

NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Project Implementation Working Group

July 11, 2014 at 10am

Fairfax Department of Transportation Office – 4050 Legato Road (Suite 400)

SUMMARY NOTES

I. Introductions

- Chairman Nohe called the meeting to order at 10:05am. The meeting began with participant self-introductions.
- Attendees:
 - ✓ PIWG Members: Chairman Nohe, Vice Chair Garczynski, Marti Reinfeld (City of Alexandria); Larry Marcus, Sarah Crawford, Jason Friess (Arlington County); Tom Biesiadny, Karyn Moreland, Ray Johnson, Noelle Dominguez (Fairfax County); Paul Stoddard (City of Falls Church); Bob Brown (Loudoun County); Patrick Moore (City of Manassas); Rick Canizales (Prince William County); Allison Davis (WMATA); Jillian Linnell (NVTC); Cynthia Porter-Johnson (PRTC); Rich Roisman (TPB); Helen Cuervo; Renee Hamilton; Kanti Srikanth; Valerie Pardo, Maria Sinner (VDOT); Joe Swartz (VRE).
 - ✓ NVRTA Members: Board Member Hynes (Arlington County); Chairman York (Loudoun County); Council Member Rishell (City of Manassas Park); Mayor Parrish (City of Manassas); Miss Bushue (Governor's Appointee); Delegate Rust (Virginia House of Delegates).
 - ✓ NVRTA Staff: Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Mike Longhi (CFO); Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator); Denise Harris (Program Coordinator); Peggy Teal (Accountant).
 - ✓ Other Staff: Richard West (Town of Dumfries); Mark Duceman (Town of Herndon); Mark Thomas; Cam Plunkett (Chairman's Office, Fairfax County).
 - ✓ Other: Dalia Leven (AECOM); Rob Whitfield (Dulles Corridor Users Group).

II. Approval of Summary of March 21, 2014 Meeting

- Chairman York moved to approve the minutes of March 21, 2014; seconded by Mr. West. Motion carried unanimously.

III. Reports from Financial Committee/Working Group

- Mr. Longhi reported that all member jurisdictions are now receiving '30 percent' funds from NVRTA. He also reported that the Authority's line of credit facility was in place.

IV. Report and Discussion on VDOT Basic Evaluation and Rating of Regional Projects

- Mr. Srikanth presented the preliminary findings of the HB 599 study. Page numbers below refer to Mr. Srikanth's presentation dated July 11, 2014, entitled *Evaluation and Rating of Significant Transportation Projects in NoVA*.

Page #2

- ✓ The findings are high level and are intended for use by NVTA as a first set of ratings to support its programming needs.
- ✓ The regional travel demand model used for the basic ratings is good for assessing the impact of segments and corridors, but a modified version of this model was developed to evaluate the operational impacts of some types of project.
- ✓ It will not be necessary for future HB 599 studies to include two sets of ratings. However the analysis needed to generate these initial, or basic, ratings will continue to be required for the final ratings in future HB 599 studies.

Page #3

- ✓ Six intersection improvement/Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) projects necessitated the development of a modified travel demand model. The detailed analysis that will form the basis for the final ratings uses a different model that is better suited for all 37 projects being rated.

Page #4

- ✓ Five performance measures were used to evaluate each project, weighted equally. Three measures addressed the roadway being improved and two measures looked at the area experiencing the greatest impact as a result of the project.
- ✓ The study's peer review group recommended the third roadway performance measure (person miles of travel per capacity increase) to ensure that smaller projects were not at an inherent disadvantage due to their size.

Page #6

- ✓ Mr. Srikanth explained that the area of greatest impact for each project was selected to ensure that the modelling tools did not disadvantage any projects. The detailed results later this year will be less affected by such issues.
- ✓ In response to a question from Council Member Rishell, Mr. Srikanth confirmed that project impact reduces with distance from the project facility.
- ✓ Board Member Hynes asked about the definition of 'Person Miles of Travel'. Mr. Srikanth confirmed that while the person miles of travel measures included all modes, none of the projects are for transit improvements. In response to a

question from Delegate Rust, Mr. Srikanth confirmed that the modeling tools included factors to reflect the level of single-occupant vehicles (SOV).

Page #9

- ✓ Mr. Srikanth noted that projects marked with a '*' were on new alignments. The analysis of these projects considered existing adjacent facilities that would be replaced.
- ✓ Chairman Nohe asked why Project #11 (US-1 Widening, Dumfries) was rated 'high' in 2020 and 'low' in 2040, and why there are apparent inconsistencies in the ratings of adjacent projects along the same route, e.g. US-1.
- ✓ Mr. Srikanth explained that the 2020 ratings may differ from the 2040 ratings for a number of reasons, including changes in demographic and employment patterns, and the scheduling of project improvements. He noted, however, that just because a project is included in the CLRP does not guarantee when it will be constructed, if at all. The detailed ratings will incorporate some 'clean up' related to incorrect CLRP data. In general, projects in the outer jurisdictions did better in 2040.
- ✓ Mr. Garczynski suggested that modeling anomalies need to be identified (or fixed) before NVTA makes any investment decisions. Chairman York suggested that the jurisdiction proposing each project be identified.
- ✓ Board Member Hynes requested an explanation of the difference between these preliminary findings and the detailed findings expected in December. Mr. Srikanth explained that it was unusual for two different modeling processes to be used to evaluate the same projects. It was difficult to know what the differences will be between the basic and detailed ratings. Typically, regional models do not address congestion on adjacent links, and focus more on links rather than intersections. The detailed model that VDOT will be using will reflect real world conditions better than the regional model used for the basic ratings. Another difference is that the detailed ratings will use a different set of measures compared to the basic ratings. Overall, Mr. Srikanth expected a broadly similar pattern of results, with lower rated projects performing slightly better in the detailed ratings.
- ✓ At the conclusion of the rating study, the new TRANSIMS model will be available to NVTA and other jurisdictions for detailed regional modeling, including signal timing/phasing.

Page #10

- ✓ Mr. Srikanth stated that project maps would be available after July 24. Board Member Hynes asked whether the maps should be enhanced to include details of the other relevant/nearby projects that have been included. It was concluded this would be difficult for HB 599, but should be addressed during the update of TransAction 2040.

- ✓ Delegate Rust asked whether VDOT has taken into account which projects jurisdictions have implemented. Mr. Srikanth stated these are included in the base case, but any improvements currently in process may affect this.
 - ✓ Chairman Nohe asked to what extent the findings reflect regional significance. Mr. Srikanth suggested the detailed ratings will reflect regional significance more than the basic ratings.
 - ✓ Chairman York asked about the interaction between project #8 (Belmont Ridge Road) and project #22 (Northstar Boulevard). Mr. Srikanth suggested they discuss the details after the meeting.
- Chairman Nohe suggested that there be less technical detail in the report to the Authority on July 24.

V. Discussion of NVTA Six Year Program

A. Coordination with VDOT Evaluation and Rating Study

Mr. Srikanth stated VDOT's analysis will be complete by the end of October 2014, noting the draft will be available in November and final HB 599 ratings will be published by the end of December 2014. Mr. Garczynski indicated that the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) would likely handle the HB 599 ratings as a consensus item, rather than an action item. Mr. Srikanth added that there should be less focus on the methodology for the final ratings, as this has already been discussed and agreed between VDOT and NVTA.

The next HB 599 cycle is scheduled for next year. When started, VDOT estimates that the second round of HB 599 analysis should take 6 to 8 months to complete. PIWG discussed the feasibility of having a call for projects in December 2014, although no firm decision was made. VDOT indicated that after the next cycle, the intent is to repeat HB 599 every four years. Concerns were expressed that this may lead to some inflexibility for updating the Six Year Program.

Uncertainties associated with the implementation of HB2 were noted, particularly with respect to proposed projects that will use co-mingled state and local funds. Chairman Nohe stated it that it is important to know which projects rely on state funding. Board Member Hynes agreed that Authority members should be aware of this, and noted that the HB 599 ratings are one of several factors to be taken into account for making funding decisions.

Mr. Garczynski added that the CTB will be initiating a task force to address the implementation of HB 2. In Northern Virginia, the focus of HB 2 is expected to favor projects that provide congestion relief, using a simplified process. Chairman York stated that HB 2 must be implemented starting in FY2017.

Delegate Rust asked how HB 2 will address congestion relief in other parts of the state. Mr. Garczynski stated this has yet to be decided, but is likely to be less

rigorous than the HB 599 approach used in Northern Virginia. It was noted that the update of the TransAction 2040 should consider HB 2 and HB 599 as the process develops. Mr. Brown (Loudoun County) suggested that NVTA could conduct the HB 599 process using VDOT's model.

B. Timeline and Steps for NVTA Six Year Program Strawman

Mr. Canizales presented a draft schedule for the FY2015-16 Two Year Program, with NVTA approval planned in April/May 2015. Project selection criteria may need to be reviewed to reflect different priorities compared to the FY2014 project selection process. The draft schedule assumes coordination with the JACC, TAC, and PCAC in October, although this could occur in September if the schedule needs to be accelerated. Depending on how public involvement is addressed, it may be possible to accelerate the schedule from late spring to early spring.

VI. Other Business

- None

VII. Next Meeting

- 10:00 am, Monday August 18, 2014 at FCDOT offices, Legato Road.

VIII. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.