

NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Technical Advisory Committee

April 16, 2014 at 7pm

NVTA Office – 3060 Williams Drive (Suite 510)

SUMMARY NOTES

I. Call to Order/Welcome

Chair Boice

- Chair Boice called the meeting to order at 7:01pm.
- Attendees:
 - ✓ Members: Chair Boice; Agnes Artemel; Robert Dunphy; Doug Fahl; Pat Turner; Shangjiang Zhu.
 - ✓ NVTA Staff: John Mason (Interim Executive Director); Michael Longhi (CFO); Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator).
 - ✓ Other Staff: Noelle Dominguez (Vice Chair, JACC).
- Mr. Mason introduced Keith Jasper, who provided an overview of his transportation background and experience.
- Mr. Mason explained that all Committee members appointed by NVTA will serve for a term of three years, with no limit to the number of terms that can be served. However, the duration of the initial term for some current members will be less than three years to minimize the number of Committee members up for re-election or replacement in any given year. The following initial terms were agreed:
 - ✓ Chair Boice – two years (2013-2015)
 - ✓ Agnes Artemel – two years (2013-2015)
 - ✓ Pat Turner – one year (2013-2014)
 - ✓ Absent NVTA members – TBD
- The duration of terms for Committee members appointed by the Secretary of Transportation were set at the time of their appointment.

II. Approval of Summary Notes – March 19, 2014

- Following a brief discussion regarding the wording in the penultimate sub-bullet on page 1 of the March 19, 2014 draft minutes, Committee members agreed that “sometimes a worst spot could be the better measure of the big picture” be replaced with “sometimes a more congested spot could be the better measure of the big picture”.
- Agnes Artemel moved to approve the minutes of March 19, 2014 with the above modification; seconded by Doug Fahl. Motion carried unanimously.

III. “Benefits” – Definition and Methodology

- Mr. Mason set the context for the discussion by referencing a key passage from HB2313 regarding long-term benefits for each locality, and by summarizing some topics for consideration by TAC members.
- The Committee had a wide-ranging discussion regarding “Benefits” and possible approaches for determining the “Benefits” to each jurisdiction. Key highlights/suggestions were:
 - ✓ Terms such as “Benefit” and “Long-Term” are not defined by HB 2313.
 - ✓ Funds should be allocated to projects that help to achieve regional solutions. A regional plan is needed that will lead to regional projects that are prioritized for implementation. The TransAction 2040 Plan does not do this.
 - ✓ Regional projects can be expected to have an impact beyond the jurisdiction in which they are implemented. This is important for achieving a geographic balance in the allocation of benefits.
 - ✓ It was noted that current forecasts call for a larger population in the future and we must anticipate that congestion will worsen if we do not make transportation investments and/or change land use policies.
 - ✓ Regional activity centers may represent a good focus for transportation improvements.
 - ✓ Projects selected for implementation must reflect urban density and scale in the locality.
 - ✓ It is critical to demonstrate how projects selected for implementation will be a benefit to the region. This calls for an objective and robust methodology towards estimating impacts and benefits, leveraging existing data sources and models. The methodology must embrace highway, rail, and transit improvements.
 - ✓ It was suggested that a review be conducted to determine whether there are any lessons that can be learned related to allocation of benefits from the original WMATA Compact. NVTC has an allocation model for operational costs.
 - ✓ Potential benefits-related metrics could include delay, travel time, emissions/pollution and accessibility.
 - ✓ Project development schedules and the slow rate of making changes in land use mean estimation of benefits should be made over a period of not less than six years, and could actually be longer.
 - ✓ It is difficult to communicate the concept of transportation investments making traffic conditions better than they would have been, while not actually making conditions better than they are today.
- At the conclusion of the discussion, the Committee agreed four key principles:
 - ✓ Benefits may have a positive impact on multiple jurisdictions.
 - ✓ Benefits to jurisdictions cannot be equated to revenues generated by, or attributable to, each jurisdiction.
 - ✓ The minimum time period for the estimation of benefit accruing to each locality should be at least six years.

- ✓ The estimation of benefits should take advantage of ongoing analyses and existing models.

IV. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 8:15pm.