



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

**Thursday, April 23, 2015**  
**6:00pm**  
**3040 Williams Drive, Suite 200**  
**Fairfax, VA 22031**

**MEETING MINUTES**

**I. Call to Order** Chairman Nohe

- Chairman Nohe called the meeting to order at 6:06pm.

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

- Voting Members: Chairman Nohe; Chairman Bulova; Chair Hynes; Supervisor Letourneau; Mayor Parrish; Mayor Silverthorne (arrived 6:29pm/departed 7:26pm); Council Member Rishell; Council Member Snyder (arrived 6:49); Senator Ebbin; Delegate Rust; Delegate Minchew (arrived 6:28pm); Miss Bushue; Mr. Garczynski.
- Non-Voting Members: Ms. Cuervo; Mr. Horsley.
- Staff: Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Michael Longhi (CFO); Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator); Peggy Teal (Assistant Finance Officer); Camela Speer (Clerk); various jurisdictional staff.

**III. Minutes of the March 25, 2015 Meeting**

- Chairman Bulova moved approval of the March 25, 2015 minutes; seconded by Mayor Parrish. Motion carried with seven (7) yeas and two (2) abstentions [with Supervisor Letourneau and Mr. Garczynski abstaining as they were at the March 25 meeting].

**Presentation**

**IV. Implementation of Provisions of HB 2 (2014)**

Nick Donohue, Deputy Secretary of Transportation

- Deputy Secretary Donohue presented an update on the Implementation of the Provisions of HB 2 (2014).
- Mr. Garczynski noted that, from the Commonwealth Transportation Board's (CTB) perspective, the selection process for high priority projects will be pretty selective. The sense from the last meeting was that the CTB will look to the Metropolitan Planning Organizations for suggested candidate projects, but they will have to be within a corridor of state-wide significance, moving the

most people and goods for the greatest impact. He emphasized that this will be very selective and competitive. It will not be awarded loosely by the CTB. He added that all regions think their projects are a high priority and cited examples like the Fairfax County Parkway and Route 1, or multimodal transportation in the inner core.

- Chair Hynes asked how the HB 2 scoring will work over time. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that since projects are ranked against those submitted to each project selection cycle, a project that scores lower in one year could be ranked number one in the next round. He added that the project selection is also based on what the State can fund.
- Chairman Nohe noted that projects will be ranked against each other in each round, therefore in each round there will be new and different projects and previously submitted projects will be rescored against those. He cited HB 599 as an example, noting that there are probably projects in Northern Virginia that would have scored higher than those in this last study, but they were not considered, mostly because they were not submitted. He posed the question, “Does the score in year one stand, or in order to get a reasonable outcome, does it get rescored in the next round in order to have accurate data?” Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that under the draft proposal the score would be updated. Chairman Nohe added that this makes sense, but that it is not intuitive, particularly to the jurisdictions whose projects are impacted by this. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that he suspects there will be robust discussions regarding the first time this happens. He added that the CTB, similar to the Authority, is not required to select just the top scoring projects, noting that they are a policy Board and as such retain the policy discretion to fund those projects they believe provide the greatest benefit. The scores will be made public prior to the CTB making draft selections and a draft Six Year Improvement Program being released. He added that if a project is funded in a different part of the state that has a lower score than a project in Northern Virginia, he expects to see the Authority members at the Six Year Improvement Program public hearings to ask why.
- Delegate Rust asked for clarification regarding the question as to whether total funding or only HB 2 eligible funds should be considered in project scoring. He noted that if total funding is considered, than if a project has other funding sources it will score higher. Deputy Secretary Donohue explained that the law requires not just looking at the largest benefit, but the largest benefit for dollars spent. Since there are limited funds and the State cannot fund everything, we need to look at what can the State can achieve with the available resources it has. Project benefits will be divided by the cost to get some relative benefit per million dollars spent. This raises the question as to whether to take the total project cost, regardless of whether or not it is State HB 2 eligible or includes additional funding sources, or only consider the HB 2 incremental burden to the State. The staff recommendation is to use the HB 2 only cost to encourage local communities to leverage resources with the State. He added that the CTB does not have consensus on this issue. He noted that some jurisdictions have concerns that they do not have additional resources like

Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads, and are not as well off, so do not have the resources to co-invest. There is concern that this could create an unfair circumstance for these communities.

*(Delegate Minchew and Mayor Silverthorne arrived.)*

- Supervisor Letourneau asked who will be assigning project scores and putting them into the weighting framework. Secretary Donohue explained the process:
  - ✓ There will be an on-line application with drop down menus from which to choose options.
  - ✓ Staff at the State will be responsible for undertaking the projects scores and reviews.
  - ✓ Expect to have a very simple and streamlined process for applicants to submit projects. It is not anticipated that applicants will need to hire consultants to do this.
- Supervisor Letourneau asked, for example, who will do the evaluation on the economic development impact, as this is not necessarily something at that transportation staff would be the best served to evaluate. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that this is also being discussed with the CTB. He added that he expects there will be a few teams that are probably led by staff, but consist of consultants and others that score these projects. It is also being discussed as to how to put in place quality assurance and quality control. One consideration is to have three teams with each scoring 40% of the projects so that there is a natural overlap of 20%. A review will be done of the projects scored by all three teams to see if they got the same score. If not, there will be a review and rescore.
- Mr. Garczynski added that beta testing of the framework is being done now as test scoring is due to the CTB next month.
- Chairman Bulova noted that jurisdictions may want to score projects on their own to test the State scoring. She asked if there will be a way to challenge the State scores. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that this is being looked into. It has been suggested that there needs to be a way for applicants to express concerns about projects being properly scored. He added that they are working on how to work this into the timeframe and are looking to create a web portal to make the factors the State is using available to jurisdiction and agency staff in advance. He added that the State wants to make this as transparent a process as possible.
- Chair Hynes asked if the crash model looks beyond the car and takes into account different modes of transportation. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that the model does not do the best job of this. He stated it does a very good job on the automobile side and that there are some crash modifications for non-motorized travel, but they are a bit nonsensical. He added that they talking with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and some other regions that have similar situations to try to find options for non-motorized calculations. Chair Hynes noted that there are 6000 bike and pedestrian trips across the Key Bridge every day.

- Chairman Nohe moved to item X to discuss the draft Authority comments on the HB 2 Draft Implementation Policy Guide.

## **X. Approval of Comments on HB 2 Draft Implementation Policy Guide**

Ms. Dominguez, Chair, JACC

- Ms. Dominguez stated that on behalf of the Authority, the JACC has prepared a full list of draft comments on the HB 2 Draft Implementation Policy Guide. She noted that the safety measure issue was addressed in the draft comments, stating that while it was agreed that fatalities and severe injuries should be a factor in calculating impacts on safety, we believe that measurements should not be limited to those criteria. The reduction of all accidents should be included, and not limited to only the most severe. Deputy Secretary Donohue responded that the CTB has tried to focus in all these measures on the items where we can really demonstrate results that create the biggest issues within the Commonwealth. He added that, for example, on crashes the focus is only on fatalities and severe injuries, but on the flip side, for this region when looking at delay, the focus is on the more severe types of congestion and stop-and-go-issues. Deputy Secretary Donohue explained that in rural parts of the state, where there is not a lot of delay, they don't want to include fender bender types of crashes. He concluded that by not including these types of crashes, it will have a lower impact on safety for Northern Virginia projects. However, 35% of the score in this area is based on congestion and the way the congestion score has been developed, it is focused on the most severe congestion problems which tend to exist in this regional.
- Ms. Dominguez pointed out two more comments:
  - ✓ Under environmental quality, there are comments that access to essential destinations is extremely important, but the JACC thought this belongs more in accessibility than in environmental quality.
  - ✓ In regard to co-funding and project costs, reiterated the Authority's comment provided in December that stated that the Authority continues to strongly support the provision that for purposes of cost benefit analysis, the project benefits will be calculated relative to the HB 2 costs only. The reason is that it is important to leverage various sources and that HB 2313 specifically states that Northern Virginia's regional funds cannot be used to calculate or reduce the share of local, federal or state revenues otherwise available to participating jurisdictions.
- Mr. Garczynski stated that he would welcome any comments from individual members of this body prior to the upcoming CTB meeting.
- Delegate Minchew noted that the adoption of HB 2 in 2014 did something unusual, it said that the CTB shall consider comments from various stakeholders and that the CTB shall explicitly consider input provided by the NVTA. He suggested that this statute means that input provided by the Authority shall be given high probative weight, meaning that it is important to get it right and make sure our comments are comprehensive, but also set forth

the consensus of the Authority. He added that we want to get it right the first time and suggested that, unless there is a hurry to get this to the CTB, we have a work session on the comments to ensure they embody the view members have as a whole. Mr. Garczynski explained that there is a sense of urgency as these debates are going to happen next month in Northern Virginia and there is only a window of about three weeks. He suggested that if the Authority wants to fine tune what the JACC has proposed, there is a sense of urgency.

- Ms. Dominguez stated that the JACC, with staff members from all the localities as well as the regional agencies, has compiled four pages of notes. She suggested that the Authority members take time to review the comments, send any additional feedback and then Ms. Backmon could draft a letter along those lines.
- Chairman Nohe stated that he does not want to do anything that creates unnecessary delay in this. He requested that the Authority approve the draft comments this evening, with understanding that jurisdictions can provide additional comments to Ms. Backmon. He noted that we have a little time to make adjustments and added that we can always provide additional comments to the CTB. He expressed concern about delaying this process since the Authority does not meet again until after the CTB meeting.
- Delegate Minchew noted the importance of these comments, given that the General Assembly gave the Authority a higher priority of comment probative weight, and that we a good collection of people from our local government, so wants to make sure that we really crystalize their thinking in our corporate comments to the CTB.
- Chairman Bulova asked for confirmation that in the process thus far jurisdiction staffs have already been working together. Ms. Dominguez responded that the Policy Guide was sent to the entire JACC when it was released last March. At the JACC meeting two weeks ago, members discussed the comments, then the draft comments were sent out for changes or modifications. She noted that this evening's comments by Chairman Nohe, Chairman Bulova and Chair Hynes are not included in this list of comments, but will be incorporated in the final letter. Chairman Nohe added that there are also many jurisdictions that are providing comments separately from the Authority.
- Chairman Nohe asked that the Authority take action on this item.
- Supervisor Letourneau moved approval of the Draft Comments on the Draft HB 2 Implementation Policy Guide, and asked that they be provided in a letter to the Virginia Secretary of Transportation; seconded by Chairman Bulova with understanding that there is still an opportunity to provide additional comments.
- Chair Hynes asked for clarification that additional comments would be consensus comments. Chairman Nohe responded that any additional comments would need to be sent to Ms. Backmon for Authority consensus.

(Council Member Snyder arrived.)

- Motion carried with twelve (12) yeas and one (1) abstention [Mr. Garczynski].
- Deputy Secretary Donohue concluded his presentation.

### **Action**

#### **V. Approval of Budget Adjustment – Regional Revenue Fund Budget**

Mr. Longhi, CFO

- Mr. Longhi briefed the Authority on the Budget Adjustment to the Regional Revenue Fund budget. He noted this is a voluntary withdraw of the FY2014 Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) bus project. This action will return \$7 million of project funding to the Regional Revenue Fund.
- Mayor Parrish moved approval of the voluntary request from the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) to withdraw its FY2014 funding request of \$7 million for new buses, and cancellation the FY2014 appropriation; seconded by Chair Hynes. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **VI. Approval of Regional Revenue Budget**

Mr. Longhi, CFO

- Mr. Longhi updated the Authority on the FY2016 Regional Revenue budget. He noted that these funds must first be used to meet debt service obligations, then funds may be allocated to projects. He noted significant developments since the previous Authority briefings on this budget.
  - ✓ \$7 million withdraw from WMATA.
  - ✓ Consensus has been reached with the member jurisdictions on the funding of the TransAction Update.
  - ✓ The Executive Director is forming an Advisory Panel to develop policies for the contingency and Transportation Project Reserves. The funding decisions for the Transportation Project Reserve will be presented after the policy approval. No funds from either of those reserves will be used until the policies are in place. The proposed funding of the Transportation Projects Reserve was reduced from \$12 million to zero, pending the establishment of the policy.
  - ✓ These adjustments increase the Regional Revenue Fund balance available for projects from the previous \$359 million to \$371 million.
- He reviewed the summary statement of the budget in the Authority packet.
  - ✓ The funds available for projects are \$371 million.
  - ✓ The original project recommendations from the Project Implementation Working Group (PIWG) were \$337.9 million. The April recommendations added another \$8 million, for a total recommended project funding of \$345.9 million.
  - ✓ There are un-programmed funds of \$25.1 million.

- ✓ Working Capital Reserve, which the FY2016 proposed budget will complete the funding of, is \$103.5 million. This is governed by the Debt Policy.
  - ✓ Debt Service Reserve of \$5.5 million which was funded through our first debt issuance.
  - ✓ Total Restricted Reserves of \$109 million.
  - ✓ For the Contingency for Approved Projects, the Finance Committee recommended funding of \$7.8 million.
  - ✓ For the Transportation Projects Reserve, the Finance Committee requested removal of the \$12 million and that the decision on that funding be deferred until the policy is ready.
  - ✓ Total NVTA Directed Reserves of \$7.8 million.
  - ✓ Based on the funds left over from the potential approval of the FY2015-16 Two Year Program, the NVTA Directed Reserves and Un-programmed Funds will be \$32.9 million. These are funds that ultimately are under the Authority's control.
  - ✓ Total Reserves and Un-programmed Funds will be \$141.9 million.
- Chair Hynes moved approval of the FY2016 Regional Revenue Fund budget, with adjustment of the Transportation Projects Reserve to zero pending the establishment of related policies, as recommended by the Finance Committee; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried unanimously.

## **VII. Adoption of the FY2015-16 Two Year Program**

Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

- Ms. Backmon updated the Authority on the proposed FY2015-16 Two Year Program. She reviewed the process to date:
  - ✓ Call for Projects issued in December 2013.
  - ✓ 52 projects were submitted in February 2014.
  - ✓ 33 of these projects were highway projects that were recommended to the CTB to be rated and evaluated as part of the HB 599 process.
  - ✓ 19 transit projects were not included in the HB 599 evaluation, but it was always the Authority's intent to include transit projects in the HB 599 process.
- Mr. Jasper briefed the Authority on the specifics and the work of the April 13, 2015 meeting of the PIWG. He noted:
  - ✓ Public Hearing was held on March 25, 2015.
  - ✓ At the April meeting, the PIWG considered all public comments received.
  - ✓ The recommendation from the April meeting of the PIWG recommends 21 highway and 16 mass transit projects for a total of \$345,939,000, leaving over \$25 million un-allocated.
- Mr. Jasper summarized the public comments received from all sources, including:
  - ✓ Received 229 comments, including the testimony from the Public Hearing and a 467 signature petition which was treated as a single comment.

- ✓ All public comments are posted on the Authority's website and they are listed in the Authority meeting packet.
- ✓ For review at the PIWG meeting, comments were divided into three groups.
  - Comments related specifically to project 8S, which is a Fairfax County project to widen US 1 Richmond Highway. There was substantial support expressed for this project.
  - Comments related to multiple projects, including project 8S.
  - Comments completely unrelated to 8S and supporting various projects.
- ✓ There were also some process related comments. These did not focus so much on projects, but on the business of coming up with recommended projects.
- Mr. Jasper briefly reviewed the Project Selection Process.
  - ✓ Started in the summer of 2014.
  - ✓ The Authority approved this process at the October 2014 Authority meeting.
  - ✓ When HB 599 results were available, they were incorporated.
  - ✓ Stressed that the process that was adopted was particularly geared toward projects that offered congestion relief, but also project readiness. So that not only was congestion relief delivered by the projects, but it would be delivered quickly. The Authority's process very much reflects that.
- Mr. Jasper reviewed the recommended highway projects.
  - ✓ 21 recommended projects, which is three more than original proposed list.
  - ✓ First grouping of projects on the list were recommended because these are the projects that achieved the highest NVT A score, using the adopted selection process.
  - ✓ Five additional projects were recommended. He explained those recommendations:
    - Frontier Drive Extension Project, 8R, was added as a result of public support. He noted that there is additional information in the Authority packet which provides a greater background as to the congestion benefit reliefs of this project.
    - Leesburg Rt. 15 Bypass Project, 1P, was included in the FY2014 Program, so as part of the qualitative considerations, this project was added as a continuation of funding for an already approved project.
    - Fairfax County Rt. 28 Widening Project, 3K, was included based on the HB 599 rating of 17.3 and because although it is in preliminary engineering, it offers potential congestion relief in the Rt. 28 corridor sooner than some other projects being considered.
    - Rolling Road Widening Project, 5C, was added in part because of comments received in the Public Hearing. It has a decent HB 599 rating and is fairly advanced in the Right-of-Way phase.
    - Fairfax County US 1 Richmond Highway Project, 8S, was added as a result of comments received during the public comment process.
  - ✓ Many of the recommended highway projects chosen using the Authority's selection process will be applying regional funds to construction activities.



This shows that the process that was adopted emphasizes projects which will deliver congestion relief the fastest.

- Mr. Jasper reviewed the recommended transit projects.
  - ✓ Recommended the 15 highest scoring projects, using the NVTA scoring system.
  - ✓ One additional project being recommended is the Crystal City Platform Extension Study. Although this received the lowest NVTA score and is a study, there are many other studies going on that affect this particular VRE corridor and VRE believes it is very important as this study will help locate the Crystal City Station within context of those other ongoing studies. If the study does not start at this time, there is a potential that the Crystal City project will become out of sync with the other studies' recommendations.
- Mr. Jasper commented that two of the qualitative considerations used within the project selection process were geographic balance and modal balance. He noted that there is not standard to apply as to whether something is geographically or modally balanced, so the PIWG worked to ensure balance and a table is included in the Authority meeting packet to show the balance in the draft Two Year Program.
- Ms. Backmon stated that this is the recommend FY2015-16 Two Year Program.
- Senator Ebbin moved adoption of the FY2015-16 Two Year Program; seconded by Delegate Rust.
- Chairman Nohe noted that at least one Authority member may have a conflict with a project in the Program. He requested dividing the motion to allow for this.
- Ms. Bushue stated that she has a conflict with project 6L on the transit list. She stated that she will vote for the projects, but wishes to abstain from this one project.
- Chairman Nohe asked the NVTA Council of Counsels if there is a need for separate votes, or if this acknowledgement is sufficient. Council of Counsels recommended separate votes.
- Senator Ebbin revised the motion.
- Senator Ebbin moved adoption of the FY2015-16 Two Year Program with the exception of project 6L; seconded by Delegate Rust.
- Council Member Snyder asked about the issue of long term revenue versus benefit. He asked if the Authority is going to keep studying this issue and assign a methodology. Ms. Backmon responded that at the Authority's December 2014 meeting the guiding principles were adopted for determining long term benefit. One of the prominent principles was that after ten years the Authority will retrospectively do a calculation. She added that with the adoption of the Two Year Program, the NVTA staff has already started this process. She noted that a model has not been run as the principles also

included that the latest model at that time be used. Council Member Snyder stated that this is very important and requested that staff continue to refine this.

- Chairman Nohe thanked everyone. He noted that the Authority did the Call for Projects for the Two Year Program in December 2013 and that feels like an eternity ago, but also a month ago. He stated that the NVTA has been in existence for 13 years and in business for less than two years, since the bill was signed. We are now adopting our second major set of investments. Twenty-five months ago we were shocked that the bill had passed and here we are. This is extraordinary work. There is probably not a project on here that we are going to adopt tonight that there could not be some criticisms of. The work that we do with our regions often falls in that category. He noted that the definition of a good deal is one where everyone feels a little disappointed. A bad deal is one where everyone feels disappointed. Chairman Nohe stated that this is a huge leap forward in terms of doing the thing that we spent eleven years talking about. He added that people used to ask what TransAction was and we used to answer it is the document that answers that question “What would you do with \$300 million if you had it?”. We now have \$300 million and we are proving that that is what we are going to do. Chairman Nohe thanked everyone who helped in this process.
- Delegate Rust commented that the Authority is going to approve a number of projects tonight that is almost equivalent to what the Commonwealth will spend in the entire year throughout the entire state.
- Chairman Bulova pointed out that the process that has been developed, within a short period of time, for the thoughtful selection of projects has been pretty phenomenal. She stated this speaks well to the work of the Authority. Chairman Bulova added that she appreciates the outreach the Authority has done to the community to ensure that the community understands the entire process with each project, adding that this is historic.
- Delegate Minchew suggested that given the hole that we were in in the region with the underfunding of our transportation infrastructure for a number of years, in fairly swift order this project list will do a great job of relieving congestion. He added it is a good project list and he votes for it. He asked that as we go forward and do this again, we should always keep an eye toward the “game changer” projects that really have regional significance that will give a regional “shot in the arm” for addressing congestion for our entire region. Since we are doing triage on projects that have been needed for a while, this is a wonderful thing. He suggested that as we go forward in our corporate lives as the Authority, we keep an eye to the “game changer” projects that will really give a regional “bang-for-the-buck”.
- Mayor Parrish stated that he mindful of those we have worked with, both in terms of Virginia staff, as well as Senators and Delegates that serve in Richmond, and especially perhaps the elected representatives in Northern Virginia. He added that as a member from the City of Manassas, he appreciates the fact that we are able to work well together. He is also mindful of the energetic staff that we have and thanked them for what they have done and what they will do. Mayor Parrish stated that with regard to Delegate

Minchew's comment about the "game changer" projects, he is looking forward to what the NVTa will be when it grows up, because we have some large decisions to make. He added that he hopes there are large decisions to make for the future of transportation in here in Northern Virginia, because he does think there are "game changer" projects and there is more work to do.

- Chair Hynes thanked the members of the Authority who have been involved for these eleven years, and our Delegates and Senators. She noted that there was an interesting conversation at the PIWG about the fact that while we have two lists here today, road and transit, that when the PIWG really started talking about the projects, many projects of the projects are multimodal. She added that we have not necessarily described them that way, but there are a lot of projects on the list that add a trail or improve pedestrian access, as well as adding capacity to roads, or capacity for transit. She encouraged the Authority as we continue to move this forward to find a way to convey that message to the public, because the solution here in Northern Virginia is not one of anything, the solution is all of it, all of it moving together to give people choices that make sense in their lives. She added that the more we can help people see that in the choices we make and the way we describe these projects, the better off we will all be, because we can't just pick one, it won't work.
- Motion carried unanimously.
- Senator Ebbin moved the adoption of the FY2015-16 Two Year Program with respect to item 6L; seconded by Delegate Minchew. Motion carried twelve (12) yeas and one (1) abstention [Miss Bushue].

### **VIII. Adoption of Policy 16 – Standard Project Agreement Activation**

Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

- Ms. Backmon briefed the Authority on Policy 16 – Standard Project Agreement (SPA) Activation, as recommended by the Finance Committee. She highlighted:
  - ✓ When the Authority assigns funding to a project, it is with the expectation that the project will advance per the approved scope of work.
  - ✓ If there is an issue with any particular project in getting to the SPA phase, the Authority, being mindful of its best interest, may need to de-obligate these funds.
  - ✓ This policy addresses projects that are not advancing to an executed SPA. This is not for projects that have an SPA, then have additional delays. Only for projects that do not have an approved SPA.
  - ✓ NVTa funds may be made available per actions taken under this policy and they could be returned to the Regional Revenue Fund.
  - ✓ Important to note for FY2014 project list, we have 29 approved SPAs, with the final two expected to be approved in May. After that, the FY2014 Program will have approved SPAs for every project.

- ✓ The NVTA has closed out two projects, meaning projects have been fully reimbursed and are complete.
  - ✓ If an SPA has not been approved by the governing body of the sponsoring entity within six months of project approval by the Authority, the project shall be considered for NVTA action to de-obligate funds for the project.
  - ✓ If we do not have an SPA approved within six months, this does not automatically trigger deactivation. It means that the Executive Director will contact the entity for a status update. Staff is already doing this and a project status update is included each month in the Executive Director's report to the Authority, as well as posted to the website.
  - ✓ At the request of a sponsoring entity, made within six months, the Authority, at its discretion, may refer the matter to the appropriate committee for recommended extension of the timeframe.
  - ✓ In all cases, agreement will be sought with the implementing jurisdiction or agency. If the agreement is not forthcoming, the Executive Director may take the de-obligation request to the Authority for action.
  - ✓ This policy governs the FY2015-16 and FY2017 Programs. The policy will be revisited prior to the adoption of the Six Year Program FY2018-2023.
- Chair Hynes moved approval of NVTA Policy 16 – Standard Project Agreement (SPA) Activation, as recommended by the Finance Committee; seconded by Chairman Bulova.
  - Chairman Bulova asked for clarification that nothing will be de-obligated without discretion and consideration for the circumstances. Ms. Backmon confirmed that is correct.
  - Chairman Nohe added that the policy states that at the six month mark, Ms. Backmon will have a meeting with the entity, but that likely she will have these meetings at the four month mark. At the six month point, Ms. Backmon will bring it to the attention of the Authority and present a recommendation when it is appropriate. Ms. Backmon confirmed this.
  - Chairman Bulova asked for clarification that de-obligation will not happen automatically. Ms. Backmon responded affirmatively.
  - Motion carried unanimously.

## **IX. Approval of the Scope of Work for the TransAction Update**

Mr. Jasper, Program Coordinator  
and Dan Malouff, Chair of TransAction Subcommittee

- Mr. Malouff briefed the Authority on the Scope of Work for the Transaction Update. He noted that:
  - ✓ Full RFP is still being reviewed by Council of Counsels.
  - ✓ Statement of Work is the planning activity only.

- ✓ Has been developed over the last six months by the TransAction Subcommittee, which is part of the JACC.
- ✓ Subcommittee has met regularly and held in depth discussion.
- ✓ JACC, TAC and PCAC have reviewed and had the opportunity to offer comments.
- ✓ Requested that the Authority approve the scope tonight.
- ✓ After approval of scope, RFP will be posted as soon as it receives Council of Counsels approval.
- ✓ Consultant selection will be this spring, with work starting after that.
- Chairman Nohe thanked Mr. Malouff for his work on this.
- Council Member Snyder moved approval of the Statement of Work for the TransAction update; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried unanimously.

**XI. Approval of Testimony on the Commonwealth Transportation Board's FY2016-2021 Six Year Improvement Program and VTrans 2040**

Ms. Dominguez, Chair, JACC

- Ms. Dominguez briefed the Authority on the draft Testimony on the Commonwealth Transportation Board's (CTB) FY2016-2021 Six Year Improvement Program (SYIP) and VTrans 2040. She noted that the JACC has developed testimony for the Six Year Improvement Program. She added that the State has been working on VTrans 2040, which is the Commonwealth's long range statewide multimodal policy plan. There is currently a draft vision, goals, objectives and guiding principles document out for comment. JACC has provided comments on this as well. Ms. Dominguez highlighted the comments on the SYIP.
  - ✓ First items generally talk about the need for the Commonwealth and the Authority to work together as HB 2313, HB 599, HB 2 and HB 1887 are all being considered.
  - ✓ 45% of HB 1887 funds go to the State of Good Repair fund. These are broken down by percentages by construction district. It is important to note that no construction district can get less than 5% or more than 17.5% of these State of Good Repair funds. Northern Virginia is expected to receive about 10.6% of these funds. For the SYIP, that is about \$36.1 million. Comment notes concern that Northern Virginia is only getting about 10.6% of these funds based on how bad some of our roads in Northern Virginia are.
  - ✓ The plan in the Draft SYIP is to substantially decrease funding for Revenue Sharing. This program allows for dollar for dollar matching from the State for funds provided by the localities. This has been incredibly successful in Northern Virginia. The plan in the SYIP is to have it at the current amount, which is about \$185 million and goes down to \$50 million in FY2021. The comment voices concern with this issue.

*(Mayor Silverthorne departed.)*

- Mr. Jasper reviewed the VTrans 2040 comments, highlighting:
  - ✓ While the vision statement appropriately addresses looking at the transportation system from a business perspective, we suggest there is a need to address the needs of Virginians, specifically, as well.
  - ✓ Are generally in agreement with guiding principles that will be used to help develop the plan, but we have the following comments:
    - Guiding principal 1 (Optimize Return on Investment) must embrace all modes and not just highways.
    - Guiding Principle 4 (Consider Operational Improvements and Demand Management First) speaks to the increasingly important role of transportation technology, as well as innovative options to influence travel behavior. In Northern Virginia these are very important and this will be addressed within our own TransAction long range plan and also the future role and impact (good or bad) of driverless vehicles.
    - Guiding Principle 5 (Provide Transparency and Accountability through Performance Management) could require the development of region wide monitoring systems to measure these things. Asked for guidance on this.
    - Guiding Principle 6 (Improving Coordination between Transportation and Land Use) notes that this will include “providing incentives” to local governments for this purpose. We would like to understand a bit more what is meant by incentives.
  - ✓ Comments on the goals include:
    - Want to understand how economic competitiveness relates to increasing person throughput as another Objective.
    - For Accessibility and Connected Places, Regional Activity Centers are very important to us in Northern Virginia, so would like to see that addressed.
    - Would like to see safety for all users incorporated in all modes, not just roadways.
- Ms. Dominguez noted that the remainder of the comments are essentially the same as comments approved in previous NVTA testimony to the CTB.
- Council Member Snyder moved approval of the Testimony on the Commonwealth Transportation Board’s FY2016 – 2021 Six-Year Improvement Program and VTrans2040 Draft Vision, Goals & Objectives, and Guiding Principles; seconded by Delegate Rust.
- Chairman Bulova noted that the CTB hearing is scheduled for April 23 which is a Board meeting day for most Authority members. She requested that in the future there be a better way of coordinating things so that this might not happen again.
- Ms. Dominguez asked if this should be included in the testimony. Chairman Bulova requested that it be added.

- Chairman Nohe stated that, as has been the case for the last 3-4 CTB hearings, VDOT has invited him, as Chairman of the Authority, to sit on the hearing panel. He noted that he will not be reading the NVTA comments into the record, but they will be provided in writing. He will reference them when asked to comment from the dais.
- Motion carried unanimously.

### **Discussion/Information**

**XII. CMAQ/RSTP Reallocation Request** Ms. Dominguez, Chair, JACC

- No verbal report.

**XIII. Finance Committee Report** Chairman York, Chair, Finance Committee

- No verbal report.

**XIV. Monthly Revenue Report** Mr. Longhi, CFO

- No verbal report.

**XV. Operating Budget Report** Mr. Longhi, CFO

- No verbal report.

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

- Ms. Backmon reminded the Authority of the upcoming Ground-breaking and noted that the invitation is in the Authority packet. She noted:
  - ✓ It is on Monday, May 11 at 1:30pm at the Innovation Avenue Bridge.
  - ✓ This speaks to the Authority being a major player in making transportation investments.

**XVII. Chairman's Comments**

**XVIII. Adjournment**

- Meeting adjourned at 7:32pm.