



Minutes

PROJECT: Richmond Highway BRT Executive Committee Meeting #3

DATE & TIME: May 7, 2018; 1 to 2:30 PM

LOCATION: Franconia Government Center

Attendees:

Jeff McKay, Supervisor -- Lee
Dan Storck, Supervisor – Mt. Vernon
Vanessa Aguayo, FCDOT
Tom Biesiadny, FCDOT
Barbara Byron, OCR
Helen Cuervo, VDOT
Julie Cline, DPWES
Tae Choi, BOS
Tom Fahrney, FCDOT
Taylor Holland, BOS

Patti McCay, COA
Doug Miller, FCDOT
Brent Riddle, FCDOT
Fred Selden, FCDPZ
Eric Teitelman, FCDOT
Lara Hegler, PMC
Henry Kay, PMC
Jenny Koch, PMC
Camille Montanez, PMC
Jim Wright, PMC

Supervisor McKay opened the meeting with introductions. Vanessa Aguayo provided a report on major project activities since the last meeting of the Executive Committee. These includes initiative the Community Advisory Group process with the first meeting; launching and updating the project website; notifying federal, state, and county agencies that the environmental documentation process is underway; coordination with the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Highway Administration; initiation of the 20% design task; and holding public meetings on April 17 and 18.

Supervisor McKay asked for a summary of the nature of comments received at the public meetings. Jenny Koch said she was developing a report, but in the general the comments were supportive of the BRT project as well as bicycle and pedestrian access improvements.

Vanessa introduced the topic of the project delivery recommendation. Eric Teitelman reviewed the range of project delivery options and local examples of each method. Supervisor Storck asked if the projects were successful examples of each method, and Tom Biesiadny said they were. Eric described each delivery option in terms of public and private sector responsibility and risk.

Eric reviewed the process used to develop a recommendation which included a workshop involving county, state, and regional agencies. At the workshop, attendees developed goals, reviewed delivery options, considered the pros and cons of each option, and developed a recommendation.



Eric presented the project goals which are presented in order of priority with schedule certainty and ability to respond to public and stakeholder input at the top. Eric reviewed the pros and cons for each option relative to the project goals as follows:

	Pros	Cons
Design-Bid-Build	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Familiar • Complete design control 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County retains most risks • Least opportunity for schedule acceleration
Design-Build	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single entity responsible for design and construction reduces interface risk; greater potential for cost and schedule certainty • Can achieve design control with prescriptive requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O&M and lifecycle risks remain with County
Construction Manager at Risk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guaranteed completion for a negotiated price • Advice on schedule, budget, and constructability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engineering solutions are tied to an industry standard not a County standard • Interface risk between the designer and the contractor • Any change order will increase cost
Design-Build-Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar benefits to DB approach • Relatively low financing, costs due to short debt tenor • If funds are not otherwise available, project timeline can be accelerated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational readiness • Higher cost of capital • Financing limited to 5-7 years • O&M and lifecycle risks remain with County
Design-Build-Operate-Maintain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar benefits to DB approach; O&M considerations incorporated in the design • Whole life costing • Minimize interface risk between design, construction, and operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational readiness • Reduced County control • May take longer to procure
Design-Build-Finance-Operate-Maintain	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O&M considerations incorporated in the design • Whole life costing • Nearly all risks transferred 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organizational readiness • Reduced County control • Higher cost of capital • May take longer to procure • Lack of procedural definition and precedent • May consume public debt capacity



Supervisor McKay asked if the delivery method affects the chances of receiving federal funding. Henry Kay said it does not. FTA has requirements for a competitive, qualifications-based process, but all cost and schedule risk is on the project sponsor. Tom said that transferring risk could raise the project cost which FTA would be concerned about.

Helen Cuervo said the critical issue for any of the options that leave the final design up to the contractor is to specify “must haves.” Every change after that tends to drive up the project costs.

Supervisor Storck said that keeping the project on schedule and on budget is the priority for elected officials. Tom said these priorities are reflected in the order of the goals.

Supervisor McKay said that stakeholder input can be achieved under any delivery method, but it comes at a cost. He does not want to leave the impression that the county would give up all design control. Tom said the county can make changes under any delivery method, but because the county is in a weak negotiating position the change might cost more.

Supervisor Storck asked if the goals are specific to BRT. Eric said the goals were developed for this specific project.

Eric reviewed the project delivery recommendations which is to use Design-Build followed by a separate O&M contract. This achieves schedule certainty, and allows the county to retain a reasonable level of control.

Supervisor McKay asked for the team’s thoughts about the O&M contractor. He is strongly biased against using WMATA for this service based on his believe the county is more efficient. Tom said the county is leaning toward a county-held contract, but we still need to decide whether to roll the additional service into the Connector contract or use a BRT-specific contract.

Supervisor Storck asked if there was any other delivery method that could further reduce the schedule. Tom said there was not. Eric said that if FTA funding is delayed the county will keep the design moving to protect the schedule. Tom said that P3 options are promoted as faster, but this does not account for a lengthy procurement process

Vanessa reviewed the current funding plan which is a combination of regional, state, county, and federal funding. Supervisor McKay asked if the county would cover the cost of O&M. Tom said it would. Supervisor McKay said this should be presented in order to address the misconception that the county is not paying its share of the project cost.

Barbara Byron made a motion to accept the staff recommendation to deliver the project with a Design-Build procurement. The motion was approved unanimously with no abstentions.

Jim Wright provided an update on the brand development process. A brand will authentically convey the nature of the service and its benefits. Jim reviewed a number of prior, similar projects and showed a short video developed to explain BRT to the public.



The brand development approach includes Research; Brainstorming; Testing; Adapting; Implementing; and Measuring. The county will convene a Brand Development Team with up to 17 members that will hold workshops between late May and January 2019. A logo will be complete by September 2018 and taken to focus groups. There will be an online survey in winter 2018.

Supervisor McKay said the supervisors are working on an overall re-branding of the corridor, including new land uses, and asked if the BRT should be coordinated. Jim said the brand usually reflects the nature of the service, but ideally it would align with the larger corridor brand. Barbara said it might be helpful to at least coordinate the colors. Supervisor McKay said if the brand initiatives are not on the same schedule they should at least complement each other. Supervisor Storck asked if the brand development timeline would be slowed at least a month to coordinate with other efforts. Tom said that was reasonable, and the group agreed on a fall kick-off. Vanessa will work with Taylor Holland to plan a presentation to the corridor branding group.

Supervisor McKay asked if the Brand Development Team is the same as the Community Advisory Group. Tom said it is not because the brand effort will be over quickly. Eric said that Brand Development Team members will be recruited from the community

Supervisor McKay said topics for the fall meeting would include Environmental Analysis and a recommendation for the O&M Facility. Supervisor McKay adjourned the meeting at 2:40 PM.