

**2031 Long-Range Transportation Plan
Advisory Committee Meeting
Richmond Regional Planning District Commission
January 24, 2008**

MEETING ATTENDEES

Jameson Auten -- RideFinders
Viktoria Badger – City of Richmond
Scott Clark – GRTC Transit System
Tom Coleman – Goochland County
Cora Dickerson – EDAC – United Way
Todd Eure – Henrico County
Larry Hagin – GRTC Transit System
George Homewood – New Kent County
Meredith Judy– VDRPT
Liz McAdory -- VDOT
Mark Riblett -- VDOT
Dan Grinnell – VDOT
Barbara Smith – Chesterfield County
Brandon Stidham – Powhatan County
Stephen Story – James River Buslines
Michael Testerman – CTAC- VARP
Joe Vidunas – Hanover County (Chairman)
Lloyd Vye – CTAC – RABA (Vice-Chairman)
John Zeugner – VCN
Lee Yolton - Richmond Regional Planning District Commission
Dan Lysy - Richmond Regional Planning District Commission
Barbara Nelson -- Richmond Regional Planning District Commission
Archita Rajbhandary – Richmond Regional Planning District Commission
Jin Lee – Richmond Regional Planning District Commission

MEETING NOTES

Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Chairman Vidunas at approximately 9:10 am.

Administration: Mr. Yolton requested that Items #6 and #7 be switched in order as they appear in the agenda. This was so the The Advisory Committee (the “Committee”) could consider the summary of the LRTP citizen survey prior to discussion of the LRTP constrained project list. The Committee approved the revised agenda for the meeting.

The Committee had no revisions or corrections to the January 7 meeting notes as presented.

Public Comment Period: There was no one present who made comments during the public comment period.

Project Director’s Report: Mr. Yolton noted that the deadline for review and comments concerning the draft Goals and Objectives for the LRTP would be extended; namely the deadline would be extended to February 7, and a reminder would be emailed to the Committee members, along with the most recent draft.

Business:

Ms. Nelson handed out a packet entitled, “Preliminary Summary of Citizen Survey Responses,” which packet presented a graphic summary of the results of the citizen surveys collected so far. In the form of pie charts, the packet showed information concerning: where respondents live, how far they travel to work or school, how they usually get to work or school, what time they leave, and what time they usually return

to home. In addition, bar charts showing the respondents' opinions concerning important ways to reduce traffic congestion, ways to enhance quality of life, and top priorities for the region also were presented.

The next item of business was the review of the initial draft list of proposed projects compiled by staff from input received over the past several days. Mr. Yolton handed out the draft projects list and noted that, while every effort was made to include all the input received, it had been very difficult to both compile and verify the list in the short amount of time available.

In addition, Mr. Yolton distributed a chart showing the proposed time bands to be used, with the inflation factor shown for each time band. The inflation factors to apply were calculated at a compound rate of three (3) percent per year, and averaged over each six-year time band.

Several Committee members noted that the project list did not appear complete based on information that had been submitted over the past several days. Mr. Yolton apologized and indicated he would review and verify project submittals, revise the list, and again distribute it to Committee members as soon as possible.

One item noted was that, in accord with the standing policy, RideFinders would be allocated 11.4 percent of regional CMAQ funds, so the CMAQ revenue forecast needed to be adjusted accordingly.

Mr. Yolton discussed the need to divide the forecasted revenue into time bands so that the required cost inflation factors could be applied. In turn, the proposed projects needed to be prioritized to correspond to the three time bands. Thus the projects should be rated by the submitters as either "near term," "mid term" or "long term."

In addition, Mr. Yolton noted that the revenues were categorized by funding source (e.g., interstate, primary, urban, etc.) and this also needed to be taken into account as far as project costing.

The Committee discussed the relationship between the forecasted time bands and the air quality conformity analysis. It was noted that only projects deemed "regionally significant" were included in the conformity analysis. VDOT staff indicated that information regarding the definition of regionally significant would be provided to the Committee.

Also, the Committee raised questions about the rules for expenditures from different funding sources, particularly when a project is defined as maintenance versus construction. In addition, the Committee briefly discussed what process would be used to eliminate proposed projects in the very likely event that not enough funds would be available for all the submitted projects.

It was determined that a revised draft project list would be distributed to Committee members after staff had verified the source material and revised the list accordingly. The spreadsheet would have additional columns added so that project submitters could indicate whether each project was deemed to be short, mid or long range. Also, columns would be added to correspond to each funding source so that submitters could indicate the likely source, or combination of sources from which funds were anticipated for each proposed project.

Mr. Yolton indicated that a separate email transmission would distribute the compiled list of projects representing the "Existing + Committed" project list for final draft review. It was noted that the E+C projects have a balance to complete that would be loaded into the first time band following the end of the existing adopted six year improvement program (SYIP), and that these costs would be inflated appropriately. Mr. Riblett from VDOT stated that he had a concern with this approach that he would later discuss with the staff.

There was a brief discussion regarding whether projects could, or should be grouped together for purposes of the LRTP, and why certain projects such as enhancement projects needed to be shown in the LRTP.

Given the amount of review required, plus the additional information requested from the project submitters, it was determined that the material would not be ready by the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Committee on Jan. 29th. Therefore, it was determined to reschedule the Jan. 29th meeting

to Jan. 31st to allow for two extra days to gather and compile the new and revised material. Under this new schedule, project submitters were to have their lists returned to Mr. Yolton by Jan. 29th.

Next Meeting/Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:15 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for January 31, 2008 at 8:30 a.m.