

**RICHMOND REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

MINUTES OF MEETING

May 7, 2015

MEMBERS PRESENT

Manuel Alvarez, Jr., Chairman	Goochland County
Jonathan Baliles	City of Richmond
James H. Burrell.....	New Kent County
Steve A. Elswick.....	Chesterfield County
Daniel A. Gecker	Chesterfield County
Kathy C. Graziano	City of Richmond
David Green	GRTC Transit System
Edward L. Henson, III	Town of Ashland
James M. Holland	Chesterfield 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
David T. Williams.....	Powhatan County

MEMBERS ABSENT

Parker C. Agelasto	City of Richmond
Cliff Burnette (Nonvoting)	VDA
Sean M. Davis.....	Hanover County
Angela L. Gray.....	RMTA
Ryan Long (Nonvoting).....	FTA
Brian Montgomery (Nonvoting) (Alternate/ EDAC Acting Chairman).....	EDAC
Michelle R. Mosby.....	City of Richmond
W. Canova Peterson, IV, Vice Chairman	Hanover County
Ellen F. Robertson	City of Richmond
John Rutledge.....	CRAC
C. Thomas Tiller, Jr.	New Kent County
Carson L. Tucker	Powhatan County
Julien Williams (Nonvoting).....	CTAC

OTHERS PRESENT

Rick Chess	Fast Potomac
Roger D. Cole	Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB)
E. Todd Eure	Henrico County
Jeffrey Kuttesch	VDOT
Walter Johnson.....	CTAC
John Morton.....	DC2RVA
Mike Sawyer	City of Richmond
Randy Selleck	DRPT
John Siddall.....	Siddall, Inc.

Barbara K. Smith Chesterfield County
Myra Smith Leadership Metro Richmond
Emily Stock..... DRPT
Ronald Svejkovsky VDOT
Joseph E. Vidunas..... Hanover County
Jeanne Welliver.....City of Richmond

RRPDC STAFF PRESENT

Daniel N. Lysy, TPO Secretary

Sulabh Aryal	Chuck Gates	Jin Lee
Bob Crum	Julie Fry	Sarah Rhodes
Tiffany Dubinsky	Barbara Jacocks	Greta Ryan
Billy Gammel	Ken Lantz	Chris Wichman

CALL TO ORDER

TPO Chairman Manuel Alvarez, Jr., called the May 7, 2015 meeting of the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) to order at approximately 9:35 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.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW MEMBER(S)

Chairman Alvarez asked if there were any new members to introduce and Mr. Lysy said there was one new member to introduce. He welcomed Mr. Ivan Rucker, who will now represent the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on the TPO Board as a nonvoting member. Mr. Rucker replaces Ms. Tammye Davis, who has been reassigned to a different position within the Richmond FHWA office. Mr. Rucker thanked members for their welcome.

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 made by Ms. Lascolette and seconded by Mr. Thornton, members unanimously approved the agenda as submitted.

B. Open Public Comment Period –

There were no requests from the public to address the TPO, and Chairman Alvarez closed the public comment period.

C. Consent Action Items –

Mr. Lysy said there is one consent action item, which is included in the agenda enclosures packet under Tab 1 – Minutes of the April 2, 2015 meeting. He said if there

was no request for discussion, staff would request that the TPO take action to approve the minutes as submitted. On motion made by Ms. Graziano and seconded by Mr. Williams, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) approved the minutes of the April 2, 2015 meeting as presented, with Ms. O'Bannon and Mr. Miles abstaining from the vote as they were not present during the April 2 meeting.

D. TPO Chairman's Report –

1. Rescheduled Richmond Region Second Annual Transportation Forum

Chairman Alvarez reminded members that the Second Annual Transportation Forum will be held June 4 at the Luck Stone Corporate Headquarters in Goochland County. Mr. Alvarez said staff will send address information and directions prior to the June meeting. He said Luck Stone is requesting a list of attendees so members will be asked to RSVP if they plan to attend. Mr. Lysy said staff will be in contact with everyone to request RSVPs. Chairman Alvarez said if members would like to tour the facility, please indicate that with the RSVP and a tour can be arranged.

2. Election of FY 2016 TPO Chairman and Vice Chairman –

Chairman Alvarez reported that for FY 2016, the Chairmanship rotates to Hanover County and the Vice Chairmanship rotates to Chesterfield County. The jurisdictions have appointed Mr. Canova Peterson (Hanover County) and Mr. Steve Elswick (Chesterfield County) to serve in these positions.

Chairman Alvarez said that unless there are nominations from the floor, he would entertain a motion to elect Mr. Peterson as TPO Chairman and Mr. Elswick as TPO Chairman. He noted that the TPO Executive Committee had approved these nominations during that meeting earlier this morning.

There were no nominations from the floor and on motion made by Mr. Williams and seconded by Mr. Burrell, the TPO members unanimously elected Mr. Canova Peterson to serve as TPO Chairman and Mr. Steve Elswick to serve at TPO Vice Chairman during FY 2016.

3. Other Business –

There was no other business to report.

E. CTB Member's Report –

Mr. Cole said he has a brief amount of time to provide his report, and he will be happy to answer any questions offline from members regarding upcoming CTB meetings.

Mr. Cole said he will be reporting on two items discussed by the CTB during its last meeting – draft Six-Year Improvement Plan (SYIP) and HB2.

The draft SYIP is showing a decrease in funds from last year's SYIP (for FY2015-FY2020), from \$10 billion to \$9.5 billion during the period 2016 – 2021. This supports over 3,000 projects. Mr. Cole said in the 2016 plan, over 133 new projects have been added. All of these are HB2 exempt. There were 324 projects that received additional allocations.

The SYIP continues the transition to the prioritization methodology of HB2 and incorporates the transition into HB1887. Mr. Cole said HB2 will be fully implemented beginning with the 2017 SYIP.

Updates reflect a reduction of \$165 million in state revenues. Mr. Cole noted that the revenue sharing plan is being reduced. He said many jurisdictions have utilized the revenue sharing plan very well. In 2016, the state share of the revenue sharing plan is scheduled to be \$185 million and drops to \$50 million by the end of the SYIP in 2020 and 2021.

Mr. Cole said the reserve that has been set aside for HB2 projects were reduced from \$416 million to \$319 million. He said this indicates that projects have found alternate sources of funding. The total amount available for HB2 is \$785 million in the SYIP.

Mr. Cole said the Richmond District's current SYIP is \$629 million versus \$614 million in the draft SYIP. This is a 2.3 percent decrease. The state's overall decrease is five percent. Richmond also fared well in the state of good repair category. The Richmond District will receive 17.4 percent of the total amount available to all districts. This equates to \$59.7 million. Mr. Cole noted that the 17.4 percent is within one-tenth of a percent of what the legislature is allowing for any one district – 17.5 percent is the maximum any one district can be allocated. Mr. Cole said the state of good repair in the Richmond District is lower than that in any of the other districts.

Mr. Cole said he appreciated Chesterfield County's hospitality in hosting the SYIP public hearing on Tuesday night (i.e., May 5, 2015).

With regard to HB2, Mr. Cole reported that during the April CTB meeting, information was presented on the four categories of weighting for HB2 projects. MPOs set their own category and this may change from time to time depending on projects.. The category must be confirmed by the CTB. Mr. Cole said he did not see very many instances in which the CTB would not confirm a decision set by an MPO. The area's within the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission that are outside of the TPO Study Area boundary may also choose categories. All of these areas must be in the same category, but it does not have to be the same category selected by the MPO.

Mr. Cole said that the Richmond District has been placed in Category A with Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads. He said he learned this categorization was just for

demonstration purposes. Mr. Cole said the HB2 process is still not settled until the June CTB vote.

Mr. Cole said that concluded his report. Chairman Alvarez asked if there were any questions.

Mr. Williams asked for the reasoning behind the reductions in the revenue sharing plan. Mr. Cole said the reason for the reduction is primarily budgetary.

Mr. Riblett added that other than needing to put funds into the state of good repair, the budgetary reasoning is correct. Mr. Cole said the program itself has been very successful.

Chairman Alvarez asked if Mr. Cole could repeat the figures for the SYIP. Mr. Cole said the Richmond District will be going from \$629 million to \$614 million.

Ms. Lascolette asked if Mr. Cole could provide all of these figures to members in writing. Mr. Cole said he can do this and noted that the PowerPoint presentations used during the CTB meetings are on the CTB website. Mr. Cole indicated that he will provide a link to the information to Ms. Fry for distribution to members.

Chairman Alvarez thanked Mr. Cole for his report.

II. OLD BUSINESS

No old business was brought forward.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Washington DC to Richmond High-Speed Rail Project (DC2RVA) –

Chairman Alvarez said that this presentation will be made by Mr. Randy Selleck, who most members remember from his tenure as a Principal Planner for RRPDC.

Mr. Selleck thanked Chairman Alvarez for his introduction and for the opportunity to speak with members this morning on the DC2RVA rail project. Mr. Selleck said the presentation will provide information on the project overview, schedule, current activities, and next steps.

The DC2RVA rail project includes the portion of the Southeast High Speed Rail corridor that runs from the Potomac River to just below Centralia (Virginia) where the CSX A line and S line intersect.

DRTP is currently in the Tier II EIS process, which is the second portion of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that was begun under Tier I (from Washington DC to North Carolina). The length of the corridor determined this approach. Tier I is an

overarching approach study. Tier II EIS studies will be for Washington DC to Richmond, followed by Richmond to Raleigh, and then Raleigh to Charlotte.

The DC2RVA project is in the Tier II study. The final EIS is being prepared currently and will be sent to the Federal Rail Administration (FRA) for a decision on the larger project.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process is a tiered approach:

Tier I Program-Level Document

- program is being introduced that may have far reaching effects
- large physical area is being addressed
- looks at general environmental conditions and general levels of impact
- site-specific details have not yet been identified or designated

Tier II Project-Level Document

- performed when a specific project is investigated in detail
- impacts are quantified and analyzed and potential mitigation measures are being identified
- documentation and decisions lead to Record of Decision (ROD), permitting, final design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction

Mr. Selleck provided information on the project, including:

- 123-mile corridor
- northernmost segment of the Southeast High-Speed Rail (SEHSR) corridor
- connects to Amtrak's northeast corridor
- preliminary engineering and environmental review
- ridership and revenue review
- station area improvements
- service frequency

Improvement concepts will include:

- construction of additional main line tracks and crossovers
- improvements to sidings and signals
- straightening of curves
- station area improvements
- improvements to grade crossings

Mr. Selleck said there are some challenges that will need to be addressed:

- updating key elements of the 2002 SEHSR Tier I EIS
- effectively applying past studies
- addressing unresolved corridor issues
- considering future Virginia Railway Express (VRE), Amtrak, and freight rail plans

Mr. Selleck reviewed the project schedule, noting currently, screening of alternatives to the plan are being researched. Scoping of the project concluded in late 2014/early 2015. This involved some public meetings. A draft purpose and need document was prepared and is currently under review by stakeholders. Once that review is completed, the document will go to FRA and then made available for public review. Mr. Selleck reported that about 3,000 property owners along the corridor have been contacted regarding the need for survey work on private property. Most of the preliminary survey work can be done with aerial photography which will limit the need to access private property.

Mr. Selleck said the next set of public meetings will be to inform the public on the process being used to look at alternatives and the criteria that will be used to screen the alternatives.

There are three ultimate service goals for this project:

- reliability
- travel time
- frequency

Mr. Selleck noted that these goals are essential to make any intercity passenger rail a viable option and competitive with auto and air travel. The improvements will help improve operations even if higher speed is not attainable.

Mr. Selleck provided a slide that illustrated the density of trains by segment along the corridor, comparing passenger trains and freight. This comparison is one of the grant requirements to ensure capacity. Information was also provided on the frequency of current intercity passenger rail along the corridor.

The DC2RVA plan will add eight new SEHSR round trips: four to North Carolina, three to Norfolk, and one to Newport News. There will also be one new regional round trip to Lynchburg via Newport News. Additionally, one new shuttle will be added from Richmond to Norfolk.

As alternatives for the project are defined, design options such as rail alignment, stations, and road/rail crossings will be examined. Service options that will be reviewed include frequency of service, schedules, and station stops.

The screening process for rail alignment includes the following steps:

- develop preliminary track alignment options
- Stage I screening – fatal flaw
- Stage II screening – order of magnitude impacts
- Stage III screening – infrastructure constraints
- Stage IV screening – area option

The next public hearings on the screening process will be held as follows:

- Monday, June 1 – Alexandria
- Tuesday, June 2 – Fredericksburg
- Wednesday, June 3 – Richmond

Each public meeting will be in the open house format from 5:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. During the next set of public meetings, to be held in the fall, information will be provided on the narrowed-down list of alternatives.

Mr. Selleck introduced Ms. Emily Stock, DRPT Project Manager, and Mr. John Morton, one of the consultants for the project.

Ms. O'Bannon asked if any research has been completed on the types of tracks or trains that will need to be utilized. She said she understands that lighter trains need to be used for high speed service. Ms. Stock said it is being assumed that the service can be achieved using existing Amtrak rolling stock and current track that will accommodate Acela-type trains. Mr. Morton added that the higher speed trains will continue in the northeast corridor and need to be consistent with current rolling stock. The conventional trains in service now are capable of the speeds being considered for the corridor. Ms. Stock said the current infrastructure can be used for higher speeds as long as the curves in the tracks are straightened out a bit. She noted reliability and travel time are the main focus of the project at this time. Ms. Stock said there can't be a different track design as long as passenger and freight are operating on the same lines. She said DRPT has worked with Amtrak, VRE, and CSX on design elements to ensure compatibility.

Mr. Burrell noted that on a recent trip he made to Boston via rail, he noticed that from Richmond to Washington, the ride was noisy and there was a lot of train whistle blowing. Once he changed to an electric train in Washington for the remainder of the trip to Boston, the ride was much quieter. Ms. Stock said that during the Tier I EIS in 2002, the potential for electrification and greenfield alignment was studied. She said the outcome of the Tier I indicated the best option would be to look at incremental improvements to the current system. It is hoped that in the future, a hybrid engine using diesel and electric can be phased in. Improvements being considered should help smooth out the ride and decrease the need for whistle blowing.

Ms. Lascolette asked about the timeline for notifying property owners and asked if any responses have been received from the property owners. Ms. Stock said she has spoken

with about 100 persons so far and most of them want to know what type of access to the property will be needed. No one in the Richmond Region has received notices as yet. Ms. Stock said currently photos of structures 50 years or older are being made. This will be followed by wetlands studies. Most of the calls are to ask when someone will be on the property and if the project relates to eminent domain. Ms. Stock said the goal is to stay within the current CSX right-of-way. DRPT wants to ensure that the cultural resources are protected within 500 feet of the CSX right-of-way.

Ms. Lascolette asked for clarification on the width of the right-of-way. Ms. Stock said the width can vary, but generally it is 80 feet. Ms. Lascolette asked if the aerial photos are being taken by drones. Ms. Stock said drones are not being used. She said DRPT is using the same aerial photographer used by VDOT. Mr. Selleck said the planes are also looking at elevations, which will allow good, preliminary design work to be completed. Mr. Morton added that the photography work has already been completed.

Mr. Lysy asked if the Buckingham Branch and S lines would be considered and if the exact corridor had been set. Ms. Stock said the Tier I did set the corridor using comingled service in the existing CSX corridor. The service will go through Main Street Station, using the S line. In Tier II, the A line (along I-95) is being considered as an alternative to the S line (Main Street Station). The Buckingham Branch was also studied and there is extensive documentation on why this line will not work. FRA indicated that this needs to be documented using the NEPA process. Ms. Stock said she does not anticipate that the Buckingham Branch will be an alternative.

Mr. Lysy asked if Tier II will determine the location of stations. Ms. Stock said a ridership and revenue analysis will be completed. In the Richmond Region, alignment will drive station placement. Mr. Lysy said currently there is Main Street Station, Staples Mill and Glendale in Henrico County, and Ashland. He asked if any alternatives to these stations will be considered. Mr. Lysy said he believed at one time there was discussion of relocating Staples Mill. Ms. Stock said all options are being considered.

Mr. Gecker said he believed the TPO board has formally adopted the use of Main Street Station as the preferred location as has Chesterfield County and the City of Richmond. Mr. Gecker said in an analysis of ridership and revenues, Main Street Station will also lose because of increased travel time through ACCA Yard. Looking ahead, taking intercity rail and making it city to suburb rail is a classic planning error. He said he believed the focus should be on how intercity rail can enhance the future of the Region as a whole and making downtown Richmond more vibrant. Focus on the suburbs will cause the loss of downtown and the inner ring. Mr. Gecker asked how long of a long-term impact was considered when determining where to locate a station. Ms. Stock said DRPT and FRA are both committed to the type of model Mr. Gecker is discussing. She asked Mr. Morton to address the planning horizon.

Mr. Morton said FRA is requiring a 20-year horizon past the implementation year. In this case, 2025 is the potential implementation year, which will put the horizon year at 2045. He said DRPT is looking at what it will take to make Main Street Station work and

vital – infrastructure requirements, etc. The ridership analysis will be made by comparing like stations.

Mr. Gecker said there is a great emphasis on taking cars off the road, but by going city to suburb, the need for cars is enhanced. The employment and residential base will be moved out of the city core. By using the urban core, the number of vehicles can be mitigated. Mr. Morton said one of the FRA guidelines is to connect downtowns. FRA also wants DRPT to look at suburban stops in terms of accommodating park-and-ride situations. Ms. Stock said the FRA grant is for high speed rail and there are a lot of guidelines created by FRA. One of these is to connect downtown to downtown, central business districts to central business districts. She said having urban stations is a goal of this project.

Chairman Alvarez thanked Mr. Selleck, Ms. Stock, and Mr. Morton for their presentation. He asked if a public hearing schedule could be provided to members. Mr. Selleck said he could forward information to staff.

B. I-64 East Corridor Widening Projects –

Mr. Lysy introduced Mr. Jeff Kuttesch, who is with the VDOT Central Region Traffic Engineering Office. Mr. Kuttesch will provide an update on the status of projects underway with regard to the I-64 corridor widening. Mr. Lysy said there are a few copies of the PowerPoint presentation that can be distributed to anyone who would like a copy.

Mr. Kuttesch thanked members for the opportunity to present a status update on the I-64 corridor project to members.

Mr. Kuttesch provided background and related studies information on the following:

- I-64 Peninsula Study – Final EIS
- I-64 East Bound Standalone Paving (UPC 104499)
- Travel Time and Alternate Route Signing
- 2000 Truck Weigh Station Relocation Study

Information was provided on a study of the I-64 corridor and traffic conditions, focusing on the segment between I-295 and the James City County line. Mr. Kuttesch noted that summer weekend volumes exceed 50,000 vehicles in each direction in the highest volume segment. About ten percent of the traffic exits at Bottoms Bridge and another 10-15 percent will exit at West Point.

A crash analysis for the timeframe January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2013, showed a total of 754 crashes in this segment (both directions), including eight fatalities. The highest number of crashes occur on Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, with the highest number occurring on Sunday along the west bound lanes. Additional, more detailed information was provided by mile marker.

The study showed the following recommended improvements:

- infrastructure / capacity improvements
 - priority #1 – add third lane from I-295 to Exit 205
 - priority #2 – modify I-64 east bound lane usage at I-295 interchange
 - priority #3 – extend substandard acceleration / deceleration lanes
 - priority #4 – modify Exit 205 interchange
- roadway departure countermeasures
 - clearing median slopes
 - widen paved left shoulder
- operational / incident response improvements
 - increase camera coverage
 - improve I-64 west bound signing
 - static alternate route signing / dynamic travel time signing
 - improve / add crossovers
 - park and ride capacity increase

Mr. Kuttesch said that the infrastructure and capacity improvements, priority #1, will provide the following benefits:

- significant operational improvements
- targets highest crash segment
- consistent with I-64 Tier I EIS
- incorporates roadway departure countermeasures

Ms. O'Bannon noted that in the area being referenced, the signage needs to be improved. She said there is not enough notice to get into the proper lane. Mr. Kuttesch said there are recommendations to look at the current signage.

Mr. Burrell noted that in many instances, crashes are caused when drivers follow too closely. He said he's not sure if widening the roadway will address this issue.

Ms. O'Bannon said she believed there is technology that can be used to alert drivers to the fact that they are following too closely. She asked about the possibility of using that. Mr. Kuttesch said all options will be considered. Some options may include driver education. VDOT has the most control over infrastructure improvements.

The risks and challenges include:

- includes I-64 bridges over Chickahominy
- potential noise impacts
- funding availability
- FHWA concurrence

For priority #2, benefits include:

- better balance of lanes with demand
- fewer lane changes, reduced potential for rear end crashes, side swipe crashes
- potential fast implementation
- works well with future median widening

Risks and challenges for priority #2 include:

- FHWA approval required
- driver familiarity (new left side lane drop)
- does not address capacity constraints

Ms. O'Bannon noted that the merge ramp is too close to the weigh station in this segment of I-64.

Benefits for priority #3 include:

- targets multiple crash types
- potentially improves operations
- works well with future median widening

Priority #3 risks and challenges include:

- potential weigh station relocation – are expenditures at current site worthwhile

Benefits for priority #4 include:

- eliminates low speed loop with short acceleration lane
- targets high crash area
- works with future median widening

As pointed out by Ms. O'Bannon, Mr. Kuttesch said the acceleration and deceleration lanes are too short and don't meet current VDOT standards.

Risks and challenges include:

- detailed operational analysis and FHWA approval required (IMR)
- potential right-of-way impacts

Mr. Kuttesch reported that with regard to roadway departure countermeasures, left shoulder widening and tree removal, this effort is focused on mile posts 200 to 205. Benefits to this improvement will be:

- reduces potential for roadway departure crashes (approximately 60 percent are run-off left)

- reduces potential severity when crashes do occur

Risks and challenges include:

- could be addressed through priority #1
- does not address underlying cause of large portion of crashes (congestion)
- stormwater management

Mr. Burrell asked if guardrails would be a potential to help prevent cars from running off the road into the ditch. Mr. Kuttesch said he did not believe so as guardrails have a potential to send cars off into the other lanes if the car bounces off the guardrail. He said signage revisions are also under consideration.

Operational and incident response improvements will include:

- improve ITS camera coverage (\$1-1.5 million)
- improve I-64 west bound C-D road signing at I-295 (\$500 thousand)
- static alternate route signing – design complete, pending CN funding (\$100 thousand)
- dynamic travel time signing – to be completed in early 2015
- improve crossovers and consider new crossover between mile posts 205 and 211
- park and ride lot capacity increase at Exit 205 (UPC 106304)

Benefits:

- reduce incident response times and overall incident duration
- reduce demand on I-64 corridor (targets congestion)
- improve motorist information / guidance

Risks and Challenges:

- ongoing operating and maintenance costs
- potential traffic impact on parallel routes (Rt. 60 and Rt. 249)
- limited availability of power and communications infrastructure

Mr. Svejksky provided detailed information on the next steps for each of these four priority items, including costs. He noted that an application for \$2.5 million in RSTP funds was approved by the TPO to begin PE work. Each priority now has its own UPC and is in the draft FY16-21 SYIP. Fund transfers (using previous funds) and TIP amendments for three of the four projects will be considered during the June 4, 2015, TPO board meeting. Mr. Svejksky also reported that fund transfers (using previous funds) and the TIP amendment for the fourth priority project will be considered during the June 4 or August 6 TPO board meeting.

Mr. Svejksky also provided information on the I-64 east bound projects being undertaken by the Hampton Roads Transportation Authority Commission.

Chairman Alvarez thanked Mr. Kuttesch and Mr. Svejksky for their presentation.

C. MAP-21 Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) FFY16 Projects and Allocations –

Chairman Alvarez said that Ms. Sarah Rhodes will present this information. He noted that a public hearing will be required during the presentation. Ms. Rhodes added that TPO action will also be required.

Ms. Rhodes said that TAP funding is focused on bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The funding comes to the state and is divided between the state (CTB) and the MPOs. Transportation Management Areas (TMA) are responsible for project selection and allocation. Richmond is a TMA. Mr. Cole released his recommendations for TAP projects in February and of those, five RRTPO projects were partially funded.

Ms. Rhodes reviewed the TAP funding breakdown:

- total TAP funding is approximately \$19.94 million
- about \$1 million is set aside for recreation trails program
- state receives about \$9.4 million
- approximately \$9.4 million is suballocated
 - \$5.7 million to urban areas over 200,000 (RRTPO)
 - \$1.3 million to urban areas between 5,001 and 200,000
 - \$2.4 million to urban areas less than 5,000
- RRTPO received a FY16 allocation of \$977,657; amount remaining in FY15 is \$492,278

Ms. Rhodes said the CTB member selection projects are:

- Harrowgate Road (sidewalk)
- Dorey Park (shared trail)
- Carnation Street (sidewalk)
- Bellemead Park (pedestrian trail)
- Bank Street / Franklin Street (multipurpose)

Chairman Alvarez asked if the trails are using part of the funds earmarked for trails. Ms. Rhodes said the funds are purely TAP allocations, and noting that TAP funds allocated to DCR are for projects within parks. The projects listed for the TPO are tied to VDOT.

TAC recommended the TPO staff recommendations during its meeting on April 21, 2015.

TPO staff is recommending that the remaining balances for the five CTB member projects be fully funded. This will require an allocation of \$797,540 in RRTPO TAP resources, and will utilize remaining FY15 funds first. Staff further recommends that the unallocated amount of \$672,395 in FY16 funds be carried over to the FY17 TAP cycle.

Ms. Rhodes said the reason for the carryover is that there are many good projects for which applications were submitted. There were some questions about a few of the applications and additional information is being requested prior to approval of the applications.

Ms. Rhodes noted that the resolution for approval is included in the agenda packet. She said the need for a public hearing today is because public hearings for these types of projects are typically included in SYIP public hearings. The most recent SYIP public hearing was held on May 5, and staff was not able to meet that deadline. Ms. Rhodes said since the TPO board is the body that allocates funds, it seemed appropriate for anyone with questions on the allocations to bring them before the TPO board instead of having public comments made during the CTP SYIP public hearing and then relayed back to the TPO.

Ms. Lascolette asked for clarification on TAC's approval of the allocations. Ms. Rhodes said that TAC did provide their recommendation that the allocations be approved by the TPO board. Ms. Lascolette asked if members today had received the same information as what was presented to TAC. Ms. Rhodes said that was correct. The information is identical.

Chairman Alvarez opened the public hearing and asked if anyone had any comments regarding the recommended TAP allocations. As there were no requests for comments, Chairman Alvarez closed the public hearing.

Chairman Alvarez asked if there were any other questions. Mr. Lysy noted that staff advertised and submitted notice for public comment on the TAP allocations. No comments were received during the two-week public review period.

Ms. Lascolette asked why funds are being carried over when there are projects that could be funded. Ms. Rhodes said that following review of the project applications submitted, TPO staff and TAC are recommending that funds be carried over as there are no other projects ready for funding at this time. Ms. Rhodes said it was felt that it would be more appropriate to go back to those who submitted the application and discuss what additional information would be needed in order for the application to move forward. Ms. Rhodes said that when funding is allocated, it is locked to the project. If the project is not ready to advance, the funding must stay with the project. Ms. Rhodes said many of the applications had been submitted in previous fiscal years. She said she hoped by going

back to the jurisdictions that submitted the applications, those applications can be improved so that funds can be allocated in the future.

Ms. O'Bannon clarified that the five recommended projects are ready to go, and Ms. Rhodes said that was correct.

Mr. Lysy added that the full resolution being submitted for approval is included in the agenda packet and provides more detailed information than the slide that Ms. Rhodes presented.

Chairman Alvarez asked why trail funds would not be used. Ms. Rhodes said trail funding is not allocated by the TPO. She said trails refer to parks and recreation type activities. The trails listed on the proposed projects list presented are referring to multiuse paths.

Mr. Williams made a motion that the following resolution be approved:

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) approves the allocation of remaining Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2015 Transportation Alternative Program funds and a portion of FFY 2016 Transportation Alternative Program funds, and authorizes submission of these projects to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) for inclusion in the FY 2016 – 2021 Six-Year Improvement Program as follows:

1. Harrowgate Road Sidewalk – Chesterfield County
\$200,000 in FFY 2015 TAP federal funds;
2. Dorey Park Shared Use Trail – Henrico County
\$47,278 in FFY 2015 TAP federal funds and \$65,262 in FFY16 TAP federal funds;
3. Carnation Street Sidewalk – City of Richmond
\$240,000 in FFY 2016 TAP federal funds;
4. Bellemeade Park Pedestrian Trail and Pedestrian Bridge – City of Richmond
\$93,000 in FFY 2015 TAP federal funds;
5. Bank Street/Franklin Street Bike Lane and Bank Street Sidewalk Widening – City of Richmond
\$152,000 in FFY 2015 TAP federal funds.

The motion was seconded by Ms. O'Bannon. There was no additional discussion and the motion carried unanimously.

D. FY 2016 Unified Work Program (UWP)

Mr. Lysy said this item will require TPO action. He said he will provide an overview of the UWP, and he has asked those staff members who will be leading specific tasks to provide highlights of those tasks. Mr. Lysy said he will also provide budgetary information relating to the UWP.

Mr. Lysy said that the TPO is a multimodal planning and programming process for highways, transit/paratransit/TDM, freight/intermodal, and bicycle/pedestrian. He said the process takes into consideration public participation, Title VI, air quality/environmental impacts, financial resources, performance measures/targets, and economic development.

Mr. Lysy provided a listing of all of the UWP TPO staff work tasks and noted that one new task has been added for FY16 and three other tasks are included per Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requirements as information items:

- 5.3: Richmond Region Transit Vision Plan – DRPT
- 5.7: Broad Street BRT Project – GRTC
- 5.8: Richmond Area Rail Studies and Projects – DRPT
- 5.9: GRTC Downtown Bus Transfer Center – GRTC

Mr. Lysy provided information on the following work tasks:

- Task 1.1 (TPO Maintenance and Special Studies)
 - transition to new Transportation Director
 - revision of TPO Bylaws; last major review completed in late 1980s/early 1990s
 - new anticipated federal planning regulations
 - execute VDOT/RRPDC agreement for regional travel demand model consultant
- Task 1.2 (TPO Citizen Participation)
 - TPO public participation plan update
 - fill vacant Senior Planner position (staff lead for public participation and coordinate staff public outreach)
 - website for TPO (separate from RRPDC website)
- Task 5.5 (Regional Public Transportation Services – Lead Staff Ken Lantz)
 - participate on advisory committees/work groups (GRTC Broad Street BRT Policy and Technical Committee; DRPT DC2RVA High Speed Rail Work Group; Ridefinders Advisory Board)
 - Richmond Regional Transit Vision Plan (initiated by DRPT)

Mr. Lysy asked Ms. Jacocks to continue with the UWP review. Ms. Jacocks noted that Planning staff works closely with the TPO and the local planning staffs to update the socioeconomic data on a four-year basis. An update was just completed regarding Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) population and employment trends. Ms. Jacocks provided a map that illustrated the data collected during the recent update. She said the

data can be used by the localities in their planning efforts. The data will also be used in the MTP update and the BRT land analysis.

Ms. Dubinsky provided information on Task 2.2 – Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) update. A section on the TPO website will allow better accessibility for the public. Ms. Dubinsky will also focus on a fiscally constrained plan, looking at revenue projections received from VDOT and other state and federal sources. Between now and the horizon year of 2040, project evaluations will be undertaken to determine which are regionally significant or which will contribute to the investment in the regional transportation network. At the end of the 2035 plan development, an interactive map was created to provide information on projects. Staff will work with locality staffs represented on TAC to develop a project ranking procedure process.

Ms. Dubinsky noted she will also work on Task 2.3 – Regional Travel Demand Model. Staff will look to see what other tasks and projects this model can be used on, such as corridor studies, subarea analysis, congestion, and transit. Work will be completed in concert with the travel demand consultant.

Mr. Aryal provided information on Task 2.5 – Transportation Database Development/GIS:

- GIS support for all TPO plans and projects
 - development of Regional Bike Infrastructure GIS layer
 - data/maps for MTP update
 - data development for the TPO Title IV plan update
 - maps for 2014 Federal Function Classification of Roads in Richmond
- update of the Richmond Region Bridge and Culvert Inventory and Structural Analysis report

Mr. Aryal also provided maps that illustrated the types of data that will be collected in the 2014 Federal Function Classification update (from the VDOT website).

At this time, Mr. Lysy asked Chairman Alvarez if a vote can be taken on the UWP as some members have begun to leave. Mr. Lysy noted that with the weighted vote structure, a quorum of members is still in attendance; however, he would recommend that a vote be taken on the UWP while there still in a quorum in attendance.

There were no questions and on motion made by Ms. O'Bannon and seconded by Mr. Holland, the Unified Work Program was approved unanimously as presented.

Mr. Lysy asked Ms. Ryan to continue with the presentation on UWP Work Tasks.

Ms. Ryan said she will be the lead staff on Task 3.1 – Congestion Management Process. This is a federally mandated assessment of congestion in the Region. It informs the MTP. Data will be analyzed to determine the location and intensity of congestions as

well as key times when congestion occurs. Ms. Ryan said she will also work on ways to include these visualizations on the TPO website.

Ms. Rhodes noted that she will be lead staff on Task 4.1 – Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). She noted that the BRT land analysis is not included in the TIP because this project will need to be approved by TPO members during the June TPO meeting.

Ms. Rhodes said she will also be the lead staff on the HB2 process. She provide a slide that was used during the SYIP meeting earlier in the week. The slide shows the annual cycle for the HB2 process. Localities wishing to apply for funds available in the HB2 process must submit applications to the TPO for review and approval. The TPO is also eligible to apply for project funding. A firm deadline has not been set, but it is anticipated the date will be in October, 2015.

Ms. Rhodes will also be the lead staff for Task 8.1 – Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning and Task 8.2 – Bicycle and Pedestrian County Pilot Program. Ms. Rhodes pointed out that the RRTPO was one of only ten MPOs selected to receive grant funding for Task 8.2. Sports Backers will be partnering with the TPO on this Pilot Program.

Mr. Wichman presented information on Task 6.1 – Intermodal Planning, which deals with planning for freight movement via barge, truck, and rail:

- Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) update
- Richmond's Future Logistics Roundtable
- Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS)
- coordination with Virginia Port Authority (VPA) on Port of Richmond and I-64 Express Barge Service

Mr. Wichman reminded members that since FY09, the RRTPO has allocated over \$13 million in regional funds to support projects in and around the Port of Richmond's freight and distribution gateway. He provided a slide that showed the amount of funding since FY09.

Mr. Burrell asked for clarification on the I-64 Express. Mr. Wichman said this is the barge service that makes three trips a week (approximately 150 containers/barge) between the Hampton Roads marine terminals and the Port of Richmond. This helps to alleviate truck traffic on I-64. Mr. Lysy added that the James River is classified as M64 by the Maritime Administration. In response to a follow-up question from Mr. Burrell, Mr. Lysy said Parham Landing was deemed not usable because of issues with bridge clearance.

Mr. Lysy said he asked lead staff to present information on key UWP tasks so members will be able to see who will be working on these tasks. He said staff will be glad to assist in any way and answer any questions.

Mr. Lysy reviewed the FY16 UWP funding sources and budget:

FHWA/FTA Planning Funds	\$1,702,620
FTA 5303/5304 Special Allocation	\$22,079
Task 5.1 BRT Conn./Land Use Study	
FHWA Bike/Ped Count Pilot	\$20,000
Local Match provided by Sports Backers	

Total \$1,744,699

Ms. Inman provided additional information on the Richmond Regional Vision Plan. She noted DRPT will be working with the TPO and can include areas outside of the TPO Study Area in this process. She said DRPT will provide additional information on this effort during the June meeting. Ms. Inman said she will be glad to discuss the process further with any members.

IV. COMMITTEE AND STAFF REPORTS

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

In the interest of time, Chairman Alvarez said he would bring members' attention to this report, which is included in the agenda packet.

B. RRPDC Transportation Director's Report –

1. New RRPDC Principal Planner –

Mr. Lysy announced that Ms. Dubinsky has been promoted to fill the Principal Planner position left vacant when Randy Selleck moved to DRPT. Ms. Dubinsky's promotion has created a vacancy on staff for a Senior Planner. Mr. Lysy said it is anticipated this position will be filled during the late fall, once the new Transportation Director is on board.

2. Other Business –

Mr. Crum announced that the recruitment process for a new Transportation Director has been completed. He said an overlap in time was part of the process to allow the new Transportation Director time to work with Mr. Lysy prior to his September 1 retirement date. Mr. Crum thanked members of the TPO Executive Committee and Chairman Alvarez for their direction, support, and guidance during this process.

Mr. Crum announced that Ms. Barbara Nelson will be the new RRTPO Transportation Director. He said that Ms. Nelson will begin on July 1 and is looking forward to being back in the Richmond Region.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

A. Upcoming TPO Policy Board Meetings –

Chairman Alvarez noted that information on this item is included in the agenda packet.

B. Next Meeting –

Chairman Alvarez reported the next meeting is scheduled for June 4 at 9:30 a.m. and will be held at the Luck Stone Corporate Headquarters in Goochland County. Details will be provided prior to the meeting.

C. Other Business –

There was no other business to be brought before members.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Alvarez adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:45 a.m.