



Northern Virginia Transportation Authority
The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WORKING GROUP

Friday, November 6, 2015, 1:00 pm

Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

3040 Williams Drive, Suite 200

Fairfax, Virginia 22031

SUMMARY NOTES

I. Call to Order/Welcome

Chairman Nohe

- Mr. Garczynski called the meeting to order at 1:06 pm.
- Attendees:
 - **PIWG Members:** Chairman Nohe; Vice Chairman Garczynski, Chairman Bulova (Fairfax County); Chair Hynes (Arlington County); Council Member Rishell (City of Manassas Park); Rick Canizales, (Prince William County); Tom Biesiadny, Noelle Dominguez (Fairfax County); Bob Brown (Loudoun County); Andrew D’huyvetter (Arlington County); Jim Maslanka, Pierre Holloman (City of Alexandria); Paul Stoddard (City of Falls Church); Wendy Block Sanford (City of Fairfax); Patrick Moore (City of Manassas); Mark Duceman (Town of Herndon); Richard West (Dumfries); Calvin Grow (Leesburg); Maria Sinner, Valerie Pardo (VDOT); Todd Horsley (DRPT); Kate Mattice (NVTC); Sonali Soneji (VRE); Cynthia Porter Johnson (PRTC).
 - **NVTA Staff:** Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Mike Longhi (CFO); Sree Nampoothiri (Program Coordinator), Keith Jasper (Program Coordinator).
 - **Other Staff:** Mark Thomas (Fairfax County), Kimberly Bibbee (Prince William County).
 - **Other:** Nancy Smith (Northern Virginia Transportation Alliance).

II. Meeting Summary of October 7, 2015, Meeting

- Approved.

Discussion/Information

III. FY2017 Program

Mr. Jasper

Congestion Reduction Relative to Cost

- Mr. Jasper informed the group that there are no changes to the schedule; the deadline for the call of projects is 5:00 p.m. on November 30, 2015; and he provided a recap of the September PIWG meeting.
- The group discussed the staff recommendation to use the year 2020 for the congestion reduction relative to cost evaluation for the FY 2017 Program. Mr. Tom Biesiadny suggested using 2030 since there are projects that will not be completed until well after 2020. Mr. Jasper explained that the year simply provides a point in time and having the earliest year possible allows for the most extrapolation and a more reliable analysis. He also pointed out that whichever year is chosen will result in some projects opening and some projects closing at or near that chosen year. Ms. Valerie Pardo added that the year 2020 was chosen as a short-term view for the HB599 evaluation with the assumption of project completion by December 31, 2019, regardless of whether a project would actually be completed for the purposes of the evaluation. She also pointed out that there will not be vast difference in ratings between 2030 and 2040.
- Mr. Bob Brown and other members agreed with the staff recommendation to use years 2020 and 2040 and, after further discussion, the group agreed to use those years for the FY2017 evaluation.
- Mr. Jasper reviewed the FY2017 project selection process and the four main components for evaluation: the preliminary screening, the NVTa quantitative score, the proposed methodology for Congestion Reduction Relative to Cost, and qualitative considerations.
- Mr. Jasper provided an overview of recommendations from the Jurisdictional and Agency Coordinating Committee (JACC), including their recommendation of Test C for the quantitative scoring (e.g., Congestion Reduction 45%; Project Readiness: 15%; Urgency: 0%; Improved Bike/Ped: 10%).
- Mr. Jasper also noted that the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended the Congestion Reduction weighting increase to 50%, Project Readiness decrease to 10%, Connectivity increase to 15%, Improved Bike/Ped decrease to 5%.
- Chair Hynes proposed that the PIWG recommend Test C as the criteria rating for the FY2017 Program, in accordance with the JACC recommendation, and the group unanimously agreed.
- Mr. Jasper stated that the JACC agreed to the high, medium, and low score criteria for Project Readiness and the PIWG unanimously approved the language for Project Readiness.

Congestion Reduction Relative to Cost Methodology

- Mr. Jasper summarized the JACC's review of the Methodology for Congestion Reduction Relative to Cost. Two candidate approaches were considered: the Travel Time Savings methodology and the Congestion Reduction Relative to Cost (CRRC) ratio methodology (staff recommendation).
- Mr. Jasper explained that, in addition to the inputs for TRANSIMS HB599 person hours of delay reductions, annual travel time savings, and project costs, the CRRC

ratio approach also computes the average hourly value of time, which will be somewhere between \$10 to \$25 hourly. Once this number is determined, it will be applied consistently across all projects. He added that the CRRC methodology converts traffic time savings to a monetary value (the higher the number, the better the project).

- The group discussed bus acquisition projects and how the maintenance and operations of buses are funded. It was emphasized that, once the NVTA buys a bus, the jurisdictions/agencies that take delivery of that bus factor into their capital replacement program and the bus is maintained at no additional cost to the NVTA. Chairman Nohe added that the law requires that the NVTA only pay for transit capital investments that increase capacity.
- Mr. Stoddard pointed out how long-term maintenance for transit and road projects seems to be handled differently (e.g., when a road is completed, ongoing funding and maintenance can become the responsibility of VDOT). Ms. Backmon responded that the Authority cannot fund operations; therefore, it is assumed that the operations component of the project has already been accounted for prior to project submission. She did note certain towns and cities must fund their own maintenance and it is important to ensure there are no issues with operations prior to the Authority awarding funding.
- Mr. Jasper continued with the JACC comments regarding the proposed CRRC ratio methodology. The JACC commented that this approach seems difficult to understand and suggested using a standard approach that is easily explained. They also commented that monetizing savings in time could imply an inequity; people may not agree that an hour saved is the same for everyone and may value the worth of their time differently. The JACC also questioned how an appropriate discount rate is determined.
- Chairman Nohe suggested avoiding the use of a dollar amount since mathematically it adds no value. He added, as long as the discount rate is applied universally, the bottom number will be the same proportionally. He emphasized the importance of the public understanding how the numbers are determined.
- Mr. Biesiadny agreed and added the project rankings can be understood simply with the travel time savings and without the added financials. Mr. Ricardo Canizales and other PIWG members also agreed that simplicity is crucial.
- Chair Hynes noted that, it is about time and money and, although the calculation is complicated, there can be a way to explain it so the public can understand.
- Mr. West also suggested, although the finances are an important factor, for simplicity in showing a reduction in travel time to the public, capturing how the travel time reduction equals a certain amount of congestion reduction (1st approach).
- Ms. Backmon noted that congestion reduction relative to cost must be demonstrated; while a project may provide the greatest level of congestion reduction, the cost could be so high that it is not attainable.
- Chairman Nohe pointed out that both methodologies develop a score that captures Congestion Reduction Relative to Cost (CRRC), but this score is not plugged into the Quantitative score (Test C) that captures Congestion Relief, Project Readiness, etc. If

projects will be chosen based on the recommended quantitative rating, and this CRRC score is not a factor, he expressed concern over establishing a number that will ultimately not be used but will give the public reason to say that a good decision has not been made.

- Mr. Jasper responded that each project will present with the two scores; the project is highly impactful if it scores at the top of both lists. The group discussed the circumstance of having to reconcile a project scoring high on one list and low on the other and how qualitative factors would be the determination of whether the project receives funding.
- Members of the group recommended the Travel Time Savings methodology and Mr. Stoddard requested a report demonstrating what the outcome would be using the CRRC ratio methodology after the FY2017 project selection. The group agreed that exploring the value of this methodology would be beneficial.
- Mr. Brown suggested choosing the CRRC ratio methodology because the ratio provides congestion reduction relative to the cost of the project and he believes this methodology to be more consistent with the law stating: "...The Authority shall give priority to selecting projects that are expected to provide the greatest congestion reduction relative to the cost of the project and shall document this information for each project selected."
- After further discussion, the group chose to recommend the Travel Time Savings methodology with the understanding that the CRRC ratio methodology would be considered for future evaluations.
- After discussing the pros and cons for evaluating projects based on the total cost versus the NVTAs cost, the group agreed to consider both costs for the purposes of the evaluation.

IV. FY2017 Program Policies

Ms. Backmon

- Ms. Backmon explained the NVTAs policy for first drawdown stating that after the SPA is executed (within 6 months of Authority adoption), that project activity is expected by June 30, 2019. Otherwise, it may be in the best interest of the Authority to cancel the project or de-obligate funds. Ms. Backmon added, if no agreement is forthcoming, the Executive Director may take the de-obligation request to the Finance Committee and the Finance Committee then makes a recommendation to the Authority.
- Ms. Backmon noted that retroactive payments would be discussed in future PIWG meetings after further examination and she stated that the goal is to ensure everything is in alignment and adheres to the provisions of the law.

V. CFO Report

Mr. Longhi

- Mr. Mike Longhi reminded the group that the updated Appendix Bs are due by November 30, 2015. He also asked that jurisdictions with no changes make it known that there are no changes.

- Regarding insurance certificates, Mr. Longhi noted that projects not yet under contract do not have insurance and it is important to relay this information to the Authority since insurance is required when requesting reimbursement.
- Mr. Longhi announced to the group that another SPA Workshop will be held in the spring 2016. He explained that this annual certification workshop serves to improve coordination and communication regarding the SPAs and he encouraged the group to consider recommendations to bring this workshop to improve the SPA process.

VI. NVTA Update

Ms. Backmon

- Ms. Backmon informed the group that ten Standard Project Agreements (SPAs) will be presented at the next Authority meeting on November 12, 6:00 p.m.
- Ms. Backmon explained that a list of projects submitted for HB 2 funding in the Corridors of Statewide Significance category has been compiled to ensure the inclusion of these projects in the NVTA's resolution of endorsement.
- Ms. Backmon noted that the I-66 Outside the Beltway Project Committee met and recommended the Authority's endorsement of the I-66 Outside the Beltway Project approval resolution.

Adjournment

VII. Adjourn

- The meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.
- The next PIWG meeting was scheduled for 9:30 am on Wednesday, December 2, 2015 at NVTA