

NORTHERN VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

Technical Advisory Committee

January 15, 2014 – 7:00 pm

3060 Williams Drive (Suite 510)

SUMMARY NOTES

I. Call to Order/Welcome

Chair Randy Boice

- Chair Boice called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.
- Attendees:
 - ✓ Members: NVTA Chairman Nohe, ex officio; Chair Boice; Agnes Artemel; Doug Fahl; Meredith Judy; Robert Puentes; Pat Turner; Shangjiang Zhu.
 - ✓ Staff: John Mason; Mike Longhi; Camela Speer.
 - ✓ Visitors: Bob Chase; Rob Whitfield (arrived 7:45pm).
- Chairman Nohe welcomed and thanked the Committee members for their participation. He commented that NVTA is through the legislative and funding hurdles and is now in a position to determine what the Authority will be in the future, with the focus on long-term sustainable funding for transportation in Northern Virginia. He added that the challenge will be determining what the Authority does in its second, third and fourth years. Chairman Nohe stated that the legislation clearly calls for input and oversight from various bodies including the jurisdictions. The elected officials of the Authority are trusted with transportation planning and will need formal technical assistance in this planning from TAC. He concluded that this body needs to figure out how it can be most supportive of the Authority in how the Authority makes transportation decisions.

II. Clarification of Appointments and Terms

Chair Boice/John Mason

- Mr. Mason asked the members if anyone had been assigned a specific term of service when they were appointed to the Committee. General consensus was that members were aware that there were terms, but had not been assigned.
- Chairman Nohe added that his recollection was that terms were not discussed. He stated that establishing terms for the members appointed by the Authority could easily be coordinated, but those appointed by the Secretary of Transportation should be coordinated with Secretary.
- Mr. Mason commented that he would follow up.

III. Role of Technical Advisory Committee

John Mason, Interim Executive Director

- Mr. Mason reviewed the legislation creating TAC and the NVTA charge to TAC. He then requested feedback from the Committee as to what members thought the role of the Committee should be.

- Chair Boice reviewed past challenges of the Committee, citing the wealth of information to include the Six-Year Plan, Transaction 2040, COG, etc. With all these regional plans, it is challenging to get an accurate picture of what should be a regional priority. He added that jurisdictions have additional priorities.
- Mr. Mason stated that developing NVTA priorities is a process that TAC is part of, but that TAC is not tasked with deciding those priorities. The aim is for TAC to provide technical advice to NVTA. JACC is tasked with providing technical support for project selection from the viewpoint of the jurisdictions. PCAC will also play a role in this process as well.
- Member feedback regarding TAC role:
 - ✓ When VDOT releases the approved project list from the HB 599 evaluation process, the Committee can comment and provide feedback on those projects.
 - ✓ TAC should have input prior to the VDOT evaluation process. Should have input on the list of projects that go to VDOT for evaluation and on the evaluation process.
 - ✓ There is a need to form consensus on the functional classifications of all arteries in the region, classify them and create a road map that shows the whole picture.
 - ✓ Concern was expressed that last year Committee was given the 2014 project list with only two weeks to review and provide feedback. The question was raised that with jurisdictions now providing projects lists for 2015, when does TAC get to evaluate those lists and how much time will they have for evaluation. Chairman Nohe responded that these are the same challenges that NVTA is facing. He gave some background on the HB 599 process.
 - ✓ Chairman Nohe suggested that TAC should be a key player in the development of the Transaction 2045 plan that will need to be more robust than 2040 and will need to be done soon.
 - ✓ Concern was raised that the planning budget for Transaction 2040 was woefully underfunded. Chairman Nohe responded that he anticipates that there will be more funding to create a more robust 2045 plan.
 - ✓ Mr. Mason agreed that TAC should focus on the Transaction 2045 plan.
 - ✓ Chairman Nohe explained that the HB 599 evaluation process is not close to completion. At this point, VDOT, CTB and NVTA have only agreed upon the definitions of the evaluation process. He added that there are some misconceptions with expectations of what process will do/provide:
 1. Expectation was that VDOT would evaluate a large list of projects. VDOT will only evaluate 20-30 projects at a time. If a project is not evaluated, NVTA cannot fund it from the 70% money. Mr. Mason added that for this process the definition of project has been expanded to be a package of projects.
 2. Expectation was that the product of the evaluation would be a ranked project list. Evaluation will only determine that the project alleviates congestion and is regional, yes or no. We will likely get a list back that says all these projects are good.
 - ✓ Chairman Nohe added that jurisdictions are now proposing projects that they would like to see evaluated. CTB will also propose projects. A list of 50-60 projects will be narrowed to 20-30 to be evaluated.

- ✓ It was suggested that TAC should put a map on the wall and determine what projects are regionally significant and what projects will make the most impact regionally.
- ✓ The question was raised as to how transit and non-road projects are incorporated in the planning. Chair Boice responded that the Committee will need to work with NVTA and the other committees to figure out how to align this.
- ✓ Mr. Mason stated that there will be parallel planning processes going on with programmatic short-term project planning at the same time as Six-Year and long range planning.
- ✓ Chairman Nohe emphasized that a medium range project for the Committee would be developing the Transaction 2045 plan. He added that the Authority is not ready to start this yet, but would soon. He stated that in the short-term, NVTA would be submitting projects to VDOT for evaluation and they would provide an approved project list. Then, the Committee should evaluate and provide feedback as to what parts of approved projects should be funded first, which will provide the most impact. He commented that for 2014, the Authority was looking for projects that were ready to go and could be started quickly. In the future, the Authority will need engineering advice on what the best projects are for the long-term regional planning.
- ✓ Mr. Mason added that TAC could review the project list for VDOT and could provide feedback on which projects are best from an engineering perspective.
- ✓ It was suggested that TAC should help establish the criteria for the VDOT evaluation process.
- ✓ Chair Boice stated that the charge of the Committee is to review the development of major projects and potential funding sources, clarifying that TAC reviews how projects were selected and if funding strategies for the projects make sense and then provide feedback to NVTA.
- ✓ Mr. Mason emphasized that we need to figure out which part of the process TAC fits into.
- ✓ Chair Boice added that there are many groups looking at projects and we need to find the balance as to where TAC fits into the evaluation process.
- ✓ Chairman Nohe stated that the NVTA working groups will be dissolved very soon and that the committees will be taking over those roles. He added that the Planning Coordination Advisory Committee needs to be developed and will be looking at long-term capital improvements, in conjunction with TAC.
- ✓ A question was raised as to the timeline for HB 599 and how TAC fits into that timeline. It was suggested that TAC should evaluate projects before they go to VDOT evaluation and that NVTA can then use TAC for “cover” to make sure the chosen projects are the best for the VDOT study. Also suggested that there are probably other places in the timeline that TAC can review the projects again.
- ✓ Mr. Mason assured the Committee that NVTA is committed to finding a way to effectively incorporate the TAC into the regional planning process. He advised the group that there is an institutionalized process currently that gives the JACC dominance in this process, as well as other regional processes. The JACC makes

recommendations directly to the Authority. However, the JACC focuses primarily on short-term projects, so TAC should review longer-term projects. He added that the JACC has representation from all jurisdictions.

- ✓ It was stated that TAC needs to review projects early enough in the process to have influence.
- ✓ Mr. Mason added that the TAC Chair needs to speak directly to the Authority, not go through another Committee.

- Mr. Mason will draft a paper to address the role of TAC in the NVTA process.
- Chairman Nohe added that the highway versus transit is a mixed question and very political. Many believe transit is the only good way to move people. Other jurisdictions believe highways may not be the best way, but are the only way in some jurisdictions. Transit agencies make project requests to NVTA as well as the jurisdictions. One challenge is that most transit projects are in a specific jurisdiction and while they will alleviate regional congestion, they may not impact the jurisdiction the project is in. Transit projects are competing with jurisdiction projects, not interstates. It used to be that transit automatically got so much transportation funding off the top, then the rest went to highways. He pointed out that transit projects do not need to be evaluated by VDOT, but are competing with highways for funding.
- Chair Boice observed that Transaction 2040 includes all forms of transportation. He suggested there needs to be a balanced approach to regional transportation.
- Mr. Mason pointed out that this conversation has been about the 70% funding, that the 30% funding has another set of rules. And, that the legislation states that all nine jurisdictions must receive proportional benefit for their investment over a six year period.
- The question was raised as to whether freight projects were included in this mix. Chairman Nohe answered they are.
- The question was raised as to whether technological projects, such as HOT lanes, are included. Mr. Mason answered that they are and are scorable and significant. Chairman Nohe responded that there are good future opportunities to do more PPTA projects like the HOT lanes. He suggested that in the next year we should think about what kinds of projects we want PPTAs to bring to NVTA as proposals.

IV. Update on NVTA Organization and Activities

John Mason

- Mr. Mason gave a brief overview of NVTA, highlighting the NVTA organizational chart and the transition from working groups to committees and staff.

V. Preferred Meeting Date/Time

Chair Boice

- Chair Boice polled the Committee for preferred meeting days and times. Consensus was to hold future meetings on the 3rd Wednesday of each month at 7pm at NVTA.

VI. Next Steps for TAC

John Mason

- NVTA staff to send out tonight's meeting minutes to attendees who missed meeting.
- Mr. Mason to create agenda and further define role of Committee for next meeting.

- Meeting adjourned at 8:14pm.