



**Northern Virginia Transportation Authority**  
*The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia*

**PLANNING COORDINATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, November 17, 2016, 6:30pm**

**NVTA Office  
3040 Williams Drive, Suite 200  
Fairfax, Virginia 22031**

**AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order/Welcome** Chairman Foreman

**Action**

- II. Approve Summary Notes of October 26, 2016 Meeting**  
*Recommended Action: Approval [with abstentions  
from those who were not present]*

- III. TransAction Update – Performance Measures** Mr. Jasper

**Discussion/Information**

- IV. NVTA Update** Ms. Backmon, Executive Director

**Adjournment**

- V. Adjourn**

**Next Meeting:  
TBD  
6:30pm NVTA Office**



# Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

*The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia*

## PLANNING COORDINATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Wednesday, October 26, 2016, 6:30 pm  
 Northern Virginia Transportation Authority  
 3040 Williams Drive, Suite 200  
 Fairfax, Virginia 22031

### SUMMARY NOTES

#### I. Call to Order/Welcome Chairman Foreman

- Chairman Foreman called the meeting to order at 6:33 pm.
- Attendees:
  - **PCAC Members:** Chairman Foreman (Town of Dumfries); Council Member Jonathan Way (City of Manassas); Chair Libby Garvey (Arlington County); Supervisor Ralph Buona (Loudoun County); Supervisor John Foust (Fairfax County); Mayor Frank Jones (City of Manassas Park); Council Member Phil Duncan (City of Falls Church); Mayor David Butler (Town of Leesburg); Council Member David Kirby (Town of Herndon); Council Member Karen Jimmerson (Town of Purcellville).
  - **NVTA Staff:** Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Keith Jasper (Principal, Transportation Planning and Programming).
  - **Other:** Noelle Dominguez, Paul Doku (Fairfax County); Sarah Crawford (Arlington County); Mark Duceman (Town of Herndon).

### Action

#### II. Meeting Summary Notes of September 28, 2016, PCAC Meeting

- The September 28, 2016 Planning Coordination Advisory Committee meeting summary was unanimously approved, with abstentions from members not present.

#### III. TransAction Update – Performance Measures Mr. Jasper

- Mr. Jasper provided an overview of how performance measures will be used during the TransAction update. A handout was provided listing candidate measures related to each of the three goals that had been previously adopted by the Authority. This handout was briefly discussed at the September 28, 2016 PCAC meeting.
- The Committee had a robust discussion on each of the candidate measures. While no overarching action was taken to recommend a list of measures, the Committee took selective actions on specific measures, and requested additional information or

clarification from NVTa staff on others. The Committee rescheduled its November meeting in order to make a final recommendation prior to the Authority meeting in December.

Candidate Measures for Goal 1 (Enhance quality of life and economic strength of NoVA through transportation)

- Measures 1.1.1 thru 1.1.4: The Committee chose not to change these measures as they have been previously used for the HB599 process.
- Measures 1.2.1 thru 1.2.2: The Committee chose not to change these measures noting that one of these had been previously used for the HB599 process.
- Measures 1.3.1 thru 1.3.2: Chair Garvey requested that ‘high quality’ should be inserted prior to ‘transit’ in measure 1.3.1. Supervisor Buona proposed that this measure should be deleted as communities should decide whether to put development near transit. Supervisor Buona expressed concern that the measure 1.3.2 disadvantages residents in outer jurisdictions where residents have longer commutes. Chair Garvey responded that if commuters in closer-in communities transfer to transit, this would benefit those who drive longer distances. A broader discussion ensued regarding the relative balance between modally specific measures. Mayor Jones commented that some projects may be better suited to 30 percent revenues that 70 percent regional revenues.
- The Planning Coordination Advisory Committee recommended that candidate measure 1.3.1 be deleted (6-4).
- The Committee chose not to change measure 1.3.2.
- Measure 1.4.1: Not discussed pending a definition from NVTa staff.
- Measure 1.5.1: Without objection, the Committee chose to retain this measure but requested NVTa staff revise the wording. For example, Council Member Kirby suggested ‘support’ rather than ‘consistency’. Mayor Jones suggested ‘aligned with’. Mayor Butler noted that, as with other measures, the weighting assigned to this measure will determine the extent to which it influences evaluation of each project/project package.
- Measure 1.6.1: The Committee chose not to change this measure.

Candidate Measures for Goal 2 (Enable optimal use of the transportation network and leverage the existing network)

- Measure 2.1.1: The Committee recognized the importance of safety but requested NVTa staff revise the wording. Council Member Jimmerson asked whether VDOT has a threshold for implementing crash measures. Mayor Jones stated this analysis should be based on experiential data, not predictions. Supervisor Buona suggested the measure should take account of crash rates, rather than absolute numbers.
- Measure 2.2.1: The Committee requested the wording should be changed to ‘First/Last mile connections’. It was noted that this measure references connectivity at the beginning and end of trips in general terms, and was not intended to be specifically one mile.

- Measures 2.3.1 and 2.4.1: The Committee considered these measures were somewhat similar. Supervisor Foust and Council Member Kirby suggested consideration be given to consolidating them. In response to a question from Mayor Foreman regarding whether these measures should be combined there was no response. In response to a further question from Mayor Foreman, Committee members indicated they were comfortable with the wording of measure 2.3.1. Supervisor Buona was concerned highway projects would not score well with these measures.
- The Planning Coordination Advisory Committee recommended that candidate measure 2.4.1 be deleted (10-0).
- Measures 2.5.1 and 2.5.2: The Committee considered these measures were somewhat similar, noting that measure 2.5.2 is had been previously used for the HB599 process.
- The Planning Coordination Advisory Committee recommended that candidate measure 2.5.1 be deleted (10-0).
- Measures 2.6.1: Council Member Way considered that cost-benefit analysis should be handled separately from this evaluation process. Mayors Jones and Butler proposed using the congestion reduction relative to cost (CRRC) methodology developed for the FY2017 Program. Supervisor Foust stated a focus on congestion reduction may be too narrow, and expressed a preference that this analysis be broadened to include air quality impacts. Mayor Foreman requested staff come back with a formula for this analysis.
- The Planning Coordination Advisory Committee recommended that candidate measure 2.6.1 be addressed separately from the rating process (7-3).
- Additional measure 2.6.2: Council Member Way proposed that the rating process take into account the leveraging of private or other external (non-NVTA) funding. Ms. Backmon noted that this cannot be modeled and may not be known. She added a qualitative measure is preferable.
- The Planning Coordination Advisory Committee recommended that candidate measure 2.6.2 be added to the rating process (10-0).

Candidate Measures for Goal 3 (Reduce negative impacts of transportation on communities and the environment)

- Measure 3.1.1 thru 3.4.1: Supervisor Foust suggested these four measures could be combined into two measures, with one general environmental measure and one related to air quality. Council member Kirby proposed a single measure ‘reduce negative impacts on the environment’. Mayor Butler noted measures 3.1.1 and 3.4.1 were both tied to vehicle miles travel by speed, and suggested these could be combined. Supervisor Buona was concerned by measure 3.3.1.
- The Planning Coordination Advisory Committee recommended that NVTA staff propose consolidation from four to two measures for Goal 3 (10-0).

**IV. Development of NVTA’s 2017 Legislative Program**

- The Committee had previously highlighted two primary concerns; the impact on transit providers of the absence of a ‘floor’ on the gas tax; and the impact of recent

legislation on the ability of local jurisdictions to apply revenues from development proffers to related transportation infrastructure improvements. NVTA's draft Legislative Program already included language on the former, and new language had been added to address the latter. Supervisor Buona stated that the new language accurately addressed the proffer-related concerns.

- The Planning Coordination Advisory Committee unanimously recommended that the draft Legislative Program be adopted by the Authority.

### **Discussion/Information**

**V. Development of FY2018-23 Six Year Program** Mr. Jasper

- There was insufficient time for discussion on this item.

**VI. NVTA Update** Ms. Backmon

- Ms. Backmon briefly mentioned the dates of upcoming NVTA committee and Authority meetings.

### **Adjournment**

**VII. Adjourn**

- The meeting adjourned at 8:56 pm.

Summary of Candidate TransAction (TA) Measures – PCAC Comments 10/26/2016 (in red)

TA Goals	Proposed TA Objectives	Candidate TA Measures/Weightings <sup>1</sup>	TransAction 2040 Measures/Weightings	FY2017 Program Measures/Weightings
Goal 1: Enhance quality of life and economic strength of NoVA through transportation	1.1 Reduce congestion and crowding experienced by travelers in the region	1.1.1 Total Person Hours of Delay (HB599)	2.8 Reduces roadway congestion 6.67	Project reduces roadway congestion (HB599 overall rating) 45
		1.1.2 Transit Crowding (HB599)		
		1.1.3 Person Hours of Congested Travel in Automobiles (HB599)	2.1 Addresses existing significant level of service (LOS) deficiencies for all modes of transportation 3.33	
		1.1.4 Person Hours of Congested Travel in Transit Vehicles (HB599)		
	1.2 Improve Travel Time Reliability	1.2.1 Congestion Severity: Maximum Travel Time Ratio	2.2 Addresses existing structural and maintenance deficiencies for all modes of transportation 3.33	
		1.2.2 Congestion Duration (HB599)	1.1 Improves capacity and reliability of freight 6.67	
	1.3 Increase access to jobs, employees, markets, and destinations	1.3.1 Percent of jobs/population within 1/2 mile of high quality transit. Should be excluded – land use. Covered by proffers. Communities decide whether to put development near transit. Voted 6-4 to remove.		
		1.3.2 Access to Jobs within 45 mins by auto (HB599) Disadvantages outer jurisdictions with longer commutes. But if inner jurisdictions transfer from auto to transit, this benefits outer jurisdictions. Smaller projects are better candidates for 30% revenues – should not have “false-weighted” criteria that disadvantage big projects. Outer jurisdictions “export” population (for jobs)		
	1.4 Improve connections among and within areas of concentrated growth	1.4.1 TBD	4.1 Improves connections between multiple Activity Centers 6.67	Project improves connections between multiple Activity Centers 5
				Project connects jurisdictions and modes 5
	1.5 Support and strengthen local land use objectives	1.5.1 Consistency with (Alt: Support to/Aligned with) local planning efforts (qualitative assessment) Noted that TA is unconstrained and can include projects not in a Comp Plan. Not a veto but a weighting. KEEP BUT CHANGE WORDING.	4.2 Supported by a Comprehensive Plan 6.67	
	1.6 Reduce household transportation costs	1.6.1 Average cost per commute trip		
2.3 Able to be readily implemented 6.67			Project will be advanced as a result of FY2017 Program funding; 15	
Goal 2: Enable optimal use of the transportation network and leverage the existing network	2.1 Improve the safety of transportation network	2.1.1 Serious injuries and fatalities by mode Research shows crashes increase with widened roads (Citation?) Include peds. Will this be related to traffic levels? Should use actual, not predictive data. Does VDOT have a threshold for implementing safety measures? Higher crash locations should score higher. PROVIDE DEFINITION AND CLARITY.	2.5 Improves the safety of the transportation system 6.67	Project improves the safety of the transportation system 5
	2.2 Increase integration between modes and systems	2.2.1 “First/Last mile” connections (qualitative assessment)	1.2 Supports multiple use development patterns in a walkable environment 6.67	Supports multiple use development patterns in a walkable environment 10
	2.3 Provide more route and mode options to expand travel choices and improve resiliency of the system	2.3.1 Share of travel by non-SOV modes Some people do not have choice to switch modes unless drive 20 miles first. Too much BRT encourages sprawl. This is aspirational. Consolidate with 2.4.1? Per capita? Road projects will not score well on this measure (and 2.4.1) Wording change suggested to add “Increase” (see general comment)	1.4 Creates multimodal choices for travelers as indicated by increases in transit capacity 3.33	
			1.3 Creates multimodal choices for travelers as indicated by increases in non-SOV mode share 3.33	
	2.4 Manage travel demand during peak periods	2.4.1 Number of SOV trips during peak periods Considered combining with 2.3.1 then voted 10-0 to delete	2.6 Increases person-miles traveled by non-SOV modes. 3.33	
	2.5 Sustain and improve operation of the regional system		2.7 Increases person-miles traveled by SOV mode 3.33	
2.5.1 PHT in congested/crowded conditions Duplicates 2.5.2. Voted 10-0 to delete.		2.9 Reduces person-hours traveled 6.67		

<sup>1</sup> Note: ‘HB599’ indicates measure used by VDOT during the HB599 Evaluation and Rating process for the FY2015-16 and FY2017 Programs.

		2.5.2	Person hours of travel caused by 10% increase in PM peak hour demand (HB599)						
					5.1	Improves the management and operation of existing facilities through technology applications	6.67	Project improves the management and operation of existing facilities through technology applications	5
	2.6	Optimize investments by increasing benefits relative to costs for short-, medium-, and long-term timeframes	2.6.1	Cost Benefit Analysis Voted 7-3 to use CRRC. Prefer to handle separately from rating process. Define what is included in benefit, e.g. air quality, economic development. PROVIDE CLARITY ON FORMULA.	N/A	Benefit/Cost Rating		Congestion Reduction Relative to Cost (CRRC) ratio	N/A
			2.6.2	Voted 10-0 to add criteria that reflects external funding. (Cannot be modeled, therefore must be qualitative)	6.1	Leverages private or other outside funding	6.67	Project leverages private or other outside funding	5
Goal 3: Reduce negative impacts of transportation on communities and the environment	3.1	Reduce greenhouse gas emissions caused by transportation	3.1.1	GHG emissions based on VMT by speed	2.4	Reduces vehicle-miles traveled (VMT)	6.67	Project reduces vehicle-miles (VMT)	5
	3.2	Reduce stormwater runoff	3.2.1	Amount of impervious area suggested "Reduce negative impacts on environment" (Note this is similar to goal 3)					
	3.3	Protect environmental and cultural assets and resources	3.3.1	Number of ROW expansions that impact resources	3.1	Right-of-way minimizes impacts on sensitive areas	6.67		
	3.4	Reduce transportation-related air pollution	3.4.1	Criteria pollutant emissions based on VMT by speed		See TransAction 2040 measure 2.4		See TransAction 2040 measure 2.4	

General

- Balance between transit and highway measures
- 2.3.1/2.4.1 – is an increase or decrease in SOV share a good thing? Should we clarify whether increase or reduction scores more strongly?
- The importance of any measure depends on its weighting relative to other measures.
- Goal 3: voted 10-0 for staff to propose consolidation from four to two measures. Most likely a general (qualitative?) measure and another related to air quality (VMT-related)