



**CENTRAL VIRGINIA
METROPOLITAN
PLANNING
ORGANIZATION**

Location:

Bank of the James Building
828 Main Street
12th Floor
Lynchburg, VA 24504

November 20th, 2014 at 4:00 p.m.

Agenda

1. Call to Order.....Stan Goldsmith, Chair
2. Approval of the August 21st, 2014 Meeting Minutes.....Stan Goldsmith, Chair
3. Discussion and Consideration of an Amendment to the Central Virginia Transportation Improvement Program Fiscal Years 2015-2018.....Bob White, Deputy Director
4. Discussion of the Statewide Prioritization Process for Project Selection by the Commonwealth Transportation BoardBob White, Deputy Director
5. Status Report and Discussion of the Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan Year 2040 Update.....Bob White, Deputy Director
6. Opportunity for Public Comment.....Stan Goldsmith, Chair
7. Matters from the Members.....All
8. Adjournment
9. Information Items

Next Meeting:

January 15, 2014, 5:00 p.m.
*Large Conference Room,
828 Main Street, Lynchburg, Virginia*

Central Virginia Metropolitan Planning Organization (CVMPO)

November 20, 2014

Executive Director's Report

1. Call to Order

2. Approval of the August 21st, 2014 Meeting Minutes

(See attachment 2)

The minutes of the August 21st, 2014 meeting of the CVMPO are attached for your review and approval.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval.

3. Discussion and Consideration of an Amendment to the Central Virginia Transportation Improvement Program (CVTIP) Fiscal Years 2015-2018

(See attachment 3a and 3b)

VDOT is requesting an amendment to the CVTIP relating to the Odd Fellows Road Interchange and Greenview Drive projects. The amendment relates principally to funding mechanisms for the projects. The attached narrative provides information regarding this matter.

This item requires a public meeting.

The Transportation Technical Committee has reviewed this matter and recommends approval. A thirty day public comment period is in effect; comments will be provided at the meeting. A resolution approving this amendment is attached for the member's consideration.

Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the attached resolution.

4. Discussion of the Statewide Prioritization Process for Project Selection by the Commonwealth Transportation Board

(See attachment 4)

The Commonwealth Transportation Board is requesting comments from the CVMPO on the development of the statewide prioritization process for transportation project selection. Specifically, the Board is interested in the relative importance of the transportation system's efficiency and effectiveness, transportation safety, transportation accessibility for people and freight, environmental quality, and economic development. The Board is also interested in any actual criteria that can be used to measure these considerations. An overarching focus of the effort is to serve the needs of the 21st century workforce and goods movement in the region. The members will be asked to offer their views on this matter.

The update to the Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan is being accomplished with a focus on staying aligned with the development of the Board's prioritization efforts. A particular focus for the update is development of a CVMPO prioritization process. Safety and economic development are key focus areas to date. The Plan update will be discussed later in the agenda.

A copy of the General Assembly bill (HB2) enacting the statewide prioritization process is attached.

Recommendation: Discuss this matter and offer comments to the Commonwealth Transportation Board, as appropriate.

5. Status Report and Discussion of the Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan Year 2040 Update

(See attachment 5)

Work continues on the update to the Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan Year 2040. Staff and our consultants, EPR, will provide a status report, an HB2 update, project evaluation tools update, and a project schedule update. The attached MPO briefing packet provides material to support this discussion. (The HB2 update may be included as part of item 4.)

Recommendation: Participate in the discussion.

6. Opportunity for Public Comment

7. Matters from the Members

8. Adjournment

9. Information Items

a. The CVMPO will be meeting at 4:00 p.m. on the following dates, unless otherwise noted or notified.

- January 15, 2015
- April 16, 2015
- July 16, 2015
- November 19, 2015

b. The attached list (see attachment 9) identifies Central Virginia Transportation Improvement Program (CVTIP) amendments and adjustments accomplished. The amendments have been approved by the CVMPO. The adjustments have been approved by the staff in accordance with the MPO Adjustment Agreement, dated July 21, 2005. These adjustments do not require CVMPO approval since they are not new projects, but rather are projects that have adjustments made primarily to their funding stream or schedule.



**CENTRAL VIRGINIA
METROPOLITAN
PLANNING
ORGANIZATION**

Attachment 2
pp 5 - 6

Central Virginia Metropolitan Planning Organization

20th Floor, Bank of the James Building

828 Main Street

Lynchburg, Virginia 24504

August 21st, 2014 at 4:00 pm

MEMBERS PRESENT

Joan Foster for Turner Perrow.....Lynchburg City
 Stan Goldsmith, *Chair*.....Campbell County
 Jack Hobbs.....Town of Amherst
 Kim Payne.....Lynchburg City
 Mark Reeter.....Bedford County
 Dean Rodgers.....Amherst County
 John Sharp.....Bedford County
 Rick Youngblood for Chris Winstead.....Lynchburg VDOT District

MEMBERS ABSENT

Lee Beaumont.....Liberty University
 Ken Bumgarner.....Town of Amherst
 David Laurrell.....Campbell County
 William Mays.....Amherst County

OTHERS PRESENT

Gary Christie.....Local Government Council
 Matt Perkins.....Local Government Council
 Bob White.....Local Government Council

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Stan Goldsmith, Chair, called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm.

2. Approval of the July 17th, 2014, Meeting Minutes

Upon a motion by Kim Payne to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by Rick Youngblood, the minutes of July 17th, 2014, were unanimously approved.

3. Public Hearing and Consideration of an Amendment to the Central Virginia Transportation Improvement Program Fiscal Years 2012-2015 (CVTIP)

Bob White provided background information related to the amendment request. VDOT requested the change in order that the Odd Fellows Rd interchange project and Greenview Drive projects move from a public procurement process to a design-build

process. Bob noted that this amendment would then make the projects two separate projects.

Stan Goldsmith, Chair, opened the Public Hearing at 4:08 p.m. and read aloud the Resolution of the Central Virginia Metropolitan Planning Organization to Amend the Central Virginia Transportation Improvement Program Fiscal Years 2012 – 2015.

There being no public comments, Stan Goldsmith closed the Public Hearing at 4:11 p.m.

Upon a motion to approve the amendment to the CVTIP by Kim Payne, seconded by Rick Youngblood, this motion was approved unanimously.

4. Opportunity for Public Comment

There were none present to comment and no comments were received.

5. Matters from the Committee

Joan Foster mentioned that she suspended her representation on the CVMPO Board and the Lynchburg City Council appointed City Councilman Turner Perrow to the seat.

Bob White mentioned that Nick Donahue, Deputy Secretary of Transportation, would be attending the September 18th, 2014 Local Government Council meeting and invited those on the MPO who are not also members of the LGC to attend.

Rick Youngblood mentioned that the VDOT Fall Transportation Meeting will be held on September 23rd, 2014, as it relates to the 6-Year Improvement Program.

Also, Rick mentioned that the Lynchburg Expressway Study would be finalized soon and that from that additional projects are being formulated to study additional corridors adjacent and connected to the Lynchburg Expressway.

6. Adjournment

Stan Goldsmith, Chair, upon a motion to adjourn brought by consensus of the members, adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

Signed _____ Date: _____

Narrative of Changes to Primary Projects section of CVTIP FY15-18 for Consideration at November 20th, 2014 CVMPO

Narrative of Changes:

These are two new projects (with new UPC numbers) related to the Odd Fellows Road Interchange and Greenview Drive Projects. These additions are related to Debt Service additions based upon the use of Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicles (GARVEE) Bonds being used to fund the projects. A GARVEE Bond is a type of anticipation vehicle, which are securities (debt instruments) issued when moneys are anticipated from a specific source to advance the upfront funding of a particular need. In the case of transportation finance the anticipation vehicles' revenue source is expected Federal-aid grants. GARVEE bonds allow states to borrow against future federal entitlements through bond issues to speed up work on highways.

Proposed Additions to Primary Projects Section:

UPC NO	106533	SCOPE	New Construction Roadway			
SYSTEM	Urban	JURISDICTION	Lynchburg	OVERSIGHT	FO	
PROJECT	RTE 29/460 - INTCHG & EXT (ODD FELLOWS RD) DEBT SERVICE			ADMIN BY	VDOT	
DESCRIPTION	FROM: VARIOUS TO: Various					
PROGRAM NOTE	TIP AMD to add \$1,104,477 (NHPP) FFY15, \$1,000,894 (NHPP) FFY16, \$1,619,587 (NHPP) FFY17, \$1,971,375 (NHPP) FFY18, and \$23,776,396 (AC-NHPP) FFY18. (lco 10/8/14)					
ROUTE/STREET	VARIOUS (6029)			TOTAL COST	\$36,840,911	
	FUND SOURCE	MATCH	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18
PE	Federal - NHPP	\$1,424,083	\$1,104,477	\$1,000,894	\$1,619,587	\$1,971,375
PE AC	Federal - AC	\$5,944,099	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$23,776,396
MPO Note						

UPC NO	106537	SCOPE	Reconstruction w/ Added Capacity			
SYSTEM	Urban	JURISDICTION	Lynchburg	OVERSIGHT	NFO	
PROJECT	UR-6056 - D/B WIDEN FR 2-4 LNS (GREENVIEW DR) DEBT SERVICE			ADMIN BY	VDOT	
DESCRIPTION	FROM: SC-1541 (HERMITAGE RD) TO: 0.220Mi. S. UR-6066 (LEESVILLE RD) (0.4500 MI)					
PROGRAM NOTE	TIP AMD to add \$163,852 (AC-STP) FFY15 with conversion in FFY16, \$551,658 (STP) FFY17, \$775,700 (STP) FFY18, \$10,082,660 (AC-STP) FFY18. (lco 10/8/14)					
ROUTE/STREET	GREENVIEW DRIVE (6056)			TOTAL COST	\$14,467,338	
	FUND SOURCE	MATCH	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18
PE	Federal - AC CONVERSION		\$0	\$163,852	\$0	\$0
	Federal - STP/F	\$331,840	\$0	\$0	\$551,658	\$775,700
PE TOTAL		\$331,840	\$0	\$163,852	\$551,658	\$775,700
PE AC	Federal - AC	\$2,561,628	\$163,852	\$0	\$0	\$10,082,660
MPO Note						



RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL VIRGINIA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION TO AMEND THE CENTRAL VIRGINIA TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FISCAL YEARS 2015 – 2018

WHEREAS, the Central Virginia Transportation Improvement Program (CVTIP) is required to be submitted to the Virginia Department of Transportation for inclusion in the State Transportation Improvement Program; and

WHEREAS, inclusion of transportation projects in the CVTIP is a condition of federal participation in the funding of projects and programs; and

WHEREAS, this amendment of the CVTIP includes new line items into the Primary Projects Section (UPC #106533 and #106537). These new line items are associated with the funding changes to the Odd Fellows Road Interchange and Greenview Drive Projects to accommodate the use of GARVEE bonds, as shown below; and

UPC NO	106533	SCOPE	New Construction Roadway			
SYSTEM	Urban	JURISDICTION	Lynchburg	OVERSIGHT	FO	
PROJECT	RTE 29/460 - INTCHG & EXT (ODD FELLOWS RD) DEBT SERVICE			ADMIN BY	VDOT	
DESCRIPTION	FROM: VARIOUS TO: Various					
PROGRAM NOTE	TIP AMD to add \$1,104,477 (NHPP) FFY15, \$1,000,894 (NHPP) FFY16, \$1,619,587 (NHPP) FFY17, \$1,971,375 (NHPP) FFY18, and \$23,776,396 (AC-NHPP) FFY18. (lco 10/8/14)					
ROUTE/STREET	VARIOUS (6029)			TOTAL COST	\$36,840,911	
	FUND SOURCE	MATCH	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18
PE	Federal - NHPP	\$1,424,083	\$1,104,477	\$1,000,894	\$1,619,587	\$1,971,375
PE AC	Federal - AC	\$5,944,099	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$23,776,396
MPO Note						

UPC NO	106537	SCOPE	Reconstruction w/ Added Capacity			
SYSTEM	Urban	JURISDICTION	Lynchburg	OVERSIGHT	NFO	
PROJECT	UR-6056 - D/B WIDEN FR 2-4 LNS (GREENVIEW DR) DEBT SERVICE			ADMIN BY	VDOT	
DESCRIPTION	FROM: SC-1541 (HERMITAGE RD) TO: 0.220Mi. S. UR-6066 (LEESVILLE RD) (0.4500 MI)					
PROGRAM NOTE	TIP AMD to add \$163,852 (AC-STP) FFY15 with conversion in FFY16, \$551,658 (STP) FFY17, \$775,700 (STP) FFY18, \$10,082,660 (AC-STP) FFY18. (lco 10/8/14)					
ROUTE/STREET	GREENVIEW DRIVE (6056)			TOTAL COST	\$14,467,338	
	FUND SOURCE	MATCH	FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18
PE	Federal - AC CONVERSION		\$0	\$163,852	\$0	\$0
	Federal - STP/F	\$331,840	\$0	\$0	\$551,658	\$775,700
PE TOTAL		\$331,840	\$0	\$163,852	\$551,658	\$775,700
PE AC	Federal - AC	\$2,561,628	\$163,852	\$0	\$0	\$10,082,660
MPO Note						

WHEREAS, public input has been sought in amending the CVTIP as required.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Central Virginia Metropolitan Planning Organization does hereby approve the Central Virginia Transportation Improvement Program Fiscal Years 2015-2018, as amended and dated November 20, 2014.

Upon motion by Member _____ duly seconded by Member _____, adopted this ____ day of _____ 2014.

ATTESTED BY:

 Gary F. Christie, Secretary
 Central Virginia Metropolitan
 Planning Organization

CERTIFIED BY:

 Stan Goldsmith, Chair
 Central Virginia Metropolitan
 Planning Organization

CHAPTER 726

An Act to amend the Code of Virginia by adding in Article 1.1 of Chapter 1 of Title 33.1 a section numbered 33.1-23.5:5, relating to prioritization of projects funded by the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

[H 2]

Approved April 6, 2014

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That the Code of Virginia is amended by adding in Article 1.1 of Chapter 1 of Title 33.1 a section numbered 33.1-23.5:5 as follows:

§ 33.1-23.5:5. *Statewide prioritization process for project selection.*

A. The General Assembly declares it to be in the public interest that a prioritization process for projects funded by the Commonwealth Transportation Board be developed and implemented to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the state's transportation system, transportation safety, transportation accessibility for people and freight, environmental quality, and economic development in the Commonwealth.

B. Subject to the limitations in subsection C, the Commonwealth Transportation Board shall develop, in accordance with federal transportation requirements, and in cooperation with metropolitan planning organizations wholly within the Commonwealth and with the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority, a statewide prioritization process for the use of funds allocated pursuant to § 33.1-23.1 or apportioned pursuant to 23 U.S.C. § 104. Such prioritization process shall be used for the development of the Six-Year Improvement Program pursuant to § 33.1-12 and shall consider, at a minimum, highway, transit, rail, roadway, technology operational improvements, and transportation demand management strategies.

1. The prioritization process shall be based on an objective and quantifiable analysis that considers, at a minimum, the following factors relative to the cost of the project or strategy: congestion mitigation, economic development, accessibility, safety, and environmental quality.

2. Prior to the analysis in subdivision 1, candidate projects and strategies shall be screened by the Commonwealth Transportation Board to determine whether they are consistent with the assessment of capacity needs for all for corridors of statewide significance, regional networks, and improvements to promote urban development areas established pursuant to § 15.2-2223.1, undertaken in the Statewide Transportation Plan in accordance with § 33.1-23.03.

3. The Commonwealth Transportation Board shall weight the factors used in subdivision 1 for each of the state's highway construction districts. The Commonwealth Transportation Board may assign different weights to the factors, within each highway construction district, based on the unique needs and qualities of each highway construction district.

4. The Commonwealth Transportation Board shall solicit input from localities, metropolitan planning organizations, transit authorities, transportation authorities, and other stakeholders in its development of the prioritization process pursuant to this section. Further, the Board shall explicitly consider input provided by an applicable metropolitan planning organization or the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority when developing the weighting of factors pursuant to subdivision 3 for a metropolitan planning area with a population over 200,000 individuals.

C. The prioritization process developed under subsection B shall not apply to the following: projects or activities undertaken pursuant to § 33.1-23.02; projects funded by the Congestion Mitigation Air Quality funds apportioned to the state pursuant to 23 U.S.C. § 104(b)(4) and state matching funds; projects funded by the Highway Safety Improvement Program funds apportioned to the state pursuant to 23 U.S.C. § 104(b)(3) and state matching funds; projects funded by the Transportation Alternatives funds set-aside pursuant to 23 U.S.C. § 213 and state matching

funds; projects funded pursuant to subdivisions B 2 and 3 of § 33.1-23.1; projects funded by the revenue-sharing program pursuant to § 33.1-23.05; and projects funded by federal programs established by the federal government after June 30, 2014, with specific rules that restrict the types of projects that may be funded, excluding restrictions on the location of projects with regard to highway functional classification. The Commonwealth Transportation Board may, at its discretion, develop a prioritization process for any of the funds covered by this subsection, subject to planning and funding requirements of federal law. However, the Board shall defer to individual local governments for projects funded pursuant to subdivisions B 2 and 3 of § 33.1-23.1.

D. The Commonwealth Transportation Board shall make public, in an accessible format, the results of the screening and analysis of candidate projects and strategies under subsection B, including the weighting of factors, in a timely fashion.

2. That the Commonwealth Transportation Board shall select projects for funding pursuant to the provisions of this act beginning July 1, 2016.
3. That, at the discretion of the Board, a project fully funded in the Six-Year Improvement Program that has completed the state environmental review process or the review process required by the National Environmental Policy Act may be exempt from the provisions of this act.
4. That the prioritization process developed pursuant to § 33.1-23.5:5 of the Code of Virginia, as created by this act, shall not apply to funds allocated to the Northern Virginia Transportation Authority Fund established pursuant to § 15.2-4838.01 of the Code of Virginia, the Hampton Roads Transportation Fund established pursuant to § 33.1-23.5:4 of the Code of Virginia, or federal funds subject to 23 U.S.C. 133(d)(1)(A)(i).
5. That the Commonwealth Transportation Board in implementing § 33.1-23.5:5 as created by this act shall comply with the allocation of funds pursuant to § 33.1-23.1.
6. That, for Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads highway construction districts, the Commonwealth Transportation Board, pursuant to subdivision B 3 of § 33.1-23.5:5 as created by this act, shall ensure that congestion mitigation, consistent with § 33.1-13.03:1 of the Code of Virginia, is weighted highest among the factors in the prioritization process. For metropolitan planning areas with a population over 200,000, the prioritization process shall also include a factor based on the quantifiable and achievable goals pursuant to subsection B of § 33.1-23.03 of the Code of Virginia.
7. That notwithstanding § 33.1-23.5:5 as created by this act, the Commonwealth Transportation Board shall ensure that no project shall be undertaken primarily for economic development purposes.
8. That if any portion of this act shall be adjudged unconstitutional in any court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining portions of this act shall remain in effect.

Legislative Information System



Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan 2040 Update
MPO Board Briefing Package
November 2014



Briefing Materials

for MPO Board Review

November 10, 2014

(In Preparation for the November 20th, 2014 MPO Board Meeting)

Table of Contents

Part 1- Project Status Update.....	2
Part 2- Status/Update on House Bill 2	3
Part 3- Update on Project Evaluation Tools.....	4
Part 4- Updated Project Schedule	5

Appendices

- Appendix 1- Project Evaluation Tools Summary*
- Appendix 2- Benefit Evaluation Matrix Record of Development*
- Appendix 3- Updated Project Schedule*



Part 1- Project Status Update

Since the July 2014 MPO Board Meeting, work on the Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan 2040 Update has focused primarily on four tasks: the development of project evaluation tools, refining and updating the vision project list, public and stakeholder outreach, and priority intersection analysis. A description of each is provided below.

Development of Project Evaluation Tools- One of the primary tasks of this Long Range Plan Update has been to create an effective and transparent method of evaluating and prioritizing potential projects. These tools should reflect the transportation priorities of the region, while also addressing the goals that are likely to be considered by the state in future competitive funding programs.

- ✓ Development of Project Benefit Evaluation Tool
- ✓ Development of Project Readiness Evaluation Tool
- ✓ Development of Project Benefit-to-Cost Evaluation Tool
- ✓ Assignment of weights to Vision Themes and Performance Measurements in Benefit Evaluation tool
- ✓ Documentation of Project Benefit Evaluation Tool development

Refining and Updating the Vision Project List- The study team and the TTC have been reviewing the projects listed in the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan to ensure that the projects considered in the 2040 Update are current, accurate, and complete.

- ✓ Review of prior LRTP Vision List for accuracy and currency
- ✓ Review of other planning documents for additional project recommendations

Public and Stakeholder Outreach- The public and key stakeholders are being engaged in order to ensure that the plan update truly reflects the current priorities, concerns, and interests of the region.

- ✓ Monthly TTC meetings
- ✓ Public meetings in all four localities
- ✓ Economic Development Alliance meeting
- ✓ Launch of “Mindmixer” project website

Intersection Analysis- The 2040 Update will include an analysis of important intersections in the region to measure their operational efficiency and to make any necessary improvement recommendations.

- ✓ Selection of five priority intersections per locality
- ✓ Collection of traffic data for each selected intersection



Part 2- Status/Update on House Bill 2

Deliverable: Presentation to MPO Board

<i>Purpose:</i>	Report update based on latest CTB presentation by Deputy Secretary
<i>MPO Action Requested:</i>	None; information provided for board consideration
<i>Future Steps:</i>	Consultant team will continue to update staff and board of further developments in the HB2 process as they are available

A. Introduction & Purpose

On October 14, 2014, one of the consultant team members attended the CTB meeting in Richmond, VA and collected information from a presentation to the CTB made by Deputy Secretary of Transportation Nick Donohue. Mr. Donohue was reporting to the CTB on the Secretary’s meetings with each MPO in the Commonwealth to get input on HB2, and on recent work that the HB2 working groups have done on proposals for how the evaluation of projects will be accomplished under this legislation. Anticipated schedules for roll out of the HB2 process were also discussed at this meeting. A summary of the presentation made to the CTB will be presented to the MPO board for their consideration.

B. Specific Input Needed

None- a period for comments or questions will be provided following the presentation.



Part 3- Update on Project Evaluation Tools

<i>Deliverable:</i>	Project Evaluation Tool Summary, Benefit Evaluation Matrix Record of Development
<i>Purpose:</i>	To review the function and development of the project evaluation tools that will be utilized for the 2040 Update.
<i>MPO Action Requested:</i>	Provide feedback regarding any questions, concerns, or suggestions about the evaluation process.
<i>Future Steps:</i>	Every project on the final vision list will be evaluated by the process described here, and the results will be reported in the final LRTP document.

A. Introduction & Purpose

The study team and the TTC have developed a set of project evaluation tools that will be used to measure and rate every project that is included for consideration in the Long Range Transportation Plan Update. This process will provide a transparent record of evaluation that will allow all readers to understand what factors were included in the decision making process. It will also allow the region to provide clear and measurable justifications for any projects that will be considered for state-wide competitive funding.

Two documents have been included in the briefing package that address these tools in detail. The first, “Project Evaluation Tool Summary” provides information regarding the structure and use of the latest evaluation tools. The second, “Benefit Evaluation Matrix Record of Development,” provides a clear record of the evolution of the Benefit Evaluation Matrix, including the dates on which any significant changes were made and the logic behind all of the changes and methods utilized in the development process.

B. Specific Input Needed

This information has been provided for the MPO board’s consideration. The study team will welcome any questions, concerns, or suggestions about any of the material that is covered in this discussion.



Part 4- Updated Project Schedule

Deliverable: Updated Project Schedule

<i>Purpose:</i>	Revisions reflect current project status and adjustments to future deliverables and scheduled meetings.
<i>MPO Action Requested:</i>	Review and offer questions or suggestions where appropriate.
<i>Future Steps:</i>	The project schedule will be updated periodically as necessary.

A. Introduction & Purpose

The project schedule was updated this fall in order to better reflect the current status of the planning effort, as well as to make small adjustments to scheduled meetings and deliverables. Notable changes include:

- The second community meeting was moved from December to January in order to allow more time for project list finalization and evaluation.
- There will be a total of two economic development alliance meetings rather than the originally scheduled three. The study team chose to consolidate the final two meetings into one meeting as a more effective use of time.
- The first draft of the LRTP is scheduled to be reviewed in February rather than January.

The final review and adoption is still expected to occur in the originally scheduled time frame of May-July.

B. Specific Input Needed

None; The revised schedule is presented for the MPO board’s consideration. Comments, concerns, or questions will be welcome in discussion.

Project Evaluation Tools Summary

Draft

November 10, 2014

Contents

Project Benefit Evaluation Matrix.....	3
Organization of State Transportation Themes and Regional Goals.....	4
Description of Performance Measurements	5
Project Readiness Evaluation	6
Benefit to Cost-per-User Evaluation	7
Sample Draft Evaluation Results	8

Introduction

The following package describes the draft project evaluation tools that will help the region select its transportation project priorities in the forthcoming update to the Central Virginia MPO Long Range Transportation Plan. These tools include a Project Benefit Evaluation, a Project Readiness Evaluation, and a Project Benefit-to-Cost Evaluation.

The Project Benefit Evaluation on page three is being developed to show how well a project advances the MPO’s transportation priorities, as identified in the 2035 LRTP Update and revisited in the current planning effort. The region’s goals have been grouped into five “Vision Themes” that correspond to categories previously used by CTB prioritization tools, as shown on page four. Each “Vision Theme” is weighted according to its relative importance to the region and subsequently measured by a set of performance factors that are described on page five. Each measurement within a vision theme is itself weighted according its importance to that category. All weights were determined by the MPO TTC and are being verified by public feedback.

Following this, the Project Readiness Evaluation on page six is intended to show how quickly a project could be advanced to construction if selected. Finally, the Project Benefit-Cost Evaluation on page seven is intended to show the relative benefit produced by each project per the project cost-per-user.

The final page of this package uses a sample set of projects from the region to demonstrate how the results of this evaluation process may be presented to the MPO and reported in the final LRTP document.

Theme	Goals	Weight
Mobility and Accessibility: Provide a transportation system that facilitates the efficient movement of people and goods	Make it Flow, Make it Accessible	20%
Safety: Provide a safe and secure transportation system	Make it Safe	25%
Economy: Retain and increase business and employment opportunities	Promote Vitality, Make it Efficient	25%
Community and Nature: Improve the quality of life and protect the environment	Sustain Quality	15%
Efficiency: Preserve the existing transportation system and promote efficient system management	Make it Function, Coordinate Investments, Balance Priorities	15%
Total		100%

Theme	Performance Factors	Weight Relative to Goal
Mobility and Accessibility: Provide a transportation system that facilitates the efficient movement of people and goods	A. 2040 Volume to Capacity Ratio	37%
	B. 2040 Weighted flow rate (passenger car equivalents, per hour, per lane)	23%
	C. Freight Volume	20%
	D. Addition or improvement of alternative transportation facilities	20%
Total		100%
Safety: Provide a safe and secure transportation system	A. Accident Rate/Number of Accidents	61%
	B. General safety improvements	39%
Total		100%
Economy: Retain and increase business and employment opportunities	A. Regional or statewide economic development significance	25%
	B. Regional commuter significance	44%
	C. Surrounding employment density	31%
Total		100%
Community and Nature: Improve the quality of life and protect the environment	A. Major environmental issues or concerns	30%
	B. Aesthetic corridor improvements (ie. Streetscaping)	30%
	C. Sufficiency of existing right of way	40%
Total		100%
Efficiency: Preserve the existing transportation system and promote efficient system management	A. Roadway maintenance status	32%
	B. VDOT Functional Roadway Class	10%
	C. Coordination with state, regional, and local plans	27%
	D. Distribution of benefits to multiple communities	31%
Total		100%

Relation of State Transportation Themes and Regional Goals

Mobility and Accessibility *Provide a transportation system that facilitates the efficient movement of people and goods*

Related Goals

Make it Flow: Improve mobility and connectivity for people and freight, across all travel modes

Make it Accessible: Promote equal access to all modes of transportation for people of all ages and abilities

Safety *Provide a safe and secure transportation system*

Related Goal

Make it Safe: Promote transportation safety and security for motorized and non-motorized travelers

Economy *Retain and increase business and employment opportunities*

Related Goals

Promote Vitality: Support the economic vitality of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency

Make it Efficient: Maximize transportation operations and efficiency of key corridors such as Route 29 in the region and between regions. The Route 29 corridor is a vital economic artery for the region and the state and must be managed and developed accordingly.

Community and Nature *Improve the quality of life and protect the environment*

Related Goal

Sustain Quality: Support and enhance environmental resilience, energy conservation, and community quality of life

Efficiency *Preserve the existing transportation system and promote efficient system management*

Related Goals

Make it Function: Ensure that the existing transportation system is maintained

Coordinate Investments: Ensure consistency with local and state plans and goals for land use, environmental preservation, and economic development

Balance Priorities: Balance cross-jurisdictional transportation needs and concerns

Description of Performance Measurements

Theme	Measurement	Application
Mobility and Accessibility Provide a transportation system that facilitates the efficient movement of people and goods	2040 Volume to Capacity Ratio	Does the project increase roadway capacity of a high congestion corridor?
	2040 Weighted Flow Rate	Does the project improve the operation of a high volume corridor?
	Freight Volume	Does the project improve a major freight corridor?
	Addition or improvement of alternative transportation facilities	Does the project add new alternative transportation facilities?
Safety Provide a safe and secure transportation system	Accident Rate	Does the project improve roadway operations at a location with a high accident rate?
	General safety features	Does the project include design features specifically intended to improve safety?
Economy Retain and increase employment opportunities	Regional or statewide economic significance	Does the project advance economic development plans?
	Regional commuter significance	Does the project improve the performance of a major commuter corridor?
	Surrounding employment density	Does the project make transportation improvements in a high density employment area?
Community and Nature Improve the quality of life and protect the environment	Major environmental concerns	Does the project avoid negative impacts on sensitive environmental and cultural resources?
	Aesthetic corridor improvements	Does the project include designed landscaping or streetscaping elements?
	Sufficiency of existing right of way	Does the project require the purchase of additional right of way?
Efficiency Preserve the existing transportation system and promote efficient system management	Roadway maintenance status	Does the corridor experience recurring maintenance problems?
	VDOT Functional Roadway Class	Does the project invest in a corridor with high statewide significance?
	Coordination with state, regional, and local plans	Does the project coordinate with other planning recommendations?
	Distribution of benefits to multiple communities	Does the project distribute transportation benefits to multiple communities?

Project Readiness Evaluation

Rating Categories

Criteria 1: NEPA Screening (1 point)

The project is awarded one point if it has cleared a NEPA screening review or if a review is not needed.

Criteria 2: Right of Way (1 point)

The project is awarded one point if all necessary right of way has been acquired or if no additional right of way is required.

Criteria 3: Ongoing Projects (1 point)

The project is awarded one point if it is the next phase of an ongoing project.

Scoring

Projects will be assigned to one of three readiness categories based on the number of points they have been awarded.

High Readiness- 3 points

Medium Readiness- 2 points

Low Readiness- 1 or 0 points

Benefit to Cost-per-User Evaluation

Initial Calculation

The Benefit to Cost-per-User score for each project will be determined using the following formula:

$$\text{Rating} = \text{Benefit Score} / (\text{Project Cost in Millions of Dollars} / \text{Corridor Users in Thousands of Vehicles})$$

Rating Categories

After the Benefit to Cost-per-User score have been calculated for every candidate project, the results will be ordered from high to low score and then divided into three equally sized categories.

Projects that are included in the top third of score results will be given a “High” Benefit to Cost-per-User rating. Projects that are included in the middle third of score results will be given a “Medium” Benefit to Cost-per-User rating. Projects that are included in the bottom third of score results will be given a “Low” Benefit to Cost-per-User rating.

Sample Draft Evaluation Results

The following table shows the **draft** evaluation results for 14 projects from the Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan 2035 Update. While there may be minor changes to the scores in the final evaluation, this table demonstrates the three-category evaluation result format that will be presented to the board for consideration in the final project selection process.

Project	Benefit	Readiness	Benefit/Cost Category
Rt 460/29- Rt 501 (Campbell Ave) to Rt 29 (Monacan Pkwy)	85.13	High	High
Rt 29- Rt 460 intersection to Rt 24	76.39	Medium	High
Rt 29 South Bypass-- Route 29 Bypass at Route 460 to Route 29 in the vicinity of Route 24 (Yellow Branch)	70.55	Low	Low
Rt 221 (Lakeside Dr) intersection- 0.25 MW Rt 501 to 1.15 ME Rt 501	70.14	Medium	High
New interchange extending Odd Fellow Road over Rt 29/460	68.19	High	Low
Route 670 (Old Candler Mountain Road)- Mayflower Dr to Route 460	68.05	Medium	High
Midtown Connector- Rt 29 Bus to Int. Memorial/5th	67.08	High	Medium
Route 811 (Thomas Jefferson Road)- Route 460 to Route 221	54.58	Medium	Medium
Greenview Dr - Hermitage Rd to 0.22 MS Leesville Rd	54.58	High	Medium
Route 622 (Waterlick Road)- Bedford County Corporate Limits to Route 1520 (Rainbow Forest)	52.50	Medium	High
Route 682 (Woodys Lake Rd)- Rt 29 Business to Dead End	52.36	Medium	Medium
Route 622 (Waterlick Rd)- Route 811 to Campbell County line	50.00	Medium	Medium
Rt 622 (Lynbrook Rd) over Flat Crk (Rt 683 to Rt 29)	46.38	Medium	Low
Rt 659 (Union Hill Rd) over Rutledge Crk W of N&S RR Xing to Rt T-606	41.11	Medium	Low

Key

2035 Constrained List Project
2035 Vision List Project

Benefit Evaluation Matrix

Record of Development

Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan 2040 Update

****DRAFT, October 29, 2014****

Contents

Introduction	3
Part 1: Structure.....	3
Part 2: Goals.....	4
Part 3: Vision Themes	4
Phase I: Four Original Themes	4
Phase II: VDOT/CTB Transportation Goals.....	5
Part 4: Performance Factors	5
Mobility and Accessibility	5
Safety	6
Economy.....	6
Community and Nature	7
Operational Efficiency.....	8
Part 5: Scoring Method	9
Phase I: High, Medium, and Low.....	9
Phase II: The 0-100 Point Scale	9
Part 6: Weighting Strategy.....	9
Phase I: Reasonable Estimation	9
Phase II: Equal Weight for Measurements	10
Phase III: Equal Weight for Goals.....	10
Phase IV: TTC Weighting Exercise	10
Phase V: Rating Performance Factors, Part I	10
Phase VI: Rating Performance Factors, Part II	11
Part 7: Scoring Factors	11
Phase I: Benefit Analysis	11
Phase II: Benefit/Cost Analysis.....	11
Phase III: Benefit/(Cost per User) Analysis	11
Phase IV: Cost and User Point System	12
Phase V: Separate Columns for Benefit Score, Cost, Users, Project Readiness.....	12
Phase VI: Three Factor Evaluation Method	12

Introduction

The need to develop a clear and transparent project evaluation process is the result of changes to both federal and state transportation funding programs. The new federal transportation law, known as MAP-21, mandates a performance driven, outcome-based transportation planning process that directs funding to projects that are able to clearly explain their value and benefits toward meeting desired regional outcomes and national goals.

At the state level, House Bill 2 was signed into law in Virginia in March 2014 and provides for the development of a prioritization process for projects that are funded by the Commonwealth Transportation Board. In order to allow the region's projects to be competitive for funding under both laws, the Central Virginia MPO is developing an evaluation system that can easily be adapted to each.

Part 1: Structure

Performance evaluation frameworks that are being used in regional and statewide planning efforts around the country were reviewed as examples of ways to develop an evaluation system. Special attention was focused on examples from the Commonwealth of Virginia, including evaluation systems developed by the National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board, the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization, and Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization.

The basic approach used by these other MPOs includes four primary parts: identifying transportation goals, identifying transportation elements related to the goals, defining a measurement and scoring methodology for each element, and weighting each element according to its overall importance.

Introduction

*Content explained in project
White Paper distributed on
May 21, 2014*

Structure

*Originally presented to Central
Virginia MPO TTC on May 8,
2014*

Using this as a guide, an evaluation matrix structure was developed for the region that included the following parts:

- 1) Vision Theme Categories
- 2) Goals
- 3) Performance Factors
- 4) Measurements
- 5) Weighting

Part 2: Goals

The foundation of the Central Virginia MPO's project evaluation process was set by the ten transportation goals that were developed in the Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan 2035 Update. These included:

- Make it Flow
- Make it Accessible
- Make it Safe
- Promote Vitality
- Sustain Quality
- Make it Function
- Make it Efficient
- Coordinate Investments
- Balance Priorities
- Leverage Funding

In this update, these goals are being reviewed in meetings with the public and MPO representatives to determine which are most important to the region. The list of goals is not expected to change through the planning process, but may do so if it is determined to be necessary.

Part 3: Vision Themes

Phase I: Four Original Themes

The goals listed in Part 2 were categorized into four broad vision themes that were derived from the Vision Statement of the Long Range Transportation Plan 2035 Update. These themes included:

Goals
*Originally presented to Central
Virginia MPO TTC on May 8,
2014*

Vision Themes
*Originally presented to Central
Virginia MPO TTC on May 8,
2014*

- Mobility and Accessibility
- Safety
- Economy
- Community and Nature

Phase II: VDOT/CTB Transportation Goals

In 2005, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) developed a prioritization tool to analyze statewide interstate and primary highway projects. Recently, the VDOT Lynchburg District Office adapted the tool for use in their rural long range plan. Although the state is still in the process of developing an official prioritization tool, this example reflects many of the ideas and goals that are likely to be used in the development process.

This study's original prioritization matrix shared many close similarities to the prior VDOT/CTB matrix. One difference between the two was the addition of a fifth category theme in the VDOT tool, which was described as "Preserve the existing transportation system and promote efficient system management."

This category, which was added to this study's evaluation matrix and given the title of "Operational Efficiency," has been used to capture objectives previously included in "Economy" and "Mobility and Accessibility." It was the opinion of the study team that this new category provided a helpful distinction between some of the objectives that further clarifies the evaluation process.

Part 4: Performance Factors

Mobility and Accessibility

Current Performance Factors:

Auto Congestion- Added as a more precise measurement of "Improved Traffic Flow." Measures predicted 2040 traffic volumes, compared to roadway capacity. Standard traffic engineering measurement. Used in VDOT/CTB prioritization tool. (Related Goal: Make it Flow)

Traffic Volume- Added as a more precise measurement of "Improved Traffic Flow." Measures the number of vehicles per

Vision Themes: Phase II
*Presented to Central Virginia
 MPO TTC on August 28, 2014
 for consistency with state
 methodology*

Performance Factors
*Originally presented to Central
 Virginia MPO TTC on May 8,
 2014*

hour, per lane, on a given roadway. Standard VDOT measurement. Used in VDOT/CTB prioritization tool. (Related Goal: Make it Flow)

Freight Volume- Originally entitled, “Capacity and Reliability of Freight.” Measures the percentage of truck traffic on a roadway. Standard traffic engineering measurement. Used in VDOT/CTB prioritization tool (Related Goal: Make it Flow)

Alternative Transportation Facilities- Modified from “Supports Alternative Modes of Transportation.” Accounts for the addition of facilities supporting alternative modes of transportation. Used in VDOT/CTB prioritization tool. (Related Goal: Make it Accessible)

Eliminated Performance Factors:

Improved Traffic Flow- This evaluation element was eliminated in favor of more precise measurements of traffic congestion and weighted traffic flow.

Region-Wide Delay- This evaluation element was eliminated due to modeling limitations.

Safety

Current Performance Factors

Traffic Accident Rate- Originally entitled, “Addresses an Existing Safety Deficiency.” Identifies high accident locations in the region. VDOT data. (Related Goal: Make it Safe)

General Safety Improvements- Originally entitled, “Specifically Improves Roadway Safety.” Acknowledges road improvement projects specifically designed to improve safety, as described in the Virginia State Highway Safety Plan. (Related Goal: Make it Safe)

Eliminated Performance Factors:

None

Economy

Current Performance Factors:

Impact on Economic Development- Adapted from “Access to Markets and Labor.” Acknowledges projects that have been

recommended by state and regional economic development plans. (Related Goal: Promotes Vitality)

Commuter Use- Adapted from “Access to Markets and Labor.” Identifies relation of project to corridors that have been identified as primary regional commuter corridors. (Related Goal: Promotes Vitality)

Surrounding Employment Density- Adapted from “Access to Markets and Labor.” Measures the density of employment in the area surrounding a proposed project, as reported by the US Census. (Related Goal: Promotes Vitality)

Eliminated Performance Factors:

Access to Markets and Labor- Eliminated in favor of the more precise measurements currently in use.

Community and Nature

Current Performance Factors:

Major Environmental Concern- Originally entitled, “Impact on Sensitive Environmental Areas.” Identifies the proximity of a project to sensitive environmental areas. Used in VDOT/CTB prioritization tool. (Related Goal: Sustain Quality)

Right of Way Needs- The amount of additional right of way needed to be acquired to complete the project. Large amounts of new right of way acquisition can have a negative effect on both the community, due to the loss of private property, and on nature, due to development on previous undeveloped land. Used in VDOT/CTB prioritization tool. (Related Goal: Sustain Quality)

Roadway Aesthetics- Acknowledges projects specifically intended to improve corridor appearance to promote economic development or quality of life enhancements. (Related Goal: Sustain Quality)

Eliminated Performance Factors:

Impact on Quality of Life Factors: This evaluation factor was eliminated due to the wide range of opinions regarding what qualities produce a high quality of life.

Operational Efficiency

Current Performance Factors:

Recurring Maintenance Problems- Originally entitled, “Severe pavement or bridge condition deficiency.” Identifies roadways that require frequent maintenance due to deficient roadway or pavement design. (Related Goal: Make it Function)

Road Functional Class- Adapted from, “System Operation and Management.” Rates a corridor according to its VDOT functional categorization. Higher roadway classes understood to play a greater role in overall system operation. (Related Goal: Make it Efficient)

Coordination with State, Regional, and Local Plans- Identifies road projects that have been cited in multiple planning documents. These plans include:

- Virginia 2012-2016 Strategic Highway Safety Plan
- Virginia Statewide Multimodal Freight Study, Phase II
- Virginia Surface Transportation Plan 2035
- VTrans2035 Update
- Region 2000 Park and Ride Lot Location Study
- Commuter Services Study
- Greater Lynchburg Transit Company Transit Development Plan
- Region 2000 Bicycle Plan
- Region 2000 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy
- Region 2000 Coordinated Human Service Mobility Plan
- Region 2000 Greenways, Blueways, and Trails Plan: 2012 Connection Vision
- Region 2000 2035 Rural Long Range Transportation Plan
- Amherst County Comprehensive Plan
- Town of Amherst 2009 Comprehensive Plan
- Bedford County 2025 Comprehensive Plan
- Campbell County Comprehensive Plan
- City of Lynchburg Comprehensive Plan

(Related Goal: Coordinate Investments)

Distribution of Benefits- Originally entitled, “Equal Benefits for Multiple Communities.” Identifies projects that provide benefits

for multiple jurisdictions in the region. (Related Goal: Balance Priorities)

Eliminated Performance Factors:

Leverages new sources of transportation funds- Eliminated due to the indeterminate funding sources available to most proposed projects.

Part 5: Scoring Method

Phase I: High, Medium, and Low

Due to the broad range of elements that are measured in these processes, it was necessary to also develop a common scoring scale that could be used across every category. Many MPOs, including Washington DC's National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board, employ a three level scale based on how well a project advances the region's desired outcomes. Those that strongly advance them receive a "high" score, those that somewhat advance them receive a "medium" score, and those that advance them little or not at all receive a "low" score.

The original scoring system designed to award three points for a high score, two points for a medium score, and one point for a low score.

Phase II: The 0-100 Point Scale

Feedback indicated that the original scoring scale, which produced a range of scores from 1-3, was too narrow to clearly demonstrate the differences between two projects. In order to accomplish this, it was suggested that the projects be rated on a 100 point scale. In this new method, a high score is given 100 points, medium scores given 66.7 points, and low scores given 33.3 points.

Part 6: Weighting Strategy

Phase I: Reasonable Estimation

An educated estimate of the appropriate weight of each evaluation element was assigned by the study team. Feedback

Scoring Method

Originally presented to Central Virginia MPO TTC on May 8, 2014

Scoring Method: Phase II

Presented to Central Virginia MPO TTC on August 14, 2014, in response to feedback from July 2 TTC Meeting

Weighting Strategy

Originally presented to Central Virginia MPO TTC on July 2, 2014

indicated that these weights should be set as equal until more extensive committee and public feedback.

Phase II: Equal Weight for Measurements

An equal weight was assigned to each evaluation element. This method, however, resulted in a greater importance to goals that had a greater number of established measurements with no regard for the overall importance of each goal category. (For example, “Mobility and Accessibility” was effectively 7 times more important than safety, simply because the original method used seven mobility measurements to only one safety measurement. In reality, the relative importance of both goals is likely to be very similar.)

Phase III: Equal Weight for Goals

Rather than assigning an equal weight to each evaluation element, the weighting division was performed among the five broader vision themes. Each vision theme was given relative weight of 20%.

Phase IV: TTC Weighting Exercise

On August 28th, 2014, the Transportation Technical Committee held a special meeting to determine the relative weight of the five vision themes. Economy and Safety were assigned the highest importance (25% each), followed by Mobility & Accessibility (20%), followed by Operational Efficiency and Community & Nature (15% each).

Phase V: Rating Performance Factors, Part I

On September 11, 2014, an exercise was completed by the TTC to help determine the relative importance of the performance factors used to rate each project in the Vision Themes of “Mobility and Accessibility” and “Safety.” The results are listed below:

Mobility and Accessibility Factors: Congestion (37%), Traffic Volume (23%), Freight Volume (20%), Alternative Modes (20%)

Safety Factors: Existing Safety Concern (61%), General Safety Improvement (39%)

Weighting: Phase II

Presented to Central Virginia MPO Board on July 17, 2014 in response to feedback from July 2 TTC meeting

Weighting: Phase III

Presented to Central Virginia MPO TTC on August 14, 2014 for consistency with VDOT approach

Weighting: Phase IV

Presented to Central Virginia MPO TTC on September 11, 2014 in response to results from August 28 meeting

Weighting: Phase V

Exercise completed by the Central Virginia MPO TTC on September 11, 2014. Results reported to TTC on October 10, 2014.

Phase VI: Rating Performance Factors, Part II

On October 9, 2014 an exercise was completed by the TTC to help determine the relative importance of the performance factors used to rate each project in the Vision Themes of “Economy,” “Community and Nature,” and “Efficiency.” The results are listed below:

Economy Factors: Primary Commuter Corridor (44%), Located in High Density Employment Area (31%), Identified Major Economic Corridor (25%)

Community and Nature Factors: Remains within existing right of way (40%), Avoids Major Environmental Concerns (30%), Adds aesthetic/landscaping improvements (30%)

Efficiency Factors: Experiences Recurring Maintenance Problems (32%), Provides direct benefits to multiple communities (31%), Coordinates with Other Existing Plans (27%), VDOT Functional Roadway Classification (10%)

Weighting: Phase VI
Exercise completed by the Central Virginia MPO TTC on October 10, 2014.

Part 7: Scoring Factors

Phase I: Benefit Analysis

The score produced by the original project benefit evaluation matrix only reflected the beneficial outcomes of the proposed project. Feedback expressed concern that this failed to account for the cost or viability of the projects. As a result, large projects that were unlikely to be built could be given consideration over smaller projects that could easily be completed.

Scoring Factors
Originally presented to Central Virginia MPO TTC on July 2, 2014

Phase II: Benefit/Cost Analysis

One of the primary obstacles to a project’s completion is cost. In order to account for this, the project benefit score was divided by the estimated cost (in millions of dollars) to produce a Benefit/Cost score. This score reflected the relative amount of benefit gained per million dollars of cost. The resulting scoring strongly favored low-cost projects, no matter how limited their overall benefit.

Scoring Factors: Phase II
Presented to Central Virginia MPO TTC on August 14, 2014 in response to email feedback

Phase III: Benefit/(Cost per User) Analysis

The Project Benefit Score was divided by the estimated cost per user. This score was intended to give more favor to projects

Scoring Factors: Phase III
Calculated in response to feedback from August 14 TTC meeting

that were both cost effective and served large numbers of users. The resulting scores, however, indicated that road traffic volume became the dominant determining factor, regardless of project benefit.

Phase IV: Cost and User Point System

Point values were assigned to both project costs and road traffic volume and added or subtracted to the original benefit score. Using the same scoring system developed for the 2030 Long Range Transportation Plan Update, one point was subtracted for every \$2.5 million in project cost, while one point was added for every 2,000 expected vehicles. This method allowed these factors to have an influence without becoming the sole determining factor. Feedback expressed concern, however, that 2,000 vehicles and \$2.5 million dollars were arbitrary figures and could not reasonably be given a point value.

Phase V: Separate Columns for Benefit Score, Cost, Users, Project Readiness

A project evaluation table was developed that lists the benefit evaluation score, cost, cost per user, and project readiness for each project. This method eliminates the need to determine an appropriate point value for cost, users, and readiness, while still allowing decision makers to clearly consider each. Feedback requested additional research into the approach used by other MPOs to acknowledge project cost and readiness.

Phase VI: Three Factor Evaluation Method

Small refinements were made to the evaluation table produced in Phase V to enhance the clarity of the information and to have consistency with the approach used by other MPOs in Virginia. Each project is evaluated in three ways. The first evaluation, Project Benefit, measures how well the project advances the region's transportation goals. Each project is scored on a 1-100 point scale. The second evaluation, Project Readiness, measures the viability of the project in terms of environmental screenings, right of way acquisition, and continuity with previous efforts. Projects are rated on a High, Medium, Low scale. Finally, the third evaluation, Benefit/Cost, measures the benefit of the project relative to the cost per user. Projects are rated on a High, Medium, Low scale.

Scoring Factors: Phase IV

Presented to Central Virginia MPO TTC on August 28, 2014 for consideration due to study team concerns

Scoring Factors: Phase V

Presented to Central Virginia MPO TTC on September 11, 2014 in response to feedback from August 28 meeting

Scoring Factors: Phase VI

Presented to Central Virginia MPO TTC on October 9, 2014 in response to evaluation requested in September 11 TTC meeting.

CVLRTP 2040 - SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS AND DELIVERABLES 2014: Past Meetings														
MEETING TENTATIVE DATE PURPOSE / FOCUS OF MEETING GENERAL AGENDA SCOPE TASK(s) DELIVERABLES TO REVIEW KEY DECISIONS NEEDED FROM MEETING	MARCH		APRIL		MAY		JUNE		JULY		AUGUST		SEPTEMBER	
	TTC 1	MPO Board 1	TTC 2	TTC 3	TTC 4	TTC 5	MPO Board 2	TTC 6	TTC 7	TTC 8	Community Outreach 1			
	March 13 Project Kick Off and Review Scope / Schedule													
	Project Overview - Review Public Participation Plan - Review CEDS process and Stakeholder Groups - Review MPO Data - Review MPO Data	Project Introduction - Review Public Participation Plan - Review CEDS process and Stakeholder Groups - Review MPO Data - Review MPO Data	Technical Data Review - Review Background Plans - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Vision, Goals and Draft Prioritization Framework - Review Current Plans & Project - Review Vision & Goals - Review Draft Prioritization Framework - Review data on state of the system	Project Evaluation Methodology - Review Public Participation Purpose - Review CEDS process and Stakeholder Groups - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Public Outreach Strategy and Evaluation Framework Review - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Values Projects & Refined Prioritization Framework - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Performance Management and Review of Project Evaluation Methodology - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Community Outreach Plan and Work Session Results - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Project Overview & Review Policy Context - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on				
	2, 17, 27 Public Participation Plan - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Project Overview & Review Policy Context - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Technical Data Review - Review Background Plans - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Vision, Goals and Draft Prioritization Framework - Review Current Plans & Project - Review Vision & Goals - Review Draft Prioritization Framework - Review data on state of the system	Project Evaluation Methodology - Review Public Participation Purpose - Review CEDS process and Stakeholder Groups - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Public Outreach Strategy and Evaluation Framework Review - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Values Projects & Refined Prioritization Framework - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Performance Management and Review of Project Evaluation Methodology - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Community Outreach Plan and Work Session Results - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Project Overview & Review Policy Context - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on				

CVLRTP 2040 - SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS AND DELIVERABLES 2014: Upcoming Meetings											
MEETING TENTATIVE DATE PURPOSE / FOCUS OF MEETING GENERAL AGENDA SCOPE TASK(s) DELIVERABLES TO REVIEW KEY DECISIONS NEEDED FROM MEETING	OCTOBER		NOVEMBER		DECEMBER						
	TTC 9	Econ Dev Committee 1	TTC 10	MPO Board 3	TTC 11						
	Additional Projects - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Project Introduction & Review Policy Context - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Recommended Projects & Refined Prioritization Framework - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Applying the Prioritization Framework & Draft Recommended Project List - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on							
	Weighting Performance - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Project Overview - Review CEDS Transportation - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Recommended Projects & Refined Prioritization Framework - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Applying the Prioritization Framework & Draft Recommended Project List - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on							
	List of potential new projects - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Draft Vision Themes and Goals - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	DRAFT Recommended Projects - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Apply model run to compare - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on							
	Input on new projects - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Input on Vision, Goals and Draft - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Affirm refined Policy Framework - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Affirm Draft Project List - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on							

CVLRTP 2040 - SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS AND DELIVERABLES 2015											
MEETING TENTATIVE DATE PURPOSE / FOCUS OF MEETING GENERAL AGENDA SCOPE TASK(s) DELIVERABLES TO REVIEW KEY DECISIONS NEEDED FROM MEETING	JANUARY		FEBRUARY-MARCH		APRIL		MAY - JUNE		JULY		
	TTC 12	MPO Board 4	Community Outreach 2	Agency Outreach	TTC 13	Econ Dev Committee 2	Community Outreach 3	TTC 14	MPO Board 5	TTC 15	MPO Board 5
	Review public meeting and economic development meeting - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Applying the Prioritization Framework & Draft Recommended Project List - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on
	Review public meeting and economic development meeting - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Applying the Prioritization Framework & Draft Recommended Project List - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on
	Review public meeting and economic development meeting - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Applying the Prioritization Framework & Draft Recommended Project List - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on	Review Draft LTP - Review MPO Data on Safety - Review MPO Data on - Review MPO Data on

CVTIP Adjustment / Amendment Requests FY 2015-2018				
Date	Type of Change	UPC	Description	Resolution
5/15/2014	Adoption	NA	The Central Virginia Transportation Improvement Program (CVTIP) FRY2015-2018 has been reformatted from the CVTOP FY2012-2015. Project descriptions and associated funding allocations in the CVTIP FY2015-2018 supercede those in the CVTOP FY2012-2015 as well as any associated adjustments and amendments.	NA
11/20/2014	Proposed Amendment	106533 106537	These amendments to the funding of the Odd Fellows Road Interchange and Greenview Drive Projects are related to Debt Service additions based upon the use of Grant Anticipation Revenue Vehicles (GARVEE) Bonds being used to fund the projects.	NA