**PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, March 28, 2018, 10:00 am**

**Northern Virginia Transportation Authority**

**3040 Williams Drive, Suite 200**

**Fairfax, Virginia 22031**

**SUMMARY NOTES**

1. **Call to Order/Welcome**

* Chairman Nohe called the meeting to order at 10:18 am.
* Attendees:
  + **PPC Members:** Chairman Nohe (Prince William County); Chairman Bulova (Fairfax County); Chair Randall (Loudoun County); Mayor Rishell (City of Manassas Park).
  + **Authority Members and other Elected Officials:** Chair Cristol (Arlington County); Council Member Snyder (City of Falls Church); Ms. Hynes (Governor’s Appointee, CTB Member).
  + **NVTA Staff:** Monica Backmon (Executive Director); Keith Jasper (Principal); Carl Hampton (Investment & Debt Manager); Michael Longhi (CFO); Sree Nampoothiri (Transportation Planner); Harun Rashid (Transportation Planner); Peggy Teal (Assistant Finance Officer).
  + **Council of Counsels:** Ellen Posner (Fairfax County)
  + **Staff:** Rich Roisman (Arlington County); Noelle Dominguez (Fairfax County); Bob Brown (Loudoun County); George Phillips (Prince William County); Tarrence Moorer, Steve Sindiong (City of Alexandria); Chloe Ritter (City of Fairfax); Christine Hoeffner (VRE); Maria Sinner (VDOT).

**Action**

1. **Approve Summary Notes of October 4, 2017 PPC Meeting**

* The October 4, 2017 Planning and Programming Committee meeting summary was unanimously approved. Mayor Rishell requested that staff send the draft meeting summary soon after the meeting.

**Discussion/Information**

1. **FY 2018-2023 Six Year Program Update**

* Ms. Backmon reminded the Committee that the NVTA staff has been carrying out evaluation of the FY 2018-2023 Six Year Program (SYP) applications since mid-December 2017. Ms. Backmon also stated that while HB 2313 requires that the Authority give priority to the projects that provide the greatest level of congestion reduction relative to cost (CRRC), there are additional quantitative and qualitative factors (per the Authority’s enabling legislation and HB 2313) that the Authority takes into account when making funding determinations.
* Ms. Backmon informed the Committee that staff will provide a high level summary of the evaluation process and next steps. She noted that the staff is not providing any project funding recommendations at this time.
* Mr. Jasper pointed out that the meeting packet includes the following items:
  + Project list of 62 applications, fund requested, total project cost, phases for which fund requested, modal components, and local priority,
  + Map showing the location of these projects,
  + Preliminary qualitative and quantitative evaluations, and
  + Preliminary CRRC scores and ranks
* Mr. Jasper reminded that the law requires VDOT to post quantitative performance analysis, which is generally known as HB599 analysis. This analysis is based on the long range plan, TransAction, and is not included in this analysis. He added that it is being finalized working with VDOT.
* Mr. Jasper added that staff is working on a general overview of the long term benefit analysis as requested by the Authority but is not yet ready to share.
* Mr. Jasper noted that the top five projects in the CRRC ratio list stand out with high values and the rest fall into a long tail. He added that the WMATA’s New Blue Line Study project is not ranked since there is insufficient information to calculate meaningful CRRC, which looks at the total project cost.
* Mr. Jasper reminded that CRRC ratio and HB599 ratings measure two different aspects of projects and therefore is not expected to match in all cases. Since HB599 does not consider project cost, large projects having large impact tend to receive high rating. On the other hand, the CRRC ratio normalizes these impacts with cost and represents “bang for the buck.” Large projects are generally associated with high cost and small projects with lower cost. Small projects with reasonably large impacts (e.g. intelligent transportation system projects) will score high in CRRC analyses.
* Mr. Jasper noted that it is necessary to look at both quantitative measures as well as qualitative considerations for a complete picture.
* In response to Chairman Nohe’s question on whether there are studies currently under consideration, Mr. Jasper noted that the WMATA Blue Line Study is the only study under consideration.
* In response to Mayor Rishell’s question on the cost breakout between different modes of projects, Mr. Jasper replied that such breakout is not feasible to calculate and that information was not requested in the application. However, Mr. Jasper noted that it is possible to report funding requests by the primary mode associated with each project, recognizing that most projects have more than one mode associated with them.
* In response to Ms. Hynes’ clarification request on Fairfax County’s Route 28 project being the only project with just road symbol while others have multimodal components, Ms. Dominguez noted that this particular segment of Route 28 functions as a highway with no sidewalk/bike path on the sides.
* In response to Council Member Snyder’s inquiry if the analyses considered the future planned developments and associated traffic conditions, Mr. Jasper answered that the analyses used the Metropolitan Washington Council of Government (COG) Round 9.0 forecasts for the horizon year 2040. He added that if there were developments approved by any jurisdiction after the development of Round 9.0 forecasts, those might not have captured in this analyses.
* Council Member Snyder noted that the West Falls Church & Joint Campus Revitalization project is City’s top priority since the area is slated for a number of redevelopment projects and the City wants to ensure adequate transportation improvement is provided for ahead of the development.
* Ms. Backmon noted that staff has received qualitative information similar to what Council Member Snyder mentioned on several projects and the Authority will be asked to consider this information.
* In response to Chair Cristol’s question on the difference between HB599 ratings and TransAction ratings, Mr. Jasper mentioned that while HB599 considered seven factors including congestion reduction, TransAction considered 15 measures (inclusive of the HB599 measures) including congestion, accessibility, connectivity, safety, first and last mile connection, and vehicle emission.
* In response to Chair Randall’s question on the impact of funds from sources other than NVTA on the application, Mr. Jasper noted that the CRRC is calculated based on total project cost and therefore, external funds will not affect the CRRC analyses. He added that the leveraging of external funds is considered a positive and noted in the qualitative considerations.
* Ms. Backmon noted that for continuation projects, the amount of funds reimbursed is an important qualitative consideration. Chair Randall noted that if there are unforeseen circumstances that delay a project, jurisdictions and agencies should proactively contact NVTA staff and discuss the details.
* Chairman Nohe observed that here may be a need to look at the project progress and see if there is a need to take money back from one project and fund other projects, may be from the same jurisdiction.
* Ms. Hynes noted that SmartScale program requires reevaluation if there is a scope change for the project. She added that the Authority might want to consider flexibility in projects previously funded if there is any legitimate policy change that results in a scope change and a governing body request with a resolution.
* Chair Randall noted that the WMATA bill by the Commonwealth should take care of all Metro needs but it affects funding availability for local transportation projects.
* Ms. Hynes noted that the Authority needs to ensure that the projects submitted for NVTA funding are not in the Capital Needs covered under the WMATA funding legislation.
* Chairman Bulova requested staff to look at the detailed list of projects to be covered under the WMATA bill and if the SYP applications are duplicates, those projects could be removed.
* In response to Council Member Snyder’s question on additional opportunity to submit more qualitative information for SYP evaluation consideration, Ms. Backmon requested all applicants to provide any such information as soon as possible.
* Chairman Nohe asked if the planned SYP adoption in June is still possible with the uncertainty of available funds because of the WMATA bill. He noted that the Authority was ready to adopt the Six Year Program with $1.5B in available PayGo funding, in June 2018. However, the General Assembly action has now put uncertainties and delay in the process. He added that a possible solution to address the uncertainty is to remove fixed dates from the current schedule and authorize the Executive Director to reschedule dates after the General Assembly’s Veto date (April 18).
* In response to Mr. Brown’s remark on the uncertainty this delay will create on jurisdictions’ ability to submit applications for SmartScale, Ms. Sinner noted that the jurisdictions have time until August 1 to finalize which projects they want to submit to SmartScale.
* Chairman Nohe noted that if the Authority goes beyond June 30 to adopt the SYP, we will need to document reasons for any change in project selection outside CRRC score.
* The Planning and Programming Committee unanimously recommended the NVTA staff to work with Chairman to decide how to modify the SYP schedule and authorized Executive Director to bring that to the Authority meeting.
* In response to Chairman Bulova’s question on developing strategies for funding the SYP in the reduced revenue scenario, Ms. Backmon noted that staff is working on this information and the Finance Committee will consider at its next meeting, which will be after the April Authority meeting.

1. **NVTA Update**

* Ms. Backmon informed the members that the next Authority meeting is scheduled on April 12.

**Adjournment**

1. **Adjourn**

* The meeting adjourned at 11:40 am.