



Northern Virginia Transportation Authority
The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia

Thursday, March 10, 2016
7:00 pm
3040 Williams Drive, Suite 200
Fairfax, Virginia 22031

MEETING MINUTES

I. Call to Order Chairman Nohe

- Chairman Nohe called the meeting to order at 7:12pm.

II. Roll Call Ms. Speer, Clerk

- Voting Members: Chairman Nohe; Chairman Bulova; Board Member Fisette; Mayor Silberberg (arrived 7:39pm); Mayor Parrish; Council Member Rishell; Council Member Snyder; Mr. Garczynski; Miss Bushue.
- Non-Voting Members: Ms. Cuervo; Mr. Horsley.
- Staff: Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Michael Longhi (CFO); Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator); Sree Nampoothiri (Program Coordinator); Camela Speer (Clerk); various jurisdictional staff.
- Chairman Nohe noted that Mayor Silverthorne and Chair Randall were unable to attend this meeting due to jurisdictional budget presentations. He added that Mayor Silberberg would arrive late to the meeting.

III. Minutes of the January 14, 2016 Meeting

- Mayor Parrish moved approval of the January 14, 2016 minutes; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried with seven (7) yeas and one (1) abstention [with Council Member Snyder abstaining as he was not at the January 14, 2016 meeting].

Presentations

IV. TransAction Update Mr. Jasper, Program Coordinator

- Mr. Jasper presented the TransAction overview video to the Authority and shared tentative upcoming outreach opportunities.
- Chairman Nohe asked about the tentatively scheduled workshop at Queen of Apostles Church on Sunday, May 15, 2016. Mr. Jasper responded that the TransAction consultants have recommended this time and location based on previous outreach efforts to engage the Spanish community. Chairman Nohe

asked if the workshop would be bilingual or entirely in Spanish. Mr. Jasper responded that it would be bilingual, with Spanish translators available.

- Miss Bushue asked who the intended audience for the TransAction video is. Mr. Jasper responded that the initial audience is the jurisdictional governing bodies and the second is the general public. Miss Bushue stated that the video is not effective to her and looks like a typical bureaucratic video. Ms. Backmon responded that the sole purpose of the video is to explain what TransAction is. Ms. Backmon thanked Miss Bushue for her feedback.
- Board Member Fisette inquired about the format of the pop-up presentations. Mr. Jasper responded that the presentations would be tailored to what is appropriate for each event. He stated that most would have a booth comprised of a tent and table manned by a combination of NVTAs, consulting and jurisdictional staff to interact with the public and encourage them to tell us their transportation needs. He added that there would be tablets to enable data collection. Board Member Fisette asked if the tablets would have a questionnaire on them that would be consistent and allow for tabulation of results. Mr. Jasper acknowledged that this is the plan and that staff would assist with the taking of the questionnaire, particularly for those not comfortable with the technology.
- Mr. Garczynski asked if there would take-a-ways available at the public engagement presentations. Mr. Jasper responded that the details for these events are still being coordinated. He stated that the primary goal is to drive people to the website and social media channels to allow for continued interaction. He added that there will be basic information about TransAction, the process and the business cards with the TransAction website on them.
- Mayor Parrish asked about presentations to the governing bodies. Mr. Jasper responded that the plan is to meet with the governing bodies of each member jurisdiction. He did note that in some cases the presentation was given to the Transportation Commissions, based on suggestions from the jurisdictional staff as to what was more effective for them. Ms. Backmon added that this outreach has also been extended to the regional chambers and special interest groups to engage as much as possible on the front end of this process. Chairman Bulova stated that the pop-up idea is good to piggy-back on existing opportunities and go to the people for this engagement. She suggested that a pop-up be added at Celebrate Fairfax noting that it starts Friday, June 10 and ends Sunday, June 12. She added that this is Fairfax County's biggest event. Mr. Jasper responded that he would follow up with the consultant team and thanked Chairman Bulova for the suggestion.
- Council Member Snyder suggested that the City of Falls Church has a similar event on Memorial Day and suggested a pop-up presentation be added for this event as well.

V. Route 7 Corridor Transit Study

Ms. Coyner, Executive Director, NVTC

- Ms. Coyner and Mr. Goldfarb briefed the Authority on the Route 7 Corridor Transit Study. They were joined by Mr. Flood, project consultant and Special Projects Lead, US Advisory Services.
- Board Member Fisette asked how the corridor growth numbers were calculated. Mr. Goldfarb responded that the growth numbers were calculated by aggregating Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZ's) to make a district, therefore may not be directly related to the jurisdictional boundaries. He added that the areas, using the methodology as identified in the scope, would be much wider, explaining that the Falls Church area would be from Tyson's to Seven Corners, within the Route 7 transit corridor. Board Member Fisette asked if the numbers shown on slide number 3 are the number of people living in these areas. Mr. Goldfarb responded that these numbers are based on population. Board Member Fisette stated that the population number shown for Falls Church is startling, suggesting this shows how few people live in Tyson's compared to jobs. Mr. Goldfarb responded that some of these numbers might come from the Arlington/East Falls Church area. Board Member Fisette asked if this is what is seen as the residential area that is in the shed of using the system. Mr. Goldfarb responded that this was an attempt to define the corridor in an aggregated way that would make sense. He stated that they wanted to have a simple 20 x 20 or 10 x 10 matrix for evaluation. He added that this is a summary more for analytical purposes than for display. Board Member Fisette suggested that for practical purposes, Falls Church is a small place and this is a strange message. Mr. Goldfarb responded that it might be better to put this into a smaller aggregation and only show those parts that are admissible. He added that in grouping things together, it looks like Greater Falls Church. Chairman Nohe stated that there are far more people who will tell you that they live in a location than actually do live in that location.

(Mayor Silberberg arrived.)

- Board Member Fisette stated that the presentation shows that the proposed new transit system must connect to the East Falls Church Metro as it adds dramatically to the users and gives people a reason to connect with a heavy rail system. He asked what will happen with the crossover to get onto Roosevelt Street, because now it is very difficult to get through here. He noted that the Constrained Long Rang Plan (CLRP) has a wonderful crossover that would completely simplify this. He asked about the timing and asked if the analysis is based on today's system, or the proposed master plan of Fairfax. Mr. Goldfarb responded that the analysis is based on 2040 conditions for planning purposes. He added that they are working with the Route 7 Technical Advisory Committee that has representatives from the jurisdictions. He acknowledged that if this implementation was being done today, there would be challenges getting to the East Falls Church Metro Station and the surrounding area. Mr. Goldfarb added that Arlington County staff have also pointed out that this metro station is at capacity for transit service for buses, so part of the next step will be figuring out how this will play into an East Falls

Church Metro station redevelopment. Mr. Flood stated that the assumption was made that there will be a structure to get through this area that does not exist today. He added that the cost estimate for this structure was built into the Light Rail Transit (LRT) option, recognizing that it cannot function through this area without this type of structure. Board Member Fisette asked how this would apply to the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) option. Mr. Flood responded that the BRT option is assumed to be on the existing street. Board Member Fisette asked if this was built into the time savings. Mr. Flood responded that it has been. Board Member Fisette noted that this means some very slow time was built into the time saving to get through this area. Mr. Flood responded that he is unaware of what the 2040 CLRP has for improvements in this area, or whether this infrastructure will be there. Board Member Fisette asked for clarification, noting that Mr. Flood had indicated that the cost of building the new bridge had been added into the costs for the LRT. He asked Mr. Flood to further explain how this would work with the BRT option. Mr. Flood responded that turns are challenging in a rail vehicle, so part of the planning level engineering assessment is to look at the corridor to determine where turns can be made. He noted that in this particular area a rail engineer has already indicated a structure will be necessary to get the rail vehicles through this area. He added that in this area, it was assumed that the LRT would be “on structure” due to the challenges with current conditions. Board Member Fisette asked about BRT. Mr. Flood responded that the BRT can make the turns, therefore can run on existing roadways. Board Member Fisette asked for clarification that there are not costs built into the BRT option for a future crossover structure. He noted that he does not know if Fairfax will have built the proposed structure by 2040. He added that if the BRT is using existing roadways, this is built into the time differential as well. Mr. Flood responded that there has to be a set future condition, it cannot be malleable. Everything that is going to exist in 2040 has to be in an existing capital plan in order to be included into assumptions built into planning assumptions.

- Chairman Bulova suggested that the LRT option would be more expensive, because a rail yard would be necessary. Mr. Goldfarb added that a structure and electricity would be necessary as well. Chairman Bulova asked if these items were built into the cost estimate. Mr. Goldfarb responded affirmatively. Chairman Bulova noted that there is also a need for storage for BRT vehicles. Mr. Goldfarb responded that this has been built into the cost estimates, but noted this could be an expansion of an existing garage, so it is cheaper because it assumes some pre-existing construction. Mr. Flood stated that the rail yard has to be along the rail alignment, and this is expensive real state. He added that the BRT can share a bus depot somewhere, if it is fitted to service the BRT vehicles. Chairman Bulova asked for confirmation that it has been calculated in that there will probably be a need for expansion somewhere for the BRT. Mr. Flood responded affirmatively. Chairman Bulova further asked if locations for the LRT have been considered yet. Mr. Flood responded that this has not been done yet. He added that this step will come in the future as they start to look at design, right-of-way impacts and required areas for operation.

- Mr. Garczynski asked for clarification that the preliminary cost estimates are for the infrastructure itself, but not for right-of-way, noting that these costs could be pretty significant. Mr. Goldfarb stated that a gross number to build the line was included. He added that this is a gross number per mile that includes utility realignment, pavement, etc, but does not include a valuable property, or a huge utility alignment. Mr. Goldfarb indicated that a rough footprint was used to calculate the right-of-way alignment. He stated that the next step is to do a conceptual engineering study that will really identify right-of-way needs. He added that the goal will be to work with jurisdictions to do this. Mr. Garczynski stated that the high land acquisition costs in Northern Virginia are a nemesis. Mr. Flood confirmed that there is a percentage applied to the overall gross cost that is based on similar systems from around the country.
- Miss Bushue asked if a ridership study had been conducted and asked for an explanation of that study. Mr. Goldfarb responded that one trip would be from the origin to the destination, not roundtrip. Miss Bushue stated that one rider going to and from a destination counts for two trips. She suggested that transit users are customers, not riders. Miss Bushue suggested that systems should look at customers instead of riders and suggested that this thinking needs to change within the industry. She stated that a ridership study showing 2000 people is really 2000 trips. Mr. Goldfarb responded that analysis does show trips versus new riders. Miss Bushue suggested that the new fare boxes will be able to show this data clearly.
- Board Member Fisette asked if the time projections have accounted for which of the optional routes have dedicated lanes for a LRT or BRT. He asked for this information to be shared, noting that this is one of the greatest assets that makes the LRT different than a bus. Mr. Goldfarb responded that assumptions were made that there would be a dedicated lane from Tyson's Corner to the City of Falls Church. In Falls Church and on Route 29 to the East Falls Church Metro station, the bus would share a line with vehicles that are making right turns only or Business Access and Transit (BAT) lanes. From the East Falls Church Metro station to the City of Alexandria it would be a dedicated lane and in the City of Alexandria it would be in mixed traffic. Board Member Fisette suggested that BAT lanes are a good idea and more like a dedicated lane than mixed traffic.
- Mayor Silberberg asked if the route would run straight down Route 7. Mr. Goldfarb responded that they studied whether the route would go straight down Route 7 or leave Route 7 and go to East Falls Church Metro. He stated that the ridership forecast shows a significant improvement in ridership when tied into the East Falls Church Metro. Mr. Flood added that in the City of Alexandria it was assumed to be a BAT lane in the section, but feedback from the City was that King Street would have to be a mixed traffic operation, as there is no reconstruction of King Street. He noted that the alignment on Beauregard Street is the West End Transit line. Mayor Silberberg noted this would connect to the Alexandria BRT at that point. Mr. Flood responded affirmatively. He added that recent conversations have been to determine the

best end point in the City of Alexandria, what is the best termini – Mark Center, Van Dorn Street or King Street. Mayor Silberberg asked what the currently thinking is. Mr. Flood responded that they are leaning toward Mark Center. Mayor Silberberg asked about the line going all the way to the Metro. Mr. Flood responded that reality is that Alexandria is already invested in operating a service, the West End Transit Way. He added that the decision is whether to duplicate this service, or terminate at an identified transit center where riders could transfer. Mayor Silberberg suggested that in general we should connect Metro to Metro. Mr. Flood responded that most riders are not going to ride end-to-end, they will take shorter trips within the system. He added that it needs to be determined how many riders will continue past a certain point, like the Mark Center, to determine where it makes sense to terminate the service. Board Member Fisette suggested that it makes sense to end at a Metro station, but that the numbers have to make sense.

Consent Agenda

- VI. Approval of FY2017 Local Distribution Fund (30%) Budget**
- VII. Approval of FY2017 Regional Revenue Fund (70%) Budget**
- VIII. Approval of FY2017 NVTA Operating Budget**

- Mayor Parrish moved approval of the consent agenda to include the specific motions in items VI – VIII; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried unanimously.

Action

- IX. Approval of Participation in the Virginia Retirement System, 457 Deferred Compensation Plan** Mayor Parrish, Chair, Finance Committee

- Mayor Parrish stated that the Finance Committee had reviewed this item at its March meeting. He highlighted:
 - ✓ The Authority had directed staff to examine an employee retirement system and other benefit programs to make the NVTA's plan consistent with jurisdictions in Northern Virginia.
 - ✓ The employer is not obligated to make any contributions.
 - ✓ Employees elect to make contributions.
 - ✓ Cost to the Authority is \$150 per year, included in the proposed FY2017 budget.
- Mayor Parrish moved approval of the election to participate in the Virginia Retirement System 547 Deferred Compensation Plan through the adoption of

resolution 16-05; seconded by Council Member Rishell. Motion carried unanimously.

X. Approval of Expenditure Transfer of \$124,700 from Regional Revenue Fund Budget to Operating Budget Mayor Parrish, Chair, Finance Committee

- Mr. Longhi briefed the Authority on the expenditure transfer of \$124,700 from the Regional Revenue Fund Budget to the Operating Budget. He highlighted:
 - ✓ The \$124,700 is made up of \$72,000/year in financial advisory services, \$50,000/year in Bond Counsel fees and \$2,700/year in Bond Trustee fees.
 - ✓ These fees were originally budgeted in the Regional Revenue Budget, but were determined to be more appropriate for the Operating Budget.
 - ✓ This action transfers these expenditures for FY2016 from the Regional Revenue Budget into the Operating Budget.
 - ✓ The Operating Budget is expected to accommodate this expenditure without having to use the Operating Reserve.
 - ✓ These expenses will remain in the Operating Budget in future years.
 - ✓ Of this amount, \$122,000 will be reimbursed periodically through cost of issuance when the Authority does a bond issuance.
- Mayor Parrish moved the Authority approve the expenditure transfer of \$124,700 for Financial Advisor Services, Bond Counsel and Bond Trustee fees from the Regional Revenue Fund Budget to the Operating Budget in FY2016; seconded by Chairman Bulova. Motion carried unanimously.

XI. Approval of the FY2022 CMAQ/RSTP Programming Allocations

Mr. Nampoothiri, Program Coordinator

- Chairman Bulova moved approval of the list of proposed projects for inclusion in the FY2022 CMAQ and RSTP programs to the Virginia Department of Transportation and Commonwealth Transportation Board for approval; seconded by Council Member Snyder. Motion carried unanimously.

Discussion/Information

XII. Finance Committee Report

Mayor Parrish, Chairman

- Mayor Parrish thanked the Finance Committee members for their participation and stated that the Committee is going to function very well.

XIII. Planning Coordination Advisory Committee Report

Mayor Foreman, Chairman

- Ms. Backmon stated that the PCAC had their first meeting of the year and it was well attended.

XIV. Technical Advisory Committee Report Mr. Boice, Chairman

- No verbal report.

XV. Monthly Revenue Report Mr. Longhi, CFO

- No verbal report.

XVI. Monthly Operating Budget Report Mr. Longhi, CFO

- No verbal report.

XVII. Executive Director's Report Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

- A. CMAQ/RSTP Reallocation Request for Fairfax County, the Town of Vienna, and Arlington County, RJACC Approval February 4, 2016**
- B. CMAQ/RSTP Reallocation Request for the Town of Vienna, the Town of Leesburg, the City of Alexandria, and Prince William County, RJACC Approval February 25, 2016**

- Ms. Backmon noted that the April 14, 2016 Authority meeting may pose a conflict for some members due to jurisdiction budget meetings. She proposed moving the meeting to April 28 at 6pm, prior to the NVRC meeting. Chairman Nohe noted that Prince William County has budget mark-up that evening. He stated that the main item of business in April is to approve the advertisement of the public hearing for the FY2017 Program and noted that this does not tend to be a controversial issue. Ms. Backmon responded it is not usually a controversial issue, but this is one of the major action items for the April meeting. She added that postponing this meeting does not adversely impact the FY2017 Program schedule. Board Member Fisetta clarified that this still meets the legal noticing requirements. Chairman Nohe acknowledged it does meet the legal notice requirements and added that there is another bill in the General Assembly that sets another requirement that the project list be published 15 days in advance. He noted that this a less restrictive rule than the existing public advertisement rules. There was consensus to move the date.
- Council Member Rishell moved approval to change the April 14, 2016 Authority meeting to April 28, 2016 at 6:00pm; seconded by Mayor Parrish. Motion carried unanimously.
- Ms. Backmon stated that the FY2017 Program is currently scheduled to be adopted on July 14, 2016. She noted that there may be new Authority members after June 30, 2016 and suggested there may be a desire to adopt the program prior to June 30. Chairman Nohe stated that Mr. Garczynski and Miss Bushue's terms expire on June 30, but their replacements may not be named by that time. He added that some jurisdictions have elections, with current terms

ending on June 30. Chairman Nohe stated that the advantage to adopting the FY2017 Program on June 30 is that it would ensure that the Authority membership that has participated in the process of building the FY2017 Program will participate in the public hearing, and will vote on the Program. He added that if the Program is adopted based on the current schedule, it is possible that we will have brand new Authority members who at their first meeting will be asked to adopt the FY2017 Project Plan. He suggested this might not be adequately transparent. Chairman Nohe suggested it makes sense to move the adoption to June 30 for transparency reasons.

- Board Member Fisetta asked Ms. Backmon if this would impact the work of the NVTA staff in this process. Ms. Backmon responded that the meeting would need to be held on June 30 to allow time for the Planning and Programming Committee to meet after the public hearing to consider the comments received and make a recommendation to the Authority. She noted that with the public hearing on June 9, there is enough time to meet with the Committee to make a final recommendation to the Authority on the final plan. Ms. Backmon suggested the June 30 meeting would replace the July 14 meeting date.
- Chairman Nohe stated that the plan has to be adopted after the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) adopts its plan, which is usually the 3rd Wednesday in June. Mr. Garczynski stated that it is likely that the CTB adoption of their plan will be moved back to the last week in June. Considering Mr. Garczynski's statement, Ms. Backmon proposed delaying a decision on this meeting date change. Chairman Nohe agreed, noting that the potential movement of the CTB meeting is a new detail and is significant because we need to know which projects will receive HB 2 funding prior to finalizing the FY2017 Program. He added that the Authority has some projects that have applied for funding from the State. Ms. Backmon added that the State has indicated that it will fully fund projects included in its Six Year Program. Chairman Nohe suggested talking to CTB staff and waiting to see what happens.

XVIII. Chairman's Comments

- Chairman Nohe reappointed Mayor Parrish to a 2 year term on the Finance Committee. He appointed Chair Randall and Mayor Silberberg to two year terms on the Finance Committee. He appointed Mayor Parrish and Council Member Rishell as Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, respectively.
- Chairman Nohe noted that Chairman Bulova and Council Member Rishell were reappointed to two year terms last year and are continuing those terms.
- Chairman Nohe appointed Mayor Silverthorne and Chairman Nohe to two year terms and Council Member Snyder, Miss Bushue and Delegate Minchew to one year terms on the Governance and Personnel Committee. He appointed Mayor Silverthorne and Council Member Snyder as Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, respectively.

- Chairman Nohe appointed Chairman Bulova, Board Member Fisetta and Council Member Rishell to two year terms and Chairman Nohe and Chair Randall to one year terms on the Planning and Programming Committee. He appointed Chairman Nohe and Chairman Bulova as Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman, respectively.
- Chairman Nohe noted that the Planning and Programming Committee (PPC) is the successor to the Project Implementation Working Group (PIWG). He noted that there are fourteen voting members of the Authority and eleven indicated they would like to be members of this Committee. Chairman Nohe stated that the PPC will continue the practice that all members of the Authority may attend and fully participate in the PPC meetings. The five Committee members will serve as the voting members of the PPC.

XIX. Adjournment

- Meeting adjourned at 8:17pm.