

Central Virginia Transportation Technical Committee

Region 2000 Local Government Council

Large Conference Room

828 Main Street, 12th Floor

Thursday, August 14^h, 2014 at 10:30 a.m.

Agenda

1. Call to Order.....Paul Harvey, Chair
2. Approval of the July 10th, 2014 Meeting Minutes.....Paul Harvey, Chair
See attachment 2.
3. Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan Year 2040 Update.....
.....Bob White, Deputy Director
See attachments 3a and 3b.

The Committee will continue its discussion of the Plan update. The attached briefing packet provides the points of discussion and relevant background information. Please review and be ready to discuss.

4. Recommendation to Amend the Central Virginia Transportation Improvement Program Fiscal Years 2012-2015 (CVTIP 2012-2015).....Bob White, Deputy Director
See Attachment 4.

VDOT is requesting an amendment to the CVTIP 2012-1015 relating to the Odd Fellows Road and Greenview Drive projects. This request relates to a change in the procurement practice. A narrative of the requested changes is attached. The CVMPO will act on this matter August 21st. The committee's recommendation is requested.

5. Matters from the Committee.....All
6. Adjournment - Next meeting: September 11th, 2014 at 10:30 am

General Information

- Transportation Technical Committee Statement of Purpose
See attachment GI

Central Virginia Transportation Technical Committee

828 Main Street, 12th Floor
July 10th, 2014 at 10:30 a.m.

MINUTES

URBAN MEMBERS

PRESENT

Doyle Allen.....Bedford County Citizen Representative
Christopher Arabia.....Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
Lee Beaumont.....Liberty University
Don DeBerry.....City of Lynchburg
Paul Harvey.....Campbell County
David Cook for Rick Youngblood.....VDOT-Lynchburg District
Karen Walton.....Greater Lynchburg Transit Company

ABSENT

Jeremy Bryant.....Amherst County
Mark Courtney.....Lynchburg Regional Airport
Michael Gray.....VDOT-Salem District
Jack HobbsTown of Amherst
Kevin Leamy.....Bedford County
Tom Martin.....City of Lynchburg
Richard Metz.....Campbell County Citizen’s Representative

RURAL MEMBERS

PRESENT

Doyle Allen.....Bedford County Citizen Representative
Christopher Arabia.....Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
Paul Harvey.....Campbell County
Johnnie Roark.....Appomattox County
David Cook for Rick Youngblood.....VDOT-Lynchburg District

ABSENT

Jeremy Bryant.....Amherst County
Roxanne Casto.....Town of Appomattox
Michael Gray.....VDOT-Salem District
Kevin Leamy.....Bedford County
Richard Metz.....Campbell County Citizens Representative
Russell Thurston.....Town of Brookneal
Bart Warner.....Bedford City
Dan Witt.....Town of Altavista

OTHERS PRESENT

Philipp Gabathuler.....Local Government Council
Vlad Gavrilovic.....Renaissance Planning Group
Kelly Hitchcock.....Local Government Council
Matt Perkins.....Local Government Council
Matthew Rehnborg.....EP&R
Bob White.....Local Government Council
Bill Wuensch.....EP&R

Minutes

1. Call to Order

Chairman Paul Harvey called the meeting to order at 10:35 am.

2. Approval of the June 12th, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Upon the motion of Doyle Allen to approve the minutes of June 12th, 2014 as presented, seconded by Don DeBerry, the meeting minutes from June 12th, 2014 were approved unanimously.

3. Central Virginia Ling Range Transportation Plan Year 2040 Update

Bob White introduced the project for continued discussion and noted of particular importance for discussion was the project evaluation framework, the schedule for the CVLRTP project noting specifically the community meetings, and mentioned again the MindMixer website.

Bill Wuensch and Vlad Gavrilovic continued the discussion on MindMixer website and other methods of promoting the effort in order to gain as much exposure as possible.

Additionally, Bill and Vlad discussed and presented information regarding the project evaluation framework and discussed with the Committee in detail the criteria for the indicators and the approach to the numbers used in the “weighting” of the objectives. Within this context, a review and discussion followed with the members regarding the vision theme and goal associated with “Community & Nature.” Members discussed the various types of data that could be used providing that certain goals and objectives could be identified.

Committee members discussed how Transit projects fit in to the project evaluation framework.

Also, Matthew Rehnberg of EP&R, along with Bill and Vlad, presented to the group for their discussion and review, a sample project comparison of current projects when data from those projects was inputted in the proposed project evaluation framework.

4. Matters from the Committee

No further matters were brought before the Committee for discussion or form informational purposes.

5. Adjournment

A motion was made by the Committee to adjourn, and with no objections noted, Chairman Harvey adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

Signed: _____ **DRAFT** _____
Paul E. Harvey, Chair



Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan **2040**
Update

August 2014 TTC Meeting Briefing Package



Table of Contents

PART 1 – Mind Mixer Site Setup.....page 2

Action Requested: Review

PART 2 – Project Evaluation Framework...page 4

Action Requested: Review

PART 3 – First Community Meeting.....page 6

Action Requested: Review

PART 4 – Other Items for Consideration....page 9



Briefing Materials

for Transportation Technical Committee Review

August 6, 2014

(In Preparation for the August 14, 2014 TTC Meeting)

PART 1 – MIND MIXER SET UP

In our last TTC meetings this item was discussed at length. We are ready to launch the site pending the determination of the public meeting dates, times and locations and the following logistical details:

- Anticipated launch date: August 18th or 19th (after TTC meeting)
- Facebook page: Same launch date – will need info on public meeting date/time/locations
- E-mail distribution of MindMixer site launch: to be sent out on launch date. Ideally we will have the meeting dates/times in this initial email, however if not then we will include that in the follow-up email two weeks in advance of the meeting. Information about the meetings will be placed on the website as soon as that information is available.
- Separate website for comments outside of the MindMixer site: Same launch date – will need info on public meeting date/time/locations

In preparation for the website launch, the TTC should let us know at the meeting if there



are any other changes needed prior to the launch of this site.

Deliverable: MindMixer website

<i>Document Link:</i>	www.cvlrtp2040.org
<i>Purpose:</i>	This is the draft project website which is intended to provide ongoing interaction and input opportunities for the public throughout the life of the project
<i>TTC Action Requested:</i>	Review and be prepared to offer input in the August TTC meeting. Discussion regarding first public meeting (date/time/place)
<i>Time Frame:</i>	This site will be launched in mid August 2014
<i>Future Steps:</i>	Prepare email “blast” to those on the project contact list. This message will include information regarding the first public meetings. Finalize the “who’s listening” section, and launch the site. Finalize the Topics to be included on the site Finalize the email (contacts) list

Specific Input Needed

Several specific items are needed from TTC members in order to be able to update the site and prepare for the launch:

1. Final contact info of the website administrator and (if applicable) Facebook site administrator for your organization/locality.

We need to post the link for the MindMixer website on the websites of each locality and organization that is part of the MPO.

2. Any final updates to the master contact list for the LRTP.

This is the master list of e-mail and/or street addresses that will be used to send out notices of public meetings and plan announcement for the LRTP. This list will also be used to send out notification when the project website is launched.

3. Updates for names for the “Who’s Listening” Page.



The MindMixer site has a “Who’s Listening” page. Please go to the link and review it. For now, it only lists Bob White, Paul Harvey, and the consultant team members, but typically it should have locality or organization officials in the Region. These are the “face” of the LRTP project and will give the public an idea of who will receive the input that they post on the site. By putting your name and photo on this page, you are not obligated to receive any extra input or respond to any input. You will receive a summary of the total public input received the same as all TTC and MPO Board members. Your name on this page will only establish a presence – a name and face – for those who help shape and guide this project.

PART 2 – PROJECT EVALUATION FRAMEWORK – Methods and Measurements Documentation

A. Introduction & Purpose

The Draft Methods and Measurement document (attached) is intended as an accompaniment to the Draft Project Evaluation Matrix. It has been created to clearly describe the logic used to determine project evaluation ratings and the data sources used to perform the analysis. It is important to note that the Draft Project Evaluation Matrix is an evolving document and will continue to be refined based on public, TTC and MPO Board input. Therefore, the Draft Methods and Measurement document will also need to be updated accordingly. Input from committee members regarding any of the content or approaches described in the document is welcomed and appreciated.



Deliverable: Project Benefit Evaluation Matrix Update

<i>Document Link:</i>	N/A (Attached – “Methods and Measurements”)
<i>Purpose:</i>	This document begins to describe the specific measurements and data sources that will be used to rate each of the projects with the Benefit Evaluation Matrix.
<i>TTC Action Requested:</i>	Review content and call attention to any measurements or data sources that may need to be modified or changed to better serve the evaluation process.
<i>Time Frame:</i>	Ongoing- Final goals, objectives, and measurements will be solidified during the fall meeting series.
<i>Future Steps:</i>	Continue modifications and efforts as needed throughout the TTC, MPO Board, and public meeting process. Finalize methods and measurements before official project rating process Incorporate the “benefit / cost” ratios as the next evaluation step.

B. Specific Input Needed

Specific input and discussion is needed from TTC members in order to be able to continue to refine the Draft Framework. We are not requesting comments in advance, but we would like to engage in a rigorous conversation about the performance criteria and methods of measurement so that we can further refine the suggested process.

At the upcoming TTC meeting additional ranking results will be presented, and benefit to cost ratios will be provided for discussion purposes.



PART 3 – FIRST COMMUNITY MEETINGS

Public Meeting Format

As discussed in the prior TTC meeting, the first round of public meetings will be held in September and the dates/times/locations should be finalized ASAP, by mid Mid-August, prior to the website launch.

The following is a discussion of the logistics and format for the first round of community meetings. These meetings will be held in each of the member localities.

Deliverable:	Community Meetings (first round)
<i>Document Link:</i>	N/A
<i>Purpose:</i>	Refine a plan for conducting a meeting in Amherst, Bedford, Campbell, and Lynchburg, in early/mid September.
<i>TTC Action Requested:</i>	Provide recommendations for location, time, and general meeting logistics.
<i>Time Frame:</i>	Finalize ASAP as needed to create meeting advertisements.
<i>Future Steps:</i>	Advertise for the meetings Develop the meeting agenda and materials Conduct meetings

Input Meetings for the CVLRTP Plan 2040 (series of four public forums)

General Time Frame: 1:30 to 6:30 p.m. (open house format)

The major objectives of this meeting will be to:

- Introduce the project and the process
- Review the objectives, tasks and schedule for completing the Plan
- Review some initial data and analysis about transportation in the region as well as economic data from the CEDS plan



- Identify the major transportation issues and opportunities facing the Region
- Provide input on Vision, Goals and initial Vision list of Projects
- Provide input on Draft Project Benefit Evaluation Matrix

Engage Citizens and Stakeholders at Work Stations

One or two staff or consultants will support each of three work stations. Other staff people will support the sign-in table. The fourth station will be “background info” and will be passive – just have materials for people to peruse.

Each work station will have a table for participants to work at and chat as needed, plus one or two easels as needed. Thus, assuming about six people per table, each station could accommodate about 15 to 20 people at a time. At 20 minutes per station it would take each person one hour to visit all three stations.

Citizens will visit each work station and review data/information and provide input about the subject by writing on flip charts, speaking with facilitators or marking up base maps.

Four work stations:

1. Topic: Issues & Opportunities.

Materials available: Large scale base maps of MPO area plus blow up of the local area.

Exercise: Participants will have colored dots – red for concerns or threats and green for opportunities or assets.

They will be asked to put dots on the map for safety or congestion concerns or needs for improvements or opportunities to be addressed. Facilitators will prompt participants to verbalize the reason for placing the dot and will make sure that each dot is numbered and a note is put on the flipchart with the issue noted for each numbered dot.

2. Topic: Vision and Goals

Materials available: Poster showing Draft Goals and Vision



Exercise 1: What's Missing. Participants will comment on the Vision and Goals and identify any issues or goals that are missing or should be revised

Exercise 2: Rate the Goals. Participants will fill out a survey worksheet asking them to rate the goals in order of importance to them. There will be room to add further goals or considerations and to add general comments on what the goals mean to them.

3. Topic: Draft Project Evaluation Matrix.

Materials available: Poster showing Draft Project Evaluation Matrix AND Poster showing a sample Project Evaluation for 3-4 example projects.

Exercise : What's Missing / What Needs Refinement. Participants will comment on the Draft Project Evaluation Matrix and identify any issues that are missing or should be revised. Participants will be encouraged to write comments on post it notes that will be placed and organized on flipcharts by facilitators.

4. Topic: Background Information.

Materials available:

- Analysis Maps showing Safety and Congestion Inventory Data
- Map of Vision and Constrained Projects from last update
- Summary poster of Economic Data in the Region – from CEDS Plan
- Various “off the shelf” reports, maps, plan drawings, etc. showing various background information – population, business activity, transportation analyses, existing plans, public facilities, economic development initiatives, population forecasts, etc.

No exercise and one staff – just to answer questions.



PART 4 – OTHER ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION

These items are a mix of shorter discussion items that pertain to the LRTP process.

1. Discussion about Transit Investments – where do they fit in the LRTP and how are they to be evaluated?
2. Final list of analysis intersections (Campbell, Amherst, Bedford are pending). Data collection for this effort should begin in September once schools are back in session. Five intersections per locality need to be identified. A list of the prior analysis intersection (prior LRTP) along with the five highest crash rate intersections, per the VDOT database, were provided to the TTC previously.



Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan 2040 Update

Project Benefits Evaluation Matrix Update: Methods and Measurements DRAFT

for Transportation Technical Committee Review

Prepared by EPR, P.C.

August 5, 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VISION THEME: SAFETY•3

GOAL: MAKE IT SAFE•3

Objective: Improves the safety of the transportation system•3

VISION THEME: MOBILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY•3

GOAL: MAKE IT FUNCTION•3

Objective: Improves the state of good repair of the transportation system •3

GOAL: MAKE IT FLOW•4

Objective: Reduce roadway congestion•4

Objective: Reduce delay/ time spent traveling•4

Objective: Improve capacity and reliability of freight•4

GOAL: MAKE IT ACCESSIBLE•5

Objective: Improve access to transit•5

Objective: Improve bicycle facilities•5

Objective: Improve pedestrian transportation•5

VISION THEME: COMMUNITY AND NATURE•6

GOAL: SUSTAIN QUALITY •6

Objective: Support Quality of Life •6

Objective: Support preservation of natural beauty •6

VISION THEME: ECONOMY•7

GOAL: MAKE IT EFFICIENT•7

Objective: Supports efficient system operation and management•7

GOAL: PROMOTE VITALITY•7

Objective: Support growth in jobs and income by promoting regional travel efficiency•7

Objective: Support growth in jobs and income by promoting local travel efficiency•8

GOAL: COORDINATE INVESTMENTS•8

Objective: Ensure coordination with local and state plans•8

GOAL: BALANCE PRIORITIES •9

Objective: Ensure geographic balance between communities•9

GOAL: EXPAND RESOURCES•9

Objective: Leverage new sources of transportation funding •9



VISION THEME: SAFETY

GOAL: MAKE IT SAFE

Objective: Improves the safety of the transportation system

High Score: Project designed to specifically improve system safety and/or address an existing safety deficiency.

- Indicator: Project extent includes one or more top 50 accident intersections or segments

Medium Score: Project will generally result in a safety improvement

- Indicator: Project extent includes one or more accident intersections or segments ranked between 51-100

Low score: Project will have little or no discernible positive effect on safety

- Indicator: Project extent does not include a top 100 accident intersection or road segment.

Measurement Method: The top 100 accident locations for both road segments and intersections are assembled for each of the VDOT districts. The top 100 accident locations for both types in the Lynchburg and Salem region will be mapped and compared to the location of proposed projects.

VISION THEME: MOBILITY AND ACCESSIBILITY

GOAL: MAKE IT FUNCTION

Objective: Improves the state of good repair of the transportation system

High Score: Project improves collector or arterial road that requires high maintenance costs due to deficient pavement or structure design.

- Indicator: Road is classified by VDOT as a collector or arterial road and requires high maintenance costs due to deficient designs.

Medium Score: Project improves local road that requires high maintenance costs due to deficient pavement or structure design.

- Indicator: Road is classified by VDOT as a local road and is identified as requiring high maintenance costs due to deficient designs.

Low score: Project improves a road without a known deficient pavement or structure designs.

- Indicator: Road is not identified as requiring high maintenance costs due to deficient designs.

Measurement Method: Meet with VDOT district maintenance engineer to determine what roads are subject to high maintenance costs due to deficient pavement or structure designs.



GOAL: MAKE IT FLOW

Objective: Reduce roadway congestion

High Score: Project will significantly improve traffic flow

- Indicator: The volume/capacity ratio of the project location is greater than 1.1 and adds vehicular capacity.

Medium Score: Project will moderately improve traffic flow

- Indicator: The volume/capacity ratio of the project location is greater than 0.8 but less than 1.1 and adds vehicular capacity.

Low score: Project will have little or no impact on traffic flow

- Indicator: The volume/capacity ratio of the project location is less than 0.8 or does not add vehicular capacity.

Measurement Method: Every road segment included in the project will be selected from the 2040 regional demand model. The Volume/Capacity ratio will be determined for both AM and PM peak hours. If the project spans multiple road segments, the weighted average of Volume/Capacity will be calculated for the project area. The greater Volume/Capacity ratio of the two peak hour time periods will be used as the project's V/C ratio.

Objective: Reduce delay/ time spent traveling

High Score: Project will significantly reduce region wide delay

- Indicator: To be determined

Medium Score: Project will moderately reduce region wide delay

- Indicator: To be determined

Low score: Project will have little or no impact on region wide delay

- Indicator: To be determined

Measurement Method: A region-wide delay traffic model will be built for the Central Virginia MPO. The model output results will be used to determine project ratings.

Objective: Improve capacity and reliability of freight

High Score: Project will significantly improve freight flow

- Indicator: Project adds capacity to a road that has been identified as a freight corridor in state or local planning documents or has a truck percentage greater than 5%.

Medium Score: Project will moderately improve freight flow

- Indicator: Project adds capacity to a road with a percentage of trucks that is greater than 2% but less than 5%.

Low score: Project will have little or no impact on freight flow

- Indicator: Percentage of trucks is less than 2% or doesn't add vehicle capacity.



Measurement Method: Virginia Department of Transportation Traffic Data will be used to determine the percentage of trucks traveling on each road corridor. Statewide documents including the Virginia Statewide Multimodal Freight Study, the Virginia Surface Transportation Plan 2035, and the VTrans 2035 Update will be used to identify official freight corridors.

GOAL: MAKE IT ACCESSIBLE

Objective: Improve access to transit

High Score: Project significantly supports transit.

- Indicator: Project makes transit-specific improvements on a road with multiple transit routes.

Medium Score: Project moderately supports transit.

- Indicator: Project makes transit-specific improvements on a road with one transit route.

Low score: Project makes little or no improvement to transit.

- Indicator: Project does not improve transit service or is not part of transit route.

Measurement Method: Maps of GLTC Bus Routes will be used to determine how many bus routes use each road.

Objective: Improve bicycle facilities

High Score: Project significantly supports bicycle transportation.

- Indicator: Project adds bicycle facilities to a priority bicycle route.

Medium Score: Project moderately supports bicycle transportation.

- Indicator: Project adds bicycle facilities to a non-priority road.

Low score: Project provides little or no support for bicycle transportation.

- Indicator: Project does not add bicycle facilities.

Measurement Method: The Region 2000 Bicycle Plan will be used to determine which roads have been identified as priority bicycle routes.

Objective: Improve pedestrian transportation

High Score: Project significantly supports pedestrian travel.

- Indicator: Project adds pedestrian facilities where none previously existed.

Medium Score: Project moderately supports pedestrian travel.

- Indicator: Project improves existing pedestrian facilities.



Low score: Project has little or no impact on pedestrian travel.

- Indicator: Project does not add or improve pedestrian facilities.

Measurement Method: A map file documenting the location of existing sidewalks in Region 2000 will be used for this analysis.

VISION THEME: COMMUNITY AND NATURE

GOAL: SUSTAIN QUALITY

Objective: Support Quality of Life

High Score: Project significantly improves quality of life factors

- Indicator: To be determined

Medium Score: Project moderately improves quality of life factors

- Indicator: To be determined

Low score: Project has little or negative impact on quality of life factors

- Indicator: To be determined

Measurement Method: Continued input from MPO meetings and public meetings will be used to determine measurable quality of life factors or alternative quality of life approaches.

Objective: Support preservation of natural beauty

High Score: Project has positive or no impact on sensitive environmental areas

- Indicator: To be determined

Medium Score: Project has moderate impact on sensitive environmental areas

- Indicator: To be determined

Low score: Project has high impact on sensitive environmental areas.

- Indicator: To be determined

Measurement Method: Analysis information is expected to include the location of sensitive natural and social environmental areas. Projects will be measured in terms of their impact on these sensitive areas.



VISION THEME: ECONOMY

GOAL: MAKE IT EFFICIENT

Objective: Supports efficient system operation and management

High Score: Project has significant impact on system operation and management

- Indicator: Project improves traffic flow on an “Expressway” or “Other Principle Arterial” road.

Medium Score: Project has moderate impact on system operation and management

- Indicator: Project improves traffic flow on a “Minor Arterial” road.

Low score: Project has little or no impact on system operation and management

- Indicator: Project improves traffic flow on a “Collector” or “Local” road.

Measurement Method: The Roadway Functional Classification information used by the Virginia Department of Transportation will be used to determine roadway classifications.

GOAL: PROMOTE VITALITY

Objective: Support growth in jobs and income by promoting regional travel efficiency

High Score: Project improves a key economic corridor identified in the Region 2000 CEDS Plan or Virginia Multimodal Freight Plan.

- Indicator: Project corridor is part of a key economic corridor.

Medium Score: Project improves a road that provides direct access to a key economic corridor identified in the Region 2000 CEDS Plan or Virginia Multimodal Freight Plan.

- Indicator: Project corridor provides a direct connection to a key economic corridor.

Low score: Project is not a key economic corridor or does not provide direct access to a key economic corridor as identified in the Region 2000 CEDS plan or Virginia Multimodal Freight Plan.

- Indicator: Project corridor is not part of a key economic corridor and does not provide a direct connection to a key economic corridor.

Measurement Method: A list of key economic corridors that have been identified by the Region 2000 CEDS Plan and Virginia Multimodal Freight Plan will be used to perform this measurement. These corridors include US 460, US 29, and US 501.



Objective: Support growth in jobs and income by promoting local travel efficiency

High Score: Project has a significant impact on improving access to employment centers

- Indicator: Project improves travel efficiency on a primary commuter corridor or adds multimodal accommodations in an area with an employment density greater than 2,560 jobs per square mile (4 jobs per acre or more)

Medium Score: Project has a moderate impact on improving access to employment centers

- Indicator: Project improves travel efficiency on a road that provides direct access to a primary commuter corridor or adds multimodal accommodations in an area with an employment density greater than 640 jobs per square mile, but less than 2,560 jobs per square mile. (1-4 jobs per acre)

Low score: Project has little or no impact on improving access to employment centers.

- Indicator: Project does not improve travel efficiency on a primary commuter corridor or road that provides access to a primary commuter corridor; project adds multimodal accommodations in an area with an employment density less than 640 jobs per square mile. (Less than one job per acre)

Measurement Method: Primary commuter corridors were identified in the 2008 Central Virginia MPO Park and Ride Lot Study. These roads include:

- US 460 Business/ Bypass
- US 29 Business/ Bypass
- Route 501
- US Route 221

Employment Density data is available through the US Census Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics data.

GOAL: COORDINATE INVESTMENTS

Objective: Ensure coordination with local and state plans

High Score: Project has high degree of coordination with local or state plans

- Indicator: Project is specifically cited in three or more state or local plans

Medium Score: Project has a moderate degree of coordination with state or local plans

- Indicator: Project is specifically cited in two state or local plans

Low score: Project is relatively independent of state or local plans

- Indicator: Project is specifically cited in one or zero state or local plans.

Measurement Method: Local and statewide planning documents are reviewed and recommended projects from each recorded.



GOAL: BALANCE PRIORITIES

Objective: Ensure geographic balance between communities

High Score: Project has major benefits for multiple communities

Indicator: Project area extends over multiple jurisdictions or moves a large volume of traffic that will be distributed throughout the region.

Medium Score: Project has secondary benefits for multiple communities

Indicator: Project area is contained in a single jurisdiction but is focused on a roadway that is heavily used by residents of multiple jurisdictions.

Low score: Project primarily benefits one community

Indicator: Project is contained in a single jurisdiction and primarily benefits the residents of that community.

Measurement Method: Project locations will be overlaid on a map showing the political boundaries of the participating jurisdictions.

GOAL: EXPAND RESOURCES

Objective: Leverage new sources of transportation funding

High Score: Project leverages new sources of transportation funding for the region

- Indicator: To be determined

Medium Score: Project uses new sources of transportation funding for the region

- Indicator: To be determined

Low score: Project uses traditional sources of transportation funding for the region

- Indicator: To be determined

Measurement Method: To be determined

Narrative of Changes to Primary Projects section of CVTIP FY12-15 for Consideration at August 21st, 2014 CVMPO Meeting

Existing:

UPC NO	100023		SCOPE	New Construction Roadway		
SYSTEM	Primary	JURISDICTION	Lynchburg	OVERSIGHT	NFO	
PROJECT	LYNCHBURG P3 - ODD FELLOWS/GREENVIEW - VDOT OVERSIGHT			ADMIN BY	VDOT	
DESCRIPTION	FROM: VARIOUS TO: VARIOUS					
PROGRAM NOTE	TIP Amd to update PE & RW based on current estimate and actual oblig's - release an addit'l \$230,737 (STP) FFY13, add \$2,477,902 (STP) FFY14 PE phase; release \$7,108 (EB), add an addit'l \$1,131,226 (STP) FFY13, release \$5,981,389 (STP) FFY14, release \$1,321,304 (ACC-STP) FFY15 RW phase; release \$6,449,128 (STP) FFY15 CN phase. (lco 3/5/14)					
ROUTE/STREET	VARIOUS (0460)			TOTAL COST	\$4,700,000	
	FUND SOURCE	MATCH	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15
PE	Federal - STP/F	(\$101,253)	\$0	(\$1,558,678)	\$2,477,902	\$0
RW	Federal - STP/F	\$938	\$0	\$3,035,228	(\$3,031,476)	\$0
MPO Note						

Proposed:

UPC NO	100023		SCOPE	New Construction Roadway		
SYSTEM	Urban	JURISDICTION	Lynchburg	OVERSIGHT		
PROJECT	LYNCHBURG - ODD FELLOWS/GREENVIEW - D/B DEVELOPMENT			ADMIN BY	VDOT	
DESCRIPTION	FROM: VARIOUS TO: VARIOUS					
PROGRAM NOTE	TIP Amd to release \$2,100,089 (STP/F) FFY14 PE phase; add \$71 (EB) FFY14 CN phase. CM 7-11-14					
ROUTE/STREET	VARIOUS (0460)			TOTAL COST	\$2,600,000	
	FUND SOURCE	MATCH	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15
PE	Federal - STP/F	(\$101,253)	\$0	(\$1,558,678)	\$377,813	\$0
RW	Federal - EB	\$18	\$0	\$0	\$71	\$0
	Federal - STP/F	\$938	\$0	\$2,110,616	(\$2,106,864)	\$0
RW TOTAL		\$956	\$0	\$2,110,616	(\$2,106,793)	\$0
MPO Note						

Narrative of Changes:

- The System description will change from Primary to Urban.
- The Oversight description will change from “NFO (Non Federal Oversight)” to no indication (blank).
- The project title will be changed from “Lynchburg P3 – Odd Fellows/Greenview – VDOT Oversight” to “Lynchburg- Odd Fellows/Greenview – D/B (Design/Build) Development”.
- A program note was added to the project description which reads “TIP Amd (Amendment) to release \$2,100,089 (STP/F—Surface Transportation Planning Funds) FFY14 PE (Preliminary Engineering) phase; add \$71 (EB—Equity Bonds) FFY14 CN (Construction) phase. CM (Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Funds) 7-11-14
- The total cost of the project will be changed from \$4,700,000 to \$2,600,000.
- Federal Equity Bonds (EB) will be added to the funding sources of this project.

Existing:

UPC NO	105515	SCOPE	New Construction Roadway			
SYSTEM	Primary	JURISDICTION	Lynchburg	OVERSIGHT		
PROJECT	LYNCHBURG P3 - ODD FELLOWS/GREENVIEW			ADMIN BY	VDOT	
DESCRIPTION	FROM: VARIOUS TO: VARIOUS					
PROGRAM NOTE	TIP Amd to add \$5,500,000 (NH) FFY14 PE; add \$11,014,000 (NH) & \$35,486,000 (AC-Other) FFY14 CN phase. (lco 3/5/14)					
ROUTE/STREET	VARIOUS (9999)			TOTAL COST	\$52,000,000	
	FUND SOURCE	MATCH	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15
RW	Federal - NH	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,500,000	\$0
CN	Federal - NH	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,014,000	\$0
CN AC	Federal - AC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$35,486,000	\$0
MPO Note						

Proposed:

UPC NO	105515	SCOPE	New Construction Roadway			
SYSTEM	Urban	JURISDICTION	Lynchburg	OVERSIGHT		
PROJECT	RTE 29/460 - D/B INTERCHANGE & EXTENSION (ODD FELLOWS ROAD)			ADMIN BY	VDOT	
DESCRIPTION	FROM: VARIOUS TO: VARIOUS					
PROGRAM NOTE	TIP Amd to release \$5,500,000 (NH) FFY14 and add \$604,940 (AC-OTHER) FFY14 RW phase, release \$11,014,000 (NH) FFY14 and add \$2,177,124 (AC-OTHER) FFY14 CN phase. CM 7-11-14					
ROUTE/STREET	VARIOUS (6029)			TOTAL COST	\$38,268,064	
	FUND SOURCE	MATCH	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15
RW AC	Federal - AC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$604,940	\$0
CN AC	Federal - AC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$37,663,124	\$0
MPO Note						

Narrative of Changes:

- The System description will change from Primary to Urban.
- The Project title will change from “Lynchburg P3 – Odd Fellows/Greenview” to “RTE 29/460- D/B (Design Build) Interchange & Extension (Odd Fellows Road)”. The Greenview element of the project is being broken out as a new project--UPC (106320).
- The program note will change from “TIP Amd to add \$5,500,000 (NH) FFY14 PE; add \$11,014,000 (NH) & \$35,486,000 (AC-Other) FFY14 CN phase. (lco 3/5/14)” to “TIP Amd (Amendment) to release \$5,500,000 (NH-National Highway) FFY14 and add \$604,940 (AC-Other) FFY14 RW phase, release \$11,014,000 (NH) FFY14 and add \$2,177,124 (AC-Other) FFY14 CN phase. CM 7-11-14”
- The Route/Street description will change from “Various (9999)” to “Various (6029)”.
- The total cost of the project will be changed from \$52,000,000 to \$38,268,064.
- Federal NH (National Highway) funds will no longer be part of the project’s funding stream.

New project:

UPC NO	106320	SCOPE	Reconstruction w/ Added Capacity			
SYSTEM	Urban	JURISDICTION	Lynchburg	OVERSIGHT		
PROJECT	UR-6056 - D/B WIDEN FROM 2 TO 4 LANES (GREENVIEW DRIVE)			ADMIN BY	VDOT	
DESCRIPTION	FROM: SC-1541 (HERMITAGE ROAD) TO: 0.220 MILE SOUTH OF UR-6066 (LEESVILLE ROAD) (0.4500 MI)					
PROGRAM NOTE	TIP AMD to add \$470,951 (STP/F) FFY14 RW phase; add \$1,444,704 (STP/F) FFY14, \$2,783,338 (AC-STP) FFY14 and \$11,048,163 (AC-OTHER) FFY14 CN phase. CM 7-11-14					
ROUTE/STREET	GREENVIEW DRIVE (6056)			TOTAL COST	\$16,442,991	
	FUND SOURCE	MATCH	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15
RW	Federal - STP/F	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$470,951	\$0
CN	Federal - STP/F	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,444,704	\$0
CN AC	Federal - AC	\$695,835	\$0	\$0	\$13,831,501	\$0

- This project separates out the Greenview Drive D/B (Design/build) project from the previously named "Lynchburg P3-Odd Fellows/Greenview (UPC- 105515)" project.
- The system description will be Urban and the project will have a \$16,442,291 cost.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE
Approved September 5, 2002

The Central Virginia Transportation Technical Committee (Committee) is responsible for supporting the Central Virginia Metropolitan Planning Organization's (CVMPO) and Region 2000 Regional Commission's transportation policy decision-making efforts.

The Committee provides technical advice in coordinating the federally-mandated "3-C" or continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative, transportation planning and programming process.

The Committee's three principal work efforts are updating the long range transportation plan, updating the transportation improvement program (TIP), and developing the annual unified planning work program. The Committee, in conjunction with its rural colleagues, also develops the annual Rural Transportation Planning Assistance Program Scope of Work. The Committee's intent is to review and comment on TIP projects and work program products.

The Committee acknowledges that the long range transportation plan update is the primary planning document for transportation issues in the Central Virginia region. This planning initiative drives the formulation of the transportation improvement program, as well as the annual work programs.

The Committee further realizes that the long range transportation planning process must identify regional priorities in order to fully influence project funding decisions ultimately exercised by the Commonwealth Transportation Board. The Committee's intent is to recommend priorities and encourage the CVMPO to set these priorities at the regional level.

Because of its importance, the Committee is fully committed to actively being involved in the long range transportation planning process.

In carrying out its responsibilities, the Committee will:

1. Coordinate with local planning departments to ensure an understanding of pertinent local development issues and their impact on the region;
2. Coordinate with nearby MPOs and develop an ongoing dialogue with them;
3. Strive to integrate land use and economic development, as well as transportation considerations, in its planning process;
4. Strive to be proactive as opposed to reactive in problem solving.