Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization
Board Meeting – May 17, 2018
The Regional Board Room, 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia

10:30 am
1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Agenda
3. Executive Director Report

WORKSHOP AGENDA

10:35 am
4. HRPDC and HRTPO Joint Personnel and Budget Committee Report
5. Commonwealth Transportation Board Members Update
6. Virginia Department of Transportation Update
7. Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation Update
8. Virginia Port Authority Update
9. HRT and WATA Updates
10. Community Transportation Advisory Committee Update
11. Military Liaisons Updates
12. FY 2019 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP): Mike Kimbrel, HRTPO
13. FY 2019 HRTPO Budget: Nancy Collins, HRTPO
14. Transportation Conformity: Dale Stith, HRTPO
15. I-64/Hampton Roads Bridge-Tunnel (HRBT) – Project Update: James Utterback, VDOT
16. Transit Funding Reform: Jennifer DeBruhl, DRPT

MEETING AGENDA

11:45 am
17. Public Comment Period (limit 3 minutes per individual)
18. Submitted Public Comments
19. Transcribed Public Comments from Previous HRTPO Meeting

ACTION ITEMS

20. Regional Connector Study – Authorization to Contract with Selected Consultant: Robert Crum, HRTPO

21. Approval of Consent Items
   A. Minutes
   B. HRTPO Financial Report
   C. FY 2019 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)
   D. FY 2019 HRTPO Budget
   E. Project Consistency with the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)
   F. HRTPO Guidance on SMART SCALE – Update
   G. Requests for HRTPO Resolutions of Support – SMART SCALE
   H. Hampton Roads 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP): Proposed Amendments
      I. Transportation Conformity: 2040 LRTP and FY 2018-2021 TIP
      J. Hampton Roads Regional Bridge Study
      K. Safety Performance Measures Amendment for the FY 2018-2021 TIP
L. Virginia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (VAMPO): Support for a new State Transportation Revenue System
M. HRTPO CMAQ and RSTP Project Selection Process 2017 Final Report
N. FY 2018-2021 TIP Amendment: UPC 101793
   Isle of Wight Multi-Use Trail – Segment 1
O. FY 2018-2021 TIP Amendment: UPC 101794
   Isle of Wight Multi-Use Trail – Segment 2
P. FY 2018-2021 TIP Amendment: UPC 111787
   Route 17 Widening in York County (PE Only)
Q. FY 2018-2021 TIP Amendment: UPC 112923
   I-64 Express Lanes – Segment II (PE Only)
R. FY 2018-2021 TIP Amendment: UPCs T20978, T20980, T20979, T21210, T21111, T21223, 100608, & 102999
   CMAQ Funding Transfers to New and Existing Projects
S. FY 2018-2021 TIP Amendment: UPC 102734
   Multimodal High-Speed and Intercity Passenger Rail Station Development in Newport News
T. FY 2018-2021 TIP Revision: Request to Transfer CMAQ Funding: UPC T9111
   Liberty Street Transfer Station in Chesapeake
U. Request to Transfer CMAQ Funding from UPC 110753 to HRTPO CMAQ Reserve Account
V. Request to Transfer RSTP Funding from HRTPO RSTP Reserve Account to Pocahontas Trail Multimodal Corridor in James City County
W. FY 2018-2021 TIP Revision: Request to Transfer CMAQ Funding: UPC 105592
   ATMS Phase 4C

INFORMATION ITEMS

22. HRTPO Board Three-Month Tentative Schedule
23. Correspondence of Interest
24. Minutes of HRTPO Advisory Committee Meetings
25. For Your Information
   A. HRTF Monthly Financial Statement
   B. HRTAC Program Development Monthly Executive Report
26. Old/New Business
27. Adjournment
ITEM #1: CALL TO ORDER

The meeting is scheduled to be called to order by the chair at 10:30 a.m.

ITEM #2: APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Members are provided an opportunity to add or delete items from the agenda. Any item for which a member desires consideration by the HRTPO Board should be submitted at this time for consideration under “Old/New Business”.

ITEM #3: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT

The Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization Executive Director will provide a report to the HRTPO Board.

Attachment 3
TO: HRPDC/HRTPO Board Members  
FROM: Robert Crum, Executive Director  
RE: Executive Director’s May 2018 Report  

HRPDC staff continues to manage the Norfolk/Virginia Beach Joint Land Use Study (JLUS). The primary focus of this JLUS is to address the impacts of recurrent flooding and coastal storms on the military bases in these cities. The Technical and Policy Committees for this JLUS planning effort met on April 20th, and the first public meeting session was held the evening of May 2nd and attended by approximately 30 residents. In addition, Congressman Bobby Scott and a staff member from Senator Tim Kaine’s office attended and participated in this meeting. The project consultant team is working with representatives from the two cities to develop recommendations for this study, which will be available for consideration by the two localities in the fall.

A similar JLUS planning effort for the Cities of Portsmouth and Chesapeake is also being managed by the HRPDC. A project consultant has been selected for this planning effort and this JLUS will begin this summer.

The Chief Administrative Officers (CAO) Committee held their regularly scheduled monthly meetings on April 4th and May 2nd. Agenda items for each meeting were as follows:

April 4
- Update on Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel Project
- Presentation from the Hampton Roads Economic Development Alliance
- Tax Reform

May 2
- Regional Economic Development Sites Inventory
- Old Dominion University Life in Hampton Roads Annual Survey
- Public Safety in Local Schools
The CAO Subcommittee on Sea Level Rise held its second meeting on March 7th in Newport News.

The first meeting of the Broadband Steering Committee was held April 18th. The Cities of Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Suffolk and Virginia Beach have each appointed a city manager and elected official to serve on this committee to provide oversight for Phase I of the Regional Broadband Initiative, which will include 30% design work for the Southside broadband ring and opportunities to connect across the Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel and Monitor Merrimac Bridge Tunnel to the Peninsula. Future phases of this effort will involve a similar effort on the Peninsula as the region works to leverage the transatlantic broadband cables as an economic development asset. The five Southside Cities have agreed to contribute $650,000 to complete the 30% design work for the Southside Fiber Ring.

Meanwhile, the Peninsula localities continue to advance work on the Unmanned Systems Initiative which was funded through GO Virginia. As part of this effort, a revenue sharing framework will be developed and shared through the regional CAO Committee which can serve as a model for regional collaboration around this project and other efforts involving the Hampton Roads jurisdictions.

The HRPDC staff continues to advance work on the Regional Economic Development Sites Inventory. This effort was presented to the HRPDC at its February meeting. Since this meeting, HRPDC staff has worked with locality staffs to finalize Phase I of this inventory, which identifies shovel ready mega sites of 100 acres or greater in size. Staff has also met with Virginia Economic Development Partnership (VEDP) staff to discuss the VEDP shovel ready sites program and potential next steps for the Hampton Roads effort. Staff will discuss this information with the HRPDC at the Commission’s May 17th meeting.

The HRTPO staff has worked with Working Group representatives from the local governments, HRTAC, and military and federal partners to advance the procurement process for the Regional Connectors Study. Four consultant teams were interviewed on April 9th by the Working Group. The Working Group reached a consensus on a selected consultant and directed HRTPO staff to proceed to contract negotiation with the preferred consultant team. The Working Group will meet on May 11th to discuss the status of these negotiations and an update will be provided to the HRTPO Board on May 17th.

HRPDC staff is in the process of completing meetings with the Planning Directors from each of the HRPDC localities to discuss opportunities and challenges in each jurisdiction and the possibility of re-establishing meetings of the Regional Planning Directors Committee.
The askHRgreen “Team Up 2 Clean Up” program was recently featured on WTKR News Channel 3. A brief video which includes HRPDC Principal Environmental Education Planner Katie Cullipher can be viewed at the following link:


The Executive Director provided a presentation to the Greater Norfolk Council on March 1st on the Regional Broadband Initiative.

The Executive Director served on a Transportation Panel to discuss the region’s transportation planning efforts on March 1st at the Founders Inn in Virginia Beach.

HRPDC staff has participated in the Hampton Roads Economic Development Alliance (HREDA) work with the IBM International Consultant Team and the analysis of the region’s economic competitiveness.

The Executive Director attended the Norfolk State of the City Address on March 9th.

The Executive Director attended and participated in the Regional Roundtable meeting which was hosted by the Hampton Roads Chamber on March 22nd.

The Executive Director attended the Virginia Beach State of the City Address on March 28th.

On April 2nd, the Executive Director provided Welcoming and Introductory Comments at a Regional Disability Inclusion Emergency Management Training Exercise.

The Executive Director and HRTAC Executive Director provided a joint presentation to the LEAD Peninsula Class on April 5th as part of the Organization’s Regional Transportation Day.

The Executive Director attended the Portsmouth State of the City Address on April 6th.

The Executive Director met with representatives of Hampton University on April 10th to discuss potential collaboration and opportunities for guest speaking arrangements for various classes at the University.

The Executive Director and HRTPO staff met with a representative from MARAD on April 11th to discuss potential Maritime Transportation projects and initiatives.
The Executive Director attended the State of the Port Address on April 11th.

HRPDC staff attended and participated in two Military Mission Master Plan Update forums on April 16th. The Deputy Executive Director attended the morning session on the Southside, while the Executive Director attended the afternoon session on the Peninsula.

HRTPO staff attended the Commonwealth Transportation Board’s Public Meeting which was held on April 16th in the Regional Board Room. At this meeting, HRTPO Chair Tom Shepperd addressed the CTB and State representatives stressing the importance of Smart Scale funding to support the proposed improvements to the Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel.

The Executive Director attended the April 19th Board meeting of the Hampton Roads Military and Federal Facilities Alliance and provided a brief update on the Norfolk/Virginia Beach Joint Land Use Study.

The Executive Director attended the April 19th meeting of the Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission.

HRPDC staff attended a meeting of the Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions on April 20th in Charlottesville to discuss the Chesapeake Bay program.

On April 20th, the HRPDC/HRTPO staff held an annual spring clean-up session. Staff members dedicated time during their lunch hour to collect debris from around the stormwater pond located adjacent to the Regional Building.

The Executive Director participated in a Strategic Planning Retreat for the Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions on May 1st in Richmond.

The Executive Director held an introductory meeting with new VDOT District Engineer Chris Hall on May 2nd.

The HRPDC/HRTPO Management Team continues to advance work on the following items:

- Title VI, Civil Rights and Community Outreach
- Recruitment for vacant positions
- Personnel Management
- FY 2019 budget preparation
- Provision of financial and human resource management services to the HRTAC and HRMFFA
- Deployment of updated/new computers and IT management efforts.
ITEM #4:  HRPDC AND HRTPO JOINT PERSONNEL AND BUDGET COMMITTEE REPORT

The HRPDC and HRTPO Joint Personnel and Budget Committee convened earlier this morning and will provide a report regarding its meeting.

ITEM #5:  COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEMBERS UPDATE

The Commonwealth Transportation Board members are invited to address the HRTPO Board.

ITEM #6:  VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION UPDATE

The Virginia Department of Transportation representative is invited to address the HRTPO Board.

ITEM #7:  VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF RAIL AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION UPDATE

The Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation representative is invited to address the HRTPO Board.

ITEM #8:  VIRGINIA PORT AUTHORITY UPDATE

The Virginia Port Authority representative is invited to address the HRTPO Board.

ITEM #9:  HRT AND WATA UPDATES

Transit agency representatives are invited to address the HRTPO Board.

ITEM #10:  COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CTAC) UPDATE

The CTAC representative is invited to address the HRTPO Board.

ITEM #11:  MILITARY LIAISONS UPDATES

Military liaisons are invited to address the HRTPO Board.
ITEM #12: FY 2019 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP): Mike Kimbrel, HRTPO

SUMMARY:
HRTPO staff, in coordination with Hampton Roads Transit, Williamsburg Area Transit Authority, Suffolk Transit, the Virginia Department of Transportation, and the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, developed the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for fiscal year (FY) 2019.

Mr. Mike Kimbrel, Deputy Executive Director, will brief the HRTPO Board on this item.

BACKGROUND:
The UPWP describes the mutual responsibilities of the aforementioned entities in carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process for Hampton Roads.

The draft UPWP was presented to the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee at its April 4, 2018 meeting and underwent public review from April 4, 2018 through April 18, 2018. Comments received have been addressed in the final report. The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee has recommended approval of the FY 2019 UPWP.

Enclosure 12: FY 2019 Unified Planning Work Program

RECOMMENDED ACTION (Action to be taken under Meeting Agenda Item #21-C):
Approve the FY 2019 Unified Planning Work Program.
ITEM #13: FY 2019 HRTPO BUDGET: Nancy Collins, HRTPO

SUMMARY:
The staff recommends approval of the proposed FY 2019 Budget by the HRPDC and HRTPO. Because the HRPDC is the fiduciary agency for the HRTPO, the following documents reflect the agency as a whole and are attached for your review. The HRTPO Operations and Pass-Through figures are shown on the FY 2019 Summary Budget Comparison.

- Historical Budget Trend with Bar Charts
- FY 2019 Draft Budget/Summary
- Fund Balance Report
- Member Dues and State Allocation Trend Report
- Local Jurisdiction Contributions Spreadsheet
- Revenue Pie Chart by Funding Source
- Expenditure Pie Chart by Program
- Reserves

Ms. Nancy Collins, Chief Financial Officer, will brief the HRTPO Board on this item.

BACKGROUND:
The FY 2019 Budget reflects a total revenue (and corresponding expenditure) increase of 8.13% over FY 2018. This increase is due mainly to new grant awards in Homeland Security, JLUS and Broadband funding. Over $500,000 of this increase is in pass-through funds, while agency operating expenses increased slightly.

Member contributions will remain at the reduced $0.80 per capita rate approved in FY 2013.

The budget supports a proposed 2.5% performance-based salary adjustment for staff, though the Personnel category only increased 1.35% due to retirements and a 24% decrease in the employer’s share of VRS contributions. There was an 8.2% increase in healthcare premiums. Standard Contracts increased by 7.97% due to increased legal expenses. Special Contracts increased by 52% due to website and survey development. General Operations increased by 11.7% mainly due to the community outreach program, computer replacements, and staff training. The increase in contingencies will be used in subsequent fiscal years. Staff recommends continuing to fund our reserves in order to continue to offset future increases in costs as funding continues to decrease.

Attachment 13

RECOMMENDED ACTION: (Action to be taken under Meeting Agenda Item #21-D):
Approve the FY 2019 Budget.
Draft FY 2019 Budget Compendium

May 17, 2018
## Historical Budget Trend

### FY2015 FY2016 FY2017 FY2018 DRAFT FY2019

### REVENUES

#### Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>DRAFT FY2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>2,491,510</td>
<td>2,421,597</td>
<td>2,498,577</td>
<td>2,880,856</td>
<td>2,975,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>506,897</td>
<td>535,811</td>
<td>437,749</td>
<td>485,840</td>
<td>449,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Support to PDCs</td>
<td>151,943</td>
<td>151,943</td>
<td>151,943</td>
<td>151,943</td>
<td>151,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Grants</td>
<td>354,954</td>
<td>383,868</td>
<td>285,806</td>
<td>333,897</td>
<td>297,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>2,840,401</td>
<td>2,436,799</td>
<td>2,481,475</td>
<td>2,337,600</td>
<td>2,372,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Member Contributions ($0.80/capita)</td>
<td>1,358,370</td>
<td>1,366,797</td>
<td>1,372,414</td>
<td>1,380,622</td>
<td>1,383,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Program Contributions</td>
<td>1,403,533</td>
<td>637,732</td>
<td>910,061</td>
<td>917,378</td>
<td>964,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Special Program Contributions</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>35,600</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>206,162</td>
<td>194,500</td>
<td>485,900</td>
<td>689,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for HRTAC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
<td>106,500</td>
<td>133,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for HRMFFA</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for HRCS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>317,000</td>
<td>465,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>129,500</td>
<td>87,162</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>54,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total Operations</strong></td>
<td>5,988,808</td>
<td>5,600,369</td>
<td>5,612,301</td>
<td>6,190,196</td>
<td>6,486,786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Pass-Through & Deferred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>DRAFT FY2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>1,499,699</td>
<td>1,237,679</td>
<td>1,862,434</td>
<td>1,763,469</td>
<td>1,474,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>73,783</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>42,500</td>
<td>53,600</td>
<td>43,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>2,320,424</td>
<td>2,152,340</td>
<td>810,919</td>
<td>5,092,211</td>
<td>5,940,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>49,498</td>
<td>408,270</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>185,012</td>
<td>419,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL REVENUES</strong></td>
<td>9,932,212</td>
<td>9,518,658</td>
<td>8,493,154</td>
<td>13,284,488</td>
<td>14,364,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES

#### Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>DRAFT FY2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>4,743,817</td>
<td>4,570,037</td>
<td>4,558,653</td>
<td>4,803,981</td>
<td>4,868,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Contracts</td>
<td>235,755</td>
<td>234,555</td>
<td>193,160</td>
<td>83,915</td>
<td>90,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Contracts</td>
<td>69,400</td>
<td>73,460</td>
<td>165,942</td>
<td>204,390</td>
<td>218,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>989,836</td>
<td>722,317</td>
<td>694,546</td>
<td>631,150</td>
<td>705,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>6,038,808</td>
<td>5,600,369</td>
<td>5,612,301</td>
<td>5,723,436</td>
<td>5,883,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-Through</td>
<td>3,843,906</td>
<td>3,510,019</td>
<td>2,715,853</td>
<td>6,909,280</td>
<td>7,458,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred &amp; Contingencies</td>
<td>49,498</td>
<td>408,270</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>651,772</td>
<td>1,022,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td>9,932,212</td>
<td>9,518,658</td>
<td>8,493,154</td>
<td>13,284,488</td>
<td>14,364,385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FY2018 vs FY2019 Draft Budget Comparison

#### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY2018 Total Budget</th>
<th>FY2019 Draft Budget</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPO</td>
<td>PDC</td>
<td>TPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Member Contribution Dues (Note 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,380,622</td>
<td>1,383,252</td>
<td>311,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Program Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>917,378</td>
<td>964,606</td>
<td>964,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Special Program Contributions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39,600</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous/Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,400</td>
<td>54,700</td>
<td>54,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRMFFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRTAC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>106,500</td>
<td>133,500</td>
<td>133,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRTAC - HRCS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>317,000</td>
<td>465,000</td>
<td>465,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal &amp; State Grants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,366,696</td>
<td>3,424,728</td>
<td>2,731,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,748,068</td>
<td>2,731,598</td>
<td>2,731,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>466,685</td>
<td>541,187</td>
<td>541,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning District State Allocation DHCD (Note 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>151,943</td>
<td>151,943</td>
<td>151,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OPERATING REVENUE</td>
<td>6,190,196</td>
<td>6,486,786</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred</td>
<td>185,012</td>
<td>419,116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-Thru Revenues</td>
<td>6,909,280</td>
<td>7,458,483</td>
<td>2,791,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REVENUE FOR FISCAL YEAR</td>
<td>13,284,488</td>
<td>14,364,385</td>
<td>2,791,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY2018 Total Budget</th>
<th>FY2019 Draft Budget</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TPO</td>
<td>PDC</td>
<td>TPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel (Note 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,803,981</td>
<td>4,868,931</td>
<td>2,341,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Contracts (Note 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>83,915</td>
<td>90,600</td>
<td>42,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Contracts (Note 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>204,390</td>
<td>218,786</td>
<td>115,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures Schedules Operation (Note 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>631,150</td>
<td>705,085</td>
<td>359,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>5,723,436</td>
<td>5,883,402</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass-Thru Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,909,280</td>
<td>7,458,483</td>
<td>2,791,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Contingencies (Note 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>651,772</td>
<td>1,022,500</td>
<td>782,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENSES FOR FISCAL YEAR</td>
<td>13,284,488</td>
<td>14,364,385</td>
<td>2,791,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Local Member Contributions were reduced by $0.02 in FY2013 to current $0.80 per capita.

Note 2: State Allocation grant has been reduced from a high of $366,628 in FY2001 to current $151,943.

Note 3: Funding for 47 Full Time positions.

Note 4: Standard Contracts include: Space, Insurance, Equipment Rental, Maintenance & Repairs, Legal, & Audit.

Note 5: Special Contracts include Internet/Web hosting, design, and maintenance; recycling; public involvement.

Note 6: Schedules: hospitality for mtgs, consumables, equip, copy costs, telephone, memberships, travel.

Note 7: Contingencies consist of those revenues received in current fiscal year that it is anticipated won't be spent until a future fiscal year.
### FUND BALANCE REPORT
#### FROM FY2017 - FY2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,774,405</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,002,765</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGNATED*</td>
<td>(1,378,576)</td>
<td>(1,500,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESERVES</td>
<td>(319,709)</td>
<td>(399,709)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus: Prepaid Exp</td>
<td>(31,299)</td>
<td>(22,257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GASB 45</td>
<td>(1,000,000)</td>
<td>(1,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAVE</td>
<td>(399,828)</td>
<td>(380,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,644,993</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,700,799</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CASH IN BANK:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB&amp;T Investments</td>
<td>2,801,010</td>
<td>3,108,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGIP Investments</td>
<td>1,871,609</td>
<td>1,890,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking &amp; Petty Cash</td>
<td>233,008</td>
<td>240,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CASH IN BANK</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,905,627</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,239,587</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: A/R</td>
<td>1,210,925</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plus: Prepaid Exp</td>
<td>31,299</td>
<td>22,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS/LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,147,851</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,561,844</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus: A/P</td>
<td>(310,931)</td>
<td>(424,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus: Contracts A/P</td>
<td>(50,964)</td>
<td>(105,390)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus: Misc A/P</td>
<td>(11,551)</td>
<td>(29,689)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL LIABILITIES</strong></td>
<td><strong>(373,446)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(559,079)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUND BALANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,774,405</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,002,765</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGNATED (Committed)</td>
<td>(1,378,576)</td>
<td>(1,500,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESERVES (Committed)</td>
<td>(319,709)</td>
<td>(399,709)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minus: Prepaid Exp</td>
<td>(31,299)</td>
<td>(22,257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GASB 45 (Assigned)</td>
<td>(1,000,000)</td>
<td>(1,000,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAVE (Assigned)</td>
<td>(399,828)</td>
<td>(380,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVAILABLE FUND BALANCE (Unassigned)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,644,993</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,700,799</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>MEMBER DUES PER CAPITA</td>
<td>MEMBER DUES AMOUNT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>594,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>598,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>659,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>715,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>716,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>720,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>818,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>818,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>818,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>986,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>1,304,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>1,330,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>1,338,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>1,341,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>1,346,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>1,342,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td>1,362,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>1,329,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>1,339,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>1,358,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>1,366,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>1,372,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>1,380,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>1,383,252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JURISDICTION | CENSUS Population | MMRIS | RCS | WATER PROGRAMS | HRWET | H2O | HRFOG | Staff | Direct | Per Capita | TOTAL |
---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
Chesapeake | 242,695 | 194,124 | 48,531 | 9,235 | 15,967 | 4,870 | 17,817 | 45,919 | 8,284 | 9,557 | 12,912 | 3,660 | 4,997 | 4,784 | 7,027 | 8,375 | 6,957 | 6,425 | 409,441 |
Franklin | 8,779 | 6,695 | 343 | 174 | 3,353 | 1,142 | 591 | 517 | 699 | 198 | 357 | 341 | 251 | 1,260 | 249 | 250 | 19,303 |
Gloucester County | 37,369 | 29,735 | 7,434 | 1,120 | 1,844 | 580 | 3,299 | 5,468 | 366 | 483 | 633 | 186 | 221 | 211 | 637 | 1,878 | 829 | 822 | 47,476 |
Hampton | 136,743 | 109,394 | 27,349 | 5,511 | 8,998 | 2,784 | 2,526 | 26,253 | 5,973 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 5,000 | 1,234 | 1,234 | 1,079 | 1,079 | 60,317 |
Isle of Wight County | 28,898 | 22,911 | 5,728 | 1,120 | 1,844 | 580 | 3,299 | 5,468 | 366 | 483 | 633 | 186 | 221 | 211 | 637 | 1,878 | 829 | 822 | 47,476 |
James City County | 74,722 | 59,778 | 14,944 | 2,458 | 4,917 | 1,491 | 7,758 | 14,066 | 3,137 | 3,270 | 4,418 | 1,253 | 1,822 | 1,812 | 2,152 | 2,358 | 2,130 | 2,012 | 130,736 |
Newport News | 182,155 | 145,724 | 36,431 | 7,271 | 11,985 | 3,710 | 0 | 34,985 | 6,602 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3,922 | 3,705 | 5,000 | 6,919 | 5,301 | 4,910 | 276,470 |
Norfolk | 246,256 | 197,005 | 49,251 | 9,767 | 16,204 | 5,004 | 18,061 | 47,180 | 8,354 | 9,704 | 13,110 | 3,717 | 5,040 | 4,824 | 7,220 | 8,577 | 7,148 | 6,599 | 416,755 |
Pouquosin | 12,311 | 9,849 | 2,462 | 479 | 810 | 249 | 2,526 | 2,346 | 651 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 393 | 376 | 359 | 1,377 | 355 | 365 | 22,622 |
Portsmouth | 95,440 | 76,352 | 19,086 | 3,840 | 6,280 | 1,948 | 10,232 | 18,365 | 4,231 | 4,817 | 6,598 | 1,845 | 2,552 | 2,444 | 2,810 | 3,950 | 2,783 | 2,609 | 170,653 |
Smithfield* | 8,435 | 6,748 | 1,687 | 326 | 555 | 171 | 3,239 | 1,611 | 384 | 446 | 602 | 171 | 232 | 222 | 246 | 2,159 | 244 | 288 | 18,431 |
Southampton County | 18,119 | 14,495 | 3,624 | 748 | 1,192 | 389 | 2,714 | 3,483 | 156 | 118 | 159 | 45 | 100 | 98 | 533 | 1,555 | 528 | 547 | 30,476 |
Suffolk | 92,533 | 74,026 | 18,507 | 3,482 | 6,089 | 1,858 | 8,492 | 17,514 | 2,912 | 3,729 | 5,038 | 1,429 | 1,757 | 1,682 | 2,680 | 3,813 | 2,654 | 2,491 | 158,155 |
Surry County | 6,674 | 5,339 | 1,335 | 277 | 439 | 137 | 0 | 1,288 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 | 1,207 | 195 | 243 | 106,675 |
Virginia Beach | 456,448 | 363,558 | 90,890 | 17,824 | 29,903 | 9,187 | 34,152 | 86,618 | 17,200 | 19,767 | 26,766 | 7,271 | 10,379 | 9,936 | 13,255 | 14,911 | 13,124 | 12,062 | 777,048 |
Williamsburg | 15,400 | 12,323 | 3,081 | 590 | 1,014 | 312 | 3,542 | 2,946 | 384 | 635 | 858 | 243 | 231 | 222 | 451 | 1,473 | 446 | 473 | 29,224 |
York County | 68,890 | 55,112 | 13,778 | 2,664 | 4,533 | 1,407 | 2,526 | 13,254 | 3,326 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,007 | 1,921 | 2,030 | 3,130 | 2,010 | 1,902 | 109,600 |
HRSD | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 61,645 | 0 | 0 | 37,189 | 35,600 | 0 | 0 | 148,252 |
HRUHCA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 | 0 | 0 | 18,039 | 24,370 | 6,909 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5,000 |
NN Water Works | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,500 | 0 | 0 | 31,365 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83,202 |
TOTAL | 1,729,326 | 1,383,252 | 345,815 | 99,911 | 113,775 | 35,000 | 164,099 | 330,000 | 124,324 | 71,795 | 96,938 | 27,501 | 75,001 | 71,797 | 50,001 | 70,000 | 50,001 | 46,809 | 1,156,569
FY2019 OPERATING REVENUE BUDGET

- **FEDERAL GRANTS**
  - $2,975,719, 46%

- **STATE GRANTS**
  - $297,066, 5%

- **STATE SUPPORT TO PDC**
  - $151,943, 2%

- **LOCAL MEMBER CONTRIBUTIONS DUES**
  - $1,383,252, 21%

- **LOCAL MEMBER CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAMS**
  - $964,606, 15%

- **LOCAL OTHER SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS**
  - $25,000, 0%

- **SUPPORT FROM OTHER ORGANIZATIONS**
  - $634,500, 10%

- **OTHER/MISCELLANEOUS**
  - $54,700, 1%
## HRPDC / HRTPO RESERVES
### FY2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reserves</th>
<th>Annual Contributions</th>
<th>6/30/2017 AUDITED BALANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GASB 45 Retiree Liabilities Reserve (Note 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Liability Reserve</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>399,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Replacement Reserve</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Reserve/Network Servers</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>47,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Building Replacement Reserve</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>193,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Operations &amp; Maintenance Reserve</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>37,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Debris Management Consolidation Reserve</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Upgrades - offices &amp; public areas</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>11,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL RESERVES</strong></td>
<td><strong>95,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,719,537</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: This balance was capped per management discussion.
ITEM #14: TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY: Dale Stith, HRTPO

SUMMARY:
Implications of the FHWA/FTA Interim Guidance on Conformity Requirements for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS.

Ms. Dale Stith, Principal Transportation Planner, will brief the HRTPO Board on this item.

BACKGROUND:
Federal requirements to address transportation conformity for the 1997 National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone, for which the Hampton Roads region had been in “maintenance” status, were revoked by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) effective April 6, 2015 (Federal Register, Volume 80, Number 44, March 6, 2015). With the revocation of the 1997 National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for ozone, transportation conformity was no longer required for the Hampton Roads region.

On April 23, 2018, FHWA and FTA issued Interim Guidance on Conformity Requirements for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS, (attached) in response to the US Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit February 16, 2018 decision in South Coast Air Quality Management District v. EPA, No. 15-1115, which struck down portions of the 2008 Ozone NAAQS SIP Requirements Rule concerning the ozone NAAQS. According to the FHWA-FTA Interim Guidance, any updates and amendments to the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for projects “not exempt from transportation conformity may not proceed until transportation conformity with the 1997 ozone NAAQS is determined.” The FHWA-FTA Interim Guidance is intended to stay in effect until further clarification is received from the EPA regarding possible impacts.

Based upon the FHWA-FTA Interim Guidance, and in order to expedite the transportation conformity process and avoid unintentional project delays, HRTPO staff recommends the initiation of Transportation Conformity on the 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and to authorize the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) to approve the project list for Transportation Conformity (and any related planning assumptions) and initiate the public review of the draft Transportation Conformity Analysis.

Attachment 14-A: FHWA/FTA Interim Guidance on Conformity Requirements for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS.
Attachment 14-B: HRTPO Resolution 2018-04

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS: (Action to be taken under Meeting Agenda Item #21-I):

1. Direct HRTPO Staff to initiate Transportation Conformity on the 2040 LRTP and the FY 2018-2021 TIP.
2. Approve HRTPO Resolution 2018-04 authorizing TTAC to:
   • Approve the project list for Transportation Conformity and any related planning assumptions, and
   • Initiate the public review of the draft Transportation Conformity Analysis.
Memorandum

Subject: Interim Guidance on Conformity Requirements for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS

Date: April 23, 2018

From: Walter C. Waidelich, Jr.
FHWA Executive Director – HOA-3

In Reply Refer To:
HCC-30
TCC-Helen Serassio

Matthew J. Welbes
FTA Executive Director – TOA-3

To: FHWA Division Administrators and FTA Regional Administrators

This guidance provides important information regarding transportation conformity requirements for certain pending planning and project development actions in programs administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). The U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit recently issued a decision in South Coast Air Quality Management District v. EPA, No. 15-1115, which struck down portions of the 2008 Ozone NAAQS SIP Requirements Rule concerning the ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). These portions of the 2008 Ozone NAAQS SIP Requirements Rule addressed implementation requirements for the 2008 ozone NAAQS as well as the anti-backsliding requirements associated with the revocation of the 1997 ozone NAAQS. The impact of the decision addresses two groups of ozone areas described in the decision:

Areas that were maintenance areas for the 1997 ozone NAAQS at the time of revocation and are designated as attainment for the 2008 Ozone NAAQS. These areas have not been required to make transportation conformity determinations for any ozone NAAQS since the 1997 ozone NAAQS were revoked in April 2015 by EPA’s Rule.

Areas that were designated as nonattainment for the 1997 ozone NAAQS at the time of revocation and are designated as attainment for the 2008 Ozone NAAQS. These areas have not been required to make transportation conformity determinations for any ozone NAAQS since the 1997 ozone NAAQS were revoked in April 2015 by EPA’s Rule.

Based on the information in EPA’s Greenbook,1 we have identified 82 such areas encompassing as many as 228 counties in 24 States that are potentially affected by the

---

Court’s decision.² Please refer to 40 CFR Part 81 and/or EPA’s Greenbook for a full description and maps of these 1997 ozone areas.

While we are waiting for guidance from EPA clarifying the possible impacts, all routine planning and project development actions may proceed throughout the country, except for the following actions within the identified areas that should be considered “on-hold” for now:

- New Metropolitan Long Range Plan and Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP), updates and amendments that include the addition of a project that is not exempt from transportation conformity may not proceed until transportation conformity with the 1997 ozone NAAQS is determined. Exempt projects are listed in 40 CFR 93.126 and 93.127. Administrative modifications to Metropolitan Plans and TIPs may proceed because, by definition in 23 CFR 450.104, those actions do not require a conformity determination.

- Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) approvals and amendments that include TIPs or non-exempt projects from the 82 identified areas may not proceed, unless the TIP or project is determined to conform with the 1997 ozone NAAQS or is limited to projects that are exempt from transportation conformity. Exempt projects are listed in 40 CFR 93.126 and 93.127. Partial STIP approvals, i.e., those limited to other areas of the state may proceed as described in 23 CFR 450.220(b)(1)(iii).

- Within the 82 identified areas, NEPA approvals for FHWA/FTA projects (40 CFR 93.101) may not proceed unless the existing Metropolitan Plan and TIP include the project. For projects that already completed NEPA, there is no need to delay further action, including: grant obligations; approvals of plans, specifications and estimates; and authorizations to begin construction.

If your office receives questions from a state or local transportation partner related to the impacts of this court decision on proposed planning actions or project approvals beyond what is described above, the most appropriate response is that FHWA and FTA, in coordination with OST and EPA, are reviewing the decision and evaluating next steps, and that we will provide updates as soon as possible. You should not speculate regarding the next steps that may be under review.

For technical assistance, please contact at FHWA Cecilia Ho (202-366-9862), Karen Perritt (202-366-9066) or David Kall (202-366-6276), and at FTA Dwayne Weeks (202-493-0316) or Megan Blum (202-366-0463). You may also contact Gloria Shepherd, Associate Administrator for the FHWA’s Office of Planning, Environment and Realty (202-366-0116), or Sherry Riklin, Acting Associate Administrator for FTA’s Office of Planning and Environment (202-366-5407) with any questions.

Thank you for your immediate attention to this guidance.

² The 82 areas are set forth in the tables below. We have requested confirmation of the affected counties and States from EPA and are awaiting its response.
HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BOARD RESOLUTION 2018-04

A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FROM THE HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION (HRTPO) AUTHORIZING THE HRTPO TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO APPROVE CERTAIN PROCESSES RELATED TO TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY.

WHEREAS, the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO), designated by the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia in accordance with Section 134, Title 23, United States Code (23 USC 134) and applicable federal and state regulations, is the policy body responsible for the urban transportation planning and programming process of the Hampton Roads metropolitan planning area;

WHEREAS, the Hampton Roads metropolitan planning area includes the cities of Chesapeake, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Poquoson, Portsmouth, Suffolk, Virginia Beach, and Williamsburg; the counties of Isle of Wight, James City, and York; and portions of the City of Franklin and the Counties of Gloucester and Southampton;

WHEREAS, on July 21, 2016, the HRTPO Board approved and adopted the fiscally-constrained Hampton Roads 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP);

WHEREAS, transportation conformity is a Clean Air Act requirement that connects air quality and transportation planning activities to ensure that highway and transit project activities receiving federal funds are consistent with the purpose of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for clean air;

WHEREAS, transportation conformity applies to areas that are designated “nonattainment” or “maintenance” for transportation-related criteria pollutants as specified under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS);

WHEREAS, the Hampton Roads region is currently in “attainment” of all applicable NAAQS;

WHEREAS, federal requirements to address transportation conformity for the 1997 NAAQS for ozone, for which the Hampton Roads region had been in “maintenance” status, were revoked by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) effective April 6, 2015 (Federal Register, Volume 80, Number 44, March 6, 2015), and that with the revocation of the 1997 NAAQS for ozone, transportation conformity was no longer required for the Hampton Roads region;

WHEREAS, On April 23, 2018, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued Interim Guidance on Conformity Requirements for the 1997 Ozone NAAQS, in response to the US Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit February 16, 2018 decision in South Coast Air Quality Management District v. EPA, No. 15-1115, which struck down portions of the 2008 Ozone NAAQS SIP Requirements Rule concerning the ozone NAAQS and that according to the FHWA-FTA Interim Guidance, any updates and amendments to the LRTP and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for projects “not exempt from transportation conformity may not proceed until transportation conformity with the 1997 ozone NAAQS is determined”; and
WHEREAS, The FHWA-FTA Interim Guidance is intended to stay in effect until further clarification is received from the EPA regarding possible impacts.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, based upon the FHWA-FTA Interim Guidance and in order to expedite the transportation conformity analysis process and avoid unintentional project delays, the HRTPO Board approves the initiation of transportation conformity on the 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan and the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the HRTPO Board authorizes the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee to approve the project list for transportation conformity, any related planning assumptions, and to initiate the public review of the draft transportation conformity analysis.

APPROVED and ADOPTED by the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization Board at its meeting on the 17th day of May, 2018.

__________________________
Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr.
Chair
Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization

__________________________
Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director
Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization
ITEM #15: I-64/HAMPTON ROADS BRIDGE-TUNNEL – PROJECT UPDATE:
James Utterback, VDOT

SUMMARY:
Mr. James Utterback, HRBT Project Manager, will provide the HRTPO Board a status report on this Project.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For informational purposes.
ITEM #16: TRANSIT FUNDING REFORM: Jennifer DeBruhl, DRPT

SUMMARY:
The 2018 General Assembly passed comprehensive legislation making numerous changes to the administration of and revenues for mass transit in the Commonwealth.

Ms. Jennifer DeBruhl, DRPT Chief of Public Transportation, will brief the HRTPO Board on this item.

BACKGROUND:
The legislation passed by the 2018 General Assembly made several changes to mass transit, specifically as it relates to funding of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) and the disbursement of funds in the Commonwealth Mass Transit Fund. Additionally, the 2018 General Assembly included in the legislation several transit reforms such as prioritization of statewide transit capital funds, allocation of statewide operating funds based on service delivery factors, and implementation of urban agency strategic plans. DRPT, in consultation with the Transit Service Delivery Advisory Committee, will implement these reforms over the upcoming year.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
For informational purposes.
ITEM #17: PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Members of the public are invited to address the HRTPO Board. Each speaker is limited to three minutes.

ITEM #18: SUBMITTED PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no submitted public comments. Any written public comments received after the preparation of this agenda will be distributed as a handout at the meeting.

ITEM #19: TRANSCRIBED PUBLIC COMMENTS FROM PREVIOUS HRTPO MEETING

The transcribed public comments from the March 15, 2018 HRTPO Board meeting are attached.

Attachment 19
One person requested to address the HRTPO Board at the March 15, 2018 Meeting. Chair Shepperd asked them to limit their comments to three minutes.

Ms. Donna Sayegh  
Portsmouth Citizen

Good morning, my name is Donna Sayegh and I live in Portsmouth. In the agenda for today, there is a TRAFFIX annual report. The director reported that there was a reduction of 7.3 million total vehicle miles traveled. Because of getting the vehicles off the road, it reduced carbon dioxide emissions of 3.3 tons. This information means that approximately 423,000 car trips were reduced. The commute distance was 18.6 miles and over 821 parking spots were saved daily. This information was obtained from 685 organizations with almost ten thousand commuters participating. These commuters saved over 344,000 gallons of gas and over $3.9 million in commuting expenses. He reported that TRAFFIX included bike amenities, commuter rewards, employer outreach, guaranteed ride programs, park and ride matching, and van pool assistance. Does this make sense when there are complaints that there is not enough money from the gas tax so the General Assembly created the floor tax on gas to get more money? Where is the statistics to prove this report? What cities does this report cover? Next, let’s look at Hampton Roads Transportation Fund reports of sales, use and fuel taxes for Portsmouth. How come there are no notes regarding how much revenue is coming from the tolls? If no revenue is coming in, why not? The last thing I want to address is Senate Bill 942. This bill was passed in the General Assembly this year to increase the state sales and use tax of one percent in the City of Williamsburg and the counties of James City and York. The bill will also create a tourism council of the Greater Williamsburg Chamber and Tourism Alliance. This council will oversee the office of tourism and report annually to the chief executive officer of the City of Williamsburg and the counties of James City and York. Right here, right now, this body is a regional body. Now the General Assembly wants to splinter off sections of the region to get more money. When is the Virginia government going to give back to the people their own government? The General Assembly passed this law without the consent of the people. The Senator that represents District 18 did not consult with the people to put in her vote for or against this new regional splinter group. GO Virginia was created to generate substantial employment and economic benefit for the Commonwealth of free man. Evidently that was a lie. Because the Commonwealth wants more money from this splintered regional group in addition to the floor gas tax. Thanks for listening.
ITEM #20: REGIONAL CONNECTOR STUDY – AUTHORIZATION TO CONTRACT WITH SELECTED CONSULTANT: Robert Crum, HRTPO

On October 20, 2016, the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) unanimously approved the Hampton Roads Crossing Study (HRCS) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) Alternative A–modified, to include the Bowers Hill Interchange, as the region’s Preferred Alternative. Also on October 20, 2016, the Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission (HRTAC) unanimously supported the HRTPO’s selection of Alternative A–modified, and allocated up to $7 million from the Hampton Roads Transportation Fund (HRTF) ($3 million with a $4 million contingency) for further study of the HRCS SEIS components not included in the selected Alternative A–modified. These segments include:

- I-664 (from I-64 in Hampton to US 460/58/13 in Chesapeake)
- I-664 Connector
- I-564 Connector
- VA 164 Connector
- VA 164

Other segments furthering the study’s specific goals and objectives may be added to the above five segments, employing 21st century transportation options that connect the Peninsula and Southside across the Hampton Roads Harbor and that enhance the quality of life and economic vitality of the region.

To provide oversight for this project, a Working Group (Technical Committee) consisting of representatives from the local jurisdictions and State/Federal partners was formed. HRTPO staff developed a Request for Proposals for this project and representatives of the Working Group joined members of the HRTPO staff in evaluating the proposals submitted by consultant teams for this project. A decision was made to interview four consultant teams and interviews were completed on April 9, 2018. Seventeen staff from local jurisdictions, State/Federal partner organizations, and the HRTPO participated in these interviews. Following these interviews, the panel ranked the consultants and selected a preferred consultant team. Based on this direction, the HRTPO staff has moved forward to contract negotiations with this team. The Working Group will meet on May 11th to receive an update on these contract negotiations.

Staff will provide the HRTPO Board an update at its May 17th meeting on this process and request that the HRTPO Board consider the following action:

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Authorize the Executive Director to enter into a contract with the selected consultant team for the completion of the Regional Connectors Study, in an amount consistent with the project budget provided by the Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission (HRTAC).
ITEM #21: APPROVAL OF CONSENT ITEMS

A. MINUTES

Minutes of the HRTPO Board meeting held on March 15, 2018 are attached.

Attachment 21-A

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve the minutes.
Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (TPO)
Board Summary Minutes of March 15, 2018

The Hampton Roads TPO Board Meeting was called to order at 10:31 a.m. in the Regional Board Room, 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia, with the following in attendance:

**HRTPO Voting Members in Attendance:**
- Thomas Shepperd, Jr. Chair (YK)
- John Rowe, Vice Chair (PO)
- Rick West (CH)
- Frank Rabil (Alternate, FR)
- Phillip Bazzani (GL)
- Donnie Tuck (HA)
- Joel Acree (IW)
- Michael Hipple (JC)
- McKinley Price (NN)
- Kenneth Alexander (NO)*

**HRTPO Nonvoting Members in Attendance:**
- James Baker (CH)
- Randy Martin (FR)
- J. Brent Fedors (GL)
- Randy Keaton (IW)
- Cynthia Rohlf (NN)
- Randy Wheeler (PQ)
- Michael W. Johnson (SH)
- Patrick Roberts (SU)

**HRTPO Executive Director:**
- Robert A. Crum, Jr.

**Other Participants:**
- Ella Ward (CH)
- Brian DeProfio (HA)
- Paul Holt (JC)

**HRTPO Voting Members Absent:**
- Barry Cheatham (FR)
- Eugene Hunt (PQ)
- Linda Johnson (SU)
- William Sessoms (VB)
- Paul Freiling (WM)
- John Reinhart (VPA)

**HRTPO Nonvoting Members Absent:**
- Mary Bunting (HA)

* Prepared by S. Core
Approval of Agenda

Chair Shepperd asked for any additions or deletions to the agenda. Hearing none, Mayor Rowe Moved to approve the agenda; seconded by Mr. Bazzani. The Motion Carried.

Executive Director Report

Mr. Robert Crum, HRTPO Executive Director, provided a summary of current work activities and noted legislation from the 2018 General Assembly Session has provided the HRTPO the opportunity to coordinate transit planning efforts with the region’s transit agencies and local jurisdictions. Staff is currently researching the legislation and will brief the HRTPO Board at a future meeting.

Workshop Agenda

Commonwealth Transportation Board Member Comments and Updates

Mr. John Malbon stated the CTB will hold its next meeting March 20-21 in Richmond. He noted that VDOT will hold its Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP) public meeting on April 16, 2018 from 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. in the Regional Board Room.
Mr. James Utterback stated that the March 2018 HRTAC Program Development Monthly Report was included at the table as a handout.

He indicated that VDOT is evaluating the three Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) received for the Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel Widening Project and noted that two of the teams submitted proposals for both an immersed tube and bored tunnel. VDOT will make a notification in early April regarding the short-listed teams. He stated that VDOT has started a re-evaluation of the HRBT Corridor and letters to constituents have been sent out, especially in Hampton and Norfolk. The re-evaluation will focus on four items:

- Evaluation of the corridor from I-664 to I-564 for High-Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lanes
- Evaluation of the corridor from I-664 to I-564 for a HOT Managed Shoulder Lane
- Evaluation to tie-in the I-564 Interchange to the project which was not part of the original SEIS
- Advanced acquisition of a parcel on Willoughby Spit for a construction staging area

Mr. Crum requested Mr. Utterback brief the HRTPO Board in May with more specifics on the project, including a refined cost estimate. Mr. Utterback replied affirmatively.

Ms. Jennifer DeBruhl reported that there was significant transit legislation that came out of the 2018 General Assembly Session including a reform package that contains three items:

- The development and implementation of a project-based prioritization process for transit capital projects was outlined in the Revenue Advisory Board report that was filed with the General Assembly last summer. The process is required to be in place by July 1, 2019.
- A new operating allocation formula which will require DRPT to shift from what has been a two-part allocation process to a formula that is based solely on performance factors. The new formula is also required to be in place by July 1, 2019 and will apply to the FY 2020 funding cycle.
- A strategic planning requirement which would apply to any transit operators that are operating in the urbanized areas of the state and operate over 20 buses in daily service. The strategic planning requirement will include attaining and maintaining a state of good repair, an operational efficiency component, and service to underserved communities. The CTB will provide guidance on the new requirement by December 1, 2018 and DRPT will work with the Transit Service Delivery Advisory Committee (TSDAC) to implement this piece of the legislation.
Ms. DeBruhl indicated that DRPT will brief the HRTPO Board at a future date regarding the implementation of the reform package as it is developed and rolled out.

*Cathie Vick arrives*

**Virginia Port Authority Update**

Ms. Cathie Vick reported that both terminal projects are well underway at the Virginia Port. Conduit is being laid for the rail mounted cranes at NIT, the North Gate is fully operational, and the motor carrier reservation system to mitigate the flow of trucks throughout the day has been implemented. She noted that $20 million is currently in the Governor’s budget for preliminary design funds for the deepening and widening of the Harbor Channel.

**HRT and WATA Updates**

Mr. William Harrell reported that HRT has been tracking the transit legislation in the General Assembly and stated that HRT is well poised to be able to meet the requirements of the strategic plan component. He stated it will be helpful to coordinate with WATA, Suffolk Transit, and the HRTPO regarding this legislation. He noted that a minimum of $15 million will be needed to replace 25 buses long-term, and the Tide is projected to require $7 million a year long-term for state of good repair. He believes that this legislation is an important step in terms of having a systematic way of addressing dedicated transit funding for Hampton Roads.

There was no WATA representative in attendance.

**Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) Update**

Mr. Ron Broughton, CTAC Vice-Chair, had no comments.

**Military Liaisons Comments and Updates**

Colonel Herbert Joliat of Joint Langley Eustis had no comments.

Commander Ken Kostecki of the U.S. Coast Guard reported that the Virginia Harbor Safety Committee met on February 1, 2018 and was briefed by Mr. Utterback on the two types of tunnel techniques that could be utilized to build the new tubes of the HRBT. He stated that the immersion technique, if chosen, would significantly impact Harbor traffic.

Commander Susanne Weinrich of the U.S. Navy had no comments.

**Hampton Roads Regional Priority Projects – Round 2**

Ms. Dale Stith, HRTPO Principal Transportation Planner, briefed the HRTPO Board on the status of identifying potential Round 2 candidate Regional Priority Projects at the February TPO Board meeting. Upon completion of her presentation Chair Shepperd deferred discussion until the March Board meeting. He requested Board members review the presentation and submit any questions or comments to HRTPO staff. No questions or
comments were received from HRTPO Board members. Ms. Stith recapped highlights from the previous month’s presentation. HRTPO staff composed a draft resolution for Board consideration stating:

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** that the HRTPO will continue to support the Regional Priority Projects fiscally-constrained in the region’s 2040 Long-Range Transportation, to be funded, in whole or in part, with Hampton Roads Transportation Fund (HRTF) revenues; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,** as part of the development of the 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), the HRTPO supports the analyses of additional regional projects that meet the criteria established for HRTF revenues, and that all candidate projects not already committed will be evaluated as part of the development of the 2045 LRTP.

This item was added under the Consent agenda as Item #17-G.

*Mayor Alexander arrives*

**SMART SCALE Update**

Mr. Mike Kimbrel, HRTPO Deputy Executive Director, provided a brief overview of the SMART SCALE prioritization process. SMART SCALE is divided into two programs. The first is the High Priority Project Program (HPPP) which is a statewide competitive program and must meet a need identified in VTrans 2040 for Corridors of Statewide Significance or Regional Networks. The HRTPO is an eligible applicant for this program. The second program is the District Grant Program (DGP) and only localities may apply. Projects compete against other projects within the same VDOT Construction District and the proposed projects must meet a need identified in VTRANS 2040 for Corridors of Statewide Significance, Regional Networks, Urban Development Areas, and Transportation Safety. The current statewide estimates for Round 3 are $467 million for each program with approximately $94 million available for the Hampton Roads District.

SMART SCALE is now proceeding on a biennial schedule. Pre-applications are due by June 1 (no new applications after this date) with application refinement and final applications due by August 1. SMART SCALE project applications must include a well-developed scope, schedule and cost estimate, and each applicant must rank submitted projects in priority order.

The HRTPO was successful in securing SMART SCALE funding during Rounds 1 and 2. In Round 1, the I-64 Peninsula Widening project received $145 million. In Round 2, the I-64/I-264 Interchange received $50 million, and the I-64 Southside Widening/High Rise Bridge project received $100 million. The Hampton Roads region to date has received $295 million in SMART SCALE funding through the HPPP statewide competitive program.

He noted the State has approached HRTPO staff regarding a pre-application for the Segment 4 of the I-64 Peninsula Widening project. Segment 4 would pick up where...
Segment 3 ends at Route 199 and I-64, and would continue widening up to the New Kent County line. This project is not a HRPTO Regional Priority Project, and is also not included in the Long-Range Transportation Plan. HRTPO staff recommends submitting a request for $200-$300 million for the I-64/Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel - Widening for Round 3 of SMART SCALE.

Next steps of the SMART SCALE process are:
- June 1, 2018 deadline to submit Pre-Applications,
- July 19, 2018 HRPTO Board approval of Resolutions of Support for projects to be submitted by Localities and Transit Agencies,
- August 1, 2018 deadline to submit final applications.

This item will be included in the consent agenda for approval under #17-H.

**Highway Gateways Used by Port Trucks**

Dr. Rob Case, HRTPO Chief Transportation Engineer, stated the purpose of the study is to collect gateway usage by port trucks to provide better data for the HRPTO Prioritization Tool, the US 58 Arterial Management study, and the Regional Connectors Study. HRTPO staff used the StreetLight data service which currently collects 12% of commercial truck trips in America. Staff used StreetLight data to study trips between local port-related distribution centers and the twelve gateways.

For this analysis, sufficient numbers of StreetLight trips exited the subject gateways. This analysis indicated that 93% of trucks from port-related distribution centers on the Peninsula use the I-64 gateway, and 6% use the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Tunnel (CBBT) gateway. Usage of gateways by trucks from Southside port-related distribution centers revealed the following routes are utilized: I-64 14%, Route 460 39% and Route 58 34%. Overall, port-related trucks use gateways as follows: I-64 57%, Route 460 18% and Route 58 16%. HRTPO staff plans to use the study results for scoring candidate projects, as input for major regional studies currently being conducted by HRTPO and VDOT, and as support for applications for State and Federal funding aimed at related highway projects.

This item was included in the meeting agenda for approval under item #17-F.

**Meeting Agenda**

**Public Comment Period**

Ms. Donna Sayegh, Portsmouth Citizen, expressed concern regarding the passage of Senate Bill 942 in the 2018 General Assembly Session and communication to the region’s citizens regarding this bill.

*A transcription of the public comments made orally during HRTPO Board meetings will be included in the HRTPO Agenda each month. The transcript will also be posted on the HRTPO website when available.*
Submitted Public Comments

Chair Shepperd reported there were no submitted public comments in the Agenda packet.

Consent Agenda

The Consent Agenda is as follows:

Approval of Consent Items
A. Minutes
B. HRTPO Financial Report
C. FY 2018-2021 TIP Revision – CMAQ Transfer Request: Virginia Beach
D. FY 2018-2021 TIP Revision – RSTP Transfer Request: Virginia Beach
E. RSTP Transfer Request: James City County
F. Highway Gateways used by Port Trucks: Final Report

Mr. Robert Crum, HRTPO Executive Director, requested to add two items to the consent agenda. Item #17G Resolution 2018-03 supporting the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan and Regional Priority Projects, and Item #17H HRPTO SMART SCALE application for the I-64/Hampton Roads Bridge-Tunnel Widening. Mayor Rowe Moved to approve the addition of said items; seconded by Mr. Green. The Motion Carried.

Mayor Rowe Moved to approve the Consent Agenda with the additional items; seconded by Mr. Harrell. The Motion Carried.

HRTPO Board Three-Month Tentative Schedule

Chair Shepperd outlined the HRTPO Board three-month tentative schedule in the Agenda Packet, noting the Board will not meet in April.

Minutes of HRTPO Advisory Committee Meetings

Chair Shepperd noted there were summary minutes from the HRTPO Advisory Committee meetings included in the Agenda packet.

For Your Information

Chair Shepperd highlighted the items in the For Your Information section of the Agenda packet.

Old/New Business

There was no old or new business presented to the board.
Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Hampton Roads TPO, the meeting adjourned at 11:39 a.m.

_________________________________________  ________________________________
Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr.  Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Chair  Executive Director/Secretary
B. **HRTPO FINANCIAL STATEMENT**

The Statement of Revenues and Expenditures for the activities of March 2018 is attached. This statement reflects the financial status of the HRTPO as a whole.

Attachment 21-B

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Accept the HRTPO Financial Statement.
## REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Previous YTD</th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>% Received / Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VDOT-PL SEC 112</td>
<td>$2,378,624</td>
<td>$1,015,789</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,015,789</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRTAC</td>
<td>106,500</td>
<td>39,590</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,590</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRTAC - SEIS Feasibility Study</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>57,913</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57,913</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDRPT 5303</td>
<td>679,519</td>
<td>211,859</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>211,859</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP&amp;R</td>
<td>72,500</td>
<td>25,581</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,581</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,237,143</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,350,732</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ -</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,350,732</strong></td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXPENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Annual Budget</th>
<th>Previous YTD</th>
<th>Current Month</th>
<th>YTD</th>
<th>% Received / Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL</td>
<td>$2,556,229</td>
<td>$1,205,653</td>
<td>$138,240</td>
<td>$1,343,893</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD CONTRACTS</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,173</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11,231</td>
<td>112%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL CONTRACTS/PASS THROUGH</td>
<td>3,372,955</td>
<td>106,083</td>
<td>118,099</td>
<td>224,182</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFFICE SERVICES</td>
<td>297,959</td>
<td>68,828</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>72,745</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIRECT COSTS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>577,327</td>
<td>66,196</td>
<td>643,523</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,237,143</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,969,062</strong></td>
<td><strong>$326,510</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,295,573</strong></td>
<td><strong>37%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## AGENCY BALANCE

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGENCY BALANCE</strong></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ (618,330)</td>
<td>$ (326,510)</td>
<td>$ (944,841)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HRTPO  
FISCAL YEAR 2018  
3/31/2018  
STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES  
75% OF FISCAL YEAR COMPLETE
C. FY 2019 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP)
This item was presented under Workshop Agenda Item #12.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve the FY 2019 UPWP.

D. FY 2019 HRTPO BUDGET
This item was presented under Workshop Agenda Item #13.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve the FY 2019 Budget.
E. PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH THE LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP)

Recent policy changes in the SMART SCALE process require that all project submissions must be consistent with the regional fiscally-constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan, or have an accompanying resolution of support from the MPO. At the March 7, 2018 Transportation Technical Advisory Committee, this issue of project consistency with the LRTP was brought up and the recommended action was to discuss the issue in more detail with the LRTP Subcommittee.

At its April 4, 2018 Meeting, the LRTP Subcommittee discussed the following two issues at length:

- Whether SMART SCALE project submissions relating to studies included in the LRTP should be considered consistent.
- Several localities expressed concern that since the regional prioritization process and the Commonwealth’s SMART SCALE prioritization process do not evaluate projects using the same metrics, several of their most competitive potential SMART SCALE projects are not currently included in the LRTP.
  - These localities further maintained that there needs to be enough flexibility in the LRTP planning and/or amendment process to aid in the localities’ pursuit of funding.

After much discussion, the LRTP Subcommittee made the following recommendations:

- LRTP Recommendation #1:
  - Modify the HRTPO Guidance on SMART SCALE to allow the HRTPO Board to consider issuing resolutions of support for projects not currently included in the fiscally-constrained LRTP, with the understanding that if said projects receive SMART SCALE funding, the LRTP would be amended to maintain fiscal-constraint according to the current LRTP SMART SCALE Amendment Policy (attached).

- LRTP Recommendation #2
  - Any construction project (or phase of a project) that comes out of a study currently included in the LRTP be considered consistent with the LRTP, and that if said project receives SMART SCALE funding, the LRTP would be amended to maintain fiscal-constraint according to the current LRTP SMART SCALE Amendment Policy (attached).

In addition to the LRTP Subcommittee recommendation, HRTPO staff recommended that all SMART SCALE project submissions requesting a resolution of support be consistent with the LRTP goals.
These recommendations were presented to TTAC at its May 2, 2018 meeting. TTAC recommends HRTPO Board approval of the Recommended Actions.

Attachment 21-E

**Recommended Action:**

Approve the following recommendations:

1. **HRTPO Guidance on SMART SCALE**
   
   Modify the *HRTPO Guidance on SMART SCALE* to allow the HRTPO Board to consider issuing resolutions of support for projects not currently included in the fiscally-constrained LRTP as long as said projects are consistent with the goals of the LRTP, and with the understanding that if said projects receive SMART SCALE funding, the LRTP would be amended to maintain fiscal-constraint according to the current LRTP SMART SCALE amendment policy.

2. **LRTP Project Consistency**

   Any construction project (or phase of a project) that comes out of a study currently included in the LRTP be considered consistent with the LRTP, and that if said project receives SMART SCALE funding, the LRTP would be amended to maintain fiscal-constraint according to the current LRTP SMART SCALE Amendment Policy.
F. **HRTPO GUIDANCE ON SMART SCALE – UPDATE**

Virginia’s SMART SCALE is about investing limited tax dollars in the right projects that meet the most critical transportation needs in Virginia. In the SMART SCALE prioritization process, transportation projects are scored based on an objective, outcome-based process that is transparent to the public and allows decision-makers to be held accountable to taxpayers. The Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) uses the project score information resulting from SMART SCALE to help select the right projects for funding.

In July 2015, the HRTPO Board approved the first version of *HRTPO Guidance on SMART SCALE*. The document provides information on the process used by the HRTPO to determine whether to provide a resolution of support for applicable projects to be submitted under SMART SCALE and whether to submit project applications in response to requests by other entities. The HRTPO Guidance document has been updated to facilitate the issuance of a resolution of support by the HRTPO Board for projects that are either consistent with the current fiscally-constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and/or with the LRTP Planning Goals.

The updated section of the *HRTPO Guidance on SMART SCALE* document is attached. The TTAC has recommended HRTPO Board approval of the updated document.

Complete information on SMART SCALE, including the updated Policy and Technical Guides, may be accessed on the SMART SCALE website at: [www.vasmartscale.org/default.asp](http://www.vasmartscale.org/default.asp).

Attachment 21-F

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Approve the amended *HRTPO Guidance on SMART SCALE* document.
HRTPPO Guidance
On

SMART SCALE  Funding the Right Transportation Projects in Virginia

May 2018
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ABSTRACT
This document provides information on the process used by the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) to determine whether to provide a resolution of support for applicable projects to be submitted under the SMART SCALE statewide project prioritization process and whether to submit project applications in response to requests by other entities.
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Attachment 21-F
OVERVIEW

The Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) is the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Hampton Roads area. As such, it is a federally mandated transportation policy board comprised of representatives from local, state, and federal governments, transit agencies, and other stakeholders and is responsible for transportation planning and programming for the Hampton Roads metropolitan planning area (MPA).

The MPA is comprised of the cities of Chesapeake, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Poquoson, Portsmouth, Suffolk, Virginia Beach, and Williamsburg; the counties of Isle of Wight, James City, and York; a portion of the city of Franklin; and portions of the counties of Gloucester and Southampton.

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance regarding the SMART SCALE statewide project prioritization process.
**WHAT IS SMART SCALE?**

House Bill 2 (HB2), adopted by the General Assembly and signed into law by the Governor in 2014, required the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) to develop a statewide prioritization process for capacity expansion projects based on a comparison of a project’s relative benefit to its cost. Following nearly a year of development, the HB2 process was approved by the CTB on June 17, 2015. The legislation set the requirement that the HB2 process be used to develop the Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP) starting with the FY 2017 – FY 2022 SYIP to be approved by the CTB in June 2016. On June 14, 2016, the new name for the prioritization process was announced – SMART SCALE. SMART stands for System Management and Allocation of Resources for Transportation. SCALE refers to the six evaluation factors – Safety, Congestion mitigation, Accessibility, Land use, and Economic development and the environment.

The key goals of SMART SCALE are:

- To promote performance in the selection of projects for the SYIP
- To provide stability to the SYIP
- To establish a project pipeline that links planning to programming

This document provides an overview of the SMART SCALE statewide prioritization process for the purposes of addressing HRTPO Guidance on SMART SCALE. Complete information on SMART SCALE may be accessed on the web at: [www.vasmartscale.org](http://www.vasmartscale.org).
SMART SCALE Exclusions

The SMART SCALE process excludes the following project types and funding sources:

Project Types:
- Stand-alone studies
- Pavement and bridge rehabilitation/replacement projects
- Fully-funded projects
  - Exception – Total cost expected to exceed $1 billion, procurement to start prior to award of next round of SMART SCALE, and project was ineligible for most recent previous round of SMART SCALE due to project readiness.
- Projects for which project components or features are not contiguous, proximate, or of the same improvement type

Funding Sources:
- Revenue Sharing projects
- Hampton Roads and Northern Virginia regional funds
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds
- Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds
- Highway Safety Federal funds
- Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside funds

SMART SCALE Project Screening

Only projects that meet a capacity or operational need identified under the following categories in the VTrans2040 Multimodal Transportation Plan will move forward in the SMART SCALE process:

- Corridors of Statewide Significance
- Regional Networks
- Improvements to promote Urban Development Areas
- Transportation Safety

For the most up-to-date information on VTrans2040, visit the VTrans2040 page on the website of the Virginia Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment at: www.vtrans.org/vtrans2040.asp.
SMART SCALE EVALUATION MEASURES

The legislation that resulted in SMART SCALE requires that measures used to evaluate projects be quantifiable and objective, that the analysis result in a measure of a project’s benefits relative to its cost (essentially a benefit-cost analysis using the SMART SCALE factors), and that the CTB consider all modes of transportation. The law requires that the measures fall into the following six factor areas:

- Congestion Mitigation
- Accessibility
- Safety
- Environmental Quality
- Economic Development
- Land Use Coordination (for areas with over 200,000 population)

For details on the measures and measure weights for each of the factors listed above, visit the SMART SCALE website at: www.vasmartscale.org.

SMART SCALE WEIGHTING TYPOLOGIES AND FRAMEWORKS

The legislation that resulted in SMART SCALE specifies that the CTB shall weight the evaluation factors for each of the state’s nine VDOT Construction Districts, assigning different weights to the factors based on the unique needs and qualities of each District. Figure 1 depicts the SMART SCALE weighting typologies, or frameworks, for the nine construction districts. As shown in Figure 1, several of the construction districts have more than one SMART SCALE weighting typology.

Figure 1 – SMART SCALE Weighting Typologies
As shown in Figure 1, the localities within the Hampton Roads MPA – excluding Gloucester County (which is included in the Fredericksburg Construction District), the City of Franklin, and Southampton County – are in the Category A weighting framework. Localities within the VDOT Hampton Roads Construction District, but outside of the Hampton Roads MPA, plus Franklin and Southampton County in their entirety, are in the Category D weighting framework.

Table 1 shows the weights to be applied to each of the evaluation factors for each weighting framework category.

**Table 1 – SMART SCALE Weighting Frameworks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Congestion Mitigation</th>
<th>Economic Development</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Environmental Quality</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category A</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category D</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPLICANT ELIGIBILITY**

Entities eligible to submit projects under SMART SCALE are:

- Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), Planning District Commissions (PDCs), and the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA)
- Counties
- Cities
- Towns that maintain their own infrastructure and qualify to receive payments pursuant to §33.2-319 of the Code of Virginia
- Transit agencies that receive state operating assistance from the Mass Transit Trust Fund (as established in §58.1-638(A)(4)(b)(2) of the Code of Virginia)

Table 2 summarizes the entities eligible to submit projects under SMART SCALE by project type.

**Table 2 – Eligibility to Submit Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Regional Entities (MPOs, PDCs)</th>
<th>Local Governments (Cities, Counties, Towns)</th>
<th>Transit Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corridors of Statewide Significance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, with a resolution of support from relevant regional entity</td>
<td>Yes, with a resolution of support from relevant regional entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Networks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, with a resolution of support from relevant regional entity *</td>
<td>Yes, with a resolution of support from relevant entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Development Areas</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, with a resolution of support from relevant regional entity *</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, with a resolution of support from relevant regional entity *</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Projects within established MPO study areas that are not identified in or consistent with the regionally adopted Constrained Long Range Plan (CLRP) must include a resolution of support from the respective MPO Policy Board.
**RELEVANT REGIONAL ENTITIES**

As shown in Table 2, most SMART SCALE applications must include a resolution of support from the relevant regional entity. **Table 3** identifies the relevant regional entities for localities and transit agencies within the Hampton Roads Construction District.

**Table 3 – Relevant Regional Entities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Governments  (Cities, Counties, Towns) And Transit Agencies</th>
<th>Relevant Regional Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Localities and Transit Agencies within the Hampton Roads MPA (Excluding Gloucester County)</td>
<td>HRTPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Localities and Transit Agencies outside of the Hampton Roads MPA, but within Planning District 23</td>
<td>Hampton Roads Planning District Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Localities and Transit Agencies outside of Planning District 23, but within the Hampton Roads Construction District | **For Eastern Shore Localities:** Accomack-Northampton Planning District Commission (PD 22)  
**For Sussex, Surry, & Greensville Counties:** Crater Planning District Commission (PD 19) |
| Gloucester County | Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission (PD 18) |
**Figure 2** shows the Virginia Planning Districts (PDs) with the boundary of PD 23 indicated by a bold blue line.

**Figure 2 – Virginia Planning Districts**

Source: Virginia Association of Planning District Commissions
SMART SCALE APPLICATION PROCESS OVERVIEW

In accordance with the SMART SCALE Technical Guide, in order to support the success of the evaluation process, project sponsors will need to coordinate with VDOT and DRPT early in the process to share information on prospective applications. This coordination phase will allow project descriptions and scopes of work, cost estimates, and potential benefits to be developed and refined and will facilitate the application and evaluation process.

Beginning in 2018, project sponsors are required to create a pre-application within the online application tool by June 1, and no new applications may be created after June 1. VDOT and DRPT will be available to assist in application preparation and to help project sponsors understand and meet expectations. Project applications created by June 1 will be reviewed for eligibility and project readiness and screened to determine whether the project meets a VTrans need.

SMART SCALE project applications must include the following information:

- **Scope** – At a minimum, the scope should define the limits of the project, its physical and operational characteristics, and physical and/or operational footprint.

- **Schedule** – At a minimum, the schedule should clearly define the expected process for further project development including key milestones, work activities, related activities, approvals/approval timelines. The schedule should be realistic and reflect the complexity of the project and identify durations for project phases (PE, RW, CN).

- **Cost** – At a minimum, the cost estimate should be as realistic as possible and should account for applicable risk and contingencies based on the size and complexity of the project. Projects should not be segmented to the extent that they no longer have logical termini or independent utility. Cost estimates must be escalated to the anticipated start date for future phases.

It should be noted that, as part of the application process, each applicant will be asked to rank its submitted projects in order of priority. Applicants are encouraged to focus on their highest priority projects as each applicant is limited in the number of applications it can submit.

Complete information on SMART SCALE may be accessed on the web at: [www.vasmartscale.org](http://www.vasmartscale.org).
HRTPO GUIDANCE ON SMART SCALE

This section describes the HRTPO guidance with respect to the SMART SCALE statewide prioritization process when:

1. HRTPO is the Applicant
2. HRTPO is requested to support projects submitted by Localities or Transit Agency
3. HRPDC is requested to support projects submitted by Localities or Transit Agency

WHEN HRTPO IS THE APPLICANT

As shown in Table 2, the HRTPO is an eligible applicant for projects that fall under the **Corridors of Statewide Significance (CoSS)** and **Regional Networks** project types. The HRTPO may submit projects at its discretion or at the request of another entity, such as the Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission (HRTAC), the Virginia Port Authority (VPA), etc.

Guidance Regarding Project Submissions by the HRTPO

1. It is the prerogative of the HRTPO Board whether to apply for projects at the request of other entities. Projects to be submitted by the HRTPO must meet the following criteria:
   a. The proposed project must be consistent with the current, fiscally-constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan and, as applicable, the fiscally-constrained Transportation Improvement Program.
   b. The proposed project must be listed among the HRTPO Regional Priority Projects.

2. As required by the SMART SCALE process, the HRTPO Board will specify the priority order of the projects the HRTPO submits. To assist in this decision, HRTPO staff will:
   a. Review HRTPO Project Prioritization scores for each proposed project.
   b. Review proposed projects with respect to SMART SCALE evaluation factors and measures.
   c. Provide a recommendation to the HRTPO Board on the priority order for projects proposed for submission by the HRTPO.
**When HRTPO is requested to Support the Application of a Locality or Transit Agency**

As shown in Table 2, localities and transit agencies that wish to submit projects for SMART SCALE evaluation must obtain a resolution of support from the relevant regional entity. Table 3 identifies the relevant regional entities for the Hampton Roads Construction District.

**Guidance Regarding Project Submissions by Localities and Transit Agencies**

1. In response to a request for an HRTPO resolution of support for a project proposed to be submitted for SMART SCALE evaluation, HRTPO staff will review the proposed project to determine whether it is consistent with the current, fiscally-constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). If so, an HRTPO resolution in support of the project will be provided stating that the project is consistent with the fiscally-constrained LRTP.

2. If the proposed project is not consistent with the fiscally-constrained LRTP, HRTPO staff will review the proposed project to ensure it is consistent with the Planning Goals of the current LRTP. If so, an HRTPO resolution in support of the project will be provided, including the following fiscal-constraint language referenced in the LRTP SMART SCALE amendment policy:

   *If a locality receives SMART SCALE funding for a regionally-significant project not included in the LRTP:*
   
   - The locality must identify a current LRTP project within its jurisdiction from which to transfer LRTP planning funds.
   - If there are insufficient LRTP planning funds on projects within the jurisdiction of the locality receiving SMART SCALE funds, then consensus from the LRTP Subcommittee with a recommendation to TTAC will be needed before an amendment can be considered by the HRTPO Board.

3. If the applicant requests HRTPO support for more than one project, the HRTPO resolution will specify each project supported by the HRTPO.

4. It is the responsibility of the Locality or Transit Agency to specify the priority order of the projects they submit for evaluation under SMART SCALE.

**When HRPDC is requested to Support the Application of a Locality or Transit Agency**

As shown in Table 3, for localities and transit agencies outside of the Hampton Roads MPA, but within Planning District 23, the relevant regional entity is the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC).
Guidance Regarding Project Submissions by Localities and Transit Agencies

1. In response to a request for an HRPDC resolution of support for a project proposed to be submitted for SMART SCALE evaluation, HRTPO staff will review the proposed projects to determine whether it is consistent with the current, fiscally-constrained HRTPO Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and/or the Rural Long-Range Transportation Plan (RLRTP). If so, an HRPDC resolution of support will be provided stating that the project is consistent with the fiscally-constrained LRTP and/or RLRTP.

2. If the proposed project is not consistent with the fiscally-constrained LRTP and/or RLRTP, HRTPO staff will review the proposed project to ensure it is consistent with the Planning Goals of the current LRTP and/or RLRTP. If so, an HRPDC resolution in support of the project will be provided, including the following fiscal-constraint language referenced in the LRTP SMART SCALE amendment policy when applicable:

   If a locality receives SMART SCALE funding for a regionally-significant project not included in the LRTP:
   
   • The locality must identify a current LRTP project within its jurisdiction from which to transfer LRTP planning funds.
   • If there are insufficient LRTP planning funds on projects within the jurisdiction of the locality receiving SMART SCALE funds, then consensus from the LRTP Subcommittee with a recommendation to TTAC will be needed before an amendment can be considered by the HRTPO Board.

3. If the applicant requests HRPDC support for more than one project, the HRPDC resolution will specify each project supported by the HRPDC.

4. It is the responsibility of the Locality or Transit Agency to specify the priority order of the projects they submit for evaluation under SMART SCALE.

---

1 The Rural Long-Range Transportation Plan (RLRTP) is not subject to fiscal-constraint and therefore resolutions of support for proposed projects consistent with the Planning Goals of the current RLRTP do not need to include the fiscal-constraint language referenced in the LRTP SMART SCALE amendment policy.
G. REQUESTS FOR HRTPO RESOLUTIONS OF SUPPORT – SMART SCALE

In accordance with SMART SCALE guidance documents, under certain circumstances Hampton Roads localities and transit agencies must obtain resolutions of support from the HRTPO for projects they wish to submit for SMART SCALE evaluation. HRTPO resolutions of support will be provided in accordance with the HRTPO Guidance on SMART SCALE, (refer to Agenda Item 21-F).

HRTPO Staff has received the following request (attached) from the City of Williamsburg:

- Monticello Avenue – Richmond Road – Lafayette Street Roundabout
- Lafayette Street Reconstruction – roadway reconstruction with widening and sidewalk addition
- Richmond Road Signal Coordination and Pedestrian Improvements
- Lafayette Street Signal and Pedestrian Improvements in downtown Williamsburg

Several localities have submitted requests to amend the current fiscally-constrained 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan (refer to Agenda Item 21-H). With the recent issuance of the FHWA-FTA Interim Guidance on Conformity Requirements for the 1997 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard memo (refer to Agenda Item 14) and the requirement to run transportation conformity when amending the Long-Range Transportation Plan, HRTPO staff is requesting the Board issue resolutions of support for the following projects in order to avoid unintended delays in the localities’ application for SMART SCALE Round 3.

- City of Chesapeake: George Washington Highway (Yadkin Rd. to Canal Drive)
- City of Suffolk: North Suffolk Connector (Nansemond Pkwy. to I-664)
- City of Virginia Beach: Laskin Rd (Republic Rd. to I-264)
- City of Virginia Beach: General Booth Blvd (London Bridge Rd. to Nimmo Pkwy.)

Attachment 21-G1: City of Williamsburg Request Letter for HRTPO Resolution of Support
Attachment 21-G2: HRTPO Resolution of Support for the City of Williamsburg
Attachment 21-G3: HRTPO Resolution of Support for the City of Chesapeake
Attachment 21-G4: HRTPO Resolution of Support for the City of Suffolk
Attachment 21-G5: HRTPO Resolution of Support for the City of Virginia Beach

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve the Resolutions of Support for the proposed SMART SCALE project submittals.
April 30, 2018

Mr. Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director
HRTPO
The Regional Building
723 Woodlake Drive
Chesapeake, VA 23320

RE: LRTP Consistency Request for Smart Scale

Dear Mr. Crum:

The City of Williamsburg formally requests HRTPO provide a resolution of support for four (4) projects that the City intends to submit under round 3 of SMART SCALE. It is our understanding that the resolutions of support will be reviewed and included in the HRTPO Board packets for May. The four projects are:

1. Monticello Avenue-Richmond Road-Lafayette Street Roundabout
2. Lafayette Street Reconstruction
3. Richmond Road Signal Coordination & Pedestrian Improvements
4. Lafayette Street Signal & Pedestrian Improvements

Attached are drafts of the SMART SCALE Pre-Applications from the Smart Portal website. These are provided to allow the HRTP0 staff to ascertain whether the projects are consistent with the current Long-Range Transportation Plan and, if applicable, with the Transportation Improvement Program.

We look forward to a positive response. If your staff has any questions or requires additional information, please contact Mr. Aaron B. Small, P.E., City Engineer at asmall@williamsburgva.gov or (757) 220-6140.

Best regards,

[Signature]

Marvin E. Collins, III
City Manager

Enclosures (4)

r:\cipt\funding_apps\2018 - fy25 smartscale (round 3)\2018-04-30 ltpo request.docx
HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BOARD RESOLUTION 2018-05

A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FROM THE HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION FOR PROJECTS TO BE SUBMITTED FOR EVALUATION UNDER THE SMART SCALE PRIORITIZATION PROCESS.

WHEREAS, the SMART SCALE prioritization process requires that all project submissions by Local Governments and Transit Agencies must be consistent with the regionally adopted fiscally-constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), or have an accompanying resolution of support from the respective MPO Policy Board;

WHEREAS, the City of Williamsburg has requested an HRTPO resolution of support in accordance with SMART SCALE requirements; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the HRTPO Guidance on SMART SCALE, approved by the HRTPO Board on July 16, 2015 and updated in May 17, 2018, HRTPO staff has reviewed the proposed projects and found them to be consistent with the current, fiscally-constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan and, if applicable, the fiscally-constrained Transportation Improvement Program.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the HRTPO hereby supports the following projects to be submitted for evaluation under the SMART SCALE Prioritization Process:

- Monticello Avenue – Richmond Road – Lafayette Street Roundabout
- Lafayette Street Reconstruction – roadway reconstruction with widening and sidewalk addition
- Richmond Road Signal Coordination and Pedestrian Improvements
- Lafayette Street Signal and Pedestrian Improvements in downtown Williamsburg

APPROVED and ADOPTED by the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization Board at its meeting on the 17th day of May, 2018.

Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr.
Chair
Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization

Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director
Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization
HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BOARD RESOLUTION 2018-06

A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FROM THE HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION FOR PROJECTS TO BE SUBMITTED FOR EVALUATION UNDER THE SMART SCALE PRIORITIZATION PROCESS.

WHEREAS, the SMART SCALE prioritization process requires that all project submissions by Local Governments and Transit Agencies must be consistent with the regionally adopted fiscally-constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), or have an accompanying resolution of support from the respective MPO Policy Board;

WHEREAS, the City of Chesapeake has requested an HRTPO resolution of support in accordance with SMART SCALE requirements;

WHEREAS, in accordance with the HRTPO Guidance on SMART SCALE, approved by the HRTPO Board on July 16, 2015 and updated on May 17, 2018, HRTPO staff has reviewed the proposed project and found it to be consistent with the Planning Goals of the LRTP and, if applicable, the fiscally-constrained Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the current HRTPO LRTP Amendment Policy for SMART SCALE Projects, if a locality receives SMART SCALE funding for a regionally-significant project not included in the current LRTP:

- The locality must identify a current LRTP project within its jurisdiction from which to transfer LRTP planning funds.
- If there are insufficient LRTP planning funds on projects within the jurisdiction of the locality receiving SMART SCALE funds, then consensus from the LRTP Subcommittee with a recommendation to TTAC will be needed before an amendment can be considered by the HRTPO Board.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the HRTPO hereby supports the following project to be submitted for evaluation under the SMART SCALE Prioritization Process:

- George Washington Highway Widening (Yadkin Road to Canal Drive)

APPROVED and ADOPTED by the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization Board at its meeting on the 17th day of May, 2018.

______________________________        ________________________________
Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr.               Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Chair                                  Executive Director
Hampton Roads Transportation           Hampton Roads Transportation
Planning Organization                  Planning Organization

Attachment 21-G3
HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BOARD RESOLUTION 2018-07

A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FROM THE HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION FOR PROJECTS TO BE SUBMITTED FOR EVALUATION UNDER THE SMART SCALE PRIORITIZATION PROCESS.

WHEREAS, the SMART SCALE prioritization process requires that all project submissions by Local Governments and Transit Agencies must be consistent with the regionally adopted fiscally-constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), or have an accompanying resolution of support from the respective MPO Policy Board;

WHEREAS, the City of Suffolk has requested an HRTPO resolution of support in accordance with SMART SCALE requirements;

WHEREAS, in accordance with the HRTPO Guidance on SMART SCALE, approved by the HRTPO Board on July 16, 2015 and updated on May 17, 2018, HRTPO staff has reviewed the proposed project and found it to be consistent with the Planning Goals of the LRTP and, if applicable, the fiscally-constrained Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the current HRTPO LRTP Amendment Policy for SMART SCALE Projects, if a locality receives SMART SCALE funding for a regionally-significant project not included in the current LRTP:

- The locality must identify a current LRTP project within its jurisdiction from which to transfer LRTP planning funds.
- If there are insufficient LRTP planning funds on projects within the jurisdiction of the locality receiving SMART SCALE funds, then consensus from the LRTP Subcommittee with a recommendation to TTAC will be needed before an amendment can be considered by the HRTPO Board.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the HRTPO hereby supports the following project to be submitted for evaluation under the SMART SCALE Prioritization Process:

- North Suffolk Connector (Nansemond Parkway to I-664)

APPROVED and ADOPTED by the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization Board at its meeting on the 17th day of May, 2018.

______________________________
Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr.
Chair
Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization

______________________________
Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director
Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization

Attachment 21-G4
HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
BOARD RESOLUTION 2018-08

A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FROM THE HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION FOR PROJECTS TO BE SUBMITTED FOR EVALUATION UNDER THE SMART SCALE PRIORITIZATION PROCESS.

WHEREAS, the SMART SCALE prioritization process requires that all project submissions by Local Governments and Transit Agencies must be consistent with the regionally adopted fiscally-constrained Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), or have an accompanying resolution of support from the respective MPO Policy Board;

WHEREAS, the City of Virginia Beach has requested an HRTPO resolution of support in accordance with SMART SCALE requirements;

WHEREAS, in accordance with the HRTPO Guidance on SMART SCALE, approved by the HRTPO Board on July 16, 2015 and updated on May 17, 2018, HRTPO staff has reviewed the proposed projects and found them to be consistent with the Planning Goals of the LRTP and, if applicable, the fiscally-constrained Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the current HRTPO LRTP Amendment Policy for SMART SCALE Projects, if a locality receives SMART SCALE funding for a regionally-significant project not included in the current LRTP:

- The locality must identify a current LRTP project within its jurisdiction from which to transfer LRTP planning funds.
- If there are insufficient LRTP planning funds on projects within the jurisdiction of the locality receiving SMART SCALE funds, then consensus from the LRTP Subcommittee with a recommendation to TTAC will be needed before an amendment can be considered by the HRTPO Board.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the HRTPO hereby supports the following projects to be submitted for evaluation under the SMART SCALE Prioritization Process:

- Laskin Road Phase III (Republic Road to I-264)
- General Booth Boulevard (London Bridge Road to Nimmo Parkway)

APPROVED and ADOPTED by the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization Board at its meeting on the 17th day of May, 2018.

__________________________
Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr.
Chair
Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization

__________________________
Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director
Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization
H. HAMPTON ROADS 2040 LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP): PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

Requests were received to amend the Hampton Roads 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) to add the following four projects described below:

1. **City of Chesapeake – George Washington Highway Widening**
   
The City of Chesapeake requests an amendment to the 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan to include the widening of George Washington Highway between Yadkin Road and Canal Drive in Chesapeake. The estimated year of expenditure cost for this project is $34.3 million. The LRTP planning funds that are currently associated with the Dominion Boulevard Phase II project ($23 million) plus $11.3 million from local city funds will be reallocated to the George Washington Highway project to maintain the requirement for fiscal-constraint for the LRTP. The Dominion Boulevard Phase II widening was completed in 2017 with funding provided through Revenue Sharing program. VDOT has confirmed that the Revenue Sharing funds used for the project were not included in the projected transportation revenues identified in the LRTP. Subsequently, the city requests that the funding source of the Dominion Blvd Phase II project be changed to reflect Revenue Sharing funds.

   Since the implementation of tolling at the Downtown and Midtown Tunnels in 2014, traffic congestion has significantly increased along the non-tolled routes including George Washington Highway and Military Highway. The impact of tolls has resulted in an increase of the traffic volume at the Gilmerton Bridge by 53% and severe congestion and queues along this section of George Washington Highway during peak travel times. This project proposes to widen George Washington Highway from two to four lanes between Yadkin Road and Canal Drive. The proposed four-lane divided urban design removes the existing bottleneck, provides safety and access management improvements, and constructs new pedestrian facilities along the corridor. In addition, this project will improve the ability of the corridor to function as a key emergency evacuation route.

   The proposed LRTP amendment was available for public review and comment from April 4, 2018 to April 25, 2018.

2. **City of Suffolk – North Suffolk Connector**
   
The City of Suffolk requests an amendment to the 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) to replace Finney Avenue Flyover (project 2040-142), which currently appears in the fiscally-constrained Plan as an intermodal project with an estimated cost of $38 million with the North Suffolk Connector (project #2040-135), which appears in the 2040 LRTP Regional Transportation Vision Plan as a scored candidate project.

   The City of Suffolk recently funded and completed a study of the North Suffolk Connector project and developed cost estimates for the several alternative alignments. Year-of-expenditure costs for Phase I of the project is estimated to be
$34.2 million (2026 year of expenditure dollars), less than the cost associated with the Finney Avenue Flyover project. This requested amendment would not impact LRTP fiscal-constraint, but would allow the City an opportunity to move forward on requesting SMART SCALE funding on this much needed project in a quickly growing sector of the city.

The proposed LRTP amendment was available for public review and comment from April 25, 2018 to May 9, 2018.

3. City of Virginia Beach – Laskin Road Corridor Projects, Laskin Road Phase III, General Booth Boulevard

The City of Virginia Beach requests an amendment to the 2040 LRTP to update the phasing and refine the cost estimates for the Laskin Road corridor projects as well as replace two locally-funded highway projects for SMART SCALE Round 3 consideration.

Since the 2040 LRTP was adopted in July 2016, the Laskin Road Phase I, Laskin Road Phase II, and Laskin Road Bridge projects, currently included in the fiscally constrained 2040 LRTP, have been updated. The cost refinement now includes all prior project expenditures associated with design, site acquisition and private utility adjustments, as well as addressing sea level rise and recurrent flooding criteria. The Laskin Road corridor projects were estimated at $95,000,000 in the adopted LRTP. The refined costs are $135,995,306. The recommended course for addressing the $40,995,306 cost estimate increase with City of Virginia Beach local funds is explained below.

In considering highway projects for SMART SCALE Round 3 funding, the City evaluated its list of priority projects through the lens of SMART SCALE screening criteria. Through that process, the City determined that Laskin Road Phase III (Republic Rd to I-264) and the General Booth Blvd (London Bridge Rd to Nimmo Pkwy) projects are stronger candidates per SMART SCALE criteria than the Indian River Rd (Elbow Rd to North Landing Rd) and Ferrell Pkwy (Pleasant Valley Rd to Salem Rd) locally-funded projects that are currently included in the fiscally-constrained 2040 LRTP.

In order to address the additional costs of the existing LRTP fiscally-constrained Laskin Road corridor projects ($40,995,306) and the proposed SMART SCALE Round 3 Virginia Beach projects ($51,778,352), it is recommended that the Indian River Rd and Ferrell Pkwy projects be replaced in the 2040 LRTP. The current estimated costs for the latter projects are $99,000,000, all of which is local City of Virginia Beach funding.

The proposed LRTP amendment was available for public review and comment from April 25, 2018 to May 9, 2018.
4. **US 58 Corridor Study**

The US 58 Corridor Study was initiated in 2017 and is scheduled to be completed the end of this calendar year. The cost of the study is estimated at $151,000, funded by VDOT's State Planning and Research Work Program.

US 58 is a regionally-significant facility serving as an important freight corridor and hurricane evacuation route. Additionally, US 58 is also being considered as a candidate Round 2 Regional Priority Project. It is therefore recommended that this study be included in the fiscally-constrained 2040 LRTP.

The proposed LRTP amendment was available for public review and comment from April 25, 2018 to May 9, 2018.

### Summary of proposed 2040 LRTP Amendments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Amendment Action</th>
<th>Estimated Project Cost (YOE*)</th>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Transportation Conformity Exempt Project</th>
<th>Public Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
<td>George Washington Highway (Yadkin Road to Canal Drive)</td>
<td>Include (construction)</td>
<td>$34 Million (2024)</td>
<td>LRTP Planning (already included in the current 2040 LRTP financial plan)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>April 4 – 25, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
<td>Dominion Blvd Phase II (0.75 miles south of Cedar Road to existing 4-lane segment south of Cedar Road)</td>
<td>Update funding assumption</td>
<td>$23 Million (completed in 2017)</td>
<td>Revenue Sharing Program</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>April 4 – 25, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>North Suffolk Connector (Nansemond Pkwy to I-664)</td>
<td>Include (construction)</td>
<td>$34.2 Million (2026)</td>
<td>LRTP Planning Funds (already included in the current 2040 LRTP financial plan)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>April 25 – May 9, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>Finney Avenue Flyover (Pinner Street to Route 13/337 E Washington Street)</td>
<td>Remove (add to 2040 Regional Transportation Vision Plan)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>April 25 – May 9, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>Laskin Road Phase III (Republic Road to I-264)</td>
<td>Include (construction)</td>
<td>$33.8 Million (2024)</td>
<td>Local Planning Funds (already included in the current 2040 LRTP financial plan)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>April 25 – May 9, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>General Booth Blvd (London Bridge Road to Nimmo Parkway)</td>
<td>Include (construction)</td>
<td>$18 Million (2024)</td>
<td>Local Planning Funds (already included in the current 2040 LRTP financial plan)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>April 25 – May 9, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>Indian River Road (Elbow Road to North Landing Road)</td>
<td>Remove (add to 2040 Regional Transportation Vision Plan)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>April 25 – May 9, 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Approve the proposed 2040 LRTP amendments subject to any applicable transportation conformity requirements (refer to Agenda Item 14).
I. TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY: 2040 LRTP AND FY 2018-2021 TIP

This item was presented under Workshop Agenda Item #14.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

1. Direct HRTPO Staff to initiate Transportation Conformity on the 2040 LRTP and the FY 2018-2021 TIP.
2. Approve HRTPO Resolution 2018-04 authorizing TTAC to:
   • Approve the project list for Transportation Conformity and any related planning assumptions, and
   • Initiate the public review of the draft Transportation Conformity Analysis.
J. **HAMPTON ROADS REGIONAL BRIDGE STUDY**

Bridges are a prominent part of the Hampton Roads landscape and a critical component of the Hampton Roads transportation system. Because of the importance of bridges to the regional transportation system and concerns about the condition and funding of bridges, HRTPO began analyzing factors impacting regional bridges in 2007. For the first time, the Hampton Roads Regional Bridge Study provided a regional analysis of bridge topics such as bridge inspections and ratings, deficient bridges, bridge funding and projects, and the impacts that the closure of major bridges would have on Hampton Roads travel patterns.

This 2018 update of the Hampton Roads Regional Bridge Study builds on the 2007 study and the update released in 2012. Sections regarding bridge definitions, regional summaries, bridge inspections and ratings, deficient bridges, fracture and scour critical bridges, health indices, bridge funding, bridge projects, and the anticipated cost of maintaining bridges through 2045 are included in this update. In many sections of this report, comparisons are made between the condition of bridges in Hampton Roads and those in other large metropolitan areas throughout the country. This report also includes a section detailing the new Federal bridge performance measures.

The draft report was presented to the TTAC on April 4, 2018 and made available for public review and comment from April 4, 2018 through April 20, 2018. Comments received have been addressed in the final report. The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended approval of the report.

Enclosure 21-J:  *Hampton Roads Regional Bridge Study*

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

Approve the final report for public distribution.
K. SAFETY PERFORMANCE MEASURES AMENDMENT FOR FY 2018-2021 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

A key feature of MAP-21 (and continued under the FAST Act) is the establishment of national performance goals in the areas of safety, infrastructure condition, congestion reduction, system reliability, freight movement and economic vitality, environmental sustainability, and reduced project delivery delays. This legislation also requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to prepare and set targets for the following federally-established performance measures:

- Roadway Safety
- Pavement Condition
- Bridge Condition
- Roadway Performance
- Freight Movement
- Transit Asset Management and Safety
- On-road mobile source emissions and traffic congestion for CMAQ Program

The FAST Act also requires Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) to include a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets identified by the MPO. The TIP must also link investment priorities in the TIP to the achievement of performance targets in the plans.

HRTPO staff has prepared a web page ([https://www.hrtpo.org/page/regional-performance-measures-and-targets/](https://www.hrtpo.org/page/regional-performance-measures-and-targets/)) that describes these performance measures and targets, and staff will also prepare a report on performance measures and targets on an annual basis. The HRTPO has established performance targets in the area of roadway safety and will establish targets in the remaining areas by November 2018. The first report will be released in late 2018.

The performance measures and targets are required to be addressed in the TIP prior to any amendments after May 27, 2018.

Attached is the TIP Performance Measures section to be added to the FY 2018-2021 TIP document.

The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended approval of the amendment.

Attachment 21-K

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve the amendment.
**TIP – Performance Measures**

A key feature of MAP-21 (and continued under the FAST Act) is the establishment of national performance goals in the areas of safety, infrastructure condition, congestion reduction, system reliability, freight movement and economic vitality, environmental sustainability, and reduced project delivery delays. This legislation also requires Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to prepare and set targets for the following federally-established performance measures:

- Roadway Safety
- Pavement Condition
- Bridge Condition
- Roadway Performance
- Freight Movement
- Transit Asset Management and Safety
- On-road mobile source emissions and traffic congestion for CMAQ Program

The FAST Act also requires Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) include a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP toward achieving the performance targets identified by the MPO. The TIP must also link investment priorities in the TIP to the achievement of performance targets in the plans.

HRTPO has prepared a website ([https://www.hrtpo.org/page/regional-performance-measures-and-targets/](https://www.hrtpo.org/page/regional-performance-measures-and-targets/)) that describes these performance measures and targets, and HRTPO will also prepare a report on performance measures and targets on an annual basis. The first report will be released in late 2018.

As of the publishing date of this report, the HRTPO has established performance targets in the area of roadway safety, which are described below. HRTPO will establish targets in the remaining areas by November 2018.

**Roadway Safety**

The first performance targets that had to be established by MPOs are in the area of roadway safety. There are five safety measures that MPOs are required to establish targets and monitor progress for:

- Fatalities
- Fatality Rate
- Serious Injuries
- Serious Injury Rate
- Bike/Pedestrian Fatalities & Serious Injuries (combined)

Based on the advice of the Performance Measures working group and the Hampton Roads Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC), the HRTPO Board established the following annual roadway safety targets at their February 2018 meeting:
The fatality reduction target is based on Vision Zero, where the number of fatalities is reduced by a set amount each year to reach a goal of zero fatalities by 2045, the horizon of the upcoming Hampton Roads Long-Range Transportation Plan. The remaining annual reduction targets are based on the statewide targets that were established by VDOT, which are included in the Virginia 2017-2021 Strategic Highway Safety Plan.

Based on these annual reduction targets, HRTPO has set the following regional targets for the year 2018:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018 Safety Performance Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate (per 100 Million VMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Rate (per 100 Million VMT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Bike/Pedestrian Fatalities and Serious Injuries Combined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a number of programmatic ways that the TIP will help Hampton Roads meet these targets:

**HSIP**

The Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) is a core program administered at the federal level by the U.S. Department of Transportation's (USDOT) Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Office of Safety. HSIP’s purpose is to make significant progress in reducing highway fatalities and serious injuries on all public roadways.

The Highway Safety Improvement Program was established as a core Federal-aid program in 2005. Funding for HSIP was greatly increased in 2012 under the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) transportation authorization program. Over $2.4 billion was allocated annually to the Highway Safety Improvement Program under
MAP-21. Funding levels decreased slightly under the current transportation authorization program, The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act. About $2.2 billion was allocated to the Highway Safety Improvement Program in FY 2016, increasing to $2.4 billion in FY 2020.

Virginia’s HSIP funding has also increased in recent years. Virginia received an average apportionment of $38.3 million in Federal Fiscal Years (FFY) 2006-2009 under SAFETEA-LU, and $42.8 million in FFY 2010-2012 under SAFETEA-LU extensions. Under MAP-21, Virginia was allocated $60 - $65 million in HSIP funds in each Federal Fiscal Year from 2013 to 2015. Under the FAST Act, Virginia was allocated $59.6 million in HSIP funds in FFY 2016, which will increase to $64.4 million in FFY 2020.

To be eligible for HSIP funding, a project must be a strategy, activity, or project on a public road that corrects or improves a hazardous road location or feature, or addresses a highway safety problem.

SMART SCALE

Virginia’s SMART SCALE is about selecting the right transportation projects for funding and ensuring the best use of limited tax dollars. It is the method of scoring planned projects included in VTrans that are funded by House Bill 1887. Transportation projects are scored based on an objective, outcome-based process that is transparent to the public and allows decision-makers to be held accountable to taxpayers. Once projects are scored and prioritized, the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) has the best information possible to select the right projects for funding.

Two SMART SCALE safety measures evaluate how each project addresses multimodal transportation safety concerns through implementation of crash reduction strategies. Listed below are brief summaries of the two measures.
More information about the SMART SCALE project prioritization process, including a technical guide for applicants, is available at www.vasmartscale.org.

**RSTP Project Prioritization Process**

As the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Hampton Roads metropolitan planning area (MPA), the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) is responsible for project selection and allocation of funds under two federal funding programs – the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) improvement program and the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP).

The FAST Act converted the long-standing Surface Transportation Program (STP) into the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP). The STBGP promotes flexibility in State and local transportation decisions and provides flexible funding to best address State and local transportation needs. Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds are STBGP funds that are apportioned to specific regions within the State.

The process for obtaining RSTP funding for transportation projects is a competitive one. Proposed projects are evaluated and ranked by HRTPO staff using a specific set of criteria that have been approved by the HRTPO Board. HRTPO’s Transportation Programming Subcommittee (TPS) – taking into account the available funding, policies and priorities of the HRTPO and Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB), and using the ranked project lists as a guide – produces a list of recommended projects and funding allocations for consideration by the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) and the HRTPO Board. For more information on the CMAQ/RSTP Project Selection Process, see the guide posted on the HRTPO website (https://www.hrtpo.org/page/cmaq-and-rstp/).
RSTP candidate project evaluation methodology includes several project categories that address safety as an integral part of the overall scoring. RSTP candidate project categories that include a safety component are listed below:

**Other Transit, Other Fixed Guideway and Transit ITS Projects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Consideration</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the project increase service reliability of the transit system?</td>
<td>0-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Will the project improve passenger safety, comfort and convenience?</strong></td>
<td>0-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project improve efficiency of the transit system?</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project improve the revenue collection?</td>
<td>0-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project improve transit data collection system?</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alternatives Analysis and Feasibility Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Consideration</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Yes or No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is the study necessary to address a major issue or to revise the LRTP?</td>
<td>0-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Is the study necessary to address a safety issue?</strong></td>
<td>0-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the study concerned with encouraging multimodal transportation?</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the study address the mobility or accessibility needs of the region?</td>
<td>0-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is the study well defined in terms of purpose, design concept and scope?</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do the goals and objectives of the study show support for economic development?</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do the goals and objectives demonstrate preservation or protection of the environment?</td>
<td>0-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intelligent Transportation Systems Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Consideration</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will the project improve traffic flow during peak congestion periods and special events?</td>
<td>0-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Will the project directly reduce the number or severity of accidents, which occur on roadways?</strong></td>
<td>0-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the project improve level of service, increase service capacity, or contribute to incident management?</td>
<td>0-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project address the mobility or accessibility needs of the region?</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project improve the linkage and communications among various operating agencies to provide better and accurate traffic information to the motorists?</td>
<td>0-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the project part of the Regional ITS Strategic Plan?</td>
<td>0-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RSTP Highway Projects

RSTP highway-type candidate projects are scored using the HRTPO Project Prioritization Tool. The Project Prioritization Tool evaluates projects for utility, viability, and economic vitality when scoring candidate projects. The Tool is separated into categories (i.e. highway, bridge/tunnel, interchange etc.) as the evaluation for these project types differ. The weighting factors for safety fall into the project utility factor and are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highway Projects Weighting Factors</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT UTILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Utility:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Level:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Reduction in Existing and Future V/C Ratios (Daily Delay)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing V/C Ratio</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to Nearby Roadways</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Continuity and Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security:</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Ratio</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement to Incident Management or Evacuation Routes</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Effectiveness (Cost/VMT)</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Future Development Compatibility</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal Enhancements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances Other Categories</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Vehicular Access</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT UTILITY TOTAL</td>
<td><strong>100.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Interchange Projects Weighting Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria and Sub-criteria</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT UTILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Level:</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Queue Conditions: Number of Approaches with Queues</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queue Improvements: Number of Approaches Improved</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Movements Added or Improved</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Continuity and Connectivity</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and Security:</strong></td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Ratio</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement to Incident Management or Evacuation Routes</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effectiveness (Cost/VMT)</strong></td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Future Development Compatibility</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal Enhancements:</strong></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances Other Categories</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Vehicular Access</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT UTILITY TOTAL</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Bridge & Tunnel Projects Weighting Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria and Sub-criteria</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT UTILITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Level:</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Reduction in Existing and Future V/C Ratios (Daily Delay)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing V/C Ratio</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to Nearby Roadways</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrastructure Condition (Bridge Sufficiency, Tunnel Condition, Obsolescence)</strong></td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Continuity and Connectivity</strong></td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and Security:</strong></td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crash Ratio</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement to Incident Management or Evacuation Routes</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure Impact (Impact of Detour to Alternate Crossing)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effectiveness (Cost/VMT)</strong></td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Future Development Compatibility</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modal Enhancements:</strong></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improves Vehicular Access</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhances Other Categories</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Continuous Maritime Crossing</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT UTILITY TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Active Transportation Projects

In general, Active Transportation (AT) projects are planned and constructed to benefit the safety and mobility of all AT users. There are a number of Federal, State, Regional, and Local funding sources that can be used for AT improvements. While many are specifically dedicated to transportation uses, others are non-transportation sources, which can be flexed for use in active transportation purposes. Two of the largest funding sources dedicated to AT improvements are the Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside Program and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Program:

**TA Set-Aside Program** - The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) was first authorized in the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) Federal surface transportation authorization program and provides funding for programs and projects defined as transportation alternatives. These include on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure for improving non-automobile access to public transit and enhanced mobility, community improvement activities, and environmental mitigation. Also included in the TA Set-Aside is the Safe Routes to School program projects and Complete Streets.

VDOT’s Local Assistance Division (LAD) coordinates the application process and scoring of proposed projects. Localities submit eligible projects to VDOT for review and scoring. The Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) allocates a portion of available TAP funding pursuant to VDOT guidance. Within Metropolitan Planning Areas (MPAs) and Transportation Management Areas (TMAs), the responsible Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is also responsible for selecting scored projects for MPO-administered funding allocations. More information on the TA Set-Aside Program can be found at: [http://www.virginiadot.org/business/prehancegrants.asp](http://www.virginiadot.org/business/prehancegrants.asp).

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Program** - Within VDOT’s administration of the Highway Safety Improvement Program is the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Program (BPSP). VDOT developed the BPSP due to the limitations of assessing and prioritizing non-motorized improvements. Because active transportation safety improvement proposals typically do not have the sufficient crash numbers needed to rank well for project selection under the typical HSIP project selection methods, BPSP proposals are selected based on risk factors that are compared to other active transportation projects.

The amount of funding devoted to the BPSP is 10% of the annual HSIP allocation that Virginia receives. Under the HSIP allocation levels included in the FAST act, the BPSP annual apportionment is approximately $6 million. Each active transportation project can be financed with 90% coming from federal HSIP funding, with the state or locality providing the remaining 10% match.

Eligible BPSP proposals must address documented non-motorized safety concerns on any public road, public surface transportation facility, or publicly owned bicycle or pedestrian pathway or trail.
L. VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS (VAMPO): SUPPORT FOR A NEW STATE TRANSPORTATION REVENUE SYSTEM

The Virginia Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (VAMPO) has drafted a letter (attached) to Virginia Secretary of Transportation Shannon Valentine expressing concern regarding the sustainability of the State’s current system for generating revenue for funding transportation projects due to the system’s reliance on gas taxes. In the letter, VAMPO requests that the State conduct a study of alternative systems for generating revenue for transportation improvements.

VAMPO is seeking support for the letter and study request from Virginia’s MPOs. The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended that the HRTPO Board endorse the letter and study.

Attachment 21-L

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Endorse the letter and study request from VAMPO.
June 1, 2018

Honorable Shannon Valentine
Secretary of Transportation
Commonwealth of Virginia
1111 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA  23219

RE: Request for State to Study Developing a New State Transportation Revenue System Not Based on Gas Taxes

Dear Secretary Valentine:

We are writing because we are concerned with the future sustainability of our existing state transportation revenue system because of its reliance on gas taxes. We feel that the existing level of transportation funding is inadequate to meet statewide needs. The last round of Smart Scale had over $9 Billion in project requests competing for only about $1 Billion in available funding.

As the existing vehicle fleet continues to transition to more fuel efficient, hybrid, electric, and other vehicle types which do not use gas, our gas tax revenues are expected to decrease significantly relative to usage of our transportation system as measured by metrics such as Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), transit ridership, etc. According to a study by Forbes, at the end of 2016, electric vehicles accounted for less than 1% of the U.S. Market share, but this is projected to grow to between 8% and 11% by 2025 and between 25% and 38% by 2030. If the current transportation funding system is left unchanged, this transition will cause the amount of transportation funding available for Smart Scale and other State funding programs to decrease significantly in the coming years. We appreciate the work the Commonwealth has done to develop the Smart Scale system for prioritizing the use of scarce transportation funding, but it will be of limited use in the future if there is little to no transportation funding to prioritize.

Nationally, several states have studied this issue, e.g., California, Illinois, Oregon, Washington, etc., and are considering alternative systems for raising transportation revenues not based on gas taxes, e.g., mileage-based fees. The Commonwealth has been a leader in transportation innovation nationally for many years in many areas including the Virginia Automated 20xx statewide strategic
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planning effort that is studying the transition to autonomous vehicles. This issue is another opportunity for the Commonwealth to be a leader. We request that the Commonwealth conduct a study of alternative systems for raising transportation revenues, which could include potential ways to shift from a transportation revenue system based on gas taxes to a new alternative transportation revenue system not based on gas taxes that can provide a sustainable way to fund transportation in the 21st century, among other alternatives. We would appreciate your consideration of this request.

Sincerely,
M. HRTO CMAQ AND RSTP PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS 2017 FINAL REPORT

As the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the Hampton Roads area, the HRTO is responsible for project selection and allocation of funds under two federal funding programs – the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) and the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP). The process used by the HRTO to select projects to receive funds from these two programs is referred to as the CMAQ/RSTP Project Selection Process. The project selection process is conducted annually, normally beginning in July and running through December.

The enclosed report summarizes the work of selecting CMAQ and RSTP projects during the 2017 CMAQ/RSTP Project Selection Process. Selected projects received allocations of CMAQ or RSTP funds in Fiscal Year 2024. The CMAQ and RSTP projects and allocations were approved by the HRTO Board on October 19, 2017.

The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended approval of the report.


RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve the final report.
N. FY 2018-2021 TIP AMENDMENT: UPC 101793
ISLE OF WIGHT MULTI-USE TRAIL – SEGMENT 1

The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) has requested to amend the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add one project as described below:

• UPC 101793 – Isle of Wight Multi-Use Trail – Segment 1
  o Add project to TIP
  o Description: Construct a pedestrian and bicycle trail along Battery Park Road from Nike Park Road to South Church Street in the Town of Smithfield.
  o Cost Estimate as follows:
    ▪ Right of Way (RW): $262,710
    ▪ Construction (CN): $1,299,629
    ▪ Total: $1,562,339
  o Project Phase Schedule as follows:
    ▪ RW: Start 5/30/2014; End 3/3/2017 (Complete)
    ▪ CN: Start 3/3/2017; End 5/31/2018 (Underway)
  o Allocations as follows:
    ▪ FY Previous allocation of $620,000 TAP plus $155,000 match
  o Obligations as follows:
    ▪ FY Previous RW Phase obligation of $210,168 STP/EN, plus $52,542 match
    ▪ FY Previous CN Phase obligation of $620,000 TAP, plus $155,000 match
    ▪ FY Previous CN Phase obligation of $118,045 STP/EN, plus $29,512 match
    ▪ FY18 CN Phase obligation of $255,594 TAP/F plus $63,899 match
    ▪ FY18 CN Phase obligation of $57,579 AC-Other

This request has been made available for public review and comment from April 25, 2018 through May 9, 2018. The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended approval of the TIP amendment.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve the TIP amendment.
O. FY 2018-2021 TIP AMENDMENT: UPC 101794
   ISLE OF WIGHT MULTI-USE TRAIL: SEGMENT 2

The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) has requested to amend the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add one project as described below:

- UPC 101794 – Isle of Wight Multi-Use Trail – Segment 2
  - Add project to TIP
  - Description: Construct a pedestrian and bicycle trail along Nike Park Road from Battery Park Road to the Carrolton Nike Park.
  - Cost Estimate as follows:
    - Right of Way (RW): $831,000
    - Construction (CN): $3,970,000
    - Total: $4,801,000
  - Project Phase Schedule as follows:
    - RW: Start 9/8/2014; End 3/3/2017 (Complete)
    - CN: Start 3/3/2017; End 5/31/2018 (Underway)
  - Allocations as follows:
    - FY Previous allocation of $1,216,127 RevShare TAP plus $1,216,127 match
    - FY Previous allocation of $137,969 STP/EN
    - FY Previous allocation of $513,264 Misc
    - FY Previous allocation of $34,492 LOC
  - Obligations as follows:
    - FY Previous RW Phase obligation of $205,426 STP/EN, plus $51,356 match
    - FY Previous CN Phase obligation of $858,302 STP, plus $214,576 match
    - FY Previous CN Phase obligation of $1,216,127 RevShare, plus $1,216,127 match
    - FY Previous CN Phase obligation of $1,950,547 AC
    - FY18 CN Phase obligation of $50,129 STP/SU plus $12,532 match
    - FY18 CN Phase obligation of $577 STP/STBG, plus $144 match

This request has been made available for public review and comment from April 25, 2018 through May 9, 2018. The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended approval of the TIP amendment.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve the TIP amendment.
P. FY 2018-2021 TIP AMENDMENT: UPC 111787
ROUTE 17 WIDENING IN YORK COUNTY (PE ONLY)

The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) has requested to amend the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add one project as described below:

- UPC 111787 – Route 17 Widening between Route 630 and Route 634 (PE Only)
  - Add project to TIP
  - Description: Widen Route 17 (George Washington Highway Memorial Highway) from 4 to 6 lanes between Route 630 (Wolf Trap Road) and Route 173 (Denbigh Boulevard/Goodwin Neck Road) and northbound from 2 to 3 lanes from Route 173 (Denbigh Boulevard/Goodwin Neck Road) to Route 634 (Old York-Hampton Highway).
  - Cost Estimate as follows:
    - Preliminary Engineering (PE): $833,033
    - Total: $833,033
  - Project Phase Schedule as follows:
    - PE: Start 8/14/2018; End 7/14/2020
  - Allocations as follows:
    - Add FY19 allocation of $320,000 DGP-NHPP plus $80,000 match
    - Add FY20 allocation of $346,426 DGP-NHPP plus $86,607 match
  - Obligations as follows:
    - Add FY18 PE Phase obligation of $400,000 NHS/NHPP
    - Add FY18 PE Phase obligation of $433,033 AC
    - Add FY19 PE Phase obligation of $433,033 AC-Conversion

This request is being made available for public review and comment from May 14, 2018 through May 28, 2018. The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended approval of the TIP amendment.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve the TIP amendment subject to no adverse public comments.
Q. FY 2018-2021 TIP AMENDMENT: UPC 112923
I-64 EXPRESS LANES – SEGMENT II (PE ONLY)

The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) has requested to amend the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add one project as described below:

- UPC 112923 – I-64 Express Lanes – Segment II (PE Only)
  - Add project to TIP
  - Description: Extend I-64 HOT lanes – 2 lanes from I-264 to I-664/I-264 Interchange at Bowers Hill.
  - Cost Estimate as follows:
    - Preliminary Engineering (PE): $3,500,000
    - Total: $3,500,000
  - Project Phase Schedule as follows:
    - PE: Start 7/16/2018; End 5/12/2019
  - Allocations as follows:
    - FY19 of $3,500,000 Other-Toll
  - Obligations as follows:
    - FY19 PE Phase obligation of $3,500,000 Other-Toll

This request is being made available for public review and comment from May 14, 2018 through May 28, 2018. The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended approval of the TIP amendment.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve the TIP amendment subject to no adverse public comments.
R. FY 2018-2021 TIP AMENDMENT: UPCs T20978, T20980, T20979, T21210, T21111, T21223, 100608, & 102999

CMAQ FUNDING TRANSFERS TO NEW AND EXISTING PROJECTS

The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) has requested to amend the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to redistribute funds from UPC 100606 – Hampton Roads Regional Opticom Preemption Strategic Plan and Development by adding six projects and transferring Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Conformity Program (CMAQ) funding to two existing projects and to VDOT as a balance entry as described below:

- **UPC T20978 – Traffic Signal System Preemption Upgrade (Chesapeake)**
  - Add project to TIP
  - Cost Estimate as follows:
    - Preliminary Engineering (PE): $20,000
    - Right of Way (RW): N/A
    - Construction (CN): $184,000
    - Total: $204,000
  - Project Phase Schedule as follows:
    - PE: Start 10/1/2018; End 3/23/2020
    - CN: Start 3/23/2020; End 6/24/2021
  - Allocations as follows:
    - FY Previous of $204,000 CMAQ, including State match

- **UPC T20980 – Emergency Vehicle Preemption (Hampton)**
  - Add project to TIP
  - Cost Estimate as follows:
    - Preliminary Engineering (PE): $204,000
    - Right of Way (RW): N/A
    - Construction (CN): N/A
    - Total: $204,000
  - Project Phase Schedule as follows:
    - PE: Start 9/26/2018; End 4/21/2020
  - Allocations as follows:
    - FY Previous of $204,000 CMAQ, including State match

- **UPC T20979 – Emergency Vehicle Preemption (Norfolk)**
  - Add project to TIP
  - Cost Estimate as follows:
    - Preliminary Engineering (PE): $204,000
    - Right of Way (RW): N/A
    - Construction (CN): N/A
    - Total: $204,000
  - Project Phase Schedule as follows:
    - PE: Start 9/26/2018; End 4/21/2020
  - Allocations as follows:
    - FY Previous of $204,000 CMAQ, including State match
• UPC T21210 – Portsmouth Emergency Vehicle Preemption
  o Add project to TIP
  o Cost Estimate as follows:
    ▪ Preliminary Engineering (PE): $204,000
    ▪ Right of Way (RW): N/A
    ▪ Construction (CN): N/A
    ▪ Total: $204,000
  o Project Phase Schedule as follows:
    ▪ No schedule listed
  o Allocations as follows:
    ▪ FY Previous of $204,000 CMAQ, including State match

• UPC T21111 – City of Suffolk Emergency Vehicle Preemption Development
  o Add project to TIP
  o Cost Estimate as follows:
    ▪ Preliminary Engineering (PE): $10,000
    ▪ Right of Way (RW): N/A
    ▪ Construction (CN): $194,000
    ▪ Total: $204,000
  o Project Phase Schedule as follows:
    ▪ PE: Start 7/30/2018; End 1/16/2020
    ▪ CN: Start 1/16/2020; End 4/22/2021
  o Allocations as follows:
    ▪ FY Previous of $204,000 CMAQ, including State match

• UPC T21223 Regional EVP (Opticom) Project (Virginia Beach)
  o Add project to TIP
  o Cost Estimate as follows:
    ▪ Preliminary Engineering (PE): $10,000
    ▪ Right of Way (RW): N/A
    ▪ Construction (CN): $194,000
    ▪ Total: $204,000
  o Project Phase Schedule as follows:
    ▪ PE: Start 10/3/2018; End 3/25/2020
    ▪ CN: Start 3/25/2020; End 8/4/2021
  o Allocations as follows:
    ▪ FY Previous of $204,000 CMAQ, including State match
- **UPC 100608 Newport News Intelligent Transportation System Upgrades**
  - Cost Estimate as follows:
    - Preliminary Engineering (PE): $2,847,127
    - Right of Way (RW): N/A
    - Construction (CN): N/A
    - Total: $2,847,127
  - Project Phase Schedule as follows:
    - PE: Start 11/7/2016; End 8/10/2023
  - Allocations as follows:
    - Receive $204,000 in FY Previous CMAQ, including State match, from UPC 100606

- **UPC 102999 Wythe Creek Road Traffic Signal Update (Poquoson)**
  - Cost Estimate as follows:
    - Preliminary Engineering (PE): $60,000
    - Right of Way (RW): N/A
    - Construction (CN): $200,000
    - Total: $260,000
  - Project Phase Schedule as follows:
    - PE: Start 6/18/2018; End 4/29/2019
    - CN: Start 4/29/2019; End 10/29/2019
  - Allocations as follows:
    - Receive $18,000 in FY Previous CMAQ, including State match, from UPC 100606

- **VDOT Balance Entry**
  - Receive $204,000 CMAQ Balance Entry, including State match, from UPC 100606.

This request is available for public review and comment from May 2, 2018 through May 16, 2018. The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended approval of the TIP amendment.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**
Approve the proposed project funding transfers and the associated TIP amendment.
The City of Newport News has requested to amend the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to transfer a total of $5,088,142 between UPC 102734 and its three child projects (UPCs 109075, 109076, CNN001). The specifics of the request are described below:

- Transfer $209,686 in FY 2006 Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds, including State Match, from the Newport News Transportation Center – Station, Platform, and Site Finishes project (UPC 109076) to the Multimodal High-Speed and Intercity Passenger Rail Station Development project – PE Only (UPC 102734).

- Transfer $1,620,890 in FY 2016 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, including State Match, from the Multimodal High-Speed and Intercity Passenger Rail Station Development project – PE Only (UPC 102734) to the Newport News Transportation Center – Grading, Drainage, and Utilities project (UPC 109075).

- Transfer $1,182,047 in FY 2016 CMAQ funds from the Newport News Transportation Center – Station, Platform, and Site Finishes project (UPC 109076) to the Newport News Transportation Center – Grading, Drainage, and Utilities project (UPC 109075).

- Transfer $1,664,496 in FY 2017 Intercity Passenger Rail Operating and Capital (IPROC) funds from the Newport News Transportation Center – Grading, Drainage, and Utilities project (UPC 109075) to the Newport News Transportation Center – Station, Platform, and Site Finishes project (UPC 109076).

- Transfer $411,023 in FY 2017 IPROC funds from the Newport News Transportation Center – Grading, Drainage, and Utilities project (UPC 109075) to the Newport News Transportation Center – Track-work and Service Facility project (DRPT CNN001).

This request has been made available for public review and comment from April 25, 2018 through May 9, 2018. The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended approval of the project funding transfers and the associated TIP amendment.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve the proposed project funding transfers and associated TIP amendment.
T. FY 2018-2021 TIP REVISION: REQUEST TO TRANSFER CMAQ FUNDING: UPC T9111
LIBERTY STREET TRANSFER STATION IN CHESAPEAKE

The City of Chesapeake has requested to amend the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to transfer a total of $85,000 in Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds from a completed project to another Chesapeake CMAQ project. The specifics of the request are described below:

- Transfer $58,000 in FY 1993 CMAQ funds plus Local Match of $14,500 from the Battlefield Intersection Improvements (at Great Bridge Boulevard) Project (UPC 12966) to the Liberty Street Transfer Station Project (UPC T9111).

- Transfer $27,000 in FY 1996 CMAQ funds plus Local Match of $6,750 from the Battlefield Intersection Improvements (at Great Bridge Boulevard) Project (UPC 12966) to the Liberty Street Transfer Station Project (UPC T9111).

This request was made available for public review and comment from March 28, 2018 through April 11, 2018. The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended approval of the project funding transfers and the associated TIP amendment.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve the proposed project funding transfers and associated TIP amendment.
U. REQUEST TO TRANSFER CMAQ FUNDING FROM UPC 110753 TO HRTPO CMAQ RESERVE ACCOUNT

The City of Chesapeake has requested to transfer a total of $1,050,000 in Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds from one completed project, due to the City advancing the project by using residual funds from the Urban Construction Initiative (UCI) program, to the HRTPO CMAQ Reserve Account to make the funds available for other CMAQ projects. The specifics of the request are described below:

- Transfer $550,000 in FY 2023 CMAQ funds, including State match, from the Battlefield Blvd/Kempsville Road/Great Bridge Road Intersection improvements Project (UPC 110753) to the HRTPO CMAQ Reserve Account.

- Transfer $650,000 in FY 2024 CMAQ funds, including State match, from the Battlefield Blvd/Kempsville Road/Great Bridge Road Intersection improvements Project (UPC 110753) to the HRTPO CMAQ Reserve Account.

Should the HRTPO Board approve the CMAQ fund transfers described above, the transfers will be recorded in the HRTPO CMAQ Tracking Table and the CTB Six-Year Improvement Program. This request was made available for public review and comment from March 28, 2018 through April 11, 2018. The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended approval of project funding transfers.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve the proposed project funding transfers.
V. REQUEST TO TRANSFER RSTP FUNDING FROM HRTPO RSTP RESERVE ACCOUNT TO UPC 102980 POCAHONTAS TRAIL MULTIMODAL CORRIDOR IN JAMES CITY COUNTY

James City County has requested to transfer a total of $1,544,066 in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds from the HRTPO RSTP Reserve Account to another James City County RSTP eligible project. The specifics of the request are described below:

- Transfer $1,544,066 in FY 2023 RSTP funds, including State Match, from the HRTPO RSTP Reserve Account to the Pocahontas Trail Multimodal Corridor (UPC 102980).

Should the HRTPO Board approve the RSTP fund transfer described above, the transfer will be recorded in the HRTPO RSTP Tracking Table and the CTB Six-Year Improvement Program. This request has been made available for public review and comment from April 25, 2018 through May 9, 2018. The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended approval of the project funding transfer.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Approve the proposed project funding transfer.
W. FY 2018-2021 TIP REVISION: REQUEST TO TRANSFER CMAQ FUNDING: UPC 105592 ATMS PHASE 4C

The City of Norfolk has requested to amend the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to transfer a total of $545,136 in Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds from three completed projects to another Norfolk CMAQ project. The specifics of the request are described below:

- Transfer $263,801 in FY 2002 CMAQ funds from the ATMS Phase III East Ocean View Project (UPC 92748) to the ATMS Phase 4C Project (UPC 105592).

- Transfer $82,367 in FY 2002 CMAQ funds from the ATMS Phase III Hampton Boulevard Project (UPC 92750) to the ATMS Phase 4C Project (UPC 105592).

- Transfer $198,968 in FY 2015 CMAQ funds, including State match, from the ATMS Phase 4A Project (UPC 105590) to the ATMS Phase 4C Project (UPC 105592).

This request has been made available for public review and comment from May 2, 2018 through May 16, 2018. The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) has recommended approval of the project funding transfers and the associated TIP amendment.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve the proposed project funding transfers and associated TIP amendment.
ITEM #22: HRTPO BOARD THREE-MONTH TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

June 2018
Thursday, June 21, 2018: 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Per the Regional Meeting Schedule, the HRTPO Board does not meet in June.

July 2018
Thursday, July 19, 2018: 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
- Nominating Committee: Appointments for Annual Election of Officers
- Transportation Conformity: Status Update
- 2045 LRTP: Hampton Roads 2015 Transportation Analysis Zones and Boundary Modifications – Final Report
- Hampton Roads Military Transportation Needs Study
- Candidate Segments for Road Diets in Hampton Roads

August 2018
Wednesday, August 29, 2018: 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. - Please note the day and date change
Annual HRPDC/HRTPO Joint Legislative Meeting with the Hampton Roads General Assembly Caucus
ITEM #23: CORRESPONDENCE OF INTEREST

A. LETTER REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR BOWERS HILL INTERCHANGE
   Attached is a letter, dated April 10, 2018, from Mr. Robert A. Crum, Jr., HRTPO Executive Director, to Ms. Jennifer Salyers, VDOT Environmental Division, accepting VDOT’s invitation for the HRTPO to be a Participating Agency in the Bowers Hill Interchange Environmental Assessment.
   Attachment 23-A

B. STATE OF GOOD REPAIR PROGRAM LETTER TO THE VDOT COMMISSIONER
   Attached is a letter, dated April 11, 2018, from the City Managers of the Cities of Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach to Mr. Stephen C. Brich, VDOT Commissioner, regarding the State of Good Repair Program.
   Attachment 23-B

C. STATE OF GOOD REPAIR PROGRAM RESPONSE LETTER FROM THE VDOT COMMISSIONER
   Attached is a letter, dated April 26, 2018, from Mr. Stephen C. Brich, VDOT Commissioner, to the City Managers of the Cities of Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Suffolk, and Virginia Beach, regarding the State of Good Repair Program.
   Attachment 23-C
April 10, 2018

Ms. Jennifer Salyers, Environmental Division
Virginia Department of Transportation
1401 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219

RE: Environmental Assessment (EA) for Bowers Hill Interchange

Dear Ms. Salyers:

Thank you for your letter of March 12, 2018 inviting us to be a Participating Agency in the preparation of the EA, asking us to provide comments on the coordination plan; transportation needs; and social, economic, or natural resources within the study area, and inviting us to the first agency coordination meeting.

We accept your invitation to be a Participating Agency. Robert B. Case, PE, PhD, HRTPO Chief Transportation Engineer (rcase@hrtpo.org) will be your point of contact.

Our comments follow:

**Coordination Plan for Agency and Public Involvement**

HRTPO staff recommends that the date that your assessment of environmental and socioeconomic impacts will occur be outlined clearly in this document. HRTPO staff also requests that the type of approach(es) used to arrive at the assessment be clearly outlined. HRTPO staff recommends that a CIA (Community Impact Assessment) be conducted, and that the finding be shared with the public and stakeholders.

**Transportation Needs**

Due to the proposed 8 lanes of the I-64 Southside / High-Rise Bridge Widening- Phase II project planned for 2037, improvement of the Bowers Hill interchange will be required in the distant future, but—due to the congestion appearing at the interchange on a daily basis, to be exacerbated by increased volumes from the I-64 Southside / High-Rise Bridge Widening- Phase I project currently underway—improvement of this interchange may be advisable much sooner.
Social, Economic, or Natural Resources

Concerning environmental justice, we look forward to reviewing your demographic analysis of the area.

Climate change and its impacts are a major concern in Hampton Roads. We recommend that VDOT account for climate change impacts in the planning, design, and construction of any improvements to the Bowers Hill Interchange. Specifically, the area near the Bowers Hill Interchange is significantly vulnerable to tidal and storm surge flooding. We recommend that VDOT consider incorporating an assessment of how recurrent flooding and sea level rise will affect the proposed improvements and include adaptation strategies in the design of any specific projects. Guidance for how to incorporate sea level rise into project planning is available from both NOAA (“Global and Regional Sea Level Rise Scenarios for the United States” https://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov/publications/techrpt83_Global_and_Regional_SLR_Scenarios_for_the_US_final.pdf) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (“Climate Change Adaptation – Comprehensive Evaluation of Projects with Respect to Sea-Level Change” - http://www.corpsclimate.us/ccaceslcurves.cfm).

In addition to sea level rise, recent research suggests that precipitation patterns may change significantly as result of climate change. Efforts by both FHWA (“HEC 17 – Highways in the River Environment: Extreme Events, Risk, and Resilience’ https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/engineering/hydraulics/pubs/hif16018.pdf) and the City of Virginia Beach (“Analysis of Historical and Future Heavy Precipitation https://www.hrpdcva.gov/uploads/docs/5A_Attachment_AnalysisofHistoricalandFutureHeavyPrecipitation_Finalrev_20180326.pdf) suggest that precipitation intensity and quantity will increase. VDOT should consider using the FHWA guidance and the Virginia Beach study to develop appropriate designs for any potential projects at the interchange.

Improving public access to natural and coastal resources for recreation is another area of emphasis for Hampton Roads communities. The Bowers Hill Interchange is co-located with a segment of the East Coast Greenway, a major regional multi-use trail. We recommend that the study incorporate potential impacts to this resource and potential opportunities for improving the trail during the interchange improvement process.

Mr. Case plans to attend the April 11, 2018 meeting in Richmond.

Thank you for including us in this project.

Robert A. Crum, Jr.
Executive Director
April 11, 2018

Mr. Stephen C. Brich, P.E.
Commissioner
Virginia Department of Transportation
1401 E. Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219

RE: State of Good Repair Program, Pavement Funding

Dear Mr. Brich:

The State of Good Repair (SGR) Program (formerly Primary Extension Program), provides a valuable source of funding for street re-paving. In the past, this funding has not been “federalized”, rather treated essentially as state funds and thus, no federal project delivery requirements were imposed. Our understanding is VDOT intends to federalize the FY 19 SGR funding and enforce all federal requirements. This poses a significant hardship on the localities and we request re-consideration be given to this plan.

Our normal street re-paving work is accomplished via annual services contract. When SGR funding is awarded to a locality, it is used to supplement the local funding and the work is performed under the established existing annual services contract. If the SGR funding has federal requirements imposed, we would no longer be able to use our annual service contract for construction and would be forced to solicit bids for the scope of work covered by the SGR funding. This would result in less efficient, more costly, and slower project delivery.

Our understanding is that the original intent of the SGR program was for the localities to be able to supplement our paving programs with this additional funding and use contracts already established for state maintenance type work. This new plan to federalize the SGR funding would be counter to that.
We respectfully request consideration be given to continue the current process of treating the SGR funding as “non-federalized” allowing the localities to get the maximum benefit of this valuable funding.

Sincerely,

James E. Baker
Chesapeake City Manager

Douglas L. Smith
Norfolk City Manager

Dr. L. Pettis Patton
Portsmouth City Manager

Patrick Roberts
Suffolk City Manager

David L. Hansen
Virginia Beach City Manager
April 26, 2018

Mr. James E. Baker  Mr. David L. Hansen
Chesapeake City Manager Virginia Beach City Manager

Mr. Douglas L. Smith Mr. Patrick Roberts
Norfolk City Manager Suffolk City Manager

Dr. L. Pettis Patron
Portsmouth City Manager

Dear Messrs. Baker, Smith, Patron, Hansen and Roberts:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding federalization of the State of Good Repair pavement funding for localities. I assure you that we understand and appreciate your concerns.

Federally eligible construction projects are developed according to the federal process unless there is a programmatic exemption, such as the Revenue Sharing program, or an individual project exception has been granted. This position is needed to support the larger construction program and is also a requirement for VDOT administered work. This allows the Department to maximize the use of federal funds and provides maximum flexibility with regard to the type of allocations that can be applied to projects so that a wide variety of projects can be advanced.

The need to maintain this flexibility has increased with the implementation of the state’s new construction formula and the new prioritization process, known as SMART SCALE, where projects are selected for funding based on benefit, not funding eligibility. This practice is very important given that over 50 percent of the allocations provided through the new construction formula are federal. Funding for primary extensions comes from two sources – the CTB Optional Formula, which sunsets in fiscal year 2020, and the new State of Good Repair program, which was partially implemented in fiscal year 2017, with full implementation by fiscal year 2021. Within the CTB Optional Formula, approximately $13 million per year was available for primary extensions and state funds were committed for the program.
When the State of Good Repair program is fully implemented, funding levels are expected to exceed $23 million per year. As the funding levels for State of Good Repair locality paving increase, it becomes more difficult to ensure adequate non-federal funding sources are available to support the projects submitted through SMART SCALE and selected for funding by the Commonwealth Transportation Board based on benefits. The Department recognizes that localities have been able to make efficient use of non-federal funding for local paving projects using existing contracts and that federalizing this program may require procurement of new contracts, which can be a lengthy process. To ensure that we can support locality efforts to put these funds to work as quickly as possible, the Department will commit to providing nonfederal funding sources for primary extension projects, funded through either the CTB Optional Formula or the State of Good Repair program, through fiscal year 2020 when the CTB Optional Formula sunsets.

The State of Good Repair locality paving projects approved by the CTB effective July 1, 2020 for fiscal year 2021, will need to be developed according to the federal process. This delayed effective date should provide sufficient time for all localities to make the necessary adjustments to advertise paving projects that meet the federal requirements. In the interim, VDOT will review current expectations to see if there are possible opportunities to assist localities with streamlining the federal process for these paving projects.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Stephen C. Brich, P.E.
Commissioner
ITEM #24: MINUTES OF HRTPO ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

A. TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TTAC)
The summary minutes of the March 7, 2018 meeting of the Transportation Technical are attached.

Attachment 24-A

B. TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TTAC)
The summary minutes of the April 4, 2018 meeting of the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee are attached.

Attachment 24-B
Summary Minutes of the HRTPO Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) Meeting  
March 7, 2018

The HRTPO Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) Meeting was called to order at 9:34 a.m. in the Regional Building Boardroom, 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia, with the following in attendance:

TTAC Voting Members in Attendance:
Paul Holt (Chair, JC)  Robert Brown (NO)  Phil Pullen (VB)
Sherry Earley (Vice Chair, SU)  Thelma Drake (NO)  Brian Solis (VB)
Benjamin Camras (CH)  JeffRaliski (NO)  Carolyn Murphy (WM)
Earl Sorey (CH)  Jackie Kassel (NN)  Tim Cross (YK)
Lynn Allsbrook (HA)  Garrett Morgan (NN)  Jamie Jackson (HRT)
Mike Hayes (HA)  Bryan Stilley (NN)  Bryant Porter (VDOT)
Angela Rico (HA)  Dannan O’Connell (PQ)  Dawn Odom (VDOT)
John Yorks (HA)  Beth Lewis (SH)  Eric Stringfield (VDOT)
Richard Rudnicki (IW)  LJ Hansen (SU)
Tammy Rosario (JC)  Robert Gey (VB)

TTAC Voting Members Absent:
Steve Froncillo (CH)  Claudia Cotton (Alternate, NN)  Dan Clayton III (WM)
Anne Ducey-Ortiz (GL)  Ellen Roberts (PQ)  Aaron Small (WM)
Carol Rizzio (GL)  Debbie Vest (PQ)  J. Mark Carter (YK)
Jamie Oliver (IW)  James Wright (PO)  Jeff Florin (VPA)
Donald Goodwin (FR)  Jason Souders (SU)  Sonya Hallums-Ponton (VDOT)
Britta Ayers (NN)  Robert Lewis (SU)  Josh Moore (WATA)

TTAC Nonvoting Members in Attendance:
Rhonda Murray (NAVY)  Chris Arabia (DRPT)

TTAC Nonvoting Members Absent:
Melissa McGill (FTA)  Ivan Rucker (FHWA)

HRTPO Staff:
Sam Belfield  Mike Kimbrel  Keith Nichols
Theresa Brooks  Uros Jovanovic  Leonardo Pineda
Rob Case  Steve Lambert  Dale Stith
Shirley Core  John Mihaly
Kathlene Grauberger  Kendall Miller
Others Recorded Attending:

Maria Ptakowski (Suffolk); Karen Bourne, Carl Jackson (VDOT); Bob Scott (MJ Synergy Group); Karen McPherson (McPherson Consulting); Mack Frost (FHWA); Tara Reel (VB); Bridjette Parker (NN); Kirsten Tynch (VHB); Whitney Sokolowski (Kimley-Horn); Angela Rico (HA); Samuel Hayes (Moffatt & Nichol); Alan Strasser, Rawlings Miller (US DOT); Samuel Hayes (Moffatt & Nichol); Zack Trogdon (WATA); Tori Haynes, Savannah Pietrowski (JCC); Kevin Page (HRTAC) Mike Long, Chris Vaigneur (HRPDC Staff).

Introductions

Mr. Mike Kimbrel announced the following HRTPO staff changes, Dr. Rob Case title has been changed to Chief Transportation Engineer, and Mr. John Mihaly, has been promoted to Senior Transportation Planner. As Chief Transportation Engineer, Dr. Case will continue to have Principal-Level responsibilities and authority, plus specific additional duties including coordinating HRTPO staff reviews of studies by other entities and serving as the HRTPO point person in the absence of the Deputy Executive Director. Mr. Mihaly assumes the responsibilities of transportation programming and administration. Mr. Kimbrel also introduces HRTPO’s new transportation engineer, Mr. Uros Jovanovic.

Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

Submitted Public Comments

There were no submitted public comments in the agenda packet.

Comments and Updates from State and Federal Agencies and the Military

There were no comments from the Federal Highway Administration.

There were no comments from the Virginia Department of Transportation.

There were no representatives present from the Virginia Port Authority.

There were no comments from the Navy.

Approval of Agenda

Chair Holt asked for additions or deletions to the TTAC Agenda. Mr. Phil Pullen VB requested to add a TIP Amendment. Chair Holt advised this item would be added to the agenda as Item 8B. Mr. Kimbrel requested to add an item under new business to briefly discuss consistency with the LRTP.
for the purpose of SMART SCALE applications. Mr. Yorks Moved to approve the amended Agenda; seconded by Ms. Murphy. The Motion Carried.

Summary Minutes

Chair Holt reported that the TTAC summary minutes from February 7, 2018 meeting were included in the March 7, 2018 TTAC Agenda Packet. Chair Holt asked for any additions or corrections to the minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Cross Moved to approve the minutes; seconded by Mr. Hansen. The Motion Carried.

FY 2018-2021 TIP REVISION: REQUEST TO TRANSFER CMAQ FUNDING

Mr. Phil Pullen, Virginia Beach Transportation Division Manager, to transfer a total of $1,401,912 in Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds from five completed projects to another Virginia Beach CMAQ project. The specifics of the request are described below:

- Transfer $520 in FY 1996 in CMAQ funds, from the City of Virginia Beach Signal Re-timing Project (UPC 16106) to the Indian River Road/Kempsville Road Intersection Improvement Project (UPC 84366).
- Transfer $202,566 in FY 1999 in CMAQ funds, from the I-264/Rosemont Road Interchange Improvements Study (UPC 18970) to the Indian River Road/Kempsville Road Intersection Improvement Project (UPC 84366).
- Transfer $288,217 in FY 1999 in CMAQ funds, from the I-264/Lynnhaven Interchange Improvements – Phase II Project (UPC 19005) to the Indian River Road/Kempsville Road Intersection Improvement Project (UPC 84366).
- Transfer $1,140 in FY 2005 in CMAQ funds, from the Citywide Signal System Upgrades – Phase I Project (UPC 52355) to the Indian River Road/Kempsville Road Intersection Improvement Project (UPC 84366).
- Transfer $909,469 in FY 2009 in CMAQ funds, from the Dynamic Message Sign and System Detectors Project (UPC 95983) to the Indian River Road/Kempsville Road Intersection Improvement Project (UPC 84366).
- The required 20% CMAQ match of $350,478 will be covered with local funds currently allocated to the Indian River Road/Kempsville Road Intersection Improvement Project (UPC 84366).

Should the HRTPO approve the CMAQ fund transfers described above, the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will be amended to update the funding information associated with the project. This request has been made available for public review and comment from February 28, 2018 through March 14, 2018.
Mr. Gey MOVED to recommend HRTPO approval of the TIP Amendment; seconded by Mr. Solis. The Motion Carried.

FY 2018-2021 TIP REVISION: RSTP TRANSFER REQUEST: VIRGINIA BEACH

Mr. Phil Pullen, Virginia Beach Transportation Division Manager, requested to transfer a total of $1,510,769 in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds from five completed projects to another Virginia Beach RSTP project. The specifics of the request are described below:

- Transfer $93 in FY 1997 RSTP funds, including State Match, from the City of Virginia Beach Signal Re-timing Project (UPC 16106) to the Elbow Road Extended Phase II-B Project (UPC 15828).
- Transfer $876,951 in FY 2006 RSTP funds, including State Match, from the Lynnhaven Parkway Project (UPC 13487) to the Elbow Road Extended Phase II-B Project (UPC 15828).
- Transfer $151,843 in FY 2000 RSTP funds, including State Match, from the I-264 Rosemont Road/Interchange Improvements Study (UPC 18970) to the Elbow Road Extended Phase II-B Project (UPC 15828).
- Transfer $475,556 in FY 2002 RSTP funds, including State Match, from the I-264/Lynnhaven Interchange Improvements – Phase II Project (UPC 19005) to the Elbow Road Extended Phase II-B Project (UPC 15828).
- Transfer $6,326 in FY 2012 RSTP funds, including State Match, from the Wesleyan Drive Project (UPC 52148) to the Elbow Road Extended Phase II-B Project (UPC 15828).

Should the HRTPO approve the RSTP fund transfers described above, the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will be amended to update the funding information associated with the project. This request has been made available for public review and comment from February 28, 2018 through March 14, 2018.

Mr. Gey MOVED to recommend HRTPO approval of the TIP Amendment; seconded by Mr. Solis. The Motion Carried.

FY 2018-2021 TIP REVISION: REQUEST TO TRANSFER RSTP FUNDING

Mr. Paul Holt, Director of Community Development and Planning, requested to transfer a total of $1,544,066 in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds from one project, due to its receipt of equivalent SMART SCALE funds, to the HRTPO RSTP Reserve Account to make the funds available for other RSTP projects. The specifics of the request are described below:
• Transfer $1,544,066 in FY 2023 RSTP funds, including State Match, from the Skiffes Creek Connector Project (UPC 100200) to the HRTPO RSTP Reserve Account.

Should the HRTPO Board approve the RSTP fund transfer described above, the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will be amended to update the funding information associated with the project. This request has been made available for public review and comment from February 28, 2018 through March 14, 2018.

Ms. Rosario MOVED to recommend HRTPO approval of the TIP Amendment; seconded by Ms. Kassel. The Motion Carried.

FY 2019-2020 Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Update

Mr. John Mihaly, HRTPO Senior Transportation Planner, explained the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) was established under MAP-21. He noted there are 10 TA Set-Aside eligible project categories with the on-road and off-road category being the most popular. He noted the TAP required 50 percent of the funds received by the state to be sub-allocated to areas based on population, while the remaining 50 percent could be allocated to other areas within the state. For FY 2019-2020, the total TA Set Aside funds to be allocated by the HRTPO is $3,614,909. In Virginia, District members of the CTB are provided $1 million per year ($2 million per cycle) in TA-Set Aside funds to allocate to projects within their district.

TA Set-Aside Applications are now submitted through VDOTs’ SMART Portal. The deadline for the current application process was November 2017. The deadline for application submission for the FY 21-22 will be November 2019. HRTPO staff recently met with Mr. Malbon, the Hampton Roads CTB representative, to determine his selected projects and allocations. Moving forward, the TPS reviews the proposed projects and scores and recommends a set of projects and allocations for consideration by the TTAC. The TTAC will then review those recommendations and send a list of recommendations to the HRTPO board for approval. The project score is based on funding, concept, extent to which projects improves transportation network, ability of sponsor to administer federal project, and project readiness. Existing projects are also ranked from 1 to 6, a score of 1 means the project is ready for construction and a score of 6 means the project is in the initial stages of project development. He reported the 2019-2020 TA Set-Aside Funding Distribution is as follows, MPOs $12.2 million, CTB district members $18.0 million ($2 million each), and CTB at-large members & secretary $10.0 million for a total of $40.2 million statewide. For FY 2019-2020 25 applications were submitted in the HRTPO area and of these, two were previously approved. The total funding request for the HRTPO area was $10.5 million, with $3.6 million available for funding allocations. This does not include funds the CTB district member may allocate to the HRPto Area. Next steps include TPS recommendation of TA Set-Aside projects and allocations for TTAC consideration, TTAC recommendations to the HRTPO for approval, and HRTPO board approval of a set of TA Set-Aside projects and allocations for inclusion in the draft FY 2019-2024 Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP).

2045 LRTP Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ) Base Year (2015) Update

Mr. Leonardo Pineda, HRTPO Transportation Planner II, reminded the committee that in July 2017 the HRTPO board approved the 2045 Socioeconomic Forecast. As part of this forecast, the 2015 base year data was approved and will be used as the control totals. At the February LRTP
subcommittee meeting localities reviewed the total population and employment categories. Staff used the LRTP subcommittee feedback and this month will be presenting household data, vehicles, workers and employment categories. He noted the socioeconomic data feeds into the travel demand model, which gives the traffic forecast that feeds into the Prioritization Tool and Long-Range Transportation Plan. Since the current data in the model is from 2009 and current data cannot be more than 10 years old, staff will be updating to the 2015 base year data. He reported data sources include ARC, GIS, business analyst, Virginia Employment Commission, Department of Education and the Military. Next steps include a review of the TAZ boundaries which were last updated in 2000. Following the Base year data review, TAZs will be adjusted based on locality feedback and VDOT guidelines. HRTPO staff will meet with localities to review all modifications made to boundaries. Following the meeting household, automotive, worker, and employment category data will be distributed thru FTP and Dropbox.

Mr. Pineda asked the TTAC to review the Draft 2015 base year data and submit comments to him at lpineda@hrtpo.org by March 30, 2018.

**VDOT STARS and Mercury Boulevard (Route 258) Operations and Pedestrian Enhancement Study**

Mr. Carl Jackson, VDOT Hampton Roads District Transportation Planner, and Ms. Whitney Sokolowski, Kimley-Horn Transportation Engineer, provided an overview of the VDOT Strategically Targeted Affordable Roadway Solutions (STARS) and Mercury Boulevard Operational and Pedestrian Enhancement Study. The study aims to develop solutions to reduce crashes and congestion using a data-driven approach. The overall goal of STARS is to develop solutions that can be programmed in the VDOT Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP). Mr. Jackson explained Mercury Boulevard was chosen due to safety and congestion concerns as well as inadequate pedestrian accommodations. He noted this particular corridor scored well on potential for safety improvement and volume to capacity ratio. The area is primarily commercial with nearby residential uses. Prior to starting the study, a pedestrian fatality occurred in 2016 near the I-64 overpass. The project study area includes the Aberdeen Rd to I-64 corridor which is approximately .7 miles in length, six study intersections, and spot safety and congestion with pedestrian improvements throughout the interchange. The project team included participants from VDOT, the City of Hampton, HRT, and Kimley- Horn.

Ms. Whitney Sokolowski, Kimley-Horn Transportation Engineer, provided a crash analysis for a five year period from January 2011 through December 2015. During that time there were 875 crashes and one fatality that occurred in 2016 at the I-64 Interchange. There were 387 crashes involving injuries and 488 property damage only crashes. The predominant crash types were 394 rear end crashes, and 289 angle crashes. The crashes are concentrated at three intersections: Aberdeen Road, Todds Lane and Power Plant Parkway, and Cunningham Drive. Affordable safety improvement recommendations include enhanced traffic signal visibility, installing additional signage, and installing mini-skip pavement markings with turn lane tapers to enhance safety along the corridor. She announced the City of Hampton was notified today they received HSIP funding for both the operational and pedestrian improvements.

**The USDOT Infrastructure Resiliency Quantification Initiative**
Mr. Alan Strasser, USDOT IRQI Project Coordinator and Stakeholder Liaison, and Dr. Rawlings Miller, USDOT Volpe Center IRQI Technical Lead, provided an update on the Infrastructure Resiliency Quantification Initiative (IRQI). This initiative will develop a tool for localities to make smart infrastructure investments through identification of vulnerable and critical transportation assets. Progress to date includes a baseline assessment of transportation assets, overview of economic analyses useful in quantifying impacts, summary data and methods and tools to analyze economic impact of extreme weather-related disruptions on regional transportation infrastructure. This baseline assessment featured extensive stakeholder input. Dr Miller demonstrated the prototype used to identify flooded assets, determine disruption to transportation networks, quantify economic impact on users, and estimate qualitative risk when quantification is not feasible.

Moving forward next steps will include:

- Model design testing and validation.
- Continued prototype development with extensive stakeholder collaboration
- Implementation of the GIS platform.
- Pilot testing of the tool to estimate economic impact and consequences of transportation infrastructure loss on a localized scale as well as integrate potential resilience strategies.

**Three-Month Tentative Schedule**

Chair Holt outlined the Three-Month Tentative Schedule in the Agenda Packet.

**For Your Information**

Chair Holt reviewed the items in the For Your Information section of the Agenda Packet.

**Announcements**

Ms. Odom announced a spring public meeting for CTB Six Year Improvement Program (SYIP) would be held on April 16, 2018 at 4pm in the HRTPO Board Room.

**Old/New Business**

Mr. Mike Kimbrel, HRTPO Deputy Executive Director, reminded the committee of policy changes in the SMART SCALE process, noting that any projects submitted must be consistent with the LRTP. The TTAC requested a LRTP subcommittee meeting after the April TTAC meeting to discuss this issue in more detail.

Chair Holt reminded committee members that the TRAFFIX subcommittee would be meeting immediately after the adjournment of the TTAC meeting.

**Adjournment**

With no further business to come before the Hampton Roads Transportation Technical Advisory Committee, the meeting adjourned at 11:00 a.m.
Summary Minutes of the HRTPO Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) Meeting
April 4, 2018

The HRTPO Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) Meeting was called to order at 9:34 a.m. in the Regional Building Boardroom, 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia, with the following in attendance:

TTAC Voting Members in Attendance:
Paul Holt (Chair, JC) Robert Brown (NO) Aaron Small (WM)
Sherry Earley (Vice Chair, SU) Jeff Raliski (NO) Carolyn Murphy (WM)
Benjamin Camras (CH) Jackie Kassel (NN) Tim Cross (YK)
Steve Froncillo (CH) Garrett Morgan (NN) Jamie Jackson (HRT)
Earl Sorey (CH) Bryan Stilley (NN) Dawn Odom (VDOT)
Belinda Harper (GL) James Wright (PO) Sonya Hallums-Ponton (VDOT)
Lynn Allsbrook (HA) LJ Hansen (SU) Eric Stringfield (VDOT)
Mike Hayes (HA) Robert Gey (VB) Jeff Florin (VPA)
Angela Rico (HA) Phil Pullen (VB) 
John Yorks (HA) Katie Shannon (VB)
Richard Rudnicki (IW) 

TTAC Voting Members Absent:
Anne Ducey-Ortiz (GL) Dannan O'Connell (PQ) J. Mark Carter (YK)
Carol Rizzio (GL) Ellen Roberts (PQ) Josh Moore (WATA)
Jamie Oliver (IW) Debbie Vest (PQ) Bryant Porter (VDOT)
Tammy Rosario (JC) Beth Lewis (SH) 
Donald Goodwin (FR) Jason Souders (SU) 
Thelma Drake (NO) Robert Lewis (SU) 
Britta Ayers (NN) Brian Solis (VB) 
Claudia Cotton (Alternate, NN) Dan Clayton III (WM) 

TTAC Nonvoting Members in Attendance:
Rhonda Murray (NAVY) Chris Arabia (DRPT) 

TTAC Nonvoting Members Absent:
Melissa McGill (FTA) Ivan Rucker (FHWA) 

HRTPO Staff:
Sam Belfield Mike Kimbrel Keith Nichols
Theresa Brooks Steve Lambert Joe Paulus
Shirley Core John Mihaly Leonardo Pineda
Kathlene Grauberger Kendall Miller Dale Stith
Others Recorded Attending:

Ray Hunt, Caleb Brooks, Angela Biney, Jerry Pauley (VDOT); Karen McPherson (McPherson Consulting); Tara Reel, Bob Mathias (VB); Bridjette Parker (NN); Samuel Hayes (Moffatt and Nichol); Keisha Branch (HRT); Dawn Best (F&R); Kevin Page (HRTAC) Mike Long, Chris Vaigneur (HRPDC Staff).

Introductions

There were no introductions.

Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

Submitted Public Comments

There were no submitted public comments in the agenda packet.

Comments and Updates from State and Federal Agencies and the Military

There were no comments from the Federal Highway Administration.

Ms. Dawn Odom, VDOT Hampton Roads District Planning and Investment Manager, reminded the committee the spring public meeting for the CTB Six Year Improvement Program (SYIP) will be held on April 16, 2018 at 4pm in the HRTPO Board Room. In addition, the annual Hampton Roads locality day registration is currently open until April 11, 2018 for the April 18, 2018 event, which will be held at the Crown Plaza in Hampton.

There were no comments from the Virginia Port Authority.

There were no comments from the Navy.

Approval of Agenda

Chair Holt asked for additions or deletions to the TTAC Agenda. Hearing none, Mr. Small Moved to approve the Agenda as written; seconded by Mr. Stringfield. The Motion Carried.

Summary Minutes

Chair Holt reported that the TTAC summary minutes from March 7, 2018 meeting were included in the April 4, 2018 TTAC Agenda Packet. Chair Holt asked for any additions or corrections to the minutes. Chair Holt requested the minutes be amended to reflect Ms. Carol Rizzo, Gloucester, was in attendance at the March TTAC meeting. Mr. Small Moved to approve the minutes as amended; seconded by Mr. Yorks. The Motion Carried.
FY 2018-2021 TIP Revision: Request to Transfer CMAQ Funding

Mr. Steve Froncillo, Chesapeake City Traffic Engineer, requested to transfer a total of $85,000 in Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds from a completed project to another Chesapeake CMAQ project. The specifics of the request are described below:

- Transfer $58,000 in FY 1993 CMAQ funds plus Local Match of $14,500 from the Battlefield Intersection Improvements (at Great Bridge Boulevard) Project (UPC 12966) to the Liberty Street Transfer Station Project (UPC T9111).
- Transfer $27,000 in FY 1996 CMAQ funds plus Local Match of $6,750 from the Battlefield Intersection Improvements (at Great Bridge Boulevard) Project (UPC 12966) to the Liberty Street Transfer Station Project (UPC T9111).

Should the HRTPO approve the CMAQ fund transfer described above, the FY 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will be amended to update the funding information associated with the project. This request was made available for public review and comment from March 28, 2018 through April 11, 2018.

Mr. Sorey MOVED to recommend HRTPO approval of the CMAQ funding transfer; seconded by Mr. Lewis. The Motion Carried.

Request to Transfer CMAQ Funding: Chesapeake

Mr. Steve Froncillo, Chesapeake City Traffic Engineer, requested to transfer a total of $1,050,000 in Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) funds from one completed project, due to the City advancing the project by using residual funds from the Urban Construction Initiative (UCI) program, to the HRTPO CMAQ Reserve Account to make the funds available for other CMAQ projects. The specifics of the request are described below:

- Transfer $550,000 in FY 2023 CMAQ funds, including State match, from the Battlefield Blvd/Kempsville Road/Great Bridge Road Intersection improvements Project (UPC 110753) to the HRTPO CMAQ Reserve Account.
- Transfer $500,000 in FY 2024 CMAQ funds, including State match, from the Battlefield Blvd/Kempsville Road/Great Bridge Road Intersection improvements Project (UPC 110753) to the HRTPO CMAQ Reserve Account.

Should the HRTPO Board approve the CMAQ fund transfers described above, the transfers will be recorded in the HRTPO CMAQ Tracking Table and the CTB Six-Year Improvement Program. This request was made available for public review and comment from March 28, 2018 through April 11, 2018.

Mr. Sorey MOVED to recommend HRTPO approval of the CMAQ funding transfer; seconded by Mr. Lewis. The Motion Carried.
Hampton Roads 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan: Proposed Amendment – George Washington Highway Widening

Mr. Steve Froncillo, Chesapeake City Traffic Engineer, requested to amend the Hampton Roads 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) as described below:

The City of Chesapeake requests an amendment to the 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan to include the widening of George Washington Highway between Yadkin Road and Canal Drive in Chesapeake. The estimated year of expenditure cost for this project is $34.3 million. The LRTP planning funds that are currently associated with the Dominion Boulevard Phase II project ($23 million) plus $11.3 million from local city funds will be reallocated to the George Washington Highway project to maintain the requirement for fiscal-constraint for the LRTP. The Dominion Boulevard Phase II widening was completed in 2017 with funding provided through Revenue Sharing program. VDOT has confirmed that the Revenue Sharing funds used for the project were not included in the projected transportation revenues identified in the LRTP. Subsequently, the city requests that the funding source of the Dominion Blvd Phase II project be changed to reflect Revenue Sharing funds.

Since the implementation of tolling at the Downtown and Midtown Tunnels in 2014, traffic congestion has significantly increased along the non-tolled routes including George Washington Highway and Military Highway. The impact of tolls has resulted in an increase of the traffic volume at the Gilmerton Bridge by 53% and severe congestion and queues along this section of George Washington Highway during peak travel times. This project proposes to widen George Washington Highway from 2 to 4 lanes between Yadkin Road and Canal Drive. The proposed four-lane divided urban design removes the existing bottleneck, provides safety and access management improvements, and constructs new pedestrian facilities along the corridor. In addition, this project will improve the ability of the corridor to function as a key emergency evacuation route.

The proposed LRTP amendment was made available for public review and comment, beginning on April 4, 2018 and concluding on April 18, 2018.

Mr. Sorey MOVED to recommend HRTPO approval of the LRTP Amendment; seconded by Mr. Gey. The Motion Carried.

Candidate Segments for Road Diets in Hampton Roads: Final

Mr. Mike Kimbrel, HRTPO Deputy Executive Director, explained Dr. Rob Case, HRTPO Chief Transportation Engineer presented this report at the February TTAC meeting. He noted comments received were addressed and incorporated into the final document.

Mr. Small Moved to recommend HRTPO Board approval of the final report; seconded by Mr. Morgan. The Motion Carried.
2019 Unified Planning Work Program Draft

Mr. Mike Kimbrel, HRTPO Deputy Executive Director, briefed the TTAC on the draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY 2019. He explained the UPWP is developed by HRTPO staff, in coordination with Hampton Roads Transit (HRT), Williamsburg Area Transit Authority (WATA), the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), and the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT). The UPWP describes the mutual responsibilities of these entities in carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process for Hampton Roads.

Mr. Kimbrel described funding for the FY 2019 UPWP by entity and by funding source, as well as a detailed timeline for approval of the UPWP. He noted the draft UPWP was made available on the HRTPO website for review by the TTAC and other advisory committees of the HRTPO, as well as for the general public, following the TTAC meeting on April 4, 2018. The review and comment period will run through April 18, 2018. At the May 2, 2018 TTAC meeting, a recommendation will be made to approve the final FY 2018 UPWP. HRTPO Board approval of the final FY 2019 UPWP is expected to take place at the Board’s meeting on May 17, 2018. Mr. Kimbrel requested TTAC to review the draft FY 2019 UPWP and submit comments to Mr. John Mihaly, at jmihaly@hrtpo.org, by close of business on Wednesday, April 18, 2018.

Hampton Roads Regional Bridge Study

Mr. Keith Nichols, HRTPO Principal Transportation Engineer, provided an update on the Hampton Roads Regional Bridge Study. In 2007 HRTPO staff began analyzing regional bridges because of their importance to the regional transportation system, and concerns about bridge condition and funding. Hampton Roads has 1,261 bridges, VDOT maintains 60% of the bridges, Localities 35%, and Federal or private 6%. The median bridge age is 39 years old with 392 bridges at least 50 years old. He explained structurally deficient bridges are structures with elements that need to be monitored and/or repaired. It is important to note a structurally deficient bridge is not necessarily unsafe. Inspectors will close or place limits on bridges they deem unsafe. To be classified as a structurally deficient bridge one of the following conditions must be met: ≤ 4 deck condition rating, superstructure condition rating, substructure condition rating, culvert condition rating, ≤ 2 structural condition rating and waterway adequacy rating. In 2017 Hampton Roads had 66 bridges that are structurally deficient, down from 80 bridges in 2014.

He then reviewed the new federal performance measures. There are two bridge conditions performance measures for which states and MPO will be required to track and establish targets:

- Percentage of bridges by deck area on the National Highway System (NHS) that are in good condition
- Percentage of bridges by deck area on the NHS that are in poor condition

To determine if a bridge is in good, fair, or poor condition, the lowest condition rating determines the classification. Of bridges in Hampton Roads, 29% are in good condition, 65% fair condition and 5% poor condition.
Mr. Nichols noted bridges were previously funded through the Highway Bridge Program, this program was eliminated in MAP-21/FAST Act. Funding for improvements on the NHS (including bridges) is now through the National Highway Performance Program. All bridges can be funded from the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program. Virginia House Bill 1887 created the State of Good Repair (SGR) program, which allocates 45% of construction funding to deficient bridges and pavement. Bridges are prioritized within each VDOT district based on SGR scores, which include:

- Importance Factor (30%)
- Condition Factor (25%)
- Design Redundancy Factor (15%)
- Structure Capacity Factor (10%)
- Cost-Effectiveness Factor (20%)

Since 2010, 102 bridges in Hampton Roads have been built, replaced, or undergone major rehabilitation. A total of 51 bridges in Hampton Roads are programmed for replacement, rehabilitation, or removal in the Six Year Improvement Program (SYIP), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), or a city Capital Improvement Program (CIP). HRTPO staff calculated that $4.5 billion will be necessary to fund the maintenance of bridges through 2045. This is an assumed “worst-case” scenario where bridges are replaced rather than rehabilitated.

Next steps include public review through April 20, 2018. Approval of the final document is expected at the May TTAC and TPO Board meetings.

**Transportation Programming Subcommittee Report**

Mr. John Mihaly, HRTPO Senior Transportation Planner, provided a summary of the Transportation Programming Subcommittee (TPS) meeting held on March 16, 2018.

He reported the TPS met to review and score project proposals and submit a recommended set of TA Set-Aside projects and allocations for the TTAC’s consideration. Prior to the TPS meeting HRTPO staff met with Mr. Malbon, Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) member for the Hampton Roads District to discuss candidate projects and allocations of TA Set-Aside funds. Twenty-five applications were submitted, of which two were existing projects and twenty-three were new project proposals. For FY 2019-2020 $3.6 million in TA –Set Aside funds will be allocated by the HRTPO Board. The TPS recommends approval of the project selection and funding allocations shown in Attachment A that was included for review in the April TTAC agenda. Next steps include TTAC recommendation of the project selection and funding allocations for approval by the HRTPO Board at the May HRTPO Board meeting.

Mr. Lewis Moved to recommend HRTPO Board approval of the project selections and funding allocations; seconded by Mr. Cross. The Motion Carried.

Agenda Item 14B under the TPS report included an update to the guide to the HRTPO CMAQ/RSTP Project Selection Process. HRTPO staff drafted a new policy to be added to the Guide to clearly document how allocations will be affected in situations where projects receive duplicate funding from the CMAQ and RSTP Project Selection Process and other funding sources.
The updated policy recommendation states:

Policy for handling surplus CMAQ and RSTP allocations on a project that occur as a result of an award of funding from other programs, such as SMART SCALE, State of Good Repair, TA Set-Aside, TIGER, INFRA, etc.

Within 90 days after VDOT or DRPT confirms that an approved CMAQ/RSTP project is overfunded due to receipt of funds from other programs resulting from duplicate funding requests, any CMAQ and/or RSTP funds in excess of what is needed to fully fund the project will be handled as follows:

a. The project sponsor (locality or agency) will request that the available funds be transferred to one or more of the sponsor’s previously approved CMAQ or RSTP projects, depending upon the type of funds available; or
b. The project sponsor (locality or agency) will request that the available funds be transferred to the CMAQ or RSTP reserve account.

In the event a project has been allocated CMAQ and/or RSTP funds from the HRTPO and those allocations are subsequently removed due to the project being fully funded from other sources, the project will retain its status as a previously-approved CMAQ/RSTP project should it require additional funding from the CMAQ/RSTP reserve account, at a later date to cover a cost overrun.

Mr. Stilley Moved to recommend HRTPO Board approval of the policy, as stated above, regarding projects that receive duplicate funding from the HRTPO CMAQ/RSTP Project Selection Process and other sources. seconded by Mr. Pullen. The Motion Carried.

Mr. Mihaly briefed the TTAC on Item 14C stating the TPS report reflected updated CMAQ and RSTP “marks” for fiscal years 19-24 from VDOT on March 8, 2018. The updated marks resulted in increases in FY 19 CMAQ and RSTP funding in the amounts of $3,855 and $2,262,132, respectively.

Next steps include; localities and agencies to review current CMAQ and RSTP projects for cost overruns and potential for use of earlier FY funding, and preparing funding request for consideration at the Transportation Programming Subcommittee meeting on July 20, 2018.

Three-Month Tentative Schedule

Chair Holt outlined the Three-Month Tentative Schedule in the Agenda Packet.

For Your Information

Chair Holt reviewed the items in the For Your Information section of the Agenda Packet.

Announcements

There were no announcements.
Old/New Business

Mr. Eric Stringfield, reminded the TTAC that VDOT would offer SMART SCALE full application training on May 30, 2018. He noted pre-applications are due by 5pm on June 1, 2018, and full applications are due by 5pm on August 1, 2018. He advised applicants to consider VTRANS, eligibility, and readiness when submitting applications.

Chair Holt reminded committee members that the LRTP Subcommittee would be meeting immediately after the adjournment of the TTAC meeting.

Adjournment

With no further business to come before the Hampton Roads Transportation Technical Advisory Committee, the meeting adjourned at 10:25 a.m.
ITEM #25: FOR YOUR INFORMATION

A. HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION FUND (HRTF): MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT

The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) provides the HRTPO with monthly financial reports relating to the HRTF including the following information:

- Revenue from sources as detailed by the collecting agency
- Interest earnings
- Expenditures reflecting both the program (HRTF) total as well as project totals
- The current cash position/balance in the HRTF as well as forecasted cash position/balance

Attachment 25-A
Attached are the March 2018 financial reports. Based on the various reports received to date, the HRTAC staff has analyzed the data and prepared the attached reports and summaries:

**Revenues**

Total Gross Revenues (Inception to March 31, 2018): $1,336,203,557

- State Sales and Use Tax: 589,914,417
- Local Fuels Tax: 151,575,146
- Interest: 2,163,008
- Investment Income: 9,280,913
- Bond Proceeds: 583,270,073

**Expenditures**

Total Expenditures (Inception to March 31, 2018): $223,256,021

- Project Construction: 213,482,793
- Total DMV and Dept. of Tax Administrative Fees: 598,214
- Investment Fees: 832,284
- Bond Expenses: 5,473,179
- Operating Expenses: 2,869,551

**Cash Balance**

Ending Cash Balance: $1,112,947,536

**Encumbered Balance**

Balance of Encumbered (through FY2022): $1,017,445,303
Allocation: 1,230,928,095
- Less Construction Expenditures: 213,482,792
### Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission ("HRTAC")
#### Portfolio Summary as of March 31, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Account</th>
<th>Balance at Cost</th>
<th>Balance at Market</th>
<th>Yield at Cost</th>
<th>Yield at Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PFM Managed - Core Portfolio</td>
<td>$125,755,313.19</td>
<td>$124,165,370.73</td>
<td>1.49%</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFM Managed - Enhanced Cash Portfolio</td>
<td>$200,778,003.54</td>
<td>$199,740,254.18</td>
<td>1.51%</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Checking</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Sweep</td>
<td>$9,821,460.12</td>
<td>$9,821,460.12</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Money Market</td>
<td>$35,478,046.79</td>
<td>$35,478,046.79</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGIP(^1)</td>
<td>$350,613,242.66</td>
<td>$350,613,242.66</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAP(^2)</td>
<td>$380,204,174.29</td>
<td>$380,204,174.29</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
<td>1.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,103,650,240.59</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,101,022,548.77</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Current LGIP yield source: www.trs.virginia.gov/cash/lgip.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY2014</th>
<th>FY2015</th>
<th>FY2016</th>
<th>FY2017</th>
<th>FY2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRTF Interest Income</strong></td>
<td>363,855</td>
<td>1,243,218</td>
<td>272,261</td>
<td>291,738</td>
<td>422,455</td>
<td>2,593,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRTF Investment Income</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>153,050</td>
<td>3,993,773</td>
<td>980,870</td>
<td>3,722,701</td>
<td>8,850,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>363,855</td>
<td>1,396,268</td>
<td>4,266,033</td>
<td>1,272,608</td>
<td>4,145,156</td>
<td>11,443,921</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 1 - Total HRTF Revenues

**Hampton Roads Transportation Fund (HRTF)**

**Total of Sales & Use and Fuels Taxes**

**Fiscal Year 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Total FY2014 - FY 2017</th>
<th>Previous FY2018</th>
<th>March 2018</th>
<th>Total YTD FY2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chesapeake</strong></td>
<td>$114,985,401</td>
<td>$19,688,480</td>
<td>$2,361,352</td>
<td>$22,049,832</td>
<td>$137,035,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Franklin</strong></td>
<td>5,369,194</td>
<td>1,018,792</td>
<td>108,754</td>
<td>1,127,547</td>
<td>6,496,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hampton</strong></td>
<td>46,180,660</td>
<td>7,616,799</td>
<td>913,784</td>
<td>8,530,583</td>
<td>54,711,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isle of Wight</strong></td>
<td>9,950,877</td>
<td>1,721,422</td>
<td>162,329</td>
<td>1,883,751</td>
<td>11,834,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James City</strong></td>
<td>28,587,671</td>
<td>4,826,641</td>
<td>442,836</td>
<td>5,269,477</td>
<td>33,857,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newport News</strong></td>
<td>66,706,250</td>
<td>10,910,900</td>
<td>1,317,281</td>
<td>12,228,181</td>
<td>78,934,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norfolk</strong></td>
<td>86,298,842</td>
<td>14,380,616</td>
<td>1,736,418</td>
<td>16,117,034</td>
<td>102,415,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poquoson</strong></td>
<td>1,563,499</td>
<td>213,200</td>
<td>25,271</td>
<td>238,471</td>
<td>1,801,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portsmouth</strong></td>
<td>21,954,713</td>
<td>3,355,709</td>
<td>428,498</td>
<td>3,784,207</td>
<td>25,738,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southampton</strong></td>
<td>2,953,969</td>
<td>487,569</td>
<td>53,559</td>
<td>541,127</td>
<td>3,495,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suffolk</strong></td>
<td>29,658,369</td>
<td>4,950,039</td>
<td>616,946</td>
<td>5,566,985</td>
<td>35,225,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia Beach</strong></td>
<td>169,080,447</td>
<td>27,643,672</td>
<td>2,975,525</td>
<td>30,619,198</td>
<td>199,699,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Williamsburg</strong></td>
<td>13,827,614</td>
<td>2,345,636</td>
<td>216,844</td>
<td>2,562,480</td>
<td>16,390,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>York</strong></td>
<td>28,700,309</td>
<td>4,683,390</td>
<td>469,480</td>
<td>5,152,871</td>
<td>33,853,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>625,817,818</td>
<td>103,842,868</td>
<td>11,828,877</td>
<td>115,671,745</td>
<td>741,489,563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Interest         | 1,955,812              | 193,149         | 14,047     | 207,195          | 2,163,008 |
| Investment Income (Sterling&PFMAM/Union/LGIP/SNAP) | 5,342,953 | 2,427,034 | 1,510,926 | 3,937,960 | 9,280,913 |
| Bond Proceeds    | -                      | 583,270,073     | -          | 583,270,073      | 583,270,073 |
| **Total Revenues** | 633,116,583            | 689,733,123     | 13,353,850 | 703,086,974      | 1,336,203,557 |

| Construction     | (111,292,828)          | (93,628,600)    | (8,561,365) | (102,189,965)    | (213,482,793) |
| DMV and Dept of Tax Admin Fees | (598,214) | - | - | - | (598,214) |
| Investment Fees (Sterling&PFMAM) | (648,149) | (166,120) | (18,015) | (184,135) | (832,284) |
| Bond Expenses    | -                      | (3,505,396)     | (1,967,782) | (5,473,179)      | (5,473,179) |
| Operating Expense| (2,187,077)            | (641,366)       | (41,109)   | (682,474)        | (2,869,551) |
| Cash Balance     | 518,390,316            | 591,791,641     | 2,765,579  | 594,557,221      | 1,112,947,536 |
| Less Balance of Encumbered | (1,017,445,303) | (1,017,445,303) | (1,017,445,303) | (1,017,445,303) | (1,017,445,303) |
| Net Available Cash | 95,502,234 | 95,502,234 | 95,502,234 | 95,502,234 | 95,502,234 |
| Updated Forecast | 658,745,037            | 95,584,977      | 13,646,313 | 109,231,290      | 767,976,327 |
| Total Revenue - Forecast (under)/over | (30,971,407) | 8,257,891 | (1,817,436) | 6,440,455 | (24,530,952) |

Source: VDOT report “Revenues By Locality”
Prepared by HRTAC on 5/9/2018
### Table 1A - State Sales & Use Tax

Hampton Roads Transportation Fund (HRTF)

**State Sales & Use Tax**

**Fiscal Year 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Total FY2014 - FY 2017</th>
<th>Previous FY2018</th>
<th>March 2018</th>
<th>Total YTD FY2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
<td>$ 89,270,404</td>
<td>$ 15,346,710</td>
<td>$ 1,846,986</td>
<td>$ 17,193,695</td>
<td>$ 106,464,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>3,804,591</td>
<td>632,598</td>
<td>78,264</td>
<td>710,862</td>
<td>4,515,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>35,655,491</td>
<td>5,557,521</td>
<td>689,031</td>
<td>6,246,552</td>
<td>41,902,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
<td>5,731,108</td>
<td>940,468</td>
<td>118,575</td>
<td>1,059,043</td>
<td>6,790,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James City</td>
<td>25,149,785</td>
<td>4,287,973</td>
<td>385,720</td>
<td>4,673,693</td>
<td>29,823,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td>54,119,914</td>
<td>9,382,321</td>
<td>1,121,635</td>
<td>10,503,957</td>
<td>64,623,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>72,166,247</td>
<td>12,379,821</td>
<td>1,460,392</td>
<td>13,840,213</td>
<td>86,006,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poquoson</td>
<td>1,178,660</td>
<td>201,541</td>
<td>23,873</td>
<td>225,413</td>
<td>1,404,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>15,986,660</td>
<td>2,557,898</td>
<td>341,397</td>
<td>2,899,295</td>
<td>18,885,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>1,317,996</td>
<td>260,015</td>
<td>27,691</td>
<td>287,706</td>
<td>1,605,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td>20,605,661</td>
<td>3,673,843</td>
<td>452,480</td>
<td>4,126,323</td>
<td>24,731,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td>137,449,742</td>
<td>23,665,974</td>
<td>2,539,444</td>
<td>26,205,418</td>
<td>163,655,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
<td>10,990,948</td>
<td>1,789,548</td>
<td>175,701</td>
<td>1,965,249</td>
<td>12,956,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>22,423,620</td>
<td>3,734,316</td>
<td>391,854</td>
<td>4,126,170</td>
<td>26,549,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 495,850,828</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 84,410,546</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 9,653,043</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 94,063,589</strong></td>
<td><strong>589,914,417</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated Forecast

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>493,271,042</td>
<td>80,110,475</td>
<td>10,822,349</td>
<td>90,932,824</td>
<td>584,203,866</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diff(under)/over**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,579,786</td>
<td>4,300,071</td>
<td>(1,169,306)</td>
<td>3,130,765</td>
<td>5,710,551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: VDOT report “Revenues By Locality”
Prepared by HRTAC on 5/9/2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Total FY2014 - FY 2017</th>
<th>Previous FY2018</th>
<th>March 2018</th>
<th>Total YTD FY2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chesapeake</strong></td>
<td>$ 25,714,997</td>
<td>$ 4,341,770</td>
<td>$ 514,366</td>
<td>$ 4,856,136</td>
<td>$ 30,571,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Franklin</strong></td>
<td>1,564,603</td>
<td>386,194</td>
<td>30,490</td>
<td>416,684</td>
<td>1,981,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hampton</strong></td>
<td>10,525,169</td>
<td>2,059,278</td>
<td>224,753</td>
<td>2,284,031</td>
<td>12,809,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isle of Wight</strong></td>
<td>4,219,769</td>
<td>780,953</td>
<td>43,754</td>
<td>824,708</td>
<td>5,044,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James City</strong></td>
<td>3,437,887</td>
<td>538,669</td>
<td>57,116</td>
<td>595,784</td>
<td>4,033,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Newport News</strong></td>
<td>12,586,337</td>
<td>1,528,578</td>
<td>195,646</td>
<td>1,724,224</td>
<td>14,310,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norfolk</strong></td>
<td>14,132,595</td>
<td>2,000,795</td>
<td>276,026</td>
<td>2,276,821</td>
<td>16,409,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poquoson</strong></td>
<td>384,838</td>
<td>11,659</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td>13,058</td>
<td>397,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portsmouth</strong></td>
<td>5,968,053</td>
<td>797,811</td>
<td>87,101</td>
<td>884,912</td>
<td>6,852,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southampton</strong></td>
<td>1,635,974</td>
<td>227,554</td>
<td>25,868</td>
<td>253,421</td>
<td>1,889,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suffolk</strong></td>
<td>9,052,708</td>
<td>1,276,197</td>
<td>164,466</td>
<td>1,440,663</td>
<td>10,493,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia Beach</strong></td>
<td>31,630,704</td>
<td>3,977,699</td>
<td>436,081</td>
<td>4,413,780</td>
<td>36,044,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Williamsburg</strong></td>
<td>2,836,667</td>
<td>556,088</td>
<td>41,143</td>
<td>597,231</td>
<td>3,433,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>York</strong></td>
<td>6,276,689</td>
<td>949,075</td>
<td>77,626</td>
<td>1,026,701</td>
<td>7,303,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>129,966,991</td>
<td>$ 19,432,320</td>
<td>$ 2,175,834</td>
<td>$ 21,608,155</td>
<td>$ 151,575,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Updated Forecast</strong></td>
<td>164,600,002</td>
<td>15,474,502</td>
<td>2,823,964</td>
<td>18,298,466</td>
<td>182,898,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diff(under)/over</strong></td>
<td>(34,633,011)</td>
<td>3,957,818</td>
<td>(648,130)</td>
<td>3,309,689</td>
<td>(31,323,322)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: VDOT report "Revenues By Locality"  
Prepared by HRTAC on 5/9/2018  
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### Table 2 - Allocations

**Hampton Roads Transportation Fund (HRTF)**

**Allocations**

**Fiscal Year 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total FY2014 - FY 2017</th>
<th>Previous FY2018</th>
<th>March 2018</th>
<th>Total YTD FY2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-64 Peninsula Widening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 104905 (Segment 1) - Construction</td>
<td>$44,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$44,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 106665 (Segment 2) - PE &amp; Construction</td>
<td>189,707,675</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>189,707,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 106689 (Segment 3) - PE</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 106689 (Segment 3) - ROW &amp; Construction</td>
<td>156,376,066</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>156,376,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-64/264 Interchange Improvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 17630 - PE/ROW</td>
<td>54,592,576</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54,592,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 57048 - PE/ROW</td>
<td>15,071,063</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,071,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 57048 - Construction of Phase 1</td>
<td>137,023,653</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>137,023,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 17630/108041 - Construction of Phase 2</td>
<td>73,157,062</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>73,157,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 106693 - PE - Phase 3</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Crossing - UPC 106724 - SEIS</strong></td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>(5,000,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(5,000,000)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Projects of Third Crossing- UPC 106724</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HR Regional Connectors Study</strong></td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>7,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRCS - UPC 110577 - SEIS</strong></td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-64 Southside/High-Rise Bridge - UPC 106692 - PE</strong></td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-64 Southside/High-Rise Bridge - UPC 106692 - ROW &amp; Construction</strong></td>
<td>480,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>480,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Route 460/58/13 Connector - UPC 106694 - PE</strong></td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,231,928,095</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,230,928,095</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Prepared by HRTAC on 5/9/2018
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## Table 3 - Expenditures

**Hampton Roads Transportation Fund (HRTF)**

**Expenditures**

**Fiscal Year 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total FY2014 - FY 2017</th>
<th>Previous FY2018</th>
<th>March 2018</th>
<th>Total YTD FY2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-64 Peninsula Widening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 104905 (Segment 1) - Construction</td>
<td>$1,544,502</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 106665 (Segment 2) - PE &amp; Construction</td>
<td>49,326,465</td>
<td>37,865,940</td>
<td>3,449,991</td>
<td>41,315,931</td>
<td>90,642,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 106689 (Segment 3) - PE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,144,172</td>
<td>234,864</td>
<td>4,379,037</td>
<td>4,379,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 106689 (Segment 3) - ROW &amp; Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-64/264 Interchange Improvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 17630/108041 - PE/ROW</td>
<td>24,549,786</td>
<td>8,428,294</td>
<td>715,921</td>
<td>9,144,215</td>
<td>33,694,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 57048 - PE/ROW</td>
<td>8,941,701</td>
<td>10,795,861</td>
<td>2,475,201</td>
<td>13,271,062</td>
<td>22,212,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 57048 - Construction of Phase 1</td>
<td>17,353,214</td>
<td>22,357,605</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22,357,605</td>
<td>39,710,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 106693 - PE - Phase 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Crossing - UPC 106724 - SEIS</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Projects of Third Crossing - UPC 106724</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HR Regional Connectors Study</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57,913</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,913</td>
<td>57,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HRCS - UPC 110577 - SEIS</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,496,075</td>
<td>1,675,128</td>
<td>9,171,204</td>
<td>9,171,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-64 Southside/High-Rise Bridge - UPC 106692 - PE</strong></td>
<td>9,577,159</td>
<td>2,482,740</td>
<td>10,258</td>
<td>2,492,999</td>
<td>12,070,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I-64 Southside/High-Rise Bridge - UPC 106692 - ROW &amp; Construction</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$111,292,827</td>
<td>$93,628,600</td>
<td>$8,561,365</td>
<td>$102,189,965</td>
<td>$213,482,792</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by HRTAC on 5/9/2018
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### Table 4 - Bond Reimbursements

**Hampton Roads Transportation Fund (HRTF)**

**Bond Reimbursements**

**Fiscal Year 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total FY2014 - FY 2017</th>
<th>Previous FY2018</th>
<th>March 2018</th>
<th>Total YTD FY2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Peninsula Widening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 104905 (Segment 1) - Construction</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 106665 (Segment 2) - PE &amp; Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>82,490,841</td>
<td>8,151,556</td>
<td>90,642,397</td>
<td>90,642,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 106689 (Segment 3) - PE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,017,541</td>
<td>361,496</td>
<td>4,379,037</td>
<td>4,379,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 106689 (Segment 3) - ROW &amp; Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64/264 Interchange Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 17630/108041 - PE/ROW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,329,768</td>
<td>2,364,233</td>
<td>33,694,001</td>
<td>33,694,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 57048 - PE/ROW</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,071,063</td>
<td>7,141,701</td>
<td>22,212,764</td>
<td>22,212,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 57048 - Construction of Phase 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>39,710,818</td>
<td>39,710,818</td>
<td>39,710,818</td>
<td>39,710,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 106693 - PE - Phase 3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Crossing - UPC 106724 - SEIS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Projects of Third Crossing - UPC 106724</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR Regional Connectors Study</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRCS - UPC 110577 - SEIS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Southside/High-Rise Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UPC 106692 - PE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,557,878</td>
<td>1,512,280</td>
<td>12,070,158</td>
<td>12,070,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Southside/High-Rise Bridge - UPC 106692 - ROW &amp; Construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 183,177,908</td>
<td>$ 19,531,265</td>
<td>$ 202,709,174</td>
<td>$ 202,709,174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. HRTAC PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT MONTHLY EXECUTIVE REPORT

VDOT provides monthly reports to Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission (HRTAC) staff on the status of the Regional Priority Projects.

Handout