

April 7, 2016

MEMORANDUM

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

The Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) will meet Thursday, April 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. Action on the February 11, 2016 and March 10, 2016 *Chairman Holladay*
 Minutes, pp. 2-10
3. Action on the STP Block Grant Set-aside (formerly Transportation *Bryan Hill*
 Alternatives Program) FY'17 Preliminary Allocations, pp. 11-12
4. Action on Draft FY 2017 Unified Planning Work Program (Attachment #1) *Mark McCaskill*
5. Action on Draft RSTP Procedures Guide, p. 13 (Attachment #2) *Mark McCaskill*
6. Consideration of Resolution Recommending the Roanoke Valley TPO *Mark McCaskill*
 Policy Board Ask DRPT to Request that Amtrak Provide "Roll On/Roll Off"
 Accommodations for Bicycles on Passenger Rail Service in Virginia, p. 14
7. Updates and/or Other Business:
 - Draft Transit Vision Plan *Cristina Finch*
8. Comments by Members and/or Citizens
9. 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 February 11, 2016

The February meeting of the Transportation Technical Committee was held on Thursday, February 11, 2016 at 1:30 p.m. at the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission office, 313 Luck Avenue, SW, Roanoke, VA. Attendance follows:

Member

Liz Belcher
 Dan Brugh
 Brian Epperly
 Michael Gray
 David Holladay
 Mark Jamison
 Amanda McGee
 Kevin Price
 Cody Sexton
 Ben Tripp
 Karla Turman

Representing

Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission
 Montgomery County
 Roanoke County
 VDOT – Salem District
 Roanoke County
 City of Roanoke
 Botetourt County
 Valley Metro
 Botetourt County
 City of Salem
 Town of Vinton

Staff Present: Cristina Finch, Bryan Hill, Mark McCaskill and Shane Sawyer.

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. The following guests were in attendance: Megan Cronise and Tori Williams, Roanoke County; and Carl Palmer, Valley Metro.

Chairman Holladay stated that the January and February Minutes would be provided at the next TTC meeting.

2. TRANSIT VISION PLAN PROCESS UPDATE

Cristina Finch updated members on what has been happening with the Transit Vision Plan Process. In August of 2015, the technical report was adopted. The report was a two-year effort which looked at public input received (i.e., why is public transit important, where is it needed, etc.). That encompassed the general public, current riders, and employee surveys, as well as analyses of bus stop activity and RADAR transit trips in the region.

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

In September of 2015, a consultant (Michael Baker and Four Square Integrated Transportation Planning) was hired and has been working with staff since that a time. A steering committee was established at that time as well, which has been meeting monthly. Ms. Finch identified the groups/individuals represented on the steering committee. Ms. Finch reported that the first round of public workshops was held in November 2015 at two locations in the region (Campbell Court and the Brambleton Center) and the second round of workshops was held in January 2016 (Campbell Court and the Vinton Library). For those not able to physically attend the workshops, information/surveys were made available online and copies were also available on-board Valley Metro buses. The number counts for the two workshops included: 74 who attended the workshops, 179 who participated online, and 804 surveys provided on-board Valley Metro buses.

At the first workshop, the technical report was shared with participants, along with blank maps of the road networks in the Roanoke Valley and they were asked to draw -- where they wanted service, where they thought service needed to be for people with disabilities and seniors, what places needed to be connected for evening or Sunday service, and then where did they think all day service versus commute to work type connections needed to be. No existing transit service routes were provided to participants, they were asked "what needs to be depicted".

Staff is currently working on the online portion of the second workshop and that link should be received soon, as well as the on-board portion from the buses. The results of the last workshop were also shared, along with the draft recommendations. An investment/trade-off exercise was conducted at the Vinton Library which allowed participants to place dots next to recommendations they felt were most important. Staff is now following up with focus groups to gain more input.

Ms. Finch shared some of the data/information that the consultants looked at to prepare a *Transit Propensity Analysis* (i.e., the public input received, service area gaps, transit propensity, existing service frequencies in area to determine if there is a gap in service, as well as travel flow). The consultants also looked at our geography to see how to physically get from one part of the region to another (which was split into three areas). From this data, Ms. Finch noted one recommendation is to maintain a centralized hub acknowledging that over 50% of the trips go to or through downtown Roanoke and then develop additional peripheral transfers.

Ms. Finch provided an IdeaScale link earlier to members showing the short, mid and long-term recommendations. She also noted that the recommendations can also be found on the Commission website <http://rvarc.org/transportation/transit/>. She stressed the need for TTC members to review the recommendations now so their feedback can be shared with the steering committee as recommendations are being finalized and not when the final draft document is presented to the TTC later this spring. The Plan is scheduled to be approved by the TPO Policy Board prior to the adoption of the next Long-Range Transportation Plan this summer.

3. CONSTRAINED LONG-RANGE MULTIMODAL PLAN 2040 CANDIDATE PROJECTS DISCUSSION

Mark McCaskill reported that the aim is to have the new Long-Range Transportation Plan completed by the summer of 2016. The goals/functions of the plan have traditionally been to provide the financially constrained list (a federal requirement which is a 20-year list of financially-constrained projects). Mark noted the key is to not spend over the amount that you constrain in the financially-constrained list. The second goal has been to provide a vision list of projects that can't fit under the financially-constrained but are important to the TPO in case extra money comes along in the future that was not anticipated. The third goal of the plan has been to serve as a strategic and visionary narrative description of where the transportation system is and where the region would like it to go. Mark stated that the narrative portion is almost complete. Staff is focusing now on developing the financial constrained list portion. There is additional opportunity to make the Long-Range Transportation Plan more relevant now that HB2 is being used as the statewide project selection and programming framework. Specifically, the long-range financially constrained and vision lists can be used to provide an HB2 strategy, or "HB2 Playbook" that communicates when certain HB2 applications would be most beneficial from a regional perspective.

Mr. McCaskill stated that our TPO has never been one of the TPOs who use the model as the sole source of candidate project ideas. We also find project ideas in other regional plans, local government comprehensive plans and stakeholder input. It is now time to start discussion to develop project candidate ideas that come from sources other than the model. Included in the agenda packet were excerpts from the Bicycle Plan and Pedestrian Vision Plan that could be possible candidate projects. We are looking for ideas for regionally significant projects that can be listed as an actual project item in the financially-constrained list. Now with HB2, rather than "regionally significant" we may want to think of it as "what kind of projects would you be applying for as a stand-alone HB2 project"?

Mark asked members to email him projects from any source, as well as a description and costs estimate if available, to be included on a brainstorm list before the results of the new travel demand model are known.

4. **RSTP POLICY AND PROCEDURES RECOMMENDATIONS**

To move the process forward with the TPO Policy Board, Mark McCaskill stated what he would like decisions from the TTC so staff can start updating and developing a draft RSTP Policy and Procedures document.

The TTC needs to decide on:

- **A definitive answer on Countercyclical to HB2 Schedule** – TTC unanimously agreed on the Countercyclical approach.
- **Re-compete or Keep the Same Cycle as HB2 (Like HB2)** – Mark explained that in the last two policy and procedures documents for RSTP, the TPO has had a re-compete framework. Meaning, every time you go out for applications, those projects in the six-year funding plan that have not started must re-compete with new RSTP applications. That has been the TPO process over the last two rounds and it has seemed to work. However, he noted that HB2 has since been introduced with the

opposite philosophy. When HB2 projects are scored, projects are programmed and the cost for the projects are covered – no re-competing. Michael Gray spoke about VDOT’s “full funding policy” approved by the CTB. He stated VDOT will be encouraging their TPO/MPOs, as part of their RSTP process, to do something similar to fully fund projects so no projects will be left with inadequate funding and little work done.

The TTC felt there were both pros and cons on this issue and did not reach consensus and asked for further direction from the TPO Policy Board.

- **Annual Adjustment Review** – The TTC recommended including an “Annual Adjustment Review” procedure (show the cash flow of projects) where the TPO adjusts funding timing or details based on any unforeseen delays or other events within particular projects development cycle. The goal of the Annual Adjustment Review is to keep projects moving and not to stall other projects because of unanticipated delays in a single project.
- **Upper Limit on the Amount of funding that Projects Can Receive (“Upper Limit Project Size”)** – Mark gave a hypothetical example if a fantastic project came in with a large amount (\$40 million dollar project = \$4 million for 10 years) then that would represent 10 years of RSTP funds regardless of the countercyclical schedule. In such a scenario it would be moot to keep to the 2-year application cycle as more than 10 years of RSTP funding would be programmed in the one project.

The TTC did not reach consensus and asked for further direction from the TPO Policy Board.

5. FY’17 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP) CANDIDATE PROJECT DISCUSSION

Mark McCaskill reported that the discretionary UPWP candidate projects provided in the agenda packet, with draft narrative, were included for discussion purposes.

Liz Belcher asked for greenway corridors to be added as part of the Regional Bicycle and Workforce Commuting Study under work element 2.AA RVTPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning. She noted the corridors fall in line with workforce development since they help to provide a linkage to certain section 8 housing areas and connect them with employers.

Mark reported that staff will provide a first draft of the plan with narrative (no budget figures) to the TTC in March. Staff anticipates final action by the TPO Policy Board at their April meeting.

6. OTHER BUSINESS/UPDATES

- A. **Federal Review Overview** – The Roanoke Valley TPO will be undergoing an upcoming external federal review/compliance process by a team from the Federal Transit Administration and the Federal Highway Administration on March 2-3, 2016. All Transportation Management Area Transportation Planning Organizations (TMA-TPOs)

are required to have a review every four years. This will be the first for the Roanoke Valley TPO since becoming a TMA. As a part of the review, a public meeting will also be conducted by the federal review team on Wednesday, March 2, 2016 from 4:30 to 6:30 p.m. at Campbell Court (Second Floor) in downtown Roanoke to receive comment and feedback from the public on the TPO planning process.

- B. Update on Transportation Alternatives (TA) Projects** – Bryan Hill distributed at the meeting a copy of scores recently received from VDOT for the four applications from the Roanoke TMA requesting TA funding. Bryan stated that at their March meeting, the TTC will hear presentations from the four applicants from the Roanoke TMA and then be asked to make a recommendation to the TPO Policy Board to consider concerning the allocation of \$247,602 in TA funds for the TPO area.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:12 p.m.

Submitted by Jackie L. Pace
Recording Secretary

MINUTES

Transportation Technical Committee Meeting March 10, 2016

The March meeting of the Transportation Technical Committee was held on Thursday, March 10, 2016 at 1:30 p.m. at the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission office, 313 Luck Avenue, SW, Roanoke, VA. Attendance follows:

<u>Member</u>	<u>Representing</u>
Curtis Andrews	RADAR
Liz Belcher	Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission
Brian Epperly	Roanoke County
Michael Gray	VDOT – Salem District
David Holladay	Roanoke County
Mark Jamison	City of Roanoke
Amanda McGee	Botetourt County
Cody Sexton	Botetourt County
Ben Tripp	City of Salem
Karla Turman	Town of Vinton

Staff Present: Cristina Finch, Bryan Hill, Mark McCaskill and Jackie Pace.

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. The following guests were in attendance: David Hill, Hill Studio; Megan Cronise and Tori Williams, Roanoke County; Anita McMillan, Town of Vinton; and Lisa Ridpath, Virginia Western Community College.

2. **APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 14, 2016 MINUTES**

The Minutes of the January 14, 2016 TTC meeting were previously distributed.

Transportation Technical Committee Action:

Upon motion by Mark Jamison, seconded by Cody Sexton and carried, the January 14, 2016 Minutes were approved, as presented.

3. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES (TA) PROJECT REQUESTS

Bryan Hill noted that there are essentially “two pots” of Transportation Alternatives (TA) funds that could be utilized to fund applications within the TPO’s Service Area: (1) the direct \$247,602 allocation that the Roanoke Valley TPO will receive in FY 2017, and (2) the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) Salem District and/or Rural member allocation of approximately \$1 million each per fiscal year to projects they deem appropriate within their District, if they so choose.

Four projects from our service area submitted applications requesting TA funding. Applicants presented a brief overview of their respective project to the TTC.

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*

Staff reported they had received preliminary information that William Fralin, Salem District CTB member, may allocate a share of his TA funding to the City of Salem (\$240,000) and Town of Vinton (\$235,000) projects.

Building off of what CTB Member Fralin may recommend, Michael Gray stated that his first preference would be to see one of the aforementioned projects from Mr. Fralin’s preliminary allocations be fully funded with the TPO’s TA allocation of \$247,602. Alternatively, if the TTC desires to partially fund one of the projects that isn’t in Mr. Fralin’s preliminary allocations instead, Mr. Gray suggested the City of Roanoke project receive funding for its important regional economic development impact, whereupon discussion ensued.

TTC discussion eventually settled on the idea that if the TPO were to allocate its \$247,602 to the City of Roanoke’s Colonial Avenue Boulevard project, then three of the four TA projects would be approximately half funded (two from CTB member Fralin and one from the TPO). It was felt that this would be a strategic signal to send to CTB member Rosen so that he would have the choice of funding the remaining portion of three projects within the TPO if he so chooses.

Transportation Technical Committee Action:

Liz Belcher moved to forward to the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board, for review and consideration at their March 24, 2016 meeting, the TTC's recommendation to allocate TA funds in the amount of \$247,602 for the City of Roanoke's Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvements project. The motion was seconded by Ben Tripp and carried.

It should be noted that the TTC's recommendation will be forwarded for consideration to the Policy Board, but it should be noted that the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board has final approval on how the \$247,602 in TA funds will be distributed.

4. ACTION ON ANNUAL OBLIGATIONS REPORT

The Annual Listing of Transportation Project Obligations for Federal Fiscal Year 2015 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 share of a project's cost and has been authorized by that Federal agency (FHWA, FTA, etc.) --- this does not necessarily mean that a project has been initiated or completed during the fiscal year. The funds are set aside for a particular part of the project (ROW, PE, CN, etc.) and are used to pay expenditures.

Obligations occur when: (1) Federal Transit Administration – When the FTA grant is awarded, and (2) Federal Highway Administration – When the project agreement is executed and VDOT/Grantee requests the funds to be obligated.

Liz Belcher asked about some projects in the report that show a negative obligation amount. Michael Gray stated that a negative in obligation does not mean you are taking money away from a project.

Transportation Technical Committee Action:

The consensus was to recommend forwarding the Annual Listing of Transportation Projects for Federal Fiscal Year 2015 to the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization's Policy Board for review and action at their March 24, 2016 meeting.

5. RSTP – FEEDBACK FROM RVTPO DISCUSSION

Mark McCaskill reported on the TPO Policy Board's feedback (from their February 25 meeting) on the proposed RSTP Policy and Procedures Guide.

- Agreed on a two-year RSTP application cycle that is countercyclical to the HB2 application cycle (this would mean that 2017 is the next year for requesting RSTP applications).
- Re-compete or Keep the Same Cycle as HB2 (Like HB2) -- TPO Policy Board came up with a "hybrid concept" in that projects the first 2 years of the six year funding plan would be deemed to have started and would not re-compete in the next application cycle.
- Annual Adjustment Review procedure -- Agreed that applicants need to show the

cash flow of projects. This will illustrate the dependency a project may have that starts late. The Board wants the flexibility to respond as a part of an annual adjustment procedure.

- Upper Limit Project Size – asked TTC to suggest an upper limit that would serve as “strong guidance” but not an absolute limit. The TTC discussed two years of RSTP funding as a “strong guidance” upper limit.

Mr. McCaskill stated that a draft Policy and Procedures Guide will be developed, incorporating feedback from both the TTC and TPO, and presented at the April TTC meeting.

6. **OTHER BUSINESS**

- Federal Review Overview – Mark McCaskill reported 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 on March 2-3, 2016 were good for a TMA-TPO our size. A written report is expected within a month which will outline the pros and cons and any suggested changes they think should be undertaken.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Submitted by Jackie L. Pace
Recording Secretary

STAFF REPORT

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

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

At the March TTC meeting, a recommendation was put forward to the TPO Policy Board recommending that the Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvements project be the sole recipient of the Board'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 TPO staffs were informed of a revised FY'17 allocation. This revision increased the TPO's allocation by \$35,001, from \$247,602 to \$282,603. The spreadsheet that follows outlines the statewide increases.

Staff will be seeking a recommendation from the TTC at their April 14 meeting to present to the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board at their April 28 meeting regarding the allocation of the additional \$35,001.

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**

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

STAFF REPORT

SUBJ: Latest Changes to the Draft RSTP Policies and Procedures Guide

The Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization (RVTPO) Policy Board provided feedback and suggested changes to the RSTP Policies and Procedures document at their March Policy Board meeting. In addition, individual TPO members, TPO staff and other stakeholders have provided feedback where applicable. This collective feedback has been incorporated in the updated draft in the following ways:

- Yellow highlights represent changes from the draft that went to the RVTPO Policy Board at their March meeting. Yellow highlights from previous drafts were removed.
- The grey highlights cover a section that the RVTPO would like the TTC to re-work. VDOT is researching the question of who is the appropriate party to initiate changes and the appropriate mechanism of transferring funds (i.e., an overage and underage account?).
- The following feedback concerning section 11 “Rating Factors” was submitted by a staff member for discussion by the TTC (it is not yet included in the highlighted changes, rather it is provided below):
 - “One of the Livable Roanoke Valley goals is to promote a healthy Roanoke Valley - consider a question that addresses how the project will help improve people's personal health. Another goal is workforce development - how does the project support workforce development?”
 - “Should other criterion be added that plays into Environmental Justice/Title VI, such as - how will this project help improve the lives of the most challenged in our community including but not limited to those with few financial resources and the disabled?”
- The Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board wants the TTC to include an example of how the two-year application cycles will work with regards to projects starting in the first two years of a six-year funding plan being regarded as “previously funded” for the purposes of the next application cycle. Michael Gray has offered to bring an example to the meeting that the TTC can discuss as a group.

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 14th day of April, 2016

RESOLUTION

**by the Transportation Technical Committee
Recommending that the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization
Policy Board Ask the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
to Request that Amtrak Provide “Roll On/Roll Off” Accommodations for
Bicycles on Passenger Rail Service in Virginia**

WHEREAS, passenger rail service is anticipated to return to the Roanoke Valley in 2017;
and

WHEREAS, the City of Roanoke, the Greater Roanoke Transit Company (Valley Metro) and Wendel (Consultant) completed the “Downtown Roanoke Intermodal Transportation Study” in 2015 which called for intermodal connections between pedestrian, bicycle, transit and intercity rail modes of transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Partnership for a Livable Roanoke Valley released a plan in 2014 which emphasized non-motorized transportation, such as bicycling, as a way to achieve both transportation and public health goals at the same time; and

WHEREAS, a final ADA accessible platform design, which could facilitate potential bicycle “Roll On/Roll Off” service, was approved for the Roanoke stop; and

WHEREAS, including “Roll On/Roll Off” service when rail service starts in Roanoke would encourage the use of bicycles as a mode of transportation in trips whose primary mode is passenger rail by reducing barriers or disincentives in bringing bicycles aboard the train service;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Transportation Technical Committee recommends that the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization Policy Board ask the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation to request that Amtrak provide “Roll On/Roll Off” accommodations for bicycles on passenger rail service in Virginia.

David Holladay, Chairman,
Transportation Technical Committee

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