

**FISCAL YEAR 2002**

**JULY 1, 2001 – JUNE 30, 2002**

**UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM**  
**FOR THE**  
**RICHMOND AREA METROPOLITAN**  
**PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

Approved as a Final Report by the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, April 12, 2001.

Prepared by the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission staff through a cooperative process involving the City of Richmond, Counties of Charles City, Chesterfield, Goochland, Hanover, Henrico, New Kent, Powhatan, and the Town of Ashland, the Virginia Department of Transportation, the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation, the Virginia Department of Aviation, the Richmond Metropolitan Authority, the Capital Region Airport Commission, the Greater Richmond Transit Company, the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, and Ridefinders, Inc., on behalf of the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization.

**MPO AMENDMENT ACTIONS**

May 10, 2001 - - MPO action to add new UWP task 2.3, Chesterfield County Public Involvement Media, and to shift \$30,000 in FHWA/PL funds from task 1.1 to new task 2.3.

July 12, 2001 - - MPO action to shift \$5,000 in FHWA/PL funds from task 1.1 to task 1.2 RRPDC consultant.

## RICHMOND AREA MPO PLANNING PRIORITIES

Section 450.314 (a) of the Metropolitan Planning regulations states that TMA designated MPO's shall discuss the planning priorities facing the metropolitan planning area. The following identifies the FY 2002 UWP major planning priorities. Further discussion of these priorities is provided in the various work tasks.

1. Task 1.1, MPO Maintenance/Special Studies - Conduct various administrative and technical activities in support of the MPO process and special studies as needed. Address corrective action issues cited in the FHWA/FTA January 17, 2001 MPO Certification Review Report cover letter.
2. Task 1.2, MPO Citizen Participation - Continuing support for the MPO's Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee, developing effective and useful background information materials on the MPO process, and review of MPO best practices for public participation.
3. Task 2.1, Socioeconomic Data Report – Provide on-going support for development of socioeconomic data for use in various MPO, VDOT, and local plans, studies and reports. Work will also include identification of areas with concentrations of low income and minority populations.
4. Task 2.2, Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) - - Initiate work on the next LRTP update (year 2023 LRTP adopted by the MPO on March 8, 2001). Initial work includes development of draft work scope, initial public review and comments and suggestions, and establishment of the LRTP task force.
5. Task 3.1, Congestion Management System (CMS) - - Initiate work on the next CMS update (previous CMS update adopted by the MPO on March 8, 2001). Initial work includes development of draft work scope, initial public review and comments and suggestions, and establishment of the CMS task force.
6. Task 4.1, Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) - - Maintain current TIP by processing amendments as requested and tracking previous allocations of Regional STP and CMAQ funds, and developing the upcoming TIP. Work on the TIP will include an assessment of the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic groups for investments identified in the TIP.
7. Task 5.2, Elderly and Disabled Transportation Needs and Services - - Continuing support for the MPO's Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee

## FREQUENTLY USED MPO TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<b>MPO</b>	Metropolitan Planning Organization. The Richmond Area MPO's membership includes the following local governments and agencies: Ashland, Charles City, Chesterfield, Goochland, Hanover, Henrico, New Kent, Powhatan, Richmond, CRAC, GRTC, RMA, RRPDC, VDOT, Ridefinders, FHWA, FTA, and VDA; serves as the forum for cooperative transportation decision making in the Richmond area.
<b>NAAQS</b>	National Ambient Air Quality Standards; defined by EPA.
<b>SIP</b>	State Implementation Plan; identifies control measures and process for achieving and maintaining NAAQS; eligible for CMAQ funding.
<b>Study Area</b>	The area projected to become urbanized within the next 20 years; defines the area for MPO plans, programs, and studies.
<b>"3-C" Process</b>	("Continuing, Cooperative and Comprehensive") Language from federal legislation establishing MPOs and used in reference to the regional transportation planning and programming process.
<b>TCM</b>	Transportation Control Measures (for Air Quality Control); eligible for CMAQ funding.
<b>TDM</b>	Traffic Demand Management; various traffic control strategies and measures used in managing highway demand.
<b>TIP</b>	Transportation Improvement Program; a staged, multiyear, intermodal program of transportation projects that is consistent with the transportation plan.
<b>Transportation Plan</b>	The MPO's adopted Long-Range Transportation Plan; serves as the initial step and framework in developing a regionally based network of transportation facilities and services that meets travel needs in the most efficient and effective manner possible.
<b>TAZ (Transportation or Traffic Analysis Zone)</b>	Generally defined as areas of homogeneous activity served by one or two major highways. TAZs serve as the base unit for socioeconomic data characteristics used in various plans and studies.

#### FREQUENTLY USED MPO TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

- Urbanized Area** Term used by the U.S. Census Bureau to designate urban areas. These areas generally contain population densities of at least 1,000 persons per square mile in a continuously built-up area of at least 50,000 persons. Factors such as commercial and industrial development, and other types and forms of urban activity centers are also considered.
- UWP** Unified Work Program; MPO's program of work activities noting planning priorities, assigned staffs, work products, budgets, and funding sources.
- VOC** Volatile Organic Compounds; emissions from cars, power plants, etc; when VOCs react with oxides of nitrogen (NOx) in the presence of heat and sunlight to produce ground level ozone or smog.

#### MPO STANDING COMMITTEES

- CTAC** Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee
- EDAC** Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee
- TAC** Technical Advisory Committee

#### FEDERAL STATE AND REGIONAL AGENCIES

- CRAC** Capital Region Airport Commission
- EPA** Environmental Protection Agency
- FAA** Federal Aviation Administration
- FHWA** Federal Highway Administration
- FRA** Federal Railroad Administration
- FTA** Federal Transit Administration
- GRTC** Greater Richmond Transit Company
- MRAQC** Metropolitan Richmond Air Quality Committee
- Ridefinders** A public nonprofit corporation that provides carpool/vanpool matching and other commuter and transportation services.
- MARAD** Maritime Administration

## FREQUENTLY USED MPO TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<b>RMA</b>	Richmond Metropolitan Authority
<b>RRPDC</b>	Richmond Regional Planning District Commission
<b>USDOT</b>	United States Department of Transportation
<b>VDA</b>	Virginia Department of Aviation
<b>VDEQ</b>	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
<b>VDOT</b>	Virginia Department of Transportation
<b>VDRPT</b>	Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
<b>VTRC</b>	Virginia Transportation Research Council

## FEDERAL LEGISLATION

<b>ADA of 1990</b>	Americans With Disabilities Act
<b>CAAA of 1990</b>	Clean Air Act Amendments
<b>TEA-21</b>	Transportation Equity Act for the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century; signed into law on June 9, 1998. Authorizes federal funds for highways, highway safety, transit, and other surface transportation programs for the next 6 years. Builds on and continues many of the initiatives established in the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991.

## FUNDING PROGRAMS

<b>SPR</b>	State Planning and Research; funds allocated to VDOT in support of MPO program activities.
<b>Local Match</b>	Funds required by recipients of PL and Section 5303 funds for matching federal and state grant funds. Section 5303 and PL funds require a 10% match, with VDOT/VDRPT providing 10% and the remaining 80% provided by the federal source.
<b>PL</b>	Planning funds available from FHWA for MPO program activities.
<b>CMAQ</b>	Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality funds also available for eligible planning activities leading to project implementation.
<b>Section 5303</b>	Planning funds available from the FTA for MPO program activities.
<b>TEIF</b>	Transportation Efficiency Improvement Fund; purpose of program is to reduce traffic congestion by supporting transportation demand

## FREQUENTLY USED MPO TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

management programs designed to reduce use of single occupant vehicles and increase use of high occupancy vehicle modes; operated by the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

### **OTHER TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>ACG</b>	Address Coding Guide
<b>ADT</b>	Average Daily Traffic; used in conjunction with current and projected traffic volumes.
<b>CAO</b>	Chief Administrative Officer
<b>CMS</b>	Congestion Management System
<b>COA</b>	Comprehensive Operational Analysis
<b>CTB</b>	Commonwealth Transportation Board
<b>EJ</b>	Environmental Justice
<b>FY</b>	Fiscal Year (July 1 to June 30).
<b>GIS</b>	Geographic Information System
<b>MSA</b>	Metropolitan Statistical Area. The Richmond/Petersburg MSA includes the cities of Colonial Heights, Hopewell, Petersburg, and Richmond; the counties of Charles City, Chesterfield, Dinwiddie, Goochland, Hanover, Henrico, New Kent, Powhatan, and Prince George; and the Town of Ashland.
<b>NHS</b>	National Highway System
<b>RFP</b>	Request for Proposals; process used for reviewing and selecting proposals for consultant study activities. (Goods and non-professional services)
<b>RFQ</b>	Request for Qualifications (Consultant Services).
<b>SOV</b>	Single Occupant Vehicles
<b>CARE</b>	Community Assisted Ride Enterprise; program operated by GRTC providing demand-response paratransit service for the elderly and disabled in the City of Richmond and Henrico County.
<b>STP</b>	Surface Transportation Program
<b>TDP</b>	Transit Development Program

FREQUENTLY USED MPO TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<b>TMA</b>	Transportation Management Area (i.e. MPO's greater than 200,000 in population).
<b>VMT</b>	Vehicle Miles Traveled

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### FY 2002 UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM WORK TASKS AND BUDGET/FUNDING INFORMATION

<b>I.</b>	<b>TASKS</b>	<b><u>Page(s)</u></b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>MAINTENANCE OF THE MPO</b>	
1.1	MPO Maintenance/Special Studies .....	9-12
1.2	MPO Citizen Participation .....	13-15
1.3	Unified Work Program .....	16-17
1.4	Environmental Justice.....	18-19
<b>2.0</b>	<b>LONG RANGE PLANNING AND SURVEILLANCE</b>	
2.1	Socioeconomic Data Development/GIS Support .....	20-24
2.2	Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update.....	25-28
2.3	Chesterfield County Public Involvement Media .....	29-30
2.4	Chesterfield Co. Transportation Model Update .....	31-32
2.6	Goochland County Centerville Village Plan .....	33-34
2.7	Ashland Area Transportation Plan .....	35-36
2.8	Chesterfield County GIS Thoroughfare Plan Theme Eastern Area.....	37-38
2.9	Richmond Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan .....	39-40
<b>3.0</b>	<b>MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS/SHORT RANGE PLANNING</b>	
3.1	Congestion Management System (CMS) Update.....	41-42
3.2	Charles City and New Kent Counties Access Management Standards Studies .....	43-45
<b>4.0</b>	<b>TRANSPORTATION PROJECT PROGRAMMING</b>	
4.1	Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).....	46-52
<b>5.0</b>	<b>TRANSIT PLANNING</b>	
5.2	Elderly and Disabled Transportation Needs and Services.....	53-54
<b>7.0</b>	<b>AIR QUALITY PLANNING</b>	
7.1	Air Quality Plan and Program Activities.....	55-56
<b>8.0</b>	<b>AIRPORT PLANNING</b>	
8.1	CRAC Intermodal Transportation Facility .....	57-59
<b>II.</b>	<b>BUDGET/FUNDING INFORMATION</b>	
1.	Agency Budget Summary Sheet.....	60
2.	Funding Sources Summary Sheet.....	61

**1.0 MAINTENANCE OF THE MPO**

**1. MPO Maintenance/Special Studies**

**A. Background**

This task provides the administrative and technical support needed to maintain the MPO and MPO process, and provides for special studies and reports as directed by the MPO. Major work activities include program administration (e.g. agendas, minutes, mailing, monthly reports, program management and administration, etc.); PL/Section 5303 grant administration; pass through contracts; participation on advisory committees; special studies and projects; review/comment on pass-through work tasks; federal/state regulations and requirements; federal/state legislation review; training, workshops and conferences; and computer program support.

Under the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991, the MPO's planning and programming responsibilities have been significantly increased and its scope has become broader and more comprehensive. Most of these requirements have been continued as part of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21); signed into law on June 9, 1998. The MPO is charged with developing transportation plans and programs, which provide for the development of transportation facilities which function as a "seamless" intermodal system. The process for developing these plans must consider all modes of transportation, and must, to the maximum extent feasible, be continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive. As a TMA level MPO, the process must also consider the results of the Congestion Management System in the planning and programming of transportation projects.

On September 13 and 14, 2000, the FHWA and FTA conducted the MPO's triennial certification review. The FHWA and FTA issued its report and findings by letter dated January 17, 2001. The letter stated that the MPO is conditionally certified based on the following 5 corrective action issues:

1. The submission of a fully functioning Congestion Management System (CMS).
2. The development and implementation of a mechanism to gauge the effectiveness and appropriateness of current public outreach initiatives.
3. The documentation of current activities in place to assess the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic groups for investments identified in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
4. The development of a work element to assess and create improved strategies for reaching minority and low-income groups through public involvement efforts.
5. The implementation of specific comprehensive Environmental Justice planning activities.

## **FY 02 UWP Task 1.1**

Work to address these corrective action issues was initiated in FY 01 and should be completed in FY 02. Further information on how the MPO will conduct work activities to meet EJ requirements is addressed in UWP task 1.4, Environmental Justice.

Direct costs for all staff UWP tasks (including RRPDC consultant services) are estimated at \$160,900. Staff directs costs for MPO Maintenance are estimated at approximately \$102,500. Legal service is budgeted as a direct cost and includes: review, comment and/or certification for federal and state grant applications, contracts, and third party agreements; advising the MPO on compliance with federal and state requirements; attending MPO meetings; and other activities as directed by staff and the MPO. Direct costs for other staff work tasks may also be charged off to task 1.1.

### **B. End Products**

A well functioning MPO process which involves the MPO as the policy body for transportation planning in the Richmond Area and provides for a multi-modal, continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning and programming process

### **C. Work Elements**

Work activities include the following:

1. Provide for general maintenance and administration of the MPO “3-C” process, MPO, and MPO committees’ structure, including direct costs to support the process.
2. Provide for the preparation and documentation of MPO meetings and other committee and subcommittee meetings as appropriate.
3. Perform review activities under various local, state, and federal programs including Commonwealth Intergovernmental Review Process, State Route projects and Environmental Impact Statements and Assessments.
4. Coordinate review and presentation activities with RRPDC and other regional, local and state agencies involved with transportation planning and programming.
5. Prepare various reports including VDOT and VDRPT Quarterly Progress Reports, and MPO financial and work progress reports.
6. Provide for contract administration of PL, Section 5303, and third party agreements.

## **FY 02 UWP Task 1.1**

7. Participate in work tasks including preparation and/or review and comment on Request for Proposals, consultant review selection, and documentation.
8. Maintain up-to-date information and literature on transportation planning and programming in the Richmond Area.
9. Review and comment as appropriate on legislative and regulatory activities affecting transportation planning and programming, and perform activities necessary to ensure MPO compliance with applicable state and federal rules and regulations.
10. Attend seminars, meetings, workshops, and conferences related to MPO activities. Attend and participate on various VDOT, VDRPT, VTRC, and other advisory committees, task forces, regional and transportation planning associations (VAPDC and VASITE), etc.
11. Collect and update files and reports as necessary, with traffic count information from VDOT, RMA, and local government sources.
12. Staff support for purchase, maintenance, upgrading, and repair of computers. Also, share in attributable costs for support of computer network and support activities.
13. Develop various maps in GIS format for MPO special studies/major projects and presentations.
14. Respond to information requests from area local governments, VDOT, VDRPT, GRTC, and other government agencies.
15. Maintain current highway facilities inventory and monitor regional travel patterns [VDOT].
16. Provide traffic data forecasts for design of highway facilities [VDOT].
17. Provide technical assistance to RRPDC, local jurisdictions, and other agencies concerning transportation [VDOT].
18. Review site plans as requested [VDOT].
19. Perform and/or assist in special projects, studies, evaluations, and other activities upon direction of MPO and MPO Committees.

**D. Agency Participation**

RRPDC, VDOT, VDRPT, Local Governments, GRTC, CRAC, RMA, FHWA, FTA, FRA, EPA, VDEQ, VDA, Ridefinders, Port of Richmond.

**E. Budget, Staff and Funding**

	<u>PL<del> &amp; </del></u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>SPR</u>
RRPDC	\$347,292	\$39,686	---
VDOT	<u>---</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>\$191,000</u>
TOTAL	\$347,292	\$39,686	\$191,000
 <u>TOTAL</u>			
RRPDC	\$386,978		
VDOT	<u>\$191,000</u>		
TOTAL	\$577,978		

NOTES:  5/10/01 MPO action amending UWP and shifting \$30,000 in FHWA/PL funds to new UWP task 2.3.

7/12/01 MPO action amending UWP and shifting \$5,000 in FHWA/PL funds to UWP task 1.2, for RRPDC consultant budget. Current RRPDC staff funds includes \$2,217 to be reprogrammed for pass through work tasks at a later date.

**F. Schedule**

On-going activity.

## 1.2 MPO Citizen Participation

### A. Background

This task provides staff supports to ensure an active and involved citizen participation program, which meets federal and state requirements for public involvement in the transportation planning process. It should be noted that TEA-21 requires a high level of citizen involvement in the MPO process, including public meetings to review the TIP and Transportation Plan documents.

The MPO's current citizen participation process includes the use of two active and involved committees (i.e. CTAC and EDAC); annual public meetings for the TIP and LRTP; posting of MPO/MPO committee meetings and agendas and plan/document summaries on the RRPDC/MPO web site; submitting draft TIP's and other documents as directed by the MPO for public review and making these documents accessible to the public at area local libraries; providing opportunity for open public comment at all regularly scheduled MPO, TAC, CTAC and EDAC meetings; and other activities documented in the MPO's Guidelines for Public Participation Activities and Procedures.

The RRPDC's direct staff costs are estimated at approximately \$18,100 (e.g. advertisements, meal expenses for CTAC meetings, notices, presentation materials and publications costs). In addition, \$20,000 is budgeted for consultant services (contract to be administered directly by RRPDC staff). Note that consultant work will be initiated in late FY 01 with an estimated \$5,000 already spent towards this effort (total of \$25,000 budgeted for consultant services in FY's 01 and 02).

### B. End Products

A functional and viable citizen participation program, which provides for a well informed public and for public input to the "3-C" transportation planning and programming process.

### C. Work Elements

Work activities include the following:

1. Provide staff support for the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC).
2. Respond to public requests concerning the status of transportation projects, traffic data, and information on MPO transportation plans, programs, studies, reports, and data.

## FY 02 UWP Task 1.2

3. Conduct public meetings and other citizen involvement activities for MPO plan and program activities.
4. Maintain and update as necessary the MPO Guidelines for Public Participation Activities and Procedures.
5. Electronic dissemination of articles and information via the RRPDC/MPO web site.
6. Posting of MPO/MPO Committee agendas, meetings minutes (following approval action), notices, reports, newsletters, plan documents and summaries, on the RRPDC/MPO web site.
7. Develop, publish, and distribute background information materials on the MPO “3-C” study process.
8. Prepare and print/post on web site, and make available to CTAC, EDAC, MPO, and the public, a simple to follow guide on the MPO process including the roles and functions of its members.
9. Provide for CTAC review of best practices on obtaining public input for transportation plans and programs, and for CTAC to make recommendations on how to enhance public participation in the MPO process. The RRPDC staff will conduct a consultant review and selection process, to obtain consultant services for this work element. The consultant will assist by identifying best public participation practices from similar sized MPO’s, and providing an analysis of their effectiveness, cost, and other benefits. This review will also address the following corrective action issues identified in the January 17, 2001 FHWA/FTA Certification Review letter:
  - a. The development of proposed mechanisms that can gauge the effectiveness and the appropriateness of public outreach initiatives, including current outreach activities.
  - b. An assessment of various methods and activities of improved strategies for reaching minority and low-income groups through public involvement efforts.

Following MPO review and action on the CTAC recommendations for public input best practices, the MPO’s Guidelines for Public Participation will be revised and submitted for a 45-day public review period (federally mandated review period for proposed changes to the public participation guidelines). Comments received during the review period will be submitted for final MPO review, consideration, and action.

Provide funds for development, printing and distribution of information/printed materials based on findings from the best practices review (direct cost budget of \$10,000).

**D. Agency Participation**

RRPDC, VDOT, VDRPT, Local Governments, GRTC, CRAC, FHWA, FTA, VDEQ, RMA, Ridefinders, CTAC At-Large Organizations.

**E. Budget, Staff and Funding**

	<u>PL<del>2</del></u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>SPR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC Staff	\$62,000	\$20,000	---	\$82,000
RRPDC Consultant	\$25,000	----	---	\$25,000
VDOT	<u>----</u>	<u>----</u>	<u>\$9,000</u>	<u>\$ 9,000</u>
TOTAL	\$87,000	\$20,000	\$9,000	\$119,000

NOTE: ~~7~~7/12/01 MPO action amending UWP shifting \$5,000 from task 1.1 to task 1.2, RRPDC consultant, for a revised RRPDC consultant budget of \$25,000.

**F. Schedule**

On-going activity.

**1.3 Unified Work Program (UWP)**

**A. Background**

This task provides for the maintenance of the adopted UWP and for the annual preparation of the MPO's work program for the upcoming fiscal year (i.e., July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003). The UWP also identifies the region's planning priorities and notes various transportation study activities as informational items.

At the March 1, 2001 TAC meeting, the TAC took action to establish a UWP subcommittee to work with staff to handle initial TAC review of staff costs and proposed work tasks for the FY 2003 UWP. The TAC directed that the UWP Budget Subcommittee meet at least 2 months prior to TAC initiating its review of the draft FY 03 UWP, and that the subcommittee include at least one rural and two urban jurisdictions, GRTC, and others as may be appointed by the TAC Chairman.

**B. End Products**

1. Maintain/amend the FY 2002 UWP.
2. The FY 2003 UWP document.
3. Applications for federal and state transportation planning funds.
4. Prepare/update staff work assignments, and schedule.

**C. Work Elements**

Work activities include the following:

1. Review VDOT, VDRPT, FHWA, FTA, EPA, and other state and federal agency information and requirements, plus other materials relating to UWP preparation.
1. Solicit input for proposed work tasks from the TAC, CTAC, and EDAC.
2. Prepare a preliminary staff budget and list of proposed work tasks for the Commission's annual initial work program (used to determine local dues rates).
4. Meet with TAC UWP budget subcommittee to review proposed RRPDC staff time allocations and work assignments, work tasks, and cost information for the FY 03 UWP.

**FY 02 UWP Task 1.3**

5. Identify and discuss planning priorities.
6. Prepare work tasks and budgets.
7. Identify funding sources and amounts.
8. Prepare final work program document.
9. Secure needed approvals from MPO, VDOT, VDRPT, FHWA, FTA, and other agencies/organizations as appropriate.
10. Secure commitments for local match funds as appropriate.
11. Conduct State and Regional Intergovernmental Review process and submit grant applications.
12. Distribute final UWP document.
13. Amend adopted UWP as per MPO action.
14. Prepare and update staff work assignments, direct costs, and schedule.

**D. Budget, Staff and Funding**

	<u>PL</u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>SPR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$25,000	\$6,500	----	\$31,500
VDOT	<u>----</u>	<u>----</u>	<u>\$8,000</u>	<u>\$ 8,000</u>
TOTAL	\$25,000	\$6,500	\$8,000	\$39,500

**E. Schedule**

On-going activity for adopted UWP.

November 2001 to May 2002 for FY 2003 UWP.

## 1.4 Environmental Justice

### A. Background

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and Executive Order 12898: Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, states that no person or group shall be excluded from participation in or denied the benefits of, any program or activity utilizing federal funds. Increasingly, concerns for compliance with provisions of Title VI and the EJ Orders have been raised by citizens and advocacy groups with regard to broad patterns of transportation investment and impact considered in metropolitan planning. While Title VI and Environmental Justice (EJ) concerns have most often been raised during project development, it is important to recognize that the law also applies equally to the processes and products of planning. As a result, the FTA and FHWA have addressed MPO efforts to comply with Title VI and EJ requirements as part of the MPO's recent Certification Report. In its Certification Review Report letter dated January 17, 2001, the FHWA and FTA cited five corrective action issues, four of which address concerns over the MPO's process for public involvement and EJ planning activities. The five corrective action issues are identified in the FHWA/FTA certification review letter as follows:

1. Submission of a fully functioning Congestion Management System (CMS).
2. The development and implementation of a mechanism to gauge the effectiveness and the appropriateness of current public outreach initiatives.
3. The documentation of current activities in place to assess the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic groups for investments in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
4. The development of a work element to assess and create improved strategies for reaching minority and low-income groups through public involvement efforts.
5. The implementation of specific comprehensive Environmental Justice planning activities.

Note that the MPO took action to adopt the CMS at its March 8, 2001 meeting, addressing corrective action issue 1 noted above. In addition, work has been conducted as part of the year 2023 LRTP to address EJ. Also note that work will be initiated in FY 01 and will be continued as part of the FY 02 UWP to provide for CTAC review of best practices on obtaining public input for transportation plans and programs, and for CTAC to make recommendations on how to enhance public participation in the MPO process. Consultant services will be used in this effort and it will include recommendations to address corrective action issues 2 and 4 above. Work to address corrective action issues 3 and 5 above, and to conduct and supplement other EJ assessment and documentation activities will be conducted as part of this work task. Work to develop a demographic profile of the region's population is included as part of UWP task 2.1. This task includes a work element to identify the location of low-income and minority socioeconomic groups, and to

**FY 02 UWP Task 1.4**

examine regional and local data on car ownership, transit service, highway network, and journey to work patterns. Work to assess the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic (i.e. low-income and minority) groups for investments in the LRTP and TIP will be conducted as part of tasks 2.2 (LRTP) and 4.1 (TIP); however the documentation of the procedures and methods (i.e. the process) will be conducted as part of this UWP work task.

**B. End Products**

Documentation of MPO procedures, methods, and other information required by FHWA and FTA to demonstrate MPO compliance with federal EJ requirements.

**C. Work Elements**

Work elements include the following:

1. Documentation of work conducted as part of UWP task 1.2 for the development and implementation of a mechanism to gauge the effectiveness and appropriateness of current public outreach initiatives (following MPO action to approve and implement recommendation on enhancing the MPO’s public participation process).
2. Documentation of activities and procedures in place to assess the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic groups, including minority and low-income, for investments in the LRTP and TIP.
3. Documentation of work conducted as part of UWP task 1.2 for assessing and creating improved strategies for reaching minority and low income groups through public involvement efforts (following MPO action to approve and implement recommendations on enhancing the MPO’s public participation process).
4. Documentation of other MPO activities and procedures in place providing for specific comprehensive EJ planning activities.

**D. Agency Participation**

RRPDC, VDOT, local government, GRTC, FHWA, FTA.

**E. Budget, Staff and Funding**

	<u>PL</u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$20,000	\$15,000	\$35,000

**F. Schedule**

July 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001.

**2.0 LONG RANGE PLANNING AND SURVEILLANCE**

**2.1 Socioeconomic Data Development/GIS Support**

**A. Background**

As part of the MPO's regional transportation planning process, socioeconomic data is developed by area local governments and RRPDC staff for use in various VDOT, MPO, and local plan and study activities including plan model data input, EIS, corridor studies, air quality conformity analysis, transit studies, responding to information requests for market and other demographic studies, etc. Some local data items are maintained and developed on an annual basis while other data is updated every 3 years. In late FY 01, the staff will assist Charles City and New Kent counties in developing and implementing a socioeconomic data development and maintenance process, so that data from these jurisdictions can be developed and submitted in the same cycle as data submitted from other local governments. A Socioeconomic Data Committee work group made up of local planning staffs has been established. This work group did not hold any meetings in FY 01 as staff had anticipated, however, staff did maintain contact and worked directly with these local staffs on various data development activities. Staff plans to initiate quarterly meetings of this work group in FY 02. With the cycle for the next Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update starting in FY 02, there will be many data and forecast issues that will need to be addressed and discussed by the group. This group should also serve as a useful regional forum for sharing information on year 2000 census data. When detailed census tract information becomes available, local staffs will be able to review and check population counts and housing estimates to locally generated estimates, and make appropriate adjustments. Year 2000 data should serve as the base year for future transportation plans, air quality conformity analysis, and other studies.

Another major work element will be the development of a demographic profile of the region's population. This profile will identify the location of low income and minority population groups, and other important demographic information required for meeting Title VI and Environmental Justice (EJ) requirements. Included will be an examination of regional and local data on car ownership, transit service, highway network and journey-to-work travel patterns.

With the availability of year 2000 census data, the MPO will be required to make adjustments to its urbanized area boundary. The MPO is required to include within its urban study area all of the Richmond urbanized area. Following the 1980 and 1990 census, adjustments were made to the MPO's study area in Chesterfield County where it meets with the Tri-Cities MPO study area boundary. The staff also prepared and submitted locally approved changes to Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ) and development of year 2000 socioeconomic data will be required to be within these new TAZ's. Adjustments were made to TAZ's based on changes in census tract boundaries. This also caused changes in the TAZ numbering sequence.

## **FY 02 UWP Task 2.1**

With the development of 2000 and following year data sets based on these new TAZ's, the staff and area local governments will need to maintain two sets of TAZ's maps and corresponding data. It should be noted that should out-lying rural counties expect the extension of development over the next 20 years extending beyond the current study area boundary, then the MPO will need to take action to extend the study area boundary.

The work task also provides for staff development and maintenance of Geographic Information System (GIS) staff services. The use of GIS has become an integral part of the transportation planning process, providing an ability to work with map information and to graphically display various features, data, and other characteristics in various formats. The GIS system will also provide ability to link map and data information to transportation systems analysis.

### **B. End Products**

1. Year 2001 socioeconomic data.
2. Adjusted year 2000 socioeconomic data (based on available census data).
3. Establish process for development of socioeconomic data in Charles City and New Kent counties (work to be initiated in late FY 01).
4. Initiate work on year 2000 employment and autos data.
5. Support activities for the year 2000 census.
6. Adjustments to MPO urbanized and study area boundaries as appropriate.
7. Regional demographic profile addressing federal Title VI and Environmental Justice requirements.
8. Assistance for the RRPDC Regional Growth Assessment (as described in the 2023 LRTP).

### **C. Work Elements**

Local government work elements are as follows:

1. Year 2001 population, households, group quarters population, and other data as provided in the Socioeconomic Data Development Guidelines.
2. Adjustments to year 2000 population, households, and group quarters population, based on available census data.
3. Participation by local planning staffs on the Socioeconomic Data Committee work group.

RRPDC work elements are as follows:

## FY 02 UWP Task 2.1

1. Review year 2001 and adjusted year 2000 socioeconomic data submissions from local governments
2. Compile data and prepare the year 2000 socioeconomic data report.
3. Socioeconomic Data Committee - - Provide administrative support for quarterly meetings of local planning staffs with responsibility for development of socioeconomic data.
4. Regional Demographic Profile - - Profile of the region's population identifying the location of low income and minority population groups, and other important demographic information required for federal Title VI and Environmental Justice requirements. Profile will include an examination of regional and local data on car ownership, transit service, highway network, and journey-to-work travel patterns.
5. Data Management - - Maintain and update data files related to socioeconomic data development (census, VEC ES 202, etc). When complete, post selected data tables on web site.
6. Employment Data - - One of the first steps for the next LRTP update will be to develop base year data. Year 2000 census information will be used to support the development of population and housing unit data sets, however, the census does not provide employment data. Staff will work with the VCU Planning Department to discuss the possibility of coordinating work for development of TAZ level employment data since VCU is conducting a similar work effort. Work activities may include geocoding year 2000 ES 202 file to TAZ map (new TAZ's); using vendor resource data (e.g. Woods and Poole), for developing jurisdiction and major employment sector classification levels as a control check for ES 202 file match runs dump work; checking and verifying individual employee addresses especially for major chain employers (i.e. grocery and convenience stores, banks, gas stations, etc) including purchase of private vendor resource data (e.g. Chamber of Commerce) for employment site address and contact information.
7. Auto Data - - Utilize DMV auto registration data and distribute by households for TAZ level data (work element to be conducted if time permits).
8. GIS Support
  - a. Staff support for development of maps and data linked to GIS map system. Includes staff work in support of the LRTP, CMS, TIP (project location maps for major and priority projects, etc.) and other staff, local, and VDOT plan and study activities.

## FY 02 UWP Task 2.1

- a. Preparation and distribution of new TAZ maps based on revisions made in coordination with the year 2000 census tract boundaries. Note that socioeconomic data developed prior to 2000 will be reported and filed based on these previous (i.e. old) TAZ's while new data developed starting with year 2000 data will be reported and stored/filed based on the new TAZ's.
  - b. Technical assistance to GRTC, Ridefinders, and others in mapping data/information for analysis and display of data and/or features on a local, sub area, corridor, or regional basis.
  - c. Preparation of a report documenting and describing the RRPDC/MPO GIS Regional Map Program, including process and procedures for data entry and quality control; recording data entries and map layers; and availability and use of data/map information by local governments, businesses, and the public.
  - d. Maintenance and support for the RRPDC's street name clearing house program.
9. Census - - Staff support to the Census Bureau and area local planning staff for work related to the year 2000 census (e.g., review, filing, and reporting of population counts, block level population and housing estimates, etc.). Also provide assistance for Census Transportation Planning Package (CTPP) development.
  10. Urbanized Area - - Adjustments made to the MPO study and urbanized area boundary lines (and affected TAZ's) based on the final census urbanized area boundary used to separate the Richmond and Tri-Cities MPO's.
  11. RRPDC Regional Growth Assessment Assistance - - Provide information and assistance to the RRPDC in conducting this RRPDC work program activity. Prior to initiating work on this work element, staff will provide a report to the MPO on anticipated assistance and staff work activities.
  12. VDOT work element is as follows: Compile data for use in various special studies (e.g., Environmental Impact Statements and Assessments, etc.).

### **D. Agency Participation**

RRPDC, VDOT, Local Governments.

**F. Budget, Staff and Funding**

	<u>PL</u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$200,000	\$17,000	\$217,000
Charles City County	\$4,000	---	\$ 4,000
New Kent County	<u>\$4,000</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>\$ 4,000</u>
TOTAL	\$208,000	\$17,000	\$225,000

**G. Schedule**

July 2001 to June 2002

## 2.2 Long-Range Transportation Plan Update

### A. Background

The MPO adopted the 2023 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) on March 8, 2001. The LRTP serves as the framework and initial step in developing the region's network of transportation facilities and services. The LRTP uses a balanced, multimodal approach (i.e. automobile, buses, car and vanpools, light and commuter rail, bicycles, congestion and transportation demand management, truck and rail cargo, etc.) to address the region's long term (20 years) projected travel needs, and provides for the consideration of impacts on the natural and human environment. Projects proposed in the LRTP must be within projected levels of available financial resources and must also meet federal air quality and planning requirements. Highway and public transportation projects and programs must be consistent with the MPO's final adopted LRTP in order to be eligible for federal-aid funds.

Work on developing a LRTP Citizens Summary Guide will be initiated in FY 01 and should continue and be completed in FY 02. Copies of the full 2023 LRTP document will be printed and distributed in FY 01 in hard copy (paper) and electronic (web site postings and computer disks) formats. Printing the LRTP Citizens Summary Guide with maps of the various plan elements, socioeconomic data, and other information will be a major expense; staff has budgeted \$15,000 for this effort. In addition, staff initiated presentations of the LRTP to various groups and organizations in FY 01 and will continue these into FY 02. Comments submitted from citizens at these meetings will serve as some of the initial citizen input into the next LRTP. Note that the January 17, 2001 FHWA/FTA Certification Review letter recommended that the MPO become "more proactive in educating the public about transportation planning through public workshops and presentations." These presentations should help to address this FTA/FHWA concern. Staff will also target minority and low-income groups and areas for these presentations as part of a more proactive effort to meet Environmental Justice requirements.

As part of the 2023 LRTP Update, staff had anticipated that the proposed projects and recommendations from the GRTC Comprehensive Operations Analysis (COA)/Regional Public Transportation Study (RPTS) would be considered and incorporated as part of the LRTP. However, only the draft COA/RPTS was completed prior to adoption of the LRTP, and input from this study was very limited. It should also be noted that VDOT has funded and the MPO has initiated a Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan work task (see UWP task 2.9). Upon completion, the results of the study will be submitted to the MPO and considered for insertion in the LRTP as part of the LRTP's Bicycle and Pedestrian element (LRTP amendment section). The GRTC COA/RPTS is anticipated to be completed in late FY 01 and proposed projects and recommendations will also be submitted for consideration by the MPO for incorporation into the LRTP as part of the transit element (LRTP amendment action).

## FY 02 UWP Task 2.2

The initial major step for development of the next LRTP update should be the establishment of a LRTP task force. As part of the MPO's action accepting comments by CTAC and the staff response, staff will initiate work to establish another joint CTAC/TAC LRTP Task Force, with this task force reporting directly to the MPO and authorized to take action to have the final draft LRTP released for review and comment. Note that MPO action is required in order to establish this task force (i.e. special purpose committee). Staff will also develop and submit the LRTP work scope for public review and comment and for MPO review and action.

Work under the LRTP provides for the preparation of technical and other reports to assure documentation. Such documentation should be understandable for the general public, and should be made available to the parties consistent with the MPO's public participation policies. Development, preparation, and distribution of documentation should be addressed as part of the general work scope submitted for MPO review and action.

### **B. End Product**

1. Amendments to the 2023 Transportation Plan as necessary.
2. Year 2023 LRTP Citizens Summary Report.
3. Initial citizen input for the next LRTP.
4. LRTP scope of work and schedule.
5. Establishment of the LRTP Task Force.

### **C. Work Elements**

Work activities by RRPDC and VDOT staffs includes the following:

1. A Long-Range Transportation Plan that addresses the 7 TEA-21 planning requirements as follows:
  - a. Support the economic vitality of the United States, the States and metropolitan areas, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency;
  - b. Increase the safety and security of the transportation system for motorized and nonmotorized users;
  - c. Increase the accessibility and mobility options available to people and freight;
  - d. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, and improve quality of life;

## FY 02 UWP Task 2.2

- e. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight;
  - f. Promote efficient system management and operation; and
  - g. Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.
2. Initial citizen review meetings (i.e. annual public meeting as per MPO public participation guidelines) to provide comments and input for the next the LRTP [RRPDC].
  3. Review and submit for MPO approval, requests for functional classifications/reclassifications for study area roads [RRPDC].
  4. Develop, print and distribute the 2023 LRTP Citizens Summary Report [RRPDC].
  5. Initiate work for the next LRTP work scope and schedule, and submit for MPO review and action [RRPDC].
  6. Initiate work to update the 2023 LRTP model procedures, network counts; mode split network, and coordination with the conformity analysis model (see work element 13) [RRPDC and VDOT].
  7. Conduct technical documentation activities and make available for public review and information [RRPDC and VDOT as appropriate].
  8. Review highway construction plans for conformance with the adopted Transportation Plan [VDOT and RRPDC].
  9. Amend the 2023 LRTP to incorporate the results from the Regional Bike and Pedestrian Plan and the GRTC COA/RPTS including new projects and service area expansions, and update the financial capacity analysis.
  10. Incorporate information/strategies from the Congestion Management System (CMS) and other MPO study and plan activities for use in assessing and developing plan alternatives and proposed projects [RRPDC and VDOT].
  11. Conduct corridor/sub area travel analysis for current and future congested corridors, and other important areas/corridors identified by the TAC and/or MPO to assess impact of Plan alternatives, land-use considerations, transit/TDM measures, major activity centers, etc. [RRPDC and VDOT].
  12. Maintain/update MINUTP computer software, staff training, and direct costs [RRPDC]. Note that if VDOT acquires new model, staff will consider acquisition of similar software in order to be compatible with the VDOT model.

**FY 02 UWP Task 2.2**

13. Initiate work to provide for the development of a transit mode choice model element as part of the air quality conformity analysis model in order to estimate emissions reduction benefits of various transit alternatives recommended by the LRTP task force [VDOT conformity analysis consultant].
14. Prepare and submit documentation of current activities in place to assess the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic groups for investments identified in the LRTP (see UWP task 1.4) [RRPDC].

**D. Agency Participation**

RRPDC, VDOT, VDRPT, VDEQ, Local Governments, CRAC, GRTC, RMA, Port of Richmond, FHWA, FTA, Ridefinders LRTP task force member organizations.

**E. Budget, Staff and Funding**

	<u>PL</u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>SPR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC Staff	\$60,000	\$11,000	----	\$71,000
VDOT	<u>----</u>	<u>----</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$60,000</u>	<u>\$11,000</u>	<u>\$50,000</u>	<u>\$121,000</u>

**F. Schedule**

July 1, 2001 to June 30, 2002

## 2.3 Chesterfield County Public Involvement Media

### A. Background

Chesterfield County's Transportation Department works on many types of projects which are of interest to the public including road improvements, the Thoroughfare Plan, and new development. The County's first strategic goal is to provide world-class customer service. To achieve this, we must provide effective public involvement in regards to these projects.

During the life of road improvement projects managed by Chesterfield County, the County typically meets individually with impacted landowners and any other interested citizens and business owners. Prior to the standard posting of willingness or public hearing, the County conducts Citizen Information Meetings. Additionally, the County's Transportation Department provides information to the public regarding the Thoroughfare Plan or transportation issues related to new development or rezoning cases at public meetings and to individuals.

Chesterfield County has utilized many different, effective methods to communicate with community: Power Point presentations with photos of the area, GIS maps and scanned plan material, along with digitally enhanced "before and after" photos, color plan rolls, plan displays with photos along the project length to help orient the view. Often these materials are e-mailed to interested people.

This effort towards a continual dialogue with the community during the life of a project requires professional and clear presentation materials. While these materials are certainly invaluable, the cost charged and time for preparation prevents them from being utilized more. The County staff needs to be able to prepare as much of this information as possible in order to provide clear communications to the community while keeping projects costs down.

### B. End Product

County-produced, digitally-enhanced photos, high quality presentations with high resolution photos and scanned plan sheets, clear color GIS maps and other appropriate presentation materials which clearly depict project elements.

### C. Work Elements

1. Purchase of digital camera, color laser printer, scanner to accommodate plan sheets, and equipment necessary for creation of digitally enhanced photos.
2. Submission of report to MPO on completion of work task (i.e. equipment purchase).

**D. Agency Participation**

Chesterfield County, VDOT, RRPDC, FHWA

**E. Budget, Staff and Funding**

PL\*

Chesterfield County                      \$30,000

\*Note: Local match funds to be provided by Chesterfield County.

**F. Schedule**

July 2001 to June 2002.

**2.4 Chesterfield County Transportation Model Update**

**A. Background**

Chesterfield County's MINUTP Transportation Model provides traffic volume information that is used in planning future road projects, monitoring the impact of developing areas, and estimating the cost of future road improvement needs. This work task provides for updating the County's MINUTP Model.

Chesterfield Transportation Department staff will have oversight regarding consultant services on this project. A total of \$39,642 was programmed for this work task in FY 2000. A portion of funds programmed for this task was used by the County for equipment and software purchase. This purchase was completed in FY 2000, reviewed by TAC, and payment was processed with VDOT and made to the County. The County estimates that a total of \$28,082 (\$4,962 spent in FY 00 for equipment and software purchase and \$23,120 spent in FY 01 for consultant services) will have been spent on this work task. The total remaining budget available in FY 02 to provide for completion and close out will be \$11,560.

**B. End Product**

Updated land use forecasts, model equations, and forecasting procedures for the County's Thoroughfare plan, upgraded MINUTP software, and upgraded PC equipment and software to facilitate the model upgrade and run the model.

**C. Work Elements**

1. Review and recalibrate the base year model.
2. Review and, if necessary, improve the model's production/attraction equations.
3. Review and update development estimates for build-out of the county utilizing GIS information.
4. Adjust other model parameters as necessary.
5. Obtain the revised version of MINUTP software and upgraded PC equipment (Chesterfield County purchase completed in FY 2000).
6. Prepare draft report and supporting materials for TAC review and comment and for MPO action.

**D. Agency Participation**

Chesterfield County, VDOT, RRPDC, FHWA.

**E. Budget, Staff and Funding**

Chesterfield County Consultant	<u>PL*</u> \$11,560
--------------------------------	------------------------

\*Note: Local match funds to be provided by Chesterfield County

**F. Schedule**

July 2001 to June 2002

**2.6 Goochland County Centerville Village Plan**

**A. Background**

The RRPDC staff should complete as part of the Commission's FY 01 technical assistance program, a draft Courthouse Village Plan, for Goochland County. Staff for Goochland County has requested that RRPDC staff conduct a similar village plan effort for the Centerville area of Goochland County in FY 02 and that PL funds be used to fund this work. The study area for this project/work task is Centerville Village, one of three major villages shown in the county's adopted comprehensive plan. It is located in the northeast area of the county (within the MPO study area) which is experiencing growth extending along the Route 250 corridor from Henrico County.

**B. End Products**

Existing and future land use maps, development and facility planning guidelines (ordinance language is not a part of this project) and transportation improvement recommendations. The guidelines and recommendations will be delivered in one document along with land use maps in both document and presentation sizes.

**C. Work Elements**

The following are major work elements for this work task (note that a tentative schedule is also provided):

1. Beginning July 1, 2001, Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (PDC) staff will review existing plans and studies and evaluate the needs of the village. Staff will review these needs with the Assistant County Administrator and a county-organized steering committee to determine the primary goals of this plan.
2. Beginning September 1, 2001, PDC staff will modify existing or develop new GIS maps as needed for the Centerville village, including proposed land use, planned facilities, and transportation improvements. These maps will be developed in consultation with the Assistant County Administrator.
3. Upon approval of the Centerville Village maps described in work element (2) above, PDC staff will prepare development guidelines for land use and facilities. These guidelines, along with transportation improvement recommendations, will be developed in consultation with the steering committee and the Assistant County Administrator. Final draft guidelines will be presented to the steering committee by November 15, 2001.

**FY 02 UWP Task 2.6**

4. Upon approval of the guidelines in work element (3) above, PDC staff will prepare a final report including guidelines and maps to be presented to the MPO Board (following TAC review and recommendation).

**D. Agency Participation**

RRPDC, Goochland County, VDOT, FHWA

**E. Budget, Staff and Funding**

	<u>PL</u>
RRPDC	\$11,000

**F. Schedule**

July 2001 to February 2002

**2.7 Ashland Area Transportation Plan**

**A. Background**

The Town of Ashland has completed several transportation plans and studies over the years as the Town annexed land area into the Town or experienced significant traffic problems. On January 1, 1996, the Town annexed an area south of Ashcake Road, comprising approximately 1,000 acres of land. The Town also annexed an area east of I-95 between Jamestown Road and Mechumps Creek containing approximately 800 acres. The majority of land in these areas is vacant and subject to development. The Town also has concerns related to specific transportation needs such as the Route 1 Corridor and the I-95/Rt. 54 interchange, which warrant study.

In anticipation of full development, it is critical that the Town develop a detailed town-wide transportation plan, so that as development occurs, the appropriate road network will be constructed or right of way reserved. This necessitates the review and update of previous transportation planning efforts, the analysis of recently annexed areas and incorporation of those areas into the transportation plan, identification of discrepancies between the Town and Hanover County transportation plans, all of which will be consolidated into an overall updated plan.

**B. End Products**

Transportation plan for the Town of Ashland.

**C. Work Elements**

The Town will utilize a consultant to develop a transportation plan for the Town of Ashland. The plan will provide recommendations for transportation services, which are safe, efficient and convenient; provide services which support the study area as it exists now, and in the years of 2005, 2010 and 2020; provide services which minimize the investment of public and private resources; and provide services which minimize the adverse social, economic and environmental impacts.

**D. Agency Participation**

Town of Ashland staff and consultant, Hanover County, RRPDC, VDOT, VDRPT, FHWA.

**E. Budget, Staff, Funding**

	<u>PL</u>	<u>Local</u>	<u>Total</u>
Town of Ashland Consultant	\$0	\$170,000	\$170,000

Note: Local match funds to be provided by Town of Ashland.

**F. Schedule**

July 1999 to June 2002.

**NOTES:**

July 8, 1999 MPO action to amend work scope and to add \$170,000 in local funds for a revised study budget total of \$200,000.

1. Action by MPO on September 14, 2000 to amend UWP to provide for continuation of consultant work on this task and for completion of work in FY 2001. Note that the Town of Ashland anticipates that work on this task will be completed in FY 02. Draft plan document to be submitted for TAC review and comment and for MPO review and action.
2. FY 2000 allocated PL funds (i.e. \$30,000) expended for work completed in FY 2000. Original task budget programmed in FY 2000 UWP at \$200,000 (i.e. \$30,000 PL and \$170,000 local).

**2.8 Chesterfield County GIS Thoroughfare Plan Theme Eastern Area**

**A. Background**

The Thoroughfare Plan is part of the County's Comprehensive Plan. The plan was adopted in 1989 (amended 1999), and is illustrated on a county base map. The county is currently working towards creating a Thoroughfare Plan theme in its GIS for the western half of the county. This project would incorporate the remaining part of the Thoroughfare Plan (eastern half of the county) into this GIS theme.

The Thoroughfare Plan is used by developers, consultants, county staff and citizens in identifying functional classifications and anticipated right-of-way widths of existing roads, as well as alignments of many proposed roadways throughout the county. This information must be accurate and readily available.

**B. End Product**

The Thoroughfare Plan for the eastern area of Chesterfield County in a digitized format.

**C. Work Elements**

Analyze and evaluate each of the roadways, existing and proposed, on the Thoroughfare Plan (eastern area) at a level of detail consistent with the data available in the county GIS.

Consultant and/or staff work tasks include obtaining and receiving the following documents and information in developing a GIS theme:

1. Thoroughfare Plan.
2. Comprehensive Plan.
3. Approved zoning cases.
4. County GIS data including; existing street centerlines; parcel information; environmental features (streams, RPA, wetlands, etc.); other existing improvements (railroads, major utility lines, etc.).

**D. Agency Participation**

Chesterfield County, VDOT, RRPDC, and FHWA.

**E. Budget, Staff and Funding**

	<u>PL*</u>
Chesterfield County Consultant	\$54,586

\*Note: local match funds to be provided by Chesterfield County.

**F. Schedule**

July 2001 to June 2002

**2.9 Richmond Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan**

**UWP INFORMATION ITEM**

**A. Background**

The VDOT has provided funds for conducting the Richmond Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. This study will be conducted by a VDOT consultant and the VDOT will also serve as the study project manager.

The end result of this study will be a detailed draft plan for each participating jurisdiction that it can consider for adoption as part of its comprehensive plan and considered for insertion in the region's long-range transportation plan (LRTP) as part of the LRTP Bicycle and Pedestrian element. The study will involve the RRPDC, VDOT, area local governments and FHWA.

Work on this plan will be conducted through an MPO special purpose study advisory committee of local government representatives and other groups and organizations. (11/9/01 action by MPO to establish committee). The detailed study scope of work was set up through and approved by the study advisory committee (approved with modifications as discussed at the committee's March 9, 2001 meeting). Based on this action, VDOT will negotiate a final contract with the study consultant and distribute the final detailed work scope to the Committee. Currently, staff expects work on this study/plan to be initiated in late FY 01.

**B. End Products**

A detailed draft plan for each participating jurisdiction that it can consider for adoption as part of its comprehensive plan and can also be considered for insertion in the MPO's LRTP as part of the Bicycle and Pedestrian element.

**C. Work Elements**

The draft detailed work scope presented for action at the March 9, 2001 Committee meeting contained the following major work tasks:

1. Project kickoff events.
2. Establish vision and goals.
3. Assess existing conditions.
4. Assess latent demand for bicycling and walking.

5. Prepare draft regional network plan.
6. Prepare final regional network plans.

**D. Agency Participation**

VDOT, RRPDC, Local Governments, Richmond Area Bicycling Association, Sierra Club, CTAC representatives, and GRTC/Ridefinders.

**E. Budget, Staff and Funding**

SPR

VDOT Consultant \$500,000

**F. Schedule**

FY 01 to June 30, 2002.

**3.0 MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS/SHORT RANGE PLANNING**

**3.1 Congestion Management System (CMS) Update**

**A. Background**

The MPO took action on March 8, 2001 to adopt the region's Congestion Management System (CMS). The CMS provides a systematic process for addressing congestion by providing information on transportation system performance and proposing use of alternative transportation strategies and programs to help alleviate congestion. Travel times for the region's major highway corridors are shown and these times will serve as a benchmark for assessing the effectiveness of transportation projects and programs in addressing congestion. The CMS also documents current congestion management strategies and programs in the MPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The CMS is updated every 3 years in conjunction with the LRTP update.

In FY 2002, work on the next CMS update will be initiated. Initial major work activities include re-activation of the CMS task force as a joint TAC/CTAC advisory committee, and development of a detailed work scope including submission for public review and comment, and for MPO review and action. Work under this CMS work task also provides for staff participation and assistance to VDOT's ITS Steering Committee.

**B. End Products**

1. Initiation of work on the CMS Update.
2. Participation and assistance for the VDOT ITS Steering Committee.
3. GPS travel time runs and development of other data for the CMS update.

**C. Work Elements**

1. Initiate work on the CMS update including the following:
  - a. Establish CMS task force (joint TAC/CTAC advisory committee) reporting directly to the MPO.
  - b. Detailed work scope that is submitted for public review and action.
2. Participation in and providing assistance to the VDOT ITS Steering Committee.
3. Conduct corridor travel time delay studies on congested corridors to identify congestion points and potential improvements (conducted based on VDOT and local government request).

**FY 02 UWP Task 3.1**

4. Collect data from VDOT, GRTC, Ridefinders, and other available sources related to the CMS performance measures, and utilize this data for developing proposed CMS strategies and actions.
5. Conduct and document peak hour travel time runs for CMS network roads using GPS equipment.
6. Develop and print maps and information on regional traffic flow, congestion etc.

**D. Agency Participation**

RRPDC, VDOT, Local Governments, GRTC, Ridefinders, CRAC, RMA, FHWA, FTA, VDRPT.

**E. Budget, Staff and Funding**

	<u>PL</u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>SPR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$70,000	\$6,000	---	\$76,000
VDOT	<u>----</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>\$17,000</u>	<u>\$17,000</u>
TOTAL	\$70,000	\$6,000	\$17,000	\$93,000

**F. Schedule**

On-going activity

### 3.2 Charles City and New Kent Counties Access Management Standards Studies

#### A. Background

Access management provides a way to manage access to land development while simultaneously preserving the flow of traffic on the surrounding road system in terms of safety, capacity and speed. Access management provides for managing and planning the spacing and design of driveways, median openings, traffic signals, and interchanges. The goals of access management are as follows:

1. Improve safety while decreasing accident rates.
2. Reduce congestion by using the existing roadway network more efficiently.
3. Maintain desirable speeds along arterials.
4. Reduce interference with through traffic due to turns into or out of a site.
5. Optimize highway function and land use.
6. Provide sufficient spacing between at-grade intersections.
7. Provide adequate on-site storage areas.

In FY 2000, staff conducted a study of access management standards in Powhatan County. The study included research on access management principals and standards used in various states, which staff reviewed and presented to VDOT and county staff. Based on this research a review of current standards and practices, and the counties particular needs and preferences, a set of proposed standards and recommended techniques for managing access has been developed for the county (work was completed in FY 2001). This work will serve as a model for a similar study in Goochland County, which staff initiated in mid-FY 01. Staff had hoped to complete the Goochland study and start on the Charles City County Access Management Study in FY 01. Due to other work priorities, additional time needed for the Powhatan study, and staff changes, the Goochland study will likely continue into FY 02. Upon completion of it, staff will initiate work on the Charles City study, and time and budget permitting, start work on the New Kent County Access Management Standards study.

#### B. End Product

Utilize research from the Powhatan and Goochland counties access management standards studies on access management principals and techniques to reduce the proliferation of driveways, entrances, and crossovers and to enhance the functional capacity of intersections on secondary, primary and arterial roads.

Based on this research, standards will be presented for regulating and coordinating the various types of access connection points to the road system that can be used by the county in reviewing requests for new entrances and exits for residential subdivisions and businesses. This study will propose detailed and sophisticated techniques in access management for Goochland, Charles City, and New Kent counties.

**C. Work Tasks**

1. Review with county, VDOT, and RRPDC staffs, study intent and scope of work.
2. Review and evaluate existing VDOT minimum standards for entrances and access points to different classification of roads.
3. Review and evaluate existing county policies concerning access to roads (distances between entrances, turn lane/taper lengths) and thoroughfare plan goals and objectives.
4. Utilize previously conducted research and examples of successful application of the concepts on access management (research from FHWA, States, and rural and urban localities).
5. Analyze issue areas in relation to road classification (arterial, primary, secondary roads), distances between entrances, turn lane/taper lengths, limiting entrances, sharing entrances, internal service drives, separation of intersections including those signalized, onsite internal vehicular circulation and storage, left turn lanes particularly for subdivisions, and median crossover separations.
6. Develop recommended standards to address above access management issue areas, including reasons for and benefits that would accrue from the recommendations.
7. Review recommended standards with study participants (task 1) and selected local transportation/ planning department heads.
8. Assist in presentation of the findings to the County Board of Supervisors.
9. Present the access management standards to the MPO Board for acceptance of staff work.
10. If requested, assist VDOT Traffic Engineering Division with using recommended standards as a case example of successful acceptance and use of modern access management standards by a Virginia county.

**D. Agency Participants**

Goochland County, Charles City County, New Kent County RRPDC, VDOT, FHWA.

**E. Budget, Staffing, Funding**

	<u>PL</u>
RRPDC	\$47,500

**F. Schedule**

July 2001 to June 2002

**4.0 TRANSPORTATION PROJECT PROGRAMMING**

**4.1 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

**A. Background**

The TIP programs highway and transit projects that are allocated or scheduled to receive funds over a three-year period. Once approved as part of the TIP, federally funded projects can proceed to the next stage of implementation. Major highway projects that are funded by state, local, or other funding sources are included in the TIP for conformity analysis or information purposes.

The TIP programs transportation projects are on an administrative classification basis consistent with the Virginia Transportation Development Plan (VTDP) under the following systems and programs:

1. NHS/Interstate and Non-Interstate
2. Primary
3. Secondary
4. Urban
5. TEA-21 High Priority
6. Priority Transportation Funds
7. FRANS (Reimbursement Notes)
8. General Funds
9. Toll Facilities Revolving Account
10. Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) Program
11. Surface Transportation Program (STP)
12. Transportation Enhancement Program
13. Transportation Safety Program
14. Public Transportation
15. Airports
16. Local/Private Funded Projects

Project descriptions include implementing agency, location/service area, cost estimates, funding sources, amount of funds actually or scheduled for allocation, type of improvement, and other appropriate information. The TIP also includes a financial plan summary, GRTC's Financial Capacity documentation and certification, project implementation status, public participation and environmental justice assessment documentation and the MPO/State Statement of Certification.

Essential elements of the TIP previously required under ISTEA and continued under TEA-21 are as follows:

1. Approval and Updates--The TIP must be approved by the MPO and the Governor, and must be updated at least every two (2) years. The Richmond

## FY 02 UWP Task 4.1

Area MPO's TIP is updated on an annual basis since the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) reviews and approves state matching funds for highway and transit projects on an annual basis.

2. Scope of TIP--The TIP must include all projects within the MPO's Study Area (including pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) to be funded under Title 23 and the FTA.
3. Financial Plan--The TIP must include a financial plan component or element. The financial plan must demonstrate how the TIP can be implemented, indicate resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the plan, and recommend any innovative financing techniques to fund needed projects.
4. Project Priorities--The TIP must include a priority list of projects to be carried out in each 3-year period, and a financial plan that demonstrates how it can be implemented. Projects within a funding category for a particular year can serve as an indicator of priority, such that first year projects are the highest priority, second year projects are the next highest priority, etc. Procedures that distribute sub allocated CMAQ, STP or Section 5307 funds to individual jurisdictions or modes by predetermined percentages or formulas are inconsistent with federal planning provisions that require MPO's to develop a prioritized and financially reasonable TIP, unless they can be shown to be based on considerations required as part of the MPO's planning process. Such procedures otherwise ignore the dynamics of the planning process, hinder response to high priority problems identified through the planning process, and frustrate the flexibility features of ISTEA/TEA-21.
5. Project Selection--All federally funded projects, except NHS, Bridge, and Interstate/Interstate Maintenance projects, are to be selected by the MPO in consultation with the state from the approved TIP and in accordance with the TIP priorities. Projects that are NHS Interstate, NHS Non-Interstate, statewide STP and Bridge funded are to be selected by the state in cooperation with the MPO from the approved TIP. The TIP serves as the project selection document.
6. Transportation Plan Consistency--All federally funded TIP projects must be consistent with the MPO's adopted Transportation Plan.
7. Air Quality Conformity--The MPO, along with FHWA and FTA, must make a conformity determination for projects listed in the proposed TIP, or for amendments that add or delete regionally significant projects. Conformity is generally defined in the CAAA as conforming to the adopted State Implementation Plan's purpose for eliminating and reducing the severity and

## FY 02 UWP Task 4.1

number of NAAQS violations and achieving attainment status. In other words, the implementation of TIP projects must be shown to serve as part of the region's effort to improve air quality.

8. Public Review and Comment--The public, affected agencies, representatives of transportation agency employees, other affected employee representatives, private providers of transportation, and other interested parties must receive a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed program.
9. Environmental Justice - - The TIP documentation includes an assessment of the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic groups for investments identified in the TIP.
10. MPO Certification--In TMA's, the USDOT Secretary shall certify the planning process at least once every 3 years. A joint FHWA/FTA review was conducted in September 2000, and the MPO was conditionally certified, subject to five corrective action issues on January 17, 2001.

New provisions under TEA-21 that are now part of the TIP development process are as follows:

1. The MPO must publish or otherwise make available an annual listing of projects, consistent with the categories in the TIP, for which federal funds have been obligated in the preceding year. The purpose of this provision is to enhance public awareness of which projects are being implemented in the region (see 23 U.S.C. 134(h)(7)(B); 49 U.S.C. 530 (C) (5) (B)).
2. Freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, and representatives of users of public transit are added to the list of parties that must be given the opportunity for review and comment on plans and TIP's.
3. The TIP may include an additional list of "illustrative" projects. Such projects are intended to assist in the development of a vision-based program, and is not to be included in the fiscally constrained list of projects. Illustrative projects are defined as those projects that would be included in the TIP if additional resources would become available.
4. TEA-21 requires that each state develop a process for ensuring coordination with local elected officials in non-metropolitan areas in the development of the TIP.

Draft federal planning regulations implementing these new TEA-21 provisions were published in the federal register in early FY 01. However, as of April 2001, these draft regulations have not been issued as final. The VDOT and FHWA have advised

## **FY 02 UWP Task 4.1**

that even though there are no current regulations implementing TEA-21, the MPO is required to abide by its provisions. Staff will review these regulations when they are final and will consult with VDOT on changes that may be necessary to the TIP process.

It is important to note that as part of the Governor's Commission on Transportation Policy, recommendations were made to revise the programming and project development process. The recommendations from the Commission's Interim Report included the following:

1. A realistic and achievable programming document.
2. Objective prioritization of projects statewide.
3. A more flexible and shortened project development process.
4. A more user friendly and readable document.
5. A new Virginia Transportation Development Plan composed of two distinct phases, the Feasibility phase and the Six-Year Capital Improvement Program phase.

The staff will work with VDOT staff to incorporate these and other changes as appropriate into the TIP process when they are final and VDOT advises staff of the new process and procedures.

It is also important to note that work on the MPO's FY 00/01-02/03 TIP was delayed and that the MPO is tentatively scheduled to take action to adopt it at the May 10, 2001 meeting. As a result, work on the FY 01/02-03/04 TIP has been delayed and work on it will carry over into FY 02.

### **B. End Products**

1. Development and adoption of the FY 01/02-03/04 TIP (work initiated in FY 01) and initiating the draft FY 02/03-04/05 TIP; the MPO's annual Statement of Certification; and supporting documentation demonstrating compliance with financial plan and environmental justice requirements, FTA Financial Capacity Policy, and conformity to the Virginia State Implementation Plan (for air quality purposes).
2. Maintenance activities in support of the current TIP including processing of TIP amendment requests; maintenance of records tracking the programming of Regional STP and CMAQ funds; and a report on the implementation status of major projects from the previous TIP.

3. Development and submission of the MPO's list of regional priority transportation projects.

**C. Work Elements**

Work activities include the following:

1. Document the TIP preparation process including project advancement, area priorities and use of the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Congestion Management System (CMS) for selecting and programming projects.
2. Prepare a 3-year List of Proposed Projects for the following systems and programs based on submissions from area local governments, VDOT, VDRPT, RMA, Ridefinders, CRAC and GRTC:
  - ?? NHS/Interstate and Non-Interstate System
  - ?? Primary System
  - ?? Secondary System
  - ?? Urban System
  - ?? TEA-21 High Priority
  - ?? Priority Transportation Funds
  - ?? FRANS (Reimbursement Notes)
  - ?? General Funds
  - ?? Toll Facilities Revolving Account Program
  - ?? Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality Program
  - ?? Surface Transportation Program
  - ?? Transportation Enhancement Program
  - ?? Transportation Safety Program
  - ?? Public Transportation
  - ?? Airports
  - ?? Local/Private funded Projects
3. Coordinate submission of FTA Section 5310 project requests and submit for MPO endorsement action and final recommended projects for inclusion in the TIP. (RRPDC)
4. Coordinate submission of transportation enhancement projects and submit for MPO endorsement, and final recommended projects for inclusion in the TIP (RRPDC).
5. Coordinate identification of all regionally significant public and private transportation projects, and submit to VDOT for air quality analysis purposes (RRPDC).

## **FY 02 UWP Task 4.1**

6. Coordinate listing and description of progress in the implementation of TCM's (if appropriate). (RRPDC and VDOT)
7. Develop annual list of projects, consistent with the categories in the TIP, for which Federal funds have been obligated in the preceding year. Also, include list of other major state projects from the previous TIP that were implemented, and identify significant delays in the planned implementation of these major projects. Publication and distribution (i.e. posting on the RRPDC/MPO website) will also be conducted as part of UWP task 1.2, MPO Citizen Participation. (RRPDC)
8. Prepare and submit the TIP financial plan and supporting documentation. (RRPDC and VDOT)
9. Conduct public review and comment activities, including at least one public meeting. (RRPDC)
10. Conduct and document assessment of the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic groups for investments (i.e. projects and programs) identified in the TIP. (RRPDC)
11. Prepare and process amendments to the TIP as approved by the MPO. Conduct conformity analysis and public participation as required. (RRPDC and VDOT)
12. Prepare and process MPO Statement of Certification and supporting documentation for the area's "3-C" Transportation Planning Process. (RRPDC and VDOT)
13. Prepare and submit to the MPO a report on Virginia's Allocation of State and Federal Construction Program Funds. This report should focus on VDOT Richmond District funding for the various administrative system classifications as compared to funding for other VDOT Construction Districts (RRPDC and VDOT; staff time and funds permitting).

### **D. Agency Participation**

RRPDC, VDOT, VDEQ, VDRPT, Local Governments, GRTC, FHWA, EPA, FTA, Ridefinders, CRAC, Paratransit and other transportation operators, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, and representatives of users of public transit.

**FY 02 UWP Task 4.1**

**E. Budget, Staff and Funding**

	<u>PL</u>	<u>5303</u>	<u>SPR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$50,000	\$20,000	----	\$70,000
VDOT	<u>----</u>	<u>----</u>	<u>\$30,000</u>	<u>\$30,000</u>
TOTAL	\$50,000	\$20,000	\$30,000	\$100,000

**F. Schedule**

1. FY 01/02 – 03/04 TIP -- July 2001 to February 2001
2. FY 02/03 - 04/05 TIP -- December 2001 to FY 03
3. TIP Amendments -- On-going activity

5.0 **TRANSIT PLANNING**

5.2 **Elderly and Disabled Transportation Needs and Services**

A. **Background**

The Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee (EDAC) is composed of individuals and organizations representing the region's elderly and disabled, and advises the MPO on plans, studies, issues, and other matters related to the planning of public transportation services. It serves to advise the MPO on issues plans and studies, involving public transportation facilities and services for the elderly and disabled. It also assists GRTC by advising them of public transportation needs and issues of concern to the elderly and disabled community.

As part of the MPO's September 2000 Certification Review, four (4) corrective action issues addressing public participation and Environmental Justice were noted as follows (from the January 17, 2001 FHWA/FTA Certification letter):

- ✍✍The development and implementation of a mechanism to gauge the effectiveness and the appropriateness of current public outreach initiatives.
- ✍✍The documentation of current activities in place to assess the distribution of impacts on different socioeconomic groups for investments identified in the LRTP and the TIP.
- ✍✍The development of a work element to assess and create improved strategies for reaching minority and low-income groups through public involvement efforts.
- ✍✍The implementation of specific comprehensive Environmental Justice planning activities.

The MPO will initiate in late FY 01 and complete in FY 02 a best practices review for obtaining public input on transportation plans and programs. This review will include recommendations that address the first and third corrective action issues listed above (issues two and four are addressed as part of UWP tasks 1.4, 2.1, 2.2., and 4.1). As a result of this review and work conducted under other UWP work tasks, consideration will be given to expanding the duties, responsibilities, and membership of the MPO's Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee (EDAC) to provide for addressing Environmental Justice issues. The MPO's recently adopted 2023 LRTP also noted that the MPO should consider reformation of EDAC to include an Environmental Justice Committee. Should there be significant changes to EDAC, the UWP would need to be amended to document these changes and provide for appropriate staff and budget revisions.

This task provides RRPDC staff support and to ensure an active and involved EDAC and to assist the committee in developing up-to-date information on transportation needs of elderly and disabled in the Richmond area, their transportation needs, and available transportation services and resources. This task also provides for staff

participation in various study activities addressing the region’s specialized transportation services.

**B. End Products**

A functional and viable process that advises the MPO and GRTC on the special transportation needs of the elderly and disabled, and provides reports on elderly and disabled transportation needs and services.

**C. Work Elements**

1. Provide administrative and technical staff support for the EDAC.
2. Provide assistance to GRTC and its study consultant for the GRTC Paratransit Services.
3. Update the transportation operations inventory of private and human service agencies transportation services (staff time and budget permitting).

**D. Agency Participation**

RRPDC, GRTC, VDRPT, Local Governments, FTA, EDAC appointing organizations, private and human service agency transportation operators.

**E. Budget, Staff and Funding**

	<u>5303</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$20,000	\$7,500	\$27,500

**F. Schedule**

On-going activity

**7.0 AIR QUALITY PLANNING**

**7.1 Air Quality Plan and Program Activities**

**A. Background**

The Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990 presents serious air quality improvement challenges to almost all of the nation's mid-size to major metropolitan areas. To meet this challenge, the state has pursued a program of reduction measures, which includes various stationary source control measures, stage 2-vapor recovery, clean fuels, and other measures.

In FY1995, the Metropolitan Richmond Air Quality Committee (MRAQC) was established as the Section 174 Lead Planning Organization (LPO) based on appointments by the Governor's office. Representation on MRAQC includes local elected officials from non-attainment area jurisdictions (i.e. Richmond, Henrico, Chesterfield, Hanover, Charles City, Colonial Heights and Hopewell), from the Richmond and Tri-Cities Area MPO's, and agency representatives from VDOT and VDEQ.

In FY1997, VDEQ staff submitted a request to EPA for designating the area to attainment status. In November 1997 EPA issued notice in the Federal Register noting the Richmond Area to be in attainment status for ozone air quality standards, and was designed as a Maintenance Area.

On June 29, 2000, the state advised EPA of VDEQ recommendations for designation of areas (i.e. jurisdictions and portions of jurisdictions) subject to the revised NAAQS for ozone. For the Richmond area, this included all jurisdictions (i.e. Richmond, Colonial Heights, Chesterfield, Hanover, and Henrico) and portions of Charles City County that were in the previously designated non-attainment area. This recommended area designation was based on EPA's new 8-hour NAAQS for ozone, which was under court review and not resolved until recently. The resolution was based on a U.S. Supreme Court ruling on a challenge by the American Trucking Association (ATA) to the new 8-hour standards. The Supreme Court rejected the ATA challenge however; it also said that EPA's implementation policy for the ozone standard was unlawful and unreasonable, and that the agency must develop a reasonable interpretation. Based on this information, (Supreme Court action taken in February 2000) the VDEQ must wait for EPA guidance on how the new 8-hour standard will be implemented.

This work task also provides for RRPDC and VDOT staff work activities for conducting air quality conformity analysis in support of the TIP and LRTP.

The VDOT contracts out this work to a consultant and the RRPDC provides staff support for TIP, LRTP, and TIP/LRTP amendments (if appropriate) review and coordination. Staff work activities includes identification of

projects, project descriptions, submission of socioeconomic data and forecasts, coordinate/conduct project reviews with local staff and other administrative and coordination activities.

**B. End Products**

Administrative support for MPO activities involving development of the non-attainment area implementation plan and air quality conformity analysis.

**C. Work Elements**

1. Monitor air quality data for the Richmond area, and review EPA and Virginia Department of Air Pollution Control reports, guidelines, regulations, etc.
2. Limited administrative support for MPO participation in developing the nonattainment area implementation plan.
3. Review, comment, and conduct other activities necessary for the nonattainment area planning process.
4. Review and comment on the area’s emissions inventory, especially information relating to mobile sources and transportation control measures.
5. Computer modeling and other transportation planning activities for development of VMT data required for maintenance plan/nonattainment area plan implementation [VDOT].
6. Conduct air quality conformity analysis activities in support of the TIP and LRTP [RRPDC and VDOT].

**D. Agency Participation**

RRPDC, VDOT, VDRPT, VDEQ, MRAQC, GRTC, Ridefinders, local governments, FHWA, EPA, FTA, and Tri-Cities MPO.

**E. Budget, Staff, and Funding**

	<u>PL</u>	<u>SPR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
RRPDC	\$16,000	----	\$16,000
VDOT	----	<u>\$45,000</u>	<u>\$45,000</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$16,000</u>	<u>\$45,000</u>	<u>\$61,000</u>

**F. Schedule**

On-going activity

## 8.0 AIRPORT PLANNING

### 8.1 CRAC Intermodal Transportation Facility Study

#### A. **Background**

The ISTEA provides new opportunities to develop plans for facilities which link multiple modes of transportation in a unified, interconnected transportation system. The Act encourages cooperation between all five federal modal transportation agencies--the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and Maritime Administration (MARAD)--with the State's transportation departments (VDOT, VDRPT, VDA) and the MPO.

The Richmond International Airport is strategically located in the eastern United States and with the highway and rail systems immediately adjacent to the airport; it affords a unique opportunity to develop a regional intermodal hub facility. Such a facility could link the airport system with rail system and the interstate highway system for enhanced intermodal service of people and goods, as well as serving as a key economic stimulus for the region. Additionally, much of the major water port activity of the Port of Hampton Roads moves from that location to the Richmond region to join the north-south highway linkages, as well as to continue west bound on I-64. Together with water-borne commerce originating from and destined for the Port of Richmond, an intermodal transportation center could have significant advantages for the region's maritime interests. Working with the federal, regional and local government agencies and private interests, the Capital Region Airport Commission (CRAC) intends to develop an intermodal plan to improve intermodal connectivity. This plan would seek to assure modal compatibility and provide improved facilities to users, which can provide enhanced services to the people and business community of the Richmond/Central Virginia region, and the much larger transportation community.

At the MPO's March 11, 1998 meeting, action was taken to accept the Regional Intermodal Transportation Facility Study Phase I report. Phase I provides an extensive data base and analysis of regional and multi-state air, rail, and water borne freight movements, an assessment of seven (7) alternative sites for a regional intermodal facility, and a review of advanced technologies and technology trends that are expected to impact the future mobility requirements for access to Richmond International Airport or other regional intermodal freight facility. The Phase I report recommends that Phases II and III provide for a detailed freight movement in the region (Phase II) and a modal compatibility study assessing the role and capacity of each mode in serving regional freight demand plus conceptual site development and implementation plans for the recommended regional intermodal facility (Phase III).

At the October 18, 2000 TAC meeting; the CRAC study consultants provided a status report on Phase II. The report identified remaining major work tasks and its schedule as follows:

1. Task 3: Forecasting Future Demand (7/00 to 1/01).
2. Task 4: Modal Compatibility Study (6/00 to 3/01).
3. Task 5: Airport Intermodal Transportation Facility (1/01 to 6/01).
4. Task 6: Documentation (draft final report on 6/01 and final report on 7/01).

The TAC advised CRAC that in the future, presentations on the status of the Phase II and Phase III study work should be first presented to the TAC Intermodal Transportation Facility Study Subcommittee.

**B. End Product**

A report to CRAC, the MPO, and other appropriate planning agencies providing recommendations on actions to pursue for the development of an intermodal transportation facility.

**C. Work Elements**

The major remaining work tasks for Phase II and as presented at the 10/18/00 TAC meeting are identified in the above background description. The CRAC study consultant is also charged with administrative support for the TAC study review committee.

The RRPDC staff will participate in the TAC study review committee, provide limited technical and administrative assistance for consultant work activities, and coordinate consultant reviews and presentations to the TAC, CTAC and the MPO.

**D. Agency Participation**

CRAC, VDA, FHWA, RRPDC, VDOT, VDRPT, MARAD, Tri-Cities Area MPO, local governments, Port of Richmond.

**E. Budget, Staff, and Funding**

CRAC study cost estimated at \$1,200,000.

**FY 02 UWP Task 8.1**

Allocations to date:

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>Match*</u>	<u>Total</u>
FY 95 CMAQ	\$190,000	\$47,500	\$237,500
FY 97 CMAQ	\$240,000	\$60,000	\$300,000
FY 99 CMAQ	<u>\$530,000</u>	<u>\$132,500</u>	<u>\$662,500</u>
TOTAL	\$960,000	\$240,000	\$1,200,000

\*Match funds provided by CRAC.

	<u>CMAQ</u>	<u>PL</u>	<u>Total</u>
CRAC Consultant	\$1,200,000	----	\$1,200,000
RRPDC Staff	<u>----</u>	<u>\$4,500</u>	<u>\$ 4,500</u>
TOTAL	\$1,200,000	\$4,500	\$1,204,500

**AGENCY BUDGET SUMMARY SHEET  
FHWA PL/SPR; FTA SEC 5303/C.O.SEC 5303; CMAQ FUNDS  
FY 2002 UWP - RICHMOND AREA MPO**

Task No/ Abbrev	RRPDC			GRTC CO 5303	Local PL	Local	VDOT SPR	CRAC CMAQ	TOTAL						GRAND TOTAL
	PL	5303	CO 5303						PL	SPR	5303	CO 5303	Local	CMAQ	
1.1 MPO Maint	345,075	39,686	-	-	-	-	191,000	-	345,075	191,000	39,686	-	-	-	575,761
1.1 Pass-Thru	2,217 (1)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,217	-	-	-	-	-	2,217
1.2 Citi Partic	62,000	20,000	-	-	-	-	9,000	-	62,000	9,000	20,000	-	-	-	91,000
1.2 Consult	25,000 (2)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	-	-	-	25,000
1.3 UWP	25,000	6,500	-	-	-	-	8,000	-	25,000	8,000	6,500	-	-	-	39,500
1.4 E J	20,000	15,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	15,000	-	-	-	35,000
2.1 Data	200,000	17,000	-	-	8,000	-	-	-	208,000	-	17,000	-	-	-	225,000
2.2 LRTP	60,000	11,000	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	60,000	50,000	11,000	-	-	-	121,000
2.3 Ches. Media	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	-	-	-	30,000
2.4 Chest. Model	-	-	-	-	11,560	-	-	-	11,560	-	-	-	-	-	11,560
2.6 Gooch V P	11,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11,000	-	-	-	-	-	11,000
2.7 Ash T P	-	-	-	-	-	170,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	170,000	-	170,000
2.8 Ches GIS	-	-	-	-	54,586	-	-	-	54,586	-	-	-	-	-	54,586
2.9 B & P Plan	-	-	-	-	-	-	500,000	-	-	500,000	-	-	-	-	500,000
3.1 CMS	70,000	6,000	-	-	-	-	17,000	-	70,000	17,000	6,000	-	-	-	93,000
3.2 Access Mgt	47,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	47,500	-	-	-	-	-	47,500
4.1 TIP	50,000	20,000	-	-	-	-	30,000	-	50,000	30,000	20,000	-	-	-	100,000
5.2 ED TNS	7,500	20,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	7,500	-	20,000	-	-	-	27,500
7.1 Air Q Plg	16,000	-	-	-	-	-	45,000	-	16,000	45,000	-	-	-	-	61,000
8.1 CRAC ITF	4,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,200,000	4,500	-	-	-	-	1,200,000	1,204,500
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>945,792</b>	<b>155,186</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>104,146</b>	<b>170,000</b>	<b>850,000</b>	<b>1,200,000</b>	<b>1,049,938</b>	<b>850,000</b>	<b>155,186</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>170,000</b>	<b>1,200,000</b>	<b>\$ 3,425,124</b>

NOTES: (1) Temporarily programmed to RRPDC staff; reserved for future pass-through work task.  
(2) Direct costs for consultant assistance.

**FUNDING SOURCES SUMMARY SHEET**  
**FHWA PL/SPR; FTA SEC 5303/C.O.SEC 5303; CMAQ FUNDS**  
**FY 2002 UWP - RICHMOND AREA MPO**

Task No./ Abbrev.	PL		SPR		5303		C.O. 5303		Local	CMAQ		TOTAL		GRAND TOTAL
	Federal	State/ Local	Federal	State	Federal	State/ Local	Federal	State/ Local		Federal	State/ Local	Federal	State/ Local	
1.1 MPO Main	276,060	69,015	152,800	38,200	31,749	7,937	-	-	-	-	-	460,609	115,152	575,761
1.1 Pas-Thru	1,774	443	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,774	443	2,217
1.2 Citi. Partic.	49,600	12,400	7,200	1,800	16,000	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	72,800	18,200	91,000
1.2 Consult	20,000	5,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	5,000	25,000
1.3 UWP	20,000	5,000	6,400	1,600	5,200	1,300	-	-	-	-	-	31,600	7,900	39,500
1.4 E J	16,000	4,000	-	-	12,000	3,000	-	-	-	-	-	28,000	7,000	35,000
2.1 Data	166,400	41,600	-	-	13,600	3,400	-	-	-	-	-	180,000	45,000	225,000
2.2 LRTP	48,000	12,000	40,000	10,000	8,800	2,200	-	-	-	-	-	96,800	24,200	121,000
2.3 Ches. Media	24,000	6,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	24,000	6,000	30,000
2.4 Chest. Model	9,248	2,312	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9,248	2,312	11,560
2.5 C.C. Rt. 5	8,800	2,200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,800	2,200	11,000
2.7 Ash T P	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	170,000	-	-	-	170,000	170,000
2.6 Ches GIS	43,669	10,917	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43,669	10,917	54,586
2.9 B/P Trans	-	-	400,000	100,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	400,000	100,000	500,000
3.1 CMS	56,000	14,000	13,600	3,400	4,800	1,200	-	-	-	-	-	74,400	18,600	93,000
3.2 Rich Shk T E	38,000	9,500	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38,000	9,500	47,500
4.1 TIP	40,000	10,000	24,000	6,000	16,000	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	80,000	20,000	100,000
5.2 ED TNS	6,000	1,500	-	-	16,000	4,000	-	-	-	-	-	22,000	5,500	27,500
7.1 Air Q Plg	12,800	3,200	36,000	9,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48,800	12,200	61,000
8.1 CRAC ITF	3,600	900	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	960,000	240,000	963,600	240,900	1,204,500
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>839,950</b>	<b>209,988</b>	<b>680,000</b>	<b>170,000</b>	<b>124,149</b>	<b>31,037</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>170,000</b>	<b>960,000</b>	<b>240,000</b>	<b>2,604,099</b>	<b>821,025</b>	<b>\$ 3,425,124</b>