

February 18, 2016

The February meeting of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization (TPO) Policy Board will be held as follows:

DATE:	Thursday, February 25, 2016
TIME:	1:00 p.m.
LOCATION:	Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission office (Top Floor Conference Room), 313 Luck Ave., SW, Roanoke, VA

AGENDA

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions *Chair Johnson*
2. Approval of the January 28, 2016 Minutes, pp. 3-7 *Chair Johnson*
3. RSTP Policies and Procedures Recommendations from the
Transportation Technical Committee, p. 8 *Mark McCaskill*
4. Unified Planning Work Program Candidate Projects *Mark McCaskill*
(Discretionary) Summary, pp. 9-12
5. Long-Range Plan Process Update *Mark McCaskill*
6. Federal Review Overview, pp. 13-16 *Mark McCaskill*
 - Reminder – Public Meeting on March 2, 2016 at Campbell Court (4:30-6:30 PM)
7. Transportation Alternatives (TA) Projects – First Review/Discussion *Bryan Hill*
8. Other Business
9. Comment Period
10. 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

Public Input Policy

“At the end of each Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board meeting, the TPO Policy Board will allow for an open public forum/comment period. This comment period shall not exceed one-half hour in length and each speaker will be asked to sign up and be allowed a maximum of three (3) minutes to speak.”

ADA Compliance

The Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization intends to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and confirms that the office located at 313 Luck Avenue, SW, Roanoke, VA is ADA compliant. If you have a disability and wish to request assistance or a special accommodation, please inform Bryan Hill at 540-343-4417 or bhill@rvarc.org no later than 48 hours in advance of the posted meeting.

MINUTES

The January meeting of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization (RVTPO) Policy Board was held on Thursday, January 28, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. at the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission office, 313 Luck Avenue, SW, Roanoke, VA.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Bill Bestpitch	City of Roanoke
Todd Dodson	Botetourt County
Ray Ferris	City of Roanoke
Billy Martin, Sr.	Botetourt County
Michael Gray (Alt. for Ken King)	Virginia Dept. of Transportation-Salem District
Janet Scheid	Town of Vinton
Diana Lewis (Alt. for Efren Gonzalez)	Roanoke-Blacksburg Regional Airport
Bill Thomasson	Bedford County
Jane Johnson, Chair	City of Salem
Carl Palmer	Greater Roanoke Transit Company (Valley Metro)
Lee Osborne	Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission

1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. A quorum was present. The following guests were in attendance: William Fralin, Member, Commonwealth Transportation Board; and David Holladay, Roanoke County, and Chairman, Transportation Technical Committee.

2. APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 10, 2015 MINUTES

The Minutes of the December 10, 2015 meeting of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization Policy Board were distributed earlier.

Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board Action:

Upon motion by Mr. Martin, seconded by Ms. Lewis and carried, the Minutes of the December 10, 2015 meeting of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization Policy Board were approved, as distributed.

3. OVERVIEW OF UPCOMING FEDERAL REVIEW/COMPLIANCE PROCESS

Mark McCaskill explained that the TPO would be undergoing an upcoming external federal review/compliance process by both the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Highway Administration on March 2-3, 2016. The compliance process will cover all aspects of TPO activities including budget, financials, process and public outreach. Mark announced there would be a public meeting on March 2, 2016 from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. at Campbell Court in downtown Roanoke to receive comments and feedback on the RVTPO planning process.

4. TITLE VI PLAN ADJUSTMENTS BASED ON VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF RAIL AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION (DRPT) FEEDBACK

The Title VI Plan was approved at the December 10, 2015 TPO meeting. Mark McCaskill reported that feedback/adjustments were received from the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) to the plan. Mark further reported that staff addressed DRPT's feedback, and a summary of the proposed plan adjustments were provided to the TPO Policy Board in their agenda packet. Mark updated members at the meeting and stated that DRPT is asking that the TPO Policy Board take action to accept the adjustments to the Title VI Plan.

Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization Policy Board Action:

Upon motion by Mr. Bestpitch, seconded by Mr. Martin and carried, the adjustments to the Title VI Plan were approved, as presented.

5. REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES UPDATE

Mark McCaskill stated staff would be updating the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Policies and Procedures document and asking the Policy Board to consider establishing a more regular schedule for RSTP updates. He reported that since the HB2 process is now established to follow a two-year pattern, TPO staff is suggesting putting in a two-year time line for RSTP cycle. Three options were detailed in the staff report provided in the agenda packet --- Option One which is countercyclical meaning when HB2 is not applied for that would be the year for RSTP, Option Two is cyclical with HB2, and Option Three is leaving things as they are. Mark stated he was looking for guidance from the Board and that staff preferred the countercyclical option.

Ms. Scheid asked why the staff preferred that option. Mr. McCaskill responded it had to do with information. He said projects with HB2 funding in countercyclical situations the applicants would know how they are scored, if they would get funding, and if they need an RSTP application for an additional phase or supplemental funding. He noted it would allow the HB2 process to inform the RSTP process.

Mr. McCaskill stated that RSTP projects currently re-compete if they are not started and HB2 is not anticipated to work that way.

Mr. Fralin said once HB2 was selected it received full funding in the Six-Year Plan. He stated committed money would reduce the denominator and they were being scored both ways (per handout distributed at the meeting).

Ms. Scheid said she was in favor of the two-year schedule but was not ready to decide on cyclical or countercyclical at this time.

Todd Dodson asked what feedback had been received. Mark McCaskill said discussion at the TTC level was leaning toward a countercyclical approach, but that they had not yet made a formal recommendation. He said the document would need to be updated by the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. Dodson said he would like to see the TTC's feedback. Chair Johnson noted that this item would be placed on the agenda for further discussion at the February TPO meeting.

6. FY'17 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP) DEVELOPMENT

Mark McCaskill reported that the goal is for the TPO Policy Board to approve the FY'17 UPWP at their April meeting. The following work elements for possible inclusion in the upcoming UPWP were discussed:

- Cristina Finch reported that there were a number of recommendations in the Bikeway Plan and the Pedestrian Vision Plan that could be included in the UPWP. Mark McCaskill said they would work with the TTC on those recommendations.
- Mark noted that the Greenway Plan was discussed at the TTC level and any updates in the plan would be internal. Lee Osborne stated that the original Greenway Plan involved a consultant and that the TPO had continued some level of support since then. He said the Greenway Commission's Executive Committee was already talking about the update to include Botetourt County. He said they had not talked about bringing in a consultant but had enough support within local governments to do the update. Janet Scheid agreed with Mr. Osborne in that it was a Regional Commission decision and should be managed internally. Wayne Strickland said the TPO had been putting money into the Greenway work element. He said the Commission was interested in the project and the rural part could be handled through the rural transportation program.
- Bryan Hill reported on the regional land use element, noting that the goal was to play on stressing the importance of land use and transportation from VDOT.
- Mark McCaskill said there may be an opportunity to find a workforce and transportation common ground project but no concrete idea has been developed at this time. He said that the corridor studies were discussed at the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) level. He also noted that he asked the TTC if there were things they no longer needed on the general Bicycle Plan that could make way for things in the future. He said that the feedback from the upcoming federal review would likely include reaching out to the low-income

and minority communities more explicitly with regards to bicycle and other non-motorized transportation. Mr. Osborne said most people who use the bus (public transit) have to get to the stop whether it is by walking or riding a bike. He asked how this concern would be addressed. Mr. McCaskill said it may come down to more community outreach and noted that it could be developed internally.

- Mr. Bestpitch said he would be interested in knowing what percentage of bicycle riders in low-income communities are riding bicycles for shopping and getting to work versus recreational use. He said his observation was that lower income riders that rode bicycles for business or work may not have as much time to attend public hearing as recreational riders. Mark McCaskill said they could enlarge the scope of outreach.

7. UPDATES

- Bryan Hill reported on the status of HB2 applications, noting that five of the six applications submitted by the RVTPO have moved forward and have been scored. HB2 scores were released at the CTB meeting on January 19, 2016. The recommended TPO projects were the Roanoke River Greenway from Green Hill Park to Riverside Park (\$4,542,105), and the U.S. 220 Communication Adaptive System project (\$422,500 - from Lowes/Home Depot to second Walmart interchange in Clearbrook). Valley Metro is recommended to receive \$350,811 for Transit Accessibility Improvements on Edgewood Street. Mr. Hill noted that the transit project scored the highest in the Salem District. Hill stated HB2 is designed for smaller cost projects with higher cost benefits. HB2 project applications from TPO localities which were recommended for funding include: the 10th Street reconstruction project (\$12,451,245) and Colonial Avenue improvements (\$2,545,000) in the City of Roanoke; East Main Street US 460 Phase One (\$2,912,984) and the Multimodal improvements along Roanoke Boulevard near the VA (\$884,881), City of Salem; and the Route 419 Widening, Safety and Multimodal Improvements project (\$4,853,432), Lila Drive/Route 115 Safety Improvements (\$1,269,396), and the Route 311/419 Intersection Safety and Congestion improvements (\$1,957,006) in Roanoke County. Hill indicated that \$833 million in High-Priority statewide funds were available; and \$883 million in District Grant funds were available. This was an increase of over \$600 million from original estimates. Hill asserted that because an additional \$36 million was allocated to the Salem District, that one or more of the local projects were able to make the “cut” for recommended projects.
- Hill advised the Board of the upcoming schedule for adopting the Six-Year Improvement Plan (SYIP):
 - February CTB meeting – Review of recommended projects
 - March to April – Board to develop potential revisions to recommended scenario
 - April-May – Public hearings on recommended scenario and potential revisions
 - May CTB meeting – Revised funding scenario developed
 - June CTB meeting – Adoption of Six-Year Program

Hill noted that at the spring SYIP public hearings, local and regional entities have an opportunity to provide comments on the recommended project scenarios, prior to the formal adoption by the CTB in June.

Lee Osborne asked if they were looking for input from localities. William Fralin said the rankings were simply rankings. He referred to the information distributed at the meeting on what would possibly not get funded (based strictly on scores) and how much money localities received.

- Bryan Hill reported on the Transportation Alternatives applications, noting that they were being scored and would be presented at the next TPO meeting.
- Cristina Finch reported that work on the Roanoke Valley Transit Vision Plan is on schedule and the second round of public workshops has been completed. She noted that approximately 3,500 responses have been received and the draft recommendations are available on the Commission's webpage.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:43 p.m.

Submitted by:

Wayne Strickland, Secretary,
Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization

STAFF REPORT

SUBJ: RSTP Recommendations and Feedback from the February TTC Meeting

The TTC further discussed the open RSTP questions at their February meeting and has the following recommendations, feedback and policy questions for the RVTPO:

- **Countercyclical to HB2** – The TTC confirmed that it is formally recommending a two year RSTP application cycle that is countercyclical to the HB2 application cycle.
- **Re-compete or “Like HB2”** – A difference between our current RSTP policy and HB2 is that RSTP projects that haven’t started by the time a new application round starts have to “re-compete” with the new projects for scoring and funding. This is in contrast to HB2 where once funding is awarded it is fully funded. The TTC likes the flexibility of the “re-compete” approach. However, VDOT cautioned that it would be beneficial to combine “full funding” language into a “re-compete” approach. One way this could be accomplished is to drop or de-list any projects that haven’t started when a new application round starts. That way projects aren’t sitting on the books appearing to VDOT to be “partially funded.” ***This is a complex topic and the TTC is looking for feedback and guidance on whether the TPO also favors the “re-compete” approach and your discussion on how to also comply with VDOT’s “fully funded” project philosophy.***
- **Annual Adjustment Review** – The TTC recommends that we include an “Annual Adjustment” procedure where the TPO adjusts funding timing or other details based on any unforeseen delays or other events within particular projects. This would prevent a delayed project from stopping up the system for other projects.
- **Upper Limit of Project Size?** - The TTC was divided on this issue and requests your feedback. The idea is that a very large project (i.e., many years’ equivalent of RSTP funding) that scores well and receives funding could crowd out other projects for many years. This could be problematic if the RVTPO would need to suspend one or more application cycles due to lack of availability of funds. There were opinions on both sides of this issue at the February TTC meeting. Nonetheless a few ideas were discussed:
 - Revamp RSTP scoring to include a Numerator/Denominator like HB2 where the Numerator = Score and the Denominator = RSTP Cost.
 - Establish an upper limit equal to a certain number of RSTP equivalent funding years for an application (i.e. 3 years, 2 years or 1 year).
 - “Trust the System” – The system has worked well so far so trust the system to continue to work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Staff would like guidance on the above from the TPO Policy Board to develop a Draft RSTP Policies and Procedures update document for review at the March TPO meeting.

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

STAFF REPORT
RE: Narrative for Discretionary UPWP Projects

This staff report contains draft narrative for discretionary UPWP candidate projects. The following narrative attempts to incorporate the various ideas, tradeoffs and desired outcomes that were previously discussed. The nomenclature of 2.AA, 2.AB etc. is just a stand-in because we don't know the section numbers of the entire draft work program yet.

Note: Staff has asked VDOT whether several recent work program requests such as the Daleville Greenway Development requested by Botetourt County can be included in the UPWP or whether it needs to be included in the local/regional portion of the RVARC Work Program.

2.AA RVTPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning

Objective and Description: A continued effort to implement recommendations from the Regional Bikeway Plan, the Regional Pedestrian Vision Plan and the Regional Transit Vision plan is the organizing framework underlying Item 2.AA. In addition to this general effort the following specific plans, studies and tasks will be accomplished in the FY17 UPWP.

- **Regional Bicycle and Workforce Commuting Study** – Multimodal access to employment opportunities is a key component of improved transportation options, workforce development, community/economic development and an overall Livable Roanoke Valley. Previous efforts had focused on public transit's role in connecting people with employment opportunities. This study would take an in depth look at the bicycle modes potential in connecting people with employment opportunities in the RVTPO. Specifically this study will identify target populations who use or would potentially use the bicycle mode to primarily access employment opportunities. In addition the study will identify employers who would be willing and interested in increasing the size of their workforce through accessing bicycle commuters. Finally the study will analyze and recommend specific bicycle accommodations, programs, policies and approaches that are designed to facilitate access to employment and workforce development through the bicycle mode of transportation.
- **Engaging New and/or Traditionally Underserved Communities in Bicycle Planning and Outreach – Strategic Plan** – Public involvement in the planning process is often successful in engaging those citizens who have the time, means, interest and opportunity to attend public meetings and otherwise participate in the process. This strategic plan would focus on removing barriers to participation and/or facilitation participation for communities whose members may not have the means or opportunity to attend public meetings or participate through other well established channels. These communities are often identified in other planning efforts as Environmental Justice (EJ) Communities and/or Title VI Communities. This strategic plan would start with EJ and Title VI communities as a launching point and investigate where there are also other new or traditionally underserved communities as well. Finally, a strategic plan will be produced for better engaging these communities specifically with regards to bicycle planning.

- ***Pedestrian Performance Measures Data Collection - Continuing*** - Update shapefiles and related databases of pedestrian infrastructure and where necessary, in the field, gather pedestrian infrastructure data along public streets and bus routes to include sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signals, and ADA curb ramps. Special effort and attention will be made for mapping the above amenities that lie within ¼ mile of a fixed route bus stop.
- ***Regional Pedestrian/Bicycle Advisory Board*** - RVTPO staff will continue to staff the Regional Pedestrian/Bicycle Advisory Committee. In addition, staff will attend meetings and/or serve on the following committees: City of Roanoke BAC, Regional Greenway Commission, Regional Greenway Commission Standards and Design Subcommittee, Joint Greenway Commission-Pathfinders Marketing, PR and Education Subcommittee and other committees as appointed.
- ***General, Mapping and Website Assistance to Local Governments and Greenway Commission*** – MPO Staff assistance, public information materials design, and assistance in other areas as necessary.
- ***Continued Greenway Monitoring and User Counts*** – continue to expand the greenway usage monitoring/estimation system for using during all seasons. Monitoring system will include deployment of additional trail counters and other monitors as available.
- ***National Bicycle and Pedestrian Documentation Project Counts - Continuing*** – RVTPO will partner with local governments to continue bicycle and pedestrian snapshot counts as part of the National Bicycle and Pedestrian Documentation Project.
- ***Grant Assistance for Bicycle and Pedestrian Infrastructure Development*** – Assist local stakeholders in identifying and pursuing state, local, federal and private grants for new bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure.
- ***Tinker Creek Greenway Connectivity Study Assistance Phase II***- The Tinker Creek Greenway Connectivity Study is a multijurisdictional effort to connect the established greenway segments in Roanoke City and in Roanoke County/Botetourt County and to expand the scope of the greenway to the northeast into Botetourt County. Planning analysis with stakeholder and community input is needed to determine the best location for the greenway between the current construction terminus at Orange Avenue in Roanoke City, the existing Hollins University Trailhead north of Interstate 81 in Roanoke County, and the proposed Daleville Greenway in Botetourt County. The proposed schedule will extend over several fiscal years and UPWPs as follows:
 - Phase I - FY 2016 - Phase II Roanoke County (FY 2017) Phase III - Botetourt County (FY 2018)
- ***Town of Vinton Bicycle Accommodations Phase II*** – Any additional analysis of major corridors in the Town of Vinton for bicycle accommodations that was not completed in Phase I. The identified corridors for FY 2016-17: Walnut Avenue, South Pollard Street, Lee Avenue, Gus Nicks Boulevard/Washington Avenue.

2.AB Regional Greenway Plan Update

Objective and Description: The last Regional Greenway Plan was approved in 2007. A lot has changed in the subsequent 10 years necessitating a fresh update of the Regional Greenway

Plan. New funding sources, prioritization and programming methods including HB2 and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding have been established. The core concept and vision of the regional greenway system is now established, the Bike Plan was updated in 2012 and implementation has been growing, and a Pedestrian Plan has been completed. In addition Botetourt County has requested to join the Greenway Commission. This regional greenway plan update will focus on expanding the greenway system into Botetourt County, incorporating the system into the multimodal network, identifying connections with the regional pedestrian, bicycle, and transit networks, enabling connectivity with neighborhoods and multimodal centers, and reviewing implementation strategies. This update will incorporate recent work in the Regional Pedestrian Vision Plan, the Bike Plan, and the FY16 Transit Vision Plan.

2.AC Regional Land Use and Transportation

Objective and Description: The A project that would coordinate local government efforts around transportation and land-use by: utilizing the existing Multimodal Centers and Districts Framework; analyzing local zoning and land use compatibility with regional multimodal transportation; conducting visual preference surveys to solicit preferences of the existing built environment; instilling and fostering principles of Smart Growth (e.g. compact building design, mixed-use and transit oriented development); and utilizing the VDOT Transportation Efficient Land Use and Design guide. Products of this effort may include model comprehensive plan/zoning ordinance language, overlay districts, urban design guidelines, area specific pattern books, and other products that could be used by localities in their own planning efforts.

2.AD Corridor Studies, Area Studies and Safety Planning

Objective and Description: Corridor and area studies can uncover projected ideas that feed the CLRMTP. Likewise, the CLRMTP can suggest corridors that warrant pre-NEPA corridor studies to help move the project to next stage. The following corridors and areas were suggested by local governments and other stakeholders in the FY2017 work program development process. Analysis of each corridor or area may include but is not limited to: access management, operations evaluation, transit/bicycle/pedestrian connections, parking availability/accessibility/issues, current and future land use, existing activity density, and adjacent land zoning.

- **Route 419 Phase II**– The purpose is to continue the study initiated in FY16 on Route 419 from Route 220 to Route 221.
- **Brambleton Avenue Corridor Study Phase II** – The purpose is to continue the study initiated in FY16 on Brambleton Avenue.
- **Botetourt County Transportation Section of Comprehensive Plan Phase III** – Assistance to Botetourt County staff in the preparation of a transportation section of their comprehensive plan update. This UPWP portion will focus on the portion of the county that is within the RVTPO Study Area. A companion element for the rural portion of Botetourt County is in the FY2017 RVARC Rural Transportation Program Scope of Work. Work tasks are anticipated to include but not be limited to:
- **Exit 150 Small Area Study - Phase II** – The purpose is to prepare a comprehensive plan amendment that ties transportation, land-use and economic development together in the area around Exit 150 and the Southern Portion (i.e. RVTPO Study Area) of the County.

- **Regional Multimodal Corridors Identification** – This is a continuation of work started in the FY15 Work Program that defined multimodal districts and centers. The idea is to define to the regional multimodal corridors where infrastructure supporting public transportation, walking, and biking exists or is desired. This will allow us to suggest the multimodal corridors for inclusion in VTRANS updates and help us identify potential HB2 projects.
- **City of Roanoke – Comprehensive Community Profile and Downtown Demographic Study Related to Transportation Planning Phase II:**
 - Provide a comprehensive profile of the City of Roanoke in preparation for development of a new comprehensive plan. The profile should provide demographic, housing, transportation, environmental, and economic data.
 - Provide interpretation and analysis of data, and further inquiry as necessary to guide policy formulation.
 - Suggest potential policy responses as appropriate.
 - The report should draw from many data sources and may synthesize data from the many existing studies already developed by RVARC.
 - Provide data at neighborhood level, as available (example at <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/oni/56897>).
 - Provide comparative data for Roanoke MSA, Virginia First Cities, Virginia, and United States.
 - Provide comparative data over time to identify trends.
 - Develop projections on selected data as appropriate.
- **Intersection or corridor analysis as requested.**
- **General HB2 or UDA assistance as requested by local governments.**

Particular attention to safety planning will be present in the corridor planning process. This may include but is not limited to: accident analysis, pedestrian safety, bicycle safety, driver behavior analysis and education.

STAFF REPORT
SUB: Federal Certification Review Process

For Your Information. **Please note that Board members are NOT required or expected to attend the vast majority of these meetings.** For the most part, this review will focus on staff and the process we employ. However, please plan to attend and invite others to the Public Meeting on March 2, 2016 from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. at Campbell Court in downtown Roanoke. It is very important that we have a good turnout.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

U.S. DOT Certification Review of the
Roanoke Metropolitan Area
Transportation Planning Process
March 2-3, 2016

Location: Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization
Top Floor Conference Room
313 Luck Avenue, SW
Roanoke, VA 24016
(540) 343-4417

March 2--Citizen/Public Meeting, 4:30 PM – 6:30 PM

The Federal review team will provide an opportunity for public involvement. The public, key TPO committee members and special interest groups are invited to share their views on the transportation decision-making process being conducted in the metropolitan area. The Federal team shall consider the public input received in arriving at a decision on a certification action.

March 2-3 Certification Review

Each topic is introduced by the Federal team discussion leader, followed by an overview and update by TPO staff (and other state and/or local agencies identified by the Federal team). The Federal team will then lead a discussion involving all participating agencies.

Participants:

Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization
Transportation Technical Committee (as appropriate)
Citizens Advisory Committee (as appropriate)
Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)
Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VDRPT)
Greater Roanoke Transit Company (GRTC)
TPO Cities and Counties Reps (as appropriate)

Federal Review Team:

Ryan Long, Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Region 3
Kevin Jones, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Virginia Division
Cheng Yan, FHWA Virginia Division
Mohamed Dumbuya, FHWA Virginia Division
Jeremy Raw, FHWA HQ
Jill Stark, FHWA HQ

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

DAY 1 – Wednesday, March 2

8:45 AM Assemble

9:00 AM Introductions and Overview of the Certification Review
This opening session will provide a brief overview of the Certification Review and highlights topics to be covered.

Federal Discussion Leader: Ryan Long (FTA)

9:15 AM Overview of the Transportation Planning Organization (including Planning Area Boundary, Committee Structure, Agreements/Contracts, and Self-Certification)
Discussion on official cooperative agreements or MOUs toward carrying out a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive (3C) metropolitan planning process.

Federal Discussion Leader: Kevin Jones (FHWA)

10:00 AM Transportation Planning Process, Planning Factors, Coordination and Consistency
Discussion to include Federal planning factors, as well as coordination and consistency with related planning processes. TPO staff is encouraged to provide update of major regional issues and subarea planning studies.

Federal Discussion Leader: Jill Stark (FHWA)

10:45 AM BREAK

11:00 AM Public Outreach
Discussion to include the TPO's overall public involvement process and adopted public participation plan.

Federal Discussion Leader: Ryan Long (FTA)

12:00 PM LUNCH

1:00 PM Congestion Management Process, ITS and TDM
Discussion to include requirements for Congestion Management Systems (recurring and non-recurring congestion) and travel demand modeling issues.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

Federal Discussion Leader: Jeremy Raw (FHWA)

1:45 PM Long Range Transportation Plan, Project Selection
Discussion on the development of the LRTP and the long-term transportation investment, service and policy process for the region.

Federal Discussion Leader: Kevin Jones (FHWA)

2:30 PM BREAK

2:45 PM Transportation Improvement Program, Project Selection
Discussion on the development of the short-term programming document as it translates the policies and strategies of the LRTP, as well as prioritizes transportation investments.

Federal Discussion Leader: Ryan Long (FTA)

3:30 PM Closing Remarks/Adjourn

4:30-6:30 PM Public Meeting - The Federal review team along with appropriate regional and local representatives will meet with the public to discuss and provide information on the transportation planning process. Location - Campbell's Court (Valley Metro Transit) located at 31 Campbell Avenue, SW (2nd Floor) Roanoke, VA 24013.

DAY 2 - Thursday, March 3, 2016

8:45 AM Assemble

9:00 AM Recap of First Day

9:15 AM Unified Planning Work Program Development
Discussion to include development of the UPWP and current planning priorities facing the metropolitan planning area.

Federal Discussion Leader: Cheng Yan (FHWA)

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

10:00 AM Consultation and Coordination, Transit Planning
Discussion to include the TPO's process that outlines roles, responsibilities and key points for consulting with other agencies (outside of PPP), as well as transit planning and coordination efforts.

Federal Discussion Leader: Ryan Long (FTA)

10:45 AM Freight Planning and Goods Movement / Transportation Management and Operations
Discussion to include overall Freight Planning and Transportation Management and Operations.

Federal Discussion Leader: Jeremy Raw (FHWA)

11:30 AM LUNCH

12:30 PM Title VI, DBE, EJ and Americans with Disabilities Act
Discussion to include required elements of Title VI, LEP, Americans with Disabilities Act and DBE.

Federal Discussion Leader: Mohamed Dumbuya (FHWA)

1:15 PM Financial Planning, Financial Constraint, Annual Listing Projects
This session will focus on the funding in the Long Range Plan, TIP and planning process activities leading to identification of funding sources.

Federal Discussion Leader: Kevin Jones (FHWA)

1:45 PM BREAK

2:00 PM Legislative Updates

Federal Discussion Leader: Jill Stark (FHWA)

2:30 PM Federal Team Huddle and MPO Briefing

3:30 PM Concluding Remarks/Adjourn
Federal Discussion Leader: Ryan Long (FTA)