

**RICHMOND REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**MINUTES OF MEETING
August 6, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT

W. Canova Peterson, IV, **Chairman**..... Hanover County
Steve A. Elswick, **Vice Chairman**..... Chesterfield County
Manuel Alvarez, Jr..... Goochland County
Jonathan Baliles City of Richmond
James H. Burrell..... New Kent County
Angela L. Gray..... RMTA
David Green GRTC Transit System
Wayne T. Hazzard (Alternate) Hanover County
Amy Inman (Nonvoting)..... DRPT
Susan F. Lascolette Goochland County
Floyd H. Miles, Sr..... Charles City County
Patricia S. O'Bannon Henrico County
Mark Riblett (Alternate)..... Secretary of Transportation Designee
Ivan Rucker (Nonvoting)..... FHWA
Frank J. Thornton..... Henrico County
Von Tisdale (Nonvoting)..... RideFinders
Carson L. Tucker Powhatan County
David T. Williams Powhatan County

MEMBERS ABSENT

Parker C. Agelasto City of Richmond
Cliff Burnette (Nonvoting)..... VDA
Sean M. Davis Hanover County
Thomas Fletcher (Nonvoting)..... CTAC
Daniel A. Gecker Chesterfield County
Kathy C. Graziano City of Richmond
Edward L. Henson, III Town of Ashland
James M. Holland Chesterfield County
Ryan Long (Nonvoting) FTA
Brian Montgomery (Nonvoting)..... EDAC
Michelle R. Mosby City of Richmond
John Rutledge..... CRAC
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr. New Kent County

OTHERS PRESENT

Viktoria Badger..... City of Richmond
E. Todd Eure Henrico County
Mike Sawyer City of Richmond
Andrew Sinclair Port of Virginia
Jonathan S. Trainum CRTAB/Napoleon Taxi

RRPDC STAFF PRESENT

Daniel N. Lysy, TPO Secretary
Sulabh Aryal
Tiffany Dubinsky
Barbara Jacocks
Ken Lantz

Jin Lee
Josh Mallow
Barbara Nelson
Sarah Rhodes

Sharon Robeson
Greta Ryan
Will Sanford
Chris Wichman

CALL TO ORDER

TPO Chairman W. Canova Peterson, IV, called the August 6, 2015 meeting of the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) to order at approximately 9:30 a.m. in the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission board room.

CERTIFICATION OF MEETING QUORUM

TPO Secretary Daniel N. Lysy reported that a quorum was present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present stood and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Request for Changes/Additions to TPO Agenda –

Mr. Lysy said there is a request from VDOT to add an item to the agenda, Bonus Obligation Authority for RSTP Funds, and he recommended that this be added as New Business Item III.C. Chairman Peterson noted this information just recently came forward and that is the reason it is not already included on the agenda. On motion by David T. Williams, seconded by Susan F. Lascolette, the TPO unanimously approved the amended agenda as presented by staff.

B. Open Public Comment Period --

There were no requests to address the TPO.

C. Consent Action Items –

Chairman Peterson stated that two items will be pulled from the consent agenda. He said for the last several meetings the minutes have been pulled from the agenda for separate consideration and he said they will be pulled again today for separate consideration and will be listed for separate action in the agenda going forward. Also, action on Item 8 on the consent agenda, the RRTPO Title VI Plan Update, will be deferred to the September 24 TPO meeting. He said there were some minor errors to be corrected, but said he also realized that there was some very important information in this document on what the TPO is all about which is important for TPO members to understand and be familiar with it. He invited everyone to fully read the Title IV Plan and get back to staff with any questions so a completed draft can be considered at the September 24 TPO meeting.

Chairman Peterson noted that Andrew Sinclair with the Port of Virginia is present to answer questions on consent agenda item 7, Port of Virginia Green Operator Program;

Scope Change Permitting Additional CMAQ Funded Activities, should there be anyone who would like this item pulled from the consent agenda for discussion. There were no requests to pull this or any other item from the consent agenda.

On motion by David T. Williams, seconded by Manuel Alvarez, Jr., the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) approved items 2 through 7 of the consent agenda as follows:

2. FY 16 UWP Budget Amendments; FY 15 Section 5303 Carryover Funds –

RESOLVED, that the FY 2016 Unified Work Program (UWP) be amended to program Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5303 carryover funds and FTA Section 5303 and 5304 de-obligated carryover funds as presented in the table provided in staff's report "FY 2016 UWP Proposed Budget Amendments for RRPDC Staff Work Tasks"; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the TPO's action to amend the FY 2016 UWP work task budgets meets all requirements noted in the VDOT/RRPDC Agreement for the Utilization of Federal and State Funds to Support Metropolitan Planning in the Richmond Area as provided in Article III – Statement of Work, which includes approval by the TPO, VDOT and FHWA for programming FTA Section 5303 funds on UWP work tasks, and no further action by VDOT and FHWA is required for this UWP amendment action.

3. FY 16 UWP Amendments: Revised Task 3.0, Transportation Demand Management; and New Task 3.2, RideFinders –

RESOLVED, that the FY 2016 Unified Work Program (UWP) is amended to retitle task 3.0 to Transportation Demand Management, to add an introduction section to task 3.0, and to add a new UWP work task 3.2, RideFinders, as presented in staff's report to the TPO; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the TPO's action to amend the FY 2016 UWP as submitted meets all requirements noted in the VDOT/RRPDC Agreement for the Utilization of Federal and State Funds to Support Metropolitan Planning in the Richmond Area as provided in Article III, Statement of Work, which includes VDOT and FHWA approval of this TPO action amending the FY 2016 UWP.

4. FY 16 UWP Amendment: RideFinders Funding Sources Report –

RESOLVED, that the FY 2016 Unified Work Program (UWP) is amended to provide for the addition of a new work element under UWP task 5.5, Regional Public Transportation Services; item 9., RideFinders Funding Sources Report, plus the addition of schedule information for this new item as presented in staff's report to the TPO; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the TPO's action to amend the FY 2016 UWP as submitted meets all the requirements noted in the VDOT/RRPDC Agreement for the Utilization of Federal and State Funds to Support Metropolitan Planning in the Richmond Area as provided in Article III – Statement of Work, which includes VDOT and FHWA approval of this TPO action amending the FY 2016 UWP.

5. FFY 15 – FFY 18 TIP Amendment: Rt. 5 Bridge Replacement Over Norfolk Southern Railroad, City of Richmond –

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) amends the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2015 to FFY 2018 RRTPO

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) adding a new project as follows:

- Route 5 (Main Street) Bridge Replacement over Norfolk Southern Railroad project (UPC T16873) in the City of Richmond. Funding sources will be determined.

6. FFY 15 – FFY 18 TIP Amendment: Rt. 5 Bridge/ Superstructure Over Herring Creek Charles City County –

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) amends the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2015 to FFY 2018 RRTPO Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) adding a project as follows:

- Route 5 (John Tylor Memorial Highway) Superstructure Replacement over Herring Creek project (UPC 98134) in Charles City County. This project utilizes STP/F and PE AC funds in FY15.

7. Port of Virginia Green Operator Program; Scope Change Permitting Additional CMAQ Funded Activities –

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) approves the change in scope of the Richmond Green Operator Program to include clean diesel technologies for diesel retrofits/dray truck replacements and cargo handling equipment, a monitored 64-Express Transportation Demand Management Program inducing the shift of containers from single truck trips to barge and tug repowering; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Port of Virginia provide an annual report to TPO staff on the air quality and congestion impacts of the Richmond TPO Green Operator Program on November 1 of each year.

Following the vote on the consent agenda, the TPO took separate action on former consent agenda action item 1, Minutes of the June 4, 2015 TPO Meeting.

On motion by Patricia S. O'Bannon, seconded by David T. Williams, the TPO voted unanimous approval of the June 4, 2015 TPO meeting minutes as presented.

D. TPO Chairman's Report –

Chairman Peterson noted this will be a year of transition with Dan Lysy retiring, the unexpected replacement of the RRPDC Executive Director and new members on the TPO board. He said the TPO will begin the year with a presentation from Dan Lysy as to what the TPO is all about. He said the TPO is a very important organization and deals with a lot of very important transportation issues which need to be taken seriously.

1. Appointments to TPO Executive Committee –

At the request of the TPO Chairman, Dan Lysy read the Chairman's appointments to the FY 16 TPO Executive Committee as follows: Hanover County, W. Canova

Peterson, IV, Chairman, with Sean M. Davis as alternate; Chesterfield County, Steve L. Elswick, Vice Chairman, with James M. Holland as alternate; Town of Ashland, Edward L. Henson, III, with Faye O. Prichard as alternate; Charles City County, Floyd H. Miles, Sr., with William G. Coadas as alternate; Goochland County, Manuel Alvarez, Jr., with Susan F. Lascolette as alternate; Henrico County, Patricia S. O'Bannon, with Tyrone E. Nelson as alternate; New Kent County, C. Thomas Tiller, Jr. with James H. Burrell as alternate; Powhatan County, David T. Williams, with Carson L. Tucker as alternate; and City of Richmond, Kathy C. Graziano.

Chairman Peterson called for any corrections or changes to be voiced at this time. Ms. O'Bannon said that Henrico would need to check on whether Tyrone Nelson should be the Executive Committee alternate member since she and Mr. Thornton are the designated TPO members, and she said she would advise staff. Wayne T. Hazzard indicated that he should replace Sean M. Davis as the Hanover County alternate Executive Committee member effective at this meeting. Chairman Peterson said the Hanover County alternate Executive Committee member will be changed from Sean Davis to Wayne Hazzard and noted that this will also effect the Title VI document. Mr. Lysy said this change will be made to the document and that Mr. William G. Coadas will be added as the Charles City County alternate. He asked that Ms. O'Bannon advise staff as soon as possible so that change can be made for Henrico County as well.

2. Presentation to Outgoing TPO Chairman –

Chairman Peterson requested that Mr. Alvarez come forward and he thanked him on for his hard work as TPO Chairman in FY 2015 during a very difficult year of transition and changes. On behalf of the TPO, Chairman Peterson presented Mr. Alvarez with an engraved clock recognizing his time as TPO Chairman. Mr. Alvarez received hearty applause.

3. Resolution in Appreciation of Roger Cole, Former VDOT Richmond District CTB Member –

Action was deferred to the September 24 meeting when Roger Cole will be present for presentation of this resolution. Chairman Peterson noted all Mr. Cole's diligent work on behalf of the Richmond Region and he asked that all try to be present at the next meeting to show appreciation to Mr. Cole for his hard work.

4. Other Business –

Chairman Peterson noted that due to his retiring on September 1, this is Mr. Lysy's last official meeting, but said official recognition will be given to Mr. Lysy at the September 24 meeting when he can be present and recognized without having to work.

E. TPO Secretary's Report –

Dan Lysy said the TPO bylaws state that, "The Secretary shall be the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (RRPDC) staff liaison to the MPO [TPO]." Mr. Lysy said staff has been advised by Barbara Jacocks, Interim Executive Director of the RRPDC, that Barbara S. Nelson will be the new PDC Director of Transportation

effective September 2, 2015 and will then be the staff liaison to the TPO. He said the action requested of the TPO is to confirm the action by Barbara Jacocks to appoint Ms. Nelson as staff liaison to the PDC, which then, in effect, will make her TPO secretary.

On motion by David T. Williams, seconded by James H. Burrell, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) took unanimous action to confirm the action taken by Barbara Jacocks as Interim Executive Director of the RRPDC, appointing Barbara S. Nelson as the new RRPDC Director of Transportation and as staff liaison to the TPO with Ms. Nelson thereby becoming TPO Secretary, all effective September 2, 2015.

Ms. Nelson said she hopes she can live up to TPO expectations and fulfill the great legacy that Dan Lysy has left.

II. OLD BUSINESS

No old business was brought forward.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. TPO Orientation –

Chairman Peterson said the TPO will start this new fiscal year with a re-orientation as to what the TPO is and why it is important for members to participate. Staff distributed a checklist of information items for TPO members to select from to indicate an interest in receiving, either hard copy by mail or digitally by e-mail. Mr. Lysy noted some of these items are provided to new members, some of which have been recently updated, and others may be of interest, though not previously distributed to members. He requested that the checklists be given to staff for processing.

Mr. Lysy provided a PowerPoint presentation beginning with why the TPO is important. He said that as part of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) presentation of findings on the TPO's certification review, FHWA considers the TPO important because it decides how existing and future federal transportation funding is spent; it prioritizes regional needs and determines the best and most economical solutions with constrained funding; and the TPO planning process lays the framework for the future multimodal transportation system. Mr. Lysy reviewed federal funding programs for which the TPO annually allocates over \$25 million. He said the TPO authorizes funding in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) document noting that the FFY 15 to FFY 18 TIP contains 340 projects with a total obligation amount of approximately \$436 million. He said the TPO must authorize a project by inclusion in the TIP or it is not eligible for funding. Mr. Lysy reviewed how the TPO was established, its structure and organization, TPO voting and nonvoting member organizations and recent bylaws changes that changed the name of the organization, expanded use of the consent agenda, and established weighted voting for local governments. Mr. Lysy reviewed parameters for establishing the TPO study area which includes areas designated by EPA as

nonattainment or maintenance under the Clean Air Act including several rural areas and other rural areas that were added to the TPO under previous federal regulations.

Mr. Lysy reviewed the TPO multimodal planning and programming process and the special considerations that must be given in that process with regard to public participation, Title VI compliance, air quality and environmental impacts, growth and economic development, financial resources and new state and federal requirements for performance measures and targets. He discussed major components of the TPO process: the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP); project review, selection and funds allocation; and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Mr. Lysy reviewed each of the four major federal funding categories where the TPO has lead authority in selecting projects and allocating funds, what they may be used for, and the constraints for each, saying the total of federal funds allocated by the RRTPO in FY 16 is approximately \$25.6 million. Mr. Lysy discussed the allocation of other federal and state funds and reviewed the TIP process in more detail. Mr. Lysy concluded his presentation with an overview of challenges and opportunities for the TPO. He reminded members to submit to staff their checklist indicating informational materials they have an interest in receiving.

The following major points were brought forward during and following Mr. Lysy's presentation:

- In response to a question by Pat O'Bannon regarding the effectiveness of efforts in the Region to improve air quality, particularly the addition of 10 percent ethanol in gasoline, it was suggested that the TPO add to future agenda topics a presentation by Doris McLeod with the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) on this matter,, with an emphasis on what measures have been taken that have helped make a difference in terms of air quality improvement.
- David Williams initiated discussion on whether rural areas added to the TPO study area by virtue of air quality nonattainment would now be removed from the study area since the region is now in attainment. Chairman Peterson noted that though the region is now in attainment, the rural areas that were added to the study area as a result of nonattainment are the areas most likely to go out of attainment again and may need to be added back to the study area if removed.
- Ivan Rucker noted that FHWA regulations give the MPO [TPO] and the state great discretion and latitude in expanding the MPO [TPO] study area boundary area as opposed to the urbanized area boundary which is set by the census. He said economic and demographic development outside the current study area boundary could be considered as a basis for expanding the study area boundary with certain conditions and in cooperation with the state noting that the maintenance area can be much smaller than the study area. There was further discussion of this matter.
- Carson Tucker requested the addition to future meeting topics of an item on how effectiveness of efforts the TPO allocates money on is assessed and evaluated and at what level of government that is done.
- Frank Thornton requested that the TPO be more aggressive about public awareness of information such as that provided in Mr. Lysy's presentation and

he requested that the “ABCs of the PDC and MPO” notebook that used to be given to new members be reintroduced for orientation of new members.

B. Process for TPO Endorsements and Applications Under the House Bill (HB) 2 Process –

1. HB 2 Project Applications Endorsement –

Chris Wichman, RRPDC Senior Planner, said House Bill (HB) 2 is an attempt to add a measure of accountability to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) decision-making when it comes to programming transportation projects. He reviewed remarks by Virginia Secretary of Transportation Aubrey Layne and VDOT Richmond District Administrator Rob Cary at the June 4 meeting providing a detailed description of the scoring process. Mr. Wichman provided information on the VTrans2040 Multimodal Transportation Plan, the statewide long-range plan, which is being prepared by the Secretary’s Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIPI) and discussed its important relationship to HB 2. He said the VTrans2040 Needs Assessment determines project eligibility for HB 2 funding consideration. He briefly reviewed the development process for the VTrans2040 Multimodal Transportation Plan. He said the study framework for the plan was designed to mirror HB 2 by looking at types of needs and it was determined that two types of needs, safety and capacity/operations, are subject to HB 2. Mr. Wichman discussed the process for determining the VDOT District list of top 100 safety needs saying projects that address safety needs identified in this list are eligible to be considered for HB 2 funding. He said capacity and operations needs were considered on three scales and the travel markets served by each: corridors of statewide significance (CoSS) which is multimodal intercity; regional networks which are intra-region; and Urban Development Areas (UDAs) which are local activity center needs. Mr. Wichman said the Draft Needs Assessment was released on August 3 and staff is digesting the information and determining how the region’s projects that are being considered for HB 2 are accounted for in the needs assessment. Mr. Wichman said TAC’s HB 2 Working Group will meet next week to try to link candidate projects with the needs as presented in VTrans. He said where there are gaps, the TPO has an opportunity to submit comments to the study team to try get those incorporated into the plan.

Sarah Rhodes, RRPDC Principal Planner, provided a brief overview of the HB 2 process saying that VTrans2040 is the planning basis for projects; HB 2 provides for how projects are scored and how they are included in the Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP) for funding; and HB 1887 determines how they are funded. She said the HB 2 process only applies to discretionary state and federal funds and noted that if a project does not address a need identified in VTrans2040 it is not eligible for the HB2 process. Ms. Rhodes reviewed the previous and current process for how projects are entered in the SYIP noting that under the HB 2 process a great deal more work is done in advance of CTB project consideration and selection for inclusion in the SYIP. Ms. Rhodes said the TPO is involved in the HB 2 process in two ways. First the TPO can be an

applicant for projects on Corridors of Statewide Significance (CoSS) or on regional networks, or for projects that have been identified in the VTrans2040 Safety Assessment. She said the TPO is only eligible to apply for one pot of funding, the High Priority Projects Program funding, which means that the TPO's projects would compete at a statewide level. Second, she said the TPO is involved in HB 2 through the required endorsement of project applications from localities and public transit agencies that are on CoSS. She said TAC is also recommending that endorsement be considered for approval of projects located on regional networks because regional endorsement of a project may carry more weight for that project. Additionally, the VTrans2040 Safety Assessment was released on August 3, just three days ago. Staff recommends that if a locality's project is eligible under Safety, the locality has the opportunity at its discretion to submit a TPO resolution of endorsement for such project. Because of the timing of the Safety Assessment, there has not been an opportunity to present this staff recommendation for TAC consideration. Projects eligible under the Safety category that would be submitted for regional endorsement would need to have a clear connection to regional priorities or regional efforts demonstrated by the locality.

Ms. Rhodes reviewed the project endorsement timeline noting that preliminary project descriptions and draft resolutions of endorsement are due by close of business today for staff review to determine which of the endorsement criteria each project meets. Draft resolutions of endorsement will be returned to applicants for review by August 28. TAC will consider draft resolutions for recommendation to the TPO at the September 8 meeting and the draft resolutions of endorsement will be presented for TPO consideration and action at its September 24 meeting.

[Note: Ms. Rhodes proceeded with item 2. below prior to consideration of the item 1 resolution, the vote for which is recorded in these minutes following the vote on item 2.]

2. TPO Sponsored Project Applications Eligible Under Corridors of Statewide Significance –

Sarah Rhodes reviewed HB 2 requirements for the TPO as a project applicant noting that the RRTPO Board is responsible for approving all HB2 applications submitted by the TPO. She said the region can apply for projects on Corridors of Statewide Significance and Regional Networks, but only for funds in the High Priority Project Program. Ms. Rhodes said that after much discussion by TAC and the TAC HB 2 Working Group, two series of projects were selected for further consideration for TPO project applications for HB 2 funds. One was projects that came out of the I-95/I-64 Overlap Study and the other was the series of I-64 East projects. In discussing projects with TAC and the TAC HB 2 Working Group, it was felt that the Region's role for this cycle of HB 2 applications would be to pursue projects that have a significant need in the region, but aren't specific to any one locality. Ms. Rhodes noted that the projects list is prioritized by cost, from low to high, since cost-benefit is a key

element of the HB 2 scoring process though the priority order could change as staff works on the applications for these projects. She reviewed each of the six proposed regional candidate projects presented in tab three of the agenda package providing an aerial image and important details for each project.

Ms. Rhodes reviewed two resolutions prepared for TPO consideration. One provided for approval of the draft resolution of endorsement template presented in the agenda package and also approved the endorsement process and timeline for project applications being submitted by local governments and transit agencies for HB 2 funding consideration as well as projects that have been identified in the Safety Assessment of VTrans2040. Ms. Rhodes noted the additional staff recommended language included in the resolution being presented (not the resolution shown in the TPO agenda package) noting the additional language identifying the VTrans2040 safety category for which localities may submit project applications which has not been reviewed by TAC due to late receipt of information on this opportunity. The second resolution submitted for TPO consideration is for applications the TPO may submit for regional project funding under HB 2 which would authorize the submission of the six proposed candidate projects discussed and approve the preliminary prioritization of these projects with the understanding that any merited change in the prioritization process would be submitted for TAC consideration and recommendation action prior to TPO consideration (scheduled for September 24).

Significant discussion ensued and major points brought forward during discussion are summarized below.

- Regional priority projects were not selected as HB 2 candidate projects because they do not meet the criteria for HB 2 projects and many are more the purview of local governments so that it would be up to the local governments to submit such projects for consideration under HB 2.
- While locality applicant projects and TPO applicant projects will go into the same HB 2 scoring pot, they will be vying for different funding sources since the TPO is only eligible to apply for statewide High Priority Projects program funding whereas locality projects may be applying under the Construction District Grant Program, which offers approximately \$650 million divided among nine districts. The Richmond District's cut of that pot is approximately \$90 million.
- Projects submitted under the \$650 million statewide High Priority Projects program will be competing for funds with larger regions of the state such as Hampton Roads and Northern Virginia as well as mid-size and small regions.
- The CTB took action to approve the recommended weighting structure that will be used for scoring projects in each region and then project scores calculated and all projects ranked.
- It may take a couple of cycles of HB 2 funding to truly understand exactly what application strategy will best benefit the region.

- Decisions of this importance should not be presented asking the TPO for an immediate decision without time to consider the decision thoughtfully.

Chairman Peterson called for a motion on the projects presented for consideration based on the table shown in staff's report "Proposed Regional Candidate Applications for the HB 2 SYIP High Priority Projects Program" before additional discussion. After some discussion as to the merits of the projects proposed for TPO application, Ms. O'Bannon made a motion that the TPO submit applications for listed projects 1, 2, 3 and 6 eliminating projects 4 and 5. No second was forthcoming and there was additional discussion with the following major points made:

- Though the six projects were prioritized by cost, they were identified in two major studies, the I-64/I-95 Overlap study and the I-64 Improvement study that were partly funded by the TPO. These are the projects that were regionally significant and not locality driven (as per criteria agreed to by TAC) which rose to the top of the longer list of projects from both studies.
- The decision before the TPO is which projects to apply for; the prioritization of those projects could be considered at the September 24 TPO meeting.
- There were nine total projects reviewed by TAC and the six presented were selected by TAC as the projects that would best qualify and take advantage of the scoring process for HB 2 funding. The strategic factors that went into the selection of these projects were: the designation of the role of the TPO was to apply for projects not already championed by a locality; these projects were determined most HB 2 ready and had in some way already been funded by the region and were not fully funded by other funding sources; and other individual project-specific considerations.

Chairman Peterson again called for a second to Ms. O'Bannon's motion that the TPO submit applications for listed projects 1, 2, 3 and 6 eliminating projects 4 and 5 and no second was voiced. The motion died for lack of a second.

On motion of James H. Burrell, seconded by David T. Williams, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization approved the following resolution, with all voting in favor, except for two members with three votes (one member with two votes and one member with one vote) voting no:

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) authorizes TPO submission of the six proposed candidate applications for the House Bill (HB) 2 Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP) High Priority Projects Program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the TPO approves the preliminary prioritization process to be submitted as part of the region's candidate applications with the understanding that if this prioritization merits revision, the revised process will be submitted to the TPO's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for recommendation and for TPO board review and approval.

Following the vote, Mr. Lysy requested that because of the weighted voting structure he would like to note for the record that the "no" votes are from Pat

O'Bannon with two votes, and Susan Lascolette with one vote, since the votes for Henrico and Goochland representatives present for this vote are split (i.e., the other Henrico and Goochland TPO members voted in favor of the motion).

The TPO then considered the resolution in tab two of the agenda package on the template for endorsing local projects. There were no additional questions or discussion regarding this item.

On motion of David T. Williams, seconded by Floyd H. Miles, Sr., the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization unanimously approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) approves use of the House Bill (HB) 2 Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP) resolution of endorsement template language as submitted; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the TPO approves the proposed resolution of endorsement process and timeline detailed above, including the recommendation that resolutions of endorsement also be developed for projects located on Regional Networks as identified in the VTrans2040 plan, as well as projects that have been identified in the Safety Assessment of VTrans2040.

Prior to consideration of the next agenda item, Jon Baliles requested that the TPO recognize Vickey Badger who will retire at the end of August, and open the floor for her to say a few remarks. Ms. Badger said she has done this for two decades noting that she and Dan Lysy were classmates at Virginia Tech. She thanked the TPO for its support of Main Street Station saying high speed rail is picking up and that could be a game-changer for the Richmond Region. She said the decision on corridor placement and station location will be made within the next six months. She said they are really focusing on downtown to downtown transportation and serving the central business districts. She said it has been great working with the TPO and the staff's been great. The TPO gave Ms. Badger a hearty round of applause.

C. Bonus Obligation Authority of RSTP Funds –

Mark Riblett explained that at the end of every federal fiscal year (i.e., September 30) the state has the opportunity to request additional federal bonus obligation authority from other states that may not have been able to utilize the obligations given to them. He said the state has requested \$109 million in bonus obligation, but does not know if it will receive any of it. Federal law and regulations require that those dollars must be obligated by the end of the federal fiscal year which has an effective deadline of September 25 for purposes of this funding opportunity. Mr. Riblett said typically there are limited projects that can advance in that timeframe. He said VDOT believes there are opportunities in both non-RSTP funded and RSTP funded categories. Mr. Riblett said VDOT provided a candidate project list to FHWA and to all TPOs just a few days ago asking that they partner with the Commonwealth on advancing potential paving projects that are RSTP eligible. Mr. Riblett said the second part of the request is to consider and authorize any TIP

revisions that might be needed as a result of non-RSTP funded candidate projects. Mr. Riblett said VDOT's goal is to advance any infrastructure preservation projects for paving and bridges and so the suggested list of RSTP projects includes paving projects. He said bonus obligation has no negative impact on existing allocations and obligations for RSTP projects that the TPO has already taken action on, but it simply brings additional dollars to the state. Mr. Riblett said the challenge is one of timing and how quickly the state can act to obligate any bonus obligation funds that may be granted. He said the request is for the TPO's advice on how to move forward with their endorsement for project selection, for allocations for RSTP as well as any necessary actions for obligation on either RSTP or non-RSTP funding sources.

Barbara Nelson commented from a TPO perspective saying that they have a long history of supporting the Commonwealth in bonus obligation authority opportunities and working diligently through its RSTP and CMAQ allocations process to make sure that the first year of allocations can help VDOT meet federal strategy. She said the position that TPO staff has shared in a conference call with VDOT and FHWA is that should the opportunity for RSTP bonus obligation become available for this region, staff is recommending two RSTP projects that were competitively selected through the FHWA-approved TPO RSTP and CMAQ project process. Noting that the TPO has lead authority on RSTP project selection and allocation recommendations, Ms. Nelson noted that the TPO process has integrity and has worked well since it was put in place in 2004. She said staff recommends completion of the 30 percent engineering design of the I-64 Widening project in Henrico and New Kent counties from I-295 to Bottoms Bridge, which would advance this project from an FY 2020/2021 phase up to ready to advance now and would free up FY 2021 allocations for the Route 10 Superstreet project in Chesterfield County. Ms. Nelson said should the I-64 Widening project be determined not eligible by VDOT, a second project, also on I-64, is recommended, for which RSTP bonus obligation authority would fulfill allocations identified as needed for this TPO selected project. She said the TPO is positioned to meet the federal timeline, put the allocations on a project of regional significance that would also free up allocations to support another selected regionally significant project, or to place funds on another TPO selected project. Ms. Nelson said the request of the TPO is to authorize TAC to act on behalf of the TPO in this project selection process should the opportunity for RSTP bonus obligation authority be realized. She noted that TAC will meet twice prior to the next TPO meeting to consider project options based on the amount of RSTP bonus obligation awarded, if any. In response to a suggestion to limit TAC authorization to only the two projects proposed by staff, Ms. Nelson said that if the amount of money awarded is different than requested, that may present a challenge.

Mr. Riblett said if it is determined that neither of the proposed projects qualify, for some reason, if the TPO does not select something that does qualify, it shuts the door for that statewide \$9 million for all the other MPOs as well. He said VDOT is advocating for the paving projects, but he asked that if TAC is delegated authority to act based on the TPO's priorities and those projects are found not to be eligible, that the TPO leave the door open to make sure that the state can use the bonus obligation authority as it has determined to be most appropriate.

Chairman Peterson suggested that the motion the TPO will entertain will identify these two projects, but open the door for additional projects that are active projects that can be obligated by the deadline. Significant discussion followed and major discussion points are reflected below.

- A concern was expressed that when the TPO board approves the two projects, the people who were elected to office are making that decision, but it may not be prudent to give staff carte blanche beyond that to choose projects for which taxpayer dollars are being spent.
- The TPO is the policy board laying out the parameters and restrictions granting TAC, not staff, the authority to select projects based on FHWA determination of project eligibility and the amount of RSTP bonus obligation awarded, if any. TAC would be limited in their discretion of how to use those funds.
- TAC could not use these funds on any project that the TPO has not already approved. TAC action would just advance the funding for projects already selected by the TPO board.

Ms. Nelson restated the motion at the chairman's request and Wayne Hazzard made a motion, seconded by James Burrell, for the proposed action. Mark Riblett made a friendly amendment in clarification that the motion also include the ability for TAC to approve TIP revisions for non-RSTP funds as well as necessary. Both Mr. Hazzard and Mr. Burrell accepted the friendly amendment.

On motion of Wayne T. Hazzard, seconded by James H. Burrell, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization unanimously approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) authorizes the TPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to act on their behalf should Bonus Obligation Authority of RSTP funds become available, to be applied to either project UPC 107458 I-64 Widening or project UPC 107461 I-64 East-bound Pavement Marking Improvements;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, should it be determined that either of those two projects are ineligible to receive bonus obligation RSTP funds, the TPO authorizes TAC to consider and select any other active RSTP project already selected by the TPO where funds can be obligated, or to select pavement and infrastructure maintenance projects as recommended by VDOT; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the TPO authorizes TAC to approve on its behalf any TIP revisions required by VDOT for non-RSTP projects funded with bonus obligation funds during the FFY 15 round of bonus obligation funding.

IV. COMMITTEE AND STAFF REPORTS

In the interest of time, Committee and Staff Reports were noted in the agenda package as reported below.

A. TPO Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) Meeting Report –

The staff report was included in the agenda package under agenda tab 4.

B. TPO Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee (EDAC) Meeting Report –

The staff report was included in the agenda package under agenda tab 5.

C. RRPDC Transportation Director's Report

1. Introduction of New Staff –

- Josh Mallow, Planner, former RRPDC Intern, who is working as Project Manager for UWP task 5.1, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) Connectivity and Land-Use Analysis has been hired to a one-year contract (August 1, 2015 to July 31, 2016) with the RRPDC.
- Will Sanford, Intern, currently in the VCU's Masters of Urban and Regional Planning program, started his internship August 3 and he will be working with Mr. Mallow on the BRT Connectivity and Land-Use Analysis.

2. Other Business –

No other business was reported.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

In the interest of time, Other Business items were noted in the agenda package as reported below.

A. Upcoming TPO Policy Board Meetings –

- **Report on Upcoming TPO Agenda Items –**
See list and tentative schedule included in the TPO agenda attachments.
- **Suggestions by TPO Policy Board –**
None were offered due to lack of time.

B. Next Meeting

The September 3, 2015 TPO board meeting has been rescheduled to Thursday, September 24, 2015 due to the need for TPO action on submission to VDOT of candidate projects as part of the HB 2 project review and ranking process (meeting to be held at RRPDC). Due to the late September TPO meeting, the October 1 meeting will be cancelled.

C. Other Business

No other business was brought forward.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Peterson adjourned the meeting at noon.