

**RICHMOND AREA  
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**August 9, 2007**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

**REPRESENTING**

R. M. "Dickie" King, <b>Chairman</b> .....	County of Chesterfield
Daniel N. Lysy, <b>Secretary</b> (Alternate).....	RRPDC
Robert M. Berry .....	RMA
Malvern R. Butler .....	County of Goochland
Gary A. DuVal (Alternate) .....	City of Richmond
Ralph J. "Joe" Emerson .....	County of Henrico
E. Todd Eure .....	County of Henrico
J. Michael Flagg (Alternate) .....	County of Hanover
Russell E. Holland .....	County of Powhatan
Michael Holmes .....	County of Charles City
George Homewood .....	County of New Kent
Robert P. Morris (Nonvoting Alternate).....	CTAC
Patricia O'Bannon.....	County of Henrico
Mark E. Riblett (Alternate).....	VDOT
Barbara K. Smith (Alternate).....	County of Chesterfield
Donald D. Sowder.....	County of Chesterfield
Stran L. Trout.....	County of New Kent
David T. Williams.....	County of Powhatan

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

**REPRESENTING**

William Pantele, <b>Vice Chairman</b> .....	City of Richmond
Jameson T. Auten (Nonvoting).....	RideFinders
Charles Badger (Nonvoting).....	VDRPT
Viktoria W. Badger.....	City of Richmond
Linda G. Broady-Myers (Nonvoting) .....	EDAC
Cliff Burnette (Nonvoting) .....	VDA
Tony Cho (Nonvoting).....	FTA
John Gordon.....	County of Hanover
Thomas A. Hawthorne .....	VDOT
Joseph T. Lacy .....	County of Goochland
John M. Lewis.....	GRTC Transit System
Sherman W. Litton.....	County of Chesterfield
John McCracken .....	County of Chesterfield
Faye O. Prichard .....	Town of Ashland
Ellen F. Robertson .....	City of Richmond
Ivan Rucker (Nonvoting) .....	FHWA
John Rutledge.....	CRAC

**MEMBERS ABSENT (Cont.)**

**REPRESENTING**

Robert R. Setliff .....County of Hanover  
Frank Thornton ..... County of Henrico  
Joseph E. Vidunas .....County of Hanover

**OTHERS PRESENT**

**REPRESENTING**

William R. Britton (Alternate)..... County of Charles City  
Susan Anderson ..... VDRPT  
Robert Bass .....Wilbur Smith Associates  
Jennifer DeBruhl ..... VDOT  
The Reverend Bobby Holmes ..... Henrico County Citizen  
Dan Johnson.....AARP Virginia, EDAC  
Liz McAdory ..... VDOT  
A. Donald McEachin ..... Delegate, Virginia General Assembly  
Jim Ponticello..... VDOT  
H. Charles Rasnick..... Citizen, former MPO Chairman Citizen Appointee  
Jeremy Raw ..... VDOT  
James Slade ..... Henrico County Citizen  
Jo Evans ..... RRPDC  
Allyson Finchum..... RRPDC  
Jin Lee ..... RRPDC  
Barbara Nelson..... RRPDC  
Archita Rajbhandary ..... RRPDC  
Sharon Robeson ..... RRPDC  
Sarah Smith..... RRPDC  
Jackie Stewart ..... RRPDC  
Erin Strulson ..... RRPDC  
Sarah Weisiger ..... RRPDC  
Lee Yolton ..... RRPDC

**CALL TO ORDER**

MPO Chairman R. M. “Dickie” King, Jr. called the August 9, 2007 meeting of the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to order at approximately 1:10 p.m. in the Large Conference Room of the new Richmond Regional Planning District Commission offices at 9211 Forest Hill Avenue, Richmond, Virginia. Chairman King introduced and welcomed Delegate A. Donald McEachin, representative from the 74th House District, in attendance at today’s meeting.

**I. ADMINISTRATION**

**A. Certification by MPO Secretary of Meeting Quorum –**

Dan Lysy reported that a quorum was present.

**B. Additions to MPO Agenda –**

Dan Lysy reported a request from Powhatan County for MPO consideration of a request to expand the MPO study area boundary. Mr. Lysy said notice of this request was sent to the MPO and he said staff recommends the item be added to the agenda as new item III.A. Pat O'Bannon made a motion, seconded by Todd Eure, that this item not be added to the agenda. Ms. O'Bannon detailed her concerns about consideration of this item at this time saying this request does not follow the regular process for considering MPO study area boundary expansion; to add this work item at this time would paralyze the agency in moving forward with other work efforts and future funding; and it would set a precedent for exceptions. Ms. O'Bannon suggested that Powhatan could be first in line in the next go-round for consideration of MPO study area boundary expansion.

Russ Holland took exception to Ms. O'Bannon's motion and comments about Powhatan County not following the process. He indicated Powhatan, as a small county, should not be expected to plan in isolation, but that planning should be done with the assistance of and with clear and concise guidance from the MPO. He noted an e-mailed request from the Powhatan County planning director to Mr. Lysy requesting that he provide copies of the regulations and requirements that may effect Powhatan's request. He said Mr. Lysy responded requesting that Powhatan be more specific in its request for information. Mr. Holland said if Ms. O'Bannon's motion is passed, such action might be considered punitive because Powhatan won't be able to take this action for 20 years. Mr. Holland then noted that the MPO has not provided any guidance regarding House Bill 3202 passed in the last session of the General Assembly, which will require them to plan out for 10 years and have four units per acre in order to be in compliance with state law. He said we couldn't agree with not having the request at least being put on the agenda for discussion.

David Williams questioned whether the agency would actually be paralyzed for nine months or whether it would be more like the three to four months discussed by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), which he said recommended going forward with Powhatan's request. Mr. Williams also requested clarification as to whether the MPO could or could not amend the TIP. He said he has gotten a lot of mixed information on a matter that should be fairly straightforward.

In response to a question by Stran Trout regarding the cycle on MPO study area expansion, Dan Lysy noted this item will be discussed later on the agenda, but based on recent discussions with VDOT staff, the 2031 Long-Range Plan, currently scheduled to be completed in April 2008, will likely be completed at the latest by August 2008. Staff would then proceed to look at the MPO study area boundary as the first step in the

process for preparing the 2035 Long-Range Plan update. He said the plan is updated on a four-year cycle which begins with looking at the study area boundary for necessary changes. Mr. Trout noted that the MPO would be looking at the MPO study area boundary in a little over a year and that the time constraints are not unreasonable, though he said he doesn't object to discussing the issue.

David Williams said he needs clarification on what the rules are regarding amending the Long-Range Transportation Plan with regard to changing MPO study area boundaries and adding projects under an in-force LRTP. He said he would appreciate somebody giving him that information because there is a big difference in waiting three or four years and being able potentially to make a change a year from now. Mr. Holland said the allegation has been made that Powhatan County is not playing by the rules, but standard operating procedures for this weren't included in a briefing when he and Mr. Williams came on board and he said he'd really like to know the rules and whether those rules are MPO rules, state rules, federal rules, and whether there are any conflicts in the rules.

Chairman King noted that smaller jurisdictions aren't blessed with staff to accommodate discerning all the rules. Chairman King asked Mr. Lysy what would be the delay in time-frame to incorporate Powhatan's request for expansion of the MPO study area in preparation of this plan. Mr. Lysy noted that the plan is already delayed due to revision of socioeconomic data and that expanding the MPO study area might not present a significant delay; however, he noted there are a number of unknowns in the process that could present significant delay, for example how quickly the Governor's office could take action to approve the requested expansion. Mr. Sowder said he believes Mr. Holland made a good point about smaller counties not having the staff and that things may have been overlooked and that in all fairness, this regional body should at least put the item on the agenda for discussion.

Pat O'Bannon asked if Powhatan had not been given adequate lead time to comply with the appropriate time-frame for this request. Mr. Lysy noted the MPO study area boundary process was initiated in January of 2006 with Powhatan, Goochland, New Kent, and Charles City counties. He said New Kent County took advantage of that opportunity and the MPO did expand the study area for them. Mr. Lysy said staff addressed all the questions and needs through that process when they were presented and Powhatan was given adequate opportunity.

Mr. Williams said he would like to say Powhatan County has the planning director of his dreams, with staff that has the ability and experience to handle this kind of issue, but they don't. He said as a small county, Powhatan staff has difficulty just handling the day-to-day activities. Mr. Williams noted that the Powhatan County planning director was notified

of the time-frame, but may not have understood everything he probably should have and said that he questions whether their planning director was coached by MPO staff to understand the importance of the request and tell him that the county could not do this later on in the LRTP process.

Rudy Butler called the question because he said the matter should be added to the agenda for later discussion. Chairman King restated the motion that the Powhatan request to expand the MPO study area not be added to the agenda. The MPO voted by voice vote against the motion and so the item was added to the agenda as new item III.A.

Mr. Lysy suggested that in view of the guests present at today's meeting, that action on the consent agenda items listed as item III.A under new business, be considered immediately following the open public comment period. Chairman King agreed and so changed the order of business of the agenda. Mr. Lysy also suggested that in light of the vote, the Powhatan County request to expand the MPO study area boundary would now be New Business item III.A. and noted that staff has a handout to distribute at that time. Chairman King noted that change in the agenda.

**C. Minutes of the July 26, 2007 MPO Meeting –**

Rudy Butler moved to approve the minutes and the motion was seconded by George Homewood. Mr. Holland raised an objection to the minutes noting that many specific comments he made at the meeting were not included in the minutes. He requested that action on the minutes be deferred and requested a tape or CD of the minutes and asked for an explanation of why the comments weren't included in the minutes. Mr. Holland expressed concern that the minutes were not an accurate record of the discussion of the meeting and that they included staff rebuttal to some discussion items. Dan Lysy explained that the last MPO meeting was held at Henrico County under special circumstances because MPO staff was in the process of moving their offices and the RRPDC large conference room was not available. The Henrico facility did not have recording capabilities and therefore there was no recording of the meeting. Mr. Lysy apologized to Mr. Holland for not having that record, but said he felt under the circumstances, staff did the best they could. Mr. Holland said he felt this goes back to the previously noted problem of incomplete guidance, incomplete records, and always leaving some misunderstanding so that certain counties get left out on the short end.

Chairman King said this omission by staff does not provide a way to check rebuttal and questioned how to proceed. Mr. Lysy suggested that much of the discussion in the minutes could be deleted since there is not a record of that discussion, keeping only the actions in the minutes. Pat O'Bannon suggested that Mr. Holland may wish to attach written speaking notes of his comments to the minutes. Mr. Holland said he believed it

should be noted that the meeting wasn't recorded saying he doesn't have total recall, but he knows there were many things discussed and that the tone and much of what was discussed is not contained in the minutes. He said staff should have made special provisions for recording the meeting and that they need to be better prepared and do the job professionally in the future. Rudy Butler changed his motion to approve the minutes as presented with a notation that they were not recorded. Mr. Lysy noted that on page two of the minutes under Call to Order, in brackets at the end of the paragraph, there is an MPO Secretary's note saying: "Meeting minutes prepared based on staff notes; meeting was not recorded." Mr. Butler said he would just like to include that as part of his motion and Mr. Homewood agreed to second the motion. On motion by Malvern R. Butler, seconded by George M. Homewood, the July 26, 2007 MPO meeting minutes were approved as presented with the notation that the meeting was not recorded and with all voting in favor except David Williams and Russell Holland.

**D. Open Public Comment Period –**

Chairman King requested that speakers hold their comments to three minutes and asked those wishing to speak to raise their hands so he could call on them. Chairman King called on Delegate Donald McEachin to speak first.

Delegate McEachin noted his representation of the 74th House District which includes a lot of areas of Henrico County, Charles City County, a small portion of the City of Richmond and two precincts in Hopewell. He said he is present today on behalf of a group of citizens who live at Pleasants Street and Nine Mile Road in Henrico County. Delegate McEachin noted that Nine Mile Road is one of two state roads that run through the county in his portion of the district and he said he cares very deeply about citizen needs in the area. Delegate McEachin said Nine Mile Road, being a major thoroughfare, is quite busy and Pleasants Street leads into a number of subdivisions with Highland Springs Elementary School located at the bottom of Pleasants Street. He said school buses travel back and forth and other typical school activity occurs in that area and there is a need for a traffic signal light to govern that intersection. Delegate McEachin said they have been working with VDOT to get the signal approved and have passed VDOT's muster, but are seeking MPO approval for use of federal funds for this project so that the funds may be released. He said the two gentlemen with him today, Reverend Holmes and Mr. Slade, have been working on this project for a long time and will share in detail some of the problems at that intersection. Delegate McEachin said he hopes it will be the MPO's pleasure to approve this stoplight. Chairman King thanked Delegate McEachin for his comments and called on the next speaker.

James Slade introduced himself as a Henrico County citizen who lives right at Nine Mile Road and described the Pleasants Street and Nine Mile Road intersection as very dangerous with two fatalities and frequent accidents. He said there are a lot of new subdivisions adding to the wall-to-wall traffic and said there is no easy alternate route. Mr. Slade said he is here today to find out if they are going to get approval from the MPO for the traffic light at this location. Chairman King thanked Mr. Slade for his comments and called on the next speaker.

Reverend Bobby Holmes introduced himself as pastor of Fairfield Baptist Church in Richmond saying he has family and friends who live in that area and noted that they, along with school children and all manner of traffic, pedestrians, and vehicles use that intersection. He said there have been numerous accidents, injuries, and even fatalities at that intersection and that the traffic signal light is desperately needed and has been a hot button issue in that district for a long time. He said efforts to get the light through various Henrico County supervisors had failed and that Delegate McEachin has assisted them in fighting for this light. Reverend Holmes noted that, as Russell Holland said earlier in the meeting, the Richmond Area MPO represents all the citizens of its jurisdictions and he hopes this issue will not be denied for lack of funds. Reverend Holmes said he has a blueprint with him which has been approved. Chairman King called time and Reverend Holmes asked the MPO to look into their hearts to see if they can't get that light installed.

Chairman King called for questions and Rudy Butler inquired if someone from VDOT was present who could comment on whether or not they have gone through all the studies and obtained a warrant. Mark Riblett said warrants for the traffic signal have been approved and noted the central region operations section is in a position to begin installation as soon as VDOT receives federal approval and authorization, which should take about 30 days from the date of MPO approval. Mr. Riblett said the Sandston Residency is working very closely to make sure this project is expedited and are hoping that a signal installation could be under construction as early as October 1.

### **III.A. Consent Action Items**

[Note: This item was considered out of agenda order in consideration of those guests present who spoke on item III.A.1.]

Chairman King briefly reviewed the four consent agenda items included under Item III.A which was moved forward in the agenda, and asked, if there were no objections, that the consent agenda items be voted on as a block. Rudy Butler moved approval of the consent agenda as a block and Russell Holland seconded the motion.

1. VDOT TIP Amendment Request, Traffic Signal Installation at Route 33 and Pleasant Street –

On motion of Malvern Butler, seconded by Russell Holland, the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization unanimously approved the following resolution:

**RESOLVED**, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) amends the *FY 2006 – 2008 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)* to add the project UPC 81254 Traffic Signal Installation at Nine Mile Road (Rt. 33) and Pleasant Street in Henrico County obligating \$26,000 for preliminary engineering and \$128,000 for construction in fiscal year 2007 using Highway Safety Improvement funds.

2. FY 07 UWP Amendment; PL Funds Budget Shift from RRPDC Staff to RMTS Consultants –

On motion of Malvern Butler, seconded by Russell Holland, the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization unanimously approved the following resolution:

**RESOLVED**, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) amends the FY 2007 Unified Work Program (UWP) to shift \$8,493 in FY 2007 FHWA/PL funds from RRPDC staff UWP task 5.5, Regional Mass Transit Study (RMTS) to RRPDC consultant UWP task 5.5, RMTS, for a revised FY 2007 UWP task 5.5 RRPDC consultant PL funds budget of \$23,493, and a revised FY 2007 UWP task 5.5 RRPDC staff PL funds budget of \$39,507.

3. Authorization for RRPDC Staff Travel, AMPO 2007 Annual Conference –

On motion of Malvern Butler, seconded by Russell Holland, the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization unanimously approved the following resolution:

**RESOLVED**, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) authorizes one Richmond Regional Planning District Commission staff member to attend the 2007 Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (AMPO) Annual Conference in Little Rock, Arkansas.

4. Transportation Enhancement Funds Application Endorsement –

On motion of Malvern Butler, seconded by Russell Holland, the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization unanimously approved the following resolution:

**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.

**E. MPO Chairman's Report –**

**1. Resolution of Appreciation for Outgoing MPO Chairman Robert R. Setliff –**

On motion of Pat O'Bannon, seconded by Donald Sowder, the MPO unanimously approved the following resolution:

**WHEREAS**, Robert R. Setliff serves as one of the Hanover County members to the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO); and

**WHEREAS**, Robert R. Setliff has served as MPO Chairman from July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007; and

**WHEREAS**, Robert R. Setliff during his tenure as MPO Chairman has provided exceptional commitment, guidance and direction for the MPO;

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization does hereby express its sincere appreciation and gratitude this ninth day of August, 2007 to Robert R. Setliff for his leadership and outstanding service as MPO Chairman.

Reading of the resolution by Dan Lysy was followed by a round of applause and Chairman King, noting Mr. Setliff's absence from the meeting, said that a framed copy of this resolution would be mailed to him.

**2. Resolution of Appreciation for Outgoing CTAC Chairman William C. Nelson, Jr. –**

On motion of Pat O'Bannon, seconded by Donald Sowder, the MPO unanimously approved the following resolution:

**WHEREAS**, William C. Nelson, Jr. serves as the Powhatan County member to the MPO's Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC); and

**WHEREAS**, William C. Nelson, Jr. has served as CTAC Chairman from July 1, 2006 to June 30, 2007;

**WHEREAS**, William C. Nelson, Jr. during his tenure as CTAC Chairman represented to the best of his ability the interests of CTAC and the citizens of the Richmond area; and

**WHEREAS**, the members of the MPO wish to express their sincere appreciation to William C. Nelson, Jr.;

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization does hereby express its sincere appreciation and gratitude this ninth day of August, 2007 to William C. Nelson, Jr. for his leadership and outstanding service as CTAC Chairman.

Reading of the resolution by Dan Lysy was followed by a round of applause and Chairman King, noting Mr. Nelson's absence from the meeting, said that a framed copy of this resolution would be delivered to Mr. Nelson by David Williams.

**3. Resolution of Appreciation for Outgoing MPO Chairman's Citizen Appointee H. Charles Rasnick –**

On motion of Pat O'Bannon, seconded by Donald Sowder, the MPO unanimously approved the following resolution:

**WHEREAS**, H. Charles Rasnick was appointed by past MPO Chairman Robert R. Setliff as one of the MPO Chairman's citizen appointees to the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO); and

**WHEREAS**, H. Charles Rasnick has been a diligent and active non-voting member of the MPO during his term as MPO Chairman citizen appointee; and

**WHEREAS**, the members of the MPO wish to express their sincere appreciation to H. Charles Rasnick;

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization does hereby express its sincere appreciation and gratitude this ninth day of August, 2007 to H. Charles

Rasnick for his service to the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization.

Mr. Rasnick stepped forward for the reading of the resolution by Dan Lysy, which was followed by a round of applause, and Chairman King presented a framed copy of this resolution to Mr. Rasnick thanking him for his service. Mr. Rasnick thanked the MPO for their recognition of his service.

#### **4. MPO Executive Committee Appointments –**

Mr. King reported the following MPO Executive Committee appointments for fiscal year 2008: MPO Chairman R. M. “Dickie” King, Chesterfield County; MPO Vice Chairman William J. Pantele, City of Richmond; Faye Prichard, Town of Ashland; Michael Holmes, Charles City County, Melvin R. “Rudy” Butler, Goochland County; Robert R. “Bob” Setliff, Hanover County; Stran L. Trout, New Kent County; and Russell E. Holland, Powhatan County. Mr. King also reported that he has not received a recommendation for an MPO Executive Committee member from Henrico County.

#### **5. Other Business –**

Chairman King had no other business to report.

#### **F. RRPDC Transportation Director’s Report –**

Mr. Lysy had no business to report and he welcomed all present to the new RRPDC office facilities.

### **III. OLD BUSINESS**

#### **A. Socioeconomic Data Report, Years 2000 and 2031 –**

Dan Lysy reviewed that this item was originally considered at the June 26, 2007 MPO meeting and several members expressed concern that the 2031 population forecasts were too low and did not match current growth for some jurisdictions. Following extensive discussion, the MPO voted to defer action, to send the report back to TAC for reconsideration of the forecasts, and to bring this report back for MPO consideration at the next meeting. Staff provided TAC with a report on how development of the 2031 socioeconomic data projections had proceeded. Staff found that there were new Virginia Employment Commission (VEC) population numbers available that increased the population for all jurisdictions except the City of Richmond. Mr. Lysy said state policy is to use the VEC numbers when working with state plans and programs that involve

population numbers and VDOT allows projections up to 10 percent higher than the VEC numbers. TAC agreed to the need to use the new numbers and several smaller jurisdictions adjusted projections upward with a net increase of eight percent for the region. Major concerns were for delays that would be experienced in the 2031 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and the Regional Mass Transit Study (RMTS), which Mr. Lysy said Lee Yolton would review. Mr. Lysy noted the proposed LRTP schedule laid out on the table, a smaller version of which was mailed to the MPO on Friday, August 3.

Lee Yolton noted that both the 2031 LRTP and the RMTS are dependent on the socioeconomic forecast data which is used for the travel demand model. He explained that the finalized population data, as well as other data, is allocated to traffic analysis zones which, when the model is run, helps to anticipate where highway congestion will be. Mr. Yolton said it will take about 90 days to reallocate all the population data. The consultant for the Regional Mass Transit Study estimates it will then take another 30 days for them to redo the work they had already accomplished at an additional cost of \$49,500. The Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VDRPT), contractor for the study, has agreed to the delay and RRPDC staff may have identified funds to cover the extra cost. Regarding the 2031 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), Mr. Yolton referenced the large spreadsheet schedule on the tables and explained that this is a schedule of tasks to complete for the 2031 LRTP. Adding an extra 90 days for the socioeconomic data revisions will push the 2031 LRTP completion date to October 2008. He said staff is consulting with TAC, VDOT, and VDRPT to find ways to compress the schedule so the plan could be adopted earlier. This would allow projects in the region to be considered for possible excess federal funds that are sometimes available in August. Mr. Yolton offered to answer questions.

In response to a question by David Williams, Mr. Yolton clarified that the end of the federal fiscal year is September 30 and the beginning of the new federal fiscal year is October 1. The cost of \$49,500 was confirmed in response to a question by Rudy Butler who then asked if the extra time and money are worth the result. Dan Lysy said the current contract is approximately \$329,700, a significant sum, but that this is a very important study requested by our Commonwealth Transportation Board member and we should try to present the best possible product within the means available. Mr. Lysy agreed that the additional cost is a lot of money. Mr. King inquired if the delay would significantly alter the outcome of the LRTP or the RMTS and whether we would have a better product as a result of revising socioeconomic data. Lee Yolton said TAC discussed this matter at length and recommended using the new socioeconomic data not only for technical reasons but because the new numbers are a matter of public record published on the VEC web site and may leave our plan open to question.

Pat O'Bannon inquired how this delay will effect the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Barbara Nelson explained that staff understands from conversations with FHWA and VDOT that if the LRTP expires on April 30, that we could not make amendments or changes that would add certain new projects, but we could continue to make administrative modifications to add additional obligations to existing projects and make minor changes. Existing projects in the TIP could continue to advance. Ms. Nelson said staff has had preliminary discussions with VDOT Programming staff on how to posture the FY 09 and beyond TIP so that anticipated projects could be included in the TIP and approved before the LRTP expires in April 2008. In response to several questions from Ms. O'Bannon, Ms. Nelson said that of approximately 100 changes made to the TIP in the past year, about 95 percent would fall into the adjustment or administrative modification category. She clarified that we could not make a change to add a project in the TIP such as the one made today for a traffic signal light and said that administrative changes would be determined by the MPO administrative modification/amendment guidelines that are in place and those that are contained in the federal SAFETEA-LU final regulations. Mark Riblett said FHWA would have the final call on whether a project qualifies as an administrative change or an adjustment. Responding to questions from David Williams, Ms. Nelson clarified that in terms of the two choices, amendment versus administrative modification, 95 percent of the changes made in the past year would fall under the category of administrative modification. She said every effort would be made to include every possible project in the TIP with at least minimal obligation so that the projects would be in a position to receive additional obligations. Mark Riblett concurred with Ms. Nelson's comments on minimizing the impact on the TIP should the LRTP completion date go past April 2008. He said what VDOT would strongly ask is that we do not extend past the end of the federal fiscal year and that we allow at least a couple of months at the end of the federal fiscal year in order to add new projects should we need to in order to meet our federal obligation strategy. Extensive discussion ensued bringing forward the following points:

- The 2026 Long-Range Transportation Plan will expire in April 2008 without having a new plan being completed and approved.
- VDOT strongly recommends having a completed 2031 LRTP by the end of July.
- It is important to use the best data possible in the LRTP; however it may not be best if the LRTP cannot be completed in time to meet the necessary deadline.
- Staff will examine the LRTP work task schedule and work with VDOT and others to condense the schedule enough to meet the important deadline of having the LRTP approved in time to be flexible enough to use any additional federal money that may

become available on new projects before the start of the new federal fiscal year.

- Both the RMTS and LRTP are dependent on the socioeconomic data with the RMTS being a little more sensitive to some of the data in the travel demand model.

Chairman King commented that he thinks the MPO should direct PDC staff to complete the 2031 LRTP as quickly as possible to reduce the duration of the LRTP lapse. He said he asked Chesterfield County staff to prepare some information and Barbara Smith provided him with a list of obstacles staff would face in shortening the duration of the LRTP development and ways to address those obstacles. Chairman King shared this information saying 1) the project list update including the distribution of projected funding is time-consuming, and 2) the LRTP Advisory Committee adds more time to the process. Ways to shorten the duration of the LRTP development are 1) obtain data from VDOT, GRTC, VDRPT, and RideFinders as soon as possible, 2) avoid a rewrite of the entire document unless the analysis of the updated data changes previous conclusions, and 3) keep the LRTP Advisory Committee meetings focused on scheduled milestones providing information to the committee prior to the meetings. Chairman King called for a vote on Resolution B presented in the agenda package, which was presented as the staff recommendation. Mr. Butler questioned the need for that resolution and Mr. Lysy stated that in view of discussions and information available since that recommendation was written nearly two weeks ago, he is comfortable withdrawing the staff recommendation to allow the MPO to fully consider and recommend either resolution. George Homewood moved adoption of Resolution A with the additional language that the work on revising the socioeconomic data be expedited to the greatest degree possible. David Williams seconded the motion. Discussion ensued on whether or not to set a specific deadline for completion and adoption of the 2031 LRTP. Ms. O'Bannon asked what it would take for staff to meet the July deadline and suggested perhaps more staff would help speed up the process. Mr. Lysy suggested that minimizing work in other areas to focus on completing the socioeconomic data and LRTP might be the best choice. He said a new position for senior planner opened on July 1 and the position is posted on the RRPDC web site but in light of year-end close-out work and other activities, staff has not fully addressed filling that position. Don Sowder called the question and Chairman King restated the motion and additional discussion ensued on including a deadline in the motion. Chairman King said he is comfortable with the motion as made and read and called the question. On motion of George Homewood, seconded by David T. Williams, the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization took unanimous action to approve the following resolution:

**RESOLVED**, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) proceed with the development of revised year 2031 population and population based forecasts using recently available Virginia Employment Commission (VEC) forecasts and other adjustments (i.e., extended to December 2031 and increased by ten percent) as reported by Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (RRPDC) staff to the MPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC); and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that work on revising the socioeconomic data and developing the 2031 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) update be expedited to the greatest degree possible; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that a revised draft *Socioeconomic Data Report, Years 2000 and 2031*, be prepared using these revised and adjusted forecasts and be submitted for TAC review and recommendation and for MPO review and action; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the consultant services agreement for work on the MPO Regional Mass Transit Study (RMTS), FY 2008 Unified Work Program (UWP) task 5.5, be extended with additional funding provided as appropriate, with a report on this extension and additional funding provided to the MPO as soon as possible.

Following vote on the motion, Mr. Butler said he feels that the MPO needs an update from staff on where they are with this item. Chairman King asked Mr. Lysy to provide an update at each meeting on this project and let the MPO know what percent is completed.

#### **IV. NEW BUSINESS**

##### **A. New Powhatan County Request to Expand MPO Study Area Boundary –**

An information packet was distributed on this new agenda item and Mr. Lysy apologized for the size of the packet saying there was a lot of information contained in this request and that he thought it important to document as fully as possible what has been considered through this process. Mr. Lysy said on August 2, staff received a letter from Mr. Brandon Stidham, Powhatan County Planning Director, formally requesting an expansion of the Powhatan County MPO study area boundary and expressing serious concern that the county's MPO representatives and Mr. Stidham had with a report to Mr. Russell Holland on the Powhatan County MPO study area expansion request, a report requested from PDC staff by Mr. Holland several weeks ago. Mr. Lysy noted that both the letter and the report are in the information package just distributed. He said Mr. Stidham requested that the county's request be immediately placed in the review process by TAC and the MPO and since

the MPO would be reviewing socioeconomic data for the long-range plan, he said he felt it important to discuss this request at today's meeting.

Mr. Lysy said a special TAC meeting was called and held on Tuesday, August 7, where Mr. Stidham provided a brief summary of his letter, expressed concern on the need for expanding the MPO study area, the difficulties with the information that was provided by PDC staff when this matter was addressed by TAC in January and February 2006, and concerns with implications expressed in the staff report to Mr. Holland. Mr. Lysy said staff's response was discussed at the TAC meeting and that he believes staff provided a fairly full documentation of what was covered previously when the work first started on January 3, 2006 with a memo sent to the four small jurisdictions, Goochland, Powhatan, New Kent and Charles City counties, asking whether or not they wished to expand their MPO study area for the upcoming long-range plan. Mr. Lysy said it was important for the MPO to be aware that Mr. Stidham had been given the opportunity to request expansion of the MPO study area at that time and that Mr. Stidham was fully aware of the reasons and needs for expanding the area, the timeframe for conducting the next such review, and the pros and cons for expanding the area. Mr. Lysy said those items are all attached in various e-mails between himself and Mr. Stidham and also the information provided to TAC on pages 21 through 32 of this report. Mr. Lysy said at the end of this review, Mr. Stidham noted to him that Powhatan did not recommend any changes of the MPO study area boundary at that time. Mr. Lysy said staff proceeded with a recommendation that New Kent County had for expansion of the MPO study area in that county.

Mr. Holland inquired where Mr. Lysy was in the packet and Mr. Lysy responded that he was on page 32 of the attachments and read an e-mail from Mr. Stidham stating "Staff will not be recommending any changes to Powhatan County's MPO boundary at this time. We will evaluate any future changes as we go through the process of updating our Comprehensive Plan this year. Thanks for your help. Brandon Stidham." Mr. Holland asked if Mr. Lysy responded at that time to let Mr. Stidham know there was a deadline and what the implications were and Mr. Lysy noted that had been covered previously when the item was discussed at the January TAC meeting and also in information provided to Mr. Stidham on modifying the MPO study area boundaries. Mr. Lysy read from a series of e-mails beginning on page 26 of the handout where Mr. Stidham inquired what benefits there are to changing the MPO study area boundary lines and Mr. Lysy's response detailing the primary purpose of expanding the study area boundary, and some of the impacts on the MPO planning process and the regional rural transportation program as well. Mr. Lysy said that though the e-mails alone may not have provided a full and complete answer, this was fully covered during the TAC meeting and in previous correspondence. Mr. Lysy referenced pages 29 and 30 of the

handout where staff talks about establishing the upcoming long-range plan horizon year and about boundary adjustments and what's involved with that in addition to discussion at the TAC meeting on some of the administrative procedures involved. Mr. Lysy noted that one item in the report to Mr. Holland needed correction. He had reported that the MPO would have to go through a redesignation process with each local governing body concurring on the MPO study area expansion, which he thought he had read in the new SAFETEA-LU regulations. However, FHWA member Ivan Rucker clarified that it is sufficient for this to take place at the MPO level with an MPO vote recorded based on population and central city, which are the requirements for redesignation, and that it could occur simply by an MPO vote. Mr. Lysy said TAC then talked about various work requirements for the PDC and VDOT on this item. Mr. Lysy said it is important to note that the work for changing the travel demand model would be very minimal and would not delay the LRTP, but that approval from the Governor could take several months and could potentially delay LRTP progress. Mr. Lysy reviewed various points associated with Powhatan's request including impact on the rural transportation program, impact on the MPO's ability to amend the TIP, and impact on RSTP funds with the same amount of funds and a greater area to serve.

Mr. Lysy reported that the TAC recommendation was that the MPO move forward on this request by the Powhatan County Director of Planning to expand the MPO Study Area as presented in the July 31, 2007 letter given that the MPO first move forward with the revised 2031 population forecasts and given that VDOT also approves this request subject to a letter submitted by the Powhatan County administrator in support of the expansion, which is included in the packet, and given that Powhatan County provides information on the current development of projected growth in the proposed expansion that meets requirements for future population density, which staff has not yet received and that is covered in staff's recommendation on page seven of the packet. Mr. Holland expressed surprise that PDC staff had not received the letter yet saying he was told it was faxed to PDC staff yesterday. Mr. Lysy noted staff has received the letter, but not the documentation on current development and projected growth in the proposed expansion area that meets the requirement for future population density. Mr. Williams said Mr. Stidham included in his letter a request for information and requirements related to the expansion of the MPO boundary area and going back to e-mails, Mr. Williams noted Mr. Lysy's response to "Please be more specific." Mr. Williams said he didn't know what Mr. Stidham could have done to be more specific in asking exactly what it is that staff wants so they can provide it. Mr. Holland said it doesn't matter what size the county, that it would be impossible to provide something when they don't know what is wanted; again, what are the rules. Mr. Lysy responded that he had received the request late yesterday when he was in the process of trying to

complete this report for today's meeting and he said while that response may have been flippant on his part, he believes staff has been making every effort possible to provide information. He said the request for information that we have and that VDOT requires based on federal requirements for expanding the study area is that Powhatan County provide information on current development and projected growth for the proposed expansion area that meets the requirements for future population density. Mr. Lysy said that is addressed in his staff recommendation on the reservations staff has on this request. He said staff has estimated this area to be roughly 52 square miles, not including wildlife management or parklands or institutional facilities located on large land areas. He said in order for this area to meet the U.S. Census Bureau's definition of 1,000 persons per square mile criteria for an urbanized area, it would have to have a projected population of 52,000. He said staff estimates a year 2000 population of 5,714 and with large lot development occurring in the area with a five-acre minimum lot size type development, it would be difficult to achieve sufficient density to qualify in the future as urbanized. Mr. Lysy reiterated that staff has still not received the documentation necessary to justify this request.

Pat O'Bannon inquired about the Powhatan Board of Supervisors upcoming adoption of a formal resolution in support of the request mentioned in the Powhatan County administrator's letter, which was not yet a formal action. Mr. Lysy said that either a letter from the county administrator or a resolution from the board of supervisors supporting the request was sufficient by itself. Mr. Butler inquired about Powhatan's potential loss of rural transportation enhancement funds and some discussion ensued on this point with Mark Riblett clarifying that it would be rural transportation planning grants that Powhatan would not be eligible for within the MPO study area. Mr. Riblett also noted that page 11 of the handout essentially defines the study area expansion and is consistent with what VDOT would be looking for as documentation for the Powhatan request. Mr. Holland inquired if the request is approved and gets to the Governor whether it could be modified as it is going through the system to reduce the size if there's a particular concern and Mr. Riblett said he would never say never, but his expectation would be that if there are any questions, the request may be sent back for clarification.

Mr. Holland referenced House Bill 3202 and said, again, this is another thing that they haven't gotten a clear set of rules on and if you look at the bill, Mr. Holland said it's going to mandate New Kent, Goochland, Powhatan, and other small counties to set out areas to have four units per acre and have it where you have water and sewer. Mr. Holland said Powhatan is honestly trying to do the right thing, but when you tell us to go out and put this on these major corridors and put it where the water and utility is, he said he doesn't see where they're given clear guidance to accommodate and comply with the law that people on both sides of the

aisle voted for and the Governor signed. Mr. Holland referenced a situation in New Kent that was unclear in that you could take Interstate 64 and go 1,000 feet off the road and throw that in the MPO area. He said there isn't enough guidance and somebody's got to be the guinea pig. Mr. Holland said he assumes Mr. Lysy is working in good faith, but as he goes through the documents, there are misunderstandings. Mr. Holland said if the Powhatan Planning Director had sent him a document saying we'll give you more information when we update our comprehensive plan, a red light would have been going off saying this guy isn't clear there's a cut-off date. He said he thinks the whole thing is bigger than just Powhatan County; he thinks it's about whether the different entities and jurisdictions who want to work as a region on regional planning.

Chairman King said he is neutral in this process but he asked Mr. Holland if we are essentially discussing a process that has been in effect for a long while and Mr. Holland is finding what he believes to be fallacies in it. Chairman King said he's not taking sides, but that we're asking staff if they should have done certain things and his question is, is it the responsibility of this organization and this staff to do that and is that what we agree upon and should it have been agreed upon in years past rather than after the fact. Chairman King said Chesterfield has faced things where staff may not have gotten clear direction and noted Mr. Holland's use of the word guinea pig. Mr. Holland said he used guinea pig in reference to House Bill 3202 and doesn't think there should be a finger-pointing contest because he believes at the state level, the federal level, everywhere there is not clear guidance. Mr. Holland said he believes there is a need to be working in a cooperative manner about problem identification and how we can work together for problem solutions. But if we're truly about regional planning, Mr. Holland said, we have got to have the tools to plan and should not be penalized for 20 years. Chairman King noted he is in agreement and asked Mr. Lysy if the MPO voted on this and approved it, would Powhatan qualify and if they didn't what would that mean to the long-range plan. Mr. Lysy responded that he believes it would go forward to VDOT and VDOT would send it back to the MPO saying it does not meet the requirements that are necessary for the expansion of the MPO study area. Chairman King then asked how that affects the end result of what we're trying to accomplish with the long-range plan. Rudy Butler noted expansion of the MPO study area will not give Powhatan any more funds and asked why it is so important especially if it will slow up other work. Mr. Butler said if Powhatan wants to put the whole county in the MPO study area, that's fine with him, but asked how much is it going to slow down work on the LRTP and questioned whether we shouldn't come back next November and act on Powhatan's request.

Mark Riblett clarified that the requirements for MPO study area expansion are not VDOT requirements but rather that VDOT is charged with making sure that federal requirements are satisfied in the definition of what the

MPO study area is. He said VDOT doesn't have a particular preference one way or the other except being able to determine that the application has satisfied the federal requirements. Chairman King asked to hear from one of the other smaller jurisdictions and called on Stran Trout. Mr. Trout said New Kent County Planning Director George Homewood is the expert on this, but Mr. Trout noted they do have areas with sewer and four homes or more per acres and all the other capabilities being discussed that were incorporated into the expanded MPO study area with their recent request. He said the I-64 situation was unique and left a portion of the road off that was tied more to the urban areas at the end than to the rural area in the middle. Mr. Trout deferred to George Homewood asking him for his comments. Mr. Homewood said he is probably a bad person to ask because he said he received the memo from MPO staff, responded, and got the expansion that they needed. Mr. Homewood noted he's been doing planning for 20-some years and so he understood exactly what was requested and what was needed and New Kent turned in the paperwork, provided the required justification, and the request for MPO study area expansion was approved. Chairman King said he believes the bottom line is there is just more competition for the same amount of money and, like Mr. Butler, there isn't going to be any more money. Mr. Butler noted that Goochland County has been working for 12 years to accumulate enough money to widen less than a mile of Rt. 250 and said he believes they have finally gotten enough money approved through the federal program and so he advised that if you have a project, to say this is my project and start accumulating the money for it because it takes a long time.

David Williams said he has several points he would like to make. He said Mr. Butler is right, there isn't going to be any more money and there will be just one more county in there competing. But Mr. Williams said the MPO is going to do the same thing making choices based on what the priorities are. But Mr. Williams said the disconnect for him is that various plans show different things and he gave several examples such as VDOT's corridor study shows for Rt. 711 \$60 million for short-term, intermediate, and long-term improvements but only half of Rt. 711 is in the MPO study area. He said on Rt. 522 they're going to have a new state park coming and the VTrans study shows the road going to four lanes, but in the Powhatan long-range plan, that doesn't show up. He said half of Rt. 60 is outside the MPO study area, yet the VTrans study says it's going to six lanes. Mr. Williams said he is just trying to make sense of the various planning efforts. He said if we're going to do planning let's have consistency of planning across state documents and federal documents. He said he is willing to go through the process with VDOT to find out what he doesn't know and said it is pretty daunting when you walk in here and you don't have a background with 20 years like Mr. Homewood. Mr. Williams said his planning director probably had about two years experience when the MPO started its LRTP update process in January 2006 and Mr. Williams said he's probably just trying to keep his head

above water. Mr. Williams said Powhatan County needs PDC staff to take the planning director aside and give him guidance and provide expertise. Chairman King said he is not taking sides, but that was probably where people here feel like that discussion should have taken place, when Powhatan was first asked to consider the MPO study area expansion.

George Homewood said the PDC is working on the rural long-range transportation plan to partner with and essentially go hand in glove with the MPO long-range transportation plan which will mean that our jurisdictions will not have this great wall down the middle of them. He said he believes the only real practical difference about being in the MPO study area and being out is the ability to allocate Regional STP dollars to projects that are in the MPO study area. The dollars cannot be allocated to projects in rural areas. So, Mr. Homewood noted the amount of money isn't going to change. And Mr. Homewood asked Powhatan if that is the practical difference they are looking for. He said the question he has is what is the end goal of changing the study area boundary. Mr. Homewood asked if it was to be able to spend STP in the next generation of the plan or if it's just to show a need for these roads. He said that showing the roads will be taken care of by having both rural and long-range transportation plans. Mr. Butler said the essence of the whole thing is that Powhatan needs money but until we get more money for transportation from the General Assembly, the projects Mr. Williams mentioned on Rt. 60 and Rt. 522 will never get done. He asked again if approving Powhatan's request holds up work on other projects any more than the socioeconomic data revisions will slow down the process. Mr. Lysy said maybe slightly and Ms. O'Bannon said that's not what she heard. Mr. Lysy provided some explanation saying he believes the decision to change the study area boundary isn't going to have any greater impact than the decision to update the socioeconomic data is going to create. Mr. Lysy asked Socioeconomic Data Project Manager Allyson Finchum and LRTP Project Manager Lee Yolton if they would like to comment and Ms. Finchum said it is difficult to predict because one process may end up taking longer than the other due to unknown delays. Pat O'Bannon said her concern is that staff has identified the fact that by definition the study area expansion request is not going to be approved, so that even if we go through the process and pass it on to VDOT, VDOT has already said it doesn't qualify. Mark Riblett clarified that VDOT position is that at this point, VDOT doesn't have information that demonstrates that the request qualifies for approval. Mr. Butler said in the effort of regional cooperation he makes a motion that the MPO accept Powhatan's application for extending the MPO in their County. There was no further discussion on this matter. On motion of Malvern Butler, seconded by Donald Sowder, the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization approved the following resolution (with all voting in favor except for Patricia O'Bannon, Todd Eure, and Ralph Emerson opposed; and with Michael Flagg, Mark Riblett, Robert Berry, and Dan Lysy voting to abstain):

**RESOLVED**, that the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization accepts the application submitted by Powhatan County to extend the MPO study area boundary in Powhatan County.

**B. MPO Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) Meetings Report –**

CTAC Chairman Bob Morris introduced himself saying he represents Hanover County on CTAC. He reported that CTAC had two meetings on July 31, one for a brief organizational meeting and the other to meet jointly with the MPO Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee (EDAC) to receive what was a very good report on the Regional Mass Transit Study from the study consultant. He reported that CTAC had another meeting on August 2 to primarily have discussions with area legislative representatives. He said The Honorable John O'Bannon and Chris Huttman from Delegate Katherine Waddell's office attended and there was lively discussion. He said in both meetings, there were a number of citizens present with questions and comments. Chairman King thanked Mr. Morris for his report.

**C. Close-Out of Previous MPO Allocations for RSTP and CMAQ Funded Projects –**

Barbara Nelson reported that during development of the FY 06 – FY 08 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), it was determined that projects needed to be evaluated because of inconsistencies identified between state records and MPO records regarding allocations. Staff identified 155 projects that received either RSTP or CMAQ funds and 67 of those projects are actually still active but need to be moved toward financial close-out. It was determined that 29 of those projects had possible surplus funds, though the exact amount was difficult to determine due to multiple funding sources. It was estimated that approximately \$5 million in allocations are sitting on RSTP funded projects and another \$2 million on CMAQ projects. At its April 12 meeting the MPO adopted a resolution asking VDOT to evaluate these 29 projects and possible surpluses and to work with the MPO to determine if nearly \$7 million in surplus allocations is accurate and to allocate funds for projects with deficit payoffs and to reallocate the remaining funds to existing projects within our region. Ms. Nelson reported that VDOT has made great progress and preliminary estimates are that surplus RSTP allocations are about \$5 million and surplus CMAQ allocations are estimated at about \$1 million. VDOT has requested reviewing all 67 projects that need to move to close-out. Ms. Nelson said since the original MPO resolution only specifically addressed the 29 projects with surpluses, that a resolution is needed to direct VDOT to continue to review the remaining 38 projects identified as needing to move to close-out. Ms. Nelson complimented VDOT on their efforts saying they have allocated additional staff

resources and reshuffled priorities to address this matter and have made great strides on this project which the MPO has been working on for several years. Ms. Nelson said she anticipates having a final report in September on all 67 projects and asked Mark Riblett if he had any comments to add.

Mark Riblett said that the Programming Division has undertaken this effort with the Richmond MPO for RSTP and CMAQ projects as the first MPO in the state to make this kind of reconciliation effort. He said the Programming Division has recognized the significant efforts of Ms. Nelson and MPO staff and the information that was provided to them initially in order to jump-start their work in this process. So much so, Mr. Riblett said, that VDOT is looking at potentially using the work done in this MPO as a model for work in other MPO areas and he said Programming appreciates it very much. Chairman King thanked Mr. Riblett for his remarks and directed MPO attention to the resolution at the bottom of page three under Tab 6. Mr. Butler inquired what would happen to the excess funds and Ms. Nelson explained that these funds were allocated prior to FY 05 so that they would be returned to the locality in which the project with surplus funds originated. The new guidelines had a three-year phase-in timeframe and after FY 08, funds of this nature would go into a mutual pot for regional redistribution based on regional review of regional priorities. On motion of Malvern Butler, seconded by Russell Holland, the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization unanimously approved the following resolution:

**RESOLVED**, that as follow-up to its action of April 12, 2007 requesting that staff for the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (RRPDC) submit to VDOT its list of projects which it believes to be completed, subject to financial close-out, and have a balance of funds available for reallocation, that the MPO directs RRPDC staff to submit to VDOT its list of projects which based on information available to staff, it believes to be completed and subject to close-out, and have a projected zero or deficit balance.

[Note: In seconding the motion, Mr. Holland noted a typographical error in the third line of the resolution presented in the MPO agenda attachments; the word “project” should be “projects.”]

**D. VDOT Strategy for SAFETEA-LU Compliant TIP –**

Chairman King requested that Barbara Nelson be sensitive to the time allotted for consideration of this item and Ms. Nelson agreed to be brief. Ms. Nelson said we missed the deadline of having a SAFETEA-LU compliant TIP by June 30, 2007 for reasons which are detailed in the staff report in the agenda package. She said VDOT is asking MPOs across the commonwealth to endorse a two-step process to help us continue to move

toward SAFETEA-LU compliance. She said step one of the strategy is adoption of a resolution endorsing the VDOT strategy that we will work to add projects with obligations in the FYs 09 and 10. She said the second step is to incorporate those projects as we go through the process of adjusting or amending the TIP. Ms. Nelson said the action requested today is support of a resolution, included in the agenda package, endorsing the VDOT strategy. She said that this fall, staff will bring the projects to TAC and the MPO for adjustment and amendments into the TIP. Ms. Nelson offered to answer questions. Mr. Butler moved action on the resolution as presented and Russell Holland seconded the motion. Michael Holmes inquired whether this action would in any way restrict our latitude on projects in the future and Ms. Nelson responded that by endorsing and supporting this VDOT strategy, the MPO is granted flexibility to continue to amend the TIP. She said that after June 30, 2007, we should not have been able to continue to amend the TIP, but because of the agreement that was reached between FHWA and VDOT, and because MPOs support this strategy, we will be able to amend our TIP while we work towards full SAFETEA-LU compliance. On motion of Malvern Butler, seconded by Russell Holland, the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization unanimously approved the following resolution:

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with the requirements of the U.S. Department of Transportation, the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), in cooperation with the state and affected public transportation operators, is required to prepare a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

**WHEREAS**, this TIP documents a cooperatively developed program of projects and planned obligations scheduled for implementation during a projected four year period; and

**WHEREAS**, the MPO has recently been notified by the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, the Virginia Department of Transportation, and the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation that a strategy to bring the Commonwealth's Statewide Transportation Improvement Program into compliance with SAFETEA-LU has been under development and agreed to by those agencies; and

**WHEREAS**, this strategy includes working toward adoption of the project listing addendum, identifying obligation by project phase for the FY 2009-2010 years through either administrative modification or amendment to the FY 2006-2008 TIP; and

**WHEREAS**, the Virginia Department of Transportation is now asking the MPO to support the developed strategy in order to achieve compliance with SAFETEA-LU;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the MPO does hereby approve and endorse the strategy to incorporate the project listing addendum to the FY 2006 – 2008 TIP.

**E. Unifying the System Investment Process: SYIP, TIP, and STIP Project Programming –**

Ms. DeBruhl promised not to take more than the 20 minutes allotted on the agenda and said the good part about what she has to say is that her job is to make this process a little easier. She said she would share a little bit about how they'll be able to do that. Ms. DeBruhl provided a little background noting that each year VDOT is required by the General Assembly to do a business plan which outlines the major strategic initiatives that they will undertake. This year, Ms. DeBruhl said there were 27 different strategic initiatives and one of them was called Unifying the System Investment Process. Ms. DeBruhl described the layers of process to satisfy federal requirements the goal of which is to turn transportation dollars into projects. Ms. DeBruhl provided a PowerPoint presentation addressing the various issues involved in simplifying the process with the following slides:

- Unifying the System Investment Process; VDOT's FY 08 Business Plan (cover slide)
- VDOT's Business Plan
- Unifying the System Investment Process, Critical Issues
- Multilayered Process (bar chart)
- Unifying the System Investment Process, Our Challenge
- Unifying the System Investment Process, Core Outcomes
- Unifying the System Investment Process, Benefit to Our Partners
- Unifying the System Investment Process, Key Outcomes/Deliverables
- Unifying the System Investment Process, Schedule
- Comments/Suggestions? (name and contact information)

Ms. DeBruhl concluded her presentation and Chairman King thanked her for her presentation.

**V. OTHER BUSINESS**

Dan Lysy reported he has received an e-mail from Elderly and Disabled Advisory Committee (EDAC) Chairman Linda Broady-Myers asking that she inform the MPO board that the budget amendment for the City of Richmond to extend paratransit service for City of Richmond residents at a cost of \$360,000 as it was submitted by the Mayor and approved by City Council. Mr. Lysy said she asked that he express her thanks and appreciation to the MPO for the action taken at the

April MPO meeting in support of paratransit service for various jurisdictions in the region. Mr. Lysy asked that the record show that expression of appreciation from the EDAC Chairman was reported to the MPO. Pat O'Bannon said she was so glad to hear and inquired if the service was extended in the same manner as Henrico County's paratransit was extended with regard to hours and destinations. Gary DuVal said the service is essentially the same and that GRTC worked with the City to get the cost down and make the service similar to Henrico

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Chairman King adjourned the meeting at approximately 3:45 p.m.