

**RICHMOND REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**MINUTES OF MEETING
January 29, 2015**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Manuel Alvarez, Jr., **Chairman** Goochland County
W. Canova Peterson, IV, **Vice Chairman** Hanover County
Parker C. Agelasto City of Richmond
Jonathan Baliles City of Richmond
James H. Burrell..... New Kent County
Daniel A. Gecker Chesterfield County
Angela L. Gray..... RMTA
Kathy C. Graziano City of Richmond
David Green GRTC Transit System
Wayne T. Hazzard (Alternate)..... Hanover County
Edward L. Henson, III Town of Ashland
James M. Holland Chesterfield County
Amy Inman (Nonvoting)..... DRPT
Susan F. Lascolette Goochland County
Michelle R. Mosby..... City of Richmond
Patricia S. O'Bannon Henrico County
Mark Riblett (Alternate) VDOT
Von Tisdale (Nonvoting) RideFinders

MEMBERS ABSENT

Cliff Burnette (Nonvoting) VDA
Tammye Davis (Nonvoting) FHWA
Sean M. Davis Hanover County
Steve A. Elswick Chesterfield County
Ryan Long (Nonvoting) FTA
Floyd H. Miles, Sr Charles City County
Brian Montgomery (Nonvoting) (Alternate/ EDAC Acting Chairman)..... EDAC
Ellen F. Robertson City of Richmond
John Rutledge..... CRAC
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr. New Kent County
Frank J. Thornton..... Henrico County
Carson L. Tucker Powhatan County
David T. Williams..... Powhatan County
Julien Williams (Nonvoting)..... CTAC

OTHERS PRESENT

Viktoria W. Badger City of Richmond
Robert H. Cary VDOT
E. Todd Eure Henrico County
Tom Flynn..... City of Richmond
Barbara K. Smith Chesterfield County
Stephen Story James River Transportation
Travis Snellings Van Go, Inc.

Ronald Svejkovsky VDOT
Joseph E. Vidunas..... Hanover County
Uwanna Dabney..... Parsons Brickerhoff
Lynn Purnell..... Parsons Brickerhoff

RRPDC STAFF PRESENT

Daniel N. Lysy, TPO Secretary	Ken Lantz	Quillia Brooks
Bob Crum	Jin Lee	Sarah Rhodes
Sulabh Aryal	Greta Ryan	
Tiffany Dubinsky	Randy Selleck	

CALL TO ORDER

TPO Chairman Manuel Alvarez, Jr., called the January 29, 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.

Chairman Alvarez announced that Ned S. Creasey, Goochland County Board of Supervisors is a newly appointed TPO Alternate Member. He reintroduced Robert H. Cary, the new District Administrator for VDOT, and Quillia Brooks, RRPDC Planning Division Administrative Assistant filling in for Sharon Robeson who is out on medical leave.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present stood and recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Request for Changes/Additions to TPO Agenda –

There were no requests to amend the agenda. On motion of Kathy C. Graziano, seconded by James Holland, the TPO voted unanimously to approve the agenda as submitted.

B. Open Public Comment Period –

There were no requests to address the TPO.

C. Consent Action Items –

Dan Lysy noted the two consent action items included in the agenda enclosures packet. He said if there were no requests to pull either of these items for discussion, staff would request that the TPO take action to approve these two items as submitted. On motion of Kathy C. Graziano, seconded James H. Burrell, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) unanimously approved the following resolutions:

1. **Minutes of the December 4, 2014 TPO Meeting –**
2. **FTA Section 5310 Program Grant Applications Endorsement –**

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) endorses those applications for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 funds which are complete and properly submitted prior to the February 2, 2015 submission deadline, and found by the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) to be eligible for FTA Section 5310 Program funds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the TPO authorizes their inclusion in the TPO's Transportation Improvement Program subject to their selection for funding by the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

D. TPO Chairman's Report –

Chairman Alvarez noted that the next meeting scheduled for March 5 will be held at Luck Stone headquarters in Goochland County. Additional information will be distributed prior to the meeting. [Staff follow-up note: Following the January 29 TPO meeting, Luck Stone informed the TPO Chairman that it will need to use the meeting space scheduled for the TPO meeting on March 5, and as a result, the TPO will not be able to hold its March 5 meeting at their location].

II. OLD BUSINESS

A. House Bill (HB) 2, Statewide Prioritization Process for Project Selection –

Dan Lysy reviewed that the TPO took action at its October 2 meeting to approve TPO comments on HB 2 to Deputy Secretary of Transportation Nick Donohue on the TPO's recommended priority ranking of the various prioritization factors. Mr. Lysy also reviewed the TPO's request at its December 4 meeting asking for TAC's review and recommendation on CTAC's report to the TPO providing recommended changes to the TPO's action on recommended ranking of HB 2 prioritization factors, and CTAC's recommended additional language to the factor definitions presented in the table on HB 2 Required Prioritization Factors. Mr. Lysy also reviewed staff's report on TAC's recommendation that is provided in the TPO agenda package.

On motion of W. Canova Peterson, IV, seconded by Patricia O'Bannon, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization unanimously approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) revises the "HB 2 Required Prioritization Factors with VTrans 2035 Related Definitions and Examples of Factor Measures and MPO Recommended Rankings" to read as follows: "Significant amount of funds is generally defined as one-third of the estimated project cost"; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the RRTPO staff submit to the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIPI) the additional language recommended by the RRTPO/MPO Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) for the factors definitions in the HB 2 table with a request that the OIPI consider this additional language revising and expanding the definition of these factors as part of the next update to the VTrans statewide transportation plan.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. HB 2 Status –

Dan Lysy introduced speaker Robert Cary, new VDOT Richmond District Administrator to review the status of HB 2. Mr. Lysy reviewed details of Mr. Cary's experience with the HB 2 process. Mr. Cary provided a presentation and an overview of Deputy Secretary of Transportation Nick Donohue's presentation on HB 2 at the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) meeting held on January 13, 2015. Mr. Lysy noted that the HB 2 process is a new way to review ranking and scoring projects by providing accountability, however as Nick Donohue and Aubrey Layne previously mentioned, there will be mistakes and changes throughout this new process and continuing input is important. Staff passed out copies of the presentation slides.

Mr. Cary noted the HB 2 is not a VDOT or DRPT program. It is a Secretary of Transportation program that spans all modes. Mr. Cary stressed the importance of the role of MPOs and PDCs in this process. Projects that are considered have to go through a screening process first and through an approved plan similarly at the local level. MPO's and PDC's will be in a position to directly apply for projects to be considered for screening and scoring, possibly funding. While the process is being worked out, the recommendation to the CTB has been that MPOs and PDCs should be able to apply for projects on the corridors of statewide significance and the regional networks, but this proposal is subject to change. Local governments will have that same role in prioritizing projects that support the urban development areas around the state. Mr. Cary mentioned HB 1887 is in legislature this session and it will use HB 2 prioritization process as part of that legislation at a local level to look at projects across a district and would set guaranteed funding to districts which presently are unavailable as most projects are currently funded on a statewide basis. The presentation "House Bill 2 Update" covered the following points:

- Project's Relative Benefits - Cost Considerations
- Draft Weighting Categories
- Proposed Implementation Schedule
- Drafting Measures
- Process Moving Forward

Mr. Cary provided examples of project relative benefits and cost considerations. Mr. Hazzard inquired where the aggregate benefits numbers are derived from. Mr. Cary responded that the scale (i.e. 0 to 100 or 0 to 1000) has not yet been determined but the aggregate numbers are derived from the six factors in urban areas (5 factors around the rest of the state) and measures used in safety, congestion, economic development, accessibility, environmental quality and land use and transportation coordination. He said the scale is being worked on to make sure the process is fair across the spectrum of benefits for various areas. Mr. Peterson addressed the relative benefit stating that it appears that relative benefit is based on how much it cost VDOT. Mr. Cary responded with an example stating that the total cost of the project that the county and VDOT each pay half then from a VDOT perspective it is only costing VDOT half but you are getting the benefit of the whole project, from a taxpayer perspective since taxes are paid to state and local government, it is all tax money and should be the full cost. He also noted that the goal should be when you are leveraging money you should get credit. Funds counted as the cost is a huge impact on the relative benefit.

Mr. Cary discussed the weighting categories and recommendation from VDOT staff based on four concept weighting categories. Feedback has been received from MPOs, local governments and PDCs. This continues to be an ongoing process across the state. The draft categories were based on the concept of weighting the categories based on PDC and MPO boundaries based on demographic information provided by PDC/MPO. Mr. Cary discussed the proposed implementation schedule. He also noted that local governments will not be required to hire a consultant to complete the application as the application will be available online. Wayne Hazzard inquired if there will be an appeals process. Mr. Cary stated they are working on an appeals process now.

Mr. Cary noted that the measures are still in development and there are plans for additional meetings with all nine districts. The next meeting is scheduled for February 19. Pat O'Bannon inquired if projects that are already underway and had funding but were stopped because of HB 2 can be sped up from June 2016. Mr. Cary explained that all projects will be scored through the HB 2 process and the Commonwealth Transportation Board will adopt a Six-Year Plan which will determine whether not some projects are advanced. He also addressed the key considerations for measures and evaluating the projects impact on projected/existing conditions and presence of an addressable conditions and the challenges of forecasting. There are transportation demand models in MPO areas but there is not a statewide transportation demand model today which limits the ability to measure everything using a model. Plans to development a statewide model are underway and should be available a year from now. Mr. Cary said DRPT, VDOT, OIPI become the consultant for everyone in the uniform approach to take the burden off of local government and MPOs. A question was asked from someone in the audience asking if resolutions from boards of supervisors or city councils would be part of the application approval process. Mr. Cary said that part of the process is being developed however if a local government said they want a project and

the project is included as an element of their transportation portion of their comprehensive plan then consideration should be given at an appropriate level of review. If it is an MPO area, we would like to see it included in the MPO plan as well. If the project is serving a local urban development that would be the prerogative of the local government to put those in however if the project is serving a corridor of statewide significance then local government would not be eligible to submit for projects service corridors of statewide significance. Based on past experience, project needs to be in an approved plan which the local government would put in a resolution stating the project is in their plan and recommend it be the a priority.

Dan Lysy noted that the HB 2 endgame is an accountable scoring process in which CTB comes up with a list of projects that are reviewed, ranked and scored. CTB then takes the scores and other information they have to make decisions on funding the projects but it does not mean CTB will fund all of the top ranked projects as submitted. A lot of complications and steps, data issues, and questions remain on how regions will be balanced against one another. The TAC's ad hoc HB 2 advisory committee continues to meet and will continue to provide stakeholder input. Mr. Hazzard inquired if localities will have to agree with what the TPO considers a priority project. Mr. Cary responded that under current guidelines, it is the MPO that recommends projects on corridors of statewide significance or regional networks. Local government is not recommended to be able to apply at that level. He said if a local government wanted work on an interchange on Interstate 95 the PDC/MPO would have to submit that as a priority. Who can apply is part of the process being developed. Canova Peterson stated that as a corridor of statewide significance, I-95 runs through Hanover County however Route 1 is parallel to it and inquired if it was part of the corridor. Mr. Cary responded that all modes will be evaluated however CTB makes the final decision on projects. Chairman Alvarez thanked Mr. Cary for his time and presentation.

B. Year 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Congestion Management Process (CMP) Update; Scope of Work, Schedule and MTP/CMP Advisory Committee –

Randy Selleck and Tiffany Dubinsky, RRPDC staff project managers for the MTP and CMP, provide a high level overview of the proposed work scope and schedule. Staff distributed an information sheet “2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Congestion Management Process (CMP) Ten Things to Know” to members. Copies of the PowerPoint presentation were also available. The full scope of work document for the MTP and CMP including an outline for the plan document is located in tab three of the agenda package. Mr. Selleck discussed the MTP update scope of work, purpose, background and schedule. He noted the MTP, formally the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), serves as a multi-modal blueprint for the Richmond Region's transportation network. The MTP is regional framework for developing transportation facilities and services within a 20 year horizon. Projects in the TIP must also be included in or be consistent with the MTP to move forward and receive funds. The long-range planning process is

continuous with plan updates occurring every four years. The MTP is fiscally constrained and must be consistent with federal air quality, environmental justice and planning requirements. Mr. Selleck reviewed the status of the 2012-2040 Socioeconomic Data update and reported that the 2012 Base Year development is complete and the 2040 is near completion. The 2040 MTP will provide numerous avenues for public input and participation. Input will be sought on a continuous basis from the MTP Advisory Committee (MTPAC), composed of members from the TPO's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), Citizen's Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and Elderly and Disabilities Advisory Committee (EDAC). The MTPAC will guide the update process and will provide regular feedback to TPO staff. The TAC, CTAC and EDAC will also be briefed regularly on the plan update progress and will provide substantive input for the update process.

Comment from the general public will be sought throughout the plan update process. Public comments on the MTP vision, goals and objectives will be solicited via the TPO website, email and social media. Public comment will again be sought once a draft list of projects has been developed for the MTP. Finally, public meetings will be held across the region to solicit public comments on the draft MTP document prior to final review and adoption by the TPO Board. Work on the travel demand model update is underway and managed by VDOT which will expand the coverage to include the full PDC. (i.e. TPO study area and PD-15 rural study area). Work is also currently underway on the consultant selection process for an on-call travel demand modeling consultant to provide expertise for various tasks (e.g. assistance in reviewing plan alternatives)..

Ms. Dubinsky reviewed the Congestion Management Process (CMP) Update. The CMP is a component of the MTP but it is its own separate technical document that is updated in conjunction with the MTP. The CMP is a working and regionally accepted approach for managing congestion for our regional transportation network and looks at how our transportation system is performing by providing accurate and up to date information. Ms. Dubinsky reviewed the CMP work scope, data collection and analysis to be used in the update.

Mr. Selleck reviewed the schedule for the completion of the MTP and CMP updates. He noted that a detailed schedule will be presented at the first MTP Advisory Committee meeting which is tentatively scheduled to hold its first meeting in March. This schedule is also available upon request.

Mr. Selleck requested that the board take action and approve the MTP/CMP Update scope and schedule and the MTP/CMP Advisory as presented by staff.

Mr. Lysy added that both the TAC and CTAC reviewed and recommended the resolutions.

Chairman Alvarez called for questions and discussion. Parker Agelasto stated the MTP is forecasted to 2040 and uses socioeconomic projections and inquired how specific is the data for the demographic analysis and how many years back will be looked at for the trend. Mr. Selleck responded that the data is to the TAZ level which varies depending on the geography. He would have to defer to the

socioeconomic data project manager for the number of years. Mr. Lysy said it is not a trend. The information comes from the use of Virginia Employment Commission (VEC) data as required with a 10% deviation at a jurisdiction level along with local planning department technical staff forecasts for their jurisdictions. Population data, VEC data, housing units, households, students by zone of school, autos, retail employment and total employment data are plugged into the travel demand model which are used by the model to develop forecasts for traffic generated in the region. The new VDOT model will also be able to generate estimates for the use of transit service. Mr. Selleck stated that Weldon Cooper is now in charge of developing population forecasts which VEC had previously done. Initial forecasts are developed by TPO staff using Weldon Cooper estimates then sent out to the localities for review and edits by local demographers and returned to staff. Mr. Crum said it is more of a predictive forecasting process than a linear projection predicting what may happen from a future standpoint than from past trend. Amy Inman asked about looking at demographic data to understand the transit demand within the current service area but the service area does not cover the entire region for transit and it is the TPO's responsibility to do regional level transit planning which we heard about through the recent review with FTA and FHWA so how will this regional planning effort also look at regional public transportation as well as bicycle as pedestrian needs? Mr. Lysy responded that as the plan progresses along and we look at candidate projects that include possible transit services, you can also look at population density, employment, activity centers, etc. throughout the region not just the current transit service areas to see if public transportation services are viable or possible in some of the areas outside of the current service area to help provide for its expansion. Input for this work would largely be from the long-range plan advisory committee since local governments are the ones who make decisions in terms of providing public transportation services for their area. The TPO is required to look at and address it but local governments have to make the decision. It is an important issue brought up during the TPOs federal certification review. The RTDM on-call consultant should be available in the future to support staff and provide expertise in transit forecasting.

Ms. Lascolette inquired about the significance of expanding the travel demand model study area to the entire TPO to include New Kent and western Goochland. Mr. Selleck responded that TPO study area does not cover the entire PDC 15 region. The travel demand model was initially designed for air quality conformity analysis and did not include the western portions of Goochland and Powhatan. To the east the travel demand model covers all of Charles City and New Kent because the model is right up against Hampton roads. VDOT owns the regional model and they are created to work together and which is why to the east Charles City and New Kent are completely covered. From an analysis standpoint if the model is used for something other than air quality conformity the current study area does not make sense. That issue is being remedied with the latest update and the entire region will be modeled including Goochland and Powhatan. Lascolette requested matter be taken "offline" for further discussion.

On motion of Kathy Graziano, seconded by Patricia O'Bannon, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization unanimously approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) approves the 2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and Congestion Management Process (CMP) Update scope of work and schedule as presented to serve as guidance to staff and the MTP/CMP Update Advisory Committee for development and submission of the Year 2040 MTP and CMP Update; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the MTP/CMP Update Advisory Committee is established as a special purpose committee to provide oversight and guidance for development of the Year 2040 MTP and CMP Update, and that the Committee have the following voting membership composition:

- From TAC, each local government member, and members from DRPT, GRTC, RMTA and VDOT
- From CTAC, the FY 16 Chairman, FY 16 Vice-Chairman, and up to five at-large organization members
- From EDAC, the Chairman and one other member

IV. COMMITTEE AND STAFF REPORTS

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

In the absence of CTAC Chairman Julien Williams, Dan Lysy noted the staff report included in the agenda package for information.

B. RRPDC Transportation Director's Report –

No report.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Upcoming TPO Policy Board Meetings –

1. Report on Upcoming March 5 Meeting –

Chairman Alvarez noted this item was covered in the TPO Chairman's Report.

2. Report on Upcoming TPO Agenda Items –

No discussion of this item.

3. Suggestions by TPO Executive Committee –

Mr. Lysy noted in discussing the agenda item during the Executive committee meeting that there is a significant amount of money available under the FTA Section 5310 program that has not been allocated. It was requested to add this item to the agenda for the March or April meeting for discussion on the FTA Section 5310 Grant program and ways to

encourage human service agencies and organizations, GRTC and others to apply for and use those funds.

Mr. Lysy also noted that staff would like to present reports on projects of interest at future meetings. He noted that he will discuss with VDOT staff having them provide a report or presentation on the Route 623/Route 250 Pilot Access Management Plan which is nearing completion. It is staff's understanding that VDOT will present their pilot plan at the March 3 Goochland County Board of Supervisors meeting. He also noted that VDOT is using this plan as a model or template for conducting future access management plans in other parts of the region

Mr. Lysy also indicated that VDOT should be able to report on the I-64 East widening study (i.e. from Downtown Richmond to Hampton Roads) at the April 2 TPO board meeting.

Canova Peterson referenced information found in the enclosures under tab 5 regarding TAC's decision to take action on behalf of the TPO to transfer \$600,000 in RSTP and CMAQ funds. Mr. Peterson said the board was reorganized to meet federal guidelines yet a substantial amount of funds were transferred and the decision was delegated to this advisory committee. Are we putting ourselves in a bad position by delegating authority to an advisory committee for these type of decisions? Staff was requested to refer this matter to John Amos, RRPDC legal counsel for his advice.

4. Suggestions by TPO Policy Board –

Chairman Alvarez said the March 5 meeting is tentatively scheduled to be held at Luck Stone in Goochland County with the Second Annual Regional Transportation forum being our primary meeting topic.

B. Other Business –

No other business was brought forward.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Alvarez adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:05 a.m. and noted the next meeting will be on March 5, 2015 starting at 9:30 a.m.

DNL/qb