Minutes of the January 11, 2007 Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization – Policy Committee meeting held at 4:30 p.m. in the Petersburg Train Station located at 103 River Street in Petersburg.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Annie Mickens, Petersburg; Joe Leming, Prince George; Ken Emerson Hopewell; Doretha Moody, Dinwiddie; Barbara Smith (alternate) Chesterfield; Mark Riblett, VDOT; Ron Reekes, PAT; Denny Morris, Crater PDC;

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Wood, Colonial Heights;

OTHERS PRESENT: Dama Rice, Petersburg; Tim Blumenschine, Petersburg National Battlefield Park; Ron Svejkovsky, VDOT; Felecia Woodruff, VDR&PT; Unwanna Dabney, FHWA; Mark Bassett, Dinwiddie; Dama Rice, Petersburg; Larry Constantine, Fort Lee; Dr. Joseph Leming, Prince George; Ben Dendy, Itinere; Brian Curtis, Michael Baker, Inc.; Joe Vinsh, CPDC;

Chairperson Mickens called the meeting to order at approximately 5:45 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – November 9, 2006

Upon a motion by Mr. Emerson, seconded by Ms. Moody and carried, the minutes of the November 9, 2006 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

Mr. Vinsh reported he had contacted Dinwiddie County on the question of County support for a suggestion made by a Sierra Club representative during the November MPO meeting that the MPO give consideration to requesting the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation study a different alignment for connecting the A and S lines in conjunction with the Southeast High Speed Rail Study that would avoid the battlefields and not use the Burgess
Mr. Vinsh indicated Dinwiddie County did not have interest in pursuing a connecting route other than the Burgess Connector at this time.

STATUS REPORT ON THE FORT LEE EXPANSION TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Mr. Vinsh introduced Mr. Curtis with Michael Baker, Inc. and indicated the Technical Committee has recommended the Policy Committee adopt a resolution indicated the project report has been received and the final version will include revised project cost estimates and additional information regarding the status of Shop Gate Road.

Mr. Curtis distributed a handout and presented information summarizing project findings.

Mr. Constantine asked if the $270,000 cost estimate for Shop Road Gate improvement only included signalization.

Mr. Curtis indicated the $270,000 amount only included signalization and that current volumes do not meet VDOT warrants for signalization.

Mr. Constantine asked about the status of the Hickory Hill Road project.

Mr. Morris stated the CPDC recently received an award of one-half of the $1,500,000 amount requested from the Virginia National Defense Authority toward the $3,000,000 total cost of the Hickory Hill Road project. Mr. Morris further indicated a need to execute an agreement for the $750,000 funds awarded for this project.

Mr. Vinsh commented that a meeting has been set with VDOT to discuss options for working with this funding shortfall.

Mr. Constantine asked about the construction start date for the Hickory Hill Road project.

Mr. Morris indicated we have a 4-year window to complete the project beginning February 1, 2007.

Mr. Svejkovsky stated time requirements to complete the project will be influenced by the amount of right-of-way, if any, that may need to be acquired.

Mr. Riblett stated VDOT is interested in reviewing information on future traffic volumes projected for Shop Road Gate. This information would be helpful in evaluating improvements at this location.

Dr. Leming asked if the project cost estimates used are present day or build out.
Mr. Riblett indicated the consultant was told to prepare cost estimates in 2006 dollars.

Dr. Leming stated there is a need to have information on how project cost estimates will change over time as it is unlikely all needed projects will be built in the near term. Actual costs are likely to be significantly higher than estimates expressed in 2006 dollars.

Mr. Vinsh commented the Technical Committee has identified a need for a timeline to be attached to each of the recommended transportation projects in order to complement facility construction schedule on base.

Ms. Woodruff suggested a footnote be included in the report indicating cost estimates are expressed in 2006 dollars.

Mr. Curtis also indicated the report provides information on a federal program for transit subsidy.

Mr. Vinsh mentioned that the transportation element of the upcoming Growth Management Plan will be broader in focus and not duplicate the Baker analysis for improvements at specific locations. Transit and travel demand alternatives for reducing the loads at the gates, particularly during peak hours will be explored.

Dr. Leming asked how broad will the view be for the Growth Management Study?

Mr. Morris indicated the study area will be all six BRAC localities. VDOT has agreed to re-run the Richmond Traffic model with the BRAC growth increases. The housing element will develop information on housing stock anticipated to be available at the time BRAC related personnel arrive and into the future.

Ms. Woodruff commented on the availability of several travel demand management alternatives and explained how military bases are well-suited for these applications.

Dr. Leming made reference to page 12 of the Baker handout regarding potential options to improve internal circulation at Fort Lee. Dr. Leming commented his understanding was that the leadership at Fort Lee actually prefers Option 2, the relocation Route 36, over Option 1, the construction of an overpass at Rt. 36 and River Road as its first preference.

Dr. Leming indicated security concerns at Fort Lee may cause Option 2 to become a reality and cautioned economic development interest along a potential corridor shown by Baker for the Route 36 relocation may be adversely impacted.

Mr. Constantine indicated the split interchange at Route 36 is Fort Lee’s 1st priority in
addressing some of the problem with traffic coming in at Sisisky Gate and confirmed that the long-term goal is the relocation of Route 36.

Dr. Leming expressed concern over the possibility of making improvements justified from a transportation service perspective in the near term only to be replaced with more costly improvements justified from a military security/operations perspective at a later time.

Chair Micksens stated that we are all concerned, especially those of us heavily impacted, about the potential relocation of Route 36 and the adverse impacts such a project would have on the area.

Upon a motion by Dr. Leming, seconded by Mr. Emerson and carried, a motion was adopted to receive the Michael Baker report, including the updated project cost estimates, additional language on the current status of Shop Road Gate and a reference indicating project cost estimates are expressed in 2006 dollars.

DISCUSSION OF REQUEST FROM VDOT REGARDING ROUTE 460 PRIVATE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION ACT PROPOSALS

Mr. Vinsh indicated VDOT has requested MPO comments on the 3 PPTA Route 460 proposals by January 15, 2007. Mr. Vinsh further indicated a draft comment letter has been prepared reiterating previous MPO support for Route 460 improvements and requesting consideration for Prince George County suggestions for modifications to the approved project alignment.

Dr. Leming reviewed the following 4 suggested modifications being developed by Prince George County as comment to VDOT regarding the Route 460 solicitation:

1. Enhance the economic development potential of Southpoint Industrial Park by protecting access to the park with a new intersection and connector facility from the new Route 460 to connect with the proposed Norfolk/Southern Intermodal Facility and County property leading to Southpoint Industrial Park.
2. Preservation of the New Bohemia Area by moving the western terminus of the new Route 460 South to connect directly with I-295.
3. Preservation of north bound access along Route 156 to the City of Hopewell by preserving the construction of a future intersection at Route 156 and a new Route 460.
4. Preservation of Land Use by eliminating the construction of a new interchange at the new Route 460 and Route 625. The proposed interchange at Route 625 is outside the County growth area and is not consistent with its comprehensive plan.

Mr. Vinsh indicated he had drafted an MPO comment letter essentially restating the MPO’s previous support for improvements to Route 460 and a commitment to amend the Transportation Plan if the Commonwealth Transportation Board makes a finding the project is
financially feasible along with a request for consideration regarding additional environmental studies to more fully understand the modifications suggested by Prince George.

Mr. Vinsh also indicated the Transportation Technical Committee has reviewed the modifications being suggested by Prince George and has recommended MPO endorsement along with previous support for the project as stated in the draft letter.

Upon a motion by Mr. Emerson, seconded by Mr. Morris and carried, a motion was adopted to endorse the draft MPO comment letter.

Dr. Leming expressed appreciation for MPO support for consideration of the Prince George comments by VDOT.

REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH CORRECTIVE ACTIONS CITED IN THE 2005 FEDERAL CERTIFICATION REVIEW

Mr. Vinsh indicated the two corrective actions cited during the federal certification review were a need to modify existing public involvement procedures to include an evaluation element to assess the effectiveness of existing strategies to involve the public and a need for a 20 year financial projection on mass transit needs for Petersburg Area Transit (PAT).

Mr. Vinsh distributed a summary sheet prepared by PAT on its 20-year financial needs and requested MPO authorization to advertise this item for public review as an amendment to the 2026 Transportation Plan along with the change in existing public involvement procedures to add an evaluation element.

Upon a motion by Dr. Leming, seconded by Mr. Emerson and carried, a motion was adopted to endorse the two corrective action items.

STATUS REPORT ON THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT STRATEGY FOR THE EXPANSION OF FORT LEE

Mr. Morris provided an overview and explained the purpose of this project will be to help with the transition to absorb BRAC related growth among the local jurisdictions. Working committees will be established in the areas of housing, employment, social services, education and transportation. The Transportation Technical Committee will be the functional committee for transportation. The study will include the entire Tri-Cities Area and be completed by September-October 2007.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2006 – 2008 TRANSPORATION
IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE ROUTE 646 IMPROVEMENTS AT ROUTE 156

Mr. Svejkovsky indicated Prince George has identified a need for improvements at the intersection of Route 156 and Route 646 to be included in the County Six-Year Secondary Improvement Program.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2006 – 2008 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE PROVISION OF SAFETY AND OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS WITHIN THE TRI-CITIES PORTION OF THE RICHMOND CONSTRUCTION DISTRICT

Mr. Riblett briefly indicated a series of safety and operational improvement projects are being requested as amendments to the existing TIP in order to address the need for operational project to be included in the document. Mr. Riblett indicated the project locations would be determined by VDOT Richmond District staff and some would be located in the Tri-Cities.

REVIEW OF PROPOSAL BY VDOT TO MODIFY THE FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF ROUTE 613 IN DINWIDDIE COUNTY FOR THE SEGMENT WITHIN THE MPO STUDY AREA BOUNDARY

Mr. Svejkovsky indicated VDOT is requesting MPO approval to reclassify the segment of Squirrel Level Road (Route 613) within the MPO boundary from local minor collector to local major collector; thereby, making this facility eligible for federal-aid funds.

Upon a motion by Dr. Leming, seconded by Mr. Emerson and carried a motion was adopted to endorse all 3 resolutions proposed requested by VDOT.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:10 p.m.

Minutes of the April 12, 2007 Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization – Policy Committee meeting held at 4:30 p.m. in the Petersburg Train Station located at 103 River Street in Petersburg.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Annie Mickens, Petersburg; Ken Emerson, Hopewell; John McCracken, Chesterfield (alternate); Mark Riblett, VDOT (alternate); Leon Hughes, Prince George (alternate); Joe Vinsh, Crater PDC (alternate);

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Wood, Colonial Heights; Doretha Moody, Dinwiddie; Ron Reekes, PAT;

OTHERS PRESENT: Dama Rice, Petersburg; Larry Constantine, Fort Lee; Mark Riblett, Ron
Chair Mickens called the meeting to order at approximately 4:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – March 8, 2007

Mr. Svejkovsky stated the minutes should reflect Mr. Hawthorn as the VDOT member on the Policy Committee. Upon a motion by Mr. Emerson, seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried, the minutes of the March 8, 2007 meeting were approved, as corrected.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

No comment

REVIEW OF 2007 CMAQ AND RSTP RATING RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON FUTURE ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Vinsh distributed and reviewed a summary sheet showing the results of the 2007 ratings for the 27 candidate CMAQ and RSTP projects submitted by the 6 local governments and Fort Lee. Mr. Vinsh reviewed information on previous projects with some allocation and in need of additional allocation based on the most recent VDOT cost estimates.

Mr. Vinsh stated information had been received that the City of Hopewell is prepared to fund the Colonial Corners project (UPC 19003) with local funds and has suggested previous RSTP and CMAQ funds allocated for this project be shifted to improvements at the Oaklawn and Jefferson Park intersection.

Mr. Emerson indicated some of the funds previously allocated for UPC 19003 are still needed at Colonial Corners.

Mr. Vinsh stated he would contact the City and seek clarification on this item before proceeding with any change regarding UPC 19003.

Mr. Vinsh recommended CMAQ projects with previous allocation and in need of additional allocation, based on the recent cost estimate update, receive funding first and then new priority projects from the 2007 rating process be used to allocate available through FY 2008. Mr. Vinsh indicated the Hummel Ross & Rt. 10 (UPC 12955) project in Hopewell needs $160,985; the Rt. 156 and Route 646 (UPC 80986) project in Prince George needs $13,644 and the sidewalk project near the courthouse in Prince George (UPC 80457) needs $4,000. Mr. Vinsh indicated clarification would be needed regarding any change with the Colonial Corners project (UPC 19003) in Hopewell.
Mr. Vinsh reviewed the amounts of RSTP funding shifted during previous meetings from the Rt. 1 & Rt. 460 project in Dinwiddie for the Hickory Hill Road improvements at Route 460 and the Shop Gate Road improvements at Jefferson Park Road in conjunction with Fort Lee expansion using FY 2007 and FY 2008 RSTP funds. Mr. Vinsh also mentioned the previously endorsed $3,500,000 split intersection project at Temple and Oaklawn using $400,000 in FY 2008 RSTP funds, $1,600,000 in FY 2009 RSTP funds and the pending application for $1,500,000 in funds from the Virginia National Defense Industrial Authority.

A question was raised on the eligibility of the proposed intersection improvement at Temple and River Road given the pending proposal by Prince George, at the request of Fort Lee, to close this facility to use by the general public. After a period of discussion, it was understood CPDC staff would seek an answer to this question from FHWA before any funds were allocated to the proposed River Road & Temple Avenue intersection project.

Mr. Emerson asked about the status of the potential Route 36 relocation project.

Mr. Constantine stated the split interchange project at Temple and Oaklawn and the pedestrian/vehicular crossing project near the intersection of Route 36 and River Road is the short-term solution to the security/operation issues faced by Fort Lee regarding the need for improved connection between the northern and southern portions of the installation. Mr. Constantine explained that Fort Lee views the long-term solution for this need is the eventual relocation of Route 36.

After a further period of discussion, Mr. Emerson made a motion, seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried, that the CPDC staff be authorized to allocate CMAQ and RSTP funds as discussed to projects with previous allocation first and then to project(s) receiving the highest ratings from the 2007 ratings process. CMAQ allocations are to be made through FY 2008. RSTP allocations are to be made through FY 2008, plus $1,600,000 in FY 2009 funds for the split intersection project at Temple and Oaklawn. It was also understood that clarification would be obtained on the Colonial Corners project and on the eligibility question of the proposed Temple and River intersection project.

REVIEW OF PROVISIONS FOR REVISING THE 2026 TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR COMPLIANCE WITH SAFETEA-LU

Mr. Vinsh indicated CPDC staff is preparing a draft revised 2026 Transportation Plan in order to make the current transportation plan compliant with new metropolitan planning requirements contained in SAFETEA-LU, the new federal transportation legislation. Narrative changes include a discussion of the Tri-Cities consultation process involving selected environmental resource agencies, a safety element and a transportation security element. In addition, proposed revisions to the 2026 Plan narrative will include a PAT route map, an updated environmental justice assessment, summary information on the Fort Lee Expansion Traffic
Mr. Vinsh explained a need to revise the existing 2026 financially constrained project list and requested MPO- Policy Committee authorization to make these revisions reflect the following:
1) to include the Route 460 and Hickory Hill Road project and the Shop Road Gate and Jefferson Park Road intersection project;
2) to shift some NHS/Interstate funding from the I-85/I-95/Rt.460 interchange reconstruction project to include any eligible and unfunded Fort Lee expansion roadway and intersection projects and to shift any available regional balance in primary funds to eligible and unfunded Fort Lee expansion roadway and intersection projects.
3) to include the new Route 460 alignment currently selected by the Commonwealth Transportation Board and showing the funding source as Route 460 PPTA with a cost estimate for the Tri-Cities portion of this project to be developed by VDOT.

Mr. Vinsh indicated the proposed schedule for the 2026 revision was to have the above described revisions endorsed during the April meeting, have the draft revisions authorized for public comment during the May meeting and to take action on the draft revised 2026 Transportation Plan during the June meeting.

Mr. Vinsh further indicated that after July 1, 2007, attention will be focused on the 2031 Plan update. This effort will involve the use of new socio-economic and traffic forecasts, new financial forecast and the results of the housing element from the Crater Growth Management Plan. Mr. Vinsh added Technical Committee members have been asked to review the 2026 constrained project lists in relation to transportation priorities from their most recent comprehensive planning efforts.

Ms. Dabney commented that beginning in December 2007, there will be a new requirement that project cost be projected by year of expenditure.

After a brief period of further discussion, Mr. Hughes made a motion, seconded by Mr. Emerson and carried, to authorize CPDC staff to make described revisions to the 2026 Transportation Plan.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2006 – 2008 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE THE LAMORE DRIVE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT AND SEVERAL STATEWIDE SAFETY AND MAINTENANCE PROJECTS

Mr. Vinsh distributed project information on VDOT proposed amendments to the current transportation improvement program to advance the Lamore Drive project in Prince George and 4 statewide safety/maintenance projects.
Upon a motion by Mr. Emerson, seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried, a motion was adopted to amend the current transportation improvement program for the 5 projects.

Ms. Mickens asked if information could be made available on locations for any of the maintenance/safety projects in the Tri-Cities.

Mr. Riblett indicated he would check to see if this information is available.

Upon a motion by Mr. Morris, seconded by Mr. Emerson and carried the MPO – Policy Committee endorsed amending the 2026 Transportation Plan and FY 2006 – 2008 TIP for projects UPC#82849, UPC77586, UPC77583, UPC77584 and UPC77585.

Mr. Vinsh reported an administrative adjustment for project UPC72904 was processed since the March meeting.

After a period of discussion on several additional information items, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:50 p.m.

---

**Minutes of the June 14, 2007 Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization – Policy Committee meeting held at 4:30 p.m. in the Ramada Plaza Hotel located at 380 East Washington Street in Petersburg.**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ken Emerson, Hopewell; Barbara Smith, Chesterfield (alternate); Joe Leming, Prince George; Tom Hawthorne, VDOT; Ron Reekes, PAT; Doretha Moody, Dinwiddie; Denny Morris, Crater PDC;

MEMBERS ABSENT: Annie Mickens, Petersburg; John Wood, Colonial Heights;

OTHERS PRESENT: Dama Rice, Petersburg; Mark Riblett, Ron Svejkovsky, Laurie Henley, VDOT;

Vice-Chair Emerson called the meeting to order at approximately 4:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – May 10, 2007

Upon a motion by Mr. Morris, seconded by Ms. Smith and carried, the minutes of the May 10, 2007 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD
STATUS REPORT ON ROUTE 460 PPTA

Mr. Vinsh stated the Route 460 Independent Review Panel met on May 23rd and voted unanimously to recommend to the Commonwealth Transportation Board that all 3 proposals had met requirements of the solicitation under the Virginia Public Private Transportation Act and should be advanced to the detailed project scoping phase for further evaluation.

Mr. Vinsh further stated members of the Panel also reviewed their individual comments for other priority recommendations to be advanced to the Commonwealth Transportation Board. At the end of the meeting, the Panel Chair instructed VDOT staff to reduce the additional recommendations to writing for presentation to a future meeting of the Commonwealth Transportation Board. The additional recommendations addressed items such as tolling structure, amount of risk the private sector should be expected to assume for the project, the number of interchanges, etc. The Chair of the Route 460 Independent Review Panel would present the recommendations to a future meeting of the Commonwealth Transportation Board for consideration.

STATUS REPORT ON THE DRAFT 2026 TRANSPORTATION REVISION

Mr. Vinsh stated the original 2026 Transportation Plan adopted in March 2004 had been updated to comply with provisions of SAFETEA-LU. Elements added include transportation safety, transportation security and environmental resource agency consultation. Provisions for Fort Lee expansion projects and Route 460 PPTA project had been made in the revised document.

Vice-Chair Emerson asked how would the remaining Fort Lee expansion roadway and intersection projects be funded?

Mr. Vinsh indicated funding for Fort Lee expansion projects recommended by Baker are being shown as financially constrained projects in the 2026 Transportation Plan Revision by shifting funds from other projects in the Plan.

Mr. Morris stated getting the projects in a financially constrained plan was the first step.

Mr. Vinsh commented the total cost of all recommended Baker project is about $20,000,000. The MPO has committed about $5m in RSTP funds. About 750,000 in State BRAC funds have been approved for Hickory Hill improvements and a grant for $1.5m in State BRAC funds is pending for the Oaklawn/ Temple split interchange project. The tentative Six-Year Improvement Program includes about $10.6m in BRAC improvements at Fort Lee and Fort Lee is requesting about $5m for Baker recommended projects. While actual funding for all projects are still not...
confirmed, some progress towards securing these needed funds is being made.

Mr. Riblett provided additional information on funding sources and cost estimate ranges for the Route 460 PPTA project.

Mr. Riblett suggested the Policy Committee consider adopting the 2026 Plan Revision using a 2 step process in order to assure a SAFTEA-LU compliant plan be adopted before the end of June 2007. The first step would be to adopt the draft document as advertised and the second step would be to adopt the draft document with the additional information on funding sources and cost ranges for the Route 460 PPTA.

Mr. Riblett further explained the Route 460 project needed to be analyzed for air quality conformity before the project could technically be considered part of the long range plan.

Mr. Leming asked if the Prince George alternative could be included as a footnote under the second step suggested by Mr. Riblett.

Mr. Vinsh indicated the previous action of the MPO requesting consideration by the Commonwealth Transportation Board to study the alternative western connection suggested by Prince George County could be added to the motion and included in a footnote in the project listing.

REVIEW AND CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE 2026 DRAFT TRANSPORTATION PLAN REVISION

Mr. Vinsh indicated several written comments had been received from environmental resource agencies and several individuals in attendance at the advertised public meeting also made comments regarding the 2026 Transportation Plan Revision. Mr. Vinsh summarized the comments as follows:

The environmental resource agency comments included suggestions for further consideration of non-highway modes of travel in the discussion of planning factors along with identifying specific plants and animals that may be impacted by future highway construction projects.

The individual comments included the Fort Lee expansion projects on Jefferson Park Road, the need for expanded transit opportunities, especially for disabled persons, and concerns about added social service cost to be absorbed by local communities because of Fort Lee expansion.

CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTION OF THE 2026 TRANSPORTATION PLAN REVISION
After a period of discussion, Mr. Leming made a motion, seconded by Ms. Smith and carried that the MPO adopt the 2026 Transportation Plan Revision as advertised. This action was adopted with 7 of the 9 voting members present.

After a brief period of further discussion, Mr. Leming made a motion, seconded by Ms. Smith and carried that the 2026 Transportation Plan Revision be amended to include additional information provided on June 14, 2007 by VDOT regarding Route 460 PPTA funding sources and cost ranges for the project segment located in the Tri-Cities and the inclusion of a footnote reiterating the MPO position supporting a request for consideration for additional environmental work by VDOT to analyze the alignment modification recommended by Prince George County. This action was also adopted with 7 of the 9 voting members present.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2006 – 2008 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

Mr. Riblett reviewed proposed amendments to the current TIP for the Petersburg Downtown Signalization CMAQ project and the Beacon Theater enhancement project in Hopewell.

Upon a motion by Mr. Leming, seconded by Mr. Morris and carried, a motion was approved to endorse both amendments proposed by VDOT.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:45 p.m.
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – June 14, 2007

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Ms. Moody and carried, the minutes of the June 14, 2007 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

No comment

REPORT ON THE 2026 TRANSPORTATION PLAN REVISION CONFORMITY ANALYSIS

Mr. Ponticello distributed summary information on the results of the conformity analysis of the 2026 Transportation Plan Revision, including the Route 460 PPTA project. Mr. Ponticello explained the process followed for this analysis and indicated applicable tests for NOx and VOC did not show results that exceed budgeted levels.

Mr. Ponticello also indicated the U.S. EPA designated the Richmond Area as an attainment area under the 8 hr. ozone standard on June 8, 2007.

Mr. Ponticello reviewed the schedule for the 2026 Transportation Plan Revision and requested the MPO – Policy Committee authorize the MPO – Technical Committee to be able to approve the draft Conformity Analysis for public advertisement.

Upon a motion by Mr. Morris, seconded by Ms. Moody and carried, action was taken to authorize the MPO – Technical Committee to release the draft document for public advertisement.

Mr. Vinsh commented the draft conformity analysis would be added to the MPO website and hardcopies would be sent to public libraries in the Tri-Cities prior to sending the public notices to local newspapers regarding advertisement of the draft Conformity Analysis.

REPORT ON FUNDING FOR FORT LEE EXPANSION TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Mr. Vinsh distributed a summary profile of the Fort Lee expansion projects adopted by the MPO in the 2026 Transportation Revision. The profile indicates funding has been secured and UPC numbers established for Shop Gate, Hickory Hill, Rt. 36 & Rt. 144 intersection and a project for the construction of an additional eastbound travel lane between Sisisky Gate and Jefferson Park Road.

Mr. Vinsh mentioned the CTB has recently approved $5 million for improvement needs in the Route 36 and Route 144 corridors related to Fort Lee expansion. Mr. Vinsh also mentioned Fort Lee has requested funding from the Defense Access Road Program for several projects...
that have been endorsed by the MPO. In summary, Mr. Vinsh indicated funding for approximately one-half of the $20 million needed for the 18 transportation projects endorsed by the MPO as needed for Fort Lee expansion has been secured.

Mr. Morris indicated there has been some recent discussion at the State level that there may be a second biennium of State BRAC funding. Mr. Morris added that local administrators will need to be made aware of this potential program.

Mr. Emerson asked about the timing of Fort Lee expansion projects.

Mr. Vinsh indicated the consultant has listed the projects in order of need and the MPO has endorsed this listing. Projects in the first grouping (i.e. Shop Gate) are considered to be present-day needs; projects in the second group (i.e. Rt. 36 & Rt. 144 intersection improvement) are considered to be needed by the year 2015 and are primarily the result of BRAC growth; and projects in the third group (i.e. County Drive and Baxter Road intersection improvement) are considered to be needed by the year 2026 and the result of both BRAC growth and normal growth in the study area.

Mr. Svejkovsky added that the consultant was asked to identify any type of a need because we did not want to lose track of projects that would help with service level deficiencies resulting from expansion.

REPORT ON STAFF-LEVEL AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2006-2008 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

Mr. Svejkovsky identified the projects affected and briefly commented that 10 staff-level amendments were processed during the months of May, June and July.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE PRELIMINARY 2031 TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Vinsh commented on the draft 2031 project list and identified several proposed facilities in need of further information. These facilities were as follows: North/South facility between Chesterfield and Dinwiddie; the Route 36 Corridor and proposed I-95 interchange improvement projects at Southpark Boulevard and at Rives Road. Mr. Vinsh further added clarification of the scope for the Route 1 Corridor project in Dinwiddie was needed.

Mr. Vinsh indicated the financial forecast for the 2031 Plan was not available at this time. Mr. Vinsh added that the financial forecast for the 2031 Transportation Plan may preclude all projects currently considered financially constrained in the 2026 Transportation Plan Revision
from being listed as constrained because the 2031 financial forecast may not be as optimistic as the 2026 financial forecast. CPDC staff will need guidance on the prioritization of interstate and primary projects for the 2031 Transportation Plan Update. Priorities for Secondary System and Urban System projects will be taken directly from local project lists recently submitted and based on current comprehensive plans.

Mr. Leming commented on the importance for project cost estimates to include adequate consideration for inflation and be provided in terms of year of expenditure.

REPORT ON STATUS OF 2031 SOCIO-ECONOMIC FORECAST

Mr. Vinsh distributed available preliminary information on the 2031 forecast with consideration for Fort Lee expansion. Mr. Vinsh added the Crater Growth Plan consultant, RKG, Inc., is to provide estimated employment growth by jurisdiction related to Fort Lee expansion. This information is needed to make TAZ level distribution for employment with Fort Lee expansion.

A brief period of general discussion of the topic followed.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Upon a motion by Mr. Lemming, seconded by Ms. Moody and carried, the Chair and Vice-Chair were reelected, unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:20 P.M.
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – August 9, 2007

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Emerson seconded by Mr. Morris and carried, the minutes of the August 9, 2007 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

No comments

REPORT ON THE 2031 SOCIO-ECONOMIC FORECAST, THE CRATER GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN AND THE 2031 TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Vinsh explained the completion of the 2031 socio-economic forecast is pending resolution of assumptions to be used for off-base households anticipated by Fort Lee expansion and the distribution of those households at the traffic analysis zone level among the localities. Mr. Vinsh further explained the consultants working on the Crater Growth Management Plan, RKG, Inc. and REMI, Inc., are currently using lower assumed numbers for off-base households anticipated by Fort Lee expansion and different distribution assumptions than those used by Baker, Inc. for the Fort Lee Expansion Traffic Study. The Baker assumptions include about 3,100 off-base households and the Growth Management Consultant is now using a figure of about 1,700 off-base households. The RKG, Inc. and REMI, Inc. socio-economic forecast are being presented to the various task forces that have been organized for the Crater Growth Management Plan.

Mr. Vinsh commented a locally endorsed 2031 socio-economic forecast is needed by VDOT in order to make the next run of the Richmond traffic model. VDOT has indicated either set of assumptions would be acceptable for the purpose of running the model and forecasting future trips. Meetings with the growth management consultant RKG, Inc. and the Crater PDC staff are to be scheduled for later in September.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE 2031 TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Vinsh stated this item was on the agenda to follow-up on discussions at the previous Policy and Technical Committee meetings regarding establishing regional priorities for interstate and primary projects listed on the preliminary 2031 improvement list. Mr. Vinsh further stated that while the 2031 revenue forecast from VDOT is not available at this time, it is likely there will not be sufficient funds available during the plan horizon period to fund all projects listed. Therefore, projects need to be shown in priority order. Projects with identified funding sources will be shown in the 2031 Transportation Plan as being financially constrained. Other projects will be shown as vision projects.

Mr. Vinsh indicated the two interstate projects listed in the preliminary 2031 project list are the
reconstruction of Rives Road interchange at I-95 and improvements to the Southpark Boulevard Interchange at I-95. Mr. Vinsh the consensus of the Technical Committee on the question of priorities regarding these two projects was that the Rives Road interchange should receive the top position because it would likely serve future more regionally oriented development related to the relocated hospital on South Crater Road and the proposed intermodal facility on Lamore Drive.

Regarding the primary projects, Mr. Vinsh indicated it was important to show project connectivity between jurisdictions. Chesterfield and Dinwiddie representatives are meeting to discuss connectivity of a proposed new north/south improvement that would begin in Chesterfield and end near I-85 in Dinwiddie. Mr. Vinsh indicated further local input on this item is needed.

Regarding primary projects in the Route 460 corridor both Petersburg and Prince George have identified improvements to the existing Route 460 as priority projects.

Regarding primary projects in the Route 36 corridor, Mr. Vinsh explained consideration is being given to package 4 – 5 projects planned between Puddledock and East Washington in Petersburg and I-295 in Hopewell. Several of these projects are related to Fort Lee expansion and some include pending CMAQ projects. Funding has been identified for nearly all of these projects.

Mr. Morris asked if combining the projects would delay completion of the split interchange project at Temple and Oaklawn?

Mr. Hawthorne indicated it is possible that combining the projects could take longer to complete.

Mr. Morris asked about time requirements for additional air quality work associated with the Fort Lee expansion project that would add an eastbound lane between Sisisky Gate and Jefferson Park.

Mr. Ponticello indicated a conformity analysis would need to be conducted on the 2031 Transportation Plan anyway. Therefore, there would not be any additional time required to analyze the air quality impacts of planned projects in the Route 36 corridor.

Mr. Vinsh indicated the challenge appears to be how the administrative bring these individual projects together and move them forward at the same time with one project manager. Mr. Vinsh mentioned Dinwiddie and VDOT are meeting regarding the development of a scope of work regarding the Route 1/460 RSTP project.

A brief period of discussion followed regarding potential improvements in the existing Route 460 corridor in relation to the Route 460 PPTA project.
REPORT ON STAFF-LEVEL AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2006 – 2008 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Vinsh reported that a staff level amendment was processed for the VSU sidewalk project (UPC 72883) to release $18,167 for preliminary engineering, delete previous right-of-way obligations and obligate $108,083 in FY 2008 CM funds.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2006 – 2008 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

Mr. Vinsh indicated VDOT is proposing an amendment to the existing TIP to add UPC 85623 to improve the southbound off ramp on I-95 at Temple Avenue.

Mr. Wood asked several questions about project funding sources and schedule.

After a brief period of discussion, Mr. Wood made a motioned, seconded by Ms. Smith and carried, that the FY 2006 – 2008 TIP be amended to add UPC 85623.

REVIEW OF PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE CONFORMITY ANALYSIS OF THE 2026 TRANSPORTATION PLAN REVISION

Mr. Vinsh reported provisions of the MPO adopted Public Participation Plan were followed and no public comments were received on this item.

CONSIDERATION OF ADOPTING THE CONFORMITY ANALYSIS AND THE 2026 TRANSPORTATION PLAN REVISION

Mr. Ponticello distributed summary information and commented the findings of the conformity analysis of the 2026 Transportation Plan Revision indicate applicable tests for VOC and NOx were passed. Approvals by FHWA and EPA on the conformity analysis are anticipated to be received in November 2007.

Upon a motion by Mr. Emerson, seconded by Mr. Wood and carried, the Conformity Analysis and the 2026 Transportation Plan Revision were adopted.

CONSIDERATION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2006 – 2008 TIP FOR THE SPLIT INTERSECTION PROJECT (UPC 87464) AT ROUTE 144 (TEMPLE AVENUE) AND ROUTE
36 (OAKLAWN BOULEVARD)

As an other business item, Mr. Svejkovsky introduced a proposal to amend the current transportation improvement program to include the split interchange project located at Rt. 36 and Rt. 144 as recommended by the Fort Lee Expansion Traffic Study and identified in the 2026 Transportation Plan Revision as a financially constrained project.

Following a brief period of discussion, Mr. Emerson made a motion to amend the current TIP to add UPC 87464. The motion was seconded by Mr. Reekes and carried.

Ms. Mickens introduced an other business item regarding transit funding for Petersburg Area Transit (PAT). Ms. Mickens suggested there was a need for the MPO membership to have discussion focus on regional support for transit service in the Tri-Cities. Ms. Mickens suggested this item be forwarded to the Technical Committee for recommendation.

Mr. Wood commented it was his understanding the fares PAT collects only cover about 25% of the cost of its operation.

Ms. Mickens confirmed this was typical of transit operations across the board and that a combination of federal, State and local funds are needed to cover all operating cost.

Mr. Reekes commented that the current annual PAT operating budget is about $2 million. Of this amount 90% comes from federal sources, State sources and the farebox. The remaining 10% currently comes from the City of Petersburg.

Mr. Reekes indicated conversations with Fort Lee on the topic of transit have recently been held. PAT cannot afford to make further changes to accommodate Fort Lee expansion at this time.

Ms. Mickens asked what does the region consider a viable transit system to be outside of Petersburg?

Mr. Wood asked if input from jurisdictions outside of Petersburg on PAT services would be received.

Mr. Reekes indicated that with financial support would come input on the design of future PAT service.

Mr. Wood stated he could see several options for input, including funding, from localities outside of Petersburg regarding on PAT operations:
- Support current routes outside of Petersburg;
- Develop additional routes outside of Petersburg; and
• Eliminate less efficient routes outside of Petersburg.

Ms. Mickens stated it will be a financial hardship for Petersburg to maintain the status quo.

Mr. Reekes commented the GRTC service cost $1.1 million annually and Petersburg cannot afford to support this level of service. Mr. Reekes added that some non-Petersburg residents currently use this service.

Ms. Mickens asked if there was consensus to send this item to the Technical Committee for recommendation.

Mr. Morris stated another option would be the need to update the regional transit development program and asked if State funds are available for this purpose.

Mr. Bender agree to look into this option.

Mr. Morris also mentioned the off-base student housing Fort Lee is currently looking to secure will require the development of a transportation component.

Ms. Mickens commented option would require more time to develop recommendations and some localities are beginning budget preparations. The Technical Committee needs to know this is a priority.

Mr. Emerson stated transit service is something the City of Hopewell has received requests on. Mr. Emerson further stated he could see current transit service as more of an immediate need with Fort Lee expansion more of a longer term need.

Mr. Vinsh suggested he could send the MPO – Technical Committee Chair a message indicating the Policy Committee is requesting recommendations for local transit funding for PAT.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:15 P.M.
Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization – Policy Committee meeting held in the Crater Planning District

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Wood, Colonial Heights.

OTHERS PRESENT: Dama Rice, Petersburg; Unwanna Dabney, Yolanda Jordan, Arturo Perez, FHWA; John Bender, VDR&PT; Ron Svejkovsky, VDOT

Chair Mickens called the meeting to order at approximately 4:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – September 13, 2007

Upon a motion by Mr. Emerson, seconded by Mr. Hawthorne and carried, the minutes of the September 13, 2007 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

No comments

REVIEW OF THE 2031 SOCIO-ECONOMIC FORECAST

Mr. Vinsh distributed and reviewed summary information on three 2031 socio-economic forecasts for the MPO study area. The forecasts included the CPDC’s staff 2031 forecast with an employment growth adjustment factor developed by RKG, Inc.; a CPDC staff 2031 forecast without Fort Lee expansion and a 2031 forecast prepared by RKG, Inc.

Mr. Vinsh indicated the forecast prepared by RKG, Inc, will be used by VDOT for a special run of the 2026 Richmond traffic model. The output from this effort will be used for the Crater Growth Management Plan. The 2031 forecast prepared by Crater PDC staff will be used along with similar input from the Richmond PDC staff at a later time for the 2031 Transportation Plan update.

Mr. Morris asked why the number of students in the student forecast is constant.

Mr. Vinsh stated student enrollment is a unique item in the 2031 forecast because the number shown is based on the 2004 student population attending schools as obtained from the Virginia Department of Education. School locations are geocoded to a TAZ level and held constant thru the horizon year. The CPDC staff does not attempt to actually forecast student enrollment by TAZ.

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Morris and carried, the 2031 forecast prepared...
by the CPDC staff with Fort Lee expansion and with an employment adjustment factor developed by RKG, Inc. was adopted for use in the 2031 Transportation Plan Update.

STATUS REPORT ON THE ROUTE 460 PPTA PROJECT
Mr. Vinsh reported he had attended the September meeting of the Route 460 Communications Commission. During the meeting a VDOT representative provided a status report indicating requests for detailed proposals are expected to be forwarded to all 3 vendors this fall. The vendors who submitted conceptual project proposals were found to have satisfied State requirements and will be given the opportunity to respond with detailed proposal next spring.

Mr. Vinsh further reported a representative from the Hampton Roads PDC reported the newly formed Hampton Roads Transportation Authority has selected Route 460 as its top regional priority improvement project among a package of several major projects.

Mr. Vinsh stated the Route 460 Communications Commission was provided information on the status of the Tri-Cities 2026 Transportation Plan Revision and the Route 460 PPTA project.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2006 – 2008 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) FOR THE ROUTE 1 CMAQ PROJECT IN COLONIAL HEIGHTS AND THE DOWNTOWN SIGNAL PROJECT IN PETERSBURG

Mr. Vinsh indicated the CPDC staff recently became aware that CMAQ “signal only” and transit projects are funded at a 100% federal level rather than at an 80% level as are other CMAQ projects. Therefore, it is proposed the Route 1 Signalization project (UPC77600) be allocated $66,400 in unallocated FY 2008 federal CMAQ funds and the Petersburg Signalization project (UPC77537) be allocated $65,000 in unallocated FY 2008 federal CMAQ funds.

Upon a motion by Mr. Morris, seconded by Mr. Emerson and carried, a motion was adopted to make the additional federal allocations recommended using unallocated FY 2008 CMAQ funds.

Mr. Vinsh added he would make the changes in the CMAQ allocation worksheet.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2006 – 2008 TIP TO SHIFT ALLOCATIONS FROM THE COLONIAL CROSSINGS CMAQ PROJECT (UPC59118) TO THE HUMMEL ROSS ROAD (UPC12955) CMAQ PROJECT

Mr. Vinsh explained the City of Hopewell has made this request. The cost of the Colonial Crossings project has been absorbed locally and has freed up funds previously allocated
CMAQ funds needed for another CMAQ project in Hopewell. Upon a motion by Mr. Emerson, seconded by Ms. Smith and carried a motion was adopted to shift previously allocated CMAQ funds as requested by the City of Hopewell.

REVIEW OF ADDENDUM TO THE FY 2006 – 2008 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

Mr. Svejkovsky distributed a list of 10 proposed projects and stated, as discussed during the previous meeting, there is a need to make the current TIP a 4 year document instead of a 3-year document in order to be consistent with SAFETEA-LU requirements. Therefore, VDOT is recommending adding the 10 additional projects to the current TIP as an addendum forming a 4th year.

Mr. Svejkovsky adding this item is being brought to all MPOs in the Commonwealth. Upon a motion by Mr. Emerson, seconded by Ms. Smith and carried, a motion was endorsed to adopt the project listing distributed as the 4th year of the FY 2006 – 2008 TIP.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED RESOLUTION OF ENDORSEMENT FOR THREE PENDING ENHANCEMENT GRANT APPLICATIONS

Mr. Vinsh reviewed information on pending enhancement grant applications from Petersburg, Colonial Heights and Chesterfield and indicated a resolution of support has been requested for these applications.

Upon a motion by Mr. Emerson, seconded by Ms. Smith and carried a motion was adopted to endorse the 3 pending enhancement grant applications.

REPORT ON TECHNICAL COMMITTEE FINDINGS REGARDING TRANSIT FUNDING AND PLANNING NEEDS

Mr. Vinsh stated that following the recommendations of the Policy Committee made during the September meeting, the Technical Committee recently discussed the short-term financial needs of PAT for routes outside of the City of Petersburg and the long-term management/operational needs of public transit service in the Tri-Cities Area.

A summary of the Technical Committee’s October 5, 2007 discussion of this item is found below.
Ron Reekes explained the recent discussion at the MPO – Policy Committee regarding the future of transit in the Tri-Cities originated with a funding issue regarding the contract with GRTC. PAT has a contract with GRTC to provide express route service between downtown Richmond and downtown Petersburg. GRTC provides 6 morning buses, 1 mid-day and 6 in the afternoon. Two of the buses stop at John Tyler during the morning and during the afternoon. This past year the City of Petersburg did not have the funding in place to pay for this service. The Petersburg cost share for this route is approximately $300,000. Next year, this figure is going significantly increase. About 50% of these riders originate in the City of Petersburg; 25% from Chesterfield, and the remainder from other localities. In previous years, demonstration funds have been used to pay the cost of this service. These funds have dried up. The local burden for this express service is on the City of Petersburg.

Ron Reekes further explained that since the funding issue arose with the GRTC route, other related items have surfaced, including local financial, support for existing transit routes outside of Petersburg, potential expansion of transit service at Fort Lee and the potential for establishing regional transit entity in the Tri-Cities.

John Bender of VDR&PT commented that a planning study of local/regional bus service, including an assessment of existing PAT routes, is something VDR&PT could provide financial assistance towards. Typically, a grant request should be received by the agency before February. If the request is approved, funds could be made available in July at the earliest.

John Bender further commented some existing VDR&PT planning funds are available for “on-call” consultant services for more immediate planning studies. This is something could happen soon. A request for this assistance would need to come to VDR&PT from Tri-Cities MPO or from PAT.

Ron Reekes suggested we could use the immediate money to get started and then apply for a grant to take the project to the next step.

It was the consensus of the Technical Committee that Ron Reekes would forward the request to VDR&PT for the immediate study.

Leon Hughes asked if PAT ridership information was available on where the riders lived. Ron Reekes indicate that this information was not available system-wide and it would be costly to develop. Ron Reekes stated a ridership survey was made by GRTC on the route to downtown Petersburg. It was agreed that Joe Vinsh would send a copy of the GRTC survey results to the members.

Ron Reekes mentioned that the Richmond to Petersburg express route currently carries about 150 riders per day. Ridership on this route should increase after the transit facility is built.
Ron Reekes recommended a meeting outside of the Technical Committee be held to discuss short term PAT financial needs, long term transit planning needs in the Tri-Cities and to make contact with VDR&PT regarding provisions to accomplish these tasks.

March Altman indicated Hopewell would be interested in meeting to find ways for this to work.

George Schzenbacher asked how does the PAT route to Southpark Mall operate?

Ron Reekes explained this route came about largely because of demand from Fort Lee personnel to travel to the Mall.

George Schzenbacher indicated there may be some potential support from the City if the route would serve the community along the Boulevard.

After a brief period of further discussion, it was the consensus a summary of this discussion would be relayed to the MPO – Policy Committee during the October 16 meeting.

Mr. Vinsh also mentioned the discussion was positive and the Technical Committee had addressed the items identified by the Policy Committee.

Ms. Mickens stated she was grateful the Technical Committee had this discussion and looked forward to learning about the outcome of the meeting among local representatives regarding financial assistance for PAT routes outside of Petersburg.

Mr. Morris suggested the MPO also make the request to VDR&PT for assistance both with the short-term cost sharing discussion and for the Transit Development Program (TDP) update.

Upon a motion by Mr. Leming, seconded by Mr. Emerson and carried, a motion was adopted to have a letter prepared and sent to VDR&PT requesting assistance for both the cost-sharing discussion and the TDP update.

Mr. Leming stated the scope needs to address the question of does a locality want to have transit service and, if it does, it the service to be on 100% on its own or to participate fractionally on a regional basis.

Ms. Mickens stated she hoped these preliminary positive discussions will lead to further positive discussions on this transportation item.

Mr. Bender commented the nature of VDR&PT potential assistance would be along the lines of providing on-call consultant services for both the cost share discussion and for the TDP update.
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:20 p.m.