

NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Technical Advisory Committee

March 19, 2014 at 7pm

NVTA Office – 3060 Williams Drive (Suite 510)

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Call to Order/Welcome

Chair Boice

- Chair Boice called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.
- Attendees:
 - ✓ Members: Chair Boice; Agnes Artemel; Robert Dunphy (arrived 7:09pm); Doug Fahl; Meredith Judy; Pat Turner; Shangjiang Zhu.
 - ✓ NVTA Staff: John Mason (Interim Executive Director); Michael Longhi (CFO); Camela Speer (Clerk).
 - ✓ Other Staff: Noelle Dominguez (Fairfax County); Kanti Srikanth (VDOT); Valerie Pardo (VDOT); Dalia Leven (AECOM, VDOT Study Team).
 - ✓ Visitors: Pierre Holloman; Rob Whitfield.

II. Approval of Summary Notes – February 19, 2014

- Mr. Fahl moved to approve the minutes of February 19, 2014; seconded by Ms. Turner. Motion carried with five (5) yeas and one (1) abstention [with Ms. Artemel abstaining as she was not at the February meeting].

III. Update on Project Selection Process and Nominations

Kanti Srikanth, VDOT

- Mr. Srikanth presented the update on the Project Selection Process and Nominations. Ms. Leven further explained the Project Selection Process.

(Mr. Dunphy arrived.)

- Robust discussion followed to clarify specific criteria, project ratings and observations of the Project Selection Model. There was general appreciation for the PSM concept and the effort to quantify the evaluation process. It was also recognized that this is a first time initiative and that much will be learned from the first round.
- The following observations/suggestions were made:
 - ✓ Although VDOT used congestion averages of a project segment for this analysis, sometimes a more congested spot could be the better measure of the big picture.
 - ✓ It may be difficult to compare roadway segments to entire corridors.

- ✓ Activity center identification may not accurately reflect today's activity centers, especially in the outer jurisdictions. It was suggested this be reviewed.
- ✓ Projects that do not connect activity centers get much lower ratings than those that connect multiple activity centers, but may relieve as much or more congestion.
- ✓ The committee was pleased that the PSM scores will not be used in the subsequent evaluation and there will be no composite score (of the PSM and evaluation score). It was acknowledged that subsequent review to understand potential correlations (PSM vs. evaluation) would be useful.
- ✓ Currently the Project Selection Weights (paper) curves are not drawn to scale; would be more understandable if to scale.
- ✓ Some projects within an activity center should be considered local projects, not regional. The implication of this is that some projects would be more appropriate for 30% funding category.
- ✓ Since ultimate decisions will be driven by a political process, there is concern that the public will selectively pick the PSM scores and use them to push back on VDOT about the technical evaluation results, especially if very different results.
- ✓ Jurisdictions will know how to game this process for next year, drafting their project applications to "score" higher in PSM process.
- ✓ There was general concern about making decisions on project selections without awareness of projects already programmed or under way that, if known, would assuage concerns about lack of inclusion on list of proposed projects. Suggestion was made to incorporate identification of these projects with a circle and label on map.
- ✓ Project NVTA-18 (Real-Time Adaptive Traffic Control) should not have rated a zero for criterion #9 (Adds Capacity). VDOT responded that there is a need to figure out how to better score technology projects.
- ✓ Project NVTA-23 (Route 7/690 Interchange) should not have rated zero in several categories. Suggested need to look at whole system in that area. VDOT will review this project and the information submitted on the project nomination form.
- ✓ Criterion #10 (Reduces Vehicle Trips) should give credit to projects that are diverting traffic from another segment or route. VDOT explained that this was not the intent of this criterion, that it was intended more for transit projects.
- ✓ Project NVTA-5 (Van Dorn Street Interchange) should not have rated a 100 for criterion #1 (Project Type). VDOT will review again.
- ✓ On-grade railroad crossing may need some special consideration that is unique from PSM process.
- ✓ A few transit projects should be run through the evaluation process to determine how process works for transit projects in future nominations and studies.
- ✓ It was suggested that VDOT's posting only evaluation scores may not satisfy public expectations with respect to credibility of process.

- Mr. Srikanth requested that the TAC review the PSM process and scores and provide feedback to VDOT to be used to fine-tune the process for future studies.
- Mr. Mason proposed to draft meeting summary and distribute to TAC members as starting point for additional feedback.

IV. Discussion of Potential Initiative

John Mason, Interim Executive Director

- Mr. Mason noted that the TAC process this evening was exactly what this committee should be doing.
- Mr. Mason proposed a topic for the next TAC meeting. The legislation requires that NVTA member jurisdictions get a “benefit” over time proportional to their contribution to NVTA transportation funding. He stated that there is a need to define “benefit,” taking into account that NVTA has informally discussed benefit being over a six year period. It was agreed that this would be taken on as a “homework” assignment in preparation for April meeting.

V. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 8:53pm.