



**JOINT MEETING OF THE
NVTC-PRTC JOINT COMMISSION WORKING GROUP AND
NVTC PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE
THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 2023
Via Electronic Participation
Public Streaming via YouTube**

4:00 P.M.

*This meeting is an **all-virtual public meeting** as permitted under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and NVTC's Electronic Participation Policy. The meeting may be viewed via the [NVTC YouTube Link](#).*

If the livestream transmission fails, please contact NVTC staff via email at support@novatransit.org, which will be monitored during the meeting.

AGENDA

1. Welcome
2. Joint Commission Working Group
 - A. Meeting Summary from September 15, 2022 Joint Commission Working Group Meeting
 - B. I-395/95 Commuter Choice: Staff Recommended Program of Projects for FY 2024-2025
3. Program Advisory Committee
 - A. Meeting Summary of the September 15, 2022 Program Advisory Committee Meeting
 - B. NVTC Staff Presentations:
 - Envision Route 7 BRT
 - Northern Virginia Regional Bus Analysis
 - Northern Virginia Regional Zero-Emission Bus Strategic Plan
4. Other Business
5. Future Meetings

Members of the Joint Commission Working Group:

Jeffrey McKay, Chair (NVTC)
Sarah Bagley (NVTC)
Libby Garvey (NVTC)
Tinesha Allen (PRTC)
Kenny Boddye (PRTC)
Jeanette Rishell (PRTC)

Members of the Program Advisory Committee:

Sarah Bagley, Chair
John Foust
Libby Garvey
David Snyder
Michael R. Turner

**NVTC-PRTC JOINT COMMISSION WORKING GROUP
PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY
Via Electronic Participation
Public Streaming via YouTube
September 15, 2022**

NVTC-PRTC Joint Commission Working Group Members Present:

Jeff McKay, Chair (NVTC)
Tinesha Allen (PRTC)
Sarah Bagley (NVTC)
Kenny Boddye (PRTC)
Libby Garvey (NVTC)
Jeanette Rishell (PRTC)

Other Commissioners Present:

David Meyer (NVTC)

Staff and Others Present:

Kate Mattice, NVTC Executive Director
Monique Blyther
Matt Friedman
Allan Fye
Adam Hager
Ben Owen
Joe Stainsby
Melissa Walker

Joint Commission Working Group Chair McKay called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. He noted that staff followed procedures and guidelines to give notice to Working Group members, both Commissions, staff and the public about today's meeting. He explained that the meeting is an all-virtual public meeting as permitted under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and NVTC's Electronic Participation Policy and is being streamed live via NVTC's YouTube channel.

Mr. Fye called the roll and determined a quorum was present. He then introduced staff.

Chair McKay noted that members were provided with a summary of the previous Working Group meeting held on April 22, 2021. He asked if anyone had comments to share with staff; there were none.

Mr. Meyer joined the meeting at 4:05 p.m.

Chair McKay then thanked members for volunteering to serve on the Working Group. He explained the purpose of the Working Group, noting it serves as an intermediary between the two Commissions and corridor jurisdictions during the I-395/95 Commuter Choice funding cycle. He then asked Ms. Mattice and Mr. Stainsby for upfront remarks.

Ms. Mattice thanked members for their participation and said the Working Group will help shape exciting and transformative transit investments in this next I-395/95 Commuter Choice round. She stated that staff has already started conversations with eligible applicants about project ideas and she encouraged Working Group members to think strategically about efforts that would fit well with the program's goals.

Mr. Stainsby also thanked members for their participation and observed that OmniRide is excited to participate and play a role in helping shape the regional commuting landscape.

Chair McKay asked if there were any initial questions from members. There were none. He then asked Mr. Owen to go through his presentation.

Mr. Boddye joined the meeting at 4:21 p.m.

I-395/95 Commuter Choice Program

Mr. Owen provided a brief overview of the Commuter Choice program, noting that it reinvests a portion of toll revenues from I-66 and I-395/95 into transit and other transportation improvements that benefit the respective corridor's toll payers by moving more people and expanding travel options. He explained that NVTC and PRTC have co-approval roles for I-395/95 Commuter Choice and take actions in tandem, but NVTC staff handles day-to-day administration of the program.

Mr. Owen said staff expects \$45-48 million available for new projects in this upcoming funding cycle covering fiscal years 2024-2025. He encouraged members to consider how this funding might leverage other major investments in the corridor, including the 95 Express Lanes extension to Fredericksburg and Commonwealth-led rail upgrades, and support regional efforts to make transit more attractive to rebuild ridership. Mr. Owen also noted that the program is limited in the overall share of funding that may be allocated to transit operations, which is part of the reason that staff is encouraging capital project proposals in this round. He then provided a summary of the timeline for the call for projects process, explaining that application materials would be made available to eligible applicants in mid-November and applications would be due January 27, 2023. Mr. Owen also detailed the major steps in the program development process starting in early 2023 starting with an eligibility review for submitted applications and ending with adoption of a Program of Projects by the Commissions and the Commonwealth Transportation Board in June.

Next, Mr. Owen described the program's current technical evaluation process. He explained the four criteria – technical merit, annualized cost effectiveness, applicant preference and

interagency collaboration – of which technical merit, which comprises factors that assess projects' support for the program's goals, accounts for most (70 of 100) possible points.

Mr. Owen then outlined staff's proposed changes to the process. The changes would emphasize the measurable aspects of the process by allocating more points to technical merit and annualized cost effectiveness while reducing the points for applicant preference and removing interagency collaboration entirely. The changes would also incorporate equity considerations by adding the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments' Equity Emphasis Areas (EEAs) into the technical merit accessibility factor, allowing applications to receive points for serving or linking regional activity centers and/or EEAs interchangeably. Mr. Owen noted that staff is eager for members' thoughts on these changes, which would be reviewed with both Commissions in October for adoption in November, along with opening the call for projects.

Chair McKay then asked for questions and feedback from the Working Group.

Ms. Allen asked about the extent to which scores might change with these proposed modifications to the technical evaluation process. Mr. Owen answered that staff evaluated past projects with the proposed modifications and they only resulted in minor changes.

Ms. Rishell asked about adding EEAs and whether they overlap with activity centers. Mr. Owen responded that there may be some areas where EEAs and activity centers are overlaid on top of one another. The evaluation would look at whether projects connect one or both at either end, so the revision would create more opportunities for projects to receive higher scores under the accessibility factor.

Ms. Garvey asked when Commuter Choice began. Mr. Owen responded that I-66 Commuter Choice began in 2017 and I-395/95 Commuter Choice began in 2019. The upcoming funding cycle will be the third on the I-395/95 corridor.

Mr. McKay asked whether the \$45-48 million available for new projects is the same as previous rounds. Mr. Owen said that \$22.5 million was available in the first cycle and \$30 million in the second, but not all of the funding was allocated. The program is funded by Transurban via concessionaire payments to the Commonwealth usually totaling \$15 million per year. He stated that there is more carryover funding this round.

Ms. Bagley asked about the 50% cap on funds going to transit operations and whether it is possible to have a discussion on changing that requirement. Mr. Owen responded that it is a requirement of the program's Memoranda of Agreement with the Commonwealth, adding that the requirement is likely to help facilitate a balance in investments across various modes through the program. Ms. Mattice added that the 50% cap is specifically for transit operations such as fuel, driver salaries and the like. She noted that transit capital projects and other transit-adjacent projects do not count toward the 50% operations cap.

Mr. Meyer asked whether carryover funds were anticipated and whether they would remain in future years. Mr. Owen answered the team is looking to invest as much of the available funding as possible. He stated that staff is encouraging eligible applicants to submit larger capital project

proposals given the amount available and would hope to see a smaller carryover balance, if any, next round.

Mr. Boddye asked whether greenhouse gas reduction is part of the evaluation process. Mr. Owen said that it is not since greenhouse gas reduction is not a program goal in the Memoranda of Agreement, but that anticipated greenhouse gas reductions are now estimated and presented as part of building the rationale for adoption of a Program of Projects.

Other Business

Chair McKay asked if there was any other business for the Working Group. There was no further discussion.

Future Meetings

Chair McKay provided closing remarks including indicating that the next Working Group meeting will be held in Spring 2023, once staff have completed their evaluations and identified a draft Program of Projects to consider.

Ms. Bagley said she would follow up with staff on questions related to proposed changes to the technical evaluation process.

The Joint Commission Working Group meeting adjourned at 4:41 p.m.



I-395/95 Commuter Choice FY 2024-2025 Technical Evaluation Results



Applicant	Application Title	Application Type	Technical Merit (75 Points)	Annualized Cost Effectiveness (20 Points)	Applicant Preference (5 Points)	Application Score (100 Points)	Funding Request
Arlington County	Metrobus 16M Service Enhancement: Skyline to Crystal City	Bus Service	38	7	5	50	\$5,000,000
DASH	DASH Line 35 Service Enhancement: Van Dorn Street Station to the Pentagon (Continuation)	Bus Service	60	7	5	72	\$7,290,000
DASH	DASH Line 36A/B Service Enhancement: Mark Center to Potomac Yard-VT Station (Continuation)	Bus Service	49	7	0	56	\$3,774,000
DASH	DASH Line 35 Bus Fleet Capacity Expansion: Van Dorn Street Station to the Pentagon	Bus Capital	38	7	0	45	\$8,630,000
Fairfax County	Fairfax Connector Route 396: Backlick North Park and Ride to the Pentagon (Continuation)	Bus Service	53	7	5	65	\$1,750,915
Fairfax County	Richmond Highway Bus Rapid Transit Implementation: Fort Belvoir to Huntington Station	Bus Capital	64	13	0	77	\$20,000,000
OmniRide	OmniRide Route D-200 Service Enhancement: Dale City to Ballston (Continuation)	Bus Service	71	20	5	96	\$304,626
OmniRide	OmniRide Prince William Metro Express Service Enhancement: Dale City to Franconia-Springfield Station (Continuation)	Bus Service	45	20	0	65	\$671,678
OmniRide	OmniRide Route 1 Local Service Enhancement: Quantico to Woodbridge Station (Continuation)	Bus Service	38	13	0	51	\$755,020
OmniRide	OmniRide Route 543: Staffordboro to Downtown Washington, D.C. (Continuation)	Bus Service	68	20	0	88	\$1,025,441
OmniRide	OmniRide Route 942: Staffordboro to the Pentagon (Continuation)	Bus Service	60	13	0	73	\$1,638,926
Virginia Railway Express	TDM Strategy: Amtrak Step-Up Reinstatement on VRE Fredericksburg Line	TDM	54	13	5	72	\$1,477,065
Virginia Railway Express	VRE Fredericksburg Line Service Enhancement	Rail Service	68	7	0	75	\$4,858,805
Virginia Railway Express	Crystal City Station Expansion	Rail Capital	60	13	0	73	\$18,786,281
Virginia Railway Express	Alexandria Station Expansion	Rail Capital	38	20	0	58	\$5,710,322
Virginia Railway Express	Franconia-Springfield Station Expansion	Rail Capital	45	20	0	65	\$6,449,948

NVTC staff evaluated all eligible applications based on the information provided in submitted applications and any subsequent technical clarifications. The evaluations follow the current, Commission-adopted evaluation process reflected in the most recent version of the [Commuter Choice Recipient Handbook](#).

NVTC PROGRAM ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING SUMMARY
Via Electronic Participation
Public Streaming via YouTube
September 15, 2022

NVTC Program Advisory Committee Members Present:

David Snyder, Chair
Sarah Bagley
John Foust
Libby Garvey
David Meyer
Mike Turner

Staff and Others Present:

Kate Mattice, NVTC Executive Director
Monique Blyther
Allan Fye
Matt Friedman
Adam Hager
Xavier Harmony
Ben Owen
Melissa Walker
Ronneta Zack-Williams

Program Advisory Committee Chair Snyder called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. He noted that staff followed procedures and guidelines to give notice to committee members, the Commission, staff and the public about today's meeting. He explained that the meeting is an all-virtual public meeting as permitted under the Virginia Freedom of Information Act and NVTC's Electronic Participation Policy and is being streamed live via NVTC's YouTube channel.

Mr. Fye called the roll and indicated a quorum was present. He then introduced staff.

Chair Snyder asked for any changes to the summary of the April 14, 2022 Program Advisory Committee meeting. Committee members accepted the summary with no changes. Chair Snyder then outlined the meeting agenda's topics: I-395/95 Commuter Choice FY 2024-2025 Call for Projects, NVTC's strategic planning efforts for the Envision Route 7 Bus Rapid Transit project and deployment of zero-emission buses by Northern Virginia's transit operators.

Commuter Choice Program

Mr. Owen opened his presentation by noting that staff seeks to make minor changes to the Commuter Choice technical evaluation process this fall in tandem with opening the next call for projects in the I-395/95 corridor. He explained the four current evaluation criteria – technical merit, annualized cost effectiveness, applicant preference and interagency collaboration – of which technical merit, which comprises factors that assess projects’ support for program goals, accounts for most (70 of 100) possible points.

Mr. Owen then outlined staff’s proposed changes to the process. The changes would emphasize the measurable aspects of the process by allocating more points to technical merit and annualized cost effectiveness while reducing the points for applicant preference and removing interagency collaboration entirely. The changes would also incorporate equity considerations by adding the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments’ Equity Emphasis Areas (EEAs) into the technical merit accessibility factor, allowing applications to receive points for serving or linking regional activity centers and/or EEAs interchangeably. Mr. Owen noted that staff is eager for members’ thoughts on these changes, which would be reviewed with the full Commission as well as PRTC in October for adoption in November, along with opening the I-395/95 call for projects.

Mr. Foust asked whether fare revenue is factored into calculating annualized cost effectiveness. Mr. Owen confirmed that only the subsidy cost is evaluated. He added that annualized cost effectiveness looks at the useful life of the project, which is a maximum of two years for transit operations.

Mr. Foust asked whether the Commission could make changes to project rankings that result from scoring. Mr. Owen confirmed that the Commission may prioritize projects for funding as it deems appropriate, accounting for scores and public comment.

Mr. Turner asked for an explanation of the applicant preference and diversion mitigation measures. For applicant preference, Mr. Owen explained that each applicant receives credit in the evaluation process for their identified highest priority project of the applications they submit. Diversion mitigation looks at the ability of a project to absorb trips that might be shifted from the expressway onto local streets or arterials due to pricing or congestion. The scoring for diversion mitigation is based solely on the type of project.

Chair Snyder asked if the changes to the technical evaluation process would apply to both the I-395/95 and I-66 corridors. Mr. Owen confirmed that they would. Chair Snyder then asked about the timing for the next I-66 Commuter Choice call for projects and the amount of toll revenue that VDOT is now collecting on I-66 Inside the Beltway. Mr. Owen answered that the call for projects would open in fall 2023 and that VDOT’s collections continue to rebound: while VDOT’s payments to NVTC during fiscal year 2022 totaled nearly \$4 million, projections for fiscal year 2023 anticipate about \$10 million, close to the expected payout figure for the year in the I-66 Memorandum of Agreement.

Ms. Garvey joined the discussion at about 5:15 p.m.

Transit Resource Center

Mr. Harmony provided an update on the Envision Route 7 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) project. He stated that staff has started the Strategic Implementation Plan which will address project governance, phased implementation and strategic funding decisions. He noted a kick-off meeting was held with NVTC's consultant in August and has since then received a stakeholder engagement plan from the consultant.

Mr. Harmony stated that there is a public meeting coming up on the mobility study component of the project. He also noted there would be public pop-up events throughout the corridor to help advertise the meeting, workshops with jurisdictional staff leadership and an update to the Commission this fall.

Chair Snyder asked whether there would be pop-up events in Fairfax County. Mr. Foust said he would be supportive of this and Ms. Bagley asked whether there would be one in Alexandria. Mr. Harmony clarified that this current phase ends at Seven Corners and that Alexandria would be assessed in a later phase.

Mr. Foust asked whether the public meeting at Meridian High School would be in-person and include a virtual attendance option. Mr. Harmony said it was in-person, but there would be options to watch and listen online. Mr. Foust suggested staff make any presentations available online and that the public be able to submit comments online for a period. He then asked if there was a flyer to advertise the public meeting and any pop-ups. Mr. Harmony responded that the team is actively working on materials and will soon distribute these items. Ms. Mattice noted that the pop-up events are meant to help steer the public to the public meeting.

Ms. Garvey asked about the intent of the traffic simulation and demand modeling analysis and what might be presented to the public. Mr. Harmony stated that the focus at the October public meeting would be to cover the existing conditions in the study corridor. This would help identify impacts on existing transit service should the BRT be implemented.

Mr. Foust recommended staff coordinate with Fairfax County and City of Falls Church transportation staff and observed that the public would want to know when the project might wrap up.

Transit Technology Program

Mr. Fye noted that proposals are due on September 16, 2022 for the Regional Zero-Emission Bus Strategic Plan and staff anticipate awarding a contract in November. He added that there will be a Transit Technology Workshop with jurisdiction and transit agency staff this fall. Mr. Fye stated that he and Program Analyst Ronnetta Zack-Williams will be in California next week presenting on the plan and its intended outcomes.

Mr. Fye added that the Regional Fare Collection Strategic Plan is moving forward and the associated Fare Collection Working Group is continuing to meet.

Ms. Bagley asked whether fare evasion is a topic of study within the work NVTC is doing. Mr. Fye responded that the fare collection work is focused on the technology side, not fare evasion. He added that there is technology available for bus operators to count passengers who do not pay in a discreet way.

Ms. Garvey asked whether any work was being done to allow for fare collection beyond only tapping a SmarTrip card and whether passes for certain periods of time might be allowed. Mr. Fye stated that there is some work taking place, noting some passes already exist.

Mr. Meyer noted that all fare decisions are local and that circumstances for one provider might not fit another's. He described the unique circumstances in the City of Fairfax that led to the city going fare-free.

Other Business

Chair Snyder asked if there is there any other discussion for the committee. There was no further discussion.

Future Meetings

Chair Snyder stated that staff would follow up regarding the timing of the next committee meeting and he adjourned the meeting at 5:54 p.m.