



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

**PLANNING COORDINATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Wednesday, May 23, 2018, 6:30 pm**

**Northern Virginia Transportation Authority**

**3040 Williams Drive, Suite 200**

**Fairfax, Virginia 22031.**

**SUMMARY NOTES**

**I. Call to Order/Welcome**

Chairman Buona

- In the absence of Chairman Ralph Buona, Vice Chair Linda Colbert called the meeting to order at 6:37 pm.
- Attendees:
  - **PCAC Members:** Council Member Linda Colbert (Town of Vienna); Council Member Suzanne Fox (Town of Leesburg); Supervisor Ruth Anderson (Prince William County); Council Member Pamela Sebesky (City of Manassas); Board Member Erik Gutshall (Arlington County); Supervisor Daniel Storck (Fairfax County); Council Member Phil Duncan (City of Falls Church).
  - **NVTA Staff:** Michael Longhi (Chief Financial Officer); Keith Jasper (Principal, Transportation Planning and Programming); Harun Rashid (Transportation Planner); Sree Nampoothiri (Transportation Planner).
  - **Other:** Noelle Dominguez (Fairfax County); Robert Brown (Loudoun County); Paolo Belita (Prince William County), Hillary Orr (City of Alexandria), Gregory Tkac (Town of Dumfries).

**Action**

**II. Approve Summary Notes of April 25, 2018, PCAC Meeting**

- The April 25, 2018 Planning Coordination Advisory Committee meeting summary was unanimously approved, with abstentions from members not present.

**III. Draft FY2018-2023 Six Year Program**

Mr. Jasper

- Mr. Jasper addressed the committee stating the background of the proposed Six Year Program (SYP), starting with the long-range planning process of TransAction, and the culminating project recommendations. He expressed his gratitude to all Committee members for their valuable guidance in the last couple of years. He started the presentation with a brief overview of the project selection criteria, with public comments as new information (slide #3). Mr. Jasper then recapped the public comment events in the past few weeks, and in slides 5 -7, presented a tally of all comments received in the public comment period that ended on May 20. A total of approximately 1,200 citizens/organizations responded, with 85 percent of all comments addressing 9 candidate projects. There are some general comments that did not identify a specific project, but rather addressed the planning process, and some comments were not related to SYP. Mr. Jasper then noted the updates in project application – reduced funding requests (6 projects), project phase and milestone (3 projects), other (2 projects). He stressed that these updates had minimal effect on the staff recommendation. A summary of 60 candidate projects were then presented (slides 10,11,12):
  - Total number of projects, total cost, requested amount, available Pay-Go funds.
  - Tally of candidate projects by jurisdictions and agencies.
  - Tally of candidate projects by primary modal component.
- Mr. Jasper then explained the process staff employed to recommend funding. There were two starting points – project rankings by the Congestion Reduction Relative to Cost (CRRC) ratios, and the estimated Pay-Go revenue. He stressed that the use of CRRC ratios is directed by HB 2313, and that the estimated Pay-Go revenue is yet to be approved by the Finance Committee/Authority. This was a 2-step process:
  - Step 1: based on CRRC ratios
    - 1a: Top 30 ranked projects were identified, with a total requested amount of \$1,383,671,861.
    - 1b: From this initial list, 3 projects were eliminated because of other funding source and project readiness factor, totaling \$42,000,000.
    - 1c: Fund requests were adjusted for 6 other projects, due to project phasing and readiness factors, with a total adjustment of \$291,187,580

Step 1 identified 27 projects for funding recommendations, with a total of \$1,050,484,281.
  - Step 2: based on qualitative considerations
    - 2a: From the ranked list, after projects selected in step 1, 12 projects were identified with full fund request, based on public comments and other qualitative factors. Total fund request - \$199,389,000.
    - 2b: 3 more projects were added to the list, with adjusted fund requests, based on project phases. Fund request adjusted - \$35,400,000.

So, in this process, a total of 42 projects are selected for fund recommendation, with a grand total of \$1,285,273,281, which is the estimated Pay-Go revenue during the SYP period.

This recommended set of 42 projects have a good overlap in both CRRC and TransAction ratings, and in the next part of presentation slides, projects' recommended funding were summarized by:

- jurisdictions/agency,
- primary modal components,
- and geography (corridors, inside the beltway, outside the beltway).

A map was included in the presentation to show these projects' locations – to highlight how the recommended projects meet the overarching goal of a balanced regional planning and programming activity. Mr. Jasper then pointed to a set of suggested priorities, only applicable if the committee decides to modify the staff recommendation. This was followed by other additional staff recommendations:

- application to SmartScale funding,
- NVTAs next cycle of funding,
- deadline for executed SPAs,
- and future policies regarding expiration of allocated revenues.

To this last item of de-allocation policy, Mr. Longhi added that there is a substantial portion of un-used funds in all 3 funding programs (FY 2014, FY 2015-16, FY 2017), and staff is finalizing a draft policy to release these funds back to regional revenue source. To respond a question from Board Member Gutshall, Mr. Longhi mentioned that this draft policy will be presented as a discussion item in the next Finance Committee meeting, to be held on June 6 at 9:30 am. On projected Pay-Go revenue, he mentioned that staff had been working with Finance Committee members since May 2017, and the estimate is stable now barring legislative uncertainties at General Assembly.

- Next, schedules and timelines were presented for the upcoming cycle of program update. Mr. Jasper highlighted that this schedule will allow more time for jurisdictions/agency staff and committee members to review program materials. In the last presentation slide, Mr. Jasper reiterated last few months' effort of staff and committee members to evaluate and recommend a set of projects for funding in the SYP, and requested that the members now consider to endorse the two-step process of staff project recommendation.
- In response to this request, Vice Chair Colbert invited questions and /or concerns from committee members:
  - Regarding a question on the estimated Pay-Go revenue from Council member Suzanne Fox, Mr. Longhi opined that due to the loss of two out of three revenue sources to Authority, the estimate is fairly straight-lined and has fewer options to go up than the current assumption.
  - Supervisor Storck asked how the proposed policy of de-allocation will be structured. Mr. Longhi explained that the policy will not impose any hard deadlines to expend the allocated funds, but will propose continued and effective communication between the project sponsor and NVTAs staff as the project progresses through various phases.
  - In response to a question from Board Member Gutshall on the Step 1 process, Mr. Jasper confirmed that the initial set of 30 projects were selected based on their CRRC rankings, fund requests, and estimated Pay-Go revenue. Subsequent

project elimination and addition to this set was explained with two specific projects ranked (CRRC) at 4 and 8. He mentioned that all these process steps will be documented after the recommendation from the Planning and Programming Committee meeting.

Following this Q/A session, Supervisor Storck moved to approve the Step 1 process of staff recommendation.

- Vice Chair Linda Colbert then invited questions/discussion for Step 2 in staff recommendation process.
  - Supervisor Ruth Anderson expressed her concern for a project (ranked at #51) not being recommended for funding, and described how this project would enhance access to commuter bus service by PRTC, and ultimately help to reduce congestion on nearby I-95 segments. Mr. Jasper explained that this particular project did not perform well in the quantitative evaluation scales, and there were no compelling qualitative factors to otherwise move the needle towards a recommendation. He mentioned that in the next funding cycle, NVTA staff will work with applicant jurisdictions to refine project scopes to score better, which is also applicable to other projects. Supervisor Storck agreed and offered the support from Fairfax County staff to team up for regionally-significant projects like this. Board Member Eric Gutshall stated that this issue further highlights the need for more regional fund revenues for NVTA, and appreciated NVTA staff's work for the difficult task of project prioritization and funding allocations.

Without any further questions/concerns on the process, Council Member Duncan moved to approve the Step 2 process of staff recommendation.

- This question/answer session was followed by votes of committee members to approve process step 1 and 2. Both motions were approved by all committee members except Supervisor Anderson (passed 6-1).
- Board Member Gutshall expressed his concern that public comments, if not processed carefully, can erroneously skew the decision-making process. Mr. Jasper agreed, and explained that public comments for this cycle were treated as additional support to projects that were otherwise strong enough in evaluation. For discussion on the last part of staff recommendation, Step 3 with a set of priorities for committee members for fund re-allocation, Board Member Gutshall made clear that the priorities are in no particular order. Supervisor Anderson asked to clarify the objective to approve Step 3 recommendations. Mr. Jasper explained that Step 3 applies only if the committee members choose to modify staff's proposed funding recommendations. After these discussions, Board Member Gutshall motioned to approve staff recommendation in Step 3. The motion was approved by all committee members except Supervisor Anderson (passed 6-1).
- Supervisor Storck described the background of recent General Assembly's action to re-direct some of Authority's revenue stream for WMATA funding, and then motioned to approve the final staff recommendation of the meeting - to request to General Assembly to devise legislation of alternative funding sources for WMATA funding, and re-authorize a portion of the lost revenue back to Authority. This motion was unanimously approved (passed 7-0).

## **Discussion/Information**

- IV. NVT A Update** Ms. Backmon, Executive Director
- In the absence of Ms. Backmon, Mr. Longhi reminded the committee members of the upcoming Finance and Planning and Programming Committee meetings.

## **Adjournment**

- V. Adjourn**
- The meeting adjourned at 8:20 pm.