Meeting Agenda
Colonial Heights Public Library (1000 Yacht Basin Drive Colonial Heights, VA)

November 2, 2018
10:00 AM

Meeting Type: □ Annual
✓ Regular
□ Special (Called)

Invitees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield County</td>
<td>Ms. Barb Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Colonial Heights</td>
<td>Mr. Chuck Henley, P.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinwiddie County</td>
<td>Mr. Mark Bassett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hopewell</td>
<td>Mr. Johnny Butler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Petersburg</td>
<td>Mr. Lionel Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George County</td>
<td>Mr. Horace Wade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)</td>
<td>Mr. Mark Riblett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg Area Transit</td>
<td>Mr. Charles Koonce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VDR&amp;PT)</td>
<td>Ms. Tiffany Dubinsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crater Planning District</td>
<td>Mr. David Hyder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)</td>
<td>Mr. Mack Frost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lee</td>
<td>Mr. Fritz Brandt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg National Battlefield Park</td>
<td>Mr. Adam Baghetti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Call to order

Approval of minutes from last meeting
Action Needed Approval
The Minutes of the September 7, 2018 Meeting area attached (Attachment 1) for your review.
Minutes Approved as □presented/□modified.

Motion By __________________________  Second By __________________________

Status Report on the NEPA Rail Station Study  Discussion & Possible

- Federal Rail Administration (FRA) and Crater released an EA (Environmental Assessment) dated January 2017 on March 10, 2017;
- The formal comment period ran from April 21, 2017 through May 22, 2017;
- The Concerned Citizens of Ettrick spoke at the August MPO meeting expressing their preference for the Ettrick Site;

The Concerned Citizens of Ettrick again presented at the September MPO meeting. Their presentation included the following excerpt from an internal Federal Railway Administration Memorandum:

“FRA strongly advises that the State and localities resolve their disagreement on station location prior to the conclusion of the EA process. Resolution would better enable a project proponent to garner state/local match to any selected application for Federal funding, whether that funding is sourced through BUILD or another program.”

- We do not have a date for the release of the FONSI at this time.

Based upon the quote above the MPO may choose to recommend a site to Federal Rail Administration. Many MPO members, and staff members, were not involved in the Station NEPA project from the beginning. To help us better understand conditions Ms. Stock of DRPT will present the Commonwealth Transportation Board’s Intercity Passenger Rail Station Policy (Attachment 2 & Attachment 3).

In addition Mr. Hyder has prepared a summary of Rail Station Project (Attachment 4). The intent of this summary is to review the technical decision making criteria and identify three unanswered policy questions:

1. How will FRA accept the MPO’s recommendation if it is different from the EA’s preferred alternative;

2. If FRA choses a site different from the preferred alternative in the EA how will the FONSI be completed, and

3. Will the Commonwealth Board of Transportation fully support a recommendation made by the MPO?

We are especially interested in any other questions you may have. Please develop other questions you may have for inclusion in the summary.

DRPT Report  Information
Ms. Dubinsky will give an update on the status of Petersburg Area Transit’s Transit Development Plan. The kick-off meeting for the TDP was August 28 in PAT’s training room.

Part of the TDP process is a passenger survey. The link to that survey is:

- [https://patsurvey.metroquest.com/](https://patsurvey.metroquest.com/)

The graph below illustrates the productivity of PAT’s various routes on both the weekends and weekdays. An average route has a score of 50.

![Graph of PAT route productivity](image)

**Performance Targets**

In accordance with 23 CFR §§490.105 and 490.107, targets for twelve federally mandated asset condition and system performance measures must be established and reported to FHWA every four years, beginning in 2018. Federal regulations require both State Departments of Transportation and Metropolitan Planning Organizations to set targets for the twelve measures. The rule requires MPOs to establish targets by either:

- “agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishment of the relevant State DOT target”
- “committing to a quantifiable target for that performance measure for their metropolitan planning area”.

---

**Performance Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Area</th>
<th>Weighted Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Recommendation**

The performance targets are based on the weighted average score of the routes. The recommendations are based on the target set by the MPO.
The Tri-Cities MPO chooses to accept the Virginia Department of Transportation’s performance targets for pavement condition, bridge condition and system reliability as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>4-Year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pavement in Good Condition (Interstate)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pavement in Poor Condition (Interstate)</td>
<td>&lt;3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pavement in Good Condition (Non-Interstate NHS)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pavement in Poor Condition (Non-Interstate NHS)</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Deck Area of Bridges in Good Condition (NBI on NHS)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Deck Area of Bridges in Poor Condition (NBI on NHS)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Reliability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Person-Miles Traveled that are Reliable (Interstate)</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Person-Miles Traveled that are Reliable (Non-Interstate NHS)</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Travel Time Reliability Index</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A draft of the MPO’s letter submitting the performance targets to VDOT is included as Attachment 5.

RSTP and CMAQ Call for Projects

The most recent call for projects was several years ago and we have been working from that list for several years now. During that time we have accumulated a balance of funds for both categories. In addition the CTB is preparing its 2020-2025 SYIP. If we would like new projects included in that program we will need to have a TAC recommended list of projects by the end of March, 2018. A copy of our RSTP and CMAQ selection processes are included for your review (Attachment 5).

Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan –The travel model update is on schedule. We have completed reviewing the 2017 data (population, employment, and autos) and given that information to the modeling consultant. We will start on projections shortly.

MTIP

Nothing to Report
Unified Planning Work Program

Unified Planning Work Program - Nothing to Report

Committee Bylaws - Nothing to Report.

Certification Review – We are working with Richmond TPO to review our cooperation agreement. One component that remains to be resolved is DRPT’s role.

VDOT Report
Smart-Scale Update - Information

Adjournment
Call to order
The Minutes of the August 10, 2018 Meeting upon a motion by Mr. Henley (Colonial Heights) with a Second by Mr. Bassett (Dinwiddie County) the minutes of the August 10, 2018 meeting were approved as presented.

Status Report on the NEPA Rail Station Study

- Federal Rail Administration (FRA) and Crater released an EA (Environmental Assessment) dated January 2017 on March 10, 2017;
- The formal comment period ran from April 21, 2017 through May 22, 2017;
- The Concerned Citizens of Ettrick spoke at the August MPO meeting expressing their preference for the Ettrick Site;
- We do not have a date for the release of the FONSI at this time.

DRPT Report

Ms. Dubinsky reported that:
- The kick-off meeting of the Transit Development Plan Process for Petersburg Area Transit on August 28, 2018.
- Kimley-Horn is currently gathering data from PAT and the MPO/Crater PDC to develop the TDP.
- DRPT has completed the Transit Access Management (TAMS) Component of the Performance Management System. This language needs to be incorporated into both the Transportation Improvement Program and the Long Range Plan. The TAMS language needs to be incorporated into the TIP by October 1, 2018.
- DRPT is now working on the required Safety Element of Transit Performance Management Plan. The safety element is due by July 1, 2020.

Metropolitan Transportation Plan Update

2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan – The Richmond MPO is a bit ahead of us in the planning cycle and needs to start work on their 2045 plan this year. The purpose of this effort is to develop housing, employment and auto-ownership for the travel demand model. As mentioned last month Mr. Nicholas has accepted a job with Caltrans. Staff changes in the Richmond TPO have also delayed work. The schedule for developing the socio-economic data is shown in the table below. The current status of the project is shown below.
Transportation Conformity

Mr. Ponticello (VDOT) reported on the status of transportation conformity for the Richmond Urbanized Area. As of this meeting the MPO has only received one written comment (from the Southern Environmental Law Center). The comments and response are summarized below.

The comment period began Monday August 13th and concludes Thursday September 13th. To date we have received only one comment (from the Southern Environmental Law Center) on the conformity report. Copies of those comments (Attachment 2A) and VDOT’s response (Attachment 2B) are attached. In summary SELC’s comments are:

a) changes to the CAFÉ Standards will affect CO₂ emissions;
b) that the MOVES model does not anticipate this and;
c) that the first year of the analysis is too close to the budget level.

In response CO₂ is not a criteria pollutant and not subject to conformity. Furthermore as described in the regulation, the emissions budget test is met so long as the emissions for each analysis year are below the budget level.
The Southern Environmental Law Center did not bring up any issues that affect the MPO’s ability to make a conformity determination.

The TAC recommends that the MPO adopt the conformity resolution as presented/modified.

Motion By Mr. Riblett (VDOT) Second By Ms. Smith (Chesterfield Co.)

Table 1 gives the Federal Register Citation of each conformity requirement, names the test and shows that both the plan and TIP meet all the conformity requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regulatory Citation</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>LRTP</th>
<th>MTIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40 CFR § 93.108</td>
<td>Fiscal constraint</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 CFR § 93.110</td>
<td>Latest planning assumptions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 CFR § 93.111</td>
<td>Latest emissions model</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 CFR § 93.112</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 CFR § 93.113(b)&amp;(c)</td>
<td>Any Transportation Control Measures in</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the SIP are on Schedule and Producing the expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 CFR § 93.118</td>
<td>Estimated Motor Vehicle Emissions are less than</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the SIP Budget(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unified Planning Work Program
Unified Planning Work Program- Nothing to Report
Committee Bylaws- Nothing to Report.
Certification Review – Nothing to Report
VDOT Report
Smart-Scale Update
- MPO Members have submitted eighteen projects to the SmartScale Portal for scoring in Round 3 of SmartScale.
- Mr. Hyder reported that the MPO has provided an omnibus resolution of support for seventeen of the eighteen projects.
  o Two projects were either ineligible or did not receive resolutions of support from the submitting jurisdictions.
  o The MPO submitted a resolution of support for seventeen projects after determining that one project (Application 3781 the Tri-Cities Multi-modal Rail Station) was not ready to move forward because the NEPA document was incomplete (As noted above the MPO is awaiting a FONSI from Federal Rail Administration).
  o Mr. Henley (Colonial Heights) noted that from Colonial Heights’ point of view failure to support the project was a low point in regional cooperation.

Adjournment
Sign In Sheet TRI-CITIES AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE
Colonial Heights Public Library (1000 Yacht Basin Drive)

September 7, 2018
10:00 AM

Meeting Type:  □ Annual
  ✔ Regular
  □ Special (Called)

Invitees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield County</td>
<td>Ms. Barb Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Colonial Heights</td>
<td>Mr. Check Henley, P.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinwiddie County</td>
<td>Mr. Mark Bassett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hopewell</td>
<td>Mr. Ed Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Petersburg</td>
<td>Mr. Lionel Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince George County</td>
<td>Mr. Horace Wade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)</td>
<td>Mr. Mark Riblett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg Area Transit</td>
<td>Mr. Charles Kooene, Jr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VDR&amp;PT)</td>
<td>Ms. Tiffany Dubinsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crater Planning District Commission</td>
<td>Mr. David Hyder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Commission (FTA)</td>
<td>Ms. Melissa McGill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)</td>
<td>Mr. Mark Erosi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lee</td>
<td>Mr. Fritz Brandt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg National Battlefield Park</td>
<td>Mr. Adam Baghetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)</td>
<td>Mr. Ron Svejkovsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY OF HOPEDALE</td>
<td>Tony Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg Area Transit</td>
<td>Shane B. Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lee Environmental</td>
<td>Julian Dunnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Signatures]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intercity Passenger Rail
Station Policy

**Purpose**
The purpose of this policy is to assist localities and other public entities preparing to submit a proposal for an intercity passenger rail station to the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT).

It is also intended to guide the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) and DRPT with decisions when evaluating a proposal.

**Background**
Within the Commonwealth of Virginia, DRPT is the lead agency for rail and public transportation. DRPT provides operating support for four routes which are operated by Amtrak on privately owned freight railroads.

The Intercity Passenger Rail Operating and Capital (IPROC) Fund provides state operating funds as well as funding for capital improvements necessary for new and enhanced services. DRPT has taken an incremental approach to expanding and enhancing passenger rail services. This ensures scarce funding resources are spent wisely, and allows the Department to evaluate the incremental impact of each project on the existing state-supported routes.

Since 2009 DRPT has funded infrastructure improvements and provided operating support for Amtrak state-supported routes. As service has expanded across the Commonwealth the demand for new stations has grown. There are generally three categories for station proposals which this policy guide will address:

- Adding a new station to an existing intercity passenger rail route;
- Modifying an existing station along an existing intercity passenger rail route;
- Adding a new station where service does not yet exist.

This policy guide does not guarantee approval of a proposal. It defines the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, provides a breakdown of station cost factors, sets out considerations for a proposal, and outlines the process and expectations set forth by the CTB.

There may be circumstances where a proposal is brought forth as a state initiative. DRPT may also work with a locality and a region on a DRPT initiated station proposal.
Stakeholders – Roles and Responsibilities

There are multiple stakeholders with specific roles who should be part of the consideration of a proposed station, and the impact of a station on a community, ridership, and the rail network. Stakeholders commonly include, but are not limited to:

- **DRPT** – DRPT has existing operating agreements with Amtrak, and close working relationships with the Host Railroads. DRPT will work with localities, MPOs, and PDCs through the Proposal Phase to develop concepts for a station, and then facilitate discussions with the passenger rail service providers (Amtrak/VRE) and the Host Railroads after consultation with the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

- **Project Sponsor** – Localities, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO), Planning District Commissions (PDC), and DRPT can be a Project Sponsor. However, unless a proposal is initiated by DRPT, the local government must take a lead role in the proposal with regional support from the MPO and PDC. The locality must demonstrate a commitment to the land use and multimodal planning efforts that create a successful station (see Expectations of a Successful Station). The locality is also responsible for developing a funding plan that addresses construction of the station and the long term operation and maintenance (O&M) costs of the proposed station.

- **Host Railroads** – Private freight railroads own the tracks over which intercity passenger rail services operate south of Washington, D.C. The Class I (Host) Railroads in Virginia are CSX and Norfolk Southern. The Host Railroads will typically lead any analysis related to the impact a proposed station would have to their freight network.

- **Amtrak** – Incorporated as the “National Railroad Passenger Corporation”, Amtrak provides the rolling-stock for and operates the state-supported routes in Virginia through an operating Agreement with DRPT. DRPT relies exclusively on Amtrak to provide ridership analysis for state-supported services. Amtrak can also provide a program of station requirements for a proposal based on the anticipated service frequency and ridership.

- **Virginia Railway Express (VRE)** – VRE is a commuter rail service that operates in Northern Virginia over CSX (Fredericksburg Line – I-95 Corridor) and Norfolk Southern (Manassas Line – I-66 Corridor) with a northern terminus at Washington Union Station in Washington DC. VRE owns rolling-stock and stations, some of which are also served by Amtrak state-supported service.

- **Federal Railroad Administration (FRA)** – The FRA regulates safety for the Host Railroads and Amtrak, and has approval authority over the design of station platforms associated with intercity passenger rail stations (Amtrak). Any station proposal must comply with FRA Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards for boarding passenger trains.
• Federal Transit Administration (FTA) – The FTA provides funding for transit services, and has jurisdiction of ADA requirements associated with commuter rail stations (VRE). Any proposal affecting a VRE station must comply with FTA’s ADA standards for boarding commuter trains.

• Public Interest Groups – While the Project Sponsor must be a public entity, public interest groups can play an important advocacy role and shape the overall proposal. DRPT will work with Public Interest Groups by receiving comments on proposals, or as part of the Project Sponsor team.

Station Cost Factors
The following infographic breaks down the components of a station. The funding responsibilities associated with these station components should be addressed in a station proposal. While certain costs are the responsibilities of other stakeholders, as defined below, DRPT will work with the Project Sponsor to develop an overall cost estimate before presenting a proposal to the Commonwealth Transportation Board.
Operations

The costs of operating state-supported routes are funded by ticket revenues and covered by DRPT through the IPROC Fund. Costs for the service are allocated to DRPT according to a federal methodology created under the Passenger Rail Investment and Improvement Act of 2008, known as the PRIIA Methodology.

Capital Equipment

Capital equipment costs for state-supported routes are funded by DRPT through the IPROC Fund. Costs for capital equipment are allocated through the PRIIA Methodology. Virginia shares the cost of capital equipment with the Amtrak Northeast Regional services, since Virginia’s state-supported routes are extensions of the Northeast Regional trains, which operate between Washington, D.C. and cities in the Northeast.

Capital Construction

Capital construction costs related to intercity passenger rail services are determined through negotiations between DRPT and the Host Railroads. These costs typically include projects that enhance rail capacity in a corridor in order to mitigate the impacts of passenger service on the Host Railroad’s system. These projects are funded through the IPROC Fund or other state and federal funds. Capital improvements to the network are proposed through a Host Railroad led analysis, and subject to negotiation with DRPT. The level of investment may vary depending on whether a station proposal is for a new station on an existing route, a modification of an existing station, or a new station where service does not yet exist. DRPT will also consider the previous ten years of capital investments in the corridor of the Station exploratory proposal, to first ensure that benefits have been fully realized.

Stations

Station Building

Funding for a station building is the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. This includes, but is not limited to, funding for design and construction, as well as covering operational costs associated with the Station Cost Factors. Project Sponsors may use public or private funds for these costs. The Station Building should be considered a community asset for multimodal connectivity and public/quasi-public space. Design of the station will require DRPT coordination with Amtrak to satisfy minimum square footage and space requirements.

Platform

Design of an intercity passenger rail station platform must be consistent with FRA standards for ADA compliance. An Exploratory Proposal should assume the platform will be built to 1,000 feet in length and 48 inches above the top of the rail for level boarding (commonly called a high-level platform). It should be noted that high-level platforms interfere with freight train operations because of the clearance required to operate freight trains. Therefore, any station Exploratory Proposal must also consider the infrastructure requirements to achieve a high-level
platform, such as construction of a siding off the Host Railroad mainline. Design and construction of a platform and associated passenger track is eligible for Intercity Passenger Rail Operating and Capital (IPROC) grant funding through DRPT. Platform costs associated with Station Cost Factors typically fall under PRIIA operating agreements between DRPT and Amtrak.

**Land Use and Connectivity**

While not explicitly a capital cost factor, or an operating cost factor, planning for land use and connectivity implies a commitment of resources to maximize the state and local investment in creating a multimodal station. DRPT will look to the local government to ensure appropriate land use and transportation connectivity around a proposed station (see Expectations for a Successful Station). This means accessibility to and from the station to other destinations by multiple transportation modes (i.e. transit, car, taxi, bike, walk, etc.). Land use around the station may vary in an urban or suburban location but should promote density and economic activity.

**Proposal Development**

There are three phases of determining viability of a proposal.

**Proposal Phase**

A proposal is submitted by a Project Sponsor to DRPT, unless DRPT is initiating the proposal. The parties will collaborate on the proposal. DRPT will inform stakeholders such as the Host Railroads and Amtrak in order to solicit any concerns over the initial viability of the proposal.

**Adding a New Station to an Existing Route**

DRPT and the Project Sponsor will work collaboratively to address the proposal as it relates to Station Cost Factors and the Factors for Consideration as defined by this policy statement.

**Modifying an Existing Station on an Existing Route**

DRPT and the Project Sponsor will work collaboratively to address the proposal as it relates to Station Cost Factors and the Factors for Consideration as defined by this policy statement.

**Adding a New Station where service does not yet exist**

Because extensions of existing service entail long-term capital and operating cost commitments, DRPT and the Project Sponsor will discuss the merits of the proposal and the current DRPT priorities which may determine whether a proposal will move beyond the Proposal Phase. Such proposals must be consistent with the Virginia State Rail Plan.
**Assessment Milestone**

The Assessment Phase will include two CTB Rail Committee meetings. At the first CTB-Rail Committee meeting DRPT staff will introduce the proposal to the CTB Rail Committee. At the second CTB Rail Committee meeting, the Committee will decide whether or not to recommend the proposal for presentation to the full Commonwealth Transportation Board.

**Negotiation Milestone**

If the CTB Rail Committee recommends the proposal for CTB presentation, DRPT will work with the Project Sponsor to prepare a cost estimate for the station proposal, which will include the full cost for the station, any infrastructure enhancements to the Host Railroad, as well as long-term operational costs. CTB approval of a proposal advances a proposal to a project. DRPT will take the lead in negotiating with Host Railroads and Amtrak on related operational impacts, service changes, capital improvements, platform requirements, ridership analysis by Amtrak, and modeling by the Host Railroad. Subsequent funding commitments to advance the project with state funds will also require approval of the CTB.
Factors for Consideration

The following questions intended to guide the Project Sponsor when preparing a proposal. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list, but addresses CTB expectations.

1. **What funding is the Project Sponsor committing to the station?**

   The Project Sponsor must develop a funding plan that addresses construction as well as the operation and maintenance of a station. Federal and state funds may be available for the development and construction of a station, but local funding commitments are part of the factors for consideration.

2. **Is the station proposal consistent with state transportation goals of the Virginia State Rail Plan?**

   The State Rail Plan has been developed to guide DRPT and the CTB in planning and funding decisions. The State Rail Plan describes the CTB’s priorities for the expansion of passenger rail across the Commonwealth, and prioritizes corridors for future investment. Any station proposal should reference the Virginia State Rail Plan for passenger rail policies and priorities.

3. **How does the station proposal affect the railroad network and other existing services?**

   A holistic evaluation of the rail network, including existing passenger services, will be based on discussions with DRPT staff and may incorporate results of operational modeling performed by the Host Railroad. Considerations will include existing freight traffic, existing intercity passenger rail services, existing commuter services (including intercity bus), and existing needs in the corridor.

4. **What is the effect of this station proposal upon other stations?**

   Proximity to other stations is a consideration because a rail station is a regional transportation asset that represents significant public investment. A station proposal should quantify the population density within the ridership catchment area. It should also discuss the degree to which ridership at this station will be comprised of new riders to the corridor, as opposed to redistributing riders that utilize existing stations. In evaluating the impact to existing stations, DRPT will also review federal and state investments in the past 10 years to other stations and intercity passenger rail services in this corridor.

5. **How will this station affect the total ridership for the route?**

   DRPT will rely on Amtrak to perform a ridership analysis. Amtrak’s ridership analysis will estimate the total new riders added to existing routes. DRPT may perform a benefit-cost analysis to evaluate the net benefit to Virginia from the net new ridership added to a route.
One consideration in the benefit-cost analysis will be capacity on the existing route to absorb the estimated number of new riders resulting from the proposed station addition. If capacity were an issue, additional planned train frequencies (consistent with the State Rail Plan) should be operational in a timely manner to accommodate new ridership from the new station.

6. What are the capacity requirements of the proposed station?

The Great American Stations website www.greatamericanstations.com is a resource guide for developing a station proposal. DRPT can also coordinate discussions with Amtrak on capacity requirements. While Amtrak may recommend square footage requirements based on proposed service frequency and ridership, stations can be part of a multi-use building with larger community spaces. The Project Sponsor should clarify what other functions a proposed station might serve in the community.

7. What is the viability of the proposed station, given the Station Cost Factors?

The funding plan provided by the Project Sponsor should include design, construction, and operation of a station. DRPT will work with the Project Sponsor and stakeholders when appropriate to develop costs related to capacity improvements and Amtrak services.

The costs for engineering and analysis necessary to obtain a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) estimate of a proposed station are the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. The Project Sponsor is also responsible for a funding plan which addresses O&M costs, with the expectation the locality will provide or secure funding for O&M of the station.

8. What are the current and future land use plans around the station proposal?

A station proposal should reference the locality’s current comprehensive plan, land use plan, and zoning, as well as any community plans for a proposed station. It should address any natural and historic resources potentially affected by the proposal. Any economic development impact of a station can also be part of this discussion.

9. What transportation connections are available or planned for the proposed station?

The locality should differentiate between existing connectivity options, funded future options, and plans for connectivity that are part of this proposal.

**Expectations for a Successful Station**

**Local and Regional Consensus**

The locality where the station would be built or modified should be a strong partner and have a lead role. Regional entities such as MPOs and PDCs should support the proposal. DRPT will
look for resolutions and letters of support from neighboring localities, regional governments, public advocacy groups, and the business community.

Location

The advantage and convenience of intercity passenger rail service is travel from one city center to another, or to other centers of high population density and economic activity. The proposed location of a station should be located in significant population centers that are major nodes of economic activity for a region.

Land Use and Multimodal Connectivity

Land use around a station should support density and multimodal connectivity to final passenger destinations. A station should serve as a transportation hub for the locality or region. Connectivity via transit, car, taxi, bike, walking, etc. should be part of the proposal.

Policy Proposal Submission List

1. Introductory Narrative
2. Map identifying proposed sites for a station
3. Narrative describing how sites were selected
4. Funding plan related to Station Cost Factors identified in this policy
5. Narrative discussing Factors for Consideration
6. Letters and resolutions of support from local and regional governments
7. Letters of support from advocacy groups and the business community
Intercity Passenger Rail Station Policy

Tri-Cities MPO Technical Advisory Committee Meeting November 2, 2018

Emily Stock, DRPT
Purpose and Background

- Adopted by CTB January 2018

- Provides a policy guide to a Project Sponsor

- Serves as a guide for DRPT and CTB to evaluate proposals

- Allows CTB to review the relationship between State Rail Plan and future station proposals

- Emphasis on an incremental approach

- Identify categories for station proposal
  - Add new station to an existing route
  - Modify an existing station along an existing route
  - Adding new station where service does not yet exist
  - DRPT initiated station project
Stakeholders

- Identify key players:
  - DRPT, Project Sponsor, Host RR, Amtrak, VRE, FRA, FTA, Public Interest Groups

- Clarify typical roles and responsibilities

- CTB-Rail Subcommittee and CTB decisions will move a proposal forward
# Station Cost Factors

## State Investment

### Operations
- Amtrak staff, management, ticket services
- Fuel
- Food and beverage
- Equipment: maintenance, cleaning
- Leases
- Insurance
- Performance payments
- Alternative transportation (during service disruptions)

### Capital Construction & Equipment
- Track construction
- Signal systems
- Grade separations & roadway crossings
- Locomotives
- Train cars
- Long-term track maintenance

## Local Investment

### Platforms
- Tactile strip & surfaces
- ADA compliance
- Stormwater treatment
- Lighting
- Utilities
- Cleaning
- Litter/garbage collection
- Insurance

### Stations
- Maintenance
- Utilities
- Janitorial services
- Parking
- Landscaping
- Insurance
- Security

### Connectivity
- Land use & economic activity
- Public roads, sidewalks, & bike lanes
- Public transit

## State Revenues
- Tickets
- Food & beverage
- State Support

## Local Revenues
- Rent
- Tax Revenues
- Parking
Milestones

• Proposal Phase
  • DRPT/Sponsor clarify type of proposal
  • DRPT/Sponsor collaborate on Cost Factors and Considerations
  • Initial consultation with Amtrak and Host RR

• Assessment Milestone
  • Two CTB-R Meetings:
    • Presentation – Q&A
    • Request Concurrence for CTB Presentation

• Negotiation Milestone
  • DRPT/Sponsor prepare cost estimate
  • CTB action required to become DRPT project
  • DRPT leads coordination with Host RR and Amtrak
Consideration Factors

• Project Sponsor funding commitments
• Consistency with Virginia State Rail Plan
• Effect on the railroad network and existing services
• Effect of station on others stations
• Review of recent investment history in corridor
• Effect of total ridership on route
• Cost and viability of proposed station
• Land use surrounding station
• Transportation connections available or planned
Expectations for a Station

- Local and Regional Consensus
- Preferred Site for Station Location
- Land Use and Transportation
- Multimodal Connectivity
Questions?
Rail Station Project Summary

The Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact are part of the National Environmental Policy (NEPA) process. Congress intended that NEPA provide decision-makers with enough information to make a reasonable decision when spending federal money. Although the NEPA process is discussed as the environmental process the problem to be solved must also be considered.

**Common Things**

All the station sites share several common assumptions. This section highlights some of those common factors.

- **Ridership**
  - All Stations assume around 30,000 passengers per year (80 daily) today.
  - All Stations assume around 98,000 passengers per year (270 daily) by 2025\(^1\).

- **All the alternatives include the following features**\(^2\)
  - A center passenger platform (564’ to 833’ long x 24’ wide) between the eastern most main line track and the Southeast High Speed Rail (SESHR) track\(^3\)
  - A tunnel, or overhead walkway, to provide safe access to the platform
  - A building of approximately 3600 square feet
  - A parking lot for 130-170 vehicles (about 0.6 acres)

---

**Table 1: Summary Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Site (Alphabetical Order)</th>
<th>Purpose and Need</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>94,000 People w/i 10 minutes travel(^4) ~1.0 mi from I-95 Exit (Temple Ave.,) 3 turnings from the ramp Visible from US 1 564 foot long platform 170 Parking Spaces</td>
<td>2.67 Acres Private Owner Paved Site DHR has Concurred with this site Parts of the site are within the 1% flood plain.(^5)</td>
<td>Low $9.0 High $12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) DRPT, Pre-NEPA Evaluation Tri-Cities Area Multimodal Station Study (2012), 7.

\(^2\) Environmental Assessment and Section 4(f) Statement for the Tri-Cities Multimodal Station (2017), ES-12.

\(^3\) The minimum platform length given is 300 feet outside the Northeast Corridor. *Amtrak Station Programing and Planning Guide* (2013), 87.

\(^4\) The persons within ten minutes travel has been estimated using GIS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Site (Alphabetical Order)</th>
<th>Purpose and Need</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
<th>Cost ($ Million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branders Bridge</td>
<td>91,000 People w/i 10 minutes travel</td>
<td>2.57 Acres</td>
<td>$9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~1.1 mi from I-95 Exit 54 (Temple Ave.)</td>
<td>Private Owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 turnings from the ramp</td>
<td>Wooded Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visible from Branders Bridge Rd</td>
<td>Potential Endangered Species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>833 foot long platform</td>
<td>Needs DHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>153 Parking Spaces</td>
<td>Concurrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New 24’ wide Access Road ~600 ft.</td>
<td>No Flood Plain Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Permits are needed</td>
<td>Additional Permits are needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This site may be affected by the need for an overpass of Branders Bridge with the rail line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collier Yard</td>
<td>66,000 People w/i 10 minutes travel</td>
<td>4.30 Acres</td>
<td>$14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~0.9 mi from 1-85 Exit 65 (Squirrel Level Rd.)</td>
<td>Wooded Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 turnings from the ramp</td>
<td>Owned by Petersburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visible from Halifax Road</td>
<td>Needs DHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,250 foot long platform</td>
<td>Concurrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>135 Parking Spaces</td>
<td>No Flood Plain Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New 24’ wide Access Road~2,575 ft.</td>
<td>Additional Permits are needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Permits are needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ettrick (Build)</td>
<td>74,000 People w/i 10 minutes travel</td>
<td>2.34 Acres</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~2.0 mi from I-95 Exit 54 (Temple Ave.)</td>
<td>Paved Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 turnings from the ramp</td>
<td>Owned by CSXT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not visible from River Road</td>
<td>Needs DHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>833 foot long platform</td>
<td>Concurrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150 Parking Spaces</td>
<td>No Flood Plain Impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New 24’ wide Access Road ~210 ft.</td>
<td>Additional Permits are needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional Permits are needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 The term ‘100 year flood’ plain implies that a flood occurs only once in a hundred years. Actually, this size flood could happen back to back so resource agencies are switching to the more precise 1% chance of recurrence.

6 This impact can be mitigated by avoiding land clearing during certain months.

7 See Additional Work below.
### Purpose and Need

As stated in the Environmental Assessment Report:

“The purpose of this Project is to construct a multimodal station for current intercity passenger rail service through Petersburg, including the relatively new conventional [rail] service to Norfolk, and prepare for the future introduction of high speed rail service on the SEHSR corridor to Norfolk and North Carolina.

The secondary purposes of this Project are to:

- Construct a station in a location that supports the SEHSR goal of diverting trips from air and highway within the travel corridor to passenger rail use, thus reducing the growth rate of congestion on I-95; and
- Construct a station in a location that serves long-distance, regional, business and leisure travelers within and beyond Virginia, including Amtrak’s Northeast Corridor (NEC), extending from Washington, DC, to Boston, MA, as well as points south (the SEHSR Tier-II EIS serves as the key link for these travelers to the busy Northeast) and east to the Norfolk and Hampton Roads area.”

The first paragraph implies a desire for a modern station building and platform with modern amenities including safe trackside access and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. All of the constructions alternatives meet these goals.

The second paragraph implies that a new station should be close to the center of population, be close to the Interstate, and be easy to find and see from the road. The construction alternatives fulfill the requirements of the second paragraph to varying degrees. Table 1 and Figures 4, 5, 6 and 7 show each construction alternative meets the goals of the second paragraph.

---

8 The No-Build does not meet the requirements of the purpose and need statement. *Environmental Assessment and Section 4(f) Statement for the Tri-Cities Multimodal Station (2017)*, 29

9 The No-Build Option will require work to make the station Americans with Disabilities Act Compliant.

10 *Environmental Assessment and Section 4(f) Statement for the Tri-Cities Multimodal Station (2017)*, P-ES-6.
**Environmental**
- During the NEPA process Federal and State Resource Agencies have reviewed each location
  - Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation
  - Virginia Department of Game and Fisheries
  - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
  - Virginia Department of Historic Resources (i.e., SHPO)
  - U.S. Department of the Interior – National Park Service (Petersburg National Battlefield)
- The Resource Agencies have not identified significant impacts for any site. Thus all the sites are permit able.
- It appears that the resource agencies have given standard responses to requests for comments. These responses include lists of permits needed later in the construction process.
- Building a new station adjacent to the existing Ettrick Site appears to have the fewest environmental impacts.\(^\text{11}\)

**Cost**
The costs in the Environmental Assessment Report are planning level estimates they are basically averages of costs of similar work on several recent rail stations. The Environmental Assessment report shows a range of costs for each alternative will become clearer.

There has been some discussion of land acquisition costs for the Boulevard site. The Environmental Assessment

**CTB Station Policy**
In January 2018 the Commonwealth Board of Transportation adopted an *Intercity Passenger Rail Station Policy*. This section summarizes key parts of that policy.

**Success Factors**
DRPT lists these factors for successfully in developing rail station projects:
- Regional consensus,
- Preferred Site for Station Location, and
- Existing Land use that supports density,
- and connectivity to final destinations.\(^\text{12}\)

**Cost Factors**
Figure 2 summarizes elements of rail capital and operational costs that the Commonwealth Transportation Board will participate in. Effectively Virginia may choose to participate in the capital costs of: track and platform improvements, grade separations, and ADA and safety improvements at stations, drainage improvements and lighting. The local sponsor will be responsible for building the station itself, parking facilities, landscaping and access to the site.

---

\(^\text{11}\) Environmental Assessment and Section 4(f) Statement for the Tri-Cities Multimodal Station (2017), ES-14 to ES-16.
\(^\text{12}\) DRPT, *Intercity Passenger Rail Station Policy, 2018* 8,9.
Unanswered Questions
There are a number of policy questions that have no technical answer. This section shares some of those questions.

- Will Federal Rail Administration accept the Tri-Cities MPO’s selection or will Federal Rail Administration continue with the preferred alternative described in the Environmental Assessment Report?
- If Federal Rail Administration chooses a site different from the preferred alternative identified in the Environmental Assessment and Section 4(f) Statement for the Tri-Cities Multimodal Station
  - what additional work will be needed to complete the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI);
  - how will this work be paid for (the UPC for this project has been closed for several months);
  - who will manage the work; and

---

• Will the Commonwealth Board of Transportation fully support a site chosen by the MPO?

Additional Work Needed to Support High Speed Rail
The work described below does not affect the station location decision but is included as additional information. The Tier II Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Southeast High Speed Rail Project cites some additional work that the region needs to undertake to support high speed rail between Richmond and Raleigh. The work highlighted here will need to be done to improve overall rail service and ultimately to support high speed rail.

• Completely double track the rail line from Collier Yard to the Staple Mills Road Station
• Replace the at grade crossing of Branders Bridge Road with an overpass
• Replace the existing railroad overpass bridge at US 1 (in Colonial Heights)
• Additional Landscaping near River Road
• A land exchange with the National Park Service to mitigate impacts near the Fort Wadsworth Unit of the Petersburg National Battlefield
DATE

Margie Ray  
Performance Measures Manager  
Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment  
1221 East Broad Street  
Richmond, VA 23219

Subject: Tri-Cities MPO Performance Targets for Pavement Condition, Bridge Condition and Reliability

Dear Ms. Ray:

The Tri-Cities Metropolitan Planning Organization is pleased to submit this letter to the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIPI) to fulfill the target setting requirements of the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) January 2017 final rulemakings for National Performance Measures for asset condition and system performance. This letter satisfies the federal requirement for MPOs to report targets to their respective State DOT “in a manner that is documented and mutually agreed upon by both parties” (23 CFR §§490.107(c)(1)). Documenting the targets in this letter also allows for the State to provide MPO targets to FHWA, upon request, satisfying a reporting requirement of State DOTs (23 CFR §§490.105(f)(9)).

In accordance with 23 CFR §§490.105 and 490.107, targets for twelve federally mandated asset condition and system performance measures must be established and reported to FHWA every four years, beginning in 2018. Federal regulations require both State Departments of Transportation and Metropolitan Planning Organizations to set targets for the twelve measures (23 CFR §§490.105, 490.307, 490.407, 490.507, 490.607, 490.707, and 490.807).1 The rule requires MPOs to establish targets by either (1) “agreeing to plan and program projects so that they contribute toward the accomplishment of the relevant State DOT target” or (2) “committing to a quantifiable target for that performance measure for their metropolitan planning area” (23 CFR §§490.105(f)(3)). By supporting any of the State targets, we agree to plan and program projects to contribute toward achieving the State target.

### Asset Condition Methodology Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Pavement in Good Condition (Interstate)</th>
<th>VDOT</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>If MPO, please describe the methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pavement in Poor Condition (Interstate)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pavement in Good Condition (Non-Interstate NHS)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The performance measures for peak hour excessive delay, non-single occupancy vehicle use, and emission reductions are only required in the Washington, DC-MD-VA urbanized area, which is represented by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Government.
Percentage of Pavement in Poor Condition (Non-Interstate NHS) ☒ ☐
Percentage of Deck Area of Bridges in Good Condition (NBI on NHS) ☒ ☐
Percentage of Deck Area of Bridges in Poor Condition (NBI on NHS) ☒ ☐

System Performance Methodology Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>VDOT</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>If MPO, please describe the methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Person-Miles Traveled that are Reliable (Interstate) ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Person-Miles Traveled that are Reliable (Non-Interstate NHS) ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Travel Time Reliability Index ☒ ☐</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tri-Cities Selected Performance Targets

The Tri-Cities MPO chooses to accept the Virginia Department of Transportation’s performance targets for pavement condition, bridge condition and system reliability as shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>4-Year Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pavement Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pavement in Good Condition (Interstate)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pavement in Poor Condition (Interstate)</td>
<td>&lt;3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pavement in Good Condition (Non-Interstate NHS)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Pavement in Poor Condition (Non-Interstate NHS)</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bridge Condition</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Deck Area of Bridges in Good Condition (NBI on NHS)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Deck Area of Bridges in Poor Condition (NBI on NHS)</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>System Reliability</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Person-Miles Traveled that are Reliable (Interstate)</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Person-Miles Traveled that are Reliable (Non-Interstate NHS)</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Travel Time Reliability Index</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We acknowledge MPO targets are reported to the State and will be made available to FHWA upon request. Our targets are submitted for each performance measure within
180 days of the State establishing its statewide targets, which falls on November 14, 2018.

For questions or comments, please contact me at dhyder@craterpdc.org or (804) 861-1666.

Respectfully,

The Honorable T.J. Webb  
Chairman – Tri-Cities MPO

Mr. David W. Hyder  
Secretary-Tri-Cities MPO  
1964 Wakefield Street  
P.O. Box 1808  
Petersburg, VA 23805
Policies and Procedures

1. The MPO Policy Committee periodically decides to initiate a new RSTP candidate project list and rating.
2. Candidate projects must be consistent with Federal RSTP guidance contained in the 23 U.S.C. 133(b). Projects must be identified in the current Tri-Cities Area Transportation Plan or as a capital improvement project in the current the Transit Development Plan.
3. Street or road projects must be on the National Highway System or a federal aid route, except bridge, safety, carpool-related, and bicycle/pedestrian projects which may be on any public road.
4. A construction project must be a permanent improvement and not temporary construction that must be replaced in the near future; staged construction is considered permanent rather than temporary so long as future stages build on rather than replace previous work.
5. Noise barriers, lighting projects, drainage projects, fences, landscaping, etc., are ineligible for funding unless part of a larger roadway construction, safety, capacity, or bikeway/walkway construction project which qualify under the above criteria.
6. Street or road projects must be structurally capable of handling all anticipated vehicles of legal load limit.
7. Bikeways/walkway projects must meet one or more of the following location criteria: (a) be along a federal-aid route, (b) provide a means of crossing a controlled access federal-aid route or (c) shift non-motorized traffic which would have normally used a federal-aid highway route to an adjacent route in the corridor; and, ordinary sidewalk construction is not eligible as a separate project.
8. RSTP candidate project sponsor(s) and VDOT and/or VDR&PT will provide assurance to the MPO that any RSTP funds allocated for the candidate project can be federally obligated within 12 months of allocation and expended within 36 months of such obligation.
9. MPO – Technical Committee will review results of the ratings and recommend multi-year project allocations beginning with the highest rated project.
10. Prioritized projects with some prior year RSTP allocation will be given funding priority.
11. MPO – Policy Committee will review candidate project ratings and recommended allocations prior to endorsing RSTP allocations.
12. Crater PDC staff and VDOT staff will maintain records of CMAQ project funding.
13. Implementing agencies will execute RSTP project agreements with either VDOT or VDR&PT.
### RSTP Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MPO action to develop a new candidate list and rating</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project sponsor(s) and/or implementing agency provide candidate project background information to CPDC staff, including scope of work, schedule and aerial showing project location.</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Project sponsor(s) provide applicable traffic or project ridership information to VDOT</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VDOT provides/confirms project cost estimate and traffic background information to CPDC staff</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MPO—Technical Advisory Committee rates candidate projects</td>
<td>November/December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CPDC staff assembles results of the ratings and recommends tentative project allocations over a multi-year period.</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MPO—Technical Advisory Committee reviews results of ratings and the tentative allocations and makes recommendations for tentative project allocations over a multi-year period.</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MPO—Policy Committee reviews the results of candidate project ratings and the recommended tentative allocations and takes action.</td>
<td>March/April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CPDC staff and VDOT staff maintain records of project allocations with the RSTP worksheet and with VDOT programming modules.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Project sponsor(s) and implementing agency execute project agreement.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RSTP Candidate Project Rating Factors

(project sponsor adds narrative explaining how candidate project relates to each factor, maximum 5 points per factor and 40 points per project)

#### Candidate Project # ________

1. **Support the Economic Vitality of the Metropolitan Area** *(project serves a corridor with commercial and/or industrial development growth by adding capacity with improvements such as adding travel lanes to existing streets, new interchanges or bridge replacement/widening)* ________

2. **Increase the Safety and Security of the Transportation System** *(project includes provision to help prevent accidents, such as railroad crossings, or pedestrian safety/security)* ________
3. Increase the Accessibility and Mobility Options Available to People and for Freight (*project includes provision for improvements such as transit capital acquisition, intermodal connection, park & ride lots, carpool/vanpool projects, bike lanes or sidewalk modifications to comply with the Americans with Disability Act of 1990 or park & ride lots*)

4. Protect and Enhance the Environment, Promote Energy Conservation, and Improve Quality of Life (*project includes provision for improvements that involve the reduction of fuel consumption, wetlands mitigation or improve natural wildlife habitats*)

5. Enhance the Integration and Connectivity of the Transportation System, Across and Between Modes, for People and Freight (*project includes provision improvements such as an intermodal facility, park & ride lot, sidewalk improvement or bicycle facility*)

6. Promote Efficient System Management and Operation (*project includes provision for improvements such as congestion/management systems, signal coordination, turn lanes and intelligent transportation system applications*)

7. Emphasize the Preservation of Existing Transportation System (*project includes provision for system preservation, such as resurfacing, rehabilitation of pavement, roadway or bridge replacement*)

8. Cost/Benefit Consideration

Total Points
1. A re-rating of all prioritized projects with no funds expended will be accomplished during the fall of 2012. New candidate projects not previously rated will also be considered during this prioritization round. The next regional prioritization round will be conducted during the fall of 2014 and every 2 years thereafter.


3. Candidate projects must be prioritized by the MPO and be consistent with State CMAQ time limit requirements. CMAQ funds must be federally obligated within 24 months of their allocation by the Commonwealth Transportation Board and expended within 48 months of obligation by the Tri-Cities MPO.

4. VDOT will provide the MPO updated six-year CMAQ revenue estimates annually. The MPO – Technical Committee will annually review the status of CMAQ projects with expenditures or proposed to have expenditures within the next 2-year period. The MPO – Technical Committee will make recommendations to the MPO – Policy Committee and the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) for project allocations of future year CMAQ funds to prioritized projects over the next six-year period. The CTB Commissioner for the VDOT – Richmond Construction District will annually review and revise as appropriate recommended CMAQ allocations.

5. For each prioritization round, candidate project sponsor(s) will provide information identifying the proposed implementing agency; the project location, including an aerial; proposed preliminary scope of work; funding needs by phase; and, information on any other project(s) anticipated to be under contract in the vicinity during the same time.

6. VDOT will either prepare candidate project cost estimates or confirm non-VDOT prepared cost estimates for preliminary engineering, right-of-way (including utilities) and construction phases by anticipated year the project will be under contract. VDOT will be responsible for determining the reasonableness of project cost increases and scope changes. Locally initiated project cost increases and/or scope changes that occur after a project funds have been expended are subject to State legislative provisions for reasonableness, including potential reimbursement for 100% of the cost increase subject to VDOT assessment of the scope change and cost increase.

7. VDOT will provide NOx and hydrocarbon reduction estimates for each CMAQ project during the project implementation. Qualitative assessments of anticipated emissions reductions will be made, as appropriate. If required data for this analysis is not
available qualitative assessments will be made. Project emissions reduction estimates will be used for federal reporting.

8. Crater PDC staff will provide available candidate project traffic information from the most recent data base used for the Congestion Management Process (CMP) in the Tri-Cities Area. The Crater PDC will also provide staff support for conducting the rating of candidate CMAQ projects during each prioritization round.

9. The MPO – Technical Committee will confirm the list of candidate projects and review available background information with each project sponsor prior to project rating. Candidate project sponsors will have an opportunity to present their projects to the MPO – Technical Committee members for questions prior to candidate project rating.

10. Uncompleted prioritized projects with some prior year CMAQ funding expenditure are considered the highest priority to receive future allocations and balance entry funds remaining from completed projects, as needed to complete project funding.

11. The MPO - Policy Committee will review and consider adjustments to the results of candidate project ratings and MPO – Technical Committee recommendations prior to endorsing CMAQ allocations for the next Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP) update.

12. VDOT staff and CPDC staff will maintain records of CMAQ funds sub-allocated by the State to the Tri-Cities MPO.

13. Implementing agencies will execute CMAQ project agreements with VDOT or VDR&PT.

14. VDOT & VDR&PT will “flex” CMAQ funds for transit projects, as required by the federal agencies, and prepare an annual report for FHWA and FTA showing how CMAQ funds have been expended and anticipated air quality benefits for the Tri-Cities Area.

**Suggested Schedule for a Prioritization Round**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action #</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MPO action taken to develop new candidate list and rating.</td>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project sponsor(s) and proposed implementing agency provide candidate project background information to CPDC staff as described in #5 above.</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CPDC staff provides applicable traffic and/or ridership information supporting each candidate project application.</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>VDOT provides or confirms cost estimates by phase for candidate projects.</td>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>VDOT provides estimates for potential air quality emissions benefits after during project implementation.</td>
<td>During Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MPO – Technical Committee voting members rate candidate projects and the Crater PDC staff summarizes the results of the ratings.</td>
<td>November/December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPO—Technical Committee reviews results of candidate project ratings and recommends MPO—Policy Committee action.</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MPO—Policy Committee reviews results of candidate project prioritization and recommendations and takes action on Project allocations for the next Six-Year Program update.</td>
<td>February/March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VDOT, CPDC staff and project sponsors, as appropriate, prepare and update a CMAQ project allocation spreadsheet in order to prepare project obligations for the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) update.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sponsoring agencies execute project agreements with VDOT or VDR&amp;PT</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>VDOT &amp; VDR&amp;PT prepare annual report for FHWA and/or FTA review of CMAQ expenditures.</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CMAQ Project Profile – Candidate #

1. Project Sponsor(s):
2. Proposed Implementing Agency:
3. Project Location and Attached Aerial Showing Proposed Improvement Location:
4. Description of Preliminary Proposed Scope of Work and Relation to Other Projects:

]|   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>RW</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Cost/ Benefit Assessment:
   - Cost/Existing Volume:
   - Cost/Proposed Ridership:
   - Qualitative Assessment:

CMAQ Candidate Project Rating Factors

Candidate Project #________

1. A. For Candidate Roadway/Intersection Projects - Corridor Traffic Flow Improvement Potential (maximum of 5 points):
   - Combination of Left and Right Turn Lanes (including roundabouts) and Traffic Signal Coordination Projects – 5 points
   - Left Turn Lane – 4 points
   - Transit or Travel Demand Management – 3 points
   - Right Turn Lane – 2 points
   - Bike & Pedestrian – 1 point

   A. _____

   B. For Candidate Roadway/Intersection Projects – Potential Present-Day Number of Vehicles Served (maximum of 1.75 points):
   - >15,001 = 1.75 points
   - 10,001 to 15,001 = 1.5 points
   - 5,001 to 10,000 = 1.25 points
   - <5,000 = 1.0 point

   B. _____

   C. For Candidate 3 Year Transit Demonstration Route Projects - Transit Ranked Density of Potentially Transit Dependent Population Using Figure 3-25 from the 2010 Tri-Cities Area Transit Development Plan update (maximum of 3 points):
   - Low Potential = 1 point
   - Moderate Potential = 3 points
   - High Potential = 5 points

   C. _____

   D. For Candidate Transit and Travel Demand Management and Other Eligible Capital Improvement Projects - (maximum of 1.75 points):
   - Capital Replacement Project = 1.0 point
   - Capital Expansion Project = .75 point

   D. _____

Candidate Project Impact Rating: 1A + 1B + 1C + 1D = ______
2. Cost/Benefit Score (maximum of 4 points):
   - 9 or less = 0 points
   - 10 to 13 = 1 point
   - 14 to 17 = 2 points
   - 18 to 21 = 3 points
   - 22 or more = 4 points

   Total Points (1 + 2)

---

**RSTP Project Profile – Candidate Project #**

1. Project Sponsor(s):

2. Proposed Implementing Agency:

3. Project Location and Attached Aerial Showing Proposed Improvement Location:

4. Proposed Scope of Work, Schedule and Relation to Other Projects or Project Phases:

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

5. Functional Classification:

6. Existing Traffic Volume and Level of Service with Improvement:

7. Existing Volume/Capacity:

8. Future Traffic Volume or Projected Ridership with Service Implementation:

9. Future Volume/Capacity and Level of Service:

10. Explain how this project addresses transportation safety:

   ____________________________________________________________

11. Estimated Project Cost by Phase (Preliminary Engineering, Right-of-Way (including
utilities) and Construction (including administration):   PE _______

               RW _______

               CN _______

12. Cost/Benefit Assessment
    • Cost/Existing Traffic Volume or Cost/Projected Ridership: