

Roanoke Valley Transportation PLANNING ORGANIZATION



313 Luck Avenue, SW
Roanoke, Virginia 24016
P: 540.343.4417 / F: 540.343.4416
rvtpo.org

January 7, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Transportation Technical Committee
FROM: Mark McCaskill, AICP, Director of TPO Programs
SUBJ: January 14, 2016 TTC Meeting/Agenda

The Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) will meet Thursday, January 14, 2016 at 1:30 pm at the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission office (Upstairs Conference Room), 313 Luck Avenue, SW in Roanoke, VA.

AGENDA

1. Welcome, Call to Order and Introductions *Chairman Holladay*
2. Approval of the September 10, 2015 TTC Minutes, pp. 2-6 *Chairman Holladay*
3. FY 2017 Work Program Discussion, pp. 7-8 *Mark McCaskill*
4. RSTP Policies and Procedures Update-First Discussion, pp. 9-10 *Mark McCaskill*
5. Pedestrian Performance Measures Update *Shane Sawyer*
6. Other Business/Updates, pp. 11-12
 - Transit Vision Plan Public Meetings *Cristina Finch*
 - HB2 Scores (*to be released January 15*) *Bryan Hill*
 - Update on TA Projects *Bryan Hill*
7. Comments by Members and/or Citizens
8. Adjournment

TPO POLICY BOARD: Cities of Roanoke and Salem; Counties of Bedford, Botetourt, Montgomery and Roanoke; Town of Vinton; Greater Roanoke Transit Company (*Valley Metro*); Roanoke-Blacksburg Regional Airport; Virginia Department of Rail & Public Transportation; Virginia Department of Transportation

MINUTES

Transportation Technical Committee Meeting September 10, 2015

The September meeting of the Transportation Technical Committee was held on Thursday, September 10, 2015 at 1:30 p.m. at the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission office, 313 Luck Avenue, SW, Roanoke, VA. Attendance follows:

Member

Liz Belcher
 Chris Chittum
 Michael Gray
 David Holladay
 Mark Jamison
 Amanda McGee
 Cody Sexton
 Karla Turman
 Gary Woodson

Representing

Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission
 City of Roanoke
 Virginia Department of Transportation – Salem District
 Roanoke County
 City of Roanoke
 Botetourt County
 Botetourt County
 Town of Vinton
 Town of Vinton

Staff Present: Cristina Finch, Tyler Godsey, Bryan Hill, Mark McCaskill, Shane Sawyer, and Eddie Wells

1. CALL TO ORDER, WELCOME & GUESTS IN ATTENDANCE

Chairman Holladay called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. and noted that a quorum was present. New TTC members in attendance – Amanda McGee, Botetourt County (replaced Jeff Busby) and Karla Turman, Town of Vinton (replaced Ryan Spitzer). Guests in attendance: Rachel Lucas and Lee Freisland, Channel 10.

2. APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 13, 2015 TTC MINUTES

The Minutes of the August 13, 2015 Transportation Technical Committee meeting were distributed earlier. Liz Belcher asked that text on page 4 be changed... “Following **that** meeting, a Survey Monkey link would be distributed to TTC members to prioritize projects in order from one to five (1-5).” **Change to read...** Following **the August** meeting, a Survey Monkey link would be distributed to TTC members to prioritize projects in order from one to five (1-5).”

TPO POLICY BOARD: Cities of Roanoke and Salem; Counties of Bedford, Botetourt, Montgomery and Roanoke; Town of Vinton; Greater Roanoke Transit Company (*Valley Metro*); Roanoke-Blacksburg Regional Airport; Virginia Department of Rail & Public Transportation; Virginia Department of Transportation

Transportation Technical Committee Action:

Upon motion by Liz Belcher, duly seconded and carried, the Minutes of the August 13, 2015 Transportation Technical Committee meeting were approved, as amended.

3. APPROVAL OF THE 2015 PERFORMANCE MEASURES REPORT

Bryan Hill presented the 2015 Performance Measures Report. This report is generated as part of a statewide effort among Transportation Management Area-Metropolitan Planning Organizations (TMA-MPOs) to track common performance measures to evaluate the region's transportation system against its transportation goals and standards and contribute to the Statewide Transportation Plan. As a TMA-MPO, the Roanoke Valley TPO is required by the State to track regional performance measures. The Roanoke Valley TPO will be eligible for funding through sources only available to TMA-MPOs and receipt of those funds is contingent upon the MPO's development, and the Commonwealth Transportation Board's approval, of the regional performance measures. Regional performance measures fall under the following categories: Congestion Reduction, Safety, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Usage, Transit Usage, HOV Usage, Jobs-to-Housing Ratio, Job and Housing Access to Pedestrian Facilities, Air Quality, and Movement of Freight.

Transportation Technical Committee Action:

Cody Sexton moved that the 2015 Performance Measures Report be forwarded to the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board for their review and adoption. The motion was seconded by Amanda McGee and carried.

4. ANNOUNCEMENT OF UPCOMING "TRY TRANSIT WEEK", SEPTEMBER 21-25

Mr. Godsey reported that in 2014 over 2,300 flyers were printed and distributed to downtown residents/apartment buildings, the Roanoke CoOp, and various downtown businesses. In 2015, RIDE Solutions expanded the campaign by partnering with Park Roanoke and additional downtown property managers to increase distribution. The purpose of *Try Transit* is to raise awareness and generate new ridership on Valley Metro's transit system.

5. HOUSE BILL 2 PROJECT APPLICATION PROCESS UPDATE

Mark McCaskill stated that the goal of the September TTC meeting is to rank the House Bill 2 applications that the TTC would recommend to the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board for consideration at their September 24, 2015 meeting. At the August TTC meeting, five (5) candidate projects had been brought forward by members for a potential recommendation. Following the August TTC meeting, members and staff voted, by way of an online survey on www.surveymonkey.com. After that initial voting and prior to the September TTC meeting, staff held discussions with VDOT, City of Roanoke and Roanoke County planning staff and reported receiving a sixth project request ---

Locality: Roanoke City/Roanoke County

Project Name: U.S. 220 Signal Improvements

Description: Install traffic cameras and signal timing devices at five interchanges from Route 419 South to Clearbrook Village Lane

HB2 Project Type: Corridor of Statewide Significance

Cost Estimate: \$1 million (VDOT revised this estimate to \$422,500)

At the September meeting, TTC members were provided a slip of paper with the sixth project and asked to assign a priority ranking (1 to 6, with 1 the highest and 6 the lowest priority). During the meeting, the voting results from all six projects were collected and entered into a spreadsheet to arrive at a recommendation to the TPO Policy Board. The online survey previously mentioned was sent to members of the TTC, Citizens Advisory Committee and Regional Commission staff. Bryan Hill stated that the results of the online survey would be shown after TTC members concluded voting on the sixth project. Mark McCaskill asked that the TTC keep in mind the numbers are advisory, not binding. Not all members of the TTC, CAC or staff participated in the online survey. Based on TTC and staff responses (which were identical), and adjusting for some votes only ranking five projects, Bryan Hill reported the current priority order as follows:

PRIORITY #1

Locality: Roanoke County

Project Name: I-81 Capacity Project A

PRIORITY #2

Locality: Roanoke County

Project Name: I-81 Capacity Project (full)

PRIORITY #3

Locality: Roanoke County and Roanoke City

Project Name: U.S. 220 Signal Improvements

PRIORITY #4

Locality: Roanoke County/City of Salem/Botetourt County

Project Name: Lighting at I-81 Exit 137 to Exit 150

PRIORITY #5

Locality: Roanoke County

Project Name: Roanoke River Greenway, Green Hill Park to Riverside Park

PRIORITY #6

Locality: Botetourt County

Project Name: I-81 Capacity Project

Cody Sexton asked VDOT if the lighting project had an updated cost estimate. Michael Gray stated that the final estimate will include all six interchanges, but currently only one estimate has been developed -- Exit 143. Mark McCaskill reported that staff is researching available examples and case studies of interchange lighting in other States, in order to fill out some of the benefits and scoring criteria oriented questions.

Michael Gray suggested that the TTC's scores from today's meeting serve as the basis of their recommendations to the TPO Policy Board. Michael Gray asked that the scores of the Citizens Advisory Committee and Regional Commission staff also be provided to the TPO Policy Board for informational purposes.

Mark Jamison stated that the TTC needs to be cognizant of the amount of money being requested in project requests to the TPO. With the exception of the Roanoke River Greenway project, there are

five (5) Corridor of Statewide Significance projects. Under the new High Priority Projects Program, developed this year by the General Assembly (Code of Virginia § 33.2-370), there is \$500 million available statewide over the next six years. Mr. Jamison said there is a benefit to include smaller, lower cost projects (\$1 or \$3 million) that can be completed in a timely manner, with the ability of scoring high. He added that this strategy should be considered because there is no way of determining how many projects statewide will be submitted.

Liz Belcher asked if the full I-81 widening project (priority #1) would be funded by the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB), would there any longer be a need for the I-81 auxiliary lane project (priority #2). Michael Gray and staff agreed. Michael Gray said that discussion would occur at the CTB level to resolve situations in which two versions of a project had been awarded funds. Staff stated that other regions of the State were likely to pursue a similar strategy of asking for both a “full” expensive project and then a scaled down first step version of the same or a similar project.

Chairman Holladay stated that another thing to consider with the two I-81 projects is that this process is a communication tool from local governments and the TPO Policy Board of the strong desire for full widening of I-81--whether it scores well or not.

TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ACTION:

Mark Jamison moved to forward the priority order recommended by the TTC for HB2 projects (as outlined below) to the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board for their consideration and approval at the September 24, 2015 Policy Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Cody Sexton and carried unanimously.

PRIORITY #1

Locality: Roanoke County
Project Name: I-81 Capacity Project A

PRIORITY #2

Locality: Roanoke County
Project Name: I-81 Capacity Project (full)

PRIORITY #3

Locality: Roanoke County and Roanoke City
Project Name: U.S. 220 Signal Improvements

PRIORITY #4

Locality: Roanoke County/City of Salem/Botetourt County
Project Name: Lighting at I-81 Exit 137 to Exit 150

PRIORITY #5

Locality: Roanoke County
Project Name: Roanoke River Greenway, Green Hill Park to Riverside Park

PRIORITY #6

Locality: Botetourt County
Project Name: I-81 Capacity Project

6. **OTHER BUSINESS**

- Mark McCaskill stated that VDOT has been urging public involvement/awareness in the HB2 process. Bryan Hill has been coordinating with the Roanoke Regional Chamber of Commerce to hold a joint open house to receive public comments on Thursday, September 17, 2015 from 8:30 to 10:30 a.m. at the Roanoke Regional Chamber office in downtown Roanoke.
- Bryan Hill noted that transit agencies are another eligible entity that can apply for HB2 projects. As such, Valley Metro intends to apply for the following two projects:
 - (1) Transit Accessibility Improvements on Edgewood Street in Roanoke City, and
 - (2) New Commuter Transit Service on Orange Avenue/U.S. 460 (from downtown Roanoke to EastPark Commerce Center in Botetourt County).

Valley Metro will seek project endorsement by the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board as required by HB2. Michael Gray asked if it was understood that transit agencies are only eligible for the statewide high priority funds, adding that unless the project is applied for by the City of Roanoke they are not eligible for the Highway Construction District Grant Program (Code of Virginia § 33.2-371). Cristina Finch stated that she was made aware that transit agencies are eligible to apply for both statewide and district-wide funding. Mr. Gray stated that he would research the matter and get back with Ms. Finch.

- VDOT's Office of Intermodal Planning & Investment (OIPI) will hold a webinar on VTRANS Multimodal Transportation Plan on September 17, 2015 from 1:00-3:00 p.m. on the "*Needs of Assessment and HB2 Linkages*".

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Submitted by Jackie L. Pace
Recording Secretary

Staff Report

RE: UPWP Development

This meeting we are hoping to finalize a list of candidate projects for UPWP consideration. We will endeavor to have some basic UPWP narrative completed by the February TTC meeting. The goal for the March TTC meeting is to provide you with a near-complete UPWP Draft that may still be missing budget information. Finally the goal for the April meeting is to recommend the UPWP to the TPO for approval at their April Meeting. That said the following is a list of candidate projects that we are aware of at the staff level. The list is divided into “Have to” and “Discretionary” project ideas. The “Have to” items are what is expected of us as a TMA MPO by Federal and State stakeholders. Typically the “Have to” items consume between 60% to 75% of the UPWP budget and staff effort depending on year, conditions and opportunities.

“Have to:”

- General administration and operations of the 3-C (Comprehensive, Cooperative and Continuous) transportation planning process.
- UPWP Development for FY 18.
- Long-range transportation planning process (plan)
- Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Process
- Performance Measures Tracking and Reporting Process
- Management of RSTP and TA project selection and funding processes
- Public Participation, Title VI and Environmental Justice integration into planning processes
- Air Quality Planning (i.e. maintaining our attainment status)
- Public Transportation Planning Assistance (5303 funding source of the UPWP) – (i.e. Transit Vision Planning Process, assistance with Transit Development Plans etc.)
- Congestion Management Process (CMP)
- HB2 related planning and local government assistance (state process).

Discretionary:

- ***Continued efforts to implement recommendations from the Bikeway Plan and the Pedestrian Vision Plan.***
- ***2007 Conceptual Greenway Plan Update (suggested by Liz Belcher)*** – our role lead? Assistance? Role of Regional Commission and Rural Transportation Work Programs?
- ***Regional Land Use and Transportation (suggested by staff)*** – A project that would coordinate local government efforts around transportation and land-use possibly by expanding upon the existing Multimodal Centers and Districts Framework, reviewing local zoning and land use compatibility with regional multimodal transportation, and utilizing the VDOT Transportation Efficient Land Use and Design guide.
- ***Workforce and Transportation (suggested by staff)*** – An opportunity to work with the Workforce Investment Board?

- **Regional Multimodal Corridors Identification (suggested by staff)** – Continuation of work started in the FY15 Work Program and working off the regional modal plans to define the regional corridors where infrastructure supporting public transportation, walking, and biking exists or is desired.
- **Corridor and Area Studies (current work program)** – Studies on the current FY16 UPWP include: 419, Brambleton Avenue, Downtown Salem Parking Analysis, Botetourt Comprehensive Plan Assistance, Exit 150 Small Area Study. Any of these projects need to live on as a phase II? Any new ideas?
- **General Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning (current work program)** – can we drop anything (i.e website assistance, committee assistance etc) we are currently doing.
- **RIDE Solutions Bicycle Coordinator Position – suggested by City of Roanoke and RIDE Solutions staff (only partially funded through UPWP, most of the funding will be RIDE Solutions, City of Roanoke etc.)** - The RIDE Solutions Bicycle Coordinator position, in addition to taking marketing, promotion, and outreach activities to support growing the mode share of bicycle trips in the region, will support specific bicycle-related planning services to the Commission and the MPO. In this area, the Bicycle Coordinator may support or lead projects involving fieldwork, routing, wayfinding, infrastructure improvement, and similar areas of interest.
- **General Technical Assistance (current work program)**

Staff Report

RE: RSTP Project Development and Selection Procedures Update

It is time to update the RSTP Project Development and Selection Procedures document in anticipation of future rounds of RSTP applications. This update will produce the third version of the Selection Procedures. The original was approved on 03-28-2013 and an update was approved on 06-26-2014. This will be a multi meeting discussion with the goal of developing an update by this summer. The purpose of the January meeting is to get the ball rolling on a robust discussion, so that staff can develop a draft document for your review at future meetings.

Staff anticipates that the central question in the RSTP discussion will be RSTP's role with regards to HB2. To the best of our knowledge we anticipate that the next round of HB2 will begin on August 1, 2016 with subsequent rounds on a biennial schedule beginning August 1, 2018, August 1, 2020, and so forth. With this in mind there are at least three potential RSTP strategies to consider and discuss:

- **Countercyclical** – In this strategy we would recommend to the RVTPO Policy Board, through the RSTP Project Development and Selection Procedures update, that RSTP applications be received on a fixed biennial basis that runs countercyclical to HB2. That would mean that RSTP applications would be accepted in August/September of 2017, 2019, 2021 etc. This strategy would abandon the current practice of RSTP applications being called at the RVTPO's discretion in response to external conditions in favor of the fixed biennial schedule that would give more predictability to applicants. It also has the advantage of positioning RSTP as a way to complement, supplement or replace any funds that did or did not get awarded in previous cycles.
- **Cyclical** – This strategy would resemble the previous strategy in recommending a fixed biennial schedule. The only difference is that RSTP would run simultaneous with the HB2 application cycle so that applications would be accepted August/September 2016, 2018, 2020 etc. One advantage of this strategy is that applicants can prepare the information for both HB2 and RSTP simultaneously. Additionally, with the simultaneous application cycle, and provided the TPO's RSTP selection occurs following HB2 scoring announcements (roughly January of the following year), additional funds could potentially be available to other RSTP applicant projects which either did not apply for or did not score well in the HB2 process. Since the applications would be simultaneous they would essentially proceed independently. Similar to the countercyclical strategy, fully funded HB2 project applications can provide an opportunity to other projects seeking RSTP funding.
- **Other/No Material Change** - Of course one option would be to leave things as they are and have the RVTPO decide when to call for a new round of RSTP applications purely at their discretion without a fixed schedule. The advantage of this strategy is that the RVTPO could be completely responsive to changing opportunities or conditions.

We can also discuss other aspects of the RSTP Project Development and Selection Procedures and change other provisions and items that may not be related to any of the aforementioned strategies.

Continued on next page

This document becomes the “rules of the game” for future RSTP applications. If you have something to discuss about RSTP this process and the next series of meetings are your best opportunity. The current RSTP Selection Procedures can be found here: <http://rvarc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/RVAMPO-RSTP-Project-Selection-Procedures-Updated-06-26-2014.pdf>

Staff recommendation: At this point of the discussion, RVTPO staff members favor the countercyclical approach.

Staff Report

RE: Other Business

HB2 Update

On Friday, January 15th, HB2 project scores from the 287 statewide screened-in and scored applications statewide, will be publicly released on the HB2 website at <http://www.virginiahb2.org/projects/default.asp>. There will be a standard scorecard for each project, breaking down an application’s score based on the measures defined by the HB2 process and the project cost. Further information and details will follow from VDOT and DRPT on future consultation with those localities/entities whose projects were not awarded in this round.

TA Process Update

To date, TA scores have not been released by VDOT. We will inform the TTC when the TA scores are available, with a review and discussion of the candidate projects at the February TTC meeting, and a recommendation to follow for the February TPO meeting.

The following are some statewide and districtwide totals for TA applications.

FY17 TAP REQUESTS

DISTRICT	TOTAL LOCALITY REQUEST AMOUNT	NO. PROJECTS REQUESTED
BRISTOL	\$6,146,732	13
FREDERICKSBURG	\$958,915	3
CULPEPER	\$1,794,869	4
HAMPTON ROADS	\$9,078,910	17
LYNCHBURG	\$2,886,250	9
NORTHERN VIRGINIA	\$8,263,716	16
RICHMOND	\$5,381,618	16
SALEM	\$4,061,401	12
STAUNTON	\$2,737,423	8
TOTAL	\$41,309,834	98

Continued on next page

MPO	TOTAL REQUEST AMOUNT	NO. PROJECTS REQUESTED
Hampton Roads	\$8,489,762	14
NOVA	\$8,263,716	16
NOVA - Stafford	\$492,785	1
Richmond	\$3,217,772	8
Richmond - TriCities	\$628,000	4
Roanoke	\$1,493,019	4
TOTAL	\$22,585,054	47

[Type text]