

FISCAL YEAR 2003
JULY 1, 2002 – JUNE 30, 2003

UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

FOR THE

RICHMOND AREA METROPOLITAN

PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Approved as a Final Report by the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, April 11, 2002.

Prepared by the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission staff through a cooperative process involving the City of Richmond, Counties of Charles City, Chesterfield, Goochland, Hanover, Henrico, New Kent, Powhatan, and the Town of Ashland, the Virginia Department of Transportation, the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, the Virginia Department of Aviation, the Richmond Metropolitan Authority, the Capital Region Airport Commission, the Greater Richmond Transit Company, the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, and Ridefinders, Inc., on behalf of the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization.

MPO AMENDMENT ACTIONS

- June 13, 2002:
 - a.) MPO action to revise task 1.2 to add work element description for Best Practices Review for MPO Public Participation and to shift \$8,334 in PL funds from RRPDC staff task 1.1 to RRPDC consultant task 1.2.
 - b.) MPO action to add UWP task 5.3 Downtown Circulator Study.
- September 12, 2002: UWP task 2.6 “Goochland Co. Centerville Village Plan” changed to “Goochland Co. Village Overlay Design Standards.”
- December 12, 2002:
 - a.) UWP task 2.4 added as UWP information item.
 - b.) FY 02 Sec. 5303 funds programmed to UWP tasks 1.1, 1.2, and 4.1.
- March 13, 2003 MPO Meeting:
 - a) Shift PL funds among various RRPDC staff work tasks (tasks 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 4.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2, 6.1, and 7.1).
 - b) UWP task 5.4 added as UWP information item.
- April 10, 2003: MPO action to transfer \$17,000 in PL funds from UWP task 2.3 to FY 04 UWP for task 2.3.
- June 12, 2003 MPO Meeting: MPO action to shift PL funds among various RRPDC work tasks (tasks 1.1, 1.3, 2.5, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 6.1, and 7.1).

RICHMOND AREA MPO PLANNING PRIORITIES

Section 450.314 (a) of the Metropolitan Planning regulations states that Transportation Management Area (TMA) designated MPO's shall discuss the planning priorities facing the metropolitan planning area. The following identifies the FY 2003 UWP major planning priorities. Further discussion of these priorities is provided in the various work tasks.

1. Task 1.1, MPO Maintenance/Special Studies – Conduct various administrative and technical activities in support of the MPO process and special studies as needed.
2. Task 1.2, MPO Citizen Participation – Continuing support for the MPO's Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee, developing effective and useful background information materials on the MPO process, and review and incorporate as appropriate, recommendations from the Best Practices for MPO Public Participation.
3. Task 2.1, Socioeconomic Data Report – Provide on-going support for development of socioeconomic data for use in various MPO, VDOT, and local plans, studies and reports. Work will also include identification of areas with concentrations of low income and minority populations.
4. Task 2.2, Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) – Initiate work on the next LRTP update (year 2023 LRTP adopted by the MPO on March 8, 2001). Initial work includes development of draft work scope, initial public review and comments and suggestions, and establishment of the LRTP advisory task force.
5. Task 3.1, Congestion Management System (CMS) – Initiate work on the next CMS update (previous CMS update adopted by the MPO on March 8, 2001). Initial work includes development of draft work scope, initial public review and comments and suggestions, and establishment of the CMS task force.
6. Task 4.1, Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) – Maintain current TIP by processing amendments as requested and tracking previous allocations of Regional STP and CMAQ funds, and developing the upcoming TIP. Work on the TIP will include an assessment of the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic groups for investments identified in the TIP.
7. Task 5.2, Elderly and Disabled Transportation Needs and Services -- Continuing support for the MPO's Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee

FREQUENTLY USED MPO TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization. The Richmond Area MPO's membership includes the following local governments and agencies: Ashland, Charles City, Chesterfield, Goochland, Hanover, Henrico, New Kent, Powhatan, Richmond, CRAC, GRTC, RMA, RRPDC, VDOT, Ridefinders, FHWA, FTA, and VDA; serves as the forum for cooperative transportation decision making in the Richmond area.
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards; defined by EPA.
SIP	State Implementation Plan; identifies control measures and process for achieving and maintaining NAAQS; eligible for CMAQ funding.
Study Area	The area projected to become urbanized within the next 20 years; defines the area for MPO plans, programs, and studies.
"3-C" Process	("Continuing, Cooperative and Comprehensive") Language from federal legislation establishing MPOs and used in reference to the regional transportation planning and programming process.
TCM	Transportation Control Measures (for Air Quality Control); eligible for CMAQ funding.
TDM	Traffic Demand Management; various traffic control strategies and measures used in managing highway demand.
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program; a staged, multiyear, intermodal program of transportation projects that is consistent with the transportation plan.
Transportation Plan	The MPO's adopted Long-Range Transportation Plan; serves as the initial step and framework in developing a regionally based network of transportation facilities and services that meets travel needs in the most efficient and effective manner possible.
TAZ (Transportation or Traffic Analysis Zone)	Generally defined as areas of homogeneous activity served by one or two major highways. TAZs serve as the base unit for socioeconomic data characteristics used in various plans and studies.

FREQUENTLY USED MPO TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Urbanized Area	Term used by the U.S. Census Bureau to designate urban areas. These areas generally contain population densities of at least 1,000 persons per square mile in a continuously built-up area of at least 50,000 persons. Factors such as commercial and industrial development, and other types and forms of urban activity centers are also considered.
UWP	Unified Work Program; MPO's program of work activities noting planning priorities, assigned staffs, work products, budgets, and funding sources.
VOC	Volatile Organic Compounds; emissions from cars, power plants, etc; when VOCs react with oxides of nitrogen (NOx) in the presence of heat and sunlight to produce ground level ozone or smog.

MPO STANDING COMMITTEES

CTAC	Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee
EDAC	Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee

FEDERAL STATE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES

CRAC	Capital Region Airport Commission
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FRA	Federal Railroad Administration
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
GRTC	Greater Richmond Transit Company
MRAQC	Metropolitan Richmond Air Quality Committee
Ridefinders	A public nonprofit corporation that provides carpool/vanpool matching and other commuter and transportation services.
MARAD	Maritime Administration

RMA	Richmond Metropolitan Authority
RRPDC	Richmond Regional Planning District Commission
USDOT	United States Department of Transportation
VDA	Virginia Department of Aviation
VDEQ	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
VDOT	Virginia Department of Transportation
VDRPT	Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
VTRC	Virginia Transportation Research Council

FEDERAL LEGISLATION

ADA of 1990	Americans With Disabilities Act
CAAA of 1990	Clean Air Act Amendments
TEA-21	Transportation Equity Act for the 21 st Century; signed into law on June 9, 1998. Authorizes federal funds for highways, highway safety, transit, and other surface transportation programs for the next 6 years. Builds on and continues many of the initiatives established in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991.

FUNDING PROGRAMS

SPR	State Planning and Research; funds allocated to VDOT in support of MPO program activities.
Local Match	Funds required by recipients of PL and Section 5303 funds for matching federal and state grant funds. Section 5303 and PL funds require a 10% match, with VDOT/VDRPT providing 10% and the remaining 80% provided by the federal source.
PL	Planning funds available from FHWA for MPO program activities.
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality funds also available for eligible planning activities leading to project implementation.
Section 5303	Planning funds available from the FTA for MPO program activities.

TEIF Transportation Efficiency Improvement Fund; purpose of program is to reduce traffic congestion by supporting transportation demand management programs designed to reduce use of single occupant vehicles and increase use of high occupancy vehicle modes; operated by the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

OTHER TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACG Address Coding Guide

ADT Average Daily Traffic; used in conjunction with current and projected traffic volumes.

CAO Chief Administrative Officer

CARE Community Assisted Ride Enterprise; program operated by GRTC providing demand-response paratransit service for the elderly and disabled in the City of Richmond and Henrico County.

CMS Congestion Management System

COA Comprehensive Operational Analysis

CTB Commonwealth Transportation Board

EJ Environmental Justice

FY Fiscal Year (July 1 to June 30).

GASB Government Accounting Standards Board; private, non-profit organization established in 1984; responsible for setting generally accepted accounting principals for state and local governments

GASB # 34 GASB’s Statement Number 34 “Basic Financial Statements and Management’s Discussion and Analysis for State and Local Governments”; requires state and local governments to report the value of their infrastructure assets including roads, bridges, sewer and water facilities, etc.

GIS Geographic Information System

I/M Inspection and Maintenance

FREQUENTLY USED MPO TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

MSA	Metropolitan Statistical Area. The Richmond/Petersburg MSA includes the cities of Colonial Heights, Hopewell, Petersburg, and Richmond; the counties of Charles City, Chesterfield, Dinwiddie, Goochland, Hanover, Henrico, New Kent, Powhatan, and Prince George; and the Town of Ashland.
NHS	National Highway System
NO_x	Nitrogen Oxides
RFP	Request for Proposals; process used for reviewing and selecting proposals for consultant study activities. (Goods and non-professional services)
RFQ	Request for Qualifications (Consultant Services).
SIP	State Implementation Plan (for attainment and maintenance of air quality standards)
SOV	Single Occupant Vehicles
STP	Surface Transportation Program
TDP	Transit Development Program
TMA	Transportation Management Area (i.e. MPO's greater than 200,000 in population).
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VTDP	Virginia Transportation Development Plan; approved by the CTB (previously the 6-Year Improvement Program)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FY 2003 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM WORK TASKS AND BUDGET/FUNDING INFORMATION

I.	TASKS	<u>Page(s)</u>
1.0	MAINTENANCE OF THE MPO	
1.1	MPO Maintenance/Special Studies	9-12
1.2	MPO Citizen Participation.....	13-15
1.3	Unified Work Program	16-17
2.0	LONG RANGE PLANNING AND SURVEILLANCE	
2.1	Socioeconomic Data Development.....	18-21
2.2	Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update.....	22-25
2.3	Chesterfield County Public Involvement Media	26-27
2.4	City of Richmond – Update of the Transportation Element of the City Master Plan.....	28-29
2.5	Transportation Data Base Development/GIS	30-31
2.6	Goochland County Village Overlay Design Standards	32-33
2.7	I-95 Northern Corridor Interchanges Study.....	34
2.8	Chesterfield County GIS Thoroughfare Plan Theme Eastern Area.....	35-36
2.9	Richmond Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.....	37-38
3.0	MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS/SHORT RANGE PLANNING	
3.1	Congestion Management System (CMS) Update.....	39-40
3.2	Access Management Studies	41-43
3.5	Richmond GASB 34 Transportation Asset Management System	44-46
4.0	TRANSPORTATION PROJECT PROGRAMMING	
4.1	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).....	47-53
5.0	TRANSIT PLANNING	
5.2	Elderly and Disabled Transportation Needs and Services	54-55
5.3	Downtown Circulator Study.....	56-57
5.4	Downtown Transit Center Need and Location Study.....	58-59
5.5	Regional Light-Rail Development Program.....	60-61
6.0	INTERMODAL PLANNING	
6.1	Intermodal Transportation Development.....	62-63
7.0	AIR QUALITY PLANNING	
7.1	Air Quality Plan and Program Activities.....	64-65
II.	BUDGET/FUNDING INFORMATION	
1.	Agency Budget Summary Sheet.....	66
2.	Funding Sources Summary Sheet.....	67

1.0 MAINTENANCE OF THE MPO

1.1 MPO Maintenance/Special Studies

A. Background

This task provides the administrative and technical support needed to maintain the MPO and MPO process, and provides for special studies and reports as directed by the MPO. Major work activities include program administration (e.g. agendas, minutes, mailing, monthly reports, program management and administration, etc.); PL/Section 5303 grant administration; pass through contracts; participation on advisory committees; special studies and projects; review/comment on pass-through work tasks; federal/state regulations and requirements; federal/state legislation review; training, workshops and conferences; and computer program support.

Under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991, the MPO's planning and programming responsibilities had been significantly increased and its scope has become broader and more comprehensive. Most of these requirements have been continued as part of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21); signed into law on June 9, 1998. The MPO is charged with developing transportation plans and programs, which provide for the development of transportation facilities which function as a "seamless" intermodal system. The process for developing these plans must consider all modes of transportation, and must, to the maximum extent feasible, be continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive. As a TMA level MPO, the process must also consider the results of the Congestion Management System in the planning and programming of transportation projects.

On September 13 and 14, 2000, the FHWA and FTA conducted the MPO's triennial certification review. The FHWA and FTA issued its report and findings by letter dated January 17, 2001. The letter stated that the MPO is conditionally certified based on the following 5 corrective action issues:

1. The submission of a fully functioning Congestion Management System (CMS).
2. The development and implementation of a mechanism to gauge the effectiveness and appropriateness of current public outreach initiatives.
3. The documentation of current activities in place to assess the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic groups for investments identified in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
4. The development of a work element to assess and create improved strategies for reaching minority and low-income groups through public involvement efforts.
5. The implementation of specific comprehensive Environmental Justice planning activities.

FY 03 UWP Task 1.1

Work to address these corrective action issues was initiated in FY 01 and should be completed in FY 03. The MPO adopted the CMS Update at its March 8, 2001 meeting (issue 1). The staff has also worked to incorporate environmental justice (EJ) analysis as part of the review of proposed Regional STP and CMAQ projects being considered for the TIP (issue 3). Work on the next LRTP update will build on existing EJ analysis activities and consider results from the current MPO Best Practices Review for MPO Public Participation (issue 3). The Best Practices Review report is scheduled to be presented at the June 13, 2002 MPO meeting. Based on this report, recommendations from CTAC, and comments/action by the MPO, staff will review its current public participation procedures and submit appropriate recommendations for review and action by the MPO. This should take place by the October 2002 MPO meeting. (issues 2, 4, and 5)

The initial estimate for all staff direct costs is estimated at approximately \$159,000. Staff direct costs are reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as part of the UWP development process and are reported to VDOT and VDRPT as part of its submission of quarterly work progress reports.

B. End Products

A well functioning MPO process which involves the MPO as the policy body for transportation planning in the Richmond Area and provides for a multi-modal, continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning and programming process

C. Work Elements

Work activities include the following:

1. Provide for general maintenance and administration of the MPO “3-C” process, MPO, and MPO committees’ structure, including direct costs to support the process.
2. Provide for the preparation and documentation of MPO meetings and other committee and subcommittee meetings as appropriate.
3. Perform review activities under various local, state, and federal programs including Commonwealth Intergovernmental Review Process, State Route projects and Environmental Impact Statements and Assessments.
4. Coordinate review and presentation activities with RRPDC and other regional, local and state agencies involved with transportation planning and programming.

FY 03 UWP Task 1.1

5. Prepare various reports including VDOT and VDRPT Quarterly Progress Reports, and MPO financial and work progress reports.
6. Provide for contract administration of PL, Section 5303, and third party agreements.
7. Participate in work tasks including preparation and/or review and comment on Request for Proposals, consultant review selection, and documentation.
8. Maintain up-to-date information and literature on transportation planning and programming in the Richmond Area.
9. Review and comment as appropriate on legislative and regulatory activities affecting transportation planning and programming, and perform activities necessary to ensure MPO compliance with applicable state and federal rules and regulations.
10. Attend seminars, meetings, workshops, and conferences related to MPO activities. Attend and participate on various VDOT, VDRPT, VTRC, and other advisory committees, task forces, regional and transportation planning associations (VAPDC and VASITE), etc.
11. Provide for use of legal counsel and audit services, under the direction of the RRPDC Executive Director, for administering federal and state contracts, meeting reporting requirements, and other activities and services necessary and appropriate for staffing the MPO.
12. Provide staff assistance for special studies, projects and programs in response to requests by area local government, MPO member organizations, and others as determined by the RRPDC Executive Director.
13. Collect and update files and reports as necessary, with traffic count information from VDOT, RMA, and local government sources.
14. Staff support for purchase, maintenance, upgrading, and repair of computers. Also, share in attributable costs for support of computer network and support activities.
15. Develop various maps in GIS format for MPO special studies/major projects and presentations.
16. Respond to information requests from area local governments, VDOT, VDRPT, GRTC, and other government agencies.

FY 03 UWP Task 1.1

17. Maintain current highway facilities inventory and monitor regional travel patterns [VDOT].
18. Provide traffic data forecasts for design of highway facilities [VDOT].
19. Provide technical assistance to RRPDC, local jurisdictions, and other agencies concerning transportation [VDOT].
20. Review site plans as requested [VDOT].
21. Perform and/or assist in special projects, studies, evaluations, and other activities upon direction of MPO and MPO Committees.

D. Agency Participation

RRPDC, VDOT, VDRPT, Local Governments, GRTC, CRAC, RMA, FHWA, FTA, FRA, EPA, VDEQ, VDA, Ridefinders, Port of Richmond.

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

	<u>PL ①③</u>	<u>FY 03 5303</u>	<u>FY 02 5303 ②</u>	<u>SPR</u>
RRPDC	\$368,608	\$44,732	\$23,949	----
VDOT	<u>----</u>	<u>----</u>	<u>----</u>	<u>\$152,000</u>
TOTAL	\$368,608	\$44,732	\$23,949	\$152,000
 <u>TOTAL</u>				
RRPDC	\$437,289			
VDOT	<u>152,000</u>			
TOTAL	\$589,289			

NOTES: ① 6/13/02 MPO action to shift \$8,334 in RRPDC staff FHWA/PL funds to task 1.2, RRPDC consultant.

② 12/12/02 MPO action to add \$23,949 in available FY 02 Section 5303 carryover funds.

③ 6/12/03 MPO action to add \$29,000 in PL funds (shifted from various other work tasks).

F. Schedule

On-going activity.

1.2 MPO Citizen Participation

A. Background

This task provides staff support to ensure an active and involved citizen participation program, which meets federal and state requirements for public involvement in the transportation planning process. It should be noted that TEA-21 requires a high level of citizen involvement in the MPO process, including public meetings to review the TIP and Transportation Plan documents.

The MPO's current citizen participation process includes the use of two active and involved committees (i.e. CTAC and EDAC); annual public meetings for the TIP and LRTP; posting of MPO/MPO committee meetings and agendas and plan/document summaries on the RRPDC/MPO web site; submitting draft TIP's and other documents as directed by the MPO for public review and making these documents accessible to the public at area local libraries; providing opportunity for open public comment at all regularly scheduled MPO, TAC, CTAC and EDAC meetings; and other activities documented in the MPO's Guidelines for Public Participation Activities and Procedures.

Note that a study consultant was hired and started work in mid-FY 02 to conduct a Best Practices Review of MPO Public Participation activities and procedures. The consultant is tentatively scheduled to provide its report, and staff will present results of the June 25, 2002 CTAC meeting ranking of best practices for MPO public participation included in the consultant's report and other best practices as identified by CTAC, at the MPO's July 11, 2002 meeting. Staff will work to provide CTAC with further information on the top ranked best practices and will prepare and report to the MPO the revised draft MPO Guidelines for Public Participation along with CTAC comments and recommendations on the revised draft guidelines. Changes to the MPO's Guidelines for Public Participation document must be submitted for a 45-day public review and comment period before the MPO can take final action. Revisions to the staff work elements and budget may be needed following MPO action on this matter.

B. End Products

A functional and viable citizen participation program, which provides for a well informed public and for public input to the "3-C" transportation planning and programming process.

C. Work Elements

Work activities include the following:

FY 03 UWP Task 1.2

1. Provide staff support for the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC).
2. Respond to public requests concerning the status of transportation projects, traffic data, and information on MPO transportation plans, programs, studies, reports, and data.
3. Conduct public meetings and other citizen involvement activities for MPO plan and program activities.
4. Maintain and update as necessary the MPO Guidelines for Public Participation Activities and Procedures.
5. Electronic dissemination of articles and information via the RRPDC/MPO web site.
6. Posting of MPO/MPO Committee agendas, meetings minutes (following approval action), notices, reports, newsletters, plan documents and summaries, on the RRPDC/MPO web site.
7. Develop, publish, and distribute background information materials on the MPO “3-C” study process.
8. Prepare and print/post on web site, and make available to CTAC, EDAC, MPO, and the public, a simple to follow guide on the MPO process including the roles and functions of its members.
9. Provide for CTAC review of best practices on obtaining public input for transportation plans and programs, and for recommendations on enhancing public participation in the MPO process. The RRPDC staff conducted (in FYs 01 and 02) a consultant review and selection process, to obtain consultant services for this work element. The consultant has prepared a report identifying best public participation practices from similar sized MPOs, and providing an analysis of their effectiveness, cost, and other benefits. This review also addresses the following corrective action issues identified in the January 17, 2001 FHWA/FTA Certification Review letter:
 - ❖ The development of proposed mechanisms that can gauge the effectiveness and the appropriateness of public outreach initiatives, including current outreach activities.
 - ❖ An assessment of various methods and activities of improved strategies for reaching minority and low-income groups through public involvement efforts.

Following MPO review and action on the consultant’s report, staff will develop further information on top recommended best practices, review it with CTAC, prepare and review proposed revisions to the MPO Guidelines for Public

FY 03 UWP Task 1.2

Participation, and present the proposed Guidelines document, along with CTAC comments and/or recommendations for MPO review and action. Note that the revised Guidelines must be submitted for a 45-day public review period (i.e. federally mandated review period for proposed changes to the MPO’s adopted Guidelines for Public Participation) before the MPO can take final action and the revised Guidelines are implemented. Public review comments received during the review period, along with staff response comments, will be submitted for MPO review and consideration.

D. Agency Participation

RRPDC, VDOT, VDRPT, Local Governments, GRTC, CRAC, FHWA, FTA, VDEQ, RMA, Ridefinders, CTAC At-Large Organizations.

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

	<u>PL ③</u>	<u>FY 03 5303</u>	<u>FY 02 5303 ②</u>	<u>SPR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC Staff	\$95,000	\$20,000	\$40,000	----	\$155,000
RRPDC Consultant①	8,334	----	----	----	8,334
VDOT	----	----	----	<u>\$7,000</u>	<u>7,000</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$103,334</u>	<u>\$20,000</u>	<u>\$40,000</u>	<u>\$7,000</u>	<u>\$170,334</u>

NOTES: ① 6/13/02 MPO action to shift \$8,334 in RRPDC staff FHWA/PL funds from task 1.1 to RRPDC consultant (for completion of consultant work on Best Practices Review for MPO Public Participation).

② 12/12/02 MPO action to add \$40,000 in available FY 02 Section 5303 carryover funds.

③ 3/13/03 MPO action to add \$25,000 in PL funds (shifted from various other work tasks).

F. Schedule

On-going activity.

1.3 Unified Work Program (UWP)

A. Background

This task provides for the maintenance of the adopted UWP and for the annual preparation of the MPO's work program for the upcoming fiscal year (i.e., July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004). The UWP also identifies the region's planning priorities and notes various transportation study activities as informational items.

Note that in FY 02, as part of the FY 03 UWP development, TAC took action to establish a UWP Development Subcommittee to review funding, staff's proposed budget and staff time allocations, and direct costs as a first step in the UWP process. TAC has indicated that this process should be continued for development of the FY 04 UWP.

B. End Products

1. Maintain/amend the FY 03 UWP.
2. FY 04 UWP document.
3. Applications for federal and state transportation planning funds.
4. Prepare/update staff work assignments and schedules.

C. Work Elements

Work activities include the following:

1. Review VDOT, VDRPT, FHWA, FTA, EPA, and other state and federal agency information and requirements, plus other materials relating to UWP preparation.
2. Solicit input for proposed work tasks from the TAC, CTAC, and EDAC.
3. Prepare a preliminary staff budget and list of proposed work tasks for the Commission's annual initial work program (used to determine local dues rates).
4. Meet with TAC UWP Development subcommittee to review proposed RRPDC staff time allocations and work assignments, work tasks, and cost information for the FY 04 UWP.

FY 03 UWP Task 1.3

5. Identify and discuss planning priorities.
6. Prepare work tasks and budgets.
7. Identify funding sources and amounts.
8. Prepare final work program document.
9. Secure needed approvals from MPO, VDOT, VDRPT, FHWA, FTA, and other agencies/organizations as appropriate.
10. Secure commitments for local match funds as appropriate.
11. Conduct State and Regional Intergovernmental Review process and submit grant applications.
12. Distribute final UWP document.
13. Amend adopted UWP as per MPO action.
14. Prepare and update staff work assignments, direct costs, and schedule.

D. Budget, Staff and Funding

	<u>PL ①②</u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>SPR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$32,000	\$8,000	----	\$40,000
VDOT	<u>----</u>	<u>----</u>	<u>\$6,000</u>	<u>6,000</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$32,000</u>	<u>\$8,000</u>	<u>\$6,000</u>	<u>\$46,000</u>

NOTE: ① 3/13/03 MPO action to add \$15,000 in PL funds (shifted from various other work tasks).

② 6/12/03 MPO action to subtract \$3,000 in PL funds (shifted to various other work tasks).

E. Schedule

On-going activity for adopted UWP.

November 2002 to May 2003 for FY 04 UWP.

2.0 LONG RANGE PLANNING AND SURVEILLANCE

2.1 Socioeconomic Data Development

A. Background

As part of the MPO's regional transportation planning process, socioeconomic data is developed by area local governments and RRPDC staff for use in various VDOT, MPO, and local plan and study activities including plan model data input, EIS, corridor studies, air quality conformity analysis, transit studies, responding to information requests for market and other demographic studies, etc. Some local data items are maintained and developed on an annual basis while other data is updated every three years. A Socioeconomic Data Committee work group made up of local planning staffs has been established, however, it has not been active for several years. Staff's primary focus in FY 02 has been development of base year employment data. Staff will distribute it for review and comment by local planning staffs in late FY 02/early FY 03. Staff will then initiate work on developing forecasts at the TAZ level for the various demographic factors. The Socioeconomic Data Committee will serve as a useful forum for discussion of issues related to methodology, data consistency, and applications.

Another major work element has been the development of a demographic profile of the region's population. In FY 02, staff developed information on the location of low-income and minority groups by census tract. This information was used in conducting the environmental justice analysis for proposed Regional STP and CMAQ projects being programmed in the MPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Note that the 1990 census provided the latest available data for locating low income population groups. Staff will update this data when 2000 census information becomes available.

Note that as part of the FY 02 consultant report on Best Practices for MPO Public Participation, other data may be identified as needed for improving the MPO's public participation requirements. This may include examination of regional and local data on car ownership, transit service, and journey-to-work travel patterns. Some of this work can begin upon release of the Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP) for the Richmond area.

A major issue facing the Richmond and Tri-Cities Area MPOs is establishment of the urbanized area boundaries. On July 27, 2001, the Census Bureau published in the Federal Register a notice of proposed criteria and reopening for public comment. Based on the proposed criteria, the Richmond and Petersburg (i.e., Tri-Cities area) urbanized areas would be merged. If the final criteria is adopted as proposed and the Richmond and Petersburg urbanized areas are merged, these two MPOs will need to work out agreements for the division of CMAQ and transit funds since these federal funds are allocated based on urbanized area populations. There is also a question of

FY 03 UWP Task 2.1

whether or not the Tri-Cities area will then be eligible for Regional STP funds. Such issues will need to be identified and addressed when the final regulations are issued.

Work on developing and reporting of annual socioeconomic data has fallen behind schedule in FY 02. In late FY 02, staff will submit final TAZ maps, with boundaries that have been adjusted based on the census, to local planning staffs for their use in reporting base year TAZ socioeconomic data. This work should be completed in early FY 03. Note that the new TAZ maps were submitted to local planning staffs in late 1999. The new TAZ maps being submitted in late FY 02 should have better defined boundary lines making it easier to identify areas within each TAZ. Also, note that staff will provide assistance to New Kent and Charles City counties since staff was not able to initiate work in FY 02 on establishing a socioeconomic data development process for these two counties.

B. End Products

1. Year 2001 and/or 2002 socioeconomic data.
2. Adjusted year 2000 socioeconomic data (based on available census data).
3. Complete work on year 2000 employment and autos data.
4. Support activities for the year 2000 census.
5. Adjustments to MPO urbanized and study area boundaries as appropriate.
6. Update regional demographic profile addressing federal Title VI and Environmental Justice requirements.

C. Work Elements

Local government work elements are as follows:

1. Reporting year 2002 population, households, group quarters population, and other data as provided in the Socioeconomic Data Development Guidelines.
2. Adjustments to year 2000 population, households, and group quarters population, based on available census data.
3. Participation by local planning staffs on the Socioeconomic Data Committee work group.

RRPDC work elements are as follows:

1. Review year 2001, 2002, and adjusted year 2000 socioeconomic data submissions from local governments.
2. Compile data and prepare socioeconomic data report.

FY 03 UWP Task 2.1

3. Socioeconomic Data Committee - - Provide administrative support for quarterly meetings of local planning staffs with responsibility for development of socioeconomic data.
4. Regional Demographic Profile - - Update profile of the region's population identifying the location of low income and minority population groups, and other important demographic information required for federal Title VI and Environmental Justice requirements. Profile may include additional data elements based on recommendations approved by the MPO as part of the Best Practices Review for MPO Public Participation.
5. Data Management - - Maintain and update data files related to socioeconomic data development (census, VEC ES 202, etc). When complete, post selected data tables on web site.
6. Employment Data - - Complete development of base year employment data and include in socioeconomic data report.
7. Auto Data - - Utilize DMV auto registration data and distribute by households for TAZ level data.
8. Census - - Staff support to the Census Bureau and area local planning staff for work related to the year 2000 census (e.g., review, filing, and reporting of population counts, block level population and housing estimates, etc.). Also provide assistance for Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP) development.
9. Urbanized Area - - Adjustments made to the MPO study and urbanized area boundary lines (and affected TAZs) based on the final census urbanized area boundary used to separate the Richmond and Tri-Cities MPOs. Also, address issues related to final urbanized area criteria (issues related to merging of areas to be addressed under MPO Maintenance).
10. RRPDC Regional Growth Assessment Assistance - - Provide information and assistance to the RRPDC in conducting this RRPDC work program activity. Prior to initiating work on this work element, staff will provide a report to the MPO on anticipated assistance and staff work activities.
11. VDOT work element is to compile data for use in various special studies (e.g., Environmental Impact Statements and Assessments, etc.).

D. Agency Participation

RRPDC, VDOT, Local Governments.

FY 03 UWP Task 2.1

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

	<u>PL ①</u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$85,000	\$14,500	\$99,500

NOTE: ① 3/13/03 MPO action to add \$25,000 in PL funds (shifted from various other work tasks).

F. Schedule

July 2002 to June 2003

2.2 Long-Range Transportation Plan Update

A. Background

The MPO adopted the 2023 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) on March 8, 2001. The LRTP serves as the framework and initial step in developing the region’s network of transportation facilities and services. The LRTP uses a balanced, multimodal approach (i.e. automobile, buses, car and vanpools, light and commuter rail, bicycles, congestion and transportation demand management, truck and rail cargo, etc.) to address the region’s long term (20 years) projected travel needs, and provides for the consideration of impacts on the natural and human environment. Projects proposed in the LRTP must be within projected levels of available financial resources and must also meet federal air quality, environmental justice, and planning requirements. Highway and public transportation projects and programs must be consistent with the MPO’s final adopted LRTP in order to be eligible for federal-aid funds.

In FY 02, *Destinations 2023; A Citizens Guide to the LRTP* was prepared and printed. This document will be distributed at the initial public review meetings for obtaining citizen input on the LRTP. The MPO is also scheduled to take action in late FY 02 or early FY 03 to establish the LRTP Advisory Task Force as a special purpose MPO committee. A detailed work scope for the upcoming LRTP will be reviewed by the task force and then submitted to the MPO. This work scope will include the public participation elements for development of the LRTP and identify other requirements (e.g., air quality conformity analysis, environmental justice analysis, etc.)

As part of the 2023 LRTP Update, staff had anticipated that the proposed projects and recommendations from the GRTC Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA)/Regional Public Transportation Study (RPTS) would be considered and incorporated as part of the LRTP. However, only the draft COA/RPTS was completed prior to adoption of the LRTP, and input from this study was very limited. It should also be noted that VDOT has funded and the MPO has initiated a Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan work task (see UWP task 2.9). Upon completion, the results of the study will be submitted to the MPO and considered for insertion in the LRTP as part of the LRTP’s Bicycle and Pedestrian element (LRTP amendment action). The GRTC COA/RPTS was completed in late FY 01 and the MPO took action at its July 12, 2001 meeting to accept the study as work completed. The findings, and proposed projects from this study should be reviewed by the LRTP Advisory Task Force and considered for incorporation into the next LRTP. If not, then full consideration needs to be given to developing the LRTP’s transit element including proposed projects, services, costs and funding, etc.

Note that TEA-21 mandated the elimination of the Major Investment Study as a stand-alone federal planning/programming requirement, while integrating the concept

within the planning and project development/environmental review process. The LRTP work scope should address how this requirement will be met. Also note that based on the FHWA's letter of May 16, 2001 finding the 2023 LRTP in conformance with the air quality requirements, the next LRTP update is due within three years (i.e., by May 16, 2004).

Work under the LRTP provides for the preparation of technical and other reports to assure documentation. Such documentation should be understandable for the general public, and should be made available to the parties consistent with the MPO's public participation policies. Development, preparation, and distribution of documentation should be addressed as part of the general work scope submitted for MPO review and action.

B. End Product

1. Amendments to the 2023 Transportation Plan as necessary.
2. Initial citizen input for the next LRTP.
3. LRTP scope of work and schedule.
4. Establishment of the LRTP Advisory Task Force.

C. Work Elements

Work activities by RRPDC and VDOT staffs includes the following:

1. A Long-Range Transportation Plan that addresses the 7 TEA-21 planning requirements as follows:
 - a. Support the economic vitality of the United States, the States and metropolitan areas, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
 - b. Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users;
 - c. Increase the accessibility and mobility options available to people and freight;
 - d. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve quality of life;
 - e. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
 - f. Promote efficient system management and operation; and
 - g. Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.

FY 03 UWP Task 2.2

2. Initial citizen review meetings (including annual public meeting as per MPO public participation guidelines) to provide comments and input for the next the LRTP [RRPDC].
3. Review and submit for MPO approval, requests for functional classifications/reclassifications for study area roads [RRPDC].
4. Print and distribute additional copies of the 2023 LRTP citizens summary report (i.e., *Destinations 2023; A Citizens Guide to the LRTP*) [RRPDC].
5. Initiate work for the next LRTP work scope and schedule, and submit for LRTP Advisory Task Force review and recommendation, and for MPO review and action. Work scope should address how the MPO will meet federal requirements related to the integration of major investment studies into the planning and project development/environmental review process [RRPDC].
6. Update LRTP model procedures, network counts; mode split network, and coordination with the conformity analysis model [RRPDC and VDOT].
7. Conduct technical documentation activities and make available for public review and information [RRPDC and VDOT as appropriate].
8. Review highway construction plans for conformance with the adopted Transportation Plan [VDOT and RRPDC].
9. Incorporate information/strategies from the Congestion Management System (CMS) and other MPO study and plan activities for use in assessing and developing plan alternatives and proposed projects [RRPDC and VDOT].
10. Conduct corridor/sub area travel analysis for current and future congested corridors, and other important areas/corridors identified by the TAC and/or MPO to assess impact of Plan alternatives, land-use considerations, transit/TDM measures, major activity centers, etc. [RRPDC and VDOT].
11. Maintain/update computer software, staff training, and direct costs [VDOT].
12. Prepare and submit documentation on the analysis and assessment of impacts on different socioeconomic groups for investments identified in the LRTP [RRPDC].

D. Agency Participation

RRPDC, VDOT, VDRPT, VDEQ, local governments, CRAC, GRTC, RMA, Port of Richmond, FHWA, FTA, Ridefinders, LRTP advisory task force member organizations.

FY 03 UWP Task 2.2

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

	<u>PL</u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>SPR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$90,000	\$10,000	----	\$123,000
VDOT	----	----	<u>\$39,000</u>	<u>39,000</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$90,000</u>	<u>\$10,000</u>	<u>\$39,000</u>	<u>\$151,000</u>

F. Schedule

July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003

2.3 Chesterfield County Public Involvement Media

A. Background

Chesterfield County's Transportation Department works on many types of projects which are of interest to the public including road improvements, the Thoroughfare Plan, and new development. The County's first strategic goal is to provide world-class customer service. To achieve this, we must provide effective public involvement in regards to these projects.

During the life of road improvement projects managed by Chesterfield County, the County typically meets individually with impacted landowners and any other interested citizens and business owners. Prior to the standard posting of willingness or public hearing, the County conducts Citizen Information Meetings. Additionally, the County's Transportation Department provides information to the public regarding the Thoroughfare Plan or transportation issues related to new development or rezoning cases at public meetings and to individuals.

Chesterfield County has utilized many different, effective methods to communicate with the community: Power Point presentations with photos of the area, GIS maps and scanned plan material, along with digitally enhanced "before and after" photos, color plan rolls, plan displays with photos along the project length to help orient the view. Often these materials are e-mailed to interested people.

This effort towards a continual dialogue with the community during the life of a project requires professional and clear presentation materials. While these materials are certainly invaluable, the cost charged and time for preparation prevents them from being utilized more. The County staff needs to be able to prepare as much of this information as possible in order to provide clear communications to the community while keeping projects costs down.

Funds for this UWP task were first programmed as part of the FY 02 UWP (MPO action on May 10, 2001 to add to UWP and to program available PL funds) and the RRPDC/Chesterfield County Agreement for PL funds pass-through was executed on September 24, 2001.

B. End Product

County-produced, digitally-enhanced photos, high quality presentations with high resolution photos and scanned plan sheets, clear color GIS maps and other appropriate presentation materials which clearly depict project elements.

C. Work Elements

1. Purchase of digital camera, color laser printer, scanner to accommodate plan sheets, and equipment necessary for creation of digitally enhanced photos.
2. Submission of report to MPO on completion of work task (i.e. equipment purchase).

D. Agency Participation

Chesterfield County, VDOT, RRPDC, FHWA

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

PL* ①②

Chesterfield County \$26,034

NOTES:

① Local match funds to be provided by Chesterfield County.

② 4/10/03 MPO action to transfer \$17,000 to FY 04 UWP.

F. Schedule

July 2002 to FY 04.

2.4 City of Richmond – Update of the Transportation Element of the City Master Plan

A. Background

In 1997, the City of Richmond contracted with Michael Baker Jr., Inc. for the development of the Transportation Element of the City Master Plan. The document analyzed the existing conditions of the various modes of travel within the city, developed multimodal goals/objectives/policies and developed recommendations for implementation. This document was incorporated into the city’s Master Plan document in 2001.

Since six years have passed and considerable development has occurred, the city is interested in updating the Transportation Element of the Master Plan. The city would also like to make sure that the various modes link together within the city and the region so that travel for the city’s residents and visitors is seamless and user friendly. The city would like to update the 1997 document analyzing the existing conditions, projecting for future growth and development and developing recommendations for implementation. The document should include a financial plan and establish priorities for implementation. This document will be used in the planning and programming of funds.

B. End Product

Update of the Transportation Element of the City Master Plan.

C. Work Elements

1. Data Collection:
 - a) Review of City Master Plan, Richmond Downtown Plan, census information, economic development and planning projects, regional plans, VDOT six-year plan, other city plans and other documents that include appropriate projections relevant to transportation planning, and analysis of land use patterns.
 - b) Interviews with city staff, GRTC, Ridefinders, Port of Richmond, Capital Region Airport Commission, Greyhound, Capital Region Taxicab Association, Richmond Renaissance, Neighborhood Teams, and other organizations.
2. Analysis of information gathered.
3. Development of multimodal goals, policies and recommendations of specific transportation improvement projects and their relationship to land use.
4. Development of maps, which are compatible with ARCVIEW, and provided in a digital format.

- 5. Financial analysis of recommendations
- 6. Community charettes and presentations

D. Agency Participation

RRPDC, City of Richmond, GRTC, Port of Richmond, Capital Region Airport Commission, Greyhound, Capital Region Taxicab Association, Richmond Renaissance, Shockoe Bottom Merchants and Residents Associations, VDOT, VDRPT, Richmond Metropolitan Convention and Visitors Bureau and many other organizations.

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

	<u>RSTP *</u>
City of Richmond Consultant	\$100,000

NOTE: * Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds funded at 80 percent federal (\$80,000) and 20 percent state match (\$20,000).

F. Schedule

December 2002 to April 2003.

2.5 Transportation Data Base Development/GIS

A. Background

Conducting the MPO's regional transportation planning and programming process involves extensive work efforts to develop data and information on the region's transportation network. While some of this information is developed by RRPDC staff, a great deal is developed by VDOT, VDRPT, consultants, area local governments, and others. Much of this information is of interest to area local governments, transportation agencies, business and marketing firms, educational institutions, citizens groups, and others. Responding to information requests involving certain data items often results in staff work to develop the appropriate information, refer the requesting organization/individual to another agency, or advising them that the information is not available. This UWP task provides for work by RRPDC staff to develop data bases and informational reports on the region's transportation system, and to develop and distribute reports, maps, and other information.

This UWP task also provides for staff development and maintenance of Geographic Information System (GIS) staff services. The use of GIS has become an integral part of the transportation planning process, providing an ability to work with map information and to graphically display various features, data, and other characteristics in various formats. The GIS system also provides staff the ability to link map and data information to conduct transportation systems analysis.

B. End Products

1. Informational reports, maps, inventories, and other documents, reporting on transportation activities and development.
2. GIS support for MPO plans, programs, studies, and other work activities.

C. Work Elements

7. Development of transportation data for use in various reports, studies, plans and programs.
8. Develop, print and distribute informational reports on transportation plans, programs, activities, and data.
9. GIS support as follows:
 - a. Staff support for development of maps and data linked to GIS map system. Includes staff work in support of the LRTP, CMS, TIP (project

FY 03 UWP Task 2.5

location maps for major and priority projects, etc.) and other staff, local, and VDOT plan and study activities.

- b. Technical assistance to GRTC, Ridefinders, and others in mapping data/information for analysis and display of data and/or features on a local, sub area, corridor, or regional basis.
- c. Maintenance and support for the RRPDC’s street name clearing house program.

D. Agency Participation

RRPDC, VDOT, VDRPT, FHWA, FTA, local governments, GRTC, CRAC, RMA, Ridefinders.

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

	<u>PL ①②</u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$78,000	\$12,000	\$90,000

NOTE: ① 3/13/03 MPO action to subtract \$30,000 in PL funds (shifted to various other work tasks).

② 6/12/03 MPO action to subtract \$12,000 in PL funds (shifted to various other work tasks).

F. Schedule

On-going

2.6 Goochland County Village Overlay Design Standards

A. Background

Goochland County is undergoing revisions to its comprehensive plan and expects to have a revised plan adopted November 2003. As part of the planning process, public meetings were held in spring and summer 2002 to gauge community input on the comprehensive plan. Many citizens spoke of a desire to incorporate design standards in the established county villages. These standards would address concerns for access, site design, and aesthetics among other things.

Staff for Goochland County has requested that RRPDC staff act as technical support for the county's design review committee in developing a design overlay district for key county roadways. The study area for this project includes Rt. 250 (Broad Street Rd.) and Rt. 6 (Patterson Ave.) from the Henrico County Line to Oilville and Goochland Courthouse, respectively.

NOTE: Action taken at the September 12, 2002 MPO meeting to change UWP task 2.6 from the "Goochland County Centerville Village Plan" to the above noted task (budget and staffing remain the same).

B. End Products

Technical Assistance to the design review committee, including maps and GIS data development, planning guidelines and graphics. End product for the committee will be an addendum to the comprehensive plan.

C. Work Elements

This scope of work will include, but not be limited to, the following: conduct meetings with the county planner to discuss the specific needs of this project and how it fits into the long-range planning goals of Goochland County; develop guidelines for a village design in consultation with the county planner and designated village citizen representatives; develop illustrations and graphic aids to accompany the design guideline text; submit a final draft of the design guideline text including graphic elements to county staff; present the final project to the planning commission.

D. Agency Participation

Goochland County, RRPDC, VDOT, FHWA

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

	<u>PL</u> _____
RRPDC	\$14,000

F. Schedule

July 2002 to June 2003

2.7 I-95 Northern Corridor Interchanges Study

A. Background

The Transportation Planning Division of the Virginia Department of Transportation is seeking expressions of interest from consulting firms who wish to be considered to provide professional engineering services for the development of a planning/conceptual study to assess transportation improvements needed to the I-95 corridor beginning with the interchange of I-95/Route 802 in Hanover County through the I-95/Route 54 interchange in the Town of Ashland and ending with the interchange of I-95/Route 30 in Hanover County.

B. End Products

Study providing interim and ultimate design recommendations to enhance current and future traffic flow on I-95 through the three interchanges in Hanover County/Town of Ashland (i.e., Route 802, Route 54, and Route 30 interchanges).

C. Work Elements

This scope will include, but not be limited to, the following: examine existing (2001) traffic conditions; develop and analyze future year (2025) traffic conditions considering proposed land use around the interchanges; make recommendations for operational and capacity improvements; prepare conceptual plan drawings and cost estimates for planning purposes; coordinate with Hanover County, the Town of Ashland and VDOT; and make presentations to the Hanover County Board of Supervisors and Ashland Town Council. VDOT reserves the right to eliminate, in whole or in part, any of the above mentioned services.

D. Agency Participation

VDOT, FHWA, Hanover County, Town of Ashland

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

SPR _____

VDOT Consultant \$500,000

F. Schedule

July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003

2.8 Chesterfield County GIS Thoroughfare Plan Theme Eastern Area

A. Background

The Thoroughfare Plan is part of the County's Comprehensive Plan. The plan was adopted in 1989 (amended 1999), and is illustrated on a county base map. The county is currently working towards creating a Thoroughfare Plan theme in its GIS for the western half of the county. This project would incorporate the remaining part of the Thoroughfare Plan (eastern half of the county) into this GIS theme.

The Thoroughfare Plan is used by developers, consultants, county staff and citizens in identifying functional classifications and anticipated right-of-way widths of existing roads, as well as alignments of many proposed roadways throughout the county. This information must be accurate and readily available.

This UWP task was first programmed in the FY 01 UWP by amendment action of the MPO on June 12, 2000. The RRPDC/Chesterfield pass-through funds agreement was executed on March 1, 2001, and the Chesterfield/study consultant contract was executed on January 31, 2002. It was originally budgeted at \$54,586.

B. End Product

The Thoroughfare Plan for the eastern area of Chesterfield County in a digitized format.

C. Work Elements

Analyze and evaluate each of the roadways, existing and proposed, on the Thoroughfare Plan (eastern area) at a level of detail consistent with the data available in the county GIS.

Consultant and/or staff work tasks include obtaining and receiving the following documents and information in developing a GIS theme:

1. Thoroughfare Plan.
2. Comprehensive Plan.
3. Approved zoning cases.
4. County GIS data including; existing street centerlines; parcel information; environmental features (streams, RPA, wetlands, etc.); other existing improvements (railroads, major utility lines, etc.).

D. Agency Participation

Chesterfield County, VDOT, RRPDC, and FHWA.

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

PL*

Chesterfield County Consultant \$54,586

*Note: local match funds to be provided by Chesterfield County.

F. Schedule

July 2002 to June 2003

2.9 Richmond Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

A. Background

The VDOT has provided funds for conducting the Richmond Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. This study will be conducted by a VDOT consultant and the VDOT will also serve as the study project manager.

The end result of this study will be a detailed draft plan for each participating jurisdiction that it can consider for adoption as part of its comprehensive plan and considered for insertion in the region's long-range transportation plan (LRTP) as part of the LRTP Bicycle and Pedestrian element. The study will involve the RRPDC, VDOT, area local governments and FHWA.

Work on this plan will be conducted through an MPO special purpose study advisory committee of local government representatives and other groups and organizations (11/9/01 action by MPO to establish committee). The detailed study scope of work was set up through and approved by the study advisory committee (approved with modifications as discussed at the committee's March 9, 2001 meeting). Based on this action, VDOT negotiated a final contract with the study consultant and initiated work in mid-FY 02 (study kick-off committee meeting held on January 23, 2002).

B. End Products

A detailed draft plan for each participating jurisdiction that it can consider for adoption as part of its comprehensive plan and can also be considered for insertion in the MPO's LRTP as part of the Bicycle and Pedestrian element.

C. Work Elements

The draft detailed work scope presented for action at the March 9, 2001 Committee meeting contained the following major work tasks:

1. Project kickoff events.
2. Establish vision and goals.
3. Assess existing conditions.
4. Assess latent demand for bicycling and walking.
5. Prepare draft regional network plan.

6. Prepare final regional network plans.

D. Agency Participation

VDOT, RRPDC, Local Governments, Richmond Area Bicycling Association, Sierra Club, CTAC representatives, and GRTC/Ridefinders.

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

SPR

VDOT Consultant \$500,000

F. Schedule

FY 01 to June 30, 2003.

3.0 MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS/SHORT RANGE PLANNING

3.1 Congestion Management System (CMS) Update

A. Background

The MPO took action on March 8, 2001 to adopt the region's Congestion Management System (CMS). The CMS provides a systematic process for addressing congestion by providing information on transportation system performance and proposing use of alternative transportation strategies and programs to help alleviate congestion. Travel times for the region's major highway corridors are shown and these times will serve as a benchmark for assessing the effectiveness of transportation projects and programs in addressing congestion. The CMS also documents current congestion management strategies and programs in the MPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The CMS is updated every 3 years in conjunction with the LRTP update.

Due to limited availability of staff in FY 02, work on the next CMS update will be initiated in late FY 02/early FY 03. Initial major work activities include re-activation of the CMS task force as a joint TAC/CTAC advisory committee, and development of a detailed work scope. Work under this UWP work task also provides for staff participation and assistance in VDOT's ITS Steering Committee.

B. End Products

1. Initiation of work on the CMS Update.
2. Participation and assistance for the VDOT ITS Steering Committee.
3. GPS travel time runs and development of other data for the CMS update.

C. Work Elements

1. Initiate work on the CMS update including the following:
 - a. Establish CMS task force (joint TAC/CTAC advisory committee) reporting directly to the MPO.
 - b. Detailed work scope that is submitted for public review and action.
2. Participation in and providing assistance to the VDOT ITS Steering Committee.
3. Conduct corridor travel time delay studies on congested corridors to identify congestion points and potential improvements (conducted based on VDOT and local government request).

FY 03 UWP Task 3.1

4. Collect data from VDOT, GRTC, Ridefinders, and other available sources related to the CMS performance measures, and utilize this data for developing proposed CMS strategies and actions.
5. Conduct and document peak hour travel time runs for CMS network roads using GPS equipment.
6. Develop and print maps and information on regional traffic flow, congestion etc.

D. Agency Participation

RRPDC, VDOT, Local Governments, GRTC, Ridefinders, CRAC, RMA, FHWA, FTA, VDRPT.

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

	<u>PL ①②</u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>SPR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$53,000	\$13,000	----	\$66,000
VDOT	<u>----</u>	<u>----</u>	<u>\$13,000</u>	<u>13,000</u>
TOTAL	\$53,000	\$13,000	\$13,000	\$79,000

NOTE: ① 3/13/03 MPO action to subtract \$35,000 in PL funds (shifted to various other work tasks).

② 6/12/03 MPO action to add \$8,000 in PL funds (shifted from various other work tasks).

F. Schedule

On-going activity

3.2 Access Management Studies

A. **Background**

Access management provides a way to manage access to land development while simultaneously preserving the flow of traffic on the surrounding road system in terms of safety, capacity and speed. Access management provides for managing and planning the spacing and design of driveways, median openings, traffic signals, and interchanges. The goals of access management are as follows:

1. Improve safety while decreasing accident rates.
2. Reduce congestion by using the existing roadway network more efficiently.
3. Maintain desirable speeds along arterials.
4. Reduce interference with through traffic due to turns into or out of a site.
5. Optimize highway function and land use.
6. Provide sufficient spacing between at-grade intersections.
7. Provide adequate on-site storage areas.

In FY 2000, staff conducted a study of access management standards in Powhatan County. The study included research on access management principals and standards used in various states, which staff reviewed and presented to VDOT and county staff. Based on this research a review of current standards and practices, and the counties particular needs and preferences, a set of proposed standards and recommended techniques for managing access has been developed for the county (work was completed in FY 01). This work served as a model for a similar study for Goochland County, which staff initiated in mid-FY 01. Staff had hoped to complete the Goochland study by mid-FY 02 and a draft document was prepared and submitted to County staff. The document is being reviewed by the County Attorney and the staff is considering various revisions before moving ahead with developing proposed ordinances. Once the County has agreed to a final draft document (which is expected by late FY 02) it will be submitted for MPO review and action.

Note that work on the Charles City and New Kent counties' access management standards, scheduled to begin in FY 02 (after completing the Goochland County standards), was delayed due to changes in both jurisdiction's chief administrative officers (CAOs) and due to New Kent County also hiring a new planning director. Staff will begin work for one of these jurisdictions when requested.

G. End Product

Utilize research from the Powhatan and Goochland counties access management standards studies on access management principals and techniques to reduce the proliferation of driveways, entrances, and crossovers and to enhance the functional capacity of intersections on secondary, primary and arterial roads. Based on this research, standards will be presented for regulating and coordinating the various types of access connection points to the road system that can be used by the county in reviewing requests for new entrances and exits for residential subdivisions and businesses. This study will propose detailed and sophisticated techniques in access management for Goochland, Charles City, and New Kent counties.

H. Work Tasks

1. Review with county, VDOT, and RRPDC staffs, study intent and scope of work.
2. Review and evaluate existing VDOT minimum standards for entrances and access points to different classification of roads.
3. Review and evaluate existing county policies concerning access to roads (distances between entrances, turn lane/taper lengths) and thoroughfare plan goals and objectives.
4. Utilize previously conducted research and examples of successful application of the concepts on access management (research from FHWA, States, and rural and urban localities).
5. Analyze issue areas in relation to road classification (arterial, primary, secondary roads), distances between entrances, turn lane/taper lengths, limiting entrances, sharing entrances, internal service drives, separation of intersections including those signalized, onsite internal vehicular circulation and storage, left turn lanes particularly for subdivisions, and median crossover separations.
6. Develop recommended standards to address above access management issue areas, including reasons for and benefits that would accrue from the recommendations.
7. Review recommended standards with study participants (task 1) and selected local transportation/ planning department heads.
8. Assist in presentation of the findings to the County Board of Supervisors.

FY 03 UWP Task 3.2

- 9. Present the access management standards to the MPO Board for acceptance of staff work.
- 10. If requested, assist VDOT Traffic Engineering Division with using recommended standards as a case example of successful acceptance and use of modern access management standards by a Virginia county.

D. Agency Participants

Goochland County, Charles City County, New Kent County, RRPDC, VDOT, FHWA.

E. Budget, Staffing, Funding

PL ①②

RRPDC \$4,000

NOTE: ① 3/13/03 MPO action to subtract \$10,000 in PL funds (shifted to various other work tasks).

② 6/12/03 MPO action to subtract \$21,000 in PL funds (shifted to various other work tasks).

F. Schedule

July 2002 to June 2003

3.5 Richmond GASB 34 Transportation Asset Management System

A. Background

The City of Richmond, Virginia with three interstate routes, six federal routes and 11 state routes and other streets in its 63 square miles is actively involved on a preliminary basis with GASB 34 (depreciation method), GIS (Geographic Information Systems) and the establishment of an Asset Management System for its Surface Transportation System. This project would assist in the management of the city's public streets to establish the conceptual framework to collect and manage transportation data for the modified approach to GASB 34 alternative to the "depreciation method" and Transportation Asset Management System. The VDOT has agreed to conduct this study for the City of Richmond by providing the services of its on-call consultants.

NOTE: 9/13/01 MPO action to amend UWP to add task 3.5.

B. End Products

1. A conceptual report outlining alternatives and recommendations to collect and process materials for a transportation asset management program. This report would address organizational needs, annual costs for three fiscal years and possible funding resources. This conceptual report would address issues related to the conversion to a GASB 34 (modified approach).
2. Short overviews of some cities in the 190,000 to 300,000 population range, which are actively involved with:
 - a. Managing and processing materials for a Transportation Asset Management System.
 - b. Using GIS as part of a Transportation Asset Management System.
 - c. Using both a Transportation Asset management System and a GASB 34 (modified approach).

C. Work Elements

The consultant, in conjunction with the modified method to depreciation of GASB 34 would complete the following work elements:

1. A conceptual overview of how various transportation improvements and routine transportation work activities (by city personnel and others) might be quantified and priced in accordance with GASB 34 standards.

FY 03 UWP Task 3.5

2. A priority system to quantify and value transportation improvements.
3. The pricing of major capital and operating transportation improvements on selected federal routes (initially) or a broad category of elements.
4. A detailed listing of personnel needs and equipment resources for a progressive GASB 34 plan.
5. An annual operating budget for GASB 34.
6. A detailed listing of possible funding resources for GASB 34.
7. Other elements and activities as deemed appropriate.

The consultant in conjunction with a Transportation Asset Management System would complete the following work elements:

1. A conceptual overview of how field activities might be easily captured on a daily or weekly basis to keep an Asset Management System current.
2. A priority system to implement an Asset Management System.
3. The creation of computerized input sheets for transportation assets related to: major facilities; lighting; underground utilities; traffic signals, signs, pavement markings; drainage facilities, survey markers; other features and appurtenances.
4. A detailed listing of personnel needs and equipment resources for a transportation asset management system (citywide).
5. An annual operating budget.
6. A detailed listing of possible funding resources for a transportation asset management program.
7. Other elements and activities as deemed appropriate.

D. Agency Participation

City of Richmond, VDOT, VDOT consultant, FHWA

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

SPR

VDOT on-call consultant \$81,000

F. Schedule

FY 02 to June 2003

4.0 TRANSPORTATION PROJECT PROGRAMMING

4.1 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

A. Background

The TIP programs highway and transit projects that are allocated or scheduled to receive funds over a three-year period. Once approved as part of the TIP, federally funded projects can proceed to the next stage of implementation. Major highway projects that are funded by state, local, or other funding sources are included in the TIP for air quality conformity analysis or information purposes.

The TIP programs transportation projects on an administrative classification basis consistent with the Virginia Transportation Development Plan (VTDP) under the following systems and programs:

1. NHS/Interstate and Non-Interstate
2. Primary
3. Secondary
4. Urban
5. TEA-21 High Priority
6. Priority Transportation Funds
7. FRANS (Reimbursement Notes)
8. General Funds
9. Toll Facilities Revolving Account
10. Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) Program
11. Surface Transportation Program (STP)
12. Transportation Enhancement Program
13. Transportation Safety Program
14. Public Transportation
15. Airports
16. Local/Private Funded Projects

Project descriptions include implementing agency, location/service area, cost estimates, funding sources, amount of funds actually or scheduled for allocation, type of improvement, and other appropriate information. The TIP also includes a financial plan summary, GRTC's Financial Capacity documentation and certification, project implementation status, public participation and environmental justice assessment documentation and the MPO/State Statement of Certification.

Essential elements of the TIP previously required under ISTEA and continued under TEA-21 are as follows:

1. Approval and Updates--The TIP must be approved by the MPO and the Governor, and must be updated at least every two (2) years. The Richmond

FY 03 UWP Task 4.1

Area MPO's TIP is updated on an annual basis based on action by the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) to review and approve federal and state projects, and state matching funds.

2. Scope of TIP--The TIP must include all projects within the MPO's Study Area (including pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) to be funded under Title 23 and the FTA.
3. Financial Plan--The TIP must include a financial plan component or element. The financial plan must demonstrate how the TIP can be implemented, and indicate resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the plan.
4. Project Priorities--The TIP must include a priority list of projects to be carried out in each 3-year period, and a financial plan that demonstrates how it can be implemented. Projects within a funding category for a particular year can serve as an indicator of priority, such that first year projects are the highest priority, second year projects are the next highest priority, etc. Procedures that distribute sub-allocated CMAQ, STP or Section 5307 funds to individual jurisdictions or modes by predetermined percentages or formulas are inconsistent with federal planning provisions that require MPO's to develop a prioritized and financially reasonable TIP, unless they can be shown to be based on considerations required as part of the MPO's planning process. Such procedures otherwise ignore the dynamics of the planning process, hinder response to high priority problems identified through the planning process, and frustrate the flexibility features of ISTEA/TEA-21.
5. Project Selection--All federally funded projects, except NHS, Bridge, and Interstate/Interstate Maintenance projects, are to be selected by the MPO in consultation with the state from the approved TIP and in accordance with the TIP priorities. Projects that are NHS Interstate, NHS Non-Interstate, statewide STP and Bridge funded are to be selected by the state in cooperation with the MPO from the approved TIP. The TIP serves as the project selection document.
6. Transportation Plan Consistency--All federally funded TIP projects must be consistent with the MPO's adopted Transportation Plan.
7. Air Quality Conformity--The MPO, along with FHWA and FTA, must make a conformity determination for projects listed in the proposed TIP, or for amendments that add or delete regionally significant projects. Conformity is generally defined in the CAAA as conforming to the adopted State Implementation Plan's purpose for eliminating and reducing the severity and number of NAAQS violations and achieving attainment status. In other words,

FY 03 UWP Task 4.1

the implementation of TIP projects must be shown to serve as part of the region's effort to improve air quality.

8. Public Review and Comment--The public, affected agencies, representatives of transportation agency employees, other affected employee representatives, private providers of transportation, and other interested parties must receive a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed program.
9. Environmental Justice - - The TIP documentation includes an assessment of the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic groups for investments identified in the TIP. The RRPDC conducts this assessment for RSTP and CMAQ projects.
10. MPO Certification--In TMA's, the USDOT Secretary shall certify the planning process at least once every 3 years. A joint FHWA/FTA review was conducted in September 2000, and on January 17, 2001 the MPO was conditionally certified, subject to five corrective action issues.

New provisions under TEA-21 that are now part of the TIP development process are as follows:

1. The MPO must publish or otherwise make available an annual listing of projects, consistent with the categories in the TIP, for which federal funds have been obligated in the preceding year. The purpose of this provision is to enhance public awareness of which projects are being implemented in the region (see 23 U.S.C. 134(h)(7)(B); 49 U.S.C. 530 (C) (5) (B)).
2. Freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, and representatives of users of public transit are added to the list of parties that must be given the opportunity for review and comment on plans and TIP's.
3. The TIP may include an additional list of "illustrative" projects. Such projects are intended to assist in the development of a vision-based program, and is not to be included in the fiscally constrained list of projects. Illustrative projects are defined as those projects that would be included in the TIP if additional resources would become available.
4. TEA-21 requires that each state develop a process for ensuring coordination with local elected officials in non-metropolitan areas in the development of the TIP.

Draft federal planning regulations implementing these new TEA-21 provisions were published in the federal register in early FY 01. However, as of April 2002, these draft regulations have not been issued as final. The VDOT and FHWA have advised

FY 03 UWP Task 4.1

that even though there are no current regulations implementing TEA-21, the MPO is required to abide by its provisions. Staff will review these regulations when they are final and will consult with VDOT on changes that may be necessary to the TIP process.

It is important to note that work on the FY 01/02-03/04 TIP was delayed due to late action by the CTB to adopt the FY 01/02 VTDP (adopted by the CTB on December 18, 2001). Staff was advised by VDOT in January 2002 that due to state funding problems and issues, the recently adopted VTDP was being put on hold. As a result, staff advised VDOT and TAC that work on the TIP was being suspended until VDOT advised us to proceed forward. The MPO has been advised that VDOT will conduct the preallocation public meetings for the next (i.e. FY 02/03) VTDP and that a revised list of projects covering both periods (i.e. FY 01/02 and FY 02/03 for actual allocations) will be included as part of the new VTDP. The MPO however, has not yet been advised by VDOT of the Richmond area's FY 02/03 RSTP and CMAQ allocations (as of March 29, 2002).

Staff has also been advised by VDOT that future VTDP's will be posted on VDOT's web site and made available by electronic format (e-mail). This should reduce the amount of staff time needed for copying and inserting descriptions and allocations for Richmond area TIP projects.

B. End Products

1. Development and adoption of the FY 02/03-04/05 TIP (work initiated in FY 02) and initiating the draft FY 03/04-05/06 TIP; the MPO's annual Statement of Certification; and supporting documentation demonstrating compliance with financial plan and environmental justice requirements, FTA Financial Capacity Policy, and conformity to the Virginia State Implementation Plan (for air quality purposes).
2. Maintenance activities in support of the current TIP including processing of TIP amendment requests; maintenance of records tracking the programming of Regional STP and CMAQ funds; and a report on the implementation status of major projects from the previous TIP.
3. Development and submission of the MPO's list of regional priority transportation projects.

C. Work Elements

Work activities include the following:

FY 03 UWP Task 4.1

1. Document the TIP preparation process including project advancement, area priorities and use of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Congestion Management System (CMS) for selecting and programming projects.
2. Prepare a 3-year List of Proposed Projects for the following systems and programs based on submissions from area local governments, VDOT, VDRPT, RMA, Ridefinders, CRAC and GRTC:
 - NHS/Interstate and Non-Interstate System
 - Primary System
 - Secondary System
 - Urban System
 - TEA-21 High Priority
 - Priority Transportation Funds
 - FRANS (Reimbursement Notes)
 - General Funds
 - Toll Facilities Revolving Account Program
 - Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Program
 - Surface Transportation Program
 - Transportation Enhancement Program
 - Transportation Safety Program
 - Public Transportation
 - Airports
 - Local/Private funded Projects
3. Coordinate submission of FTA Section 5310 project requests and submit for MPO endorsement action and final recommended projects for inclusion in the TIP. (RRPDC)
4. Coordinate submission of transportation enhancement projects and submit for MPO endorsement, and final recommended projects for inclusion in the TIP (RRPDC).
5. Coordinate identification of all regionally significant public and private transportation projects, and submit to VDOT for air quality analysis purposes (RRPDC).
6. Coordinate listing and description of progress in the implementation of TCM's (if appropriate). (RRPDC and VDOT)
7. Develop annual list of projects, consistent with the categories in the TIP, for which Federal funds have been obligated in the preceding year. Also, include list of other major state projects from the previous TIP that were implemented,

FY 03 UWP Task 4.1

and identify significant delays in the planned implementation of these major projects. Publication and distribution (i.e. posting on the RRPDC/MPO website) will also be conducted as part of UWP task 1.2, MPO Citizen Participation. (RRPDC)

8. Prepare and submit the TIP financial plan and supporting documentation. (RRPDC and VDOT)
9. Conduct public review and comment activities, including at least one public meeting. (RRPDC)
10. Conduct and document assessment of the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic groups for investments (i.e. projects and programs) identified in the TIP. (RRPDC)
11. Prepare and process amendments to the TIP as approved by the MPO. Conduct conformity analysis and public participation as required. (RRPDC and VDOT)
12. Prepare and process MPO Statement of Certification and supporting documentation for the area's "3-C" Transportation Planning Process. (RRPDC and VDOT)
13. Prepare and submit to the MPO a report on Virginia's Allocation of State and Federal Construction Program Funds. This report should focus on VDOT Richmond District funding for the various administrative system classifications as compared to funding for other VDOT Construction Districts (RRPDC and VDOT; staff time and funds permitting).

D. Agency Participation

RRPDC, VDOT, VDEQ, VDRPT, Local Governments, GRTC, FHWA, EPA, FTA, Ridefinders, CRAC, Paratransit and other transportation operators, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, and representatives of users of public transit.

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

	<u>PL ②③</u>	<u>FY 03 5303</u>	<u>FY 02 5303 ①</u>	<u>SPR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$105,000	\$18,000	\$20,000	----	\$143,000
VDOT	<u>----</u>	<u>----</u>	<u>----</u>	<u>\$23,000</u>	<u>23,000</u>
TOTAL	\$105,000	\$18,000	\$20,000	\$23,000	\$166,000

FY 03 UWP Task 4.1

NOTE: ① 12/12/02 MPO action to add \$20,000 in available FY 02 Section 5303 carryover funds.

② 3/13/03 MPO action to add \$30,000 in PL funds (shifted from various other work tasks).

③ 6/12/03 MPO action to add \$15,000 in PL funds (shifted from various other work tasks).

F. Schedule

1. FY 02/03 – 04/05 TIP -- July 2002 to December 2002
2. FY 03/04 - 05/06 TIP -- December 2002 to FY 04
3. TIP Amendments -- On-going activity

5.0 TRANSIT PLANNING

5.2 Elderly and Disabled Transportation Needs and Services

A. Background

The Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee (EDAC) is composed of individuals and organizations representing the region's elderly and disabled, and advises the MPO on plans, studies, issues, and other matters related to the planning of public transportation services. It serves to advise the MPO on issues plans and studies, involving public transportation facilities and services for the elderly and disabled. It also assists GRTC by advising them of public transportation needs and issues of concern to the elderly and disabled community.

This task provides RRPDC staff support to ensure an active and involved EDAC and to assist the committee in developing up-to-date information on transportation needs of elderly and disabled in the Richmond area, their transportation needs, and available transportation services and resources. This task also provides for staff participation in various study activities addressing the region's specialized transportation services.

In FY 02, staff completed an update to the Transportation Operators Inventory. This report provides information on private, private non-profit, and social service agency transportation operators serving the Richmond area. Information shown in the inventory include the company/agency name, address and phone number, contact person, type of organization, service area and times, and number of vehicles. The inventory is used by local governments, GRTC, Ridefinders, and area social service organizations as an information resource for contacting transportation operators. Information contained in this document is continually changing, and staff will maintain updates on a continuing basis. Staff will also post this document on its web site making updates easier and accessible.

Staff is also preparing and submitting EDAC meeting agendas and agenda attachments to several EDAC members by e-mail. This format allows visually impaired committee members to receive and read these materials in an accessible format. Information posted on the RRPDC/MPO web site is also accessible to these members.

B. End Products

A functional and viable process that advises the MPO and GRTC on the special transportation needs of the elderly and disabled, and provides reports on elderly and disabled transportation needs and services.

C. Work Elements

1. Provide administrative and technical staff support for the EDAC.
2. Maintain/update the transportation operations inventory of private and human service agencies' transportation services on an on-going basis.

D. Agency Participation

RRPDC, GRTC, VDRPT, Local Governments, FTA, EDAC appointing organizations, private and human service agency transportation operators.

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

	<u>5303</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$20,000	\$5,000	\$25,000

F. Schedule

On-going activity

5.3 Downtown Circulator Study

A. Background

New development in downtown Richmond and the expansion of the regional Convention Center have highlighted the importance of convenient, easy-to-use public transportation for employees, residents and visitors. Recognizing the need for mobility within the downtown, GRTC operated a rubber-tire trolley system until 1999, when funding for the program ran out. Community leaders have expressed interest in the establishment of a fixed-rail circulator system in the downtown.

The GRTC Transit System is enlisting the assistance of a professional consulting firm to study potential capital and operational features of a steel-rail streetcar system in the Downtown, which could someday serve as the core of a regional light rail service. A steering committee with representation from local stakeholder groups (Richmond Renaissance, Historic Richmond Foundation, Museums on the Boulevard, downtown developers, Dominion Power, etc) will provide input during meetings with the consultant, who will use the gathered information to develop recommendations tailored to meet the needs of the community.

B. End Products

Study providing design recommendations for the optimal steel-rail streetcar line linking important trip generators (Convention Center, Shockoe Slip, downtown employers, Main Street Station, etc) in downtown Richmond.

C. Work Elements

1. Present relevant information about downtown rail services in other cities;
2. Develop ridership forecasts for a Richmond streetcar system, and analyze the effect of the fare structure on ridership;
3. Identify an optimal route alignment and configuration and describe visual and other environmental impacts;
4. Compare and contrast vehicle options for a streetcar service;
5. Develop capital and operating cost estimates for the recommended streetcar service;
6. Prepare a cash flow analysis and identify potential sources of funding;
7. Develop a final report with accompanying visual presentation media;
8. Complete other elements and activities as deemed appropriate.

GRTC reserves the right to eliminate, in whole or in part, any of the above-mentioned services.

D. Agency Participation

GRTC, VDRPT, RRPDC, the City of Richmond, Richmond Metropolitan Convention and Visitors' Bureau, Richmond Renaissance, Historic Richmond Foundation, Museums on the Boulevard.

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

	<u>CMAQ</u>	<u>Enhancement</u>	<u>5313b</u>	<u>TOTAL*</u>
GRTC Consultant	\$225,000	\$100,000	\$50,000	\$375,000

* Local match to be provided by VDRPT, the City of Richmond and GRTC.

F. Schedule

May 1, 2002 to May 1, 2004

5.4 Downtown Transit Center Need and Location Study

A. Background

GRTC’s major transfer area for its bus riders has traditionally been located in downtown where the north/south and east/west bus routes converge. In March of 2002, several modifications were made to the transfer stops to provide better amenities for the riders and to accommodate the growth and development in downtown.

The proposed study will determine if there is a need for a transit center or centers in the downtown area. The study will include an analysis of the modifications of the bus stops made in March of 2002, the future growth of GRTC ridership, and the land use and development plans in the downtown area. If the need is justified, the study will determine the type of transit center or centers, which will best address the needs and will determine the location for the center/centers.

B. End Product

Determination of the need, type and location of a downtown transit center/s.

C. Work Elements

1. Identification of need for transit center
 - a. Review of GRTC current ridership and impact of March 2002 route changes.
 - b. Review of existing reports on GRTC transit center locations and examples of centers/s from other cities.
 - c. Review of projected GRTC ridership patterns.
 - d. Review of City of Richmond Master Plans and development plans.
 - e. Analysis of data.
 - f. Determination of need for transit center/s.

2. Identification of the type of transit center/s

Based on the existing and projected needs, a type of transit center/s will be recommended.

3. Identification of location of transit center/s

- a. Based on the need and recommended type of transit center/s, several locations will be recommended.
- b. An analysis of the impact of the proposed transit center/s on GRTC riders (i.e., walking distances, travel time, ability to transfer, comfort and convenience and projected new boarding

patterns of impacted riders), development in downtown and the GRTC operations (i.e., running time issues and their relationship to operating costs and fleet requirements impact upon surrounding bus stops and waiting areas).

- 4. Presentation of Impacts
 - a. Presentation of findings and recommendations
 - b. Development of PowerPoint presentation
 - c. Hold numerous public meetings

D. Agency Participation

GRTC, RRPDC, City of Richmond, Richmond Renaissance, Metropolitan Richmond Convention and Visitors Bureau, VDRPT, FTA.

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

FTA 5313b*

City of Richmond Consultant \$10,000

*Note: Local match to be provided by VDRPT (\$1,000) and City of Richmond (\$1,000). Federal share is \$8,000.

E. Schedule

March 2003 to June 2003

5.5 Regional Light-Rail Development Program

A. Background

The MPO's adopted LRTP includes a proposed light-rail (LR) line along Broad Street in the City of Richmond from Church Hill to the Science Museum of Virginia. The Museums on the Boulevard has developed and presented its Vision for the Boulevard long-range concept plan, which includes a proposed rail line running from Maymont Park to Lewis Ginter Botanical Garden in Henrico County and connecting with a Broad Street rail line. The Transportation Element of the City of Richmond Master Plan calls for light-rail lines along Broad Street between the Science Museum and Main Street Station, and from downtown across the James River through Manchester, over to Midlothian Turnpike and out to Cloverleaf Mall in Chesterfield County.

The MPO's Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) has had an on-going interest and concern in LR development. IN reviewing and discussing a presentation on the Charlotte, North Carolina \$19.7 million city funded trolley program, the CTAC requested that staff work with several CTAC members to come up with a recommended course of action. Based on further discussions, it was requested that staff prepare and submit a proposed work task providing for the development of an action plan to develop and implement LR in the Richmond region.

This work task proposed funding for a consultant study to review various City and regional plans and proposals for light rail and trolley service, and to present recommendations for developing and implementing LR in the region. In addition, the study should provide information on service demand (i.e. ridership), costs and benefits, and land-use recommendations.

VDOT has agreed to conduct this study by providing the services of its on-call consultant. The study was added to the UWP by MPO amendment action on September 13, 2001. As part of the MPO's action, a special purpose study review committee was established. This Committee met on December 9, 2001 to review and discuss a proposed work scope. The Committee met again on February 27, 2002 with VDOT's on-call consultant to discuss the proposed work scope. A revised draft scope will be prepared by the study consultant and submitted to the committee for final review. It will then be submitted to the MPO for review and comment. When acceptable to both the MPO and VDOT, VDOT will negotiate a final contract with the study consultant, the final work scope will be distributed to the committee, and work will be initiated.

B. End Products

1. A review of plans and proposals in The Richmond area and recommendations for developing and implementing LR service.
2. A phased program of work elements addressing service demand, costs and benefits, land-use considerations, and other necessary work activities.

C. Work Elements

1. Establish study review committee.
2. Develop detailed work scope with assistance from the consultant.
3. Submit detailed work scope recommended by committee for MPO review and comment. (VDOT will then negotiate final consultant contact.)
4. Conduct work elements as provided in detailed work scope.
5. Present draft study/program report to TAC and CTAC for review and comment, and to MPO for review and action.

D. Agency Participation

RRPDC, local governments, GRTC, VDRPT, VDOT, VDOT consultant, FHWA.

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

SPR

VDOT Consultant (contract pending)

F. Schedule

FY 02 to June 2003

6.0 INTERMODAL PLANNING

6.1 Intermodal Planning

A. Background

In FY 02, the MPO completed work on the Richmond Regional Intermodal Study. The study had two major goals: first, to examine the potential for an intermodal freight center in the Richmond/Tri-Cities area; and second, to examine the region's freight transportation network (i.e. highways, rail, airport, and port) and provide recommendations to enhance and improve freight movement. The study was completed in two phases. The Phase 1 Report provided for the identification and collection of data while the Phase 2 Report provided for the development of freight forecasts and recommendations. Each transportation mode is addressed with recommendations provided for truck, rail, air, and port modes. It also concludes that the region does not need an intermodal facility at this time; however, it recommends the establishment of an Intermodal Committee charged with monitoring future demand for such a facility. Such a committee could also prove to be an effective liaison with the freight movement industry and providing for their input into the regional transportation planning process (one of the federal MPO planning requirements).

At the February 14, 2002 MPO meeting, action was taken to accept the study as work completed and for staff to prepare and present for MPO review, consideration, and action a proposal for the establishment of a joint Richmond Area MPO and Tri-Cities Area MPO Intermodal Advisory Task Force. Staff's proposal should be ready for review and action at the June 13, 2002 MPO meeting.

A major charge for the task force will be to provide further consideration and comment on the recommendations presented in the Intermodal Study. This committee will also advise the MPO on issues and concerns facing the freight industry including concerns dealing with congestion and proposed improvements to the region's transportation network. It should be noted that FHWA recently conducted a survey of shippers and freight operators in the Richmond/Petersburg area to solicit their comments and suggestions on transportation network improvements. FHWA found however, that there was a low response rate to their survey. With the establishment of the Intermodal Advisory Task Force, staff should be able to have an important liaison with the region's freight industry and receive effective input on the transportation improvements based on the freight community's perspective.

B. End Products

1. Comments and recommendations from the Intermodal Advisory Task Force on the study findings and recommendations presented in the

Richmond Regional Intermodal Study and submitted for MPO review, consideration, and action as appropriate.

2. An active and involved Intermodal Advisory Task Force advising the MPO on transportation issues and concerns facing the freight industry including concerns dealing with congestion and proposed improvements to the region’s transportation network..

C. Work Elements

1. Administrative and technical support for the Intermodal Advisory Task Force (member organizations to be jointly appointed by the Richmond and Tri-Cities Area MPOs).
2. Advisory Task Force review of study findings and recommendations presented in the Richmond Regional Intermodal Study with task force comments and recommendations presented for MPO review, consideration and action as appropriate.
3. Organize and conduct workshops with representatives from the freight community to solicit comments and suggestions on capital and/or operating improvements needed for the region’s transportation network.
4. Monitor and report to the MPO on service demand and need for a regional intermodal transportation facility.

D. Agency Participation

RRPDC, VDOT, VDRPT, Crater PDC, CRAC, Port of Richmond, local governments, members of the Intermodal Advisory Task Force

E. Budget, Staff and Funding

	<u>PL ①②</u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$3,000	\$5,000	\$8,000

NOTE: ① 3/13/03 MPO action to subtract \$15,000 in PL funds (shifted to various other work tasks).

② 6/12/03 MPO action to subtract \$12,000 in PL funds (shifted to various other work tasks).

F. Schedule

On-going

7.0 AIR QUALITY PLANNING

7.1 Air Quality Plan and Program Activities

A. Background

The Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990 presents serious air quality improvement challenges to almost all of the nation's mid-size to major metropolitan areas. To meet this challenge, the state has pursued a program of reduction measures, which includes various stationary source control measures, stage 2-vapor recovery, clean fuels, and other measures.

In FY1995, the Metropolitan Richmond Air Quality Committee (MRAQC) was established as the Section 174 Lead Planning Organization (LPO) based on appointments by the Governor's office. Representation on MRAQC includes local elected officials from non-attainment area jurisdictions (i.e. Richmond, Henrico, Chesterfield, Hanover, Charles City, Colonial Heights and Hopewell), from the Richmond and Tri-Cities Area MPO's, and agency representatives from VDOT and VDEQ.

In FY1997, VDEQ staff submitted a request to EPA for designating the area to attainment status. In November 1997 EPA issued notice in the Federal Register noting the Richmond Area to be in attainment status for ozone air quality standards, and was designed as a Maintenance Area.

On June 29, 2000, the state advised EPA of VDEQ recommendations for designation of areas (i.e. jurisdictions and portions of jurisdictions) subject to the revised NAAQS for ozone. For the Richmond area, this included all jurisdictions (i.e. Richmond, Colonial Heights, Chesterfield, Hanover, and Henrico) and portions of Charles City County that were in the previously designated non-attainment area. This recommended area designation was based on EPA's new 8-hour NAAQS for ozone, which was under court review and not resolved until recently. The resolution was based on a U.S. Supreme Court ruling on a challenge by the American Trucking Association (ATA) to the new 8-hour standards. The Supreme Court rejected the ATA challenge however; it also said that EPA's implementation policy for the ozone standard was unlawful and unreasonable, and that the agency must develop a reasonable interpretation. Based on this information, (Supreme Court action taken in February 2000) the VDEQ must wait for EPA guidance on how the new 8-hour standard will be implemented.

This work task also provides for RRPDC and VDOT staff work activities for conducting air quality conformity analysis in support of the TIP and LRTP.

The VDOT contracts out this work to a consultant and the RRPDC provides staff support for TIP, LRTP, and TIP/LRTP amendments (if appropriate) review and coordination. Staff work activities includes identification of

projects, project descriptions, submission of socioeconomic data and forecasts, coordinate/conduct project reviews with local staff and other administrative and coordination activities.

B. End Products

Administrative support for MPO activities involving development of the non-attainment area implementation plan and air quality conformity analysis.

C. Work Elements

1. Monitor air quality data for the Richmond area, and review EPA and Virginia Department of Air Pollution Control reports, guidelines, regulations, etc.
2. Limited administrative support for MPO participation in developing the nonattainment area implementation plan.
3. Review, comment, and conduct other activities necessary for the nonattainment area planning process.
4. Review and comment on the area's emissions inventory, especially information relating to mobile sources and transportation control measures.
5. Computer modeling and other transportation planning activities for development of VMT data required for maintenance plan/nonattainment area plan implementation [VDOT].
6. Conduct air quality conformity analysis activities in support of the TIP and LRTP [RRPDC and VDOT].

D. Agency Participation

RRPDC, VDOT, VDRPT, VDEQ, MRAQC, GRTC, Ridefinders, local governments, FHWA, EPA, FTA, and Tri-Cities MPO.

E. Budget, Staff, and Funding

	<u>PL ①②</u>	<u>SPR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$12,000	----	\$12,000
VDOT	----	\$35,000	35,000
TOTAL	\$12,000	\$35,000	\$47,000

NOTE: 3/13/03 MPO action to subtract \$5,000 in PL funds (shifted to various other work tasks).

② 6/12/03 MPO action to subtract \$4,000 in PL funds (shifted to various other work tasks).

F. Schedule

On-going activity

**AGENCY BUDGET SUMMARY SHEET
FHWA PL/SPR; FTA SEC 5303/C.O.SEC 5303 FUNDS
FY 2003 UWP - RICHMOND AREA MPO**

Task No/ Abbrev	RRPDC			GRTC CO 5303	Local PL	VDOT SPR	OTHER	TOTAL					GRAND TOTAL
	PL	5303	CO 5303					PL	SPR	5303	CO 5303	OTHER	
1.1 MPO Maint	368,608	44,732	23,949	-	-	152,000	-	368,608	152,000	44,732	23,949	-	589,289
1.2 Citi Partic	95,000	20,000	40,000	-	-	7,000	-	95,000	7,000	20,000	40,000	-	162,000
1.2 Consult.	8,334	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,334	-	-	-	-	8,334
1.3 UWP	32,000	8,000	-	-	-	6,000	-	32,000	6,000	8,000	-	-	46,000
2.1 Data	85,000	14,500	-	-	-	-	-	85,000	-	14,500	-	-	99,500
2.2 LRTP	91,000	10,000	-	-	-	39,000	-	91,000	39,000	10,000	-	-	140,000
2.3 Ches. Media	-	-	-	-	9,034	-	-	9,034	-	-	-	-	9,034
2.4 City MP (3)	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,000	-	-	-	-	100,000	100,000 (3)
2.5 GIS	78,000	12,000	-	-	-	-	-	78,000	-	12,000	-	-	90,000
2.6 Gooch V P	14,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	14,000	-	-	-	-	14,000
2.7 I-95 N. Cor.	-	-	-	-	-	500,000	-	-	500,000	-	-	-	500,000
2.8 Ches GIS	-	-	-	-	54,586	-	-	54,586	-	-	-	-	54,586
2.9 B & P Plan(1)	-	-	-	-	-	500,000	-	-	500,000	-	-	-	500,000 (1)
3.1 CMS	53,000	13,000	-	-	-	13,000	-	53,000	13,000	13,000	-	-	79,000
3.2 Access Mgt	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	4,000	-	-	-	-	4,000
3.5 GASB 34 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	81,000	-	-	81,000	-	-	-	81,000 (1)
4.1 TIP	105,000	18,000	20,000	-	-	23,000	-	105,000	23,000	18,000	20,000	-	166,000
5.2 ED TNS	5,000	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	5,000	-	20,000	-	-	25,000
5.3 Dwt .Cir (2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(2)
5.4 Dwt. Ctr (3)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(3)
5.5 Reg L-R (1)	-	-	-	-	-	(1)	-	-	(1)	-	-	-	(1)
6.1 Int. Modal	3,000	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	3,000	-	5,000	-	-	8,000
7.1 Air Q. Plg.	12,000	-	-	-	-	35,000	-	12,000	35,000	-	-	-	47,000
TOTAL	953,942	165,232	83,949	-	63,620	1,356,000	100,000	1,017,562	1,356,000	165,232	83,949	100,000	\$ 2,722,743

- NOTES:
- (1) Work conducted by VDOT on-call consultant.
 - (2) Work conducted by GRTC consultant (UWP information item).
 - (3) Work conducted by City of Richmond consultant (UWP information item).

**FUNDING SOURCES SUMMARY SHEET
FHWA PL/SPR; FTA SEC 5303/C.O.SEC 5303 FUNDS
FY 2003 UWP - RICHMOND AREA MPO**

Task No./ Abbrev.	PL		SPR		5303		C.O. 5303		OTHER		TOTAL		GRAND TOTAL
	Federal	State/Local	Federal	State	Federal	State/Local	Federal	State/Local	Federal	State/Local	Federal	State/Local	
1.1 MPO Maint	294,887	73,721	121,600	30,400	35,786	8,946	19,159	4,790	-	-	471,432	117,857	589,289
1.2 Citi Partic	76,000	19,000	5,600	1,400	16,000	4,000	32,000	8,000	-	-	129,600	32,400	162,000
1.2 Consult.	6,667	1,667	-	-	-	6,667	-	-	-	-	6,667	1,667	8,334
1.3 UWP	25,600	6,400	4,800	1,200	6,400	1,600	-	-	-	-	36,800	9,200	46,000
2.1 Data	68,000	17,000	-	-	11,600	2,900	-	-	-	-	79,600	19,900	99,500
2.2 LRTP	72,800	18,200	31,200	7,800	8,000	2,000	-	-	-	-	112,000	28,000	140,000
2.3 Ches. Media	7,227	1,807	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7,227	1,807	9,034
2.4 City MP (3)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80,000	20,000	80,000	20,000	100,000 (3)
2.5 GIS	62,400	15,600	-	-	9,600	2,400	-	-	-	-	72,000	18,000	90,000
2.6 Gooch V P	11,200	2,800	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11,200	2,800	14,000
2.7 I-95 N. Cor	-	-	400,000	100,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	400,000	100,000	500,000
2.8 Ches GIS	43,669	10,917	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43,669	10,917	54,586
2.9 B & P Plan(1)	-	-	400,000	100,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	400,000	100,000	500,000 (1)
3.1 CMS	42,400	10,600	10,400	2,600	10,400	2,600	-	-	-	-	63,200	15,800	79,000
3.2 Access Mgt	3,200	800	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,200	800	4,000
3.5 GASB 34 (1)	-	-	64,800	16,200	-	-	-	-	-	-	64,800	16,200	81,000 (1)
4.1 TIP	84,000	21,000	18,400	4,600	14,400	3,600	16,000	4,000	-	-	132,800	33,200	166,000
5.2 ED TNS	4,000	1,000	-	-	16,000	4,000	-	-	-	-	20,000	5,000	25,000
5.3 Dwt. Cir.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(2)
5.4 Dwt. Ctr.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(3)
5.5 Reg L-R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	(1)
6.1 Int. Modal	2,400	600	-	-	4,000	1,000	-	-	-	-	6,400	1,600	8,000
7.1 Air Q. Plg.	9,600	2,400	28,000	7,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	37,600	9,400	47,000
TOTAL	814,050	203,512	1,084,800	271,200	132,186	39,714	67,159	16,790	80,000	20,000	2,178,195	544,548	\$ 2,722,743

NOTES:

- (1) Work conducted by VDOT on-call consultant.
- (2) Work conducted by GRTC consultant (UWP information item).
- (3) Work conducted by City of Richmond consultant (UWP information item).