

June 15, 2016

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

<b>DATE:</b>	<b>Thursday, June 23, 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>

## **AGENDA**

1. Call to Order, Roll Call, Introductions ..... *Chair Johnson*
2. Approval of the May 26, 2016 Minutes, pp. 3-7 ..... *Chair Johnson*
3. Report by the Chair ..... *Chair Johnson*
4. Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Discussion, pp. 8-9 ..... *Mark McCaskill*
5. Candidate House Bill 2 (HB2) Projects for RVTPO Application ..... *Bryan Hill*
6. Discussion of Financially Constrained List of Projects ..... *Bryan Hill/Mark McCaskill*
7. Other Business
8. Comment Period
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

**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 May meeting of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization (RVTPO) Policy Board was held on Thursday, May 26, 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, <i>Vice Chair</i>	City of Roanoke
Jane Johnson, <i>Chair</i>	City of Salem
Diana Lewis	Roanoke-Blacksburg Regional Airport
Billy Martin, Sr.	Botetourt County
Lee Osborne	Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission
Carl Palmer	Greater Roanoke Transit Company
Jason Peters	Roanoke County
Janet Scheid	Town of Vinton
Kendall Wallace ( <i>for Ken King</i> )	Virginia Dept. of Transportation-Salem District

### 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: Jim Atkins, RADAR member, Transit Vision Steering Committee; Antwyne Calloway, Blue Ridge Independent Living Center member, Transit Vision Steering Committee; Richard Caywood, Roanoke County; David Holladay, Roanoke County member, and Chairman, Transportation Technical Committee; Michael Gray, Virginia Department of Transportation-Salem District member, Transportation Technical Committee; David Miller, Foursquare Integrated Transportation Planning; Kevin Price, Greater Roanoke Transit Company member, Transportation Technical Committee; Court Rosen; Member, Commonwealth Transportation Board; Sherman Stovall, City of Roanoke member, Transit Vision Steering Committee.

### 2. APPROVAL OF APRIL 28, 2016 MINUTES

The Minutes of the April 28, 2016 meeting of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization Policy Board were distributed earlier.

**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

Wayne Strickland noted the word changes to the last page of the Minutes, under Other Business (first bulleted paragraph), to read:

- *“Wayne Strickland noted that the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) recently met in Lynchburg. He asked Ken King, District Engineer at Salem VDOT, to report on some of the changes to the HB2 funding recommendations discussed at that meeting. Mr. King said the changes that occurred in the Salem District, were the addition of two projects and removal of two projects. The projects recommended for removal are the Phase II project of N. Franklin Street in Christiansburg, approximately \$9 million, and a safety improvement project to the “S” curves on I-81 mile marker 166.5-168.5, near the Arcadia exit, estimated at approximately \$35 million. The projects recommended for HB2 funding are improvements to “S” curves on U.S. 460 in the Montvale area, and the provision of an auxiliary lane on I-81 from Exit 141 to 143 that would extend the access lane for Route 419 onto I-81 northbound which would tie the merging on-lane to the off ramp at I-581 (making that segment of I-81 three lanes instead of two).”*

**Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board Action:**

Upon motion by Billy Martin, seconded by Todd Dodson and carried, the Minutes of the April 28, 2016 meeting of the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization Policy Board were approved, as amended.

**3. REPORT BY THE CHAIR**

Chair Johnson announced that the TPO staff received two 2016 Excellence in Regional Transportation Awards by the National Association of Development Organizations (NADO). The two awards were for their work on: (1) “A Basic Guide to the Transportation Improvement Program”; and (2) “The Roanoke Valley Pedestrian Vision Plan”. These NADO awards recognize noteworthy projects and practices in rural and small metropolitan areas that help meet regional needs through various program areas, including; bicycle and pedestrian planning, air quality, equity, project implementation, public involvement, safety and transit.

**4. UPDATE ON REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP) – NEW FUNDS**

Michael Gray, Virginia Department of Transportation – Salem District, reported that the Roanoke Valley TPO area is projected to receive \$9,243,360 in additional RSTP funding in years 2017 through 2022. Handouts were distributed at the meeting showing the current (FY’16-21) RSTP Six-Year Financial Plan with the projects and amounts approved by the TPO Policy Board in March of 2015, updated RSTP allocations and their approved amount for each year, as well as the new funding received for years 2017-2022.

Mr. Gray asked the members for their feedback/guidance on how to go about distributing the additional funding. He outlined the scenarios expressed by the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) for the possible distribution of the additional funds:

- Estimates need to be revised for all projects; extra funding could be used to cover increases (high priority to low); not a way to add to the scope of the project.

- Is there a need to advance funding for any of the “committed” projects?
- Projects that start in out years of FY 16-21 (FY 19-21) could be started earlier; potential to fully fund those projects.
- Could call for applications this year, returning to two-year cycle next year. Would provide new list of projects to compete for funding.
- Could fund a priority project of the RVTPO Board.

Mr. Gray stated when the Six-Year Improvement Program comes out in June the existing funding will show in a line item (in a special account not yet programmed to a specific project). Mr. Gray further stated that the money could be left in the “balance entry account” but suggested that perhaps the TPO may want to take the FY17-18 funding and apply it toward a project.

Jason Peters stated that with the new funds coming in now, the Board might want to look at calling for applications this year.

Staff was asked to look at other TPOs in the Commonwealth and their RSTP funding, and to review the updates from project managers on cost estimates of previous RSTP applications.

**Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board Action:**

Billy Martin moved that Mark McCaskill, Bryan Hill, Mike Gray and David Holladay look at what are the best options for the TPO with the additional RSTP funding at this time and to bring that information back for further discussion at the June Policy Board meeting. The motion was seconded by Todd Dodson and carried.

**5. SIX-YEAR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM/HB2 PRIORITIZATION PROCESS UPDATE**

Bryan Hill discussed HB2 and its role/presence in the State’s Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP) and brought the following items to the Policy Board’s attention:

- In the VDOT SYIP, there are 116 projects in the TPO area, totaling approximately \$783 million. Those projects include 11 HB2 that the localities and TPO Board applied for and were recommended for funding, as well as a variety of bridge, RSTP, Transportation Alternatives Program (now known as the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program), revenue sharing, and district-wide maintenance projects.
- In the FY16 SYIP, FY22-23 funds for HB2 will be programmed at that point.
- Regarding VDOT’s commitment to a full funding policy to projects over the six-year period, Mr. Hill noted that from a staff perspective it is good to get projects on and off in a fast/timely manner.
- Timeline: staff has started discussions with localities and the TTC on priorities for new projects and those projects that were not recommended for funding this year. Focus in on projects found in local and regional plans and develop project priorities. Staff anticipates an endorsement by the TPO Policy Board in July on candidate projects. By

August 1, the HB2 application window opens. The deadline for project submissions is September 30, 2016. Scores will be released in January 2017 and following in the spring, the CTB will review and hold public meetings on the Six-Year Improvement Program.

Michael Gray also noted the upcoming timelines and asked the TPO Policy Board to start considering what projects they would like to submit (or resubmit). He stated applicants might want to think about submitting smaller projects, rather than “big ticket” projects.

## **6. PRESENTATION ON THE DRAFT ROANOKE VALLEY TRANSIT VISION PLAN**

Cristina Finch began working with the consulting firm of FourSquare Integrated Transportation Planning, and with the stakeholders of the Transit Vision Plan Steering Committee, in September 2015 on the Roanoke Valley Transit Vision Plan. Regional Commission staff had previously conducted initial public surveys and background data analysis beginning in July 2013.

David Miller, with FourSquare Integrated Transportation Planning, reported on the Executive Summary of the (Draft) Transit Vision Plan at the meeting. In 2012, the Roanoke Valley urbanized area became classified by the federal government as a Transportation Management Area (TMA) as its population in the urban area surpassed 200,000 residents. This population number is significant, particularly as federal funding is concerned, to distinguish smaller urban areas from larger ones. The change required Roanoke Valley decision-makers to begin thinking about transit, and specifically the investment in public transportation and the value that transit brings to the community. The Transit Vision Plan becomes one element of the region’s Constrained Long-Range Multimodal Transportation Plan.

The Plan will accomplish the following functions:

1. Record the region’s vision, goals, and strategies for improving the transit mode of transportation in the Roanoke Valley as identified through input from citizens and local leaders.
2. Serve as a resource guide for transit service planning in the Roanoke Valley.
3. Encourage local governments to incorporate transit supportive development and infrastructure in local ordinances, policies, plans, and related guiding documents.
4. Identify and map all existing and proposed transit services.
5. Identify and map locations where transit services are needed and desired.
6. Provide strategies for accomplishing the needed services in a reasonable timetable.

The Transit Vision Plan is divided into six parts: (1) Introduction, (2) Background/Existing Conditions, (3) Existing Conditions Technical Report, (4) Preferences and Demand, (5) Recommendations, and (6) Implementation Strategies.

Mr. Miller outlined the Short-, Medium- and Long-Term Recommendations in the Plan, which were based upon four different inputs: (1) Service Gap Analysis, (2) Service Connection Analysis, (3) Frequent Corridor Analysis, and (4) Public Input.

Elements Critical to Success: Throughout the planning process it was clear that the way forward to realize the recommendations of the plan would require significant changes in the

approach of how transit service is both funded and delivered. Valley Metro currently operates as a subset of the City of Roanoke. As such, it is controlled and funded primarily by the City and, as a result, provides very little service beyond the City limits. Some service and funding outside the City is accomplished through a Memorandum of Understanding with partnering localities, such as the City of Salem and the Town of Vinton. While this may meet the basic needs of many residents, it is felt that this does not meet the needs of the region and it cannot produce a transit system that helps achieve the goals of a Livable Roanoke Valley. To realize the transformative potential of the Vision Plan will require a truly regional approach with multiple jurisdictions serving on a regional transit agency. As a result, a critical next step is to work collaboratively with local partners to develop a path forward that will enable a true regional organization with participation from many stakeholders and equitable regional decision-making.

The entire draft document is available at [www.rvarc.org/transit](http://www.rvarc.org/transit). The Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization will review the plan for approval in the near future.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Submitted by:

Wayne Strickland, Secretary,  
Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization

**STAFF REPORT**

**SUBJ: Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Discussion**

Extra unanticipated RSTP funding is a good problem to have. TPO staff, in partnership with the VDOT Salem District Office staff, have contacted project sponsors of current RSTP projects to ask if there are any unanticipated cost overruns on current projects. The results will be presented at the June Policy Board meeting. If unanticipated cost overruns exist, through no fault of the project sponsor, they may be good candidates for your consideration vis-à-vis the extra RSTP funding.

Staff members have also contacted our counterparts at other Virginia Transportation Management Area (TMA) MPOs to inquire how they are approaching the extra RSTP funding. Some of the results are not directly applicable to our situation because we do not have access to Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding due to our good air quality relative to federal standards. According to the other TMA MPOs the CMAQ portion of their funding took a cut that was, in some cases, nearly equal to the increase in RSTP funding.

Here is a brief summary of those responses:

TMA	RSTP Question
Richmond Regional TPO	Richmond Regional TPO already has a yearly RSTP allocation process. RRTPO gets approximately 4 times more funding than we do (up to \$20 million a year starting in FY2022), so they are able to have a meaningful annual process. New funds were adjusted into that process to plug holes left by a drop in CMAQ, add to the contingency fund and other adjustments.
Fredericksburg Area MPO – FAMPO	RSTP primarily plugging holes left by the reduction in CMAQ funds, rest of new RSTP going to previously partially funded projects.
Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization - HRTPO	HRTPO has a yearly application and allocation process anyway. HRTPO gets just under 7 times more funding than we do (up to \$34.9 million a year starting in FY2022), so they are able to have a meaningful annual process. HRTPO has always kept a reserve fund. Some of the new RSTP may need to go to making up for reduction in CMAQ on projects that are joint RSTP/CMAQ. Other portions of new RSTP funding may go into the reserve/contingency fund.
TRI-Cities MPO (Petersburg, Colonial Heights and Hopewell)	Extra RSTP going to existing RSTP projects and for balancing out cut in CMAQ.

**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

There are some additional dynamics to keep in mind concerning this next fiscal year. Staff will be completing the long-range transportation plan, applying for HB2 projects on RVTPO's behalf and assisting our local governments in their own HB2 applications. We always find a way to serve our local governments in a professional manner. However, if we were to go out for RSTP applications early, instead of waiting until 2017, it would entail a large commitment of staff and Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) time in receiving and scoring applications. This may come at a temporary tradeoff with some of our other commitments and activities.