

REVISED 10.24.13

**SUMMARY MINUTES
NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY**

**September 26, 2013
Fairfax City Hall
10455 Armstrong Street
Fairfax, VA**

NVTA Members Present:

Voting Members:

Martin Nohe, Chairman	Prince William County
Mayor Euille, Vice Chairman	City of Alexandria (arrived at 7:15 p.m.)
Board Member Chris Zimmerman	Arlington County
Chairman Sharon Bulova	Fairfax County
Chairman Scott York	Loudoun County
Mayor Scott Silverthorne	City of Fairfax
Council Member David Snyder	City of Falls Church (arrived at 7:15 p.m.)
Council Member Rishell	City of Manassas Park
Mayor Parrish	City of Manassas
Senator Adam Ebbin	Virginia General Assembly (arrived at 7:13 p.m.)
Delegate Thomas Rust	Virginia General Assembly (arrived at 7:16 p.m.)
Mr. Gary Garczynski	Governor's Appointee, CTB Member
Ms. Sandra Bushue	Governor's Appointee

Non-voting Members:

Helen Cuervo	VDOT
Joe Swartz	DRPT

Members Absent

Delegate Joe May	Virginia General Assembly
Mayor Foreman	Town of Dumfries

Staff:

John Mason	Interim Executive Director
Camela Speers	Administrative Assistant
Pam Martin	Clerk
Various jurisdictional staff	

Item I: Call to Order

Chairman Nohe called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m.

Item II: Roll Call

The roll was called and members present were as noted above.

Item III: Approval of the Minutes of July 24, 2013

Corrections were noted by Chairman York and Mayor Parrish to be incorporated into the final minutes. Chairman York stated that the Organizational Working Group was not asked to work with the Financial Working Group regarding the budget. Mayor Parrish noted some spelling and grammar corrections. Chairman Bulova requested that page numbers be included in the future. Chairman York moved and Chairman Bulova seconded and the minutes were approved unanimously.

Item IV: Discussion/Action Items

A. DRPT's SuperNoVa Action Plan

Chairman Nohe introduced Amy Inman from DRPT who gave a PowerPoint presentation on the SuperNoVa Vision Plan which was completed last fall. Ms. Inman indicated that the next step is to develop a SuperNoVa Action Plan.

Senator Ebbin requested an example of where the hubs would be located in relation to the Core Capacity slide. Ms. Inman stated that the connections haven't been identified at this time, as DRPT wants to ensure that hubs are located in appropriate areas, and that the information will be included in the final Action Plan.

Mr. Zimmerman questioned how the definition of region was determined, as the SuperNoVa region includes areas outside of Planning District 8 and areas outside of the PRTC service area. He also asked what percentages of trips are coming from outside of Planning District 8 or PRTC service area. Ms. Inman stated that the desire is to provide mobility options further out, such as people coming from West Virginia to Loudoun County. She also stated that they can provide the information requested. Mr. Zimmerman also asked who will integrate the Vision Plan recommendations into local, state and regional plans. He also asked if localities will be asked to modify their Comprehensive Plans or if the NVTA will be asked to add recommendations to its long range plan. Ms. Inman responded that DRPT worked closely with staff in developing the recommendations so the recommendations are suitable with what's in the localities plans.

She also stated that the DRPT is working on a resolution which will spell out who will be the lead versus the support for the near time/short term.

Chairman Bulova stated that she was in attendance at the last SuperNoVa Consortium meeting. Chairman Bulova stated that there was a good discussion and that there is value in looking at Planning District 8 and where the traffic is coming from. Chairman Bulova wanted to avoid creating a new organization as there are several existing initiatives that cover planning studies/initiatives.

Mr. Snyder commented that the study is interesting and worthwhile. However, he cautioned against having another unfunded mandate. Mr. Snyder noted concern of any justification of dispersing existing transit funds to a wider area.

Chairman York expressed concern that the plan doesn't have funding for implementation. He noted that the study showed a lot of need and asked if funding for implementation was available to the areas outside of Northern Virginia. Chairman York also noted that the study is valuable in that it reflects Loudoun's need to work with Frederick and Charles Counties.

Mayor Euille agreed with the comments expressed by the other Authority members. He expressed concern that this is another unfunded mandate questioning where the funds for implementation would come from. Mayor Euille stated that the study needs to look at the economic and tourist standpoint and use a cautionary approach.

Chairman Nohe thanked Ms. Inman for her presentation.

B. VDOT-HB599 Prioritization Study

Chairman Nohe introduced Helen Cuervo from VDOT. Ms. Cuervo opened with remarks about the study and noted that both the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) and the NVTA will be involved. Ms. Cuervo stated that there will be a framework and that the CTB and NVTA will be asked to nominate projects. The final report will not recommend priorities but will be an evaluation for projects to be considered. Ms. Cuervo introduced Kanti Srikanth, study project manager from VDOT, who presented the PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Srikanth informed the NVTA that the HB599 passed a full year before HB2313, stating that HB599 is separate and independent of HB2313. Mr. Srikanth stated that HB2313 creates a linkage between HB599 and HB2313. HB599 states that a minimum of 25 projects that will reduce congestion will be recommended for study. He stated that the ratings that come out of HB599 will be made available to the CTB, the NVTA, and others who have money for implementation. Mr. Srikanth's presentation described the overall tasks and the sequence of these tasks starting with CTB priorities to the final report with ratings for each of the projects evaluated. (Slide # 8) Mr. Srikanth introduced Mr. Davis Roden of AECOM, the consultant VDOT selected for the project. Mr. Roden presented the analytical and decision framework, stating that the NVTA will help define what is regionally significant, and noted that the Authority will

have a vote on how they think congestion will be evaluated. These will be in place prior to project nominations. Mr. Roden indicated that the timeline for this study will be: (1) end of 2013 – identify existing and future congestion problems; (2) early 2014 – project selection; (3) summer of 2014 – analyze and evaluate projects; and (4) end of 2014 – project rating.

AECOM will start with the model used by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments (MWCOCG) to define demand for the region and then look at the simulation model to determine density, crowding on transit, distribution of benefits and where people live, as it relates to Northern Virginia. Mr. Roden stated that they will use a decision support tool (i.e. Decision Lens). The demand and operational modeling will provide the data on congestion and mobility and Decision Lens tool will help provide the weights for each of these measures that will be used in the final rating scores. This tool will also allow for the "what if" analysis. Once this data is obtained, it will be used as inputs for the rating scores. The study team will do "what if" tests to determine how the measures are rated, the benefits to the counties, etc. Over the next two months, the study team will define analysis measures and the tools.

Chairman Bulova asked if localities will be asked to submit projects. Mr. Roden stated that the CTB and NVTA will nominate projects. He noted that the end product is 25-30 projects. Chairman Bulova questioned whether a larger list of projects should be analyzed since some projects may not qualify under the definitions used. Mr. Srikanth stated that the 25-30 projects will all meet the criteria although they may be rated differently.

Mr. Garzynski stated that it doesn't look as if the study will help the CTB or the NVTA with the development of their respective Six Year Plans. He asked if there will be a ranking at the end of the evaluation process that will identify the top projects that relieve congestion. Mr. Srikanth stated that the study team can do a project ranking but the law doesn't require them to do it. Mr. Srikanth noted that most metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) only have a few priorities, while Northern Virginia has many more. VDOT wants to have objective rankings that carry weight with the General Assembly.

Delegate Rust stated that it is critical that the end product provide a project ranking—stating that we need to know which projects do the most.

Chairman Nohe stated that VDOT is facing the same challenge that NVTA faces in that they are trying to implement a piece of legislation that evolved rapidly. Chairman Nohe stated Northern Virginia has many more congestion and regionally significant projects than we can fund, and HB599 creates a process to tell us what we already know. Further, ranking projects 1-25 makes project number 25 look like it is a bad project when it may not be. Chairman Nohe also referenced the fact that in many cases, several alternatives are possible to address a specific need. Therefore, if several of these proposals are part of the evaluation and rating study, yet only one is selected for completion, this still reduces

the pool of projects that the Authority can consider for implementation. Mr. Garzynski stated that we need to prioritize at some point.

Mr. Zimmerman asked what role the NVTA model plays in designing the formula to use for rating the projects. He expressed concern about creating a new model for rating the projects since the NVTA has an adopted long-range plan that included extensive modeling. Chairman Bulova commented that the NVTA used modeling in the development of the TransAction 2040 Plan. Mr. Roden stated that the TransAction 2040 model used MWCOCG's model that provided demand estimates and could not provide operational congestion impacts such as those listed on slide # 14. Mr. Roden also stated that they will use the same MWCOCG model to get demand data.

Mr. Zimmerman asked if the structure of the model will be the same as was used in TransAction 2040. Mr. Roden answered no. Mr. Zimmerman question the inputs that VDOT and the study team will be using to incorporate into the model as that has a direct impact on the outputs of the model. He reiterated the fact that VDOT must coordinate with the Authority in determining model inputs and the suggested framework. Mr. Zimmerman went on to ask what coordination is being done with the NVTA to develop evaluation criteria. Mr. Roden stated that VDOT and the study team will work with the NVTA to develop the evaluation criteria. Mr. Zimmerman requested that the study team work with the professional staff to help develop the evaluation criteria; suggesting that the evaluation criteria be vetted among the Authority prior to any analysis work and reminded VDOT and the consultant that the study is to be done in coordination with the NVTA. Mr. Zimmerman also asked if the study team had any idea of how the projects would be compared—wanting to know what are the ways to say Project A reduces congestion more than Project B and why there is a 25-30 project limit. Mr. Srikanth stated that there would be congestion and mobility related measures of effectiveness used to evaluate and rate each project, and that VDOT is limiting the number of projects to 25-30 due to time and funding constraints. He also noted that the law requires the study to be updated every 4 years.

Mr. Zimmerman expressed concerns regarding the decision to only analyze 25-30 projects. Mr. Zimmerman stated that analyzing a few projects does not give the full picture with the dynamic analysis tools that VDOT is proposing. It is difficult to demonstrate how projects fair if the analysis only includes 25-30 projects. He also stated that in order to fully understand the impact of projects across the region, the Authority needs to know how the projects interact system-wide.

Mr. Zimmerman asked VDOT to ensure that the "Open Source" model would be transparent, including proprietary data. Mr. Srikanth responded the Open Source model is transparent and can be downloaded from the internet.

Ms. Rishell wanted clarity on whether the funding source will be used as a selection criterion. Mr. Srikanth stated that the law prohibits selecting projects based on its funding source but it could be used as a measure to rate the project Ms. Rishell stated that the Authority may want to use this as a criterion and wanted to know the exact mechanism for NVTA project selection. Chairman Nohe directed staff to provide some

level of technical analysis as well as with a recommendation regarding the process in the selection of the projects.

Mr. Snyder expressed concerns with Chart 3 of the presentation, stating that it draws a legal conclusion that the study is binding to NVTA funding. He requested that the Council of Counsel review the “binding nature.” He also stated that this study will assist the Authority in making decisions but the NVTA will make the decisions regarding project selection and funding.

Mayor Parrish and Chairman York expressed that the process identified for HB599 is cumbersome and doesn’t necessary allow jurisdictions to benefit from the funds generated in their localities, as is required by HB 2313.

Item V. HB 2313 – Working Group Updates

A. Public Outreach

There was no committee report.

B. Organizational

There was no committee report. Chairman York stated that the group needs to make a decision regarding long term housing for NVTA staff.

C. Project Implementation Working Group

Mr. Zimmerman stated that the last recommendations of the project implementation working group were included under the bond validation suit. He also stated that the group will meet early next month where he expects the group to start developing recommendations for HB599.

D. Financial

Vice Chairman Euille stated that the Maintenance of Effort request was answered by all jurisdictions; noting that Arlington, Fairfax County and the City of Fairfax has the Commercial and Industrial Tax-other jurisdictions have developed what they will do to make up the equivalent of the C&I tax. Tom Biesiadny, staff coordinator for the Financial Working Group, informed the group that the Treasury Board deferred action, as there was no quorum. Mayor Euille informed the Authority that the next meeting of the Financial Working Group is Monday, October 7th at noon at the Fairfax County Department of Transportation. Chairman Nohe stated that the Authority is required to have a Finance Committee and that the Financial Working Group should transition to this committee.

E. Legal

Council Member Snyder briefed the Authority that the hearing of the Bond Validation in Fairfax County Circuit Court will be September 30, 2013. Mayor Parrish raised several questions regarding who owes the debt if the revenue goes away. Other questions were raised regarding the Route 28 landowners and the 70% from HB 2313. Council Member Snyder requested the Council of Counsels respond to these questions and to review the “binding nature” at the next meeting. Chairman York asked that the Council of Counsels look into the concerns of the Route 28 landowners about the allocation of funds for Hot Spot Improvements with the tax district.

Item VI: Executive Director’s Report

A. Approval of 2014 Budget and NVRC Service Agreement

John Mason briefed the Authority on the budget. He advised that NVRC is providing office space rent free to NVRTA for six months. The original budget was set at \$1.047 million and now revised at \$904,000 due to the six months of rent free. Chairman Bulova moved and Vice Chairman Euille seconded and Chairman York abstaining.

Mr. Mason briefed the Authority on the Service Agreement with NVRC. He indicated to the Authority that the indemnification clause and insurance matters were still in the reviewing process. Chairman Bulova moved and Vice Chairman Euille seconded that the Service Agreement between NVRTA and NVRC, in a form approved by the Council of Counsels, subject to resolution of terms relating to indemnity and insurance matters and other provisions relating to non-compliance with the Agreement’s terms; and that the Service agreement, once it has been executed, shall be brought back to the NVRTA for ratification. This motion passed unanimously.

Item VII: Information Items-CMAQ/RSTP Reallocation Requests

Information items only.

Item VIII: Other Business

Chairman Nohe stated that the Commonwealth Transportation Board Fall Hearing on the Six Year Improvement Program will be on October 22, 2013. Since this meeting is prior to the NVRTA meeting, Chairman Nohe requested staff to provide draft comments to be vetted by the Authority so comments can be provided at the CTB meeting.

IX: Adjournment

The NVRTA meeting was adjourned at 9:27 p.m. Next meeting is at 3060 Williams Drive, Suite 510, Fairfax, Virginia 22031 at 5:30 p.m. on October 24, 2013.