

April 21, 2016

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

<b>DATE:</b>	<b>Thursday, April 28, 2016</b>
<b>TIME:</b>	<b>1:00 p.m.</b>
<b>LOCATION:</b>	<b>Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission office (Top Floor Conference Room), 313 Luck Ave., SW, Roanoke, VA</b>

**REMINDER: An Orientation for TPO Board members will be held at 11:45 a.m. (prior to the scheduled TPO Policy Board Meeting). Lunch will be provided.**

## AGENDA

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions ..... *Chair Johnson*
2. Approval of the March 24, 2016 Minutes, pp. 3-8 ..... *Chair Johnson*
3. Presentation on the Bedford Rail Study ..... *The Honorable Bob Camicia  
Franklin County Board of Supervisors*
4. Adoption of Supporting Resolution to Award Additional STP Block Grant Set-Aside (formerly Transportation Alternatives Program) FY'17 Preliminary Allocation of \$35,001, pp. 9-12 ..... *Bryan Hill*
5. Action on the Final Draft of the RSTP Project Development and Selection Procedures Guide, p. 13 and Attachment #1 ..... *Mark McCaskill*
6. Adoption of Supporting Resolution Approving the FY'17 Unified Planning Work Program, p. 14 and Attachment #2 ..... *Mark McCaskill*

**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

7. Adoption on Supporting Resolution Recommending that the ..... *Mark McCaskill*  
Va. Dept. of Rail and Transportation Support “Roll On-Roll Off” Accommodations  
for Bicycles on Passenger Rail Service to Roanoke, Virginia, pp. 15-16
8. Other Business
9. Comment Period
10. Adjournment

**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](mailto:bhill@rvarc.org) no later than 48 hours in advance of the posted meeting.

## MINUTES

The March meeting of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization (RVTPO) Policy Board was held on Thursday, March 24, 2016 at 1:00 p.m. at the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission office, 313 Luck Avenue, SW, Roanoke, VA.

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Doug Adams	Town of Vinton
George Assaid	Roanoke County
Bill Bestpitch	City of Roanoke
Ray Ferris, <i>Vice Chair</i>	City of Roanoke
Billy Martin, Sr.	Botetourt County
Michael Gray ( <i>Alt. for Ken King</i> )	Virginia Dept. of Transportation-Salem District
Jane Johnson, <i>Chair</i>	City of Salem
Janet Scheid	Town of Vinton
Lee Osborne	Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission

### 1. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, INTRODUCTIONS

Vice Chair Ferris called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. A quorum was present.

The following guests were in attendance: David Holladay, Roanoke County member, and Chairman, Transportation Technical Committee; Mark Jamison, Roanoke City member, Transportation Technical Committee; Anita McMillan, Town of Vinton member, Transportation Technical Committee; Court Rosen, Commonwealth Transportation Board Member - At-Large Rural; Elaine Thurman, VDOT; and Ben Tripp, City of Salem member, Transportation Technical Committee.

### 2. APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 24, 2016 MINUTES

The Minutes of the February 24, 2016 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 Mr. Adams and carried, the Minutes of the February 24, 2016 meeting of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization Policy Board were approved, as distributed.

**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

3. **CHAIR'S REPORT**

Chair Johnson presented her report on the TPO's Federal Review Process held March 2-3, 2016. Chair Johnson stated that the verbal feedback received on the federal review of the TPO's compliance process conducted by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration was good for a TMA-TPO our size. A written report is expected within a month which will outline any recommendations they have to improve the processes of the TPO. Chair Johnson thanked the TPO staff for their professional manner in responding to the federal team's inquiries during the two-day process.

4. **APPROVAL OF THE ANNUAL OBLIGATIONS REPORT**

Bryan Hill reported on the Annual Listing of Transportation Project Obligations for Federal Fiscal Year 2015 which includes all projects and strategies listed in the Transportation Improvement Program for which federal funds were obligated during the preceding program year. An obligation is the federal government's legal commitment to pay the federal share of a project's cost. An obligated project is one that has been authorized by the federal agency (FHWA, FTA, etc.) and for which funds have been committed. Projects for which funds have been obligated are not necessarily initiated or completed during the fiscal year, and the amount of the obligation will not necessarily equal the total cost of the project. Obligations occur when: (1) Federal Transit Administration – the FTA grant is awarded, and (2) Federal Highway Administration – the project agreement is executed and VDOT/Grantee requests that the funds be obligated. Mr. Hill stated that the staff is recommending that the report be forwarded to VDOT, as presented.

**Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board Action:**

Mr. Bestpitch moved that the Annual Listing of Transportation Project Obligations for Federal Fiscal Year 2015 be forwarded to VDOT, as presented. The motion was seconded by Mr. Adams and carried.

5. **FIRST DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP) POLICY AND PROCEDURES GUIDE**

The first draft of the Regional Surface Transportation Program Project Development and Selection Procedures Guide was presented for discussion. Mark McCaskill reported on the yellow highlighted text changes in the draft guide and asked for comments.

- Page 5, last paragraph on page under title "Large Projects" –TPO members agreed that only the first sentence be used and to delete the rest of the paragraph. Change to read...The RVTPO Policy Board strongly advises that no RSTP application represent more than two years of RSTP funding.
- Page 6, #1 - Change to read...The RVTPO Policy Board will initiate an initial RSTP candidate project list and rating. Thereafter, the project list will be reviewed annually by the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) in an Annual Adjustment Review process. The TTC will recommend minor adjustments and financial plan changes to existing projects. Every practical effort will be made to adhere to the most recent RSTP ranking (i.e., scoring) in making financial

adjustments in the Annual Adjustment Review. Also, the RVTPO's commitment to fully funding RSTP projects and/or project phases will be considered during the annual adjustments. The RVTPO Policy Board will have final decision making authority on all annual adjustments.

- Page 7, #15 – Change to read...The RSTP candidate project list and rating will follow a two-year cycle that is countercyclical to VDOT's HB2 process. This means that there will be a call for applications starting in June on the following calendar years: 2017, 2019, 2021, 2023, 2025, 2027.....etc.
- Page 7, #16 – Change to read...Pursuant to the two-year RSTP application cycle outlined in item #15, the first two years of any RSTP Six-Year Funding Plan will be considered "previously funded" and committed in the next application cycle. RSTP projects in the following four years will have to re-compete with the new candidate projects in the application and scoring process.

Discussion ensued. Lee Osborne stated he was still unclear about the wording of #16, noting that he reads it to say that the first two years of any project that is in that six-year plan will be considered previously funded in the next cycle. He asked if it was correct to say that even though those next years don't start until years five or six, which in the next cycle will be years three and four, they would still be considered previously funded.

Mark McCaskill responded that from the discussion at the February TPO meeting, in the six-year funding plan those first two years of funding from a policy perspective would be considered previously funded.

Michael Gray noted it is the first two years of an approved six-year plan, which would be years One and Two.

Lee Osborne asked if the TPO was saying that any project approved to be funded in the first two years of any RSTP Six-Year Funding Plan would be considered previously funded in the next cycle.

Mark McCaskill said where the TPO Policy Board ended their discussion at the February meeting it was the first two years. He further stated what we are discussing is the difference between cash flows and what a project is asking for. Mr. McCaskill asked if it is the will of the TPO Policy Board to only guarantee the first two years of cash flows or if it is the will of the Policy Board to guarantee funding for any project that starts within those first two years of the approved Funding Plan, regardless of how far their cash may extend beyond it? The central question – is it the will of the Policy Board to guarantee just the two years or to guarantee anything that starts within the two years?

Lee Osborne stated it was his understanding that the TPO talked about anything that started within that cycle, after it was approved, would be considered previously funded when it came up again regardless of how far into the future the funding was scheduled and that the TPO Board was going to limit or address the issue of large

projects by putting a cap on the total amount that could be included in a project for approval.

Mike Gray stated that the only way for a project to start in those first two years is if it has money committed in those first two years.

It was the consensus of the Policy Board to ask Mark McCaskill to use the concept of the language articulated by both Mr. Osborne and Mr. Gray to update the draft guide for review and comment by the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) at their April 14 meeting. Mr. Gray stated that a PowerPoint example would also be developed showing how things work with the Six-Year Plan.

- Lee Osborne asked about “Transfer of Unused Funds”, pp. 2-3, noting that it seemed like the issue of “unused funds” would be left with project sponsor(s) versus brought back to the TPO Policy Board so they can decide what to do with unused funds. Mr. Osborne asked why those funds wouldn’t go back into a reserve fund and dealt out in general process. Mark McCaskill responded that in the previous two RSTP Policy Guides, discussion centered around if a locality applies for funds and can’t use them for one project, are those funds given to the locality to be able to try and transfer to another project or does the locality have to give up funds to go into a general reserve. Michael Gray stated that the language in the first Guide came from other MPOs around the State who are basically giving a piece of the pie to each locality to do with what they want. Our MPO doesn’t have that same kind of process. Mike Gray said he has no problem with the funds coming back to the Policy Board and for them to decide. Lee Osborne said he wouldn’t have a problem with Item (A) saying the Board has the right to request that the funds be applied to one project. But he thinks the request should be decided by the Policy Board. He added he thinks the default would be that the funds go into a “reserve” to be allocated. Mark McCaskill added that all these items can be covered through the annual adjustment procedure. Mike Gray agreed that it should be better defined that the project sponsor can ask for the unused funds but the funds would still have to come back to the TPO Policy Board for its decision. Lee Osborne said (A) reads ok to keep in the Guide. He suggested in (B) take out the word “request” and let it be subject to process.

Mark McCaskill stated that the staff will work on refining the language and present another draft to the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC). After TTC comments, another draft guide will be brought back to the TPO Policy Board for review at their April meeting.

**6. FIRST DISCUSSION OF THE DRAFT FY’17 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM**

Mark McCaskill updated the Policy Board on the draft FY 2017 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The UPWP includes transportation projects (new and ongoing) for the TPO service area that staff will undertake during FY 2017. Mark stated that a final version, including budgeting information, will be presented at the April at which time the TPO Policy Board will be asked to take action on the FY 2017 UPWP.

**7. ALLOCATION OF TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES (TA) FUNDING**

**Background:** There are essentially “two pots” of Transportation Alternatives (TA) funds that can be allocated for applications within the TPO’s Service Area: (1) the Roanoke Valley TPO’s FY 2016 share is \$247,602, and (2) each Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) member is given approximately \$1 million per Fiscal Year to allocate toward projects they deem appropriate within their District, if they so choose.

Four projects from our service area submitted applications for funding consideration:

Sponsor: City of Roanoke  
Project Name: Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvements  
TA Funds Requested: \$458,814

Sponsor: City of Salem  
Project Name: Downtown Salem Streetscape and Intersection Improvements  
TA Funds Requested: \$480,000

Sponsor: Town of Vinton  
Project Name: Glade Creek Greenway  
TA Funds Requested: \$417,710

Sponsor: Roanoke County  
Project Name: Friendship Lane/Carvins Creek Bridge Replacement  
TA Funds Requested: \$136,495

Bryan Hill reported that the TPO Policy Board had requested the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC), their technical advisory group, forward their recommendation for consideration for the disbursement of TA funding. The TTC’s recommendation to the TPO Policy Board was to allocate \$247,602 in TA funds to the City of Roanoke’s Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvements application. Mr. Hill stated that the TTC’s recommendation to only fund one project was driven by the possible recommendation of William Fralin, CTB member – Salem District, to allocate a portion of his share of TA money to two of the other project applications (i.e., City of Salem and Town of Vinton). TTC members also felt that the City of Roanoke project should receive funding for its important regional economic development impact.

A supporting resolution endorsing the awarding of the Roanoke Valley TPO’s TA funding allocation of \$247,602 to the City of Roanoke’s Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvement project, as recommended by the TTC, was presented for consideration and adoption by the TPO Policy Board.

**Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board Action:**

Mr. Bestpitch moved adoption of the resolution to endorse and allocate the Roanoke Valley TPO’s TA funds (in the amount of \$247,602) to the City of Roanoke’s Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvements project, and that this action be forwarded to the Commonwealth Transportation Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Martin and carried.

8. **OTHER BUSINESS**

- Wayne Strickland reported that an orientation session for TPO members will be held prior to the April 28<sup>th</sup> TPO Policy Board meeting. Tentative plans are for the orientation to begin at Noon at the Regional Commission office. The TPO Policy Board will then meet at 1:00 p.m. All members are encouraged to attend, not just newly appointed members. A light lunch will be provided.
- Lee Osborne, who serves as the TPO's representative member on the Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission, announced Botetourt County's interest in joining the Greenway Commission as a member locality. Mr. Osborne reported that the Greenway Commission recently took action to unanimously recommend that each locality amend the inter-governmental agreement to admit Botetourt County to join the Greenway Commission.
- Michael Gray reported that the Spring VDOT meeting for development of the Six-Year Program is scheduled for Tuesday, April 5, 2016 at 5:30 p.m. at the Holiday Inn-Valley View.
- Wayne Strickland announced that Christopher Lloyd, from McGuireWoods Consulting, would be speaking on the *GO Virginia* legislation at the Regional Commission meeting following at 3:00 p.m. TPO members were invited to attend.

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

Submitted by:

Wayne Strickland, Secretary,  
Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization

## **STAFF REPORT**

### **SUBJ: STP Block Grant Set-aside (formerly Transportation Alternatives Program) Revised FY'17 Preliminary Allocations**

**Background:** As a result of Congress passing the FAST ACT, and effective in FY'17, the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program will now be incorporated into the Surface Transportation Program (STP) Block Grant Set-aside.

At the March 10, 2016 meeting of the TPO's Transportation Technical Committee (TTC), a recommendation was put forward to the TPO Policy Board that the Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvements project be the sole recipient of the TPO's \$247,602 Transportation Alternatives Program allocation. Subsequently, on March 24, 2016, the TPO Policy Board adopted a resolution endorsing the TTC's recommendation.

Shortly following that adoption, Salem District VDOT and RVTPO staffs were informed of a revised FY'17 allocation. This revision increased the TPO's TA allocation by \$35,001, from \$247,602 to \$282,603. The spreadsheet that follows outlines the statewide increases.

**RECOMMENDATION:** At its April 14, 2016 meeting, the TPO's TTC recommended that the TPO Policy Board allocate the additional \$35,001 in TA funds to the Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvements project. A supporting resolution is attached.

**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

**STP Block Grant Set-aside (Formerly Transportation Alternatives Program)  
FY 2017 PRELIMINARY ALLOCATIONS**

		<b>Revised FY 2017</b>	<b>Previous FY2017</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>ANYWHERE</b>		10,761,533	9,428,684	1,332,849
<b>UNDER 5,000</b>		2,759,721	2,417,922	341,799
<b>5,000-200,000</b>		1,492,970	1,308,062	184,908
<b><u>URBANIZED AREA</u></b>	<b><u>MPO</u></b>			
<b><u>RICHMOND</u></b>	<b><u>Richmond</u></b>			
	Federal	1,109,407	972,004	137,403
	<b><u>Tri-Cities</u></b>			
	Federal	173,144	151,700	21,444
<b><u>VIRGINIA</u></b>				
<b><u>BEACH/HAMPTON ROADS</u></b>	<b><u>Hampton Roads</u></b>			-
	Federal	1,936,379	1,696,552	239,827
<b><u>ROANOKE</u></b>	<b><u>Roanoke</u></b>			
	Federal	282,603	247,602	35,001
<b><u>WASHINGTON DC</u></b>	<b><u>Washington DC COG</u></b>			
	Federal	2,914,395	2,553,438	360,957
	<b><u>FAMPO</u></b>			
	Federal	92,913	81,405	11,508
<b><u>TOTAL</u></b>		<b>21,523,065</b>	<b>18,857,369</b>	<b>2,665,696</b>



The 28<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2016

**RESOLUTION**

**SUBJ: Endorsement of Transportation Alternatives (TA) Grant Application(s)  
to be Awarded Additional FY'17 TA Allocation of \$35,001**

**WHEREAS**, the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program was created by the 2012 Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) by combining what had previously been known as the Transportation Enhancements (TE), Safe Routes to School and other programs into one category; and

**WHEREAS**, on December 4, 2015, the FAST ACT became law and renamed the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Program and incorporated it into the Surface Transportation Program Block Grant Set-aside; and

**WHEREAS**, state departments of transportation are allowed to set aside a portion of their Surface Transportation Program allocation each year to be used for TA activities; and

**WHEREAS**, Virginia has chosen to set aside funds for TA activities; and

**WHEREAS**, these four grant applications applied for FY 2017 Transportation Alternatives funding from the TPO's allocation of \$247,602:

**Applicant:** City of Roanoke  
**Project:** Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvements  
**TA Funds Requested:** \$458,814

**Applicant:** City of Salem  
**Project:** Downtown Salem Streetscape and Intersection Improvements  
**TA Funds Requested:** \$480,000

**Applicant:** Town of Vinton  
**Project:** Glade Creek Greenway  
**TA Funds Requested:** \$417,710

**Applicant:** Roanoke County  
**Project:** Friendship Lane/Carvins Creek Bridge Replacement  
**TA Funds Requested:** \$136,495

**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

**RESOLUTION (Cont'd)**

**Page -2**

**WHEREAS**, the Policy Board of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization, at its March 24, 2016 meeting, awarded the total TA allocation of \$247,602 to the Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvements application; and

**WHEREAS**, since the March 24, 2016 meeting, the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization was informed that the TPO now has an additional \$35,001 in FY'17 Transportation Alternatives (TA) funds to allocate between the four candidate applications; and

**WHEREAS**, the TPO's Transportation Technical Committee met on April 14, 2016 and recommended that the TPO Policy Board consider awarding the additional FY'17 TA allocation of \$35,001 to the Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvements application.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Policy Board of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization does hereby endorse and award the additional FY'17 TA allocation of \$35,001 to the Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvements application, and forwards this decision to the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

Jane W. Johnson, Chair,  
Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization

## **STAFF REPORT**

### **SUBJ: RSTP Project Development and Selection Procedures Document**

The attached RSTP Project Development and Selection Procedures document represents the best version to incorporate the feedback received from the TPO Policy Board and the TPO's Transportation Technical Committee (TTC). Changes from the last meeting are highlighted in yellow.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Staff requests adoption of this document at the April meeting of the TPO Policy Board. The TPO staff feels that this document has undergone wordsmithing at several meetings and it is unlikely any significant progress will be made by further word choice discussions. The RVTPO Policy Board can always amend the document at a future meeting if new information becomes known.

**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

The 28<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2016

## **RESOLUTION**

**by the Policy Board of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization  
Approving the FY 2017 Unified Planning Work Program**

**WHEREAS**, the FY 2017 Unified Planning Work Program will serve as the basis for all federal Department of Transportation (DOT) funding participation and will be included in all requests for DOT planning funds within the Roanoke Valley TPO Service Area; and

**WHEREAS**, this Work Program details all transportation and transportation-related planning activities anticipated within the area during the coming fiscal year; and

**WHEREAS**, this Work Program has been reviewed by the TPO's Transportation Technical Committee;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** that the Policy Board of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization does hereby approve the FY 2017 Unified Planning Work Program, as presented.

Jane W. Johnson, Chair,  
Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization

**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

The 28<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2016

## **RESOLUTION**

**by the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization (RVTPO) Recommending that the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) Support “ROLL ON/ROLL OFF” Accommodations for Bicycles on Passenger Rail Service to Roanoke, Virginia**

**WHEREAS**, the 2012 Bikeway Plan for the Roanoke Valley Area MPO represents a coordinated effort by the RVTPO and local jurisdictions to facilitate development of a regional transportation network that accommodates and encourages bicycling as an alternative mode of travel; and

**WHEREAS**, the 2014 Livable Roanoke Valley Plan emphasizes non-motorized transportation, such as bicycling, as a way to achieve both transportation and public health goals at the same time; and

**WHEREAS**, the 2015 Downtown Roanoke Intermodal Transportation Study calls for intermodal connections between pedestrian, bicycle, transit and intercity rail modes of transportation; and

**WHEREAS**, “ROLL ON/ROLL OFF” service implements the recommendations of these plans and furthers the region’s transportation and economic development priorities; and

**WHEREAS**, AMTRAK passenger rail service is anticipated to return to the Roanoke Valley in 2017, serving an ADA-accessible high-level passenger platform suitable for a “ROLL ON/ROLL OFF” bicycle operation; and,

**WHEREAS**, including “ROLL ON/ROLL OFF” accommodations when rail service starts in Roanoke would encourage the use of bicycles by AMTRAK rail passengers and encourage bicycle transportation and tourism by reducing barriers or disincentives to bringing bicycles aboard the train; and,

**WHEREAS**, this resolution has been reviewed and recommended by the RVTPO’s Transportation Technical Committee;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Policy Board of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization recommends that the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation support “ROLL ON/ROLL OFF” accommodations for bicycles on passenger rail service to Roanoke, Virginia; and

**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

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Policy Board of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization requests that the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation work with AMTRAK to facilitate implementation of such on-train capacity with the resumption of passenger rail service to Roanoke, Virginia.

Jane W. Johnson, Chair,  
Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization