



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

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Wednesday, June 20, 2024, 7:00 p.m.**  
**Northern Virginia Transportation Authority**  
**In-Person Meeting at NVTA Offices, 2600 Park Tower Drive, Vienna, VA**  
**Live-streamed on [YouTube](#)**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**I. Call to Order/Welcome**

- The meeting was conducted in-person. Chairman Boice called the meeting to order at 7:18 p.m.
- **Attendees:**
  - **TAC Members:** Randy Boice; Karen Campblin; Michelle Cavucci; Armand Ciccarelli; Kerianne Masters; Frank Spielberg; Amy Morris; Dr. Zhu.
  - **NVTA Staff:** Monica Backmon, CEO; Keith Jasper, Principal, Transportation Planning and Programming; Sree Nampoothiri, Senior Manager; Ian Newman, Regional Transportation Planner.
  - **Others:** None.

**II. Summary Notes of March 20, 2024, Meeting**

- Approval of the summary notes of the March 20, 2024, meeting was approved unanimously.

**III. Summary Notes of May 15, 2024, Meeting**

- The summary notes of the May 15, 2024, meeting was approved unanimously.

**IV. FY2024-2029 Six Year Program Staff Recommendations**

- Mr. Jasper, Principal, Transportation Planning and Programming at NVTA, presented an overview of NVTA staff recommendations on the FY2024-2029 Six Year Program (SYP). Staff has recommended 22 out of 24 candidate projects for funding with three of those projects receiving only the partial amount of requested funding. He added that the recommendations continue NVTA's emphasis on multimodal/corridor focus with the technology projects ranking high. It is also noted that the recommended projects are geographically and modally balanced.

- Mr. Jasper gave an overview of previous funding programs. A comparison shows that this SYP has the highest level of funding recommended (\$696,335,252) relative to funding requests with the ratio standing at 74 percent.
- Mr. Jasper noted that a high level of effort went into the public engagement activities and provided a trend of public engagement over all the seven funding programs.
- Mr. Jasper provided a summary of public comments received, including projects receiving high and low levels of support or opposition. A total of 731 comments were received from 178 commenters.
- With one exception, all projects ranked by Congestion Reduction Relative to Cost (CRRC) project rating from 1 to 19 (except #10) and 22 are recommended for full funding. Projects ranked by CRRC project rating 20, 21 and 23 are recommend for partial funding.
- The two projects that are not being recommended for funding are the Blenheim Boulevard (formerly, Old Lee Highway) Multimodal Improvements (CRRC 10) and CC2DCA Multimodal Connection (formerly known as CC2DCA Intermodal Connector) (CRRC 24). Mr. Jasper noted that the reason for this recommendation is that both projects had received previous SYP funding and were understood to be fully funded. The new applications did not include any scope changes. In addition, the CC2DCA project was ranked 24 out of 24 in CRRC project rating.
- The three projects recommended for partial funding are Braddock Road Multimodal Improvements Phase II (Humphries Drive to Southampton Drive), Frontier Drive Extension and Intersection Improvements, and Route 7 Multimodal Improvements (I-495 to I-66). These projects are recommended for partial funding due to their low CRRC ranking, limited available funding, and certain phases of the projects understood to be fully funded as per previous NVTA funding approvals.
- In response to Chairman Boice's question on projects that would have received funding if only CRRC was strictly followed, Mr. Jasper mentioned that the available funds would have run out by the 21<sup>st</sup> ranked project, which wouldn't have received its full request.
- In response to Mr. Ciccarelli's question on how public comments are considered in developing the recommendations, Mr. Jasper noted that public comment is an important factor but legally, CRRC ranking has the priority. He added that when all quantitative and qualitative measures being equal and a decision has to be made between two projects, the project with more public support may be recommended. On further inquiry about the type of comments, Mr. Jasper noted that several comments were similar in nature and some of them had the same language.

- In response to Dr. Zhu’s question on feedback to the applicants about the public comments, Mr. Jasper commented that the full list of comments is published on the NVTA website and NVTA staff encourage applicants to review the comments.
- Ms. Cavucci noted that the project costs are increasing due to inflation and other factors and asked how NVTA accounts for this. Mr. Jasper responded that applicants are expected to build inflation/contingency into cost estimates and NVTA staff do not have a mechanism to address this issue in the current SYP process. He noted that there was at least one potential applicant who decided not to submit an application due to cost increase as it understood the process. He added that staff must be fair and cannot change the rules in the middle of the process.
- In response to Ms. Cavucci’s question on balancing funding among jurisdictions, Mr. Jasper noted that balancing Long Term Benefit (LTB) will take multiple cycles and will require jurisdictions that are low on LTB to submit more applications and/or larger requests to help balance LTB. In response to Chairman Boice’s comment on projects in one jurisdiction benefitting other jurisdictions, Mr. Jasper noted that the model-based LTB evaluation takes it into account. Ms. Backmon added that the Authority had discussed a contingency fund in the past but decided against this approach due to (a) the potential for it leading to applicants lowballing project costs to make their applications appear stronger and (b) the difficulty to decide which of the approved projects is more deserving to receive any reserve funds.
- In response to Mr. Ciccarelli’s question on why some projects are partially funded when one of them (Frontier Drive Extension and Multimodal Improvements) could have been fully funded, Mr. Jasper noted that the project had received previous NVTA funding and at that time, the earlier phases (preliminary engineering and right of way) of the projects were understood to be fully funded. Therefore, only the request for later phase (construction) was recommended for funding.
- Motion to endorse the staff recommendations, moved by Ms. Cavucci and seconded by Ms. Campbell, was unanimously approved.

**V. Preliminary Deployment Plan for Regional BRT System (PDP-BRT)**

- Mr. Jasper, informed the Committee that part one of a two-part Work Session with the Authority members was held at the June 13<sup>th</sup> Authority meeting. Lessons learned from the best practices and part of public engagement were provided. Part two is anticipated to be held at the July 11<sup>th</sup> Authority meeting.
- Mr. Spielberg noted that he observed the pop-up event held at the Eden Center in Falls Church.

**VI. NVTA Update**

- Ms. Backmon noted that the Annual ITS-VA Transportation Roundtable, hosted by NVTA, will be held on October 9, 2024, and a State of the Region's Transportation Network, will be held on October 30, 2024, both at the new NVTA offices.

**VII. Adjourn**

- The meeting was adjourned at 8:03 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for July 17, 2024, at 7:00 p.m.