

Central Virginia Transportation Technical Committee

Region 2000 Local Government Council

Large Conference Room

828 Main Street, 12th Floor

Lynchburg, Virginia 24504

Thursday, February 12, 2015 at 10:30 a.m.

Agenda

1. Call to Order.....Paul Harvey, Chair
2. Approval of the January 8, 2015 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. Discussion: FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program and Rural Transportation Planning Assistance Scope of Work.....Bob White, Deputy Director
5. Matters from the Committee.....All
6. Adjournment - Next meeting: March 12, 2015 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
January 8, 2015 at 10:30 a.m.

MINUTES

URBAN MEMBERS

PRESENT

- Christopher Arabia.....Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
- Doyle Allen.....Bedford County Citizen Representative
- Lee Beaumont.....Liberty University
- Don DeBerry.....City of Lynchburg
- Paul Harvey.....Campbell County
- Brad Johnson.....Bedford County
- Richard Metz.....Campbell County Citizen’s Representative

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
- Rick Youngblood.....VDOT-Lynchburg District

RURAL MEMBERS

PRESENT

- Doyle Allen.....Bedford County Citizen Representative
- Christopher Arabia.....Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
- Paul Harvey.....Campbell County
- Brad Johnson.....Bedford County
- Richard Metz.....Campbell County Citizens Representative

ABSENT

- Jeremy Bryant.....Amherst County
- Michael Gray.....VDOT-Salem District
- Johnnie Roark.....Appomattox County
- Russell Thurston.....Town of Brookneal
- Bart Warner.....Bedford City
- Dan Witt.....Town of Altavista
- Rick Youngblood.....VDOT-Lynchburg District

OTHERS PRESENT

Philipp Gabathuler.....Local Government Council
Kelly Hitchcock.....Local Government Council
Matt Perkins.....Local Government Council
Matthew Rehnborg.....EPR
Bob White.....Local Government Council
Bill Wuensch.....EPR

Minutes

1. Call to Order

Chairman Paul Harvey called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m.

2. Approval of the November 6, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Upon the motion of Don DeBerry to approve the minutes of November 6, 2014 as presented, seconded by Doyle Allen, the meeting minutes of November 6, 2014 were approved unanimously.

3. Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan Year 2040 Update

Bob briefed the committee on the status of the project. White noted that recent efforts have revolved around the continuation of the prioritization process and he underscored the importance of this effort. White mentioned that he would like to take a recommendation from the TTC on the effort to the MPO Board in March. White noted that the current local plan update process is tracking with the State process, as expected.

Matthew Rehnborg presented the draft project evaluation results and reviewed and discussed the listing of the projects by benefit scores, by their benefit-cost score, and their readiness score. Also discussed were the environmental screening measurements that were applied to the projects. Rehnborg also reviewed the individual draft project score sheets and noted that they are available on all the projects if any committee member would like to see them.

Bill Wuensch opened discussion to the Committee regarding the seventy five projects that have been evaluated.

4. Initial Discussion: FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program and Rural Transportation Planning Assistance Program Scope of Work

Bob White briefed the Committee on initial thoughts and direction of the FY 2016 Unified Planning Work Program and Rural Transportation Planning Assistance Program Scope of Work. White stated that a few of the main focus areas were completing the update to LRTP, alternative transportation efforts, grant writing, and corridor studies. Additionally, he mentioned continuing to stay active with GLTC.

5. Matters from the Committee

Bob White noted that a meeting was scheduled today regarding HB2.

White mentioned that he had received an email from the State regarding consultant support to localities to help identify development growth areas (urban development areas). White noted that the application to the State is due in late February and that it was worth considering for possible submission.

6. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Richard Metz, seconded by Don DeBerry, and with no objections being heard, Chairman Harvey adjourned the meeting at 10:56 a.m.

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



Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan 2040 Update
February 2015 TTC Meeting Briefing Package



Briefing Materials

for Transportation Technical Committee Review

February 5, 2015

(In Preparation for the February 12, 2015 TTC Meeting)

Table of Contents

Part 1- House Bill 2 Update.....	2
Part 2- Updated Project Evaluation Results.....	6
Part 3- Utilization of Project Results	10



Part 1- House Bill 2 Update

Deliverable: Report: HB2 Update Analysis (pp. 3-5)

<i>Purpose:</i>	To discuss the latest HB2 Update presented by VDOT in January. Special attention is given to the comparison of potential evaluation factors presented in the update to the evaluation process that has been developed by the Central Virginia MPO.
<i>TTC Action Requested:</i>	Review the materials and offer suggestions or questions regarding ways that the region can effectively respond to the updated information.
<i>Future Steps:</i>	The TTC will continue to be updated on any HB2 developments announced by the state.



Report: HB2 Update Analysis

Last month, VDOT gave a presentation to update stakeholders on the development of the HB2 strategies and process. Some of the key points that apply to the Lynchburg Region are provided below:

Project Eligibility

The criteria for project eligibility in the HB2 funding process remains that which was discussed previously: the project must involve a corridor of statewide significance, a regional network facility, or an improvement to promote an urban development area.

The corridors of statewide significance that are identified in the Central Virginia MPO include US 460 and US 29. Regional network eligibility is a broader category, and will focus on projects that facilitate travel within an urbanized area. This will incorporate all projects that are located in the Lynchburg Urban Area.

The Urban Development Area category includes projects that are located within a designated UDA. These projects are intended to be nominated on the local level, however, rather than the regional level.

The current project benefit evaluation results have given high rankings to projects on major corridors in the urbanized area of the Lynchburg MPO. Based on this information, these projects should all be eligible for HB2 funding.

Potential Measures: Factor Areas

VDOT is indicating that projects will be evaluated within five major factor areas: Safety, Congestion Mitigation, Accessibility, Environmental Quality, and Economic Development. They also provided sample factors that are likely to be considered within each category. Using this information, we are able to compare the evaluation matrix that we have developed with these potential factors.

Beginning with the broad “themes” or “factor areas,” both our model and the HB2 model divide performance measurements into five areas. Both models include sections for Safety, Environmental Quality/Community and Nature, and Economy/Economic Development. Unlike our single category for “Mobility and Accessibility,” VDOT indicates that they will divide those topics into two categories: “Congestion Mitigation” and “Accessibility.” Finally, our model includes a category for “Efficiency” that is not specifically included in their factor areas.

The performance measurements in our model all relate directly or indirectly with potential measures identified by VDOT, but there is some difference in the classification of those measures. Freight Support, for example, is considered as part of “Mobility and Accessibility” in our model, but will potentially be part of “Economic Development” in the VDOT model. A graphic summary of these organizational differences is provided below.



Measures: CVLRTP

Mobility and Accessibility				Safety		Economy			Community and Nature			Efficiency			
Congestion Relief	Traffic Volume	Freight Support	Alternative Transportation	Accident Rate	Safety Features	Economic Development	Commuter Support	Employment Centers Support	Avoids Sensitive Environments	Corridor Beautification	Right of Way Sufficiency	Maintenance Needs	State Functional Class	Plan Coordination	Benefit Distribution

Factor Areas: HB2 (per January 8th Presentation)

Safety			Congestion Mitigation			Accessibility		Environmental Quality		Economic Development					
Alternative Transportation	Accident Rate	Safety Features	Congestion Relief	Traffic Volume	State Functional Class	Employment Centers Support	Benefit Distribution	Avoids Sensitive Environments	Right of Way Sufficiency	Freight Support	Economic Development	Commuter Support	Corridor Beautification	Maintenance Needs	Plan Coordination

The organization in the HB2 Factor table is based on language used to describe each factor area in the presentation. A more detailed explanation is provided below.

CVLRTP Measurements	HB2 Update: Factor Areas and Potential Measurements
	Safety
Alternative Transportation	Improves cyclist and pedestrian safety
Accident Rate	High severe injury or fatal crash density (per mile) or rate (per VMT)
Safety Features	Reduces fatal crashes or crashes with injuries; Mitigates conflicts between modes
	Congestion Mitigation
Congestion Relief	High intensity of congestion; Reduce travel in severe congestion
Traffic Volume	Benefits a larger number of users; Increases person-throughput
State Functional Class	Benefits a larger number of users; Increases travel time reliability
	Accessibility
Employment Centers Support	Has good proximity to activity centers; Enhance access to job centers; promotes access to non-work activity centers
Benefit Distribution	Promotes regional connection or connects communities
	Environmental Quality
Avoids Sensitive Environments	Minimizes environmental impacts to natural, cultural resources
Right of Way Sufficiency	Minimizes the need for additional right-of-way acquisition
	Economic Development
Freight Support	Improves movement of freight and goods
Economic Development	Supports local economic development strategies
Commuter Support	Provides access to labor markets
Corridor Beautification	Positively impacts land values
Maintenance Needs	Improves movement of freight and goods; positively impacts land values
Plan Coordination	Supports expected population growth

Missing Factors

There are two primary types of performance measurements that were discussed in this presentation that are not currently addressed by our model.



The first identify projects that are specifically intended to change user travel modes. This is identified as a potential measurement in Congestion Mitigation (“Increases Transit Ridership”, “Reduces number of auto trips, such as diverting auto trips to other modes”) and Safety (“Shifts users to a safer mode of transportation”).

The second are measurements that account for social and environmental justice. These are identified as potential measurements in Environmental Quality (“Supports environmental justice”) and Economic Development (“Supports distressed areas”).



Part 2- Updated Project Evaluation Results

Deliverable: Project Evaluation Results (pp. 7-9)

<i>Purpose:</i>	To review the new list of project evaluation results, which reflects minor changes related to the omission of currently funded projects, as well as the refinement of some project definitions and extents.
<i>TTC Action Requested:</i>	Review of information. Please note that a document including a through breakdown of evaluation results, including individual score sheets for every project, will be delivered electronically along with this memo packet.
<i>Future Steps:</i>	Continue to analyze and refine project evaluation results as necessary and prudent.

*****Please note that a pdf document that includes full project evaluation results, including comparison tables of performance measurement scores and individual score sheets for every project, is included as a separate attachment in the same email that delivered this briefing package.**



#	Jurisdiction	Rte #	Facility Name	From	To	Improvement	Length	Estimated Cost	Benefit Score	Benefit-Cost Rating	Readiness Score
1	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Rt 501 (Candlers Mnt Rd)	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$16,220,000	82.24	High	Low
2	Lynchburg	460/ 29	Richmond Highway	Rt 501 (Campbell Ave)	Rt 29 (Monacan Pkwy)	Safety/Traffic Ops/TSM	1.67	\$19,092,158	81.90	High	Med
3	Lynchburg	501	Lynchburg Expressway	S of Rt 221	Rt 501 (Northwest Expwy)	New 4 lane roadway (one way pairs)	1	\$37,383,000	80.98	High	Low
4	Bedford	221	Forest Rd	Rt 1483 (Cloverhill Blvd)	Rt 621 (Cottontown Rd)	Evaluate and update signal timing	1.6	\$1,000,000	78.80	High	Med
5	Lynchburg	221	Lakeside Dr	Rt 501 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Forest Brook Rd	Widen to 4 lanes	0.9	\$19,211,175	78.23	Med	Low
6	Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 683 (Lawyers Rd)	Terminal Dr	Access Management	1.1	\$2,000,000	77.11	High	Med
7	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Odd Fellows Rd	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$7,320,000	76.79	High	Low
8	Bedford	221	Forest Rd	Rt 1426 (Gristmill Dr)	Rt 126 (Graves Mill Rd)	Access Management	0.2	\$1,000,000	76.34	High	Med
9	Lynchburg	501	Candlers Mountain Rd	Rt 460 (Richmond Hwy)	Rt 29 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Widen to 6 lanes	0.99	\$23,068,000	75.81	High	Low
10	Amherst	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Rt 163 (Amherst St)	Rt 604 (S Coolwell Rd)	Traffic Operations/ Signal Coordination	3.7	\$1,625,500	74.71	High	Med
11	Lynchburg	460/ 29	Richmond Highway	Rt 501 (Campbell Ave)	Rt 29 (Monacan Pkwy)	Widen to 6 lane limited access highway	1.67	\$39,927,900	74.47	Med	Low
12	Campbell/ Lynchburg	460	Richmond Hwy	Rt 622 (Waterlick Rd)	Rt 501 (Campbell Ave)	Increase to 6 lanes	7.1	\$173,356,000	72.31	Med	Low
13	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Kemper St/ Campbell Ave	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$14,900,000	71.41	High	Low
14	Lynchburg	--	Odd Fellows Rd	Rt 460 (Richmond Hwy)	Rt 29 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Roundabouts, bridge replacement, corridor balance	--	\$13,000,000	70.58	Med	Low
15	Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 24	Rt 460	US 29 Corridor Improvements (\$2 million study phase)	4.5	\$150,000,000	70.26	Low	Low
16	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	James St/ Stadium Rd	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$12,220,000	69.32	High	Low
17	Bedford	460	E Lynchburg Salem Trnprk	Rt 668 (Goode Rd)	Rt 811 (Thomas Jefferson)	Construct paved shldr ln and access mgmt	2.8	\$6,000,000	69.30	High	Low
18	Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 738 (English Tavern Rd)	Rt 683 (Lawyers Rd)	Signal and Access Management	0.5	\$1,000,000	68.37	High	Med
19	Lynchburg	501	Lynchburg Expressway	Rt 221 (Lakeside Dr)	Rt 620 (Wiggington Rd)	Widen to 4 lanes	1.3	\$27,652,950	66.27	High	Low
20	Campbell	622	Waterlick Rd	Bedford Corp Limit	Rt 1520 (Rainbow Forest Dr)	Widen to 4 lanes	1.1	\$23,480,500	65.61	Med	Low
21	Lynchburg	670	Old Candlers Mountain Rd	Rt 128 (Mayflower Dr)	Rt 460 (Richmond Hwy)	Widen to 4 lanes	0.7	\$17,283,000	65.53	Med	Low
22	Lynchburg	--	Downtown Streets	--	--	Downtown Complete Streets	3.55	\$50,000,000	64.90	Med	Low
23	Amherst	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Rt 163	--	Reconstruct Interchange	--	\$5,000,000	64.11	High	Low
24	Lynchburg	--	Wards Ferry Rd	Harvard St	--	Construct Roundabout	--	\$1,100,000	64.08	High	Low
25	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Main St/ Church St	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$2,700,000	62.74	High	Low



#	Jurisdiction	Rte #	Facility Name	From	To	Improvement	Length	Estimated Cost	Benefit Score	Benefit-Cost Rating	Readiness Score
26	Bedford	811	Thomas Jefferson Rd	Rt 221 (Forest Rd)	Rt 622 (Waterlick Rd)	Widen to 4 lanes	1.6	\$34,153,000	62.56	Med	Low
27	Lynchburg	501	Campbell Ave	Edmunds St	Florida Ave	Roundabouts, Road Diet, Rail to Trail	1.4	\$6,100,000	60.94	High	Low
28	Lynchburg	163	Memorial Ave	NS Railroad	Langhorne Ave	Reconstruct road and ped, add streetscape	0.4	\$2,000,000	60.48	High	Low
29	Amherst	60	Richmond Highway	Rt 606 W	MPO Boundary	2 lane improvements	2.08	\$14,904,000	59.75	Med	Low
30	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Miller St/Robins Rd	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$200,000	59.34	High	Med
31	Campbell	622	Waterlick Rd	Rt 460 (Timberlake Rd)	Rt 682 (Leesville Rd)	Widen to 4 lanes	1	\$20,889,000	59.34	Med	Low
32	Amherst	163	South Amherst Hwy	Rt 685 (River Rd)	Rt 29 (Bus)	Widen to 4 lanes with bike lane	1.6	\$34,153,000	58.15	Med	Low
33	Bedford	622	Waterlick Rd	Rt 811 (Thomas Jefferson)	Campbell Corp Limits	Widen to 4 lanes	0.9	\$19,211,500	58.06	Med	Low
34	Amherst	130	Elon Rd	NS Railroad Track	Rt 29 (Bus)	Widen to 4 lanes	1.9	\$40,556,500	55.18	Low	Low
35	Amherst	60	Richmond Highway	Rt 29 Bypass	Rt 606 W	2 lane improvements	0.93	\$9,349,000	54.25	Med	Low
36	Campbell	682	Leesville Rd	Lynchburg Corp Limits	Rt 460 (Richmond Hwy)	Widen to 4 lanes	2.1	\$41,663,500	54.23	Med	Low
37	Bedford	501	Boonsboro Rd	Lynchburg Corp Limits	Study Area Boundary	Reconstruct portions as climbing lanes	4.8	--	53.87	Low	Low
38	Amherst	29	Bypass	US 29 Bypass	Rt 663 (Izaak Walton Rd)	New Access Ramps	--	\$10,000,000	53.51	Low	Low
39	Lynchburg	163	5th St	Jackson St	Taylor St	Streetscape Improvements	0.2	\$2,000,000	52.32	High	Low
40	Campbell	726	Mt Athos Rd	Rt 460 (Richmond Hwy)	Babcock and Wilcox	Upgrade existing 2 lane rd	1.9	\$13,614,000	51.78	Med	Low
41	Lynchburg	163	5th St	Taylor St	NS Bridge	Reconstruct road and ped, add streetscape	0.3	\$2,000,000	51.46	High	Low
42	Lynchburg	--	Wards Ferry Rd	Atlanta Ave	--	Add turn lanes	--	\$495,000	51.27	High	Low
43	Bedford	811	Thomas Jefferson Rd	Rt 622 (Waterlick Rd)	Rt 704 (Great Oak Rd)	Widen to 4 lanes	2.3	\$49,095,000	50.51	Low	Low
43	Bedford	811	Thomas Jefferson Rd	Rt 704 (Great Oak Rd)	Rt 460	Widen to 4 lanes	1.2	\$25,615,000	50.51	Med	Low
45	Amherst	682	Woody's Lake Rd	Rt 29 (Bus)	End	Reconstruct Roadway	0.8	\$7,202,500	50.49	Low	Low
46	Campbell	501	Campbell Hwy	Rt 24 (Village Rd)	Rt 680 (Suburban Rd)	Widen to 4 lanes	2.2	\$27,387,500	50.17	Low	Low
47	Amherst	677	Dixie Airport Rd	Rt 699 (Amelon Rd)	Rt 622 (Galts Mill Rd)	Reconstruct 2 lane roadway	1.2	\$10,255,500	48.89	Med	Low
48	Amherst	661	Old Stage Rd	Rt 624 (Sweet Briar Ln)	London Ln	2 lane improvements	0.5	\$2,849,000	48.83	Low	Low
49	Bedford	501	Boonsboro Rd	Rt 647 (Winding Creek Ln)	--	Relocate intersection, construct turn lane	0.3	--	48.72	Low	Low
50	Campbell	681	Sunburst Rd	Rt 460 (Richmond Hwy)	Rt 622 (Waterlick Rd)	Reconstruct 2 lane roadway	2.6	\$21,736,000	48.64	Low	Low
51	Amherst	663	Izaak Walton Rd	Rt 130 (Glade Rd)	Rt 604 (S Coolwell Rd)	Reconstruct 2 lane roadway	4.5	\$25,651,000	48.25	Low	Low
52	Lynchburg	--	New Road	Campbell Ave	Odd Fellows Rd	Construct new roadway	--	\$10,000,000	46.81	Low	Low
53	Bedford	621	Cottontown Rd	Rt 662 (Hooper Rd)	Rt 660 (Hawkins Mill Rd)	Reconstruct 2 lane roadway	1.7	\$12,793,000	46.81	Low	Low
54	Amherst	685	River Rd	Rt 130	NS Railroad Tracks	Reconstruct 2 lane roadway	3.8	\$26,877,000	46.40	Low	Low



#	Jurisdiction	Rte #	Facility Name	From	To	Improvement	Length	Estimated Cost	Benefit Score	Benefit-Cost Rating	Readiness Score
55	Amherst	622	New Wright Shop Rd	Rt 210 (Colony Rd)	Rt 677 (Dixie Airport Rd)	Reconstruct 2 lane roadway	2.3	\$19,657,000	46.06	Low	Low
56	Amherst	--	(new road)	Rt 29 (Bus)	Fernwood Dr	New 2 lane connector road	0.62	\$6,232,000	45.97	Low	Low
57	Campbell	738	English Tavern Rd	Rt 29 (Wards Rd)- South int	Rt 680 (Suburban Rd)	Widen to 24 ft	1.2	\$10,032,000	45.06	Med	Low
58	Amherst	685	River Rd	NS Railroad Tracks	Rt 163	Reconstruct 2 lane roadway	2.5	\$21,459,500	44.90	Low	Low
59	Bedford	623	Turkey Foot Rd	Rt 811 (Thomas Jefferson)	Campbell Corp Limits	Widen pavement to 24 ft	1.2	\$9,030,000	44.02	Low	Low
60	Amherst	210	Colony Rd	Rt 163	Rt 1034	2 lane reconstruction with shoulder	0.3	\$2,815,000	43.80	Med	Low
61	Campbell	738	English Tavern Rd	Rt 680 (Suburban Rd)	Rt 29 (Wards Rd)- North int	Widen to 24 ft	1.6	\$13,376,000	43.56	Med	Low
62	Amherst	795	Winridge Rd	Rt 130	Rt 675	Reconstruct 2 lane roadway	1.25	\$9,429,000	43.31	Low	Low
63	Amherst	652	Cedar Gate Rd	Rt 657	Rt 675	2 lane reconstruction	1.1	\$6,271,000	41.96	Low	Low
63	Bedford	621	Cottontown Rd	Rt 644 (Coffee Rd)	Rt 662 (Hooper Rd)	Reconstruct 2 lane roadway	4	\$28,660,000	41.96	Low	Low
65	Bedford	644	Coffee Rd	Rt 665N (Elk Valley Rd)	Lynchburg Corp Limits	Reconstruct 2 lane roadway	6.3	\$45,140,500	41.35	Low	Low
66	Amherst	675	Winesap Rd	Rt 652	Rt 795	Widen pavement to 22ft	3.1	\$17,671,000	40.46	Low	Low
66	Bedford	622	Everett Rd	Kensington Pkwy	Rt 646 (Gladden Cir)	Reconstruct 2 lane roadway	2	\$14,330,000	40.46	Low	Low
68	Bedford	659	Hawkins Mill Rd	Rt 660 (Old Farm Rd)	Lynchburg Corp Limits	Reconstruct 2 In roadway	1.3	\$9,783,000	39.96	Low	Low
69	Bedford	663	Perrowville Rd	Rt 1431 (Quail Ridge Rd)	Rt 644 (Coffee Rd)	Reconstruct 2 lane roadway	2.1	\$15,047,000	38.47	Low	Low



Part 3- Utilization of Project Results

Deliverable: Report- Utilization of Project Evaluation Results (pp. 11-17)

<i>Purpose:</i>	To begin considering the different methods that the MPO can employ in order to utilize the project evaluation results in the selection of constrained list projects.
<i>TTC Action Requested:</i>	Review information and discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the prioritization methods provided as examples in the report.
<i>Future Steps:</i>	Upon receiving a funding projection from VDOT, the region will be able to utilize its preferred prioritization method to select any potential new projects.



Report: Utilization of Project Evaluation Results

Having evaluated the projects that have been proposed within the MPO, the question becomes how the results will be used to select projects for funding in the next 25 years.

First, the region must account for the projects that it has already committed to fund in its current Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). These projects include the construction of the new interchange at Odd Fellows Rd and US 460, the widening of Greenview Dr at Leesville Rd, and the completion of the Mid-Town Connector.

Following this, the region will determine whether or not they are able to include any other projects on the constrained list based on a forthcoming funding projection from VDOT. In the 2035 LRTP, the projected funding did not allow the region to add any new projects to the constrained list. If the new funding projections do exceed the amount allocated in the TIP, however, the region will need to select additional projects.

One way to do this is to simply select projects in order of their benefit rankings until all the additional money has been used. If, for example, the region is projected to receive an additional \$125,000,000 beyond current project allocations, it would be able to fund the top 9 projects as determined by their benefit scores, which are listed below.

Table 1: Example A- The Allocation of \$125,000,000 According to Project Benefit Score

#	Jurisdiction	Rte #	Facility Name	From	To	Improvement	Length	Estimated Cost	Benefit Score	Benefit-Cost Rating	Readiness Score
1	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Rt 501 (Candlers Mnt Rd)	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$16,220,000	82.24	High	Low
2	Lynchburg	460/29	Richmond Highway	Rt 501 (Campbell Ave)	Rt 29 (Monacan Pkwy)	Safety/Traffic Ops/TSM	1.67	\$19,092,158	81.90	High	Med
3	Lynchburg	501	Lynchburg Expressway	S of Rt 221	Rt 501 (Northwest Expwy)	New 4 lane roadway (one way pairs)	1	\$37,383,000	80.98	High	Low
4	Bedford	221	Forest Rd	Rt 1483 (Cloverhill Blvd)	Rt 621 (Cottontown Rd)	Evaluate and update signal timing	1.6	\$1,000,000	78.80	High	Med
5	Lynchburg	221	Lakeside Dr	Rt 501 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Forest Brook Rd	Widen to 4 lanes	0.9	\$19,211,175	78.23	Med	Low
6	Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 683 (Lawyers Rd)	Terminal Dr	Access Management	1.1	\$2,000,000	77.11	High	Med
7	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Odd Fellows Rd	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$7,320,000	76.79	High	Low
8	Bedford	221	Forest Rd	Rt 1426 (Gristmill Dr)	Rt 126 (Graves Mill Rd)	Access Management	0.2	\$1,000,000	76.34	High	Med
9	Lynchburg	501	Candlers Mountain Rd	Rt 460 (Richmond Hwy)	Rt 29 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Widen to 6 lanes	0.99	\$23,068,000	75.81	High	Low
Total Cost								\$126,294,333			



One potential weakness of this method is the fact that it ascribes a level of precision to the benefit scores that the evaluation system does not realistically have. Although the rating system does produce precise benefit scores, the internal scoring system is based around broad performance measurements (high, medium, and low categories), and not on precise data input. Additionally, it would be generous to assume that the evaluation matrix itself can perfectly capture all the factors that determine the benefits of a project.

What this evaluation system does provide is a transparent measuring tool that can be applied equally to all projects and that reasonably reflects the region's transportation goals. Its results can be used to guide decision makers in the correct direction, but the final funding decisions should still include some discretion on the part of the decision-makers themselves.

Rather than directly prioritizing project funding according to benefit scores, then, the region could consider using the rankings to identify a top tier of projects—all of which have demonstrated a strong consistency with the region's transportation goals. The selection of projects for the constrained list would be limited to that top tier of projects, but would not necessarily follow the order of ranking established by the benefit scores.

As an example, the project results could be divided into high, medium, and low score categories, consistent with the scoring methodology itself, as well as the other evaluation categories. Given that the project benefit scores ranged from 38.47 to 82.24, three equal sized categories (Range: 14.58 points) could be defined as follows:

- Low: 38.47 – 53.05
- Medium: 53.06 – 67.64
- High: 67.65 – 82.23



Table 2: Sample Project Benefit Categories, as Determined by Benefit Score

#	Benefit Score	Benefit Category	#	Benefit Score	Benefit Category	#	Benefit Score	Benefit Category
1	82.24	High	24	64.08	Med	47	48.89	Low
2	81.90	High	25	62.74	Med	48	48.83	Low
3	80.98	High	26	62.56	Med	49	48.72	Low
4	78.80	High	27	60.94	Med	50	48.64	Low
5	78.23	High	28	60.48	Med	51	48.25	Low
6	77.11	High	29	59.75	Med	52	46.81	Low
7	76.79	High	30	59.34	Med	53	46.81	Low
8	76.34	High	31	59.34	Med	54	46.40	Low
9	75.81	High	32	58.15	Med	55	46.06	Low
10	74.71	High	33	58.06	Med	56	45.97	Low
11	74.47	High	34	55.18	Med	57	45.06	Low
12	72.31	High	35	54.25	Med	58	44.90	Low
13	71.41	High	36	54.23	Med	59	44.02	Low
14	70.58	High	37	53.87	Med	60	43.80	Low
15	70.26	High	38	53.51	Med	61	43.56	Low
16	69.32	High	39	52.32	Low	62	43.31	Low
17	69.30	High	40	51.78	Low	63	41.96	Low
18	68.37	High	41	51.46	Low	63	41.96	Low
19	66.27	Med	42	51.27	Low	65	41.35	Low
20	65.61	Med	43	50.51	Low	66	40.46	Low
21	65.53	Med	43	50.51	Low	66	40.46	Low
22	64.90	Med	45	50.49	Low	68	39.96	Low
23	64.11	Med	46	50.17	Low	69	38.47	Low

In this example, all projects that have a score above 67.65 would be considered “high benefit” projects and would be eligible for inclusion on the constrained list. The projects that are included in this category would be the following:



Table 3: Sample High Benefit Project Group

#	Jurisdiction	Rte #	Facility Name	From	To	Improvement	Length	Estimated Cost	Benefit Score	Benefit-Cost Score	Benefit-Cost Rating	Readiness Score
1	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Rt 501 (Candlers Mt Rd)	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$16,220,000	82.24	135.64	High	Low
2	Lynchburg	460/ 29	Richmond Highway	Rt 501 (Campbell Ave)	Rt 29 (Monacan Pkwy)	Safety/Traffic Ops/TSM	1.67	\$19,092,158	81.90	212.06	High	Med
3	Lynchburg	501	Lynchburg Expressway	S of Rt 221	Rt 501 (Northwest Expwy)	New 4 lane roadway (one way pairs)	1	\$37,383,000	80.98	120.62	High	Low
4	Bedford	221	Forest Rd	Rt 1483 (Cloverhill Blvd)	Rt 621 (Cottontown Rd)	Evaluate and update signal timing	1.6	\$1,000,000	78.80	2810.70	High	Med
5	Lynchburg	221	Lakeside Dr	Rt 501 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Forest Brook Rd	Widen to 4 lanes	0.9	\$19,211,175	78.23	71.40	Med	Low
6	Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 683 (Lawyers Rd)	Terminal Dr	Access Management	1.1	\$2,000,000	77.11	1374.10	High	Med
7	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Odd Fellows Rd	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$7,320,000	76.79	214.02	High	Low
8	Bedford	221	Forest Rd	Rt 1426 (Gristmill Dr)	Rt 126 (Graves Mill Rd)	Access Management	0.2	\$1,000,000	76.34	3339.33	High	Med
9	Lynchburg	501	Candlers Mountain Rd	Rt 460 (Richmond Hwy)	Rt 29 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Widen to 6 lanes	0.99	\$23,068,000	75.81	166.03	High	Low
10	Amherst	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Rt 163 (Amherst St)	Rt 604 (S Coolwell Rd)	Traffic Operations/Signal Coordination	3.7	\$1,625,500	74.71	1966.31	High	Med
11	Lynchburg	460/ 29	Richmond Highway	Rt 501 (Campbell Ave)	Rt 29 (Monacan Pkwy)	Widen to 6 lane limited access highway	1.67	\$39,927,900	74.47	92.19	Med	Low
12	Campbell/Lynchburg	460	Richmond Hwy	Rt 622 (Waterlick Rd)	Rt 501 (Campbell Ave)	Increase to 6 lanes	7.1	\$173,356,000	72.31	19.15	Med	Low
13	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Kemper St/Campbell Ave	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$14,900,000	71.41	110.83	High	Low
14	Lynchburg	--	Odd Fellows Rd	Rt 460 (Richmond Hwy)	Rt 29 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Roundabouts, bridge replacement, corridor balance	--	\$13,000,000	70.58	60.92	Med	Low
15	Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 24	Rt 460	US 29 Corridor Improvements (\$2 million study phase)	4.5	\$150,000,000	70.26	15.79	Low	Low
16	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	James St/Stadium Rd	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$12,220,000	69.32	143.80	High	Low
17	Bedford	460	E Lynchburg Salem Trnprk	Rt 668 (Goode Rd)	Rt 811 (Thomas Jefferson)	Construct paved shldr In and access mgmt	2.8	\$6,000,000	69.30	316.46	High	Low
18	Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 738 (English Tavern Rd)	Rt 683 (Lawyers Rd)	Signal and Access Management	0.5	\$1,000,000	68.37	2453.98	High	Med

This group of projects is clearly larger than the region can fund in the next 25 years, but the larger number of projects provides decision makers with some level of flexibility regarding the type, location, and purpose of the projects that they will choose to prioritize.

As an example of this, suppose that the region decided that it wanted to fund a set of projects within this group that would allow the region to maximize the amount of benefit achieved relative to the project cost per user. If so, the region could reorder the high benefit projects according to the project “Benefit-Cost Score,” rather than the “Benefit Score.” If the projects were funded in the order of these new rankings, also to the limit of \$125,000,000 dollars, the following projects would be selected.



Table 4: Example B- The Allocation of \$125,000,000 According to Project Benefit-Cost Score

#	Jurisdiction	Rte #	Facility Name	From	To	Improvement	Length	Estimated Cost	Benefit Score	Benefit-Cost Score	Benefit-Cost Rating	Readiness Score
1	Bedford	221	Forest Rd	Rt 1426 (Gristmill Dr)	Rt 126 (Graves Mill Rd)	Access Management	0.2	\$1,000,000	76.34	3339.33	High	Med
2	Bedford	221	Forest Rd	Rt 1483 (Cloverhill Blvd)	Rt 621 (Cottontown Rd)	Evaluate and update signal timing	1.6	\$1,000,000	78.80	2810.70	High	Med
3	Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 738 (English Tavern Rd)	Rt 683 (Lawyers Rd)	Signal and Access Management	0.5	\$1,000,000	68.37	2453.98	High	Med
4	Amherst	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Rt 163 (Amherst St)	Rt 604 (S Coolwell Rd)	Traffic Operations/Signal Coordination	3.7	\$1,625,500	74.71	1966.31	High	Med
5	Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 683 (Lawyers Rd)	Terminal Dr	Access Management	1.1	\$2,000,000	77.11	1374.10	High	Med
6	Bedford	460	E Lynchburg Salem Trnkp	Rt 668 (Goode Rd)	Rt 811 (Thomas Jefferson)	Construct paved shldr In and access mgmt	2.8	\$6,000,000	69.30	316.46	High	Low
7	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Odd Fellows Rd	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$7,320,000	76.79	214.02	High	Low
8	Lynchburg	460/29	Richmond Highway	Rt 501 (Campbell Ave)	Rt 29 (Monacan Pkwy)	Safety/Traffic Ops/TSM	1.67	\$19,092,158	81.90	212.06	High	Med
9	Lynchburg	501	Candlers Mountain Rd	Rt 460 (Richmond Hwy)	Rt 29 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Widen to 6 lanes	0.99	\$23,068,000	75.81	166.03	High	Low
10	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	James St/ Stadium Rd	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$12,220,000	69.32	143.80	High	Low
11	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Rt 501 (Candlers Mnt Rd)	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$16,220,000	82.24	135.64	High	Low
12	Lynchburg	501	Lynchburg Expressway	S of Rt 221	Rt 501 (Northwest Expwy)	New 4 lane roadway (one way pairs)	1	\$37,383,000	80.98	120.62	High	Low
Total Cost								\$127,928,658				

As a third alternative, the high benefit projects could be ranked first in order of readiness, and then in order of benefit score within each readiness score category. Funded to \$125,000,000, the constrained list would include the projects shown in Table 5 on the following page.



Table 5: Example C- The Allocation of \$125,000,000 According to Project Readiness

#	Jurisdiction	Rte #	Facility Name	From	To	Improvement	Length	Estimated Cost	Benefit Score	Benefit-Cost Score	Benefit-Cost Rating	Readiness Score
1	Lynchburg	460/ 29	Richmond Highway	Rt 501 (Campbell Ave)	Rt 29 (Monacan Pkwy)	Safety/Traffic Ops/TSM	1.67	\$19,092,158	81.90	212.06	High	Med
2	Bedford	221	Forest Rd	Rt 1483 (Cloverhill Blvd)	Rt 621 (Cottontown Rd)	Evaluate and update signal timing	1.6	\$1,000,000	78.80	2810.70	High	Med
3	Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 683 (Lawyers Rd)	Terminal Dr	Access Management	1.1	\$2,000,000	77.11	1374.10	High	Med
4	Bedford	221	Forest Rd	Rt 1426 (Gristmill Dr)	Rt 126 (Graves Mill Rd)	Access Management	0.2	\$1,000,000	76.34	3339.33	High	Med
5	Amherst	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Rt 163 (Amherst St)	Rt 604 (S Coolwell Rd)	Traffic Operations/ Signal Coordination	3.7	\$1,625,500	74.71	1966.31	High	Med
6	Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 738 (English Tavern Rd)	Rt 683 (Lawyers Rd)	Signal and Access Management	0.5	\$1,000,000	68.37	2453.98	High	Med
7	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Rt 501 (Candlers Mint Rd)	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$16,220,000	82.24	135.64	High	Low
8	Lynchburg	501	Lynchburg Expressway	S of Rt 221	Rt 501 (Northwest Expwy)	New 4 lane roadway (one way pairs)	1	\$37,383,000	80.98	120.62	High	Low
9	Lynchburg	221	Lakeside Dr	Rt 501 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Forest Brook Rd	Widen to 4 lanes	0.9	\$19,211,175	78.23	71.40	Med	Low
10	Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Odd Fellows Rd	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$7,320,000	76.79	214.02	High	Low
11	Lynchburg	501	Candlers Mountain Rd	Rt 460 (Richmond Hwy)	Rt 29 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Widen to 6 lanes	0.99	\$23,068,000	75.81	166.03	High	Low
Total Cost								\$128,919,833				

A comparison of the funding allocation results among the high benefit projects from Examples A (Table 1), Example B (Table 4), and Example C (Table 5) is shown in Table 6 on the following page. The results are not intended to advocate for a particular approach or set of projects, but rather are a demonstration of the different results that may be achieved through different prioritization strategies.



Table 6: Comparison of Funding Allocation Results for High Benefit Projects in Examples A, B, and C

Jurisdiction	Rte #	Facility Name	From	To	Improvement	Length	Estimated Cost	Example A (Table 1) Ranking	Example B (Table 4) Ranking	Example C (Table 5) Ranking
Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Rt 501 (Candlers Mnt Rd)	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$16,220,000	1	11	7
Lynchburg	460/ 29	Richmond Highway	Rt 501 (Campbell Ave)	Rt 29 (Monacan Pkwy)	Safety/Traffic Ops/TSM	1.67	\$19,092,158	2	8	1
Lynchburg	501	Lynchburg Expressway	S of Rt 221	Rt 501 (Northwest Expwy)	New 4 lane roadway (one way pairs)	1	\$37,383,000	3	12	8
Bedford	221	Forest Rd	Rt 1483 (Cloverhill Blvd)	Rt 621 (Cottontown Rd)	Evaluate and update signal timing	1.6	\$1,000,000	4	2	2
Lynchburg	221	Lakeside Dr	Rt 501 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Forest Brook Rd	Widen to 4 lanes	0.9	\$19,211,175	5	15	9
Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 683 (Lawyers Rd)	Terminal Dr	Access Management	1.1	\$2,000,000	6	5	3
Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Odd Fellows Rd	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$7,320,000	7	7	10
Bedford	221	Forest Rd	Rt 1426 (Gristmill Dr)	Rt 126 (Graves Mill Rd)	Access Management	0.2	\$1,000,000	8	1	4
Lynchburg	501	Candlers Mountain Rd	Rt 460 (Richmond Hwy)	Rt 29 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Widen to 6 lanes	0.99	\$23,068,000	9	9	11
Amherst	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Rt 163 (Amherst St)	Rt 604 (S Coolwell Rd)	Traffic Operations/ Signal Coordination	3.7	\$1,625,500	10	4	5
Lynchburg	460/ 29	Richmond Highway	Rt 501 (Campbell Ave)	Rt 29 (Monacan Pkwy)	Widen to 6 lane limited access highway	1.67	\$39,927,900	11	14	12
Campbell/ Lynchburg	460	Richmond Hwy	Rt 622 (Waterlick Rd)	Rt 501 (Campbell Ave)	Increase to 6 lanes	7.1	\$173,356,000	12	17	13
Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	Kemper St/ Campbell Ave	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$14,900,000	13	13	14
Lynchburg	--	Odd Fellows Rd	Rt 460 (Richmond Hwy)	Rt 29 (Lynchburg Expwy)	Roundabouts, bridge replacement, corridor balance	--	\$13,000,000	14	16	15
Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 24	Rt 460	US 29 Corridor Improvements (\$2 million study phase)	4.5	\$150,000,000	15	18	16
Lynchburg	29	Lynchburg Expressway	James St/ Stadium Rd	--	Improve Interchange	--	\$12,220,000	16	10	17
Bedford	460	E Lynchburg Salem Trnkp	Rt 668 (Goode Rd)	Rt 811 (Thomas Jefferson)	Construct paved shldr In and access mgmt	2.8	\$6,000,000	17	6	18
Campbell	29	Wards Rd	Rt 738 (English Tavern Rd)	Rt 683 (Lawyers Rd)	Signal and Access Management	0.5	\$1,000,000	18	3	6

Key
Fully Funded
Partial Funded
Not Funded

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.