

Project Implementation Working Group
Fairfax County Division of Transportation
Legato Building, 4th Floor Conference Room
Fairfax, Virginia

Minutes

Meeting Held On,
June 28, 2013; 10:00 a.m.

Attendees:

Members:

Chris Zimmerman, Chair
Joe Swartz, DRPT
Jim Maslanka – Alexandria
Jennifer Fioretti – Arlington
Paul Stoddard – Falls Church
Joe Kroboth, III, PE –
Loudoun
Ron Kirkpatrick – Fairfax
Patrick Moore – Manassas
Rich Roisman – COG/TPB
Rick Canizales – Prince
William

Mark Kellogg – WMATA
Mariela Garcia-Colberg –
NVTC
Cynthia Porter-Johnson –
PRTC
Helen Cuervo – VDOT
Wendy Block-Sanford – City
of Fairfax
Doug Allen, VRE
Christine Hoeffner, VRE
Karyn Moreland- Fairfax
Calvin Grow-Leesburg

Tom Biesiadny – Fairfax
Noelle Dominguez - Fairfax
David Dickson – Sierra Club
Tracy Baynard -McGuire
Woods Consulting
Rob Whitfield – Dulles
Corridor Users Group
Bob Chase - NVTA
TL Cranmer –FC Taxpayers

I. Welcome and Introduction

Chairman Zimmerman called the meeting to order.

II. Approval of Summary of June 14, 2013 Meeting Minutes

There were no comments or corrections. The minutes were approved.

III. Summary of June 20, 2013 NVTA Meeting and Recommendations

Mr. Zimmerman reported that all recommendations of the PWIG were approved by the NVTA. He also reported that the NVTA approved the financial and legal group recommendations.

IV. Report from other Working Groups

The following updates were provided:

A. Financial Working Group (“FWG”) – Tom Biesiadny reported that the group met on Thursday June 27, 2013. The FWG meeting focused on the NVTA budget; they also had discussion with the towns about revenues. Also, The FWG worked to finalize the Memorandum of Understanding between NVTA, the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission and Arlington County Treasurer for the payment of NVTA’s bills. Mr. Biesiadny also reported that the subcommittee on VRE/ metro issues has been meeting.

B. Public Outreach Working Group (“POWG”) – No update was given.

C. Legal Working Group (“LWG”) – Tom Biesiadny reported that the legal working group has been collecting documents for bond counsel.

D. Organizational Working Group (“OWG”) –Noelle Dominguez reported that the NVTA will pursue the appointment of an interim Executive Director who will assist NVTA for at least 6 months. The NVTA is working this internally. Also, Ms. Dominguez reported that the OWG will recommend that NVTA offices are housed at NVRC for the interim.

V. Review of Overarching Questions

A. Public Comments

Mr. Zimmerman explained that we received a total of 72 comments. Ms. Fioretti organized those comments for the committee. The PIWG received no comments that dealt with the proposed selection criteria.

1. Review of public comments

Jennifer Fioretti presented two packets of tables/ charts to the PIWG. The first chart is comprised of the 69 raw comments which include the comment, the project name, name of commenter, and a summary. She also handed out three more comments received on June 27th that were not yet added in the chart; bring the total comments to 72. She then proceeded to explain chart number two; a project specific list. This chart is a subset of the first, comprised of only project specific comments. She explained that some comments made, or emails received, mentioned more than one project so this was an attempt to separate all comments into individual projects. Project specific comments from the 69 raw comments totaled 194. Staff will amend the public comment forms to include the three additional comments and share with the group at the next PIWG meeting.

2. Organization of public comments

Jennifer Fioretti also handed out a sheet which summarized how many comments were received by each jurisdiction. She explained that the jurisdictional/agency staff may either respond to the commentator directly or send responses to the PIWG coordinator so they can be posted in the website. Also, the jurisdictional/agency staff should decide if they want to respond to each individual comment or respond to a group of comments that deal with the same issue in a paragraph. Comments and responses are due by July 7th, 2013.

B. Discussion of process to develop FY 2014 project list

Mr. Zimmerman explained that the PIWG needs to provide a shorter narrower list of projects to the NVTA. He noted that prior to June 20, 2013 he and Mr. Garczynski were in favor of recommending a project list that allocates somewhat less than the funding available in FY 2014. However, he also noted that the budgeted NVTA revenue is now \$204 million and the recommendations are already below the \$190 million, which means that the recommendations are less than the expected revenues. Mr. Zimmerman also explained that, should the Authority approve a FY 14 bond list drawn from the recommended projects, the FY 2014 PAYG list will naturally diminish because some projects will have been moved to the bond list.

1. Evaluation of project list

a. Review of existing criteria

Rick Canizales discussed some of the additional criteria for the bond project list. After discussion and further clarification, the members decided the criteria for bond validation projects shall be: twenty year useful life, multimodal, geographic balance, high ranking, project dollar size, leverages local, state, or federal funds. Although not required, all the jurisdictions and agencies will have until July 3rd if they wish to recommend projects for the bond project list. Projects will only be selected from the existing submission list of 48 projects.

b. Additional selection criteria?

Mr. Jim Maslanka suggested that members look at leverage as an important criterion for projects that go to the bond project list. This was agreed, as it is among the basic project criteria which are being applied for all projects under consideration.

c. Review Calendar and Discuss Dates for Next Steps

Mr. Zimmerman reiterated the dates for next steps:

July 3 – recommendations from jurisdiction to move project to bond list due.

July 7 – response to public comments due.

July 8 – next PIWG meeting at 2:00p.m.

C. Discussion of PCAC and TAC role in selecting projects for implementation?

1. Six-Year Program

Mr. Zimmerman reported that both the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Planning Coordination Advisory Committee (PCAC) met consistently and were involved in the selection process for the projects for TransAction 2040. It would be good to formalize their involvement for the Six-Year Program Plan.

Mr. Zimmerman explained that both of these bodies have had significant turnover. Ms. Monica Backmon is trying to set up meetings for both committees in July.

VI. Discuss Dates for Next Meeting

The next PWIG meeting will be held July 8th at 2:00 p.m. at the Fairfax County DOT, 4050 Legato Road, Conference Room 400 East and West, Fairfax County, Virginia.

VII. Meeting was Adjourned