The meeting of the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission was called to order by Chairman Fisette at 8:10 P.M.

Members Present
Richard H. Black
Sharon Bulova
John Cook
Thelma Drake (alternate, DRPT)
James Dyke
William D. Euille
Jay Fisette
John Foust
Jeffrey Greenfield
Mark R. Herring
Catherine Hudgins
Mary Hynes
Jeffrey McKay
Ken Reid
Thomas Rust
Paul Smedberg
Lawrence Webb (alternate, City of Falls Church)

Members Absent
Barbara Comstock
Joe May
David F. Snyder
Christopher Zimmerman

Staff Present
Mariela Garcia-Colberg
Rhonda Gilchrest
Claire Gron
Scott Kalkwarf
Stephen MacIsaac (VRE)
Kala Quintana
Rick Taube
Dale Zehner (VRE)
Oath of Office for New NVTC Commissioner

Chairman Fisette announced that Senator Richard Black has been appointed to serve on NVTC to fill the seat vacated by Senator Whipple when she retired. Chairman Fisette administered the oath of office to Senator Black and commissioners welcomed him to NVTC.

Chairman Fisette stated that Delegate David Ramadan has also been appointed to fill the seat vacated by Adam Ebbin. However, Delegate Ramadan was unable to attend this meeting so he will be sworn in at a future meeting.

Minutes of the May 3, 2012 Meeting

Mr. Smedberg moved, with a second by Mrs. Bulova, to approve the minutes. The vote in favor was cast by commissioners Black, Bulova, Cook, Dyke, Fisette, Foust, Herring, Hudgins, Hynes, McKay, Rust, Smedberg and Webb. Commissioners Greenfield and Reid abstained.

VRE Items

Report from the VRE Operations Board and Chief Executive Officer. Mrs. Bulova reported that there are no VRE action items. She announced that this is Mr. Zehner's last NVTC meeting since he is retiring as VRE's CEO at the end of June. Mr. Zehner reported that the average daily ridership (ADR) for the month of May was 19,104. On-time performance (OTP) for May was 96 percent on the Fredericksburg line and 98 percent on the Manassas line. This is the eighth consecutive month that overall OTP has been above 95 percent. VRE also ran four excursion trains at the 18th annual Manassas Railway Festival on June 2, 2012. VRE will also run a select train on June 9th for the 100th Anniversary of the Girl Scouts. Approximately 800 people are expected to use VRE to travel to the anniversary event in Washington, D.C. Mr. Zehner also reported that Meet the Management events are continuing throughout the summer concluding in mid-August.

On behalf of the commission, Chairman Fisette thanked Mr. Zehner for his professionalism and the terrific job he did serving VRE for so many years. Mrs. Bulova observed that Mr. Zehner has been a superb CEO. He stepped into this position of leadership during a difficult time and he has brought back the luster of VRE and raised it to new heights. He has built a great team of staff who will continue providing excellent service. Mr. Zehner stated that he could not have done it without the help of NVTC, PRTC, the VRE Operations Board, DRPT, VRE staff and jurisdictional staff. VRE has doubled its ridership and is now at capacity. VRE has set a standard on how to treat customers.
Mr. Taube stated that NVTC has agreed to obtain the $350,000 federal grant and manage the project for this alternatives analysis of high-capacity transit. Non-federal matching funds of $87,500 are required and DRPT has accepted NVTC’s request to provide half of that amount. NVTC jurisdictions (Alexandria, Arlington, Fairfax County and Falls Church) have been asked to share in providing any required non-federal match up to $10,937.50 each. NVTC staff has discussed the scope of work, schedule and budget with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). At the request of FTA, staff has begun to apply on-line for the federal grant. Resolution #2192A would authorize staff to complete the application for the grant.

Mrs. Hynes moved, with a second by Mr. Smedberg, to approve the resolution.

Senator Black asked staff to provide a brief description of this project. Mr. Taube explained that there is a federal earmark to study high capacity transit in the Route 7 corridor from Tysons Corner to the King Street Station in Alexandria. The study will employ a consultant who will examine the travel patterns, travel demands, and look at different kinds of transit in that corridor. The consultant will then provide the results of the analysis to the jurisdictions for them to determine if they want to pursue any of the alternatives. In this particular corridor there is no Metrorail service.

Chairman Fisette observed that this is a regional effort and even though Arlington County is not located in this corridor, the county is still participating and providing funding. This is an example of how the jurisdictions work together for the good of the region.

The commission then voted on the motion and it passed unanimously. The vote in favor was cast by commissioners Black, Bulova, Cook, Dyke, Fisette, Foust, Greenfield, Herring, Hudgins, Hynes, McKay, Reid, Rust, Smedberg and Webb.

Mr. Euille arrived at 8:21 P.M.

NVTC Communications Plan

Chairman Fisette suggested deferring this until the next meeting. There were no objections.

DRPT Decision to By-Pass NVTC in Providing State Transit Assistance

Chairman Fisette asked Mr. Taube to provide a report. Mr. Taube stated that on May 15th DRPT Director Drake sent a letter announcing her decision to send state transit assistance directly to WMATA and NVTC’s jurisdictions. The jurisdictions were only given 10 days to agree in order to receive funding for FY 2013. NVTC and five of its jurisdictions (Arlington and Fairfax counties and the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax and
Falls Church) sent a letter objecting to this approach and asking for time to resolve the issues. DRPT initially extended the deadline until June 4th and then extended it to June 8th. Chairman Fisette stated that, although he was unable to attend, there was a meeting between DRPT and NVTC and jurisdiction representatives on May 31st to discuss these issues.

Mr. Taube reviewed correspondence, the Virginia Code documents, and NVTC’s Subsidy Allocation Model (SAM) chronology, which shows how the SAM model has evolved over the years. The SAM, which has been in existence since 1974, was developed for the jurisdictions to help share financial resources and to strengthen their regional partnership. It helps especially for jurisdictions who may receive a sharp change in aid. It has been changed from time to time, with the last change in June 2011.

Mr. Taube stated that a draft letter to Transportation Secretary Connaughton has been prepared, which outlines the concerns NVTC and its jurisdictions have regarding the funding change. The exact wording of the letter may be subject to change but staff would like the commission to focus on the issues that the jurisdictions have concerning this new policy and then authorize Chairman Fisette to sign it. Chairman Fisette stated that the word “demanded” will be changed to “directed” in the first paragraph.

Chairman Fisette asked Tom Biesiadny of Fairfax County staff to review the concerns outlined in the letter, which has been worked on collectively by local staffs. There is a concern that statutory requirements prohibit DRPT’s approach. Legal counsel informed NVTC that the Virginia Code compels the funds to be allocated in accordance with NVTC’s Subsidy Allocation Model. The proposal to send it directly to the local governments and to WMATA would mean that the allocation process must happen some other way.

Mr. Biesiadny stated the second concern is DRPT’s lack of notice. The SAM allocation process has been in place well over three decades with the most recent and significant negotiations occurring over a year-long period between 1999-2000. One of the purposes of the SAM formula is to cushion the impact of abrupt changes in state aid and to protect the smaller jurisdictions from unfair costs. For Falls Church and the City of Fairfax there is a significant amount of Metrobus service that runs through their jurisdictions but they don’t have as many riders as the larger jurisdictions. Given this history, there is concern that a 10-day notice of a significant change is particularly troubling since the SAM has been such a substantial part of how state aid and gas tax revenues have been allocated in Northern Virginia. The SAM is a prime example of regional cooperation.

Mr. Biesiadny stated that the letter also expresses a concern about DRPT’s failure to understand WMATA’s role. WMATA operates the service but is not responsible for paying for the service. The service is paid for by the local governments in Northern Virginia, and the state does contribute to those payments. WMATA bills the local governments for that service on a quarterly basis. Currently, the first quarter WMATA bill is due July 1, 2012. Local governments must pay that bill to keep Metro service operational. NVTC receives notice from the jurisdictions on how much to pay
toward the WMATA bills, which are paid from a variety of sources, including state aid, gas tax revenue, local General Funds, Trust Funds at NVTC, other local bond issues, and credits at WMATA. Once the July 1st payment is made, NVTC sends invoices for those bills to DRPT and DRPT reimburses its portion according to its own allocation formula.

Mr. Biesiadny stated that the General Assembly has asked Northern Virginia planning agencies (NVTC, PRTC, NVTA and NVRC) to conduct a study on any efficiencies in consolidation of these organizations. The task force has been meeting to discuss these issues. There is concern that changing the role of one of these agencies could impact the process. A consolidation response is expected back to the General Assembly this fall.

Mr. Biesiadny stated that the letter also points out that DRPT’s policy change creates financial burdens for NVTC and its jurisdictions, because NVTC currently prepares grant applications, submits invoices and assures compliance with DRPT’s complex rules. If jurisdictions are required to do this work, it will create additional administrative burdens with no recourse within their already approved local FY 2013 budgets. There is concern that payments would now be processed in six different locations as opposed to one place and this seems contradictory to the governor’s initiative to improve government efficiency. In addition, there are funds that come off the top of the SAM formula, including NVTC’s administrative budget as well as several regional projects, including electronic transit schedules and NTD data collection resulting in $6 million in federal funding for WMATA. These are services that NVTC provides to its jurisdictions.

In regards to DRPT’s concern for the need for transparency, Mr. Biesiadny stated that there are a number of ways to address this concern without changing the formula process. In conclusion, Mr. Biesiadny stated that the current process of distributing funds through NVTC for Northern Virginia’s transit systems has worked well for many decades and should not be changed. At the very least, the legal ramifications should be fully understood before any action is taken to change the process.

Mrs. Drake stated that it is important to hear the jurisdictions’ concerns and to look at how we move forward together. DRPT’s change in procedure is driven entirely by the need for transparency. Everywhere else in the commonwealth state funds go directly to the transit organization. The amount of funding that is currently allocated will not change; only the recipient changes. She explained that the funds could go through the SAM formula with the only difference being that it is transparent as for whom the funds are intended and where they went. It could be done through a virtual accounting process. The jurisdictions could contract with NVTC to do the work. Mrs. Drake stated that this new process is not related to the consolidation effort. DRPT expects local governments to continue to use NVTC. From the discussion at the May 31st meeting, it is very clear that the jurisdictions see value in what NVTC does for them. NVTC still will manage the gas tax revenues, state funding for VRE and the other grant projects it manages.
Mrs. Drake stated that DRPT disagrees with NVTC’s interpretation of the Code because it is superseded by budget language that has been in place for two years, which states: “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds allocated to Metro under this program may be dispersed by the Department of Rail and Public Transportation directly to Metro or any other transportation entity that has an agreement to provide funding to Metro as deemed appropriate by the Department.”

Mrs. Drake also expressed her concern about the large pool of reserve funds (approximately $148 million) held at NVTC for the jurisdictions. These funds could also be used for the July 1st WMATA billing payment. This reserve needs to be looked at as to its purpose and why such a large amount sits at NVTC.

Chairman Fisette stated that his understanding is that there is a distinction between the budget language which speaks to the dispersal of funds and the question of how the funds are allocated through the SAM as it is worded in the statute. Mr. Maclsaac stated that as he interprets the statute and the budget language, it presents a statutory interpretation problem because there are conflicting provisions of law. In 1999, the General Assembly adopted legislation (Section 58.1-638.A.5 of the Code) that says that funds for WMATA must be allocated in accordance with NVTC’s SAM model. The budget language referenced by Mrs. Drake gives DRPT the authority to make the payment to WMATA directly. The conflict of the budget language is that it addresses who may pay but it doesn’t address the manner in which the payment will be made. The conflicting statutes would need to be harmonized. The SAM formula would still need to be applied regardless of who is making the payment to WMATA.

Senator Black asked if it could be harmonized by providing DRPT with the computer allocation amounts calculated by NVTC. Mr. Biesiadny explained that the problem with this approach is that DRPT’s payments are on a reimbursement basis and each year the percentage of funding amounts change based on the state’s own allocation formula. In addition, the jurisdictions use at least three other funding sources, as described earlier, to pay their WMATA bills. All of this has to be considered before payment is received at WMATA on the first day of the quarter in order for transit service to continue. He added that DRPT may send funds to WMATA but that does not complete the process.

Chairman Fisette asked jurisdictional staff how it would work if the new process goes into effect. Mr. Biesiadny replied that staff has not identified how it could be done. Chairman Fisette asked Mrs. Drake how DRPT sees it being done. Mrs. Drake stated that the only thing that changes is the recipient. If jurisdictions choose to run the funds through the SAM, they can certainly do that. Mrs. Bulova observed that it is not a matter of “choosing” because the jurisdictions are “required” to run the funds through the SAM, and that is one of the reasons why the jurisdictions rely on NVTC to do it. In response to a question from Chairman Fisette, Mr. Biesiadny stated that Mrs. Drake’s explanation still does not clarify it.

In response to a question from Mr. Smedberg, Mr. Biesiadny stated that WMATA bills must be paid on the first day of the quarter. Since DRPT funding is on a reimbursement basis, WMATA will receive basically a double payment. Theoretically,
the double payment could be used for a future payment, but the process would still need to be figured out. It's not a simple solution. Steve Pittard from DRPT explained that state funding is allowed to be drawn down five days in advance of the due date. It doesn’t have to be done on a reimbursement basis.

Mrs. Hynes observed that the SAM is a complicated process that has been negotiated over many years. It is fair for NVTC to ask (with it being June 7th and the WMATA bills due on July 1st) that DRPT to write out exactly how the new process would work. She is reminded of when there was a shift in the allocation of the gas tax and it took an entire year to get it working correctly. There is nothing more important to this region than making sure Metrobus and Metrorail continue service to the riders as well as WMATA continuing to move towards a state of good repair. There absolutely needs to be agreement that it will work seamlessly before jurisdictions feel comfortable with the process. Mrs. Drake replied that DRPT is coming to NVTC on June 12th to review the SAM model and document how it works. In regards to the July 1st WMATA payment deadline, the jurisdictions have been anticipating this and there are funds available in the reserve.

Mr. Foust observed that the current process has been in place almost 40 years and asked if something happened to create the necessity for this change. The local governments have already passed their FY 2013 budgets and he asked why there can’t be time to discuss it and implement it over the coming year. Why does it have to be done immediately? Mrs. Drake replied that the issue is transparency. Everyone in the state is being treated the same way and the six-year plan is expected to be printed immediately. The June 8th deadline is for the jurisdictions to say whether they want their money. Discussions can still continue.

Chairman Fisette agreed with Mr. Foust and does not understand what the rush is. He is somewhat flabbergasted that no conversation occurred before DRPT's May 15th letter and now there is an expectation that it must be done immediately. It makes sense to resolve the issues first before implementing changes so that everyone knows it can be done seamlessly and that transit service is not interrupted. He does not understand how DRPT can go to the CTB with a proposal for which staff does not understand how it will be implemented. Mrs. Drake stated that the timing of the six-year plan necessitates that it be done now. Chairman Fisette replied that it does not make sense because the six-year plan can be amended at any time. Mrs. Drake stated that she hears the concerns and will take them back to the commonwealth.

Chairman Fisette responded that he does not understand the decision to do it regardless of the questions and concerns the jurisdictions have. Mr. Euille observed that if DRPT is saying that the jurisdictions would receive the funding but then could give it to NVTC to go through the formula, he asked what is gained. It is just more steps in the process. Mrs. Drake replied it is transparency. Mr. Euille stated that it implies NVTC is doing something wrong. Everything NVTC does is transparent.

Chairman Fisette asked what is DRPT's definition of “transparency.” Mrs. Drake replied that the commonwealth provides a significant amount of funding to Northern Virginia for transit that needs to be as transparent as anywhere else in the
commonwealth. It is important to be able to follow the funds. It is very difficult for people to understand the current process and see that the funds come from the state. This proposal will make it very clear where the funds are going.

Mrs. Bulova stated that this change will complicate the transparency and accountability already in place. Local governments will start to receive checks from the state, but they won’t know if it’s the correct amount according to the SAM. That is why it works so well using NVTC and why it has worked so well over the many decades. Mrs. Drake stated that there is no difference in the amount that will be received. Mrs. Bulova observed that the amount would not be according to the SAM, which has been agreed to by all the jurisdictions. It is the jurisdictions’ fear that by complying with the June 8th deadline that it will give the impression that they agree with the new process. It is counter to what the General Assembly has asked for to streamline government. Mrs. Drake responded that the letter is for DRPT and not for CTB. She fully expects the letters to say that the jurisdictions disagree; however, if they want the funds, they must submit a response by June 8th.

Mr. Reid stepped out of the room.

Mrs. Hudgins observed that the problem that has been described is the lack of transparency. Mrs. Drake stated that DRPT has no trouble following its funding contributions; however, nobody else can. Mrs. Hudgins stated that it is important to direct the solution to the explicit problem. If the public does not understand, there are other solutions, such as an annual agreement between DRPT and the jurisdictions on what the actual amount is. She asked how others will understand there is transparency with the new process. Mrs. Drake stated that it will be very clear that the money is from DRPT. Funding now goes through NVTC and it is not clear that DRPT provides funding at all. Chairman Fisette suggested that the jurisdictions provide in writing acknowledging that they are the recipients of the funds and direct DRPT to deposit the funds at NVTC, which still gives DRPT the ability to publicly clarify it. He asked if this could be the solution. Mrs. Drake stated that she can’t answer that until after June 12th.

Mr. Greenfield asked why DRPT can’t defer action until after the 12th. Mrs. Drake stated that it is important for DRPT to treat all transit throughout the commonwealth the same way and there needs to be transparency. Mr. Greenfield expressed his opinion that if it is all about acknowledging DRPT’s funding, then NVTC could amend its Communications Plan to accommodate this in a formal way. He stated that with the issue of transparency, DRPT is implying NVTC is doing something wrong. Not once since he has sat on this Board has a NVTC or DRPT audit of NVTC uncovered any problem. He also asked who are the “people” that need to understand it. Mrs. Drake stated that she hears it over and over again that the state does not give any money to Northern Virginia.

Mrs. Hynes stated that to be candid, Mrs. Drake believes it is the people in this room. Mrs. Drake stated that it is the people in this room, as well as the press, legislators and the public. Mr. Euille observed that instead of Northern Virginia sending tax revenues to the state coffers, maybe it should send it directly to those who need it throughout the state.
Mr. McKay expressed his concern that this DRPT process has been the least transparent process. If the driving factor is transparency, why would DRPT sneak a change in two weeks before the CTB approves the six-year plan without talking to the organization that handles this, without understanding the legal implications, without understanding now the SAM works, and without understanding the accounting issues associated with a change. To have DRPT give an explanation that the change will occur regardless of the concerns but DRPT could go back and ask CTB to reverse it later, just doesn’t work. He is concerned with the communication between DRPT and NVTC and its jurisdictions. There is a DRPT representative at NVTC meetings each month and nobody brought this to NVTC’s attention. If we can’t have better communication than this, then it is a sign of bad governance. It is no way to govern; it is no way to communicate. DRPT talks about partnerships; however, this is not a partnership. If transparency is the issue, then there needs to be early communication and discussions to understand all the ramifications of a change.

Chairman Fisette observed that this almost 40-year process is one of the best examples of regional collaboration and cooperation. The comparison of how it is done in other parts of the state doesn’t mean that it has to be done exactly the same in Northern Virginia. This region is unique and transit is much more complicated. It is the lifeblood of the economy. There isn’t another Metro-like transit system in the state. In his view, the evolution of the collaboration and cooperation of this region is epitomized in NVTC and the SAM model. To come in and undo that or threaten it, does not make sense.

Mr. Reid returned to the discussion.

Senator Black asked if DRPT is saying transparency is asking Northern Virginia to do what the rest of the state does. Mrs. Drake explained that it is based on the same model. The only change that will take place is where the funds are physically going. Mrs. Hynes asked, in DRPT’s desire for transparency, what is it that the public, press and legislators will look at to tell the story differently than what is currently done. Will the six-year plan be different? Mrs. Drake responded that it would not be a document. It would be clear to the jurisdictions how much is coming to each jurisdiction and how much is going to WMATA. Mr. Webb stated that Falls Church would have to amend its budget to be able to use these funds. It adds work to already overworked jurisdictional staff. Mrs. Drake stated that Falls Church subsidy is from the gas tax as well, which will continue to flow through NVTC.

Chairman Fisette stated that Mr. Biesiadny did a good job of reviewing the draft letter outlining the concerns. Mrs. Drake thanked everyone for their comments and will get back to them after June 12th. If there are any compelling reasons why this new process can’t happen, DRPT can ask CTB to reverse it.

Mrs. Bulova moved, with a second by Mr. Webb, to authorize NVTC’s chairman to sign and send the letter to DRPT, with the wording change “demanded” to “directed” in the first paragraph.
In response to a question of clarification from Mrs. Hynes, Chairman Fisette explained that the action is to only authorize him to sign the letter as NVTC’s chairman. The other five localities will take their own action. Mrs. Hynes stated that she expects that staff will continue to tweak wording over the next few days, and she is comfortable with Chairman Fisette, Vice-Chairman McKay and Secretary-Treasurer Smedberg conferring and agreeing on any edits. There were no objections.

Mr. Foust suggested adding a comment that NVTC appreciates DRPT’s desire for transparency and NVTC is willing to work with DRPT to find a way to achieve that goal without these funding changes.

Senator Herring observed that as a state legislator he feels compelled to make a statement. It seems from his vantage point, ever since the McDonnell administration has come in, that there has been one after another example of confrontational approaches to Northern Virginia transit issues, from state directed appointments on the WMATA Board, threatening millions of dollars of state funding for WMATA, financial audits, attempts to eliminate NVTC without much discussion and now this. This type of confrontational approach is a distraction from what constituents expect. They expect officials to work together—across jurisdictional boundaries and across different governmental levels—to meet the needs of the people. The status quo is not perfect and improvements can be made; however, no advance discussion and being confrontational is counterproductive. There needs to be a better way to work together.

The commission then voted on the motion and it passed. The vote in favor was cast by commissioners Bulova, Cook, Euille, Fisette, Foust, Greenfield, Herring, Hudgins, Hynes, McKay, Rust, Smedberg and Webb. Senator Black voted no and Commissioners Dyke and Reid abstained. Mr. Reid explained that Loudoun County already has a direct agreement with DRPT and it works well for them.

Chairman Fisette thanked Mrs. Drake for coming to NVTC to discuss this issue. Mrs. Drake left the meeting and did not return.

**Virginia Vanpool Incentive Program**

Chairman Fisette suggested deferring discussion of this item to the next meeting. Mr. Taube asked commissioners to read the materials and be prepared to take action at the July 5th meeting. NVTC will be asked to approve a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with PRTC and the George Washington Regional Commission (GWRC), the sponsors with NVTC of the new vanpool program. NVTC will also be asked to authorize a bridge loan in FY 2014, if needed, to the Vanpool Incentive Program of up to $1.1 million, to complete required funding and qualify for $3.4 million in state and federal aid awarded by CTB. The recommended source of funds would be NVTC jurisdiction trust funds to be budgeted for FY 2014. These are complicated and complex documents. Commissioners should contact staff with any questions or comments prior to the next meeting.
I-66 Multi-Modal Study (Inside the Beltway)

Mr. Taube stated that staff comments were provided to meet the May 22nd deadline. There are many significant issues remaining and the public will not have further opportunity to comment prior to completion of the final report. Chairman Fisette reported that VDOT project staff will be at NVTC’s July 5th meeting to provide a briefing on the final report. Mrs. Hynes stated that she received a briefing from VDOT and she came away from that meeting with a very different understanding of what she originally thought VDOT was proposing. She will share with NVTC a copy of her letter to VDOT. Mr. Reid also asked if NVTC could receive a briefing on the proposal to allow commuter buses on the shoulders of I-66 inside the Beltway.

Legislative Items

State Legislative Update. The biennial budget was approved with an additional $9.9 million for transit operating assistance statewide in FY 2013. NVTC staff estimates that its jurisdictions could realize an additional $6.3 million in FY 2013 funding, plus $619,000 for VRE and $341,000 for PRTC. No additional funding for the Dulles Rail project was provided.

Federal Legislative Update. The House of Representatives approved a “skeleton” multi-year surface transportation authorization bill for the purpose of permitting a conference committee to begin work. The Senate version includes increased expenditures and restoring the monthly tax-free transit benefit to $240.

Study of Northern Virginia Transportation/Planning Agency Efficiency and Consolidation. Mr. Taube reported that the Efficiency and Consolidation Task Force, made up of the chairs and vice-chairs of NVTC, PRTC, NVRC and NVTA, has held several meetings and the next meeting is scheduled for the end of June. The meetings are open to the public.

WMATA Items

Mrs. Hudgins stated that according to WMATA’s Vital Signs Report, Metrobus ridership has increased but Metrorail ridership is down.

Regional Transportation Items

SJR 297 Study. Mr. Taube reported that DRPT conducted another stakeholders’ meeting on May 7th in Richmond. NVTC staff discussed comments with jurisdictional staff and submitted them to DRPT. The issues mentioned in the comments are likely to persist through the final DRPT report to the General Assembly. On the positive side, this study will provide an opportunity to demonstrate to the General Assembly why more funding is needed for transit. Chairman Fisette stated that it is important to monitor this
closely because funding is fundamental to the work of this organization. Mr. Taube stated that the results of the study should be available in the fall of 2012.

Mr Reid left the meeting at 9:47 P.M. and did not return.

Regional Household Travel Survey. MWCOG recently released the results from area-specific surveys conducted in spring 2011 and fall 2011. The surveys reveal an impressive 53 percent transit mode share in Crystal City for commuting trips, but also in Shirlington (34 percent) and along Columbia Pike (25 percent). The surveys also provide important “before” data for Reston in advance of the planned Metrorail station and for Columbia Pike in advance of transit improvements in that corridor.

Region Forward. MWCOG has prepared a draft Baseline Progress Report measuring the current status of the National Capital Region with respect to the 28 targets. The report also classified targets as major, moderate, or minor challenges. This report will be presented to the MWCOG Board of Directors in June, 2012.

NVTC Correspondence

NVTC Comments on CTB’s Six Year Improvement Program. Mr. Taube stated that in the spirit of transparency and cooperation with DRPT, NVTC’s comments are kinder and gentler than comments that have been made in the past.

NVTC Letter from the Virginia Department of Tax. TAX Commissioner Burns has replied to NVTC’s letter and provides more details about his department’s ongoing efforts to improve the accuracy of taxpayers’ allocations of the 2.1 percent motor fuels tax to the correct jurisdiction.

NVTC’s Public Outreach

Commissioners had no questions on the report provided.

NVTC Financial Items for April, 2012

The financial reports were provided to commissioners and there were no questions.
Adjournment

Without objection, Chairman Fisette adjourned the meeting at 9:50 P.M.

Approved this 5th day of July, 2012.

_____________________________________
J a y  F i s e t t e  
C h a i r m a n

_____________________________________
Paul C. Smedberg  
S e c r e t a r y - T r e a s u r e r
RESOLUTION #2192A

SUBJECT: Authorization to Apply for Federal Grant Funds for NVTC’s Route 7 Alternatives Analysis Study.

WHEREAS: The Northern Virginia Transportation Commission has agreed to apply for grant funds and manage an alternatives analysis study of the Route 7 corridor (Alexandria to Tysons Corner);

WHEREAS: The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) has reviewed the proposed scope of work, schedule and budget and has asked NVTC staff to proceed with the online application for $350,000 of federal funds that expire on September 30, 2012; and

WHEREAS: DRPT and NVTC’s four participating jurisdictions have agreed to provide the required $87,500 in non-federal matching funds.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Northern Virginia Transportation Commission authorizes its executive director to complete the online application for a federal grant for $350,000 for this project, to supply whatever assurances are required, to obtain the $87,500 in non-federal matching funds that have been pledged and to execute any and all required grant agreements.

Approved this 7th day of June, 2012.

Paul C. Smedberg
Secretary-Treasurer

Jay Fisette
Chairman