



Approved November 16, 2022

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Wednesday, October 19th, 2022, 7:00 pm
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority
In-person meeting at NVTa offices
Live-streamed on [YouTube](#)

MEETING SUMMARY

I. Call to Order/Welcome

- Chairman Boice called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM in-person at the NVTa offices.
- **Attendees:**
 - **TAC Members:** Randy Boice, Karen Campblin, Michelle Cavucci, Armand Ciccarelli, Kerianne Masters, Amy Morris, Frank Spielberg, and Shangjiang Zhu.
 - **NVTa Staff:** Monica Backmon, CEO; Keith Jasper, Principal, Transportation Planning and Programming; Dr. Sree Nampoothiri, Senior Transportation Planner; and Ian Newman, Regional Transportation Planner.
 - **Others:** Tom Harrington (Cambridge Systematics), Meeting was also live streamed on YouTube.

II. Summary Notes of September 21st, 2022, Meeting

- Motion to approve the summary notes of the September 21st meeting was made by Ms. Cavucci. Seconded by Ms. Masters. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Status of the TransAction Plan Update

- Mr. Jasper gave a short refresher on what TransAction is and what TransAction is not. The purpose of this is to ensure that these items are reflected in the final draft. He stated that TransAction is a 2045 horizon year multimodal transportation plan of 429 candidate projects whose performance related to congestion reduction and other factors are evaluated using ten weighted performance measures. It is intentionally both fiscally and geographically unconstrained and is compliant with the Code of Virginia. There are mandates for NVTa to produce this Plan, a prerequisite that projects must be in the Plan to receive funding, and legislation from 2012, HB 599, sets out parameters for how NVTa can evaluate projects.

Mr. Jasper emphasized that TransAction is not a land-use plan as land use is the responsibilities of local jurisdictions. Additionally, it is not a road-building plan, funding document project/modal prioritization or ranking tool, but TransAction does provide information that could subsequently be used for project evaluation.

- Mr. Jasper discussed the key takeaways of TransAction. TransAction provides jurisdictions and agencies a diverse range of multimodal project options – not commitments – for future potential funding requests. He mentioned that TransAction supports NVTA’s vision and goals as well as Core Values. He then shared the estimated capital costs by mode for all projects included in TransAction to highlight its multimodal nature and emphasized the regional Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system and transportation technology initiatives provided in TransAction.
- The Plan evaluates two external scenarios beyond NVTA’s control: the New Normal scenario and the Technology scenario. The third scenario, Incentives/Pricing scenario, would be complex and require a high degree of multi-level government coordination. Mr. Jasper noted that TransAction acknowledges the diversity of Northern Virginia jurisdictions and inter-relationship between land use and transportation by using the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments’ (MWCOG) planning forecasts. If endorsed, TransAction will provide a range of multimodal transportation options for NVTA member jurisdictions and agencies, provide initial funding eligibility for the projects located in Northern Virginia, and provide analytical information to support the evaluation of candidate projects for subsequent Six Year Program cycles.
- Mr. Jasper then discussed the Committee comments from the previous cycle of review of the draft TransAction plan. He also reviewed the comments from the TAC, PCAC, and PPC, as well as the Authority during the Authority October 13th Authority meeting and discussed how the proposed enhancements addressed these comments.
- Mr. Jasper continued to discuss the proposed enhancements to the draft Plan. He mentioned that in Section 6, Plan Impacts, the F1: Emissions Reduction is presented with Electric Vehicle (EV) Improvements as well as with Current EV Rates providing a range of impacts from EV improvements. He noted that this could be explained better. Chairman Boice asked if the call-out box could be a separate section, to which Mr. Jasper replied that it could look more like a scenario analysis, which is not the intention. Mr. Jasper continued by emphasizing that NVTA does not have control over several aspects of EV improvements/adoption – that is dependent on Federal money, manufacturer decisions, and consumer decisions.
- Mr. Spielberg asked if the assumption on the fleet is considered a base scenario, or if this was a variant scenario. Mr. Harrington responded that the 1.7% increase

in emissions reduction is based on current electrification rates and the 54% reduction in emissions is when you have today's EV adoption in the No-Build but full adoption of EVs in the Build scenario. Mr. Spielberg then asked if the 1.7% ought to be reported only in a scenario analysis and Dr. Nampoothiri emphasized that this is the range that is being shown. He mentioned that the 54% reduction reflects many external factors plus three EV infrastructure projects in the Plan as how the three projects alone effect emissions reductions is too difficult to predict. Mr. Spielberg asked for clarification in that he inferred staff made assumptions on the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VHT) contributed by EVs. Mr. Jasper mentioned that these are considered assumptions based on research that was being conducted at the time. Dr. Nampoothiri mentioned that the 1.7% increase also does not include the impacts of the three NVTA projects concerning EV infrastructure.

- Mr. Jasper mentioned that in scenario analysis, which is a technique used to address uncertainty in long-range transportation planning, staff make assumptions and then use proxy measures to determine future impacts of each of scenarios. He mentioned that whether it deserves its own section in the plan document is under further consideration and that perhaps it should be a sub-section in TransAction. Chairman Boice mentioned it could be placed at the end, to which Mr. Jasper responded that it already is at the end but that the section should make the content clearer and dedicate more time to explain what the scenario analysis results reveal as opposed to the mechanics of scenario analysis.
- Mr. Jasper discussed Section 8 (Regional Benefits). The proposed enhancements would emphasize the major takeaways, limitations and external factors, and address what success looks like as it relates to the Plan. General points include, what TransAction is and what it is not, the decision to not use the new term "Carbon pollution" as opposed to "emissions," to continue comparing/contrasting with MWCOG's environmental goals (though these have been created under a different legislative framework than NVTA), the beautification of the Plan document, and the need to address technical jargon. Mr. Jasper mentioned that there were duplicates in the project list, which will be removed. He noted that two projects need a change in the project sponsor, three projects need a change in project location, and two projects are under construction or are in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) of the TPB.
- Mr. Spielberg mentioned that if these are the extent of the comments received by staff, then staff have performed an exemplary job. Chairman Boice then asked if a final draft can be viewed in advance of the final meeting. Mr. Jasper mentioned that the final draft will be sent at least one week prior to the next TAC meeting. Dr. Zhu reiterated that it will be very helpful to focus on findings and assumptions as opposed to mechanics in the document. He added that another item to help make the results more transparent and understandable is to comment on the

implications of scenario measures. He gave the example of implications from two extremes in EV adoption and mentioned that it would be helpful to know the EV market penetration, based on current trends, by 2045. Dr. Zhu also suggested to expand on the details of the Incentives/Pricing scenario so it can be further evaluated in terms of its likelihood to occur. He also added that it would be good to show what the number of new charging stations and what Kilowatt Hours per charging station are.

- Ms. Campblin suggested that the scenario planning needs more credence, that project effects need to be more prominent, and that we have great historical data that should be considered, taking information heard from community and incorporate it into the next five years. She added that we need to better define funding gaps, and that this information is not lost as we move into the next update. Mr. Jasper mentioned the changes that we have done in the last five years for this update and that TransAction should not end when adopted. However, we should not lose the knowledge, and re-emphasized the regional BRT program and what this program would look like. Ms. Campblin discussed her concern that NVTA's legislation is outdated and should be revisited. Ms. Backmon answered that NVTA is the only funding entity adding that TransAction is not the funding document and is purposefully unconstrained. She reminded the Committee that NVTA funds all modes of transportation.

IV. NVTA Updates

- Ms. Backmon thanked the Committee for their efforts in t during the TransAction update process, especially since committee members have full-time employment outside of being committee members. She added staff is working on NVTA's draft legislative program for 2023 noting a balance of \$38.5 million to fully restore the amount \$102 million diverted from the Authority for WMATA's State of Good Repair needs.

V. Adjournment

- The meeting adjourned at 8:05 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for November 16th at 7:00 PM over Zoom.