



Northern Virginia Transportation Authority
The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WORKING GROUP

Monday, July 13, 2015, 9:30 am

Fairfax County Department of Transportation

4050 Legato Road, Suite 400

Fairfax, Virginia 22033

SUMMARY NOTES

I. Call to Order/Welcome

Chairman Nohe

- Vice Chairman Garczynski called the meeting to order at 9:35 am.
- Attendees:
 - **PIWG Members:** Chairman Nohe; Vice Chairman Garczynski, Chairman Bulova (Fairfax County); Chair Hynes (Arlington County); Council Member Rishell (City of Manassas Park); Rick Canizales, James Davenport (Prince William County); Tom Biesiadny, Karyn Moreland, Noelle Dominguez (Fairfax County); Bob Brown, Joe Kroboth (Loudoun County); Sarah Crawford (Arlington County); Jim Maslanka, Pierre Holloman (City of Alexandria); Jeff Sikes (City of Falls Church); Wendy Block Sanford (City of Fairfax); Patrick Moore (City of Manassas); Richard West (Town of Dumfries); Mark Duceman (Town of Herndon); Maria Sinner, Valerie Pardo (VDOT); Todd Horsley (DRPT); Kate Mattice (NVTC); Elena Constantine (MWCOG/TPB); Christine Hoeffner (VRE); Cynthia Porter-Johnson (PRTC); Mark Phillips (WMATA).
 - **NVTA Staff:** Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Mike Longhi (CFO); Sree Nampoothiri (Program Coordinator), Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator).
 - **Other Staff:** Ellen Posner (Fairfax County).

II. Meeting Summary of April 13, 2015, Meeting

- Summary not available.

Discussion/Information

III. Status Update

Ms. Backmon

- Ms. Backmon reported that NVTA has currently approved 11 SPAs for the FY2015-16 Two Year Program that was adopted by the Authority on April 23, 2015. An additional 26 projects will need their Standard Project Agreements (SPAs) to be

approved by the October 2015 Authority meeting. Based on discussions with the jurisdictions, NVTA does not anticipate any issues meeting this deadline. If any of the jurisdictions or agencies are unable to obtain approval for the SPAs by the October deadline, then the NVTA would need to have an open dialogue to discuss status of their SPAs. This does not mean affected projects will automatically lose funds.

- Ms. Backmon reported that last Friday, NVTA met with Deputy Secretary Donohue to discuss congestion relief weightings for the HB 2 and HB 599 processes. For HB 2, CTB has adopted a weighting of 45% for congestion relief. There was some discussion on what this could mean for criteria weightings for NVTA's project selection process, which has a weighting of 35% for congestion reduction (based on HB 599 ratings). The focus of the PIWG meeting today will be to discuss whether the HB 599 rating and weighting should be adjusted to more closely match the measures and associated weighting for the congestion reduction component of the overall HB 2 process. There are many projects that are being funded by NVTA that have multiple funding sources. The concern is that one project may score well under one process and not so well under the other process.
- Vice Chairman Garczynski confirmed that was the message from Deputy Secretary Donohue to the NVTA concerning the potential to align the congestion reduction rating between the HB 2 and HB 599 processes. From the CTB perspective, the sophistication of the analysis is much more toward a base common denominator with the CTB than the more sophisticated analysis being used by NVTA. For example, for congestion relief CTB only used person throughput and person hours of delay while HB 599 has seven different measures for congestion reduction. It is somewhat of a dilemma but no region in Virginia has the sophistication or the challenges that we have in Northern Virginia.
- Ms. Backmon reported that the suggestion is that the HB 599 process be more closely aligned with the HB 2 process so we can have a more 'apples to apples' comparison. Instead of the seven measures currently used for the HB 599 process, should we use the two HB 2 congestion relief measures (person throughput and person hours of delay) as the two measures for HB 599. In addition, legislation requires that the Authority gives priority to the projects with the greatest level of congestion relief relative to cost. This is why with the FY2015-16 Two Year Program, project readiness had a weighting of 25% to prioritize projects that can more quickly address congestion relief in the short term.
- Mr. Holloman asked how this would interact with the current HB 599 evaluation of test transit projects. Ms. Backmon responded that there are two schools of thought. If the Authority adopts what is being proposed by Secretary Donohue, the results of the test run would be a little different with the two congestion relief measures used in HB 2 process versus the seven measures used in the HB599 process.
- Mr. Biesiadny suggested that the PIWG is being asked to consider two things:
 - Replace the seven HB 599 measures with the two HB 2 congestion relief measures; and
 - Adjust the congestion relief weighting used by NVTA (35%) to parallel that used for the HB 2 process (45%).

- Ms. Backmon responded by stating that we are not asking for a decision today but for the PIWG to begin the dialogue at today's meeting and to consider a course of action at the PIWG meeting in September 2015.
- Mr. Biesiadny expressed concern that the two different sets of measures for congestion relief in HB 2 and HB 599 might create confusion among the public. It is important that the process of project rating and selection be as transparent as possible. With the expense of conducting the HB 599 process, assuming VDOT is covering those costs right now, and with the ratings of HB 2 being used throughout the state, it might be more efficient if we use the same analysis and not a separate analysis which could potentially cost more. It is good to keep these analyses the same as far as the public is concerned. We already had questions related to the current Two Year Program and the differences between the HB 599 rating and the analysis done under HB 2313. If you throw in another layer with the HB 2 ratings, it adds confusion to the public.
- Ms. Backmon confirmed that point, especially with comments during the public comment period for the FY2015-16 Two Year Program. We did spend time educating the public about the process but questions arose related to the differences between NVTAs quantitative scores and HB599 ratings. Members of the public would comment "How is it that projects scored so well under HB 599 and not even be considered for the Two Year Program"? It is important to be transparent in the evaluation process. However, our initial reaction to replacing the HB 599 measures with the HB2 measures is that it may not work very well.
- Vice Chairman Garczynski stated that CTB want to keep the evaluation process as simple as possible so it can relate to people throughout the entire Commonwealth, not just Northern Virginia.
- Chair Hynes noted that the Northern Virginia transportation system is complex, and there is a need to consider non-road solutions. She expressed concern that we should be cautious until we know how the proposed evaluation approach would affect project ratings, especially for transit projects.
- Chairman Nohe stated that Deputy Secretary Donahue made it clear that HB 599 is analogous to the congestion relief component of HB 2 and HB 2 is more analogous to NVTAs quantitative score. He stated he is receptive to using the HB 599 more similarly to the HB2 congestion relief component, e.g. HB 2's congestion relief weighting for Northern Virginia is 45%.
- Ms. Backmon stated there are other criteria we were mandated to consider including air quality and safety.
- Ms. Sinner noted that the tool (TRANSIMS) for evaluating projects under HB 599 is very sophisticated, and needs to enable robust analysis due to the extreme nature of congestion throughout the region. The tool used for HB 2 is more granular. Replacing the HB 599 measures does not mean the tool should be changed.
- Chairman Nohe asked if we were legislatively mandated to use TRANSIMS as the regional model. Ms. Sinner responded that we are required to use the most up-to-date technology. The issue we will need to address is the fact that if projects are being

- rated differently by HB 2 and HB 599 when many of these proposed projects are being funded by both the state and through NVTA, should the state consider using the more robust analysis just for projects in Northern Virginia?
- Vice Chairman Garczynski considered this may be unacceptable to other regions, and may result in proposals to modify the statewide process for special considerations elsewhere. The intent is for a consistent statewide approach.
 - Vice Chairman Garczynski suggested that projects requiring multiple funding sources should use the HB 2 evaluation process to provide consistency. He also noted that the HB 2 process will probably not be revisited by CTB for at least two cycles. Chair Hynes suggested using the HB 2 evaluation process for projects with multiple funding sources, at least for the upcoming FY2017 Program. This would provide time to address the differences between HB 2 and HB 599 for project evaluations in the future.
 - Ms. Crawford asked how we would handle the weightings for the other criteria if the congestion relief weighting was increased. Chairman Nohe stated we should not assume they will stay the same but we also should not assume that they will be closely aligned with the HB 2 congestion relief weightings.
 - Ms. Crawford stated this will come into play as we look at job accessibility and other factors as we update TransAction 2040. She also asked if we are holding to the projects in the current TransAction 2040 plan. If evaluation criteria are changed, how will this affect the credibility of the projects currently in TransAction 2040? How far can we shift from the measures used in evaluating projects for TransAction?
 - Ms. Backmon stated that some of the 11 criteria used for the FY2015-16 Two Year Program were included in TransAction 2040. Accessibility to jobs was included in TransAction 2040 but was not included as part of the Two Year Program evaluation. We could look at including it for the upcoming FY2017 Program. NVTA must adhere to the HB 599 process for all projects, but only has to adhere to the HB 2 process for projects requesting both state funds and HB 2313 revenues. The current law states the Authority must evaluate projects in TransAction and so we want to stick to the criteria used in TransAction except for congestion relief because that is an addition to the law.
 - Chairman Nohe emphasized the evaluation ratings are intended to inform the project selection process, which includes other considerations. Ms. Backmon emphasized this is why project readiness criteria as part of the NVTA evaluation are so important. A project that may not be completed until 2030 means must be compared to other projects that may generate congestion relief benefits much sooner, e.g. bus acquisitions.
 - Ms. Backmon noted we have a tentative schedule for the FY2017 Program with the Call for Projects in September 2015 and adoption of the program in May. This is based on receiving the HB 599 test transit results by the end of August. The PIWG should approve project selection criteria at its next meeting so that these can be available when the Authority issues the Call for Projects. Vice Chairman Garczynski reported that the CTB Call for Projects will be in the August/September time-frame. Awards will be in April 2016.

- Vice Chairman Garczynski noted that NVTA will have to make a decision on which projects to submit for the HB 2 program as the designated MPO for Northern Virginia.
- Chairman Nohe stated that the next steps include a continued discussion with Deputy Secretary Donohue. NVTA staff will come back to PIWG with more analysis at its next meeting in September.
- Ms. Sinner indicated that VDOT will provide additional analysis using the HB 2 measures for the three test transit projects.

IV. Options for FY2017 One Year Program

Mr. Jasper

- Preliminary estimates for the program are approximately \$200 million on a PayGo basis.
- Mr. Jasper reported that NVTA had learned a lot from the FY2015-16 program, and will apply this knowledge to enhance the project selection process for the FY2017 Program. NVTA plans to post a lot of the project background information on the front-end of the process rather than near the end.
- NVTA will be requesting the jurisdictions and agencies provide an informal heads-up on which projects they are considering for the FY2017 Program, on a non-binding basis using the SPA Appendix B document. This will help to structure the program a little better.
- To this end, it would be helpful to have this information before the official call-for-projects. Mr. Jasper will send out this request in an email.

V. NVTA Update

Ms. Backmon

- Ms. Backmon indicated that she had briefed the JACC last week on the update of Transaction 2040 Long Range Plan. NVTA is currently working with the potential awardee on contract terms and conditions. The intention is for the Authority to approve the award at its meeting on July 23, 2015. Since the Authority does not meet in August, it is important to meet that deadline or there will be a two month slip in the work-plan schedule.
- The major agenda items for the upcoming Authority meeting will be the announcement of the TransAction 2040 update contract award and appointments to the Bylaws Committee. An update on the Greenhouse Gas Multi-Sector Workgroup activities will be presented by TPB Staff at the September NVTA Board meeting.
- NVTA has secured a photographer to take photos of Authority members for the website update and the 2015 Annual Report. The photographer will be available at the July 23rd meeting to take photos.

VI. Finance Committee Report

Mr. Longhi

- Mr. Longhi reported that the July 2015 meeting of the Finance Committee was cancelled. The Finance Committee is waiting for the work of the Reserves Advisory

Committee which is scheduled to meet at 10:30am on Wednesday, July 15 at NVTA. The Reserves Advisory Committee will report to the Finance Committee at their next meeting in the fall.

- Mr. Garczynski reported that the NVTA I-66 outside the Beltway Committee meeting is scheduled for 10:30am on Wednesday, August 5 at NVTA. Chair Bulova will serve as the committee chair.

Adjournment

VII. Adjourn

- The meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.
- The next PIWG meeting was scheduled for 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, September 16, 2015 at NVTA