



Northern Virginia Transportation Authority
The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia

Thursday, February 26, 2015
6:00 pm
3040 Williams Drive, Suite 200
Fairfax, VA 22031

MEETING MINUTES

I. Call to Order Chairman Nohe

- Chairman Nohe called the meeting to order at 6:08pm.

II. Roll Call Ms. Speer, Clerk

- Voting Members: Chairman Nohe; Council Member Lovain; Chair Hynes; Chairman York; Chairman Bulova (arrived 6:12pm); Mayor Parrish; Mayor Silverthorne; Council Member Rishell; Mr. Garczynski (arrived 6:22pm); Miss Bushue.
- Non-Voting Members: Mayor Fraser; Ms. Cuervo; Ms. Mitchell.
- Staff: Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Michael Longhi (CFO); Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator); Camela Speer (Clerk); various jurisdictional staff.
- Chairman Nohe welcomed new Authority member Mayor Fraser of Purcellville.

Presentation

IV. I-66 Inside the Beltway Deputy District Administrator Rene'e Hamilton

- Ms. Hamilton gave a presentation on the I-66 Inside the Beltway Study.

(Chairman Bulova arrived. Quorum present at 6:12pm.)

- Chairman York asked what the peak and off-peak times will be for the proposed tolling. Ms. Hamilton responded that these times have not been determined yet. She noted that off-peak, the facility will be open as it is now and vehicles will be able to use it for free. The tolling timeframe, both am and pm, has not been determined yet.
- Chair Hynes noted that the tolling will be both east and west bound during peak times. Ms. Hamilton confirmed this.

- Mayor Parrish asked who will determine the tolls and how they will be determined. Ms. Hamilton responded that VDOT's consultant, who also worked on I-95 and I-495, will determine this by looking at the traffic and revenue forecast, as well as at how much capacity can be experienced on I-66. She noted that if more people ride buses and use HOV3, it will open up the capacity for Single Occupancy Vehicles as toll paying customers to use it. She added that dynamic pricing will be used in order to ensure that the federal requirement of maintaining a free flow environment of 45 miles per hour is met. Tolling will be based on that.
- Mayor Parrish asked if the tolling will be determined by VDOT or by the contractor. Ms. Hamilton responded that VDOT will own and operate the facility. The pricing will be determined by an algorithm that will be developed with the main focus of being able to maintain free flow. Tolls will change in order to make sure the pricing is such to ensure this. Ms. Hamilton clarified that the State will maintain the tolling power.

(Mr. Garczynski arrived.)

- Chairman York expressed deep concern regarding the proposed tolling of the facility. He suggested that the toll road in Loudoun does not work and is a financial burden to commuters using it. These commuters pay five dollars to travel 13 miles, then get on the toll road and pay more. Now, to get the rest of the way to Washington, DC, they will also have to pay whatever toll is determined for the right time to get to work. Chairman York asked how much we can continue to charge the individuals who have to use their car to get to work. He noted that these costs are getting absurd, and yet we are not requiring the people who ride the rails to pay the costs for construction and operation of the system. Chairman York suggested that the person who has to use their car is paying a lot more than someone who rides the rail. He also expressed concern about the dynamic of the commuter, noting that in Loudoun County the people who want to avoid getting on the Greenway are willing to go around the toll road, sit in traffic and clog the external side roads. He questioned whether VDOT is ready to handle the additional traffic that will flow onto subsidiary roads when people refuse to pay the tolls. He added that he hopes that, if the decision is made to toll, it is affordable. There are people who cannot afford this. Chairman York expressed doubt that people will use the facility once the tolls are in place. He added that the people this will hurt the most are those coming in from the outlying areas to get to work and Loudoun citizens are already paying significant tolls just to get to the beltway. He summarized that he has concerns with this and hopes that the tolls will be affordable and not to the level that we already see to get to the beltway.
- Chairman Bulova noted that the experience in Fairfax County with the I-495 tolling has been that they are not hearing complaints from those using the toll lanes. She added that she had personally heard from some people who were adamantly opposed to the HOT lanes and now that the HOT lanes are in place, commented that they wish there were HOT lanes on I-66. Chairman York

noted that the HOT lanes are an option on I-495, but that there are really no options on the Greenway and the Dulles Toll Road. Chairman Bulova noted that the HOT lanes are working pretty well on I-495 and appear to be working on I-95. She added that the key will be not to price people out of a commuting option. She suggested VDOT keep in mind the corridor being tolled is already an expensive corridor. Chairman Bulova commented that all are especially concerned, both outside and inside the beltway, about properties and businesses abutting the project and the storm water regulations that are triggered by the I-66 project.

- Chair Hynes commented that this could be a very hot topic in Arlington and they are working through it carefully. She expressed appreciation to VDOT for their willingness to speak with the transportation commission and their offers to speak with citizen groups. She commended VDOT for listening and revisiting the effects of the first two sets of changes before looking at whether widening is the right choice in the community. She noted that this has helped in the community as people believe this will continue to be a thoughtful process. Chair Hynes added that the multimodal study was a successful and thoughtful process of what can be done in the corridor. She expressed belief that we are on a path that is manageable. She noted that she is not hearing any push back on tolling in both directions.
- Council Member Rishell commented that she is not a fan of tolling on an existing corridor that tax payer money has already built.
- Mayor Fraser suggested looking into alternatives other than toll revenues, suggesting revenues from electronic billboards. Chairman York stated that there is no space for them in this corridor. Chair Hynes added that inside the beltway they would literally be shining in people's windows and that they barely allow changeable copy signs anywhere in the County.
- Mayor Parrish recognized the challenges that Arlington has with this project and added that all recognize the need to do something to fix this corridor. He expressed appreciation to VDOT for working to find solutions. He agreed that it is hard to toll any area where the taxes have already been paid to build roadways. He noted that Manassas was left out in one of the presentation slides and asked that VDOT let Manassas know when the Prince William County opportunity to speak will be held.

III. Minutes of the January 22, 2015 Meeting

- Chairman York moved approval of the January 22, 2015 minutes; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried with eight (8) yeas and two (2) abstentions [with Council Member Lovain and Council Member Rishell abstaining as they were not at the January 22 meeting].

Presentation

V. Review of the FY2014 Annual Report

Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

- Ms. Backmon presented the 2014 Annual Report to the Authority.
- Mr. Garczynski asked that members of the CTB get copies. Ms. Backmon responded affirmatively.
- Ms. Backmon confirmed that the Annual Report will be delivered to the General Assembly.
- Chairman Nohe stated that the Annual Report is awesome. Consensus was that the Annual Report is great.
- Ms. Backmon thanked the jurisdictional and agency staffs that supported this effort, particularly Tom Wampler and Dan Malouff.
- Chairman Nohe asked that the Annual Reports be taken to the Town Hall meetings. Ms. Backmon responded affirmatively.
- Chair Hynes commented that Ms. Backmon had just presented the NVTARoad Show to the Arlington Board and it was well received.

Consent Agenda

- VI. Project Agreement for City of Falls Church–Regional Funding 610-14-029-1-06**
- VII. Project Agreement for Town of Leesburg–Regional Funding Project 402-14-028-1-01**
- XIII. Approval of Proposed FY2016 Operating Budget**
- XIV. Approval of Proposed FY2016 30% Revenue Budget**
 - Chairman York moved to approve the consent agenda to include the specific motions in items VI, VII, XIII and XIV; seconded by Chair Hynes. Motion carried unanimously.

Action Items

- VIII. Appointment of Finance Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman and Reappointment of Two Members for Calendar Year 2015** Chairman Nohe
 - Chairman Nohe appointed Chairman York as Chairman and Chairman Bulova as Vice Chairman of the Finance Committee for Calendar Year 2015. He reappointed Chairman Bulova and Council Member Rishell to the Finance Committee for two additional years.
- IX. Appointment of Technical Advisory Committee Chairman and Vice Chairman and Reappointment of Two Members** Chairman Nohe
 - Chairman Nohe appointed Randy Boice as Chairman and Doug Fahl as Vice Chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee for Calendar Year 2015. He

reappointed Agnes Artemel and Pat Turner to the Technical Advisory Committee for three additional years.

X. Appointment of Bylaws Committee Chairman Nohe

- Chairman Nohe appointed Chair Hynes as the Chairman of the Bylaws Committee.
- Chairman Nohe noted that Chair Hynes will work with Ms. Backmon to develop a plan of work for the Committee and then other members will be appointed. He noted that there are some issues that have been raised by members of some of the standing committees and that these will be addressed in this process. He requested that if there are any other issues that members have, they should send them to Ms. Backmon for consideration by the Committee.

XI. Approval of Public Hearing Date/Release of Draft FY2015-16 Two Year Program

Chairman Nohe, Chair, PIWG

- Ms. Backmon recommended that the draft FY2015-16 Two Year Program Public Hearing be held on March 25, 2015, with an Open House starting at 6pm and presentation starting at 7pm, immediately followed by the Public Hearing. She noted that this is on the draft program recommended by the PIWG, adding that all projects eligible for funding will be presented at the Public Hearing.
- Chairman Nohe noted that we are advertising all of the projects, even those that are not necessarily recommended for approval. He added that the Public Hearing had already been advertised. Ms. Backmon responded that in order to meet the 30-day public hearing notice requirements, we had to send out the advertising on the previous Tuesday.
- Chairman York moved approval of the public hearing date of March 25, 2015, and the release of the draft FY2015-16 Two Year Program for Public Hearing; seconded by Chairman Bulova.
- Mayor Parrish thanked the PIWG and staff for considering additional funding for the Route 28 Corridor Study.
- Ms. Backmon added that free shuttle service will be provided from the Dunn-Loring Metro Station to the Authority office.
- Motion carried unanimously.

XII. Approval of FY2021 CMAQ/RSTP Recommendations

Mr. Holloman, Vice Chair, JACC

- Mr. Holloman stated that the JACC recommends approval of the FY2021 CMAQ/RSTP recommendations, with the caveat that there will be adjustments that should be made based on conversations with VDOT. He noted that an information item will be provided at the next Authority meeting on the adjustments that are made. He asked the Authority to approve the recommendations this evening as VDOT plans to take this recommendation for public comment in March.
- Chairman York moved approval of the attached list of proposed projects for FY2021 CMAQ and RSTP funding for recommendation to the Commonwealth Transportation Board for consideration, with the understanding that adjustments may be made as allocation amounts are revised; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried unanimously.

XV. Approval of Proposed FY2016 70% Regional Revenue Budget

Mr. Longhi, CFO

- Mr. Longhi explained that the action on this item is to review the existing reserves in the Regional Revenue budget and to determine if the Authority wants to approve the budget as presented, or if it wants to send it back for more perusal.
- Chairman York stated that the Finance Committee had asked to bring this forward to the Authority because there are contingencies proposed in this budget and at the last meeting there was considerable debate about one of the contingencies, Transportation Projects Reserve. Based on the Authority's discussion, this budget will go back to the Finance Committee and policies will be developed in coordination with the member jurisdictions and the Council of Counsels. He added that the intent this evening is to get the advice of the Authority members. Staff will then prepare this item for action at an upcoming NVTA meeting.
- Mr. Longhi explained that the Authority has three existing reserves that are stipulated in the Debt Policy.
 1. Operating Reserve which is 20% of the Operating Budget and is to cover additional expenditures on the Operating Budget.
 2. Debt Service Reserve which is funded through bond proceeds and is to protect the bond holders.
 3. Working Capital Reserve will be approximately \$103.5 million when completely funded and is designed to be in-place in case there is a disruption in revenue from the State or a miss on the revenue estimates. Once the Authority projects really get started, there will be ongoing construction projects and this is intended to protect those projects and allow them to move forward in the event of a revenue disruption.

Chairman York added that this is a six month reserve. Mr. Longhi noted that FY2016 will be the last year we need to make a major contribution to this reserve.

- Mr. Longhi explained the other assumptions in the budget:
 - ✓ All funds that go into the Regional Revenue Fund stay in the Regional Revenue Fund.
 - ✓ Purpose of the funds is to meet debt service obligation and to fund projects.
 - ✓ Do not have a carry-over figure as we are still in the process of the FY2015-16 project approval process.
 - ✓ Revenue projections, as guided by the Finance Committee, are estimated conservatively.
 - ✓ Some money is included for professional services such as bond council and financial advisory services.
 - ✓ TransAction Update is in the budget, but the funding has not been formalized yet.
 - ✓ A new contingency is proposed for approved projects to protect against unanticipated cost overruns. It is projected at \$7.8 million.
 - ✓ The proposed new Transportation Projects Reserve is targeted to allow the Authority to meet project demands that were not originally scheduled. This would be for new projects, which would still have to meet all approval processes and requirements, that the Authority may want to move ahead with out of the normal projects cycle.
- Chairman York noted that all projects have contingency funds, but this contingency is for approved projects for when project expenses go above and beyond what can be anticipated. He suggested it would be good to have a contingency and that the amount is about 3.8% of the entire budget. Chair Hynes clarified that this is the contingency for approved projects, not the Transportation Projects Reserve. Chairman York responded affirmatively.
- Mr. Longhi stated that for both of these new proposed contingencies and/or reserves we would need to develop policies. The budget action is for FY2016 starting in July, so it would be helpful to have the budget set in April, prior to the projects being approved by the Authority.
- Chairman York noted that it would be the intent that if these funds are not used, or are partially used, remaining funds will carryover into the next year.
- Mr. Longhi stated that currently there are \$351.8 million available to fund projects, after projecting \$7.8 million for the contingency and \$12 million for the reserve. He added that this is \$14 million more than the PIWG approved project list total. He noted that the Authority has advertised a larger number of projects for consideration and this action could change the remaining \$14 million balance.
- Chairman Nohe noted that what makes this difficult as we can set an amount tonight in theory, but this number will be based on what money is left after the Authority takes action on the FY2015-16 project list.
- Chair Hynes stated that she is not certain that we need a Transportation Projects Reserve and she does not understand what we are saving this money for. She added that this is portrayed as a way to hold some money back for big

projects. She noted that the policy issues around this reserve are quite significant and deserve conversation before we start setting money aside. Chair Hynes stated that we took \$66 million out of FY2015 Regional Revenues and are taking \$33 million out of FY2016 to build our \$100 million working capital reserve, which we all support. She noted that we will not have to take this money out next year, so if we want to have this reserve, we should have the right robust conversation and think about FY2017 being the first year to do this. She reiterated that she is not sure we need this reserve yet because she is not sure how this will work for both transit and roads.

- Chairman York suggested that whether now, or in future years, it makes sense to put money in a reserve for mega projects that we have not begun discussing yet, that will be regional projects. He raised the question as to whether the Authority wants to start reserving some money for the future. He expressed understanding for the need, based on project demand, to expend all the funds as we get them. Chairman York suggested that there might be compromise. He noted that if the Authority recommends incorporating this reserve, but is concerned about being overloaded with filling other reserves over the next two years, perhaps it could be incorporated in the budget as a category. We could then develop the policies, but would not fund it at this point. Chairman York clarified that this is the issue being raised to get Authority member thoughts.
- Mr. Garczynski agreed with Chairman York's point about mega projects, suggesting that projects like I-66 may be deemed a large regional project and will need NVTA support. He also suggested that the WMATA Momentum project may be addressed as a regional plan that the NVTA should contribute to. He noted that the mega projects are out there and this is how this reserve might be used in the future. He suggested the two year suspension might be fine. Chair Hynes expressed continued concern that Momentum is the biggest transit ask that is out there, but the NVTA cannot contribute to it because of the way the legislature wrote the rules. She added that if we don't get the legislation fixed then this reserve can only be used for road projects, therefore we should not start creating this reserve if it can only fund road projects.
- Mr. Garczynski suggested that as we begin addressing Momentum, the legislature is going to have to face the reality that the use of regional revenues may have to be tweaked in this respect.
- Chairman Bulova asked the Counsels if NVTA money is not able to be used on all of the Momentum funding, or if there are some projects that could be eligible. Chair Hynes responded that traction power may be the only part of the plan that may be eligible, but that the real issue is buying the cars.
- Chairman Bulova stated that this reserve addresses some concerns that the Authority set aside funds for major projects that could present themselves in the future. She suggested this is a rational that the NVTA build some kind of a set aside, but maybe not right away.
- Chair Hynes stated that the NVTA is not going to change the rule that every project funded must be in TransAction 2045, therefore, what projects will be identified that we don't anticipate in this plan. She noted that there will also be

carryover money this year. Another strategy, which would be a policy question, is to use the overestimate to fund this reserve rather than to take money off the top. She added that we already have \$14 million not allocated, plus \$12 million, plus the overestimate, plus the \$33 million for another reserve, plus almost \$8 million for contingency. She stated that it sounds like a lot of money the NVRTA is deciding not to spend when there are worthy projects.

- Chairman Bulova suggested that the idea of populating this reserve with carryover funds is a good compromise. If there are funds leftover from projects or revenues that are more than anticipated, these could be used to start to create a reserve for unanticipated opportunities. She agreed that by taking the reserve off the top, we are reducing the amount that can be spent on projects.
- Chairman York asked if this \$12 million, if it is not taken off the top and it is in the budget, is it going to be used for transit? Chairman York asked what is keeping it from being used for transit if it is being put into a reserve fund. Mr. Longhi responded that it would be in the project selection process. Chairman York stated that there is not a concern that the reserve fund cannot be used for transit. He asked Chair Hynes to clarify why she has this concern since it boils down to the decision of this body whether it can be used for transit. Chair Hynes responded that her concern is that the reserve has been described as for mega projects and there aren't very many transit mega projects. Chairman York suggested Metro's project is a mega project. He added that he uses the term mega project to refer to very big costs, not type of project. Chair Hynes added that there has been a struggle to get the WMATA project agreement signed because of the rules.
- Chairman York summarized that there are two questions.
 1. Does the Authority want to have this type of reserve fund? If we do, we can figure out how and what policies to move forward.
 2. Do we want to wait for two years to fund, or do we want to just use carryover funds?
- Mr. Longhi stated that ultimately the use of the funds will need to be determined by the policy and the policy will need to be established prior to the funds being used. This is a budget exercise at this point. The policy will form the usages of the funds and the policy will be in compliance with HB 2313.
- Council Member Rishell stated that she cannot support taking the reserve off the top, but she might consider using carryover. She suggested deferring setting up a reserve for a year or so and then come back to revisit it.
- Chairman Nohe suggested that we can create the category called project reserve without putting any money into it. In April, we may have money leftover and will need someplace to put this. So the money does not have to come off the top, it may come off the bottom in April when we adopt the project list. Mr. Longhi responded that it would stay in the Regional Revenue Fund, only to be used for projects.
- Chairman Nohe stated that there are 44 projects on the project list. We have 45 line items to consider, those 44 projects and the question of do we have to

spend all the money. He suggested there is some room for reasonable disagreement as to whether we should leave any money on the bottom line, but leaving something on the bottom line is also an option. Chairman Nohe recommended that as a policy matter, we have the line item with zero dollars now that says “money that is going to be spent someday on transportation projects, be they highway or transit that we don’t spend right now” that is where leftover money goes. This way we understand it is for projects, not for administration.

- Council Member Rishell suggested that the carryover should not automatically be funneled into that line item and that the Authority would have to make a decision about this.
- Chairman York suggested we need to develop the policies first. Council Member Rishell asked for confirmation that the line item will remain zero until there is a policy. Chairman Nohe stated that we are not taking action on anything tonight.
- Chairman Nohe observed that the Virginia Railway Express 3rd track is a mega transit project that we can build today, but it is not one of the recommended projects because of its cost. This is something that we will have to look at over time. He added that we are proposing to fund the study for Route 28 congestion relief, then next year we will have another mega project on our list, that we have no money planned for now.
- Chairman Nohe requested that staff develop a policy proposal based on this conversation. He also suggested a list be developed of the mega projects and the barriers that have prevented the NVT A from funding them already, including any legal barriers to Momentum. He noted that Delegate Albo says there are not any. Chairman Nohe concluded that we may discover that all the barriers are so high that this does not matter in FY2015 and FY2016 because we are not funding anything until FY2019, and we may discover that there is something really important.

Discussion/Information

XVI. 2015 General Assembly Session Update Ms. Dominguez, Chair, JACC

- Mr. Biesiadny updated the Authority on the 2015 General Assembly Session. He noted that:
 - ✓ All bills introduced that were related to the NVT A were disposed of, with the exception of two. HB 1915 and SB 1314 as introduced said that when establishing funding priorities, congestion relief would be the highest priority. That language was amended and the current language says that reducing congestion in Planning District 8 is the primary objective to the greatest extent practicable. It goes on to list the other performance based criteria that were in the existing code, including improving travel times, reducing delays, connecting regional activity centers, improving safety and air quality, and moving the most people in the most cost effective manner. The bill also requires that each

locality inform the Authority, if it makes any land use or transportation changes to its comprehensive plan that are not consistent with TransAction 2040, or the current plan that the Authority has adopted. This bill did pass the General Assembly and is on its way to the Governor.

- ✓ HB 1887 creates significant changes to the allocation formula, for highways in particular. It eliminates the old 40-30-30 which was 40% primary, 30% secondary and 30% urban. It replaces it with the new formula that has three components:
 1. State of good repair.
 2. Funding major capital projects on a statewide basis that are ranked through HB 2.
 3. District grant program that will provide money to Northern Virginia to be allocated based on the criteria established by HB 2.
- ✓ HB 1887 also provides \$40 million in additional transit funds. It makes some changes to the Revenue Sharing Program that a number of the jurisdictions use. It adds a category for continued funding for projects that already receive Revenue Sharing money. This bill did pass both the House and Senate and is on the way to the Governor for approval.
- ✓ Two budget amendments related to WMATA would have restricted DRPT's ability to allocate funding for either operating or capital, unless Metro was able to secure a clean audit and address some of its financial deficiencies that were identified by the Federal Transit Administration. The ramification of this was that if the State did not provide money, the local governments that support Metro would need to provide more support to Metro or the budget would have to be significantly cut. These amendments have been changed so that they only include reporting and keeping the General Assembly updated on Metro's progress towards achieving both of those goals.

- Chairman Nohe announced that the General Assembly appointed Angela Horan, one of NVTAs Council of Counsels, to the Bench of the 31st Judicial District.

XVII. CMAQ/RSTP Reallocation Request Mr. Holloman, Vice Chair, JACC

- No verbal report.

XVIII. Planning Coordination Advisory Committee Report
Mayor Foreman, Chair, PCAC

- Mayor Foreman noted that PCAC has received outstanding briefs in the last two months from Ms. Sinner and Mr. Jasper, respectively. The Committee is still going through the storming process. The next meeting will be when the Committee starts to discuss its responsibilities as a Committee and where the flow is.

XIX. Technical Advisory Committee Report Mr. Boice, Chair, TAC

- Mr. Boice briefed the Authority on the TAC comments on the HB 599 process and the NVTA FY2015-16 Two Year Program.
 - ✓ Committee understands that the HB 599 process only considers congestion reduction. The NVTA’s project selection process considers the HB 599 ratings alongside other criteria. The Committee suggests that communicating this to the public and outside agencies would be good, as it is easy to get the two confused.
 - ✓ Suggested that ranking studies with established projects may not provide a true picture for the rankings. The rankings assume improvements envisioned in the studies will actually be done. However, studies are to ascertain what improvements, if any, are to be advanced to a project. Theoretically, some or all of the improvements outlined in a study may be found to be unwarranted, so ranking of a study project higher than an established improvement project that has been vetted, studied and warranted, can possibly skew the application of dollars away from projects that will achieve the goals of NVTA funds. Studies also tend to account for corridor areas where improvement projects are typically pieces of overall improvements identified in past studies, for example in Fairfax County a study is assessing grade separating at grade intersections as well as widening the Parkway over its length. It is likely that these improvements would be separate projects over time. Ranking studies with actual projects appears to be an apple to orange comparison. This is not to diminish the importance of the studies, but the process should be noted that the studies appear to garner points in a way that may or may not be what was intended.

XX. Finance Committee Report Chairman York, Chair, Finance Committee

- No verbal report.

XXI. Monthly Revenue Report Mr. Longhi, CFO

- No verbal report.

XXII. Operating Budget Report Mr. Longhi, CFO

- No verbal report.

XXIII. Project Implementation Working Group Chairman Nohe, Chair, PIWG

- No report.

XXIV. Executive Director’s Report Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

- No verbal report.

XXV. Chairman's Comments

- Chairman Nohe stated that the Authority has a Public Hearing on March 25, 2015 and the NVTAs has a meeting scheduled for March 26, 2015. He asked Ms. Backmon if there is anything on the agenda that needs to be done in March. Ms. Backmon responded not necessarily, that the only anticipated action items are two more Standard Projects Agreements. Chairman Nohe asked if there was any objection to holding a brief business meeting after the Public Hearing to address Consent Agenda items and move presentations to the next month. There was consensus to do this. Chairman York requested that staff email Authority member staff about the meeting change to March 25, 2015.

Closed Session

XXVI. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 7:31pm.