

Central Virginia Transportation Technical Committee

Region 2000 Local Government Council

Large Conference Room

828 Main Street, 12th Floor

Lynchburg, Virginia 24504

Thursday, August 28th, 2014 at 10:30 a.m.

Agenda

1. Call to Order.....Paul Harvey, Chair

2. Approval of the August 14th, 2014 Meeting Minutes.....Paul Harvey, Chair
See attachment 2.

3. Central Virginia Long Range Transportation Plan Year 2040 Update.....
.....Bob White, Deputy Director
See attachment 3.

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. Matters from the Committee.....All

5. 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
August 14th, 2014 at 10:30 a.m.

MINUTES

URBAN MEMBERS

PRESENT

Christopher Arabia.....Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
Lee Beaumont.....Liberty University
Jeremy Bryant.....Amherst County
Don DeBerry.....City of Lynchburg
Paul Harvey.....Campbell County
Kevin Leamy.....Bedford County
Tom Martin.....City of Lynchburg
Rick Youngblood.....VDOT-Lynchburg District

ABSENT

Doyle Allen.....Bedford County Citizen Representative
Mark Courtney.....Lynchburg Regional Airport
Michael Gray.....VDOT-Salem District
Jack Hobbs.....Town of Amherst
Richard Metz.....Campbell County Citizen's Representative
Karen Walton.....Greater Lynchburg Transit Company

RURAL MEMBERS

PRESENT

Christopher Arabia.....Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
Jeremy Bryant.....Amherst County
Paul Harvey.....Campbell County
Kevin Leamy.....Bedford County
Johnnie Roark.....Appomattox County
Rick Youngblood.....VDOT-Lynchburg District

ABSENT

Doyle Allen.....Bedford County Citizen Representative
Roxanne Casto.....Town of Appomattox
Michael Gray.....VDOT-Salem District
Richard Metz.....Campbell County Citizens Representative
Russell Thurston.....Town of Brookneal
Bart Warner.....Bedford City
Dan Witt.....Town of Altavista

OTHERS PRESENT

Mike Callahan.....Renaissance Planning Group
David Cook.....VDOT – Lynchburg District
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 am.

2. Approval of the July 10th, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Upon the motion of Don DeBerry to approve the minutes of July 10th, 2014 as presented, seconded by Johnnie Roark, the meeting minutes of July 10th, 2014 were approved unanimously.

3. Central Virginia Ling Range Transportation Plan Year 2040 Update

Bob White introduced the project and spoke to related conversations that he has had with Nick Donohue, Deputy Secretary of Transportation, specifically HB-2 and the state prioritization process. Additionally, he noted that Nick Donohue would be speaking to the Local Government Council at their September 18, 2014 meeting. Members discussed many aspects of the information presented by Bob White. Paul Harvey mentioned that the localities should consider submitting transportation projects as a region in order to increase the likelihood of funding for projects in the region.

Mike Callahan, of Renaissance Planning Group, presented the MindMixer site to the group and reviewed its functionality. Mike received input from the committee members and their suggested changes.

Matthew Rehnborg, of EPR, presented an analysis of the evaluation framework. Matthew demonstrated an example of the effects in ranking that introducing a cost/benefit analysis would have using current transportation projects identified on the current LRTP’s constrained list. Committee members discussed the weighting and other aspects of the evaluation framework.

Bob White suggested that the Committee members meet again in a couple of weeks to continue this discussion on the CVLRTP update.

Bill Wuensch presented the public meeting workshops, their purpose, the proposed set-up and the dates set for these meetings in the City of Lynchburg (Sept 16), Campbell County (Sept 17), Amherst County (Sept 25) and Bedford County (Sept 24).

4. Recommendation to Amend the Central Virginia Transportation Improvement Program Fiscal Years 2012-2015 (CVTIP 2012-2015)

Bob White presented the amendment details and briefly discussed the projects affected. Bob noted that the amendment was related to VDOT moving from a public procurement process to a design-build procurement process and that the Odd Fellows Rd interchange project and related phases and the Greenview Dr. project will become two separate projects.

Upon a motion to recommend the amendment to the CVMPO by Don DeBerry, seconded by Rick Youngblood, the motion to recommend the amendment was approved unanimously.

5. Matters from the Committee

Bob White mentioned that the MPO area enhancement grant applications are due November 1.

Rick Youngblood announced that the VDOT Fall Conference has been scheduled for September 23rd, 2014.

Christopher Arabia announced that Try Transit week is September 15-19, 2014. Chris noted some of the activities, events, and workshops that will be offered to MPOs and PDCs.

6. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Don DeBerry, seconded by Rick Youngblood, and with no objections noted, Chairman Harvey adjourned the meeting at 12:08 p.m.

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



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

August 28th 2014 TTC Meeting

**Agenda and
Sample Weighting Scenarios**



AGENDA

- 10:30 – 10:45 - Briefing on Performance Management
- What others have done
 - Optional approaches
- 10:45 – 10:55 - Review of Revised Draft Evaluation Matrix
- Project Benefits
 - Cost to Benefit Assessment
 - Cost to Benefit per capita Assessment
- 10:55 – 11:10 Applying the Draft Evaluation Matrix to a Sampling of Projects
- 11:10 – 12:00 Interactive Work Session with TTC
- Refinements to the Draft Matrix
 - How this is presented at Public Meetings
- 12:00 Adjourn

Recommended meeting preparation activities:

1. Review 2035 Constrained and Vision Lists. These can be found on the project MindMixer site. Click the “about” link at the top of the page, then look for this text near the bottom of the page “CVLRTP 2035 Summary Map Poster “.

Here is the link to that page -

http://content.mindmixer.com/Live/Projects/cvmpo/files/133302/CVLRTP2035_MapPoster_22x17.pdf?635343987504370000

2. From the 2035 Constrained and Vision lists, Identify which projects you feel might be the top 5 most important projects for the region.



In order to provide examples that can be used in the discussion of the relative importance of the Central Virginia MPO's transportation priorities, fifteen projects that were included in the 2035 Long Range Plan Update have been measured and scored according to five different goal weighting scenarios. The contents of this packet include:

Table 1: Weighting Structure

This page illustrates the weighting structure used to measure each project. It combines the goals and measurements presented in previous meetings with a format that has been utilized by VDOT previously.

The first section lists the five transportation goals and the relative weight of each. In this example, each category is given an equal importance. The fifth goal, "Efficiency," includes performance factors that were previously grouped under "Mobility and Accessibility" or "Economy."

The second section lists the performance factors included in each goal and the relative weight of each within that goal. The factors written in italics have been given a weight of 0% for this exercise due to the fact that their measurements are not yet complete, but are expected to be included in the final evaluation.

Finally, the third section on the page explains the measurements used to account for the number of users and the cost associated with each project.

Table 2: Sample Weighting Approaches

This page shows the relative weights of each goal that were used in the five example weighting scenarios. There are, of course, many other weighting approaches that can be used, but these are intended to provide a diverse range of options that can be used in the discussion to illustrate how the project priority list may be influenced by different approaches.

Table 3: Comparison of Weighting Scenario Results

This table lists the fifteen different projects that were used in this exercise, and shows the final score and rank of each project in the five different weighting scenarios. The list includes 9 projects that were part of the Constrained Plan in the 2035 Update and 6 projects that were part of the Vision Plan in the same update.

Table 4: Sample Project Measurement Sheet

This page shows a sample of one project evaluation, including the measurements and the scores that were associated with each performance factor.

Table 5: Sample Project Scoring Sheet

This page shows a sample of the project scoring sheet with the project on the previous page. This example comes from scenario one, in which all goals are weighted equally.

Table 1: Weighting Structure

Goal	Weight (Sample)
Mobility and Accessibility: Provide a transportation system that facilitates the efficient movement of people and goods	20%
Safety: Provide a safe and secure transportation system	20%
Economy: Retain and increase business and employment opportunities	20%
Community and Nature: Improve the quality of life and protect the environment	20%
Efficiency: Preserve the existing transportation system and promote efficient system management	20%
Total	100%

Goal	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	33%
	B. 2040 Weighted flow rate (passenger car equivalents, per hour, per lane)	0%
	C. Does the recommendation enhance freight movement?	33%
	D1. Does the project make transit-specific improvements?	11%
	D2. Does the project add or improve bicycle facilities?	11%
	D3. Does the project add or improve pedestrian facilities?	11%
	Total	100%
Safety: Provide a safe and secure transportation system	A. Does the project include a top crash segment or intersection?	50%
	B. Does the project involve a safety specific improvement?	50%
	Total	100%
Economy: Retain and increase business and employment opportunities	A. Has the project been identified as a significant economic corridor?	33%
	B. Is the corridor a major commuter corridor?	33%
	C. Is the project in a high-density employment area?	33%
	Total	100%
Community and Nature: Improve the quality of life and protect the environment	A. Are there major environmental issues that would affect project decisions?	0%
	B. Does the project provide designed aesthetic corridor improvements (ie. Streetscaping?)	50%
	C. Is the project likely to stay in the existing right of way?	50%
	Total	100%
Efficiency: Preserve the existing transportation system and promote efficient system management	A. Does the corridor experience recurring maintenance problems?	0%
	B. VDOT Functional Roadway Class	33%
	C. Does the project coordinate with state, regional, and local plans?	33%
	D. Does the project provide benefits to multiple communities?	33%
	Total	100%

Additional Factors

Users Served:	Add one point for every	2,000	daily vehicles.
Project Cost:	Subtract one point for every	\$2,500,000	in project cost.

Table 2: Sample Weighting Approaches

Goal	Relative Weight				
	Scenario 1: All Equal	Scenario 2: Prior VDOT Weighting	Scenario 3: Mobility Priority	Scenario 4: Economy Priority	Scenario 5: Community Priority
Mobility and Accessibility: Provide a transportation system that facilitates the efficient movement of people and goods	20%	29%	30%	25%	15%
Safety: Provide a safe and secure transportation system	20%	23%	20%	15%	25%
Economy: Retain and increase business and employment opportunities	20%	18%	15%	30%	20%
Community and Nature: Improve the quality of life and protect the environment	20%	15%	10%	20%	30%
Efficiency: Preserve the existing transportation system and promote efficient system management	20%	15%	25%	10%	10%

Table 3: Comparison of Weighting Scenario Results

Project	Scenario 1: All Equal		Scenario 2: Prior VDOT Weighting		Scenario 3: Mobility Priority		Scenario 4: Economy Priority		Scenario 5: Community Priority	
	Final Score	Rank	Final Score	Rank	Final Score	Rank	Final Score	Rank	Final Score	Rank
Rt 460/29- Rt 501 (Campbell Ave) to Rt 29 (Monacan Pkwy)	93.31	1	92.42	1	94.42	1	89.42	1	91.64	1
Rt 29- Rt 460 intersection to Rt 24	86.62	2	84.23	2	86.62	2	83.01	2	84.67	2
5th St (Route 163)- Langhorne Rd to Main St	73.70	3	72.75	4	72.22	4	72.40	4	75.55	3
Rt 221 (Lakeside Dr) Intersection- 0.25 MW Rt 501 to 1.15 ME Rt 501	72.35	4	72.97	3	73.46	3	73.47	3	70.69	4
Route 670 (Old Candler's Mountain Road)- Mayflower Dr to Route 460	68.82	5	68.10	5	68.27	5	70.77	5	67.99	5
Midtown Connector- Rt 29 Bus to Int. Memorial/5th	61.99	6	62.77	6	62.18	6	67.92	6	60.51	6
New interchange extending Odd Fellow Road over Rt 29/460	56.14	7	57.03	7	57.81	7	59.76	7	53.09	8
Greenview Dr - Hermitage Rd to 0.22 MS Leesville Rd	54.25	8	52.59	9	54.44	9	51.85	10	53.33	7
Route 622 (Waterlick Road)- Bedford County Corporate Limits to Route 1520 (Rainbow Forest)	53.71	9	53.87	8	56.67	8	51.85	9	50.56	10
Route 682 (Woodys Lake Rd)- Rt 29 Business to Dead End	50.91	10	49.02	11	47.57	12	53.68	8	52.57	9
Route 622 (Waterlick Rd)- Route 811 to Campbell County line	50.16	11	49.32	10	52.01	10	47.75	11	47.57	11
Route 811 (Thomas Jefferson Road)- Route 460 to Route 221	47.08	12	47.85	12	48.56	11	46.15	12	45.78	14
River Walk Tr. Ext- Amherst Co. Greenway- Rt 1005 & Park Entrance to 6,000' downstream	46.56	13	45.12	13	45.82	13	45.08	14	46.93	12
Rt 622 (Lynbrook Rd) over Flat Crk (Rt 683 to Rt 29)	44.46	14	42.46	14	41.32	14	45.95	13	46.32	13
Rt 659 (Union Hill Rd) over Rutledge Crk W of N&S RR Xing to Rt T-606	36.75	15	35.36	15	35.64	15	35.64	15	37.31	15

Legend
2035 Constrained Project
2035 Vision Project

Project Location	Rt 460/29- Rt 501 (Campbell Ave) to Rt 29 (Monacan Pkwy)
Jurisdiction	City of Lynchburg
Project Description	Safety/ Traffic Ops/TSM (Primary)
Length	1.67
AADT	32537
Estimated Cost	\$12,951,000

Goal	Performance Factors	Measurement Results	Goal Score
Mobility and Accessibility: Provide a transportation system that facilitates the efficient movement of people and goods	A. 2040 Volume to Capacity Ratio	V/C = 0.88, improves traffic operation	66.67
	B. 2040 Weighted flow rate (passenger car equivalents, per hour, per lane)	t = 6.54, improves traffic operation	100
	C. Does the recommendation enhance freight movement?	No impact on transit	33.33
	D1. Does the project make transit-specific improvements?	No bicycle improvements	33.33
	D2. Does the project add or improve bicycle facilities? D3. Does the project add or improve pedestrian facilities?	No pedestrian improvements	33.33
Safety: Provide a safe and secure transportation system	A. Does the project include a top crash segment or intersection?	Includes one top 50 accident segment (#22)	100
	B. Does the project involve a safety specific improvement?	Will make specific safety improvements	100
Economy: Retain and increase business and employment opportunities	A. Has the project been identified as a significant economic corridor?	Corridor of Statewide Significance, CEDS Priority	100
	B. Is the corridor a major commuter corridor?	Major commuter corridor	100
	C. Is the project in a high-density employment area?	Low density employment area	33.33
Community and Nature: Improve the quality of life and protect the environment	A. Are there major environmental issues that would affect project decisions?		
	B. Does the project provide designed aesthetic corridor	No designed aesthetic improvements	33.33
	C. Is the project likely to stay in the existing right of way?	Is likely to stay within existing right of way	100
Efficiency: Preserve the existing transportation system and promote efficient system management	A. Does the corridor experience recurring maintenance problems?		
	B. VDOT Functional Roadway Class	Urban Other Principle Arterial	100
	C. Does the project coordinate with state, regional, and local plans?	Identified as a priority in multiple state documents	100
	D. Does the project provide benefits to multiple communities?	Regionally important corridor	100

Project Location	Rt 460/29- Rt 501 (Campbell Ave) to Rt 29 (Monacan Pkwy)
Jurisdiction	City of Lynchburg
Project Description	Safety/ Traffic Ops/ TSM (Primary)
Length	1.67
AADT	32537
Estimated Cost	\$12,951,000

Goal	Performance Factors	Weight Relative to Goal	Score	Weighted Score	Goal Weight	Goal Score
Mobility and Accessibility: Provide a transportation system that facilitates the efficient movement of people and goods	A. 2040 Volume to Capacity Ratio	33%	66.67	22.2		
	B. 2040 Weighted flow rate (passenger car equivalents, per hour, per lane)	0%		0.0		
	C. Does the recommendation enhance freight movement?	33%	100	33.3	20%	13.33
	D1. Does the project make transit-specific improvements?	11%	33.33	3.7		
	D2. Does the project add or improve bicycle facilities?	11%	33.33	3.7		
	D3. Does the project add or improve pedestrian facilities?	11%	33.33	3.7		
	Total		100%		66.7	
Safety: Provide a safe and secure transportation system	A. Does the project include a top crash segment or intersection?	50%	100	50.0	20%	20.00
	B. Does the project involve a safety specific improvement?	50%	100	50.0		
	Total			100.0		
Economy: Retain and increase business and employment opportunities	A. Has the project been identified as a significant economic corridor?	33%	100	33.3	20%	15.56
	B. Is the corridor a major commuter corridor?	33%	100	33.3		
	C. Is the project in a high-density employment area?	33%	33.33	11.1		
	Total			77.8		
Community and Nature: Improve the quality of life and protect the environment	A. Are there major environmental issues that would affect project decisions?	0%		0.0		
	B. Does the project provide designed aesthetic corridor improvements (ie. Streetscaping)?	50%	33.33	16.7	20%	13.33
	C. Is the project likely to stay in the existing right of way?	50%	100	50.0		
	Total			66.7		
Efficiency: Preserve the existing transportation system and promote efficient system management	A. Does the corridor experience recurring maintenance problems?	0%		0.0		
	B. VDOT Functional Roadway Class	33%	100	33.3		
	C. Does the project coordinate with state, regional, and local plans?	33%	100	33.3	20%	20.00
	D. Does the project provide benefits to multiple communities?	33%	100	33.3		
	Total			100.0		
Total Project Benefit Score						82.22
Users Served Bonus						16.27
Project Cost Penalty						5.18
Final Score						93.31

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.