



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

**PLANNING COORDINATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Monday, September 22, 2014, 9:30am**  
**3060 Williams Drive, Suite 510**  
**Fairfax, Virginia 22031**

**SUMMARY NOTES**

**I. Call to Order/Welcome**

Chairman Nohe

- Chairman Nohe called the meeting to order 9:36am.
- Attendees: NVTA Chairman Nohe
  - ✓ Members:, Mayor Foreman; Council Member Way; Council Member Burk; Supervisor Candland; Council Member Lehr; Supervisor McKay; Council Member Merkel; Council Member Oliver; Council Member Smedberg.
  - ✓ NVTA Staff: Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Denise Harris (Program Coordinator); Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator).
  - ✓ Other Staff: Noelle Dominguez (Fairfax County), Bob Brown (Loudoun County); Rick Canizales (Prince William County); Sarah Crawford (Arlington County); Mark Duceman (Town of Herndon); Christine Hoeffner (VRE); and Linda Tenney (NVRC).

**II. NVTA Overview and PCAC Charge**

Chairman Nohe/Ms. Backmon

- NVTA Chairman Nohe gave an overview of the NVTA since its inception. He stated the original purpose of the Planning Coordination Advisory Committee (PCAC) was to provide for representation of the towns and enable a forum for input. However, in 2007, the NVTA Bylaws were amended to include one non-voting member from the towns with a population of 3,500 or more. The town member will rotate on an annual basis. The charge of the PCAC is to provide a forum for peer review and oversight. Specifically the PCAC charge is the committee shall be responsible for advising the NVTA on broad policy issues related to the periodic update of the NVTA's Long Range Transportation Plan (e.g., TransAction 2040) and the development of the NVTA's Six Year Program with special consideration to regional transportation, land use and growth issues and provide advisory recommendations to the NVTA.
- Ms. Backmon gave an overview of the work products that are currently being undertaken by the Authority. She noted that the Authority, through its Project Implementation Working Group (PIWG) is in the process of developing the draft FY2015-16 Two Year Program for consideration of the Authority. As part of the development of the Program, Ms. Backmon reviewed the status of the HB 599 process and how it relates to the development of the Two Year Program. The scheduled adoption of the FY2015-16 Two Year Program is March 2015. Ms.

Backmon also informed the Committee that the Authority will be holding a Listening Session as part of the update to the TransAction 2040 plan. The Listening Session will be held on Thursday, October 9, prior to the NVTa meeting.

### **III. Discussion of NVTa FY2015-16 Two Year Program**

Mr. Jasper

- Mr. Jasper gave a presentation on the draft FY2015-16 Two Year Program project selection criteria and schedule.
- The following discussion occurred during the presentation on the FY2015-16 Two Year Program project selection criteria.
  - ✓ A question was raised as to whether projects approved for FY2014 would automatically be funded for the FY2015/16 Two Year Program. The response noted that there is no formal commitment to fund previously approved projects for inclusion in the Two Year Program. It was recommended that this issue be further explored. There is an expectation and the law requires that the Authority give priority to the projects that provide the greatest level of congestion reduction relative to cost.
  - ✓ A question was asked if any funding has been set aside to continue funding previously approved projects. The response was this had not occurred.
  - ✓ There was discussion about how towns are different from counties and cities as it relates to NVTa funding. The town must work with their counties on the allocation/programming of their 30% funds. The PCAC members were reminded that towns do not have a Commercial and Industrial Tax or Maintenance of Effort provision as the counties and cities do. A comment was made that if a town received 70% regional funds for one year but not subsequent years, project completion could be in jeopardy without additional revenue options. The response was that the NVTa Standard Project Agreement covers all these issues. The point was made that 70% monies should not be set aside, but need to be allocated to projects ready to be implemented. Additionally, NVTa cannot become the sole funding source of transportation projects. The region is entitled to its fair share of federal and state dollars. A concern was expressed about allocations to FY2014 projects that have been funded but require future funding to implement subsequent construction phases. The response was the project selection process takes these concerns into consideration and that cost sharing is viewed favorably. It was also noted that some projects may be delayed due to the HB 2 process.
  - ✓ It was stated that it would be helpful to understand the financing options available to towns, counties and cities to determine what the jurisdictions are doing to raise other revenue sources.
  - ✓ Concerns were raised regarding the process VDOT is undertaking with the Six Year Improvement Program and the HB 2 process. Local jurisdictions

further expressed concern about losing VDOT funding on projects not progressing.

- ✓ The question was raised as to whether projects should be included in comprehensive plans. The response was that projects must be in the comprehensive plan of the locality in which the project is located.
- ✓ There was a discussion about the difference between project selection criteria and long term benefits. The PCAC members were informed that long term benefits are not part of the project selection process. The principles of long term benefits are being developed for NVTA approval. The draft project selection criteria looks at general geographic balance and modal balance, but will not look at the technical benefit question.
- ✓ A potential issue of one jurisdiction's priorities not aligning with a neighboring jurisdiction's priorities was raised. The group was then walked through how the call for projects worked with the 2010 CLRP and TransAction 2040 plans serving as the universe of projects to be considered for funding. The NVTA chose the projects to be submitted for the HB 599 rating process which excludes transit from this round. All of approved FY2014 projects were in TransAction 2040 and went through the prioritization process conducted as part of the 2040 Plan analysis. This process was upheld in the Bond Validation Suit by the Fairfax Circuit Court. In the future, transit projects should be included in the HB 599 analysis. The NVTA is working with VDOT and the Department of Rail and Public Transportation to conduct a test run of transit projects through the HB 599 model.
- ✓ There was a brief discussion on scenario planning in the TransAction 2040 plan update.

*(Supervisor Candland departed 10:36 am.)*

- ✓ Clarification was requested on the impact of the VDOT preliminary HB 599 rankings versus the final ratings due by December 31. The response was that the preliminary rankings were interim to start the HB 599 process with no impact to the project selection process. The final detailed ratings will go into the project selection process in December. It was also noted that the detailed ratings are related to congestion relief and will be considered with other project selection criteria like geographic balance.
- ✓ A question was asked about whether a "wait list" of projects will be created for projects not included in the Two Year Program in the event funding becomes available due to previously funded projects no longer requiring the funds. The response was the money goes back into the 70% regional fund for future use.

- ✓ Questions were raised as to whether the project selection process is subjective. The response was project selection is the result of the rigorous analysis and project selection criteria done in TransAction 2040 long range transportation plan.
- ✓ The Committee raised the issue of changing land use and questioned whether the project selection analysis encompasses current land use plans. The response was that the NVTA staff is meeting with jurisdictional and agency staff to ensure that the analysis includes the most comprehensive data available. In addition, VDOT charged their consultant, AECOM, to meet with each jurisdiction to ensure that model inputs/assumptions for jurisdictional projects were correct prior to running the model for HB 599 analysis.
- ✓ A question was raised about whether regional connectivity is part of the scoring in the project selection process. It was suggested that the selection criteria should look at jurisdictional connectivity to improve the transportation network as an important criteria. The response was that this point will be taken back to the PIWG.
- ✓ The comment was made that there are challenges related to funding transit capital and operations outside the NVTA region. It was pointed out that Delegate Albo's resolution that the NVTA adopted in March, states the NVTA shall not allocate any funding for a transit project until D.C. and/or Maryland (where applicable) have committed their share of the revenues needed. Additionally, VRE is complicated as its service area includes three jurisdictions not in the NVTA region.
- Mr. Jasper concluded by stating that the transportation projects recommended for inclusion in the Two Year Program will be vetted through the PCAC prior to NVTA approval.

#### **IV. PCAC Organizational Discussion**

- Ms. Backmon introduced the items of electing a PCAC Chairman and Vice Chairman per the Bylaws.
- Mayor Merkel moved to nominate Mayor Foreman as Chairman of the Planning Coordination Advisory Committee, seconded by Council Member Lehr. Motion carried unanimously.
- Council Member Burk moved to nominate Council Member Way as Vice Chairman; seconded by Mayor Foreman. Motion carried unanimously.
- Ms. Backmon stated she would work with the Chairman and Vice Chairman on the future meeting times of the PCAC. She added that a call in feature cannot be allowed for the PCAC meetings.

## Discussion/Information

- V. TransAction 2040 Update Listening Session** Ms. Harris
- Ms. Harris noted that a flyer was included in the meeting packet which invited Committee members to attend the Listening Session on October 9 at 5:00 pm at Fairfax City Hall.
- VI. FY 21 CMAQ/RSTP Program Development Schedule** Ms. Harris
- Ms. Harris noted that there is an informational item in the meeting packet that contains the schedule for the FY2021 CMAQ/RSTP Program Development.
- VII. Other Business**
- VIII. Next Meeting**
- The committee will meet in November and December with the times to be determined.

## Adjournment

- IX. Adjournment**
- Meeting adjourned at 11:14am.