

October 6, 2016

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Members, Transportation Technical Committee  
FROM: Cristina Finch, AICP, LEED AP, Director of Transportation  
SUBJ: October 13, 2016 TTC Meeting/Agenda

The October meeting of the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) will be held Thursday, October 13, 2016 at 1:30 pm at the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission office (Top Floor Conference Room), 313 Luck Avenue, SW in Roanoke, VA.

**AGENDA**

1. Welcome, Call to Order, Introductions ..... *Chairman Sexton*
2. Action on the September 8, 2016 Minutes, pp. 2-6 ..... *Chairman Sexton*
3. Review of the Six-Year Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan 2016-2021, [Attachment #1](#) ..... *Jeremy Holmes*
4. Review of the Annual Performance Measures Report ..... *Bryan Hill*  
p. 7 and [Attachment #2](#)
5. Review of the Final Draft Constrained Long-Range Multimodal ..... *Bryan Hill*  
Transportation Plan, pp. 8-9 (staff report); [Attachment #3](#) (Final Draft Vision 2040 Plan/  
Citizens Guide); and [Attachment #4](#) (List of Projects)
6. Other Business:
  - Transportation Alternatives (TA Set-Aside) Funding, pp. 10-11
  - “Excellence in Regional Transportation” NADO awards received for the *Roanoke Valley Pedestrian Vision Plan* and *A Basic Guide to the Transportation Improvement Program*
  - Six-Year Improvement Program Meetings (October 13, 2016 – 4pm Open House/5pm Meeting, Salem Civic Center)
7. Comments by Members and/or Citizens
8. 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 September 8, 2016

The September meeting of the Transportation Technical Committee was held on Thursday, September 8, 2016 at 1:30 p.m. at the Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission office, 313 Luck Avenue, SW, Roanoke, VA. Attendance follows:

#### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Liz Belcher	Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission
Chris Chittum	City of Roanoke
Michael Gray	Va. Dept. of Transportation – Salem District
Joey Hiner	Town of Vinton
David Holladay	Roanoke County
Mark Jamison	City of Roanoke
Diana Lewis	Roanoke Blacksburg Regional Airport
Kevin Price	Greater Roanoke Transit Company
Jitender Ramchandani	Va. Dept. of Rail and Public Transportation
Cody Sexton	Botetourt County
Karla Turman	Town of Vinton
Tori Williams	Roanoke County

Others Present: Nick Britton (via telephone), Va. Dept. of Rail and Public Transportation

Staff Present: Cristina Finch, Bryan Hill, Mark McCaskill, Jackie Pace, Rachel Ruhlen

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

Chairman Sexton called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m. A quorum was present.

#### 2. ACTION ON THE AUGUST 11, 2016 MINUTES

The Minutes of the August 11, 2016 TTC Meeting were previously distributed.

#### **Transportation Technical Committee Action:**

Upon by David Holladay, seconded by Mark Jamison and carried, the August 11, 2016 TTC Minutes 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. FINAL REPORT OF THE ROANOKE VALLEY TRANSIT VISION PLAN**

Cristina Finch stated that work on the Roanoke Valley Transit Vision Plan began three years ago, and it has been a monumental effort with feedback from over 4,000 citizens and stakeholders going into the plan. Ms. Finch noted that since June, staff has been working on edits requested by Roanoke County officials/staff (i.e., softening of language/wording tweaks). Those changes have now been incorporated, and all parties are comfortable with the Plan. Ms. Finch stated that the Plan provides a foundation for our region to move forward with a concept in mind as to “how do we grow our transit system beyond what we know of it today”. This plan focuses on how to make the present transit system more accessible, convenient and attractive to our population by expanding its reach and also by making simple improvements such as making bus stops ADA compliant. Ms. Finch opened the floor for any final comments or questions noting that the Plan will be presented to the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board at their September 22, 2016 meeting.

Kevin Price thanked Ms. Finch for her work on the Plan. Mr. Price noted that any metropolitan area he has been in there has been a robust transportation network that included transit, highway, sidewalks, airport, greenways, trails, etc. Noting all those work together so people can get around by choice not by necessity. The Plan gets people thinking about how we can make the Roanoke Valley more open and livable.

David Holladay also thanked Cristina and the rest of the TPO staff for their willingness to work with the County on their concerns, as well as Tori Williams who did most of the County’s editing work, along with help from Richard Caywood, Kevin Price and Carl Palmer. Mr. Holladay noted that there is currently more interest now by the County administration in exploring transit than ever before -- specifically focusing on economic development (business) efforts.

**Transportation Technical Committee Action:**

Upon a motion made by David Holladay, seconded by Diana Lewis and carried, it was recommended that the TTC forward the (Final) Roanoke Valley Transit Vision Plan, as presented, to the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board for approval.

**4. TTC RECOMMENDATION OF FINANCIALLY-CONSTRAINED & VISION LISTS OF PROJECTS FOR CONSIDERATION TO THE TPO POLICY BOARD**

Mark McCaskill stated he would present a brief overview of the framework and Bryan Hill would follow with a specific scoring exercise.

Mark reported that at the August TPO Policy Board meeting, the TPO remanded the issue back to the TTC to recommend which projects should go on the financially constrained list and which should go on the vision list. It was noted at that time that the Commonwealth’s new SMART SCALE selection process should be considered as projects are identified for each list.

Staff is looking at the Vision 2040: Roanoke Valley Transportation document as a Citizens Guide for the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). For the federal 3-C process, the Citizens Guide can be accepted as the region’s LRTP by entailing the financially constrained list, the vision list, and the Environmental Justice review. A year later the technical report

of the LRTP will be developed and include information that federal and state stakeholders will want to see, detailed documentation about the travel demand model assumptions, etc. When that it is completed, it will be amended into the citizen's version. That full technical version will be another opportunity to adjust the financially constrained and vision list of projects.

Mark reviewed the goals, objectives and principles which are important for TTC members to keep in mind before the proposed scoring exercise is undertaken.

The federal planning factors in the federal legislation (FAST ACT), which are tied with the Secretary of Transportation's ladders of opportunity concept, were presented. The ladders of opportunity are social access and social justice concepts where the idea that a transportation system should provide for economic opportunity, socio-economic mobility, etc.

Bryan Hill reported on recent changes received from Roanoke County (suggested projects to move from the Constrained List to the Vision List), most notably the 220 improvement project from 419 to Franklin County (shift \$136 million to Vision List).

To better align projects with the goals of the LRTP and the SMART SCALE factors, staff proposed a scoring process for ranking projects based on their merit, noting that the TTC has been successful in the past with scoring projects (i.e., RSTP). Instructions on scoring projects with the goals/objectives outlined earlier by Mark were provided.

Bryan reported that TTC members would be sent a spreadsheet to score the projects. Bryan asked that the spreadsheets be returned to him by COB on September 22, 2016. Bryan presented the ranking scale to be used. It is anticipated that the rankings will be discussed at the October TTC meeting and a recommendation will be made to forward the draft document with the project lists to the TPO Policy Board. Bryan stated that at the September TPO Policy Board meeting, they will have the draft LRTP document to review and be informed about the scoring exercise by the TTC.

Liz Belcher asked if the dollar amounts are known to help assist with scoring. Staff noted planning level cost estimates are available, though they are not proposed as a scoring factor for projects. Members were given two tables -- one the current six-year plan and the other has candidate projects that aren't on the current six-year plan. The current Six-Year Plan will take \$200+ million out of the \$500 million available for which the remaining half can be put towards the candidate projects. The actual constrained list is going to have much more than that because of federal money for maintenance.

Diana Lewis said at the last TPO meeting there was discussion if a project is on the RSTP list and after three years you would have to re-compete. She asked how would that play into the mix of all this.

Mark responded that only plays into the mix in that the RSTP categories are financially constrained. That is a separate scoring process -- an RSTP process. As long as it doesn't spend more than we have constrained for RSTP in the LRTP. The LRTP isn't involved in the issues of re-competing, that is the policies and procedures of the actual RSTP applications.

Mark explained the key is regionally significant projects have to be listed by name specifically. There are two concepts – “referenced in the LRTP” and “consistent with the LRTP”. There are paragraphs in the document that define what those mean. For purposes of the federal 3-C planning process, both projects referenced in regionally significant large projects ... and smaller projects consistent with the long-range plan. Both of those are deemed to be in the long-range plan. Both referenced in and consistent with are in the long range plan, just one of them lists projects in detail and the other defines categories that smaller projects can be consistent with. It was clarified that there is no amount which defines if a project is too small to list. It was suggested that projects, such as the Valley Metro transit facilities, be placed in a category rather than itemized. Categories of similar projects could help minimize the need for future amendments.

Members questioned the need to conduct a scoring exercise to determine which projects should be selected for the constrained list. Staff explained that such a system was needed to add greater clarity as to how projects are selected and that it had been recommended during the federal review of the TPO’s programs and processes. Such a system also reflects the shift towards performance-based planning. Michael Gray mentioned that Richmond and Hampton Roads have a scoring process for their LRTPs.

Members indicated that preferably such a process should be approved by the TPO Policy Board. Members also felt that rather than in engaging in a timely scoring process at this time, they suggested that the TPO staff conduct the exercise to test the merits of the system. Members offered that if any localities wanted to volunteer certain projects to not be on the constrained list that could also be considered. Given that the lists would be reviewed again within a year when the Technical Report is complete, as well as in five years when the next CLRMTTP is completed, Mr. Holladay added that a priority should be placed on which projects are likely to begin within the short-term.

Chairman Sexton acknowledged that members need to submit project descriptions and again review the project lists for candidates for the vision list.

Mark gave the opportunity for Transit and Airport members to speak on project ideas that are not the exclusive property to one local government to keep in mind.

Kevin Price, Valley Metro, stated that the FTA sees transit as a project with recurring maintenance and operating costs. Transit maintenance costs for replacement of the buses is mostly on a 12-year cycle. Kevin further stated that what you will see coming from Valley Metro, as far as normal operations, is for replacement. As far as Constrained vs. Vision, he thinks there are some things Valley Metro can move from the Constrained to the Vision side. Replacement vehicles is the primary project and expansion will probably go to SMART SCALE or some other source such as 5339B Competitive grant funding for bus and bus replacement. Valley Metro had applied for this funding earlier but just found out that their application for an expanded maintenance facility was not funded. They will continue to look for other ways to fund transit expenses. The more transit progresses, the more regional it becomes.

Diana Lewis, Roanoke-Blacksburg Regional Airport, asked to address the TTC for direction/suggestions on an underground tunnel at the airport. The tunnel is underneath

Runway 624 and was constructed in 1985 by the City of Roanoke (when the City owned and operated the airport). The structure is in need of upgrades. The lighting is original (over 30 years old), have to deal with problems to the ventilation system, had to add extra electrical back-up, etc.) and ongoing maintenance and repair. The Airport did maintenance in 2013 which cost about \$500,000 to do the necessary upkeep on the tunnel. Ms. Lewis noted that the Airport has no funding source set up to continue with the maintenance and upkeep required. She stated that the FAA would not pay since it is a road. They will pay for structural improvements, if needed, since it holds up the runway. Ms. Lewis stated that the runway was constructed in 1985 in order to add more service to the whole region and to accommodate larger aircraft -- it is a regional concern, not an airport responsibility. She noted it was going to get to the point when the airport can't afford to make improvements/provide maintenance. She asked for any ideas on how to go about getting funding, i.e., could RSTP be used for a portion; perhaps partner with a locality or two to help with some of the improvements, etc.

## 5. **OTHER BUSINESS**

- Rachel Ruhlen spoke about surveys and public information meetings being held concerning the CLRMTP.
- David Holladay presented upcoming information on a 419 meeting to be held on September 15, 2016.
- A Multi-Regional Bicycle-Pedestrian Social will be held Friday, September 16, 2016 in Christiansburg.
- Cristina Finch noted that Transportation Alternatives (TA) applications for this round will be discussed at the October 13<sup>th</sup> TTC meeting.
- Michael Gray reported that the SMART SCALE VDOT Guide (page 18) states the start date as August 1, 2022 as the earliest to get money; that date should be changed to August 1, 2021.
- Chris Chittum asked members to complete the Roanoke City League of American Bicycles survey available online.
- To review, the Roanoke Valley TPO will be submitting the following SMART SCALE projects: four I-81 auxiliary lane projects and the Route 220 Ramp at 419 project.
- This is the last TTC meeting for Mark McCaskill who will be leaving the Regional Commission after 16 years. Mark has taken a position in Olympia, Washington and his last day at the Commission will be September 23, 2016.

Adjournment at 3:10 p.m.

Submitted by  
Jackie L. Pace, Recording Secretary

October 6, 2016

## **STAFF REPORT**

### **SUBJ: 2016 RVTPO Performance Measures Report**

This report is being generated as part of a statewide effort among Transportation Management Area Metropolitan Planning Organizations (TMA MPO) to track common performance measures, evaluate the region's transportation system against its transportation goals and standards, and contribute to the Statewide Transportation Plan. The Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization (RVTPO), as a TMA MPO, is required by the state to track regional performance measures. The RVTPO will be eligible for funding through sources only available to TMA MPOs and receipt of those funds is contingent upon the TPO's development, and the Commonwealth Transportation Board's approval, of the regional performance measures.

Regional performance measures fall under the following categories:

- Congestion Reduction
- Safety
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Usage
- Transit Usage
- HOV Usage
- Jobs-to-Housing Ratio
- Job and Housing Access to Pedestrian Facilities
- Air Quality
- Airport Facility Usage
- Movement of Freight

As of the writing of this staff report, there is some data which has not been updated due to lack of availability. Those measures are: 6.1 – 6.5 and 10.1 - 10.6.

Staff recommends forwarding the Annual Performance Measures Report to the TPO Board at their October 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**TPO POLICY BOARD:** Cities of Roanoke and Salem; Counties of Bedford, Botetourt, Montgomery and Roanoke; Town of Vinton; Greater Roanoke Transit Company (*Valley Metro*); Roanoke-Blacksburg Regional Airport; Virginia Department of Rail & Public Transportation; Virginia Department of Transportation

October 6, 2016

## **STAFF REPORT**

### **SUBJ: Review of Final Draft Long-Range Transportation Plan**

Provided in your agenda packet is a final draft of the Constrained Long-Range Multimodal Transportation Plan for your first review and feedback. This is an initial “citizen-friendly” version; a more in-depth version with complete technical documentation will be amended into the CLRMTP by Summer 2017. As such, over the next year, a project selection process and an amendment to the CLRMTP process will be determined, as well as any necessary modifications made to this CLRMTP.

At the September TTC meeting, members reviewed the draft plan and a proposed scoring system to identify projects for the constrained list of projects. It was determined that RVARC staff would run the projects through a draft scoring system and that a recommendation for the prioritization of projects would be finalized at the October 13<sup>th</sup> TTC meeting.

Staff considered the following in the scoring of projects:

**Goal 1:** Focus on transportation connectivity gaps in access to employment and essential services and help address those gaps through multimodal transportation solutions. The concept behind this goal is labeled “Ladders of Opportunity”;

**Goal 2:** Build on our strengths by investing in multimodal transportation infrastructure improvements in predefined areas where citizens already live and work and where dense increases in jobs and housing are planned. The TPO Policy Board has defined these areas as Multimodal Districts and Multimodal Centers;

**Goal 3:** Invest in a seamless multimodal transportation system by developing operations management, intelligent transportation systems and similar technical and managerial best management practices to get the most out of the transportation infrastructure and assets that already exist;

**Goal 4:** Facilitate greater regional planning cooperation by advancing transportation projects that benefit the citizens of more than one TPO member locality, and/or that are sponsored by more than one TPO local government;

The six SMART SCALE Factors:

1. Safety;
2. Congestion Mitigation;
3. Accessibility;
4. Land Use and Transportation Coordination;
5. Environmental Quality;
6. Economic Development.

Public input received from surveys of 328 citizens who provided feedback on their transportation priorities.

Three spreadsheets are provided:

1 - Projects Currently in the Six-Year Improvement Program – Automatically in the Constrained List

2 – RVARC Scoring of Candidate CLRMTP Projects – additional candidate projects previously identified for the constrained and vision lists. The purpose of this list is to demonstrate how all candidate projects score.

3 – Projects initially identified for the constrained list sorted by total score. The purpose of this list is to show how projects may be prioritized for the constrained list based on initial stakeholder input of which projects to put on this list. The “lower priority” projects would be placed on the vision list.

Using the scores as a guide, initial stakeholder input on which projects to place on which list, as well as general knowledge about the timing of projects, staff asks the TTC to determine a list of projects by priority. RVARC will develop the constrained list based on the prioritization and year-of-expenditure project costs. The priority does not influence when projects would be implemented; simply, it defines which projects will be on the constrained or vision list.

---

The TTC is asked to consider recommending the plan and related project lists to the TPO Policy Board for consideration and approval at their next meeting.



## **STAFF REPORT**

### **Subj: Transportation Alternatives (TA Set-Aside) Funding**

To all eligible stakeholders wishing to seek Transportation Alternatives funding during the FY 2017 application cycle, please note the deadline to notify staff at the Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization of your project and intent is **October 13, 2016**. All stakeholders requesting a project endorsement from the Roanoke Valley TPO Policy Board must notify TPO staff via the attached form (also available on <http://rvarc.org/transportation/mpo-urban-transportation/ta-program/>).

**All applicants should have a project representative present at the October 27, 2016 Roanoke Valley Transportation Planning Organization Policy Board Meeting at 1:00 p.m.** (*Roanoke Valley-Alleghany Regional Commission office, Top Floor Conference Room, 313 Luck Avenue, SW, Roanoke, VA 24016*). At the October 27 meeting, staff will share with the TPO Policy Board the projects seeking funding. Project representatives are asked to prepare a five (5) minute presentation to explain their project(s).

Information about this transportation funding program may be found online at <http://www.virginiadot.org/business/prehancegrants.asp>

#### **RVTPO Staff Contact:**

Bryan Hill, Regional Planner III  
[bhill@rvarc.org](mailto:bhill@rvarc.org), 540-343-4417

**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



## **Request for Project Endorsement**

*Please submit this request to Bryan Hill, [bhill@rvarc.org](mailto:bhill@rvarc.org)*

**Request Date:**

**Funding Program:**

Transportation Alternatives

**Project Name:**

**Project Description:**

**Limits of the Project:**

**Estimated Total Project Cost:**

\$

**Amount Requested Via the Funding Program Above:**

\$