

RICHMOND AREA
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

MINUTES OF MEETING

February 12, 2004

MEMBERS PRESENT

REPRESENTING

Stran L. Trout, Chairman	County of New Kent
Russell E. Holland, Vice Chairman	County of Powhatan
Jack E. Apostolides (Non-voting)	VDRPT
Rollo Axton	GRTC Transit System
Richard W. Ayers	County of Powhatan
Edward Barber	County of Chesterfield
Robert Berry	RMA
Malvern R. Butler	County of Goochland
Rebecca Draper	County of Hanover
E. Todd Eure	County of Henrico
Paul E. Fisher	RRPDC
John Gordon	County of Hanover
Thomas A. Hawthorne	VDOT
Michael Holmes	County of Charles City
R. M. "Dickie" King	County of Chesterfield
Angela LaCombe	Town of Ashland
Joseph T. Lacy	County of Goochland
Diane Linderman	City of Richmond
Sherman W. Litton	County of Chesterfield
Jon Mathiasen	CRAC
Patricia O'Bannon	County of Henrico
William Pantele	City of Richmond
Ivan Rucker (Non-voting)	FHWA
Robert R. Setliff	County of Hanover
Barbara Smith (Alternate)	County of Chesterfield
Randall R. Silber	County of Henrico
D. M. "Marty" Sparks	County of New Kent
Frank Thornton	County of Henrico
Von Tisdale (Non-voting)	RideFinders
Mohammad A. Zaid	City of Richmond

MEMBERS ABSENT

REPRESENTING

Cliff Burnette (Non-voting)	VDA
Peter R. Grimm	City of Richmond
Pat Kampf (Non-voting)	FTA
John McCracken	County of Chesterfield
Barbara Nelson	CTAC

OTHERS PRESENT

REPRESENTING

Dan Lysy, Secretary	RRPDC
John R. Amos	RRPDC Legal Counsel (Amos & Amos PLLC)
Ahmet Anday	VDOT
Jameson Auten	RideFinders
Richard Beadles	VRPI
Amy Costello	VDOT
Robert Crandol	VDOT
Marleen K. Dunfee	Task Force for Responsible Growth
Gary A. DuVal	City of Richmond
Douglas Landwehr	VDOT
Anne S. McKenney	EDAC
Ron Mustain	VDOT
Herbert Pegram	VDOT
Mark Riblett (Alternate)	VDOT
Brandon Stidham (Alternate)	County of Powhatan
Ray Varney	VDOT
Joseph E. Vidunas (Alternate)	County of Hanover
Julien Williams	CTAC and LRTP
John J. Zeugner	CTAC
Mike Clements	RRPDC
Larry Hagin	RRPDC
Jin Lee	RRPDC
Sharon Robeson	RRPDC

CALL TO ORDER

MPO Secretary Daniel Lysy called the February 12, 2004 meeting of the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to order at approximately 2:30 P.M. and welcomed all in attendance. Mr. Lysy noted that there are a number of new MPO members and alternates and requested that before attending to the election of officers, those in attendance introduce themselves while an updated MPO Membership List was passed out. Introductions were made around the table.

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Election of MPO Chairman and MPO Vice Chairman –

Mr. Lysy called on John Gordon, Chairman of the MPO Officers Nominating Committee, for a report. Mr. Gordon reported that the Nominating Committee, composed of himself, Ed Barber, and Michael Holmes, had been charged with bringing forth nominations for MPO chairman and vice chairman to complete the current terms of the former chairman and vice chairman. He reported that the Nominating Committee

recommends Stran L. Trout as Chairman and Russell E. Holland as Vice Chairman. On motion by Malvern Butler, seconded by Angela LaCombe, the MPO unanimously accepted the recommendation of the MPO Nominating Committee electing Stran L. Trout as Chairman and Russell E. Holland as Vice Chairman for the remainder of Fiscal Year 2004.

B. Approval of the February 12, 2004 MPO Agenda –

On motion by Ed Barber, seconded by Russell Holland, the February 12, 2004 MPO Agenda was unanimously adopted as presented.

C. Minutes of the December 11, 2003 MPO Meeting –

On motion by Malvern Butler, seconded by Angela LaCombe, the minutes of the October 9, 2003 MPO meeting were approved as presented. Patricia O'Bannon voted to abstain noting that she did not attend the December 11, 2003 MPO meeting.

D. Open Public Comment Period –

No public comments were offered and Chairman Trout closed the public comment period of the meeting.

E. MPO Chairman's Report –

Chairman Trout appointed the newly elected MPO officers, Vice Chairman Russell E. Holland and Chairman Stran L. Trout, to serve as members of the MPO Executive Committee for the remainder of FY 04.

F. RRPDC Transportation Director's Report –

Dan Lysy passed out as an information item a flyer from Dick Beadles, Virginia Rail Policy Institute, on a transportation symposium, "Intermodal Connectivity; RX for Virginia Transportation ?," being held Friday, June 4, at the Farmington Country Club in Charlottesville.

G. Resolutions of Appreciation to Outgoing Members –

Chairman Trout turned attention to resolutions of appreciation for outgoing MPO members behind tab two of the agenda package and asked for a motion regarding the adoption of these resolutions. On motion of Bill Pantele, seconded by Rudy Butler, the MPO unanimously approve the following resolutions:

WHEREAS, the Honorable Rebecca M. Ringley has served the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization with dedication and distinguished service from January 1998 through December 2003; and

WHEREAS, she served as Chairman of the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization from July 2003 through December 2003, bringing about many positive advances; and

WHEREAS, during her tenure as MPO Chairman, she has provided exceptional commitment, guidance and direction to the MPO; and

WHEREAS, she has offered significant support and dedicated commitment to serving the citizens of the Richmond area;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization sincerely appreciates her years of service;

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, this twelfth day of February 2004, expresses deep gratitude for her dedicated efforts.

And,

WHEREAS, the Honorable Roy J. Harrison, Jr. has served the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization with dedication and distinguished service from October 1993 through December 2003; and

WHEREAS, he served as Chairman of the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization from July 1995 until June 1996, bringing about many positive advances; and

WHEREAS, during his tenure as MPO Chairman, he has provided exceptional commitment, guidance, and direction to the MPO; and

WHEREAS, he has offered significant support and dedicated commitment to serving the citizens of the Richmond area;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization sincerely appreciates his years of service;

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization this twelfth day of February 2004, expresses deep gratitude for his dedicated efforts.

And,

WHEREAS, The Honorable W. R. “Ray” Davis, Jr. has provided valuable public service from January 2000 to December 2003 as one of New Kent County’s representatives to the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization; and

WHEREAS, he has offered significant support and dedicated commitment to serving the citizens of the Richmond area through his service on the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization sincerely appreciates his important contributions and service;

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization this twelfth day of February, 2004 acknowledges and commends his dedicated efforts.

And,

WHEREAS, The Honorable J. L. “Jack” McHale has provided valuable public service from January 2000 to December 2003 as one of Chesterfield County’s representatives to the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization; and

WHEREAS, he has offered significant support and dedicated commitment to serving the citizens of the Richmond area through his service on the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization sincerely appreciates his important contributions and service;

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization this twelfth day of February, 2004 acknowledges and commends his dedicated efforts.

And,

WHEREAS, The Honorable Kelly E. Miller has provided valuable public service from January 2000 to December 2003 as one of Chesterfield County’s representatives to the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization; and

WHEREAS, he has offered significant support and dedicated commitment to serving the citizens of the Richmond area through his service on the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization sincerely appreciates his important contributions and service;

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization this twelfth day of February, 2004 acknowledges and commends his dedicated efforts.

And,

WHEREAS, The Honorable James Taylor has provided valuable public service from May 1996 to December 2003 as one of Goochland County's representatives to the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization; and

WHEREAS, he has offered significant support and dedicated commitment to serving the citizens of the Richmond area through his service on the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization sincerely appreciates his important contributions and service;

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization this twelfth day of February, 2004 acknowledges and commends his dedicated efforts.

And,

WHEREAS, The Honorable J. T. "Jack" Ward has provided valuable public service from January 2002 to December 2003 as one of Hanover County's representatives to the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization; and

WHEREAS, he has offered significant support and dedicated commitment to serving the citizens of the Richmond area through his service on the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization sincerely appreciates his important contributions and service;

AND, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization this twelfth day of February, 2004 acknowledges and commends his dedicated efforts.

Chairman Trout indicated that these resolutions would be presented at the next MPO meeting.

II. OLD BUSINESS

No old business was brought forward for consideration.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Consent Action Items –

On motion of Rebecca Draper, seconded by Richard Ayers, the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization unanimously approved the following consent agenda items as presented:

1. FTA Section 5310 Funds Applications Endorsement

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization endorses those applications for FTA Section 5310 funds as presented, and authorizes their inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Program, subject to their selection for funding by the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

2. Transportation Enhancement Funds Applications Endorsement

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization endorses those applications for Transportation Enhancement funds that are endorsed by area local governments or by quasi-jurisdictional entities in the region.

3. FY 04 UWP Budget Amendments for Staff Work Tasks

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization amends the FY 04 Unified Work Program (UWP) to shift PL funds among various RRPDC staff work task budgets as follows:

UWP Task No./ Description	Current PL Budget	Shift	Revised PL Budget
1.1 MPO Maintenance	\$258,958	+25,000	\$283,958
1.3 UWP	30,000	-5,000	25,000
2.1 Socioeconomic Data	40,000	-15,000	25,000
2.2 LRTP	120,000	+15,000	135,000
2.5 Transp. Data/GIS	100,000	-40,000	60,000
3.1 CMS	50,000	+20,000	70,000
3.2 Access Mgmt.	20,000	-5,000	15,000
4.1 TIP	70,000	+15,000	85,000
6.1 Intermodal	20,000	-10,000	10,000

4. VDOT TIP Amendment Requests for Secondary Road Projects

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization amends the Secondary System section of the AMENDED FY 02/03 – FY 04/05 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add new projects and update project entries for other projects as requested by VDOT and as presented in the attached additions (included in the MPO agenda attachments) and revisions to the TIP.

5. Hanover County TIP Amendment Request

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization amends the FY 02/03 – FY 04/05 Transportation Improvement Program to add five new projects as shown below, and that \$765,000 in Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds be transferred from Project #627-042-254, C502, B634 (UPC #17861) and allocated to these five new projects as follows:

Project #	UPC #	Description	Amount
0033-042-109, PE101,N501	68239	Shoulder Wedge	\$180,000
0656-042-331, N501	71350	Shoulder Wedge & Pavement Overlay	\$145,000
0615-042-332,N501	71351	Shoulder Wedge & Pavement Overlay	\$90,000
0627-042-333, N501	71353	Shoulder Wedge	\$250,000
0637-042-		Shoulder Wedge & Pavement Overlay	\$100,000
			\$765,000

6. VDOT TIP Amendment Request for Transportation Enhancement Projects

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization amends the AMENDED FY 02/03 – FY 04/05 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to program 2003-04 enhancement funds for six projects as requested by VDOT and as presented in the attached revisions to the TIP (included in the MPO agenda attachments).

7. VDOT TIP Amendment Requests for Transportation Safety Program and Secondary System Projects

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization amends the AMENDED FY 02/03 – FY 04/05 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add transportation safety projects and update project entries for safety projects as requested by VDOT and as presented in the attached additions and revisions to the TIP (included in the MPO agenda attachments).

8. Functional Classification Updates for Proposed Route 895/Airport Connector and Airport Drive South

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization approves the following updates to the functional classification of Richmond urbanized area roads:

- Proposed I-64/Route 895 Connector – Other Principal Arterial (from Darbytown Road to Charles City Road).
- Airport Drive South – Other Principal Arterial (from Charles City Road to Airport Entrance); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) provide the County of Henrico with written assurance that the county is not obligated for maintenance of these roadway sections based on this functional classification action, and that VDOT provide the county with this written assurance within a certain period of time (to be determined by the County of Henrico).

B. MPO Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee (EDAC) Meeting Report –

Chairman Trout noted the EDAC meeting report is contained under tab four of the agenda package. He asked if EDAC Vice Chairman Anne McKenney would like to make a report in the absence of EDAC Chairman Cora Dickerson and Ms. McKenney declined saying she had been absent

from the last meeting and had nothing to add to the report contained in the agenda package. Chairman Trout noted that the report was an information item and that no action was required. Dan Lysy offered to address questions regarding the report and there were none.

C. Proposed RSTP and CMAQ Projects –

Chairman Trout introduced the next agenda item, Proposed RSTP and CMAQ Projects, found behind tab five of the agenda package, and asked Mr. Lysy to discuss the item. Mr. Lysy said there are two actions for MPO consideration on this matter. The first is a request to authorize submission of proposed Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) projects for consideration by the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB), inclusion in the VDOT Six Year Program, and for air quality conformity and environmental justice analysis. Mr. Lysy said the list was developed following allocation procedures used for the past several years and that nothing is different in the development, approval, or presentation process. The second action is a request to direct the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to provide its recommendation on a new RSTP and CMAQ funded project review and selection process. Mr. Lysy said the reason for this action is based on a letter received from FHWA on October 21, 2003 advising that the MPO's process for selecting proposed RSTP projects may not be in compliance with federal code. Staff responded to FHWA with a letter saying we believe we are in compliance. TAC held a special meeting on January 15 to discuss instituting a new procedure right away to come up with a new process for selecting proposed RSTP and CMAQ projects. However, Mr. Lysy reported that TAC concluded such a change at this point in time would be extremely difficult due to numerous projects already underway, commitments in the secondary improvement program list, and other vital considerations. Mr. Lysy said FHWA verbally advised that the MPO should commit to a new process for selecting proposed projects with the understanding that the MPO could proceed with the current process at this time, and TAC then took unanimous action to recommend that a new process for selecting RSTP and CMAQ projects be established and used for the next round of RSTP and CMAQ funding. TAC further recommended MPO approval of the RSTP and CMAQ projects list as presented in the agenda package. Mr. Lysy reported that TAC has already established a subcommittee to look into this matter and provide a report at an upcoming TAC meeting. He said FHWA and staff have agreed this is a process that will be looked at during the upcoming Triennial MPO Certification Review Meeting targeted for this spring as part of the normal review process. Mr. Lysy said the requested MPO action is to approve the list of projects as presented for submission to the CTB for inclusion in the Six Year Program, and he noted that changes to

this list could be made as a result of the public review process. Mr. Lysy offered to address questions.

In response to a question by Pat O'Bannon, Mr. Lysy explained that FHWA believes the current process is not correct and staff believes that it is, so they have agreed to resolve this difference as part of the upcoming certification review. As a result of that process, Mr. Lysy said staff will work with TAC to look at those findings and determine what appropriate adjustments may be necessary. He said it could be that the MPO would have to revisit this matter before the final TIP is adopted if FHWA finds there are severe problems; or, FHWA may conclude that only minor changes are necessary in order to resolve this matter. He said the MPO certification review, done every three years, will resolve the matter and the final answer will come at that point. In the meantime, he said staff recommends the MPO proceed with the actions presented in the agenda package.

On motion by Ed Barber, seconded by Angela LaCombe, the MPO unanimously approved the following resolution (Resolution Number One):

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) authorizes the submission of proposed Regional Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality projects for consideration by the Commonwealth Transportation Board, inclusion in the VDOT Six Year Improvement Program, for air quality conformity and environmental justice analysis, and for public review as part of the MPO's final draft Transportation Improvement Program document.

On motion by Ed Barber, seconded by Angela LaCombe, the MPO unanimously approved the following resolution (Resolution Number Two):

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) directs the MPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) to provide its recommendation for MPO review, consideration, and action as appropriate on the MPO's process for developing and selecting proposed Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) projects, and any proposed changes which may be required based on FHWA and FTA findings from the upcoming MPO Triennial Certification Review.

D. 2026 LRTP Revised Schedule and List of Proposed Projects –

Chairman Trout called attention to information presented behind tab six of the agenda package and turned the meeting over to Mike Clements for his presentation on the 2026 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) revised

schedule and the list of proposed projects for the plan. Mr. Clements introduced himself as RRPDC Principal Planner and Project Manger for the Long-Range Transportation Plan Update project and reviewed materials he would refer to during his presentation that were included in the agenda package and provided in a separate mailing. He said that for most of his presentation he would use the summary sheet, "2026 LRTP Funding Summary," which was the first sheet in an information packet sent under separate cover from the agenda package.

Mr. Clements began his PowerPoint presentation with a flow chart showing the LRTP progress to date saying the LRTP Advisory Task Force has identified goals, taken those goals to public review meetings, received comments on them, and reported those comments to the MPO at its October 2003 meeting. Mr. Clements said staff and the LRTP Advisory Task Force have collected and analyzed a large quantity of data since the process began in May of 2003 and developed project lists which were presented at public workshop meetings held in December 2003. Comments from these workshops were compiled and responses were sent. Mr. Clements said that now the task force is ready to test alternatives and the first test to run is financial constraint. He said the MPO is presented with a scenario for a financially constrained plan to consider for adoption at today's meeting. He said that the financially constrained plan if approved by the MPO will then be submitted for two more tests, environmental justice analysis to be run by MPO staff and air quality conformity analysis to be run by VDOT staff. Mr. Clements said once those three tests are passed, the preferred alternative plan will again be submitted for public review, scheduled for March, and then be presented for MPO adoption at the April meeting. Then, he said, the entire Long-Range Plan goes on to Federal Highway (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for conformity review. Commenting on the tight schedule, Mr. Clements referred to the LRTP schedule on page 12 of the agenda package saying that staff and the LRTP Advisory Task Force have packed about a year-and-a-half's worth of work into less than one year and are running only about one month behind, but nevertheless, there are tight deadlines to meet the May 16 deadline. He said the schedule must allow for review time with a two-week public review period followed by a federal review and comment period, which can take up to 45 days.

Mr. Clements reviewed the Long-Range Plan requirements. He said it must have a minimum 20-year horizon, be multi-modal including highway, transit, bicycle, airport access, port access, and freight. Most importantly, Mr. Clements said the plan must be financially constrained including only projects the region can reasonably estimate it can afford for the next 23 years. He said the plan must also go through the various reviews for air quality conformity and environmental justice, and

incorporate meaningful public involvement. Mr. Clements explained the relationship of the LRTP to the VDOT Six Year Program (SYP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) saying the Long-Range Plan is the large master plan, the Six Year Program is the median time frame document, and the TIP is the more immediate three-year program plan. He said each of these plans must be financially constrained within themselves, but the funding does not always match from document to document due to changes in funding estimates and actual funding over time.

Mr. Clements returned to the 2026 LRTP Funding Summary 11 x 17 flow chart and explained how to read it and how it was built. He said the first step was to come up with an estimate of the amount of funds that would be available to the region over the next 23 years, which amounted to around \$6.2 billion. This estimate was developed by VDOT and provided to staff. Next the estimated maintenance costs of \$4.2 billion were subtracted from estimated funds available leaving \$2.2 billion for all projects and programs for the next 23 years. After subtracting allowances for deficit funded projects such as Rt. 288 and committed projects and those projects already in the Six Year Program or the TIP (and fully funded to include all preliminary engineering, right-of-way, and construction costs), only about \$1.4 billion remained for the task force to program. He said the task force looked at the eleven categories listed on the bottom row of the flow chart in prioritizing projects and putting together a constrained list of projects outside of the Six Year Plan to cover the life of the plan over the next twenty-three years. Mr. Clements reviewed each category discussing the types of projects included under each, giving specific examples, and explained how the projects were developed for each group. He said the task force prioritized the Interstate and National Highway System/Non-interstate funded projects. Mr. Clements explained that Primary (for purposes of the LRTP) and Secondary category funds are formula driven allocations made to counties based on 80 percent population and 20 percent land area and urban funds are allocated to the City of Richmond and the Town of Ashland based on population percentage. He said staff applied the formulas and provided each of the nine jurisdictions the specific dollar amount of its allocation asking each to prioritize its own projects. Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds are generally allocated in the TIP to smaller projects that do not have to be included in the long-range plan by line item per project so that only one project, a RideFinders project, is specified in this category. Mr. Clements said the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) projects were decided by the LRTP Advisory Task Force based on a staff-developed document, "Guide to Regionally Funded Projects." The guide was developed with the intent of maximizing the project list and the amount of dollars available to this region and Mr. Clements said the task force looked for

projects on that list that generally cannot be funded by one jurisdiction alone but would need the support of the entire region to fund.

Rebecca Draper requested permission of the chairman to ask questions of Mr. Clements during his presentation, in “workshop” format, and Chairman Trout approved this. Ms. Draper stated that on the stamped page 13 of the 11 x 17 packet, there are a total of \$1.4 billion of RSTP Proposed Projects, Previous Funding total of \$1.7 million, and that the “Balance to Complete” column has hard-keyed RSTP allocations totaling only \$194 million. Ms. Draper said she felt the “Balance to Complete” column is not labeled correctly – it is actually the anticipated total RSTP funding to be allocated to each project, with a true Balance to Complete of \$1.3 billion. She asked why these projects do not have to meet the test of financial constraint and expressed concern that the spreadsheet indicates that \$1.4 billion worth of projects would be accomplished with only a \$194 million balance to complete. She further expressed concern that Mr. Lysy said these projects have other sources of funding and inquired what those sources might be. Responding, Mr. Clements said he felt that the “Balance to Complete” column could have a better name and explained how the figures in that column were derived. Ms. Draper said she was interested in what the other sources are for the really expensive \$1.1 billion City of Richmond light rail transit project to be built with \$20 million from RSTP funds and a Minimum Guarantee from the Commonwealth Transportation Board. She said Ahmet Anday, VDOT Environmental Programs Manager, confirmed that projects which are run through the regional conformity analysis need to be financially constrained and Ms. Draper expressed concern about adopting a plan with a \$1.3 billion deficit unaccounted for. Mr. Clements explained that the light rail and commuter rail projects referred to by Ms. Draper used the \$1.165 billion cost estimate identified in the recent regional transit study. He said few if any U.S. cities fund transit projects solely through MPO funds, but rather rely on other funds made available through federal transit “New Starts” program, Congressional ear-marks, bonds, special district and other taxes, etc., sources which are not firmly identified until later in the planning and funding process. Mr. Clements said inclusion of these projects in the plan demonstrates to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) a financial commitment by this region to those types of projects.

Ms. Draper expressed additional concern that the Balance to Complete column on the 8-1/2 x 14 sheet, last page, under “Other Funded Projects,” also does not explain where all the funding comes from. She explained how Hanover County tracks funds in its six-year plan spreadsheet with the formula “cost minus funding equals balance to complete” showing any differences in a comments column. She said the plan appears disingenuous with such a large balance to complete and no funding source

shown. Ms. Draper said that with a \$1.1 billion deficit, there is a disconnect in the honesty of the document by hard-keying in such a low balance to complete number. Mr. Clements assured Ms. Draper that they think alike on this matter saying that this omission was a space-saving effort and that the full spreadsheet on his computer which shows all funding sources for every project is simply too large to reproduce for purposes of the plan. Mr. Clements further clarified that not just these transit projects, but many of the projects on the spreadsheets are funded under multiple categories. Mr. Lysy said that the primary reason the sheets are set up as they are is to demonstrate for federal requirements that the plan meets financial capacity. He said the task force took the various projects deemed appropriate for their jurisdiction and placed them under appropriate funding sources, indicating where there is a balance to complete. He said Ms. Draper is correct in saying "Other" is huge, but that it is normal. The purpose is to show the region is making a serious commitment to put serious money into putting light rail or some other kind of transit service in the region. He said from a planning standpoint, what this document does in the end, in addition to demonstrating financial capacity, is provide a list of projects that are eligible to go forward. If it is not included in the plan, it is not eligible for federal funds. Mr. Lysy said it is the nature of transit projects, especially rail projects, that they be funded largely from various sources outside the resources normally or routinely available to the region. Ms. Draper said that the balance to complete column then means the balance of the RSTP funding and not the balance to complete the project and Mr. Lysy said yes, that the label is misleading. Ms. Draper suggested that the label on that column be changed to something along the lines of RSTP Allocations Per Project or something that would clarify that this column does not represent the full balance to complete. Mr. Lysy further clarified that "commitment" does not mean a commitment to build these very expensive projects but rather a commitment to include them in a serious way in our long-range planning process.

Mr. Clements continued his presentation picking up with the minimum guarantee section explaining that these funds are also known as STP or Surface Transportation Funds, a flexible pot of funds made available to the CTB. He said we provide what our thoughts are for use of these funds and that those projects generally tend to be the larger regional projects. Mr. Clements moved on to the enhancements category saying the task force left this pot of funds alone, with the exception of the Virginia Capital Trails project through Henrico and Charles City counties, because it tends to be for smaller projects that don't have to be itemized in the long-range plan. Mr. Clements then explained the Safety Projects category saying that these funds are generally for smaller type projects and do not have to be included individually in the long-range plan. Mr. Clements said all of the money in the last list, transit capital, is for capital projects in transit

including new buses, new bus routes, new transit services such as bus rapid transit or light rail and those types of facilities. He said this pot of funds was given to GRTC for them to prioritize and they provided a list of projects.

Chairman Trout thanked Mr. Clements for his presentation and asked for further questions at this time. Ms. Draper inquired if the safety category is the Hazard Elimination Safety program and Mr. Clements responded yes. Ms. LaCombe inquired how and when projects are determined in the "Other" category listed at the bottom of the sheet under RSTP Proposed Projects. Mr. Lysy explained that these are smaller projects that have little or no effect on air quality and are not required to be itemized by project in the long-range plan; however, they need to be accounted for from a financial standpoint and so it is shown in the plan as locally initiated projects. In response to a question by Todd Eure, both Mike Clements and Dan Lysy clarified that the \$57 million in Other RSTP Projects would not be used to fund other regional projects in the plan.

Barbara Smith noted that Chesterfield has two minor amendments for MPO consideration. She said the first one involves a primary project listed on Route 10 from I-95 to Meadowville Rd. shown as a widening project from four to six lanes. Ms. Smith said Chesterfield would like to revise this project to show that about a fifth of that project will really be a widening from four to eight lanes to be consistent with project plans and design. Dan Lysy and Mike Clements clarified that the additional cost for this project would be \$2.8 million to come from Primary Systems funding. Mr. Clements said this would require shifting minimum guarantee money to primary system funds to cover the project, but that the money is available.

Mr. Clements continued with his presentation making two corrections to the project list. One project, project 110, map label 110, Commerce Rd., Walmsley Blvd./North Junction of Bells Rd., on the NHS non-interstate system list was also incorrectly listed on the urban list, page nine for the City of Richmond. The second project, page 7, map number 754, Parham Rd., Brook Rd., double left turn lane, east bound, west bound, on the National Highway System list was also incorrectly listed on the Secondary list, also map number 754. He said these projects were double-counted and that both should remain on the NHS list and be removed from the other categories, thus freeing up about \$1.2 million.

Continuing his presentation, Mr. Clements said that one item of great importance to the Advisory Task Force was how the projects split up regionally between highway projects and non-highway projects, and further, how they split up into new facilities, adding lanes, or improving traffic signals. Mr. Clements said the PowerPoint chart demonstrates that the project list is about 76 percent highway project costs and 24 percent

non-highway costs. He said this is a fairly well rounded multi-modal plan for a region of our size.

Chairman Trout thanked Mr. Clements for his presentation and clarified with Mr. Clements that the Rt. 10 project mentioned by Ms. Smith is already in the plan, but the scope of the project is changed causing the funding to change by \$2.8 million. Ms. Smith presented a list of 18 private/local funded projects to be included in the plan for purposes of demonstrating financial constraint. She said the list also includes vision projects which do not need to be financially constrained but that paint a picture of what Chesterfield County would like to do in the future.

Ivan Rucker, Federal Highway representative, said that Federal Highway (FHWA) has a very good working relationship with and respect for the MPO staff. Mr. Rucker said that FHWA will consider this particular list based on the recommendations provided by MPO staff that they believe the list and recommendations provided by Chesterfield to be accurate. He said Federal Highway would verify that at a later date. Chairman Trout thanked Mr. Rucker for his comments.

Rebecca Draper asked if other localities could adopt Chesterfield's strategy of including private/local projects in the plan. Mr. Clements verified that jurisdictions were notified last month of the need to submit private/local projects and that on page 20 of the 11 x 17 sheets there was a list of private/local projects received to date (which includes projects from Hanover County) with the exception of Chesterfield's projects presented today. Mr. Lysy explained in more detail the process of documenting private/local funds for this list of projects and said that Hanover County and others would have another opportunity to include projects when we do the LRTP update in three years or when we do the conformity analysis on the Transportation Improvement Program, it would then be a good time to consider amendments to the Long-Range Transportation Plan as well.

Ivan Rucker indicated that if FHWA sees numbers that seem unreasonable, they are going to request the MPO staff to provide back-up from the jurisdiction, including a trend analysis showing Chesterfield has been able to raise this type of funds. Barbara Smith agreed that Chesterfield would try to provide that information by next Thursday's Interagency Consultation Group meeting on the air quality conformity when they will review the assumptions for the work that's going into the conformity analysis for the long-range plan. Tom Hawthorne said that the VDOT Environmental Division has no time to spare in running the conformity analysis and emphasized the importance of leaving today's meeting with an approved projects list so that the conformity analysis could be done in order to prevent a lapse in conformity on May 16. Mr. Lysy explained how a conformity lapse could result in the region losing

funds to other localities, thereby creating significant delays in projects here.

In response to a question by Diane Linderman about air quality conformity analysis and the effect of more roads on conformity, Mr. Lysy explained that what you are trying to do in conformity analysis is show that the projects in the plan versus the population, employment and other socioeconomic trends in the region are meeting the needs. He said ultimately it's important to have a balanced multimodal plan providing the best mix of projects and meeting as many needs as possible to meet conformity in the long-run. Ms. Costello, VDOT Environmental Division staff, said you can't really just look at just roads. She said so many demographics come into play in the model and so many other factors are also considered that you can't just look at any one factor and know how it will affect the conformity analysis.

Chairman Trout noted the suggested motion on page three of tab six in the agenda package and asked if anyone would consider a motion at this time. Rebecca Draper moved that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization authorize the submission of the 2026 Long-Range Transportation Plan List of Proposed Projects as presented and as amended by staff for air quality conformity and environmental justice analysis and for public review as part of the draft 2026 LRTP subject to:

- 1.) Amending the RSTP Proposed Project List, which is stamped page 13 of the supplemental agenda information on 11 x 17 size copies, to revise the RSTP Proposed Project List which now read "Other RSTP Projects" to read "Rural Safety Projects"; and
 - 2.) To eliminate footnote number two on the RSTP Proposed Project List.
- Ed Barber seconded the motion.

Chairman Trout asked if there is a definition for rural safety and Rebecca Draper responded no, that it intentionally is not defined. She said in looking at all the funding categories there is only one safety category, Hazard Elimination Safety (HES). Ms. Draper elaborated on Hanover County's new philosophy on its road-building program saying that safety projects are replacing road-widening projects. She said they have found that the safety measures are less expensive and have a greater impact on saving lives. She said RSTP money from the MPO can pay 100 percent on a road of any (except local) functional classification for safety improvements whereas hazard elimination safety (HES) funds do not have that type of flexibility. HES funds require a 90-10 match, are competitive, and can only be spent on road segment projects of high accident location. She said that \$57 million, roughly 30 percent of the RSTP funding, if designated on the project list for rural safety projects, would allow locally initiated projects year-to-year to address safety projects in all jurisdictions and to spread this safety money around. Angela LaCombe expressed

concern that the Town of Ashland and the City of Richmond receive urban funds saying that she would have real concerns about their being able to tap into funds labeled rural safety. Ms. LaCombe said it changes the category and could eliminate Ashland getting any regional RSTP money and she would rather leave it flexible so that all jurisdictions can use the money in the way that's best for them.

Ivan Rucker said he shares Ms. Draper's concern for safety saying that safety is FHWA's growing star. However, he said that the problem with calling it rural safety is that you've got urban funds that aren't supposed to be used in rural areas. Mr. Lysy concurred saying rural implies that it's outside the MPO study area and therefore not eligible for those RSTP funds. Ms. Draper then suggested the category be called local safety giving emphasis that the projects be locally initiated and safety in nature. She said she would entertain an amendment to her motion substituting the words "local safety" for "rural safety." Ms. LaCombe continued to express concern about Ashland being able to continue using RSTP funds for projects that aren't considered safety projects. She said Ashland needs to be able to spend the funds on roads that are its highest priorities and not on a very narrow category of funds limited to just safety. Chairman Trout called for a motion to amend and John Gordon offered a motion to amend Ms. Draper's original motion to say "local safety" in place of "rural safety." Robert Setliff seconded the amendment. In further discussion, Ms. LaCombe again expressed concern about limiting use of the funds for safety. There were no further questions or comments and Chairman Trout called for a vote on the amendment and after some clarification of the amendment the MPO voted by voice vote to approve with one abstention an amendment to the original motion striking the word "Rural" and inserting the word "Local" in numbered item one of Ms. Draper's original motion.

Chairman Trout now called for discussion on the amended motion, which includes the changes made by Mr. Clements and Ms. Smith earlier in the meeting. Ms. LaCombe again expressed concern about limiting the category to safety projects and pleaded to keep the category general. Chairman Trout called for a voice vote which proved to be inconclusive and Chairman Trout then called for a show of hands.

On motion of Rebecca Draper, seconded by Edward Barber, the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization approved the following resolution by a vote of 13 in favor and 11 opposed with two abstentions:

RESOLVED, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) authorizes submission of the *2026 Long-Range Transportation Plan* (LRTP) list of proposed projects, as presented and as amended by the MPO, for air quality conformity and environmental

justice analysis, and for public review as part of the draft 2026 LRTP, subject to:

- 1.) Amending the RSTP Proposed Project List, which is stamped page 13 of the supplemental agenda information attachments, to revise the RSTP Proposed Project List which now reads "Other RSTP Projects" to read "Local Safety Projects"; and
- 2.) Eliminating footnote number two from the above noted RSTP Proposed Project List.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Trout adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:50 P.M.