. Biesiadny stated that with approval of this agreement, several FY2014 approved projects can move forward.
- Delegate Minchew suggested that he would have preferred a red lined document showing the document changes. Mr. Biesiadny responded that he has one and will circulate it.
  
- Chairman Bulova moved to approve, in substantial form, the Standard Project Agreement between the Authority and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) related to the implementation of projects funded solely with the 70 percent funding the Authority is retaining for regional projects and that are being constructed by VDOT; seconded by Council Member Rishell. Motion carried unanimously.

**XIII. Approval of Project Implementation Working Group FY15-16 Two Year Program Project Selection Criteria** Chairman Nohe, Chair, PIWG

- Mr. Jasper and Mr. Canizales briefed the Authority on the PIWG FY15-16 Two Year funding program project selection criteria. Mr. Jasper highlighted:
  - ✓ Are on schedule for the adoption of the two year plan in March 2015.
  - ✓ Next step is approval of project selection criteria.
  - ✓ The projects submitted for FY15-16 funding consideration total over \$700M, of which there is funding for about half of that.
  - ✓ Need the project selection criteria to guide selection process.
  - ✓ This process is consistent with that used in the FY2014 approval process and has been vetted by Committees and Working Groups.
  - ✓ The outcome consists of 3 components:
    - Preliminary screening to confirm that a project follows the law and established Authority rules.
    - Quantitative component that scores various criteria and applies weights.
    - Qualitative considerations that do not lend themselves to the quantitative scoring process.
- Mr. Jasper concluded that all three components will be used to make the project selection decisions. He added that it is envisioned that the project selection criteria will be revisited and enhanced each time funding approval is necessary.
- Supervisor Letourneau suggested that there are limitations to the activity center criteria because there are no geographic boundaries to activity centers. He suggested some of these determinations are subjective when this is intended to be a quantitative analysis. Mr. Jasper responded that the definition of activity centers and the general approach to scoring the criteria were largely drawn from the TransAction 2040 criteria. Many of these criteria were scored during

the TransAction 2040 process and PIWG plans to revisit the scores to ensure they are consistent with the current process. If so, will move forward with the same scores, if not they will be revisited. Mr. Jasper added that Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOCG) has identified activity centers and these will be a starting point, but acknowledged that there is a degree of subjectivity. Mr. Canizales added that we are looking at different components, like connectivity, not just activity centers. He noted that activity centers have been regionally adopted and we are looking at regional connectivity by connecting jurisdictions and activity centers.

- Supervisor Letourneau asked for clarification as to how high, medium and low ratings will work on a five (5) point scale. Mr. Jasper responded that high would receive a score of one (1), medium receive a score of 2/3 of five (5) and low a score of 1/3 of five (5). He added that there is a weighting of that score of five (5).
- Supervisor Letourneau pointed out that there is a juxtaposition between something so precise in how it is scored and the more amorphous activity centers. He expressed concern about who decides whether something connects an activity center or not. Mr. Canizales responded that on the COG map there are identified boundaries. Supervisor Letourneau stated there are no geographic boundaries. Board Member Hynes noted that NVTA took the activity centers from jurisdictional definitions, so however the activity center is defined in the jurisdictional comprehensive plan, is how the NVTA will define the activity center. She added that if a jurisdiction wants to redefine an activity center, it is within the power of the jurisdiction's Board to do so. Supervisor Letourneau suggested that the activity center boundaries defined in the comprehensive plans were defined with a different purpose in mind. Board Member Hynes responded that activity centers have been accepted as regions in which we want to grow activity. Supervisor Letourneau suggested that if activity centers can be redefined easily, a jurisdiction could redefine their activity center to achieve a higher score. Board Member Hynes stated that this is only five (5) points out of a 100.
- Council Member Way asked if the criteria will be reconciled with TPB criteria. He noted that the TPB has special criteria with regard to environment controls and pollution and are weighted rather heavily by their interest in projects. He also noted that NVTA weights are based on congestion relief and jurisdictional balance. Council Member Way suggested that these two ranking systems are not compatible. Mr. Canizales responded that PIWG will review that, but that we are not trying to be compatible with TPB. We are showing that we are compatible with TransAction 2040. Council Member Way asked if this product will be sent to the TPB as our input for the CLRP. He suggested that if so there needs to some consistency with approaches. Mr. Canizales responded that the PIWG will look at this.
- Council Member Snyder suggested an amendment to the motion for approval of this item that states that criteria will be reevaluated before the next fiscal year, to allow for further discussion. Chairman Nohe clarified that Council Member Snyder is suggesting that we review the project selection criteria prior

to the next round of project selection. He added that we will do another round of evaluation, including a lessons learned after this process. Mr. Canizales responded that this what is envisioned.

- Council Member Snyder stated that we are making good progress, but need to keep refining this process. He asked that “criteria will be reevaluated as we move forward” be added to motion.
- Chairman Nohe noted that a project that fully implements a goal gets scored fully as five (5) points. A project that gets part way to the goal gets 2/3 and a project that gets a little way to the goal gets 1/3. He suggested that while a project that does not get close to the goal should get no score, the reason it gets a score is that this is the model that was used in TransAction 2040. He added that some scores will have to be rounded to avoid repeating decimals, based on this numbering system. Mr. Canizales added that this is essentially creating a scoring system that is between 33-100, not 0-100.
- Chairman Bulova moved to approve the proposed project selection criteria for the FY2015-16 Two Year Program, with the understanding that the project selection criteria will be reevaluated before the next round of project selections; seconded by Delegate Rust. Motion carried unanimously.

**XIV. Appointment of Planning Coordination Advisory Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman** Chairman Nohe

- Chairman Nohe noted that the PCAC met and nominated Mayor Foreman as chairman and Council Member Way as vice chairman of the PCAC.
- Chairman Nohe moved concurrence of the NVTAs Chairman’s appointments of Mayor Jerry Foreman of the Town of Dumfries as Chairman and Council Member Jonathan Way of the City of Manassas as Vice Chairman of the PCAC, seconded by Delegate Rust. The motion carried unanimously.

**XV. Approval of Northern Virginia Transportation Authority Testimony to the CTB on FY15-20 Six Year Improvement Program** Ms. Dominguez, Chair, JACC

- Ms. Dominguez noted that the Secretary of Transportation and the CTB will be conducting public hearings in Northern Virginia next week. She summarized the changes from past NVTAs testimony to the CTB.
  - ✓ HB 2 comments that thank Secretary Donohue for attending the September Authority meeting and request that as the State develops this process, they look to coordinate efforts between HB 2 and HB 599. It also requests that the Commonwealth consider geographic balance in the HB 2 selection process.
  - ✓ VTrans update comments that thank the Commonwealth for including the Authority in this effort, ask that coordination between local and regional plans in regards to VTrans takes place and mentions that as there are so



many performance measures being considered by various bodies, there needs to be some coordination of those.

- Ms. Dominguez concluded that the other items in the Testimony the Authority has seen before.
  - ✓ Of the \$500 million that CTB has discretion to allocate, asked for geographic balance, or to ensure that Northern Virginia receive its fair share as required by HB 2313.
  - ✓ Funding for WMATA.
  - ✓ Update on TSDAC.
  - ✓ CMAQ item asking for funding for hybrid buses.
  - ✓ Thank you to the Commonwealth for its continued partnership in funding VRE track leases.
- Delegate Rust expressed concern that the statement suggesting that the Commonwealth must look at geographic balance in the HB 2 selection process. He suggested that since Northern Virginia is not a large geographic proportion of Virginia, if the Commonwealth were to look at geographic balance, it might impede us. Ms. Dominguez responded that at the September Authority meeting there were various references to ensuring that Northern Virginia get its fair share of State funding. She suggested that using the phrase “fair share” does not always come across well, but added that we will reword in a way that might be more consistent.
- Delegate Rust noted that when HB 2313 was passed, it was discussed that it might diminish Northern Virginia’s share of other State funds. He added that HB 2313 funding in Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads must specifically be congestion related and that funding for the rest of the state is to be economically related. He suggested that this addresses how the funds are allocated. Ms. Dominguez responded that HB 2313 specifically states “the amounts deposited in these funds should not be used to calculate or reduce the share of local, federal or state revenues otherwise available to participating jurisdictions”. HB 2 states that there are five (5) criteria that shall be considered and mandates that Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads give the highest priority to congestion.
- Delegate Rust requested that we review the “fair share” statement. Chairman Nohe added that it is reasonable that a reasonable person would understand what we mean, but from the NVRTA perspective we would say that we don’t get our fair share because we have most of the traffic and most of the need. Because we have most of the population and most of the traffic, while we may not get what we see as our proportional share, we do get more raw dollars than the other districts. This language could be interpreted that we should get less because we are already getting more than everyone else. Chairman Nohe suggested we need to be very clear about what we mean and be aggressive in stating our concern. Ms. Dominguez responded that we will revise that language.
- Delegate Minchew added that when HB 2313 went through the General Assembly, they worked to make sure this new transportation money for Planning District 8 does not ever, directly or implicitly, reduce the State

monies. He added that as the Chairman, Chairman Nohe should be aggressive in speaking for the Authority, and making that point.

- Council Member Snyder suggested that the verbiage from statute be used in the Testimony.
- Chairman Nohe commented that for the last several CTB hearings of this nature, VDOT has invited an NVTA representative to sit on the dais. He added that this is helpful and makes us more symbiotic.
- Ms. Cuervo noted that Secretary Layne will be meeting with elected officials prior to the public hearing and reviewed the arrangements and schedule for that evening.
- Chairman Bulova moved to approve the Testimony for the Revised Fiscal Year 2015-2020 Six-Year Improvement Program and upcoming FY 2016 – 2021 Six-Year Improvement Program to include direction to revise language regarding HB 2 geographic balance, including the verbiage from the statute; seconded by Delegate Minchew. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **XVI. Approval of NVTA FY15/16 Communication Plan**

Ms. Quintana, NVTA PIO

- Ms. Quintana briefed the Authority on the need for the Authority to be proactive rather than reactive in its communications strategy. She added that as NVTA matures as an organization, there is a need to ensure that our branding and messaging focus on regionalism and consensus building. Ms. Quintana highlighted that the communications plan is:
  - ✓ A result of seven (7) years of regional collaboration, working with PIOs to gather input and incorporate best practices into all of NVTA's public engagement and communication activities.
  - ✓ Is a fluid document, with the expectation that key messages and objectives will evolve over time.
  - ✓ Incorporates a series of goals, messages and key objectives.
  - ✓ Recommends creating best practices for online public engagement opportunities.
  - ✓ Outlines specific short, mid and longer goals to support objectives.
  - ✓ Preliminary message mapping exercise has been completed to incorporate specific messages that support the plan goals and can be used consistently in our communication activities.
  - ✓ Includes basic metrics to begin measuring success of activities.
- Ms. Quintana concluded that the Authority is positioned well at this time, however there is much more work to be done.
- Chairman Nohe noted that this communication plan leads into what will need to be a very aggressive communication plan when the Authority starts the TransAction process.
- Ms. Backmon emphasized that this is a fluid plan and that the main objective at this time is to let the public know that the Authority is moving forward with

funding of projects. She added that the communication plan is the foundation for public engagement and that we are looking at online tools for public involvement.

- Chairman Nohe stated that Ms. Quintana is currently working with the Authority two days a week, and as needed. He added that he appreciates this great partnership with NVTC.
- Board Member Hynes recommended to the Authority that WMATA has done a significant scan of the region and has created a comprehensive plan for public engagement. She recommended the Authority review this to add value to the Authority's plan.
- Chairman Bulova moved to approve the FY2015/2016 NVTA Communication Plan; seconded by Board Member Hynes. Motion carried unanimously.

### **Discussion/Information**

**XVII. JACC Approval of CMAQ/RSTP Reallocation Request for Loudoun County** Ms. Dominguez, Chair, JACC

- No verbal report.

**XVIII. FY14 Report to the Joint Commission on Transportation Accountability** Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

- Ms. Backmon stated that the State budget requires that the Authority report to the JCTA on its HB 2313 revenue expenditures. The draft report has been reviewed by Chairman Nohe and Delegate Rust. She added that currently the 30% revenues only show as payments to the jurisdictions, but as projects advance there is an expectation to add specific project information to these revenue expenditures.

**XIX. Report of the Planning Coordination Advisory Committee** Chair Foreman

- Mayor Foreman briefed the Authority on the first meeting of the PCAC. He highlighted that the Committee:
  - ✓ Elected a chair and vice-chair.
  - ✓ Decided to meet monthly, with schedule to be determined.
  - ✓ Reviewed the draft of the FY15/16 Two Year Program Project Selection Criteria.
  - ✓ Discussed PCAC organization.
- Supervisor Letourneau added that he missed the first meeting as Monday mornings are not good for him.

**XX. Report of the Technical Advisory Committee** Chair Boice

- Mr. Boice briefed the Authority on the September meeting of the TAC. He noted that the Committee:

- ✓ Reviewed the draft of the FY15/16 Two Year Program Project Selection Criteria.
- ✓ Received Long-Term Benefits presentation from Mr. Biesiadny and the TAC provided comments. Noted that the TAC was impressed by the efforts of the Long-Term Benefits Subcommittee and the common sense approach to the suggestions.
- ✓ Next steps are to review Long Range Plan scope of work, to include feedback received at today's listening session.

**XXI. Finance Committee Report** Chair York

- Board Member Hynes noted that there will be an action item on the bond issuance at the October 24 work session. She added the Authority's financial advisors were present at the meeting tonight.

**XXII. NVT A Revenue Receipts Report** Mr. Longhi, CFO

- No verbal report.

**XXIII. NVT A Operating Budget Report** Mr. Longhi, CFO

- No verbal report.

**XXIV. Financial Working Group** Chair Euille

- No verbal report.

**XXV. Project Implementation Working Group** Chair Nohe

- No verbal report.

**XXVI. Executive Director's Report** Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

- Ms. Backmon noted that the work session will be hosted at Historic Blenheim in the City of Fairfax and thanked Mayor Silverthorne for providing the location at no cost to the Authority. She added that the purpose of the work session is to review and discuss the recommendations regarding Long Term Benefit.
- Supervisor Letourneau asked about the update on the possibility of amending TransAction 2040 mid-cycle, previously requested by Chairman York. Ms. Backmon responded that she did reach out to Cambridge Systematics to get schedule, process, costs, etc., and she received that information the day before this meeting. As such, she has not had the opportunity to vet the information and would like to do so prior to bringing it to the Authority. Ms. Backmon stated that she would update the Authority at the next meeting.

- Chairman Nohe asked if this update could be done at the October 24 meeting. Ms. Backmon responded affirmatively.
- Ms. Backmon stated that at the request of the Authority, the staff has created an interactive map that shows all the FY2014 approved 70% fund projects. She noted that the map will be part of the Authority display table at the upcoming CTB public meeting. Ms. Backmon added that this is a work in progress and that staff is looking for ways to enhance this capability.
- Ms. Backmon noted that the NVRTA has moved to 3040 Williams Drive, Suite 200. She added that the next meeting will be held at the new facility.

## **XXVII. Chairman's Comments**

- Delegate Minchew noted that he and Delegate Rust will not be in attendance at the October 24 meeting as they will be attending House Speaker Howell's retreat.
- Chairman Nohe added several Chairman's comments.
  - ✓ Clarified that the next meeting will be October 24, followed by the work session which will be facilitated by Craig Gerhart.
  - ✓ Noted that the November 13 meeting of the Authority is during the Governor's Transportation Conference and asked if there is a need to have a November meeting. Ms. Backmon responded that since there is now a business meeting on October 24, it is likely that the November meeting is not necessary.
  - ✓ Stated that we will not officially cancel the November 13 meeting until after the October 24 meeting.
  - ✓ Stated that the other item for the November meeting was Ms. Backmon's six (6) month review. He asked Authority members if this could be a seven (7) month review at the December meeting. There was consensus to do this. He outlined the process:
    - Mayor Parrish will lead the review.
    - Ms. Backmon will write a self-evaluation based on the plan of work previously approved by the Authority.
    - Mayor Parrish will contact Authority members to solicit feedback and comments in advance of December review.
- Ms. Backmon added that there was a public listening session on the TransAction 2040 update prior to this meeting. She stated that staff and the subcommittee will prepare the comments received and responses to report to the Authority at the next meeting.

## **XXVIII. Adjournment**

- Meeting adjourned at 8:39pm.