

2002 Transportation Technical Committee Meeting Minutes

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Transportation Technical Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Offices at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on May 7, 2002 at 10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Guy Scheid, Dinwiddie; Vicki Minetree, Colonial Heights; Mark Petersohn, Hopewell, (alternate); Leon Hughes, Prince George; Ron Reeks, City of Petersburg; Hebert Pegram, VDOT; Joe Vinsh, CPDC

Members Absent: Barbara Smith, Chesterfield; Joyce Goode, Petersburg Area Transit

Others Present: Ivan Rucker, FHWA; Ian Birnie, CPDC

Chairman Scheid called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – January 17, 2002

Upon a motion by Mr. Pegram, seconded by Ms. Minetree and carried the minutes of the January 17, 2002 meeting was approved.

STATUS REPORT ON CRATER JOB ACCESS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

Mr. Vinsh stated PAT and the CPDC staff has been working with the Crater Workforce Investment Board, VEC and John Tyler Community College towards the development of new transportation services to improve job access. A \$150,000 grant for FTA Job Access and Reverse Commute has been tentatively approved for PAT. These federal transportation funds may be matched with federal social service funds at a 50% match rate. The grant can be used for eligible capital and operating expenses related to job access.

Mr. Vinsh further stated that it is anticipated that the Job Access and Reverse Commute Transportation plan prepared in 1999 for the Crater Region will be revised in June 2002. Phase I will include the extension of a PAT fixed-route eastward along Route 36 into the Crossings Shopping Center to serve the VEC's One-Stop Center. Phase II will include van service between collection sites in Petersburg to the Rowanty Training Center in Prince George. Phase III is envisioned to provide transportation services to Wakefield Job Training site. Phase IV is envisioned to provide job access transportation services in the Emporia-Greenville Area.

STATUS REPORT ON THE RICHMOND TO NORFOLK HIGH-SPEED RAIL STUDY

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VDR&PT) had just

about concluded a feasibility study for passenger high-speed rail service between Richmond and

Norfolk. Mr. Vinsh distributed copies of the project summary and further stated that while preliminary findings indicated the service is feasible, provided necessary improvements are made, further studies are needed. The project summary indicated additional study is needed to examine alternative routes and station locations in the Tri-Cities. The question of the I-64 versus the Route 460 corridors and high-speed rail also needs to be studied and resolved at the State level. The VDR&PT has posted the reports by the project consultant on engineering, environment and ridership and revenue forecast aspects of the project on its website.

Mr. Vinsh added that the rail companies attending the most recent project advisory committee meeting expressed concern that the project consultant had underestimated certain cost for upgrading the Route 460 rail facilities for passenger rail service. There appears to be consensus that higher operating speeds leads to higher operating costs and that increased service frequency leads to increased ridership.

Mr. Apostolides stated that generally with the passenger rail project there is difference between what the consultant say and what the railroads say the cost should be. The true cost should be somewhere in the middle.

Mr. Vinsh added that the main focus of the CPDC staff with this study has been with land access and highway crossings impacts.

Mr. Apostolides stated that before anything is done a lot more study will be needed on this project.

Mr. Scheid stated that a major factor in the location decision for the Petersburg station will be the choice of corridor for the Norfolk to Richmond service (I-64 or Route 460). The problem is how the tie-in is made. This impacts localities in the Tri-Cities and these localities will need to discuss the options. If the Route 460 corridor is selected for the Norfolk to Richmond service, the station location in the Tri-Cities becomes a more complicated question.

Mr. Scheid commented that summary of the public comments received during the Southeast High-Speed Study Tier I public meetings are miss leading. The individual speakers were counted as being either for or against the proposed service. No consideration was given for the number of people the speakers were representing.

REVIEW OF DRAFT FY 2003 TRI-CITIES AREA UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION WORK PROGRAM (UTPWP)

Mr. Vinsh stated that the draft 2001 Federal certification review comments were used as a basis to prepare the draft FY 2003 UTPWP.

Mr. Vinsh distributed copies of the draft Federal certification report and the proposed CPDC response.

The main topics discussed included public involvement, environmental justice, Congestion Management System, Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS).

Public Involvement

Mr. Vinsh stated that the main deficiency in the certification process was the finding regarding the lack of public participation in the transportation planning process. The advertised public meetings are poorly attended. The FHWA and FTA have indicated that a more proactive approach needs to be taken. Proposed actions to enhance public involvement include improving the CPDC website, assessing reasons for low public attendance, and options for changing the meeting location and time.

Mr. Reekes asked if information of public involvement activities of other MPOs has been reviewed.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Richmond MPO has a consultant study underway on public involvement and that a copy of the report is to be made available for information.

Mr. Reekes asked if any attempts have been made previously to combine a local planning commission meeting and a MPO public meeting.

Mr. Vinsh stated that this had not been done, but could be looked into to determine feasibility.

Mr. Vinsh commented that one task to be accomplished during the coming year is to research the origins of the 2023 LRP projects at the local government level. Previous meetings of local planning commissions and governing bodies would be researched. A document would be prepared on public involvement and local transportation improvement needs and priorities.

Mr. Scheid commented that the Dinwiddie Board has a day meeting once a month where different groups can come in and give an update on a particular topic, such as transportation.

Bikeways/Pedestrian Planning

Mr. Vinsh stated the topic of bikeways/pedestrian planning is currently receiving attention with the update of the 1979 Tri-Cities Bikeways Plan.

Freight Movement

Mr. Vinsh commented that efforts will be made to increase contact with major trucking companies in the regional and continue to participate in the Richmond Intermodal Study.

Environmental Justice

Mr. Vinsh stated the 2023 LRP included an assessment of the relative benefits and burdens of projects

for population by project type by census tract location. This assessment used Geographic Information Systems to profile projects by population impacted using 1990 census tract data.

The FHWA and FTA are looking for a documentation of the process used to evaluate the impacts of the projects on resident populations.

Mr. Rucker commented on the need to assess the provision of transit service in the region and how effective the routes are in getting people to places of interest, including employment and medical trips.

Mr. Vinsh stated transit service area expansion has been studied in the past and some expansion is being planned under the Job Access Program.

Congestion Management System

Mr. Vinsh indicated that Federal guidance has been requested under this topic. The last traffic database used for CMS analysis was for the year 1999-2000 provided by VDOT. If a newer database is available a new map of the CMS network can be prepared using GIS. Mr. Vinsh added that the Appomattox River Bridge Project and the Temple Avenue interchange improvement projects were exempt from CMS analysis because of the nature of the projects. Mr. Vinsh further added that the only other project in the 2023 LRP where capacity is proposed to be added to a CMS network facility is Route 10 between I-295 and the Hopewell Corporate Limits.

Mr. Rucker asked if Tri-Cities had a stand-alone CMS document.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the last CMS document for Tri-Cities was prepared in 1997. The last CMS update information was included in the 2023 LRP.

Mr. Rucker added that a general discussion of the tools that are available to relieve congestion is mainly what the Tri-Cities needs to accomplish under this topic at the present time.

Mr. Petersohn commented that the City of Hopewell may be requesting an amendment to one of its projects that would increase lane capacity on Route 36.

Mr. Vinsh commented that public involvement would be the most difficult topic to be addressed in this effort.

Mr. Rucker stated that the MPO may want amend the public involvement plan and use local public involvement activities.

Mr. Apostolides stated that Section 5303 funding proposed for bikeways planning under activity 2.1 needs to be switched with PL funding for the long range planning activity under 2.0. Mr. Apostolides

explained that the bikeways project would need to be specifically tied to transit service in order to be fundable under Section 5303.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the change funding sources could be made.

Upon a motion by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. Pegram and carried, it was recommended that the Policy Committee approve the draft FY 2003 UTPWP with the changes to activities 2.0 and 2.1 as discussed.

REVIEW OF REQUEST FROM CHESTERFIELD COUNTY TO AMEND FY 2002 CMAQ PROJECT ALLOCATION

Mr. Vinsh stated that the CMAQ Committee has recommended, at the request of Chesterfield County, that the Policy Committee reallocate \$160,000 from the recently completed Allied Road & Rt. 10 CMAQ project to the Enon Church Road CMAQ project.

REVIEW LETTER FROM THE VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF RAIL AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION(VDR&PT) ON MEMBERSHIP AND T-CATS COMMITTEES

Mr. Vinsh stated that the VDR&PT has requested voting membership on the Technical Committee and nonvoting membership on the Policy Committee.

Upon a motion by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. Pegram and carried, a motion was adopted to recommend that the Policy Committee change the by-laws of the Policy committee and Technical Committee to make changes in membership, as requested.

DISCUSSION OF LETTER FROM SECRETARY CLEMENT ON UPDATE OF SIX-YEAR PLAN

Mr. Vinsh commented that Charles Townes, representing Virginia's Gateway Region, and Woody Harris representing the Crater Planning District Commission, made presentations on Route 460 needs during the 2002 public hearing conducted by the Commonwealth Transportation Board for the Richmond Construction District at John Tyler.

5

Mr. Vinsh further commented that the letter was very cordial, but was noncommittal regarding future funding for Route 460.

A period of discussion followed regarding future prospects for financing Route 460 improvements, including the Hampton Roads referendum.

Upon a motion by Mr. Pegram, seconded by Ms. Minetree and carried, the meeting was adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Transportation Technical Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Offices at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on June 28, 2002 at 10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Guy Scheid, Dinwiddie; March Altman, Hopewell; Leon Hughes, Prince George; Ron Reeks, City of Petersburg; Hebert Pegram, VDOT; Joe Vinsh, CPDC

Members Absent: Vicki Minetree, Colonial Heights, Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT; Barbara Smith, Chesterfield; Joyce Goode, Petersburg Area Transit

Others Present: Diane Parker, Gerry Barefoot, Sierra Club

Chairman Scheid called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – May 7, 2002

Upon a motion by Mr. Altman, seconded by Mr. Pegram and carried the minutes of the May 7, 2002 meeting was approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

Chairman Scheid introduced Ms. Diane Parker and Ms. Gerry Barefoot as citizen attendees from the Sierra Club.

Chairman Scheid opened the Citizen Information Period for brief presentation by Ms. Parker.

Ms. Parker distributed a newsletter prepared by the Falls of the James Chapter of the Sierra Club and presented information on several topics related to the Tri-Cities Area.

Ms. Parker commented that citizens in the northeastern portion of Dinwiddie County were concerned about the potential location of a new rock quarry, the location of an interchange that no one was aware about, changes in the draft comprehensive Plan for Dinwiddie County and a high-speed rail proposal. Ms. Parker stated that the Sierra Club wants to gather information, express concern about these issues, and to make certain the public is informed of these and other transportation issues.

After about 5 minutes Ms. Parker concluded her remarks and Mr. Scheid closed the Citizen Information Period.

REPORT ON 2001 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING CERTIFICATION FINDINGS

Mr. Vinsh made reference to correspondence on FHWA and FTA findings of the October 2001 planning certification and a proposed response by the Crater Planning District Commission staff to correct deficiencies cited in the report. Mr. Vinsh added that the Crater staff has been working with FHWA and the proposed responses appear to be acceptable. Each of the items cited in the review findings were reviewed along with the proposed response. The time period given to complete the work is May 22, 2003. At that time, FHWA and FTA will make another review to confirm the corrections have been made. The transportation planning process is certified pending completion of several corrective actions. (A copy of the subject correspondence has been included in the minutes of the June 28 meeting).

Major corrective actions include the following:

- Public involvement – review current public involvement procedures and develop a work element directed at improving strategies for engaging minority and low-income groups through public involvement,
- Document current activities in place to assess the distribution of impacts on different, socio-economic groups for investments in the long-range transportation plan,
- Identify measures that have been used to verify multi-modal system access and mobility performance improvements in the long- range transportation plan and transportation improvement program comply with Title VI, and
- Develop and submit a fully functioning Congestion Management System.

Chairman Scheid asked if the public involvement comments applied to the Technical Committee as well as the Policy Committee.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the comments applied to both committee and the entire metropolitan transportation planning process.

Mr. Vinsh added that efforts would be made by the CPDC staff to document local actions regarding the identification of transportation project needs as input into the regional process.

Mr. Altman stated that most of the citizen input is at the local level and used the Hopewell River Road project as an example. Citizen concerns about this project had already been resolved at

the local level. There is little expectation that citizens would attend a subsequent meeting at the regional level to discuss this project.

Mr. Vinsh stated that Ms. Humphrey had made similar comments during recent Policy Committee meetings regarding the unlikely event of citizens attending MPO meetings to comment on long-range transportation plan projects. Mr. Vinsh added FHWA is receptive to documenting comments received

during local public meetings on transportation needs as part of public input for the metropolitan transportation planning.

Mr. Reekes stated that the MPO may receive more public input on transportation needs after Regional Surface Transportation Funds are received.

Ms. Parker asked if citizens could speak at this time.

Chairman Scheid stated that generally this period is reserved for Committee members; however, the comment would be allowed at this time.

Ms. Parker asked how is the MPO assured that citizen comments made at the local level are brought to the MPO.

Mr. Vinsh stated it would be up to local officials to sort through the public comments made on potential projects and decide the collective interests of that community. This is how the local list of transportation needs is produced.

Mr. Aultman stated that most transportation projects are local issues resolved at the local level. After the project list is approved at the local level, the MPO goes with the locally approved project list.

Ms. Parker stated that maybe public input at MPO meetings could be considered an appeal process for citizens.

Mr. Vinsh stated that public comments received during the annual MPO public meetings are summarized by CPDC staff and reported to the MPO membership for consideration.

Mr. Vinsh added while most projects are locally oriented, some projects, such as Route 460, are more regional in nature and the public may be more willing to attend MPO sponsored public meetings.

REVIEW INFORMATION ON THE URBANIZED AREA REDEFINITION AND TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM IMPACTS

Mr. Vinsh stated that effective May 1, 2002, the Petersburg, Colonial Heights, Hopewell, VA Urbanized Area and the Richmond, VA Urbanized Area were merged to form a new Richmond, VA Urbanized Area with a total population of 818,836.

Mr. Vinsh explained that the urbanized areas are units used by FHWA and FTA to allocate funding for certain transportation programs. The Richmond and Tri-Cities MPOs are both now located in the same urbanized area. Approximately, 14% of the urbanized area population is located within the existing Tri-Cities Transportation Study Area.

Mr. Vinsh then made reference to a handout prepared by CPDC staff on the implications of the new urbanized area designation for 5 transportation programs for the Tri-Cities MPO. The handout compares previous funds received with funds anticipated to be received by specific transportation program using a percentage distribution based on the urbanized area population share of each MPO.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Tri-Cities MPO would receive more planning funds if the PL and Section 5303 programs continued to use existing State allocation procedures than basing allocations on the urbanized area population share of each MPO.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Section 5307 program for transit capital and operating assistance is the program that received negative impact because of the urbanized area redefinition. Urbanized areas over 200,000 in population cannot use Section 5307 funds for transit operating assistance while urbanized areas under 200,000 in population are permitted to use Section 5307 funds for capital and operating needs. In the past, separate Section 5307 urbanized area allocations were made for two urbanized areas. Beginning with FY 2003 funding in October 2002, one allocation will be made for the urbanized area now over 200,000 in population. As a result, PAT is facing the loss of federal operating assistance eligibility after September 30, 2002. The FY 2002 Section 5307 allocation received by the Petersburg, Colonial Heights, Hopewell, VA Urbanized Area was 13% or about equal to dollar amount that would be received using a 14% 2000 urbanized population share.

Mr. Reekes stated that the City and the MPO are asking assistance from its federal legislative representatives for a remedy to this problem.

Mr. Reekes added that a loss of federal operating assistance eligibility would translate into loss of about 40% of the operating budget or about \$500,000 to \$600,000. Efforts are being made to maximize the use of federal funds available to PAT including preventative maintenance and the Job Access and Reverse Commute Program. A review of existing fixed routes is also underway.

4

Mr. Vinsh commented that 2 grants had been approved for PAT to receive Job Access and Reverse Commute funding and that PAT has extended its Blandford Route along the Route 36 corridor into Prince George County to the Crossing Shopping Center.

Mr. Vinsh added that the Job Access and Reverse Commute Plan is being updated. Consideration is being given to serving the Rowanty Training Center in Prince George and Southpark Mall in Colonial Heights.

Mr. Vinsh stated that under the Regional Surface Transportation Program, the Tri-Cities Area will be receiving 2 years worth of funding after October 1, 2002. The CPDC staff has estimated that 14% of the FY 2003 RSTP funding allocated to the Richmond Urbanized Area amounts to approximately \$1,170,260, using VDOT information based on the 1990 census information. FY 2003 RSTP allocations using 2000 Census information has not been developed by VDOT. Mr. Vinsh added that a program will

need to be established by the MPO to select projects for this program similar to the CMAQ program.

Mr. Vinsh concluded that this information provides an overview of the transportation program impacts of the urbanized area redefinition.

Mr. Vinsh mentioned that the Policy Committee adopted resolutions selecting City of the Petersburg, PAT as an applicant under the Section 3037 and Section 5307 programs in the Richmond, VA Urbanized Area and to request its federal legislative representatives to seek a remedy to the loss of federal operating assistance eligibility.

REVIEW OF FY 2003-2005 DRAFT TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

Mr. Vinsh reviewed the schedule for reviewing the draft FY 2003-2005 TIP and Conformity Analysis. Mr. Vinsh further stated that on June 10, 2002 the Policy Committee delegated to the Technical Committee the authority to approve the draft TIP and conformity documents for public review.

Following a brief period of discussion about the status of several projects, Mr. Altman made a motion to authorize the CPDC staff to advertise the Draft FY 2003-2005 TIP for public review.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Pegram and carried.

REPORT ON AMENDMENT TO COMMITTEE BYLAWS

Mr. Vinsh reported that during its June 10, 2002 meeting, the Policy Committee amended the by-laws of the Technical Committee and the Policy Committee to provide the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation with voting membership on the Technical Committee and nonvoting membership on the Policy Committee.

There being no further business, upon a motion by Mr. Aultman, seconded by Mr. Pegram and carried, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:20 a.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Transportation Technical Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Offices at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on August 8, 2002 at 10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Guy Scheid, Dinwiddie; March Altman, Hopewell; Leon Hughes, Prince George; Ron Reekes, Petersburg Area Transit; Mike Briddell, City of Petersburg; Vicki Minetree, Colonial Heights; Barbara Smith, Chesterfield County; Hebert Pegram, VDOT; Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT; Joe Vinsh, CPDC

Others Present: Diane Parker, Gerry Barefoot, Pamala Irwin, Sierra Club; Denny Morris, Ian Birnie, Victor Liu, CPDC.

Chairman Scheid called the meeting to order at approximately 10:10 a.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – June 28, 2002

Upon a motion by Mr. Pegram, seconded by Mr. Altman and carried, the minutes of the June 28, 2002 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

Chair Scheid opened the floor for citizen comments and asked for comments to be limited to 3 – 4 minutes.

Ms. Parker asked if there would be an open discussion period for the TIP.

Chair Scheid stated that committee members normally discuss agenda items during the business portion of the meeting without citizen participation in the discussion. Mr. Scheid suggested that committee members may want to address this issue in the future.

Mr. Morris asked if the TIP is formally advertised for public comment.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the FYs 2003-2005 draft TIP has been advertised for a 30-day public comment period.

Ms. Parker asked if the TIP would be approved today.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Policy Committee has authorized the Technical Committee to review the draft TIP and Conformity Analysis of the TIP for public advertisement.

Mr. Vinsh added that the Policy Committee action on the TIP and Conformity Analysis was expected during the August 29, 2002 meeting.

Chair Scheid stated committee members may want to discuss how citizen comments are handled in the future. Ms. Barefoot stated that citizens in northern Dinwiddie are very concerned about exactly where Route 460 is going and asked if there was anyway of getting a detailed map of the route. Ms. Barefoot added that high-speed rail was also a concern, especially in regard to its potential impacts on Civil War battlefield sites.

Mr. Pegram stated that no corridor has been selected and a project consultant has just been hired for the

project. Mr. Pegram added that a scope of work is being developed to evaluate a no-build alternative, an alternative to improve the existing facility, and an alternative to construct a new facility.

Mr. Barefoot asked if the study has been funded.

Mr. Pegram stated that the Commonwealth Transportation Board has set-aside funding for the study. Funding sources for the construction of Route 460 improvements have not been identified.

Mr. Pegram commented that the Hampton Roads Area will be voting on a dedicated sales tax increase this November for designated transportation projects, including a portion of Route 460.

Mr. Vinsh commented that VDOT will sponsor an extensive public involvement process in conjunction with the Route 460 study.

Ms. Parker stated she was very interested in approval process for the southwestern corridor project in Chesterfield and how the project is to be funded.

Ms. Smith stated Chesterfield is looking for ways to fund this project, including private sources. Ms. Smith added that the project is presently on hold.

Ms. Smith offered to get additional information on the project.

Chair Scheid closed the citizen information period.

STATUS REPORT ON 2001 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING CERTIFICATION-CMS

Mr. Vinsh added that the revised CMS scope of work was based on FHWA comments received pursuant to the 2001 certification review.

Mr. Vinsh reviewed the draft scope of work for a revision of the Tri-Cities Area Congestion Management Systems (CMS) Operations Plan that was adopted in September of 1997.

Mr. Vinsh further added that VDOT has offered the use of an on-call consultant to help with the CMS work.

Chair Scheid asked how soon would action need to be taken on this item.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the certification letter was dated May 22, 2002 and that the corrections were to be made within 1 year of the date of the letter. Mr. Vinsh further stated that the CMS work was 1 of 7 items cited by in the federal review as requiring additional work.

Chair Scheid stated that the committee may need additional time to study the draft scope and meet during a work session prior to the August 29th MPO meeting.

Mr. Altman stated that the additional time to review the draft scope work would be useful prior to a work session.

Mr. Morris suggested that working with the VDOT consultant on the development of a revised CMS Operations Plan appeared to be a practical course of action to meet this requirement.

After a period of discussion, August 20, 2002, was selected as a meeting date for a CMS work session to be held at 11 a.m. in the Crater Commission Office.

Chair Scheid commented on the information contained in the 1997 CMS Operations Plan related to traffic generated at Virginia Motor Sports Park (VMSP). The type of events scheduled at VMSP has changed. Traffic congestion on event days is much less now than in the past.

REVIEW OF DRAFT 2002 CRATER REGION JOB ACCESS AND REVERSE COMMUTE PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Vinsh stated that the original Crater Region Job Access and Reverse Commute Plan was prepared in 1998. Mr. Vinsh stated that the document had been updated to reflect planned service expansions by Petersburg Area Transit. Job Access transportation capital and operating projects are funded at a 50% level with Section 3037 transportation federal funds administered by the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation and match with 50% federal social service funds administered at the State level.

Mr. Vinsh added that this program is aimed at providing individuals with access to jobs and employment related services not currently offered.

Mr. Vinsh commented that the document follows the format prescribed by the Federal Transit Administration.

Mr. Reekes reviewed the scope of services listed on page 20 under the 4 phases of the plan.

- Phase I – Blandford Route Extension to Crossing Shopping Center
- Phase II – Service to Southpark Mall and John Tyler Community College with a GRTC connecting service
- Phase III – Service Rowanty Training Center
- Phase IV – Service to Wakefield and Emporia Job Training Centers

Mr. Reekes added that the service expansion would benefit riders by offering access to employment and other trip opportunities. Phase I has been implemented on a limited basis. Additional phases would be initiated over time as funds become available.

Chair Scheid asked who the target riders were for the Rowanty Training Center service.

Mr. Morris stated that a number of school divisions and agencies in the Tri-Cities Area have job training needs. Rowanty is available as a training resource. However, the Regional Workforce Investment Board and others have identified transportation service to this facility is a problem. Rowanty is near the geographic center of the southern portion of the Crater Region.

Upon a motion by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. Apostolides and carried, the Technical Committee adopted a motion to recommend Policy Committee adoption of the plan update and that copies of the update be provided to membership of the Crater Workforce Investment Board.

STATUS REPORT ON THE REGIONAL BIKEWAY PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Liu commented that work has been initiated on the update of the 1979 Tri-Cities Area Bikeways Plan. The main emphasis of the project will be to incorporate bike paths and pedestrian safety into the plan update. Meetings with several jurisdictions have been accomplished and most recommendations in the old plan are still appear valid. In addition, some extensions of bike paths will likely be acceptable to most localities. A base map is being developed using GIS. Upon completion of the local meetings, recommendations for the bikeways plan update will be presented to the Technical Committee.

Mr. Vinsh asked if the local governments were active in bikeway facility development.

Mr. Liu stated that most localities are not doing very much with existing facilities, but have significant plans for bikeways development in the future.

Mr. Altman stated that Hopewell has received a grant to establish a trail system, including a bike path, from the high school to Mathis Field/Crystal Lake with a linkage to Atwater Park. The trail system is being developed in conjunction with the implementation River Road improvement project.

Mr. Liu asked committee members to review and comment on the goals and objectives section of the handout distributed during the meeting.

Mr. Morris asked if the Appomattox River corridor initiatives would be related to the bikeways planning efforts.

Mr. Liu stated that the river projects and bikeways would be connected.

A period of further discussion followed related to rails-to-trails and high-speed rail.

REVIEW OF FY 2003-2005 DRAFT TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM Conformity

Analysis

Mr. Vinsh distributed copies of a compact disk to committee members of the conformity analysis prepared by VDOT's consultant along with a hard copy of the document summary.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the findings of the conformity analysis indicated that the FY 2003-2005 TIP was consistent with the State Implementation Plan.

Upon a motion by Mr. Altman, seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried, the draft Conformity Analysis of the draft FY 2003-2005 TIP was approved for public review.

REVIEW OF RICHMOND REGIONAL INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. Vinsh briefly commented that the Richmond International Airport had recently sponsored an intermodal study for the Richmond Region using CMAQ funding. A main purpose of this study was to determine the need for an intermodal facility in central Virginia. Mr. Vinsh also made reference to the summary of the report findings attached to the agenda packet.

The consultant recommendations included City of Petersburg improvements to the roadway network serving Collier Yard and construction of a new highway facility connecting Route 288 in Chesterfield County with I-295 in Prince George County west of Petersburg. Maps of the recommended improvements were attached to the agenda.

Mr. Vinsh asked Ms. Smith if Chesterfield had any comments on the consultant's recommendations.

Ms. Smith stated existing local plans received very little consideration by the project consultant.

Mr. Vinsh stated that Richmond MPO has requested the Tri-Cities MPO to participate on an Intermodal Committee in order to monitor the need for an intermodal facility in central Virginia.

Upon a motion by Mr. Altman, seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried, a motion was adopted to recommend that the Tri-Cities MPO participate on an Intermodal Committee for the Richmond Region.

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:40 a.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Transportation Technical Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Offices at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on October 25, 2002 at 10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Guy Scheid, Dinwiddie; March Altman, Hopewell; Leon Hughes, Prince George; Ron Reekes, Petersburg Area Transit; Vicki Minetree, Colonial Heights; Barbara Smith, Chesterfield County; Hebert Pegram, VDOT; Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT; Ivan Rucker, FHWA; Joe Vinsh, CPDC

Members Absent: Mike Briddell, City of Petersburg.

Others Present: Diana Parker, Geri Barefoot, Sierra Club; Denny Morris, Ian Birnie, Martha Burton, CPDC.

Chairman Scheid called the meeting to order at approximately 10:00 a.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – August 8, 2002

Upon a motion by Mr. Altman, seconded by Mrs. Minetree and carried, the minutes of the June 28, 2002 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

Chairman Scheid opened the floor for citizen comment on any item not on the agenda.

Ms. Parker distributed literature and presented information on a group of citizen organizations called Transportation Initiatives for Greater Richmond (TIGR). Ms. Parker stated the purpose of the TIGR was to work with governmental agencies and citizen organizations in order to promote 1) enhanced public health and security; 2) energy use and environmental protection; and, 3) the promotion of social equity and livable communities.

Ms. Parker indicated that TIGR is willing to step forward and provide input into the transportation planning process for the Tri-Cities Area.

REVIEW OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCEDURES FOR THE TRI-CITIES AREA MPO

Mr. Vinsh made reference to a review of public involvement procedures in use by the MPO as one aspect of the public involvement correction item cited during the October 2001 federal certification review.

Mr. Vinsh explained that public involvement procedure review consisted of a summary of existing procedures adopted in 1994, supplemental procedures added since 1994 and proposed additional procedures for consideration.

Mr. Vinsh mentioned that citizen comments made since January 2002 had been summarized for Policy Committee consideration and that two of the recommended new procedures were recommended by citizen organizations. The recommended new procedures included expansion of MPO web page based

information to include tentative Technical Committee and Policy Committee meeting dates, agendas and minutes of previous meeting. Additional procedures recommended include providing press releases on transportation plans and programs, use of a speakers bureau, enhanced outreach effort to organization representing low income and minority group persons and an update of the public involvement procedures.

Ms. Smith asked for more information on how low income and minority groups would be brought into the planning process.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the intent is to increase efforts to request minority group participation in the transportation planning process.

Mr. Altman suggested using public television as an additional effort to reach as many people as possible.

Ms. Parker suggested the TIGR coalition could be of assistance with providing public involvement for the transportation planning process.

Mr. Vinsh asked if there were any low income or minority group organizations affiliated with TIGR.

Ms. Parker stated that there were about 30 organizations involved with TIGR. Ms. Parker further stated that it maybe possible for the Chair of TIGR to attend the next Technical Committee meeting and give a detailed briefing.

Mr. Rucker mentioned the strategy of using the public involvement efforts of localities where transportation needs and priorities are under consideration.

Mr. Rucker asked if the procedures under Part 2 had formally been adopted by the MPO.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the supplemental procedures had not been formally adopted but have been added since the original procedures were adopted and would be included in the revised public involvement procedures endorsed by the Policy Committee.

Mr. Morris commented on the work force development agencies in the Tri-Cities Area are talking about the potential expansion of public transit services. The target population of the work force development efforts is aimed at low income and minority group population in the study area.

Ms. Smith stated that the people that serve on the Policy Committee are elected by the citizens and spend a lot of time speaking to the people they represent. The people being represented include low-income and minority group persons.

Mr. Vinsh added that Martha Burton of the CPDC staff will be documenting local public involvement

efforts in identifying transportation project needs as part of this certification item.

Mr. Morris stated that during the October 2001 certification review Chesterfield and Hopewell representatives commented on local public meetings held for the purpose of obtaining citizen input on transportation needs.

After a period of further discussion, it was determined that local government members of the Technical Committee would be the first point of local contact for this effort.

Mr. Rucker asked about the development plans for the next long range transportation plan update.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the first priority was to complete the certification corrections and then proceed to the long-range plan update. Mr. Vinsh stated that January 2003 was the anticipated date to begin the 2026 LRP update.

Mr. Pegram stated that we must have the adopted 2026 long-range plan by December 31, 2003. This means that the plan would need to be available for public review sometime in late October 2003.

Upon a motion by Mr. Altman, seconded by Ms. Minetree and carried, a motion was adopted to recommend Policy Committee endorsement of the supplemental measures developed since 1994, the 5 CPDC staff public involvement recommendations, plus a suggestion to use public television advertising.

Chair Scheid also asked CPDC staff to make arrangements to schedule a TIGR speaker during the next Technical Committee meeting.

REVIEW OF CPDC STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Mr. Vinsh reviewed federal certification findings regarding environmental justice and the reference materials in the agenda packet. The environmental justice materials included documentation of the methods used to make the environmental justice assessment of projects contained in the 2023 Long Range Transportation Plan, 2) potential measures that verify multi-modal system access and mobility performance improvement of projects and the underlying planning process comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and 3) documentation of past efforts of the Tri-Cities MPO regarding compliance with Title VI.

Mr. Vinsh commented on how transit service availability could be used as a performance measure. Mr. Vinsh reviewed information on measures used by other regions, including average number of accessible job opportunities, percent of population close to a hospital, average travel time for home-based shopping trips and average travel time to the central business district.

Mr. Pegram stated that VDOT is looking into the possibility of obtaining travel time data.

Mr. Vinsh emphasized the need to locate low income and minority population in the study area and relate this population group to the distribution of benefits and burdens of transportation improvement projects.

Mr. Altman suggested that public improvement projects funded with community development block grant funds may provide some information on how the environmental justice requirement is being addressed on the local level.

Mr. Reekes commented that progress is being made on the selection of a consultant for the multi-modal transit center project and this project should have a bearing on the environmental justice requirement.

Mr. Rucker suggested that possibility pedestrian safety and noise impacts could be considered as measures.

After a period of further discussion, it was determined that the staff was to contact Richmond and Hampton Roads MPOs to determine performance measures being used.

Ms. Parker commented that the AARP and the Sierra Club and other organizations have conducted livability surveys for specific neighborhoods in the City of Richmond.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that beyond transit accessibility, there does not appear to be consensus at this time on additional measures to recommend for future environmental justice assessments in the Tri-Cities Area.

A period of discussion followed on how Section 5310 recipients in the Tri-Cities Area comply with environmental justice requirements.

Mr. Pegram suggested that CPDC staff contact RRPDC and HRPDC to find out what measures these MPOs are using for environmental justice assessment.

Mr. Rucker stated that he would contact the CPDC staff regarding possible assessment measures.

Chairman Scheid suggested this item be looked at again during the November Technical Committee meeting.

REVIEW OF CPDC STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING FREIGHT MOVEMENT

Mr. Vinsh reviewed CPDC staff recommendations related to certification findings on freight movement. Mr. Vinsh stated that an outreach effort is proposed to contact major freight shippers in the Tri-Cities Area. The purpose of the outreach effort would be to relay developments associated with the Richmond Intermodal Committee and to establish a communication link with the freight movement community.

Mr. Vinsh made reference to an initial list of major shippers in the Tri-Cities Area. Mr. Vinsh suggested that the current list could be sent to Technical Committee members for update.

Mr. Altman suggested that the list be amended before Thanksgiving to include more companies.

Upon a motion by Mr. Altman, seconded by Ms. Smith and carried, the Technical Committee recommended Policy Committee endorsement of the outreach concept and agreed to help update the list of major shippers before Thanksgiving.

STATUS REPORT ON THE CONGESTION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM OPERATIONS PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Pegram stated that a contract with Parson, Brinkerhoff, Quade & Douglas, Inc. for this project was signed in October and work has been initiated. The project consultant will be contacting PAT regarding a transit performance measure. The project is scheduled to be completed within 4 months.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FY 2003 CMAQ ALLOCATIONS AND FY 2003-2005 TIP

Mr. Vinsh stated Chesterfield County has requested \$32,800 be transferred from the Allied Road CMAQ project to the Enon Church Road CMAQ project and that the FY 2003-2005 TIP be amended accordingly.

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Altman and carried, a motion to recommend the requested transfer and TIP amendment was adopted.

REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR THE BRANDERS BRIDGE ROAD WIDENING PROJECT

Mr. Vinsh stated that VDOT has requested information be added to the FY 2003-2005 TIP to indicate \$350,000 for the Branders Bridge widening project in estimated construction cost and a \$450,000 allocation by the Commonwealth Transportation Board for FY 2002-2003.

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Pegram and carried, a motion to recommend amendment of the FY 2003-2005 TIP as requested by the VDOT for the inclusion of \$350,000 in estimated construction cost and a \$450,000 allocation for the Branders Bridge widening project was adopted.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED TRANSIT CAPITAL AND OPERATING BUDGETS FOR THE FY 2003-2005 TIP

Mr. Reekes stated that he is working on revising the PAT capital and operating budget for TIP amendment action during the next Policy Committee meeting. Mr. Reekes further stated the Transit Flexibility Act of 2002 was recently enacted and entitles PAT to use available Section 5307 formula funding for eligible operating expenses for one more year.

DISTRIBUTION OF INFORMATION ON AN IMPLEMENTATION PLAN FOR THE SOUTHEAST HIGH SPEED RAIL (SEHSR) PROJECT

Mr. Vinsh distributed information concerning the status of the SEHSR project, including a tentative schedule recently distributed by the project sponsors for each major project segment.

Upon a motion by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. Pegram and carried, the meeting was adjourned at approximately, 11:30 a.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Transportation Technical Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Offices at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on December 6, 2002 at 11:00 a.m.

Members Present: Guy Scheid, Dinwiddie; March Altman, Hopewell; Leon Hughes, Prince George; Ron Reekes, Petersburg Area Transit; Mike Briddell, City of Petersburg; Vicki Minetree, Colonial Heights; John McCracken, Chesterfield County (alternate); Hebert Pegram, VDOT; Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT; Ivan Rucker, FHWA; Joe Vinsh, CPDC

Others Present: Diana Parker, Geri Barefoot, Sierra Club; Pat DeZern, Transportation Initiatives for Greater Richmond (TIGR); Ian Birnie, CPDC

Chairman Scheid called the meeting to order at approximately 11:00 a.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – October 25, 2002

Upon a motion by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. Apostolides and carried, the minutes of the October 25, 2002 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

Ms. Barefoot stated concerns regarding potential truck traffic hazards relating to a pending rezoning case in Dinwiddie County involving a rock quarry. Ms. Barefoot asked if the MPO would make a traffic study for this project.

Mr. Vinsh commented that the rezoning applicant would likely have traffic information on the proposal and that the VDOT would review the proposal. The County of Dinwiddie would consider information

presented prior to taking action on the rezoning request.

Mr. Scheid stated that VDOT is aware of the situation and that this was the first time someone has come to the Technical Committee with a request to get involved in a pending conditional use permit application. Mr. Scheid questioned the appropriateness of bringing this item to the attention of the Technical Committee.

Ms. Minetree stated that the MPO deals with approval of new or expanded highway projects. If its determined at the local level that this road will not handle the traffic and improvements would have to be made, then that project would come before this board. It would not be appropriate for the Technical Committee or the MPO to step and comment on the request.

Ms. Parker commented that we are learning about the process on how to get citizen involvement into the planning process before these projects are approved.

Ms. Barefoot stated that this project would involve an improvement to a road. Eventually, this project will come before this board.

Mr. Scheid stated that if the conditional use permit is granted, then the project would come before the board.

Mr. McCracken added that he supported Mr. Scheid's position.

REVIEW PROPOSED CHANGES IN ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE ANALYSIS PROCEDURES

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Technical Committee had reviewed the 3 parts of the Federal certification findings on environmental justice during the October 25th meeting. The information presented by the CPDC staff on Part I – documentation on how 2023 LRP projects were assessed and Part III – documentation on how Title VI requirements for the transportation planning and environmental justice were addressed in the 2023 LRP were considered acceptable to the Technical Committee. However, there was no consensus on Part II – establishment of performance measures for assessing 2026 LRP transit and highway projects. The Technical Committee did not want travel time to be used as a performance measure.

Mr. Vinsh presented information on the use of transit service availability as the environmental justice performance measure for future transit projects and level of service as the environmental justice performance measure for future highway projects.

Mr. Vinsh reviewed the environmental justice assessment procedures proposed for use with 2026 transit and highway projects. Map layers on the following would be developed by census tract:

- 2000 Census data on minority and low-income concentrations,
- Major shopping, employment and medical trip destinations,
- 2026 constrained transit and highway project lists;
- narrative assessment would be prepared on the distribution of transportation benefits and burdens in relation to low-income and minority areas versus the general population.

Mr. Vinsh further added that the lack of transit service availability would be considered a negative impact in census tracts with high concentration of minority and low-income population.

Ms. Minetree asked if all the necessary 2000 census data was available to complete this analysis?

Mr. Vinsh indicated that the census information to complete the proposed analysis is presently available.

Mr. Briddell asked if this methodology is similar to what is being done in other areas?

Mr. Vinsh stated that he had viewed information on several websites for large MPOs. Travel time was the main performance measure used. However, in Virginia only the Richmond, Hampton Roads and Northern Virginia MPOs have this requirement. The Hampton Roads MPO considers household income and the distribution of projects in the study area for its environmental justice assessment. The Richmond MPO used a 2023 LRP assessment method similar to what was done in Tri-Cities of 2023.

Mr. McCracken asked what was the purpose of doing the environmental justice assessment?

Mr. Vinsh stated that the purpose of the assessment is to demonstrate how the benefits and burdens of transportation projects impact minority and low-income neighborhoods as opposed to the general population in the study area.

Mr. McCracken asked if acquiring right-of-way would be considered a negative and improving the level of service a positive?

Mr. Vinsh added that the assessment of highway projects would be similar to the 2023 LRP assessment in that reconstruction projects are considered low impact projects. A widening or new location projects that involved right-of-way acquisition would be considered to be a higher impact. For the 2026 assessment, VDOT will provide the level of service rating for each constrained plan project before and after planned implementation.

Mr. McCracken asked if a project has a perceived negative impact in a low-income community, then what happens?

Mr. Vinsh stated that the assessment would be made, but did not know what the implications of the assessment would be.

Mr. McCracken asked if the MPO would be requested to endorse the environmental justice assessment findings?

Mr. Vinsh stated that the assessment would need to be completed sometime next Spring. The Technical Committee would probably be requested to agree or disagree on the assessment.

Mr. Reekes stated that any project Petersburg undertakes would likely impact a minority and low-income community.

Mr. Vinsh agreed and stated that the purpose of the assessment is to show where the benefits and burdens of the projects are going. How the project assessment is used is not known.

Mr. Briddell stated that he thought the environmental justice assessment may be used to help with comparing different corridors when considering a project impact.

Mr. Vinsh added that the regional assessment is at a broad level without much project information available to consider.

Mr. McCracken asked if Petersburg looks at the environmental justice assessment of a Petersburg project and determines the project remains desirable, then would the project continue to be listed in the constrained project list for Petersburg?

Mr. Vinsh indicated that it would.

Mr. Altman asked if there is a balance in the analysis that would consider it to be a benefit if a project goes into a minority neighbor and improves the service level.

Mr. Reekes stated that the environmental justice assessment is only one aspect of the decision to select a project for implementation.

Mr. Altman stated that projects may have both positive and negative impacts.

Mr. Vinsh stated that he assumes another level of environmental justice assessment would be done at the project level.

Mr. McCracken commented that the approach seemed reasonable.

Upon a motion by Mr. Briddell, seconded by Ms. Minetree and carried, the Technical Committee recommended Policy Committee endorsement of using transit service availability and level of service as performance measures for the 2026 LRP environmental justice assessment.

PRESENTATION BY TRANSPORTATION INITIATIVES FOR GREATER RICHMOND (TIGR)

Ms. Pat DeZern distributed handouts and presented information on the history and charter for a coalition of 85 civic organizations called Transportation Initiatives for Greater Richmond (TIGR). TIGR membership includes a variety of civic organizations located in the Greater Richmond Area that have an interest in regional transportation planning.

Ms. DeZern indicated TIGR can be of assistance to the Tri-Cities MPO in helping to solicit public input on proposed regional transportation plans and programs.

Ms. DeZern indicated that the United Way has cited transportation as the number one priority in the Richmond Area.

Ms. DeZern invited local governments and other agencies affiliated with the MPO to endorse TIGR charter concepts of economic prosperity, public health/safety, energy use/environmental protection and social equity/livable communities.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that many of the TIGR charter concepts are similar to the items the MPO works with on a regular basis.

Mr. Scheid thanked Ms. DeZern for her presentation.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED PROJECT SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECTS IN THE TRI-CITIES AREA

Mr. Vinsh commented on information attached to the agenda packet regarding a proposed basis for the Tri-Cities MPO to assess candidate regional transportation projects for selection.

Mr. Vinsh further commented that since the Petersburg, Colonial Heights, Hopewell and Richmond Urbanized areas were merged, the Tri-Cities MPO is now part of an urbanized area over 200,000 in population and entitled to project selection authority over an amount of set-aside Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds attributed to the Richmond, VA urbanized area. The amount of funds available is based on the latest census urban population in the transportation study area. There are two MPOs in the Richmond, VA urbanized area and each will share a portion of the RSTP funds available. VDOT is developing estimate on available RSTP funds.

Ms. Minetree asked if the accident information needed for the rating form is available.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that VDOT could provide accident information profiles for major intersections. Mr. Vinsh distributed a sample intersection profile of accident information obtained from VDOT.

Mr. McCracken asked if accident information was a major criteria?

Mr. Vinsh stated that the way the staff has recommended the project review procedure accident information was a major consideration. A rating system would need to be developed.

Mr. Briddell indicated that he has had problems in getting accident information for Petersburg.

Mr. Pegram indicated that obtaining accident information on intersections in the cities maybe a problem, but that a lot of secondary road accident information is available.

Mr. Altman asked if using accident information would limit projects such as a bikeway facility?

Mr. Vinsh indicated that there would be limitations with relying heavily on accident information.

Mr. Rucker suggested considering the planning factors as criteria for selecting RSTP projects.

Mr. Altman stated that he would like to know what roads are eligible for RSTP funds.

Ms. Minetree stated that the projects would need to be in the LRP.

Mr. McCracken stated that he thought any locality has a project that they think is a good candidate. Therefore, making a complex ranking process is not necessary. The funding could be rotated on an annual basis by locality as long as an eligible project was available.

Ms. Minetree stated that this approach could work only if a one-year allocation was sufficient to complete one project. The five-year cycle would be a factor.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that the 5-year project initiation requirement was a staff suggestion and could be changed.

Mr. Pegram stated the 5-year timeframe was a good thing. VDOT did not like to see a project stay on the books too long because sometimes a locality takes years to build up funds to complete a project and then the project ceases to be a priority.

Mr. Vinsh commented that a key consideration with RSTP funds in finding a project that matches available funds.

Ms. Minetree asked when would be the first time we would need to deal with the RSTP allocation.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that the funds would become available after July 2003.

Mr. Briddell asked what did the term future volume refer too?

Mr. Vinsh stated that future traffic volume would be the year 2026. However, it was not considered as a proposed rating factor.

After a period of further discussion, it was agreed that for the next meeting further information on accident information availability, a functional classification map and consideration of the planning factors for rating RSTP projects would be discussed.

REVIEW OF REQUEST FROM VDOT TO AMEND THE FY 2001-2003 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO INCLUDE ENHANCEMENT PROJECT #EN02-026 ACQUISITION OF BATTLEFIELD AT HATCHER'S RUN

Mr. Vinsh distributed correspondence from VDOT requesting the FY 2001-2003 TIP be amended to include the Hatcher's Run Enhancement Project.

Mr. Scheid commented that the Civil War Preservation Trust has been involved in this enhancement project to acquire a tract of land in Dinwiddie County that has Civil War significance. The Dinwiddie Board of Supervisors has endorsed the project. A need exists to permit the project to go forward in order to allow the sponsor to close on the property in the near future.

Upon a motion by Mr. Reekes, seconded by Mr. Altman and carried, a motion to recommend MPO approval of an amendment to the FY 2001-2003 TIP to include Enhancement Project #EN02-026 Acquisition of Hatcher's Run property.

STATUS REPORT ON 1999, 2000, 2001 TRANSPORTATION DATA REPORTS

Mr. Vinsh stated that the CPDC staff is working on the data reports that will be used as input for the draft 2026 LRP update that needs to be ready for public review in October 2003.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that it is anticipated that the reports will be completed in January. After the reports are completed, 2026 forecasts will be developed for socio-economic data items and Technical Committee members will need to work on adjusting historical data forecast for reasonableness with comprehensive plans and current land development patterns.

Mr. Vinsh added that household occupancy and housing vacancy rates at the traffic analysis zone level is still not available from the Census Transportation Planning Package. These 2000 Census items are due for release between November 2002 and January 2003. Mr. Vinsh further added that it may be necessary to use 2000 census tract occupancy and vacancy rates instead of continuing to wait the rates at the traffic analysis zone level.

STATUS REPORT ON THE ROUTE 460 COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Route 460 Communications Commission met on November 15, 2002 and briefly summarized major points of the meeting as follows:

- As with other Virginia Transportation Act projects in the Six-Year Plan, available funding for the project has been reduced from \$25 million to \$6 million. The reasons given by VDOT for the reductions were too many projects had been programmed with insufficient funding, low cost estimates were used and no inflation factor was used in the project cost estimates.
- The Richmond Construction District will not see any new interstate or primary road projects for the next 12 years.

VDOT staff stated the Route 460 Location & Environmental Study project can move forward with changes:

- Environmental analysis rather than alternative analysis will be the focus
- Project will be split into segments, some work will be accomplished by VDOT staff and some work will be accomplished by contract consultant
- The project segment between Route 226 in Dinwiddie and Route 460 in Prince George has been deleted
- Under the local improvement alternative, the project will be segmented with an emphasis on identifying congestion & safety projects that can be implemented over the next 15 year period
- Under the new facility alternative, the corridor is limited to 62 miles long and 10 mile study window with 350' wide corridor alternatives
- Factors to be considered under purpose & need include port facilities, interstate commerce, hurricane evacuation, economic development, truck traffic and I-64 alternative route
- Project will include a \$500,000 higher-speed passenger rail study that will include a financial comparison of the I-64 corridor versus the Route 460 corridor

- Project Schedule:

- January 2003 – Project Consultant will be given authorization to proceed
- March 2003 – VDOT will conduct public meetings on the project scope in 3 locations along the study corridor
- January 2006 – EIS is to be complete
- December 2006 – Record of Decision is to be obtained from federal review agencies
- Committee Chair McDonnell will invite Hampton Roads CTB members to attend future committee meetings
- Hampton Roads PDC is preparing information on a toll structure for Route 460
- VDOT will prepare and distribute project information on its website

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:40 p.m.