

May 5, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: Members, Transportation Technical Committee
 FROM: Mark McCaskill, AICP, Director of TPO Programs
 SUBJ: May 12, 2016 TTC Meeting/Agenda

The Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) will meet Thursday, May 12, 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 April 14, 2016 Minutes, pp. 2-9 *Chairman Holladay*
3. HB2 Application Discussion *Bryan Hill*
4. RSTP – New Funds *Michael Gray*
5. Review of the Draft Roanoke Valley Transit Vision Plan *Cristina Finch*
 Available for download from <http://rvarc.org/transportation/transit/>
6. Financially Constrained List Development Process and *Mark McCaskill*
 Long-Range Plan Timeline, pp. 10-17
7. Other Business
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 April 14, 2016

The April meeting of the Transportation Technical Committee was held on Thursday, April 14, 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
 Chris Chittum
 Brian Epperly
 Michael Gray
 David Holladay
 Amanda McGee
 Cody Sexton
 Ben Tripp
 Karla Turman

Representing

Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission
 City of Roanoke
 Roanoke County
 VDOT – Salem District
 Roanoke County
 Botetourt County
 Botetourt County
 City of Salem
 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: Barbara Duerk, ConnectNow; Dave Foster Rail Solutions; Pete Peters, Town of Vinton; and Tori Williams, Roanoke County.

2. APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 11, 2016 AND MARCH 10, 2016 MINUTES

The Minutes of the February 11, 2016 and March 10, 2016 TTC meetings were previously distributed.

Transportation Technical Committee Action:

Upon motion by Karla Turman, seconded by Cody Sexton and carried, the Minutes of the February 11, 2016 and March 10, 2016 TTC meetings were approved, as presented.

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. **ACTION ON THE STP BLOCK GRANT SET-ASIDE (FORMERLY TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM) REVISED FY'17 PRELIMINARY ALLOCATION**

(NOTE: 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, the TTC recommended that the TPO Policy Board consider the City of Roanoke's Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvement project to be the sole recipient of the TPO's FY'17 Transportation Alternatives (TA) allocation of \$247,602. The TPO Policy Board took action at their March 24, 2016 meeting.

After action was taken by both the TTC and TPO Policy Board in March, TPO and VDOT staffs were then informed of a revised allocation to the TPO's FY'17 TA funds in the amount of an additional \$35,001. TTC members discussed how to address the additional funds vs. the four (previous) applications that requested TA funds.

Transportation Technical Committee Action:

Cody Sexton moved that the TTC's recommendation, to allocate the additional \$35,001 in the TPO's TA funds to the City of Roanoke's Colonial Avenue Boulevard Improvements project, be forwarded to the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board for review and consideration at their April 28, 2016 meeting. Motion was duly seconded and carried.

4. **ACTION ON DRAFT FY 2017 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM**

Mark McCaskill asked if there were any additional feedback on the draft FY 2017 Unified Planning Work Program.

Michael Gray reminded members that any marketing activities for the Regional Greenway Plan Update are not an allowable item for federal planning funds. Mark responded that any needed marketing activities would be handled by RIDE Solutions or the Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission. Also, Greenway planning activities outside of the RVTPO boundary will be included in the Regional Commission's Rural Planning Scope of Work.

Mark also reported that the anticipated dollar amount for VDOT Salem District Support (SPR funding) for Planning Activities within the RVTPO area during FY 2017 would be \$29,000 (pg. 29). The Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board is expected to take action on the final FY 2017 UPWP at their April 28, 2016 meeting.

Transportation Technical Committee Action:

Upon motion by Liz Belcher, seconded by Chris Chittum and carried, it was recommended that the FY 2017 Unified Planning Work Program be forwarded to the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board for review and action at their April 28, 2016 meeting, with the understanding that staff may make any necessary minor budgetary and narrative changes prior to action by the TPO Policy Board.

5. **ACTION ON DRAFT RSTP PROCEDURES GUIDE**

Mark McCaskill stated that the changes/feedback from the March TPO Policy Board meeting have been incorporated into the latest draft of the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Project Development and Selection Procedures document.

The draft document included the following:

- (1) Yellow highlights in the draft document represent changes from the draft that went to the TPO Policy Board at their March meeting.
- (2) 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 (an overage and underage account).
- (3) Feedback concerning Section 11 “Rating Factors” was submitted by a staff member for discussion by the TTC (not yet included in the highlighted changes) but presented below:
 - (a) “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?”
 - (b) “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?”
- (4) The Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board asked 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 the RSTP Six-Year Financial Plan, being regarded as “previously funded” for the purposes of the next application cycle. Michael Gray offered to prepare an example for the TTC to discuss at their April meeting.

The floor was opened for other changes/discussion by the TTC on the latest draft of the RSTP Procedures:

- Michael Gray presented a spreadsheet listing previously funded projects, plus the first two years of committed funds by the TPO for projects, using the most recent RSTP Six-Year Financial Plan (FY16-FY21). Mark McCaskill stated that the TPO Policy Board, in its review of the draft RSTP Project Selection Procedures document, used the term “strongly advised” with regard to no single project application representing more than two years of estimated RSTP funding.
- Ben Tripp inquired if the TPO Policy Board specifically meant two years of dollar value or two years in actual time. Both Gray and McCaskill confirmed that the TPO meant dollar value. The TPO Board is looking for a clear definition; however, it desires the flexibility to address a new regional priority should it arise in the next two years.

- Page 2, change last sentence “In general, if there are unused RSTP funds allocated to a project that has been completed or cancelled, the transfer of available funds will be handled as follows, preferably in the order presented.” **TO READ** “**In general, if there are unused RSTP funds allocated to a project that has been completed or cancelled, the transfer of available funds will be evaluated by the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) with the RVTPO Policy Board making the final decision.**” This change came about from discussions on Page 3. TTC members asked why the TPO Board wanted the TTC to look at reworking or deleting a), b), and c) on Page 3. Mark McCaskill noted that text was taken from the Petersburg-Colonial Heights-Hopewell example document that staff used when developing our original RSTP Procedures document. The text was based on that area’s experience, which included infighting and ownership of funds. After further discussion, members agreed to delete a, b, and c and to reword the last paragraph on page 2 (as presented above in bold).
- Page 4, under Pedestrian and/or Bicycle Improvements –
 - Change second bullet which reads...New Sidewalks, Shared Use Paths and or Greenway Trails to read **New Sidewalks** (as its own separate bullet #2).
 - The rest of the text, with the deletion of the word “or”, ... “Shared Use Paths and ~~or~~ Greenway Trails”, would then become the third bullet.
 - “Sharrows, Striping ~~or~~ **and** other Bicycle Signage” would then become the fourth bullet, with the deletion of the word “or” and the insertion of the word “and”.
 - “Roadway Widening for Bicycle Lanes” would become the fifth bullet.
- Page 5, delete the word “of” in #3) to now read...Use ~~of~~ HB2 funds.
- Page 6, change “create” and insert “approve” in first sentence to now read... “The RVTPO Policy Board will ~~create~~ **approve** a RSTP candidate project list and rating from....”
- TTC members stated that for better comparison/reading in the future, it would be useful for staff to show the old version of the document/changes along with the newest version/changes.
- Chairman Holladay asked if there were any further text changes to the RSTP Procedures document. Mark McCaskill stated that the TPO would like the example (presented by Michael Gray) to be included as well.
- Mark McCaskill asked TTC members for their feedback about recommending to the TPO Policy Board the inclusion of Livable Roanoke Valley and Environmental Justice/Title VI as separate rating factors that would increase the point total.
- Chairman Holladay stated that the spirits of these concepts are already included in existing categories. Liz Belcher said she felt that item E already includes Quality of Life

(for Livable Roanoke Valley) and that the Environmental Justice issue was already being covered in items D & F.

- Mike Gray asked how Environmental Justice/Title VI would score. Mark said Title VI was a main item in the TPO's recent Federal Review and that it results from Executive orders instructing all federal agencies to evaluate potential impacts on minority and low income populations when federal dollars are spent. Discussion centered on whether or not to formally include Environmental Justice/Title VI in the scoring.
- TTC members agreed that it would be best to wait on the findings in the final document from the TPO's recent Federal Review to see if it provides any guidance on how to address the Environmental Justice/Title VI issue in RSTP. Mark McCaskill reported that the RSTP Project Selection and Procedures document could always be updated again when more formal federal guidance is received. For now, the RSTP document can be forwarded with the previously mentioned changes.

Transportation Technical Committee Action:

Michael Gray moved that the changes to the RSTP Procedures document, as outlined above and the inclusion of the Six-Year Financial Plan example, be forwarded to the TPO Policy Board for their consideration at their April 28, 2016 meeting. The motion was seconded by Cody Sexton and carried.

The TTC also agreed to wait on the document from the Federal Review to see if a direction concerning Environmental Justice is addressed (noting that another update of the RSTP document can be presented if necessary).

6. CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THE ROANOKE VALLEY TPO POLICY BOARD ASK VDRPT TO REQUEST THAT AMTRAK PROVIDE "ROLL ON/ROLL OFF" ACCOMMODATIONS FOR BICYCLES ON PASSENGER RAIL SERVICE IN VIRGINIA

Mark McCaskill stated that he was contacted by Barbara Duerk, representing ConnectNow, who requested that the TTC take action as a first step in communicating this issue of roll on/roll off service on passenger rail to DRPT. She further requested that action by the Policy Board of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization also follow. The TPO's recent Federal Review indicated that there are ideas and concepts that fall through the cracks and used this idea as an example. Staff research found that the appropriate audience for this resolution is DRPT (the State level) because DRPT has the contract for statewide service for AMTRAK.

A draft resolution was included in the TTC mailing whereby the TTC was recommending that the Policy Board of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization 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.

Chairman Holladay noted that he reworded the initial resolution sent to TTC members. Copies of the latest resolution were distributed at the meeting. The changes from the initial resolution to the latest resolution distributed at the meeting are as follows:

- Header Change FROM: “Resolution by the TTC Recommending that the Roanoke Valley TPO 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” TO: **“Resolution by TTC of the Roanoke Valley TPO Recommending that the RVTPO Policy Board Support Roll On/Roll Off Accommodations for Bicycles on Passenger Rail Service in Roanoke, Virginia”**.
- Add first whereas paragraph that includes text on the 2012 Bikeway Plan.
- Wording change (addition of Roanoke) from “Passenger Rail Service in Virginia” to “Passenger Rail Service in **Roanoke**, Virginia”.
- Rewording of whereas paragraph to read... “the planned AMTRAK loading platform will be level and ADA accessible, which will facilitate potential bicycle “ROLL ON/ROLL OFF” service”.
- Reworded “Now, therefore, be it resolved” paragraph FROM: “that the TTC recommends that the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board asks 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 TO: **“Now, therefore, be it resolved that the TTC recommends that the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization Policy Board support “Roll On/Roll Off” accommodations for bicycles on passenger rail service in Roanoke, Virginia”**.
- Addition of last paragraph **“Be it further resolved that the TTC asks the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board to communicate this resolution to the Department of Rail and Public Transportation, and thus asks DRPT to forward the resolution to Amtrak”**.

The floor was opened for discussion/comment on the revised resolution.

- Michael Gray said typically the TTC only makes/forwards recommendations to the TPO Policy Board to consider, review and take final action on. He questioned why the TTC was preparing its own resolution instead of making a recommendation and/or drafting a resolution for the Policy Board to consider concerning supporting the roll on/roll off service.
- Chris Chittum suggested the addition of a fourth Whereas paragraph to state... “Roll On/Roll Off service implements recommendations of these plans and furthermore would have economic and transportation benefits to the region”.
- Chairman Holladay said he agreed with Michael Gray’s suggestion that the TTC forward a resolution, with the changes/comments received, to the TPO Policy Board for review and consideration at their April meeting. Chairman Holladay asked that “Transportation Technical Committee” be stricken from the resolution’s header and changed to read “Resolution by the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization Recommending that the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation Ensure “Roll On/Roll Off” Accommodations for Bicycles on Passenger Rail Service in Roanoke, Virginia”.

- Liz Belcher said she didn't see in the revised resolution that the TPO was asking Amtrak to provide the roll on/roll off service. Michael Gray stated that the resolution was asking DRPT to forward the resolution to Amtrak (since they deal with Amtrak). Liz stated that in the first version of the resolution, the TPO was asking DRPT to request that Amtrak provide roll on/roll off accommodations for bicycles on passenger rail service. Liz said this version of the resolution sounds as if we are asking Amtrak to support the roll on/roll off service.
- Michael Gray suggested that the text be changed in the last sentence of the resolution to read... "and thus asks DRPT to forward this resolution to Amtrak requesting that roll on/roll service be implemented."

Barbara Duerk, with ConnectNow, stated in order to be pro-active on this issue, she has also spoken to Roanoke City Council and asked them to send a letter to DRPT requesting several ways to implement bicycle access on the Northeast Regional which might be by adding a baggage car, by reconfiguring a business car, or by redesigning passenger cars to allow bicycle access. Ms. Duerk said she would leave it up to DRPT to decide how to do this since they will be paying for the cars. Ms. Duerk stated that all of Amtrak's long distance routes have roll on/roll off service, with the Northeast Regionals lacking this service.

Transportation Technical Committee Action:

Chris Chittum moved that the latest version of the resolution (presented at the meeting) be redrafted/amended to include all of the additional comments received, and be forwarded to the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board for review and action at their April 28, 2016 meeting. Motion was seconded by Ben Tripp and carried.

7. UPDATES

Draft Transit Vision Plan Update – Cristina Finch reported that the Transit Vision Plan Steering Committee will be reviewing the draft plan next week. Cristina noted she is currently presenting to area planning commissions to receive input/local buy in. A comment period on the plan will also be held at the TPO's Annual Open House scheduled for May 9, 2016 at the Regional Commission office from 3:30-6:00 pm. The draft plan will be presented to the TTC at their May 12, 2016 meeting. Comments on the draft plan will be received through May 27, 2016 at www.rvarc.org/transit. Staff anticipates presenting the final Transit Vision Plan to the TPO Policy Board for action at their June 23, 2016 meeting. Cristina also stated that she hopes to incorporate the recommendations in the Vision Plan into the Long-Range Transportation Plan.

8. OTHER BUSINESS AND/OR COMMENTS

Michael Gray reported on the upcoming VTRANS Regional Forum to be held on May 16, 2016 at the Regional Commission office (Top Floor Conference Room). He reported that the Office of Intermodal Planning & Investment (OIPI) would be sending a survey next week to VDOT, VDRPT and TPO officials on needs. Another survey would go out targeting the localities. Liz Belcher asked if the TTC would be asked to take part in the survey. Michael Gray stated he would send the survey to TTC members when available.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Submitted by Jackie L. Pace
Recording Secretary

Staff Report

Re: Long-Range Plan Financially Constrained List

We are going to follow the example of Livable Roanoke Valley and produce a “summary report” or “citizen’s guide” version of the long-range plan first. Then over the next year we will finish up the “technical report” version (200+ pages), and amend it as an appendix into the long-range plan. Here is the timeline we need to follow in order to have a new long-range transportation plan completed and approved by the end of the summer.

- **May TTC Meeting** – Discussion of constrained list “homework assignment” for TTC members.
- **June TTC Meeting** – Develop initial draft financially constrained list.
- **July TTC Meeting** – Finalize draft financially constrained list.
- **Mid July** – Minimum 30 Day Public Comment Period Advertised in Paper
- **July TPO Meeting** – “First Reading” Draft “Summary Report” long-range plan.
- **August TTC Meeting** – Final revisions to Draft “Summary Report” long-range plan.
- **August TPO Meeting** – Public Hearing and approval of “Summary Report” long-range plan.

Your homework assignment is to arrive at the June TTC Meeting with your final ideas for project inclusion in the draft financially constrained list. In order to help you with this task we will provide in the following pages or at the May TTC meeting the following:

- Level of Service (LOS) Maps from the new travel demand model (at the meeting).
- The financial constraint (following)
- Ideas from unfunded HB2, SYIP and RSTP projects plus Mark Jamison’s original feedback.
- Ideas from the Transit Vision Plan (earlier agenda item for the May TTC meeting)

Time is of the essence. This is not the time to bog down our meeting process in endless discussions over semantics, minor differences in project scope or other minutiae that could be discussed directly with staff outside of the context of the meeting. If you feel strongly about some item or another during the process please contact staff and come into the office, or call, for a separate conversation.

Financial Constraint:

Things have changed since the last long-range transportation plan. We no longer have financially constrained categories such as “City of Roanoke Urban System”, “Roanoke County Secondary System”, “Interstate System”, “Primary System,” and so forth for every locality in the RVTPO Study Area. The financial constraint is now done on a regional basis reflecting recent statewide prioritization and project selection procedures through Virginia’s HB2. This is better for regional decision making and should strengthen the role of RVTPO’s Constrained Long-Range Multimodal Transportation Plan over time.

The new financially constrained categories are as follows along with the total amount constrained from FY 2016 until FY 2040 for Highway funding. On the right is a typical year's financial constraint for Transit funding (FY 2019)

	Total
Administrative	\$ 88,272,296.00
District Grant Program (HB2)	\$ 91,151,524.86
High Priority Projects (HB2)	\$ 91,151,524.85
Maintenance-Localities	\$ 411,870,834.00
Maintenance-VDOT	\$ 1,698,097,653.00
Other Discretionary Construction	\$ 196,149,536.80
RSTP	\$ 79,443,881.00
RSTP-Match	\$ 20,960,436.00
State of Good Repair	\$ 133,520,967.25
TAP	\$ 6,617,752.00
FY16 CLRP TOTALS	\$ 2,817,236,405.76

FY 2019 ²			
Estimated Federal Revenue	Non-Federal Revenue		Total Estimated Revenue
	Estimated State Revenue	Estimated Local Revenue	
\$ 125,714	\$ 15,714	\$ 15,714	\$ 157,142
\$ 2,449,772	\$ 306,222	\$ 306,222	\$ 3,062,215
\$ 694,958	\$ -	\$ 334,958	\$ 1,029,916
\$ 268,621	\$ 53,724	\$ 13,431	\$ 335,776
\$ 221,013	\$ -	\$ 55,253	\$ 276,266
\$ 3,760,078	\$ 375,660	\$ 725,578	\$ 4,861,315

The Highway Funding is provided year by year and incorporates revenue growth factors. The year by year forecasts are provided as a separate PDF. The transit funding was provided by example years all of which were the same. The transit funding assumes no revenue growth factor.

Ideas from unfunded HB2, SYIP and RSTP projects plus Mark Jamison's original feedback.

Project	Locality	Source of Project Idea	Cost Estimate
Rte. 634 Over Roanoke River Bridge Replacement	Bedford Co.	SYIP	\$396,000 (balance)
I-81 Auxiliary Lanes Exit 150 to Weigh Station & Ramp Ext.	Botetourt Co.	HB2 Application	\$47,744,589
Valley View Boulevard Extension	Roanoke City	HB2 Application	\$48,334,000
13th Street/Hollins Road Improvements	Roanoke City	HB2 Application	\$63,266,468
Orange Avenue Improvements	Roanoke City	HB2 Application	\$60,164,601
Colonial Avenue Improvements – Brandon Ave. to Winding Way	Roanoke City	TA Application; Staff	\$
Campbell Avenue – Williamson Rd. to 13th St. SE ((ties into proposed roundabout @ Wise Ave. from 13th St/ Hollins project)	Roanoke City	Staff	\$

Hershberger Road - Cove to Peters Creek	Roanoke City	Staff	\$
Cove Road - Hershberger to Peters Creek	Roanoke City	Staff	\$
King St - Gus Nicks to Orange to include Orange intersection	Roanoke City	Staff	\$
Liberty Road – Burrell to Hollins	Roanoke City	Staff	\$
Church Avenue – Jefferson to 5th	Roanoke City	Staff	\$
9th St, SE	Roanoke City	Staff	\$
Williamson Road - Orange to Angell	Roanoke City	Staff	\$
Jefferson St - Elm to McClanahan	Roanoke City	Staff	\$
Melrose/Salem Turnpike/Orange	Roanoke City	Staff	\$
Memorial Avenue – Grandin to Denniston	Roanoke City	Staff	\$
City of Roanoke – Roanoke River Greenway (UPC 72180)	Roanoke City	SYIP	\$524,000 (balance)
McVitty Rd. & Old Cave Spring Rd. Improvements	Roanoke Co.	HB2 Application	\$19,305,742
Friendship Lane/Carvins Creek Bridge Replacement	Roanoke Co.	RSTP, TA Applications	\$136,495
Rte. 221 Over Martin’s Creek Bridge Replacement	Roanoke Co.	SYIP	\$2,388,000 (balance)
Dry Hollow Road Safety Improvements	Roanoke Co.	SYIP	\$1,785,000 (balance)
Bikeshare Feasibility and Market Study	RVTPPO & RIDE Solutions	RSTP	\$35,000
Downtown Salem Streetscape & Intersection Improvements	Salem	TA Application	\$
Construction of 7-mile Bicycle/Pedestrian (UPC 56409)	Salem	SYIP	\$12,534,000 (balance)
Walnut Ave. & 8th Street Intersection	Vinton	RSTP	\$2,334,931
Glade Creek Greenway	Vinton	TA Application	\$417,710
Comprehensive Traffic Intersection Improvements	Vinton	RSTP	\$2,750,000
Carry-Over Projects from CL RTP 2035 - TBD			

ROANOKE

	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018
Administrative	\$ 2,842,245	\$ 2,784,317	\$ 2,844,391
District Grant Program (HB2)	\$ 3,247,379	\$ 1,279,984	\$ 746,817
High Priority Projects (HB2)	\$ 3,247,379	\$ 1,279,984	\$ 746,817
Maintenance-Localities	\$ 12,928,767	\$ 13,188,018	\$ 13,412,115
Maintenance-VDOT	\$ 53,194,184	\$ 54,400,215	\$ 55,333,868
Other Discretionary Construction	\$ 27,878,160	\$ 32,122,016	\$ 34,589,624
RSTP	\$ 3,155,175	\$ 3,136,931	\$ 3,136,931
RSTP-Match	\$ 788,794	\$ 784,233	\$ 784,233
State of Good Repair	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TAP	\$ 249,042	\$ 247,602	\$ 247,602
FY16 CLRP TOTALS	\$ 107,531,125	\$ 109,223,300	\$ 111,842,399

ROANOKE

	Total
Administrative	\$ 88,272,296.00
District Grant Program (HB2)	\$ 91,151,524.86
High Priority Projects (HB2)	\$ 91,151,524.85
Maintenance-Localities	\$ 411,870,834.00
Maintenance-VDOT	\$ 1,698,097,653.00
Other Discretionary Construction	\$ 196,149,536.80
RSTP	\$ 79,443,881.00
RSTP-Match	\$ 20,960,436.00
State of Good Repair	\$ 133,520,967.25
TAP	\$ 6,617,752.00
FY16 CLRP TOTALS	\$ 2,817,236,405.76

FY2019	FY2020	FY2021	FY2022	FY2023	FY2024
\$ 2,907,076	\$ 2,971,618	\$ 3,035,436	\$ 3,093,884	\$ 3,088,659	\$ 3,158,448
\$ 676,825	\$ 2,220,869	\$ 6,310,186	\$ 4,881,574	\$ 4,751,452	\$ 4,564,165
\$ 676,825	\$ 2,220,869	\$ 6,310,186	\$ 4,881,574	\$ 4,751,452	\$ 4,564,165
\$ 13,653,428	\$ 13,912,732	\$ 14,190,870	\$ 14,474,571	\$ 14,763,946	\$ 15,059,108
\$ 56,333,700	\$ 57,403,993	\$ 58,544,429	\$ 59,708,361	\$ 60,895,898	\$ 62,107,518
\$ 29,559,572	\$ 29,075,209	\$ 3,489,739	\$ 1,952,539	\$ 1,965,549	\$ 1,978,671
\$ 3,136,931	\$ 3,136,931	\$ 3,136,931	\$ 3,163,909	\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119
\$ 784,233	\$ 784,233	\$ 784,233	\$ 790,977	\$ 797,780	\$ 804,641
\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,061,844	\$ 7,988,030	\$ 7,775,103	\$ 7,468,634
\$ 247,602	\$ 247,602	\$ 247,602	\$ 249,731	\$ 251,879	\$ 254,045
\$ 107,976,192	\$ 111,974,057	\$ 104,111,455	\$ 101,185,151	\$ 102,232,838	\$ 103,150,516

FY2025	FY2026	FY2027	FY2028	FY2029	FY2030
\$ 3,229,925	\$ 3,303,137	\$ 3,378,123	\$ 3,454,933	\$ 3,533,609	\$ 3,614,199
\$ 4,366,588	\$ 4,175,636	\$ 3,994,235	\$ 3,971,500	\$ 4,055,475	\$ 3,999,189
\$ 4,366,588	\$ 4,175,636	\$ 3,994,235	\$ 3,971,500	\$ 4,055,475	\$ 3,999,189
\$ 15,360,174	\$ 15,667,261	\$ 15,980,489	\$ 16,299,983	\$ 16,625,866	\$ 16,958,266
\$ 63,343,713	\$ 64,604,983	\$ 65,891,838	\$ 67,204,799	\$ 68,544,397	\$ 69,911,174
\$ 1,991,906	\$ 2,005,255	\$ 2,018,718	\$ 2,032,297	\$ 2,045,993	\$ 2,059,807
\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119
\$ 811,561	\$ 818,540	\$ 825,580	\$ 832,680	\$ 839,841	\$ 847,064
\$ 7,145,325	\$ 6,832,859	\$ 6,536,020	\$ 6,498,818	\$ 6,636,232	\$ 6,544,128
\$ 256,230	\$ 258,434	\$ 260,657	\$ 262,899	\$ 265,160	\$ 267,440
\$ 104,063,129	\$ 105,032,859	\$ 106,071,014	\$ 107,720,527	\$ 109,793,167	\$ 111,391,575

FY2031	FY2032	FY2033	FY2034	FY2035	FY2036
\$ 3,696,753	\$ 3,781,320	\$ 3,867,954	\$ 3,956,704	\$ 4,047,626	\$ 4,140,774
\$ 3,904,186	\$ 3,947,293	\$ 3,947,952	\$ 3,892,329	\$ 3,833,672	\$ 3,803,244
\$ 3,904,186	\$ 3,947,293	\$ 3,947,952	\$ 3,892,329	\$ 3,833,672	\$ 3,803,244
\$ 17,297,315	\$ 17,643,145	\$ 17,995,891	\$ 18,355,693	\$ 18,722,690	\$ 19,097,027
\$ 71,305,684	\$ 72,728,492	\$ 74,180,173	\$ 75,661,316	\$ 77,172,521	\$ 78,714,399
\$ 2,073,740	\$ 2,087,792	\$ 2,101,966	\$ 2,116,261	\$ 2,130,679	\$ 2,145,221
\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119
\$ 854,348	\$ 861,696	\$ 869,106	\$ 876,581	\$ 884,119	\$ 891,723
\$ 6,388,667	\$ 6,459,207	\$ 6,460,285	\$ 6,369,266	\$ 6,273,281	\$ 6,223,491
\$ 269,740	\$ 272,060	\$ 274,400	\$ 276,760	\$ 279,140	\$ 281,541
\$ 112,885,737	\$ 114,919,417	\$ 116,836,797	\$ 118,588,358	\$ 120,368,519	\$ 122,291,783

FY2037	FY2038	FY2039	FY2040	Total
\$ 4,236,208	\$ 4,333,985	\$ 4,434,164	\$ 4,536,808	\$ 88,272,296
\$ 3,773,816	\$ 3,690,579	\$ 3,601,198	\$ 3,515,381	\$ 91,151,525
\$ 3,773,816	\$ 3,690,579	\$ 3,601,198	\$ 3,515,381	\$ 91,151,525
\$ 19,478,851	\$ 19,868,311	\$ 20,265,561	\$ 20,670,756	\$ 411,870,834
\$ 80,287,577	\$ 81,892,690	\$ 83,530,390	\$ 85,201,341	\$ 1,698,097,653
\$ 2,159,888	\$ 2,174,681	\$ 2,189,602	\$ 2,204,651	\$ 196,149,537
\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119	\$ 3,191,119	\$ 79,443,881
\$ 899,391	\$ 907,126	\$ 914,927	\$ 922,796	\$ 20,960,436
\$ 6,175,336	\$ 6,039,129	\$ 5,892,870	\$ 5,752,442	\$ 133,520,967
\$ 283,962	\$ 286,404	\$ 288,867	\$ 291,351	\$ 6,617,752
\$ 124,259,964	\$ 126,074,604	\$ 127,909,897	\$ 129,802,027	\$ 2,817,236,406