



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, June 17, 2020, 7:00 pm
Electronic meeting with livestreaming on [YouTube](#)

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Call to Order/Welcome

- Chairman Boice called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.
- Attendees:
 - **Members:** Randy Boice, Pat Turner, Armand Ciccarelli, Amy Morris, Dr. Shanjiang Zhu, Frank Spielberg, Karen Campblin.
 - **NVTA Staff:** Monica Backmon (Executive Director), Keith Jasper (Principal), Sree Nampoothiri (Senior Transportation Planner), Ria Kulkarni (Regional Transportation Planner).

II. Resolution finding the need to conduct meetings electronically

- Chairman Boice noted that as a result of the COVID-19 and Governor Northam's declaration of a State of Emergency, the Authority's Technical Advisory Committee Meeting was being held electronically. He noted that the passage of the amendments to HB 29 allowed regional bodies such as the Authority, and their committees to conduct business meetings electronically. He added that the meeting by electronic means is authorized because the items on the Committee meeting agenda are statutorily required or necessary to continue operations of the Authority. The resolution was approved unanimously.

III. Summary of May 20, 2020 Meeting

- The meeting summary was approved unanimously with abstentions from members not present at the May 20 meeting.

IV. FY2020-2025 Six Year Program Recommendations

- Mr. Nampoothiri briefed the TAC on the qualitative and quantitative evaluations for the 41 candidate projects that are under the ongoing Six-Year Program FY2020-2025 update. He noted that HB2313 requires NVTA to give priority to projects that achieve the greatest Congestion Reduction Relative to Cost (CRRC). He emphasized that the CRRC ratio takes into account the total project cost.



Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia

- He noted the other quantitative evaluation component, TransAction Rating, that involves evaluating projects based on 15 weighted performance measures that are used to evaluate the long-range plan, TransAction.
- Mr. Nampoothiri also added that qualitative aspects like project readiness, other available funds, local priority, and elements such as geographic and modal balance are evaluated for each candidate project in the program.
- Mr. Jasper pointed out that this was the fifth funding cycle, with total requests of approximately \$1.44 billion competing for available funding of \$522 million. This resulted in an approved to requested ratio of 36% for the FY2020-2025 Six-Year Program.
 - He provided a summary of the projects by primary mode. He also presented an overview of the public comments received highlighting four projects that received 85% of the comments and how the comments received after the public comment period did not change the course of recommendations.
 - He noted that 19 projects are on the recommended list, of which nine are continuation and 10 are first time projects.
- Chairman Boice asked why some of the continuation and highest CRRC ranking projects such as the City of Fairfax (Jermantown Rd) and Route 28 Improvements were not recommended under the FY2020-2025 Six-Year Program. Mr. Jasper explained that the projects were evaluated for readiness, geographical and modal balance, and local priority in some cases. He added that not all projects could be funded with the revenue available. City of Fairfax projects (Intersection improvements at Route 29 and Jermantown Road) could use 30% local funds for its projects. Whereas, if Prince William County project (Prince William Parkway at Clover Hill Road Innovative Intersection) were recommended, it would still have a funding gap that would keep the project far from completion. Therefore, NVTA staff recommended supporting the continuation projects through completion instead. Additionally, Prince William County submitted ten applications, of which two of its highest local priority projects were approved. Also, Route 28 project needed to finalize a design alternative before they could proceed with funding other phases of the project and therefore did not meet project readiness criteria. Mr. Jasper and Ms. Backmon echoed that the projects were evaluated for readiness, geographical and modal balance, and local priority in some cases.
- Ms. Campblin asked and Ms. Turner echoed whether the recommended funding for NOVA Parks should be used until after a public engagement process is held by NOVA Parks and Arlington County. Mr. Jasper responded that NVTA is cognizant of the overall support received for the W&OD trail expansion that outweighed



Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia

opposition. The recommended funding would enable Arlington County and NOVA Parks to collaborate with the commissions and Board to take a measured approach and an effective public engagement process. The funds were allocated toward preparatory work and design without any commitment for construction.

- Ms. Morris asked if there is a specific methodology for allocating a certain percentage of funding by mode choice or perhaps a methodology for funding mega-projects that require higher funding amounts. Mr. Jasper responded that no specific percentage for funding by mode or for mega-projects was allowed under VA Code.
- Chairman Boice wanted to know the rationale behind NVTA recommending the CC2DCA Intermodal Connector, which appears to be a ‘developer’ project (with Amazon HQ2 planned in Arlington) rather than a regional project. Ms. Backmon responded that the CC2DCA project was in TransAction before Amazon HQ surfaced for discussions and added that the connection was the ‘last leg’ of multimodal connection to the Airport. She also added that NVTA’s robust evaluation process that includes geographic and modal balance coupled with Long-Term Benefit, played an important role in how projects were recommended for funding.
- Ms. Morris was interested to know if NVTA staff considered the decline in public transit usage due to COVID and instead channel those “transit” funds to other projects. Mr. Jasper responded that it was too soon to know how the situation would change in the short and long-term. However, these factors would be considered in the long-range plan updates to better understand travel behaviors in the “new normal” as a result of telework or reluctance to use transit.
- Mr. Ciccarelli expressed that it was surprising not to see any ITS related projects submitted by localities/agencies for candidate projects. Mr. Jasper indicated that Alexandria and Arlington received funding for ITS projects in the past. However, in this program cycle, there were no projects that were specific to ITS. He indicated that there may be Transit Signal Priority related projects as a result of funding the Duke Street Transitway in Alexandria.
- There were discussions on why has Fairfax County received close to 50% of funding. Ms. Backmon explained that Fairfax County is about 48% of the population and approximately 43% of revenues are attributed to Fairfax County. The recommendations therefore provide reasonable geographic balance
- Dr. Zhu asked if there were any noticeable changes with comments received after the deadline and if there were any lessons learnt through the public comment period. Mr. Jasper responded that the comments received after the deadline were included only on face value but did not result in changes to the staff recommendations.



Northern Virginia Transportation Authority

The Authority for Transportation in Northern Virginia

- Chairman Boice moved that the Committee recommend the Authority to approve staff recommendations for the FY2020-2025 Six-Year Program. The motion was seconded by Ms. Morris. Motion passed with a 6-0-1 vote, with abstention from Mr. Spielberg.

V. Next steps

- The public comment summary and project recommendations will be relayed to the Planning and Programming Committee to consolidate the NVTA's FY2020-2025 Six-Year Program for Authority's approval. Staff will post final recommendations by June 24 followed by Authority adoption on July 9. The next call for projects is anticipated in July 2021.

VI. Adjournment

- The meeting was adjourned at 8:31 pm.