



Transit Service Delivery Advisory Committee (TSDAC)
Webinar
May 31, 2017
2:00 to 4:00 pm

Minutes

Members Present:

John McGlennon, Chair
Cheryl Openshaw
Cindy Mester
Ken Pollock

Kate Mattice
Jim Dyke

1. Call to Order / Introductions-Chairman John McGlennon called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm. He told members that the Revenue Advisory Board had met last week to discuss their recommendations for the report and that the focus of the meeting would be to review those materials.
2. Update on Revenue Analysis- Nate Macek of WSP reviewed the presentation that was given to the Revenue Advisory Board at the May 26th meeting. He discussed the evolution of the analysis of scenarios from subsequent funds. The Revenue Advisory Board asked WSP to look at a lot of different options for revenue sources. The following discussion occurred during the presentation:
 - a. Chairman John McGlennon asked if the assumption was made that Federal money remained the same. Nate Macek replied that yes, Federal money has been assumed to remain static. Chairman John McGlennon pointed out that it would be useful to highlight that fact so that the General Assembly understands that the assumption is contingent upon Federal money. Chairman John McGlennon also pointed out that it would be useful to include in the report to the legislature that the state is not always funding 80% of projects, but backfilling up to 80% based on whatever else is available. He pointed out that in the process of trying to make sure the legislature understands what we are saying, we need to make sure they know we don't always cover the full 80%. Grantees may seek up to 80% under this for a single project, and there cannot be over matching.
 - b. Ken Pollock asked that when we look at lowering the rate to include more projects, are we looking at the tipping point where funding is getting so low that projects will never get completed.
 - c. Chairman McGlennon reminded the group that the day's task is to make recommendations to the Revenue Advisory Board.

- d. More graphs were reviewed. Jen DeBruhl asked Nate Macek to remind TSDAC what would happen to funding levels if the tiers were kept. Nate shared that only rolling stock would be funded and at a very low matching rate of 30%.
- e. Chairman John McGlennon commented that under these scenarios, in the best case scenario, Major Expansion projects are only half funded. Nate Macek replied that he was correct and that at current funding levels SGR projects will not be fully funded.
- f. Key variables were discussed. The group agreed that the same participation levels are not needed for Major Expansion and SGR projects.
- g. Chairman John McGlennon asked Jennifer Mitchell what the next steps for the TSDAC are. Jennifer responded that during the Revenue Advisory Board meeting policies and principles were discussed. There was concurrence that 80% of funding would go to SGR projects and that the remaining 20% would be for major expansion projects with the understanding that funds can be moved from major expansion projects to SGR projects but not the other way around.
- h. Nate Macek said the appendix to this presentation includes the latest revenue numbers. It updates Hampton Roads numbers and confirms that Loudoun is not included until it joins the WMATA compact when the Silver Line opens. WSP also looked at eligibility of other regions, like Richmond, to establish regional funding. The Richmond region is not expected to reach that threshold in the ten year horizon of the study. Chairman John McGlennon pointed out that this could be changed legislatively. Nate Macek replied that a lot of the items reviewed will require legislative change.
- i. Kate Mattice asked what geography is defined as Northern Virginia for the regional funding assumptions. Nate Macek replied that in general it is the area covered by NVTAA.
- j. TSDAC members were asked if they had any questions or concerns with the same funding split discussed by the Revenue Advisory Board.
 - i. Kate Mattice just wanted to point out that in SMART Scale a project can get 100% funding. She feels that it is a key distinction to make. Jennifer reminded the group that VDOT controls the highway system and projects where DRPT's projects are more of a partnership.
 - ii. Ken Pollock stated that the recommendation should be contingent upon new funding. He thinks there should be one recommendation if there is new funding and one if there is not.
 - iii. Cindy Mester agreed that we may not want to change the status quo if there is no new funding.
 - iv. Cheryl Openshaw pointed out that the framework protects SGR because funding can only be moved from right to left and is moved to cover SGR needs.
 - v. Jim Dyke agreed that the flexibility to move the money is insurance to protect state of good repair. Ken Pollock agreed with that caveat and wants to make sure it is in the recommendation.
 - vi. Cindy Mester and Kate Mattice agreed.
 - vii. Chairman John McGlennon stated that a comment in the report should be made that says in the event of no new funding, we anticipate money being moved from Major Expansion projects to SGR projects.

- viii. Kate Mattice pointed out that the ask is to identify new revenues. Why would we prioritize if there is no new funding? Chairman John McGlennon replied that he saw it differently. We are showing the impact of the lack of funding. We also need to clarify in the report constrained federal funding and that the state backfills up to 80%.
3. Policy Principles and Recommendations-Jennifer Mitchell and Jen DeBruhl introduced the document which will be the meat of the recommendations going into the report. They asked for comment and questions.
 - a. Chairman John McGlennon asked that for item 3 under project prioritization that “d” and “e” be combined. It could be pointed out that cost effectiveness is not being used in SGR.
 - b. Cindy Mester pointed out that we need to reinforce the new revenues. Cheryl Openshaw pointed out that that will be part of the narrative of the report but does not need to be a part of the policy and principles document.
 - c. Jim Dyke asked that the information about WMATA be beefed up.
 - d. Kate Mattice mentioned that there should clarification on the regional funds and how they can be used. The region should be able to do what they want with them without them having to go through a prioritization. Regional Funding will create a smaller state program.
4. Wrap Up/Next Steps-Chairman John McGlennon reminded TSDAC members that there will be a Revenue Advisory Board meeting on June 16th from 9 am to 11 am in Fredericksburg.
 - a. Jim Dyke asked if the report will have a narrative. Jen DeBruhl responded that yes there will be a narrative and it will be circulated to RAB members and TSDAC members early the week of June 5th. She is working to pare down the technical work and focus the report. They are working to keep the report short with a two page executive level summary.
 - b. John McGlennon said that there should be a few charts to emphasize what is written in the report.
 - c. Jen DeBruhl discussed the next steps after the work is done on the prioritization framework. After the RAB and the report, contracts will be issued to get deeper into how the program would actually run and how it would fit into TransAM. The team is laying the foundation to do this after the report.
 - d. Chairman John McGlennon asked when the next meeting would be for planning purposes. Jennifer Mitchell said that DRPT will brief the CTB in June and in July there will be a request for endorsement. They don’t know enough now to set the next meeting.
 - e. Kate Mattice asked if there would be a vote on June 16th. Jennifer Mitchell said that would be up to the Chairman of the Revenue Advisory Board, Marty Williams.
5. Public Comment-No one was signed up for public comment.
6. The meeting adjourned at 3:12.