## MEETING AGENDA

**METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY BOARD**  
4:00 p.m., Wednesday, January 22, 2020  
407 Water Street East, Charlottesville, VA 22902

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Time†</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:00 – 4:05</td>
<td>Call to Order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1    | 4:05 – 4:10 | Matters from the Public: limit of 3 minutes per speaker  
Public are welcome to provide comment on any transportation-related topic, including the items listed on this agenda, and/or comment during items marked with an *.  
Response to Matters from the Public |
| 2    | 4:10-4:15 | Select Policy Board Officers*  
- Chair  
- Vice-Chair |
| 3    | 4:15-4:20 | Review and Acceptance of the Agenda*  
Approval of Meeting Minutes  
- July 24, 2019* [Click here for Minutes]  
- October 1, 2019* [Click here for Minutes] |
| 4    | 4:20-4:30 | Review TIP Amendments*  
- Public Hearing  
- Consider approving TIP Amendments [Click here for document] |
| 5    | 4:30-4:35 | Policy Board Meeting Schedule for 2020  
- Review draft Policy Board Meeting Dates [Click here Memo with meeting dates]  
- Consider rescheduling November 2020 meeting date |
| 6    | 4:35-5:00 | Regional Transit Partnership MOU*  
- Review amendment to include the University of Virginia in the Regional Transit Partnership [Click here for document]  
Safety Performance Measure Targets*  
- Review Safety Performance Measure Targets [Click here for documents] |
| 7    | 5:00-5:15 | Smart Scale Submissions  
- Changes to SMART SCALE Policies and Methods – Round 4 [Click here for documents]  
- Smart Scale Update |
| 8    | 5:15-5:20 | CTAC Update |
| 9    | 5:20-5:30 | Staff Reports  
- FY18-21 TIP Adjustments [Click here for document]  
- Other Staff updates |
| 10   | 5:30-5:40 | Items Added to the Agenda * |
| 11   | 5:40 – 5:50 | Other Business |
| 12   | 5:50-6:00 | Additional Matters from the Public  
Members of the Public are welcome to provide comment on any public-interest, transportation-related topic, including the items listed on this agenda. (limit of 3 minutes per speaker). |

† Times are approximate  
* Requires a vote of the Board

**Upcoming Meeting Dates:**  
- March 25, 2020
MPO Policy Board
Minutes: July 24, 2019
DRAFT

Committee – Voting Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ann Mallek, Albemarle County</th>
<th>Sandy Shackelford, TJPDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Lynch, VDOT – Culpeper District</td>
<td>Gretchen Thomas, TJPDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Signer, City of Charlottesville</td>
<td>Sara Pennington, Rideshare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Galvin, City of Charlottesville</td>
<td>Chip Boyles, TJPDC (absent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned Gallaway, Albemarle County (absent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-Voting & Alternates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brad Sheffield, JAUNT (absent)</th>
<th>Juwhan Lee, CAT (absent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Davis, JAUNT</td>
<td>Becca Sial, DRPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Proctor, VDOT-Culpeper District</td>
<td>Tony Cho, FTA (absent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia Monteith, UVA Office of the Architect</td>
<td>Mack Frost, FHWA (absent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis Pietila, CTAC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Call to Order:
Ms. Mallek called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m.

Matters from the Public:
Sean Tubbs with the PEC thanks the partnership for the work they and the staffs are doing. He noted there was a funding agreement signed last month between the City and the County “that really sets up Albemarle to take control of its own destiny re” the routes that may be coming through it.” He went on to say that the work that JAUNT is doing with the Crozet bus route is exciting. He emphasized the importance of keeping the partnership going.

He mentioned that Greene County met the night before this meeting re: Greene County transit re: the growth happening there. He also encouraged the Board to look at the growth happening in Louisa as well. He would like to see other modes of transportation to support the growth in those regions.

Response to Matters from the Public:
None

Review and Acceptance of the Agenda:
Mr. Gallaway moved to accept the agenda. Mr. Signer seconded and the motion was passed unanimously.

Approval of Minutes:
Mr. Signer moved to approve the May 22, 2019 minutes and Mr. Gallaway seconded and the minutes were approved unanimously.
**Resolutions of Support**
Ms. Shackelford explained that there are two Transportation Assistance Program (TAP) grants that need letters of resolution from the Policy Board. She introduced Chris Gensic from the City and Kevin McDermott from the County to explain the projects under consideration.

Mr. McDermott explained that the projects are being considered in the budget and are not final, but he wanted to get the resolutions started in case they do get approved. He went on to present the proposed sidewalk connection in Crozet from Tabor to Hilltop to Crozet Park.

He also presented the revenue sharing project with the City to pave the existing greenway trail/shared-use path along Moore’s Creek on the County side and under I-64 bridges to connect to another shared-use path there, which connects to Azalea Park.

Mr. Gensic presented the project which will pave a path along Hydraulic Road and either up Hillsdale or connect to the Meadowcreek Trail system. It depends on the cost of the project.

Mr. Gallaway made a motion to approve a resolution of support the projects. The resolutions will be drafted and signed at a later time. Mr. Signer seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

**CTAC Update**
Mr. Pietila reported that he was unable to attend the last CTAC meeting. He said one of the things they have been talking about doing is taking at least a couple of their meetings each year offsite and target communities and neighborhoods that may not have been as involved in the past to solicit more feedback and to educate the community members. They are not quite ready to do that in September, but are planning on a location and subject matter for a future meeting.

Mr. Pietila also reported that there is one MPO seat open on CTAC and two County spots are open. Mr. Gallaway asked for an updated list because he thought the County had appointed two new members recently. Ms. Shackelford said she would send it along to him.

**Staff Reports**
**Smartscale FY22 – August 2020 Applications**
Ms. Shackelford noted that since Chip Boyles was not available at this meeting that the technical discussion about the projects would be deferred until he could present it at a later time. She noted that the projects being considered are being discussed with CTAC and with the MPO Technical committees to evaluate how they might score on Smartscale applications.

She reported that the County will be submitting the Zan Road project and the MPO will submit the Hydraulic/29 projects. That leaves the MPO with three additional projects to submit.

Ms. Mallek and Ms. Galvin stated they did not want to start the process all over again.

Mr. Proctor asked if there were any more projects to submit because the Zan Road project may not score well on Smartscale in the areas of congestion and safety. He asked if the Policy Board would be interested in any other part of the Hydraulic/29 project that could be submitted that may score better, in addition to the Zan Road project.

Mr. Gallaway said that his understanding was that each of the individual projects work with one another and to cherry pick them wouldn’t make the entire project work. The Zan Road project,
because it is not attached to the intersection project, seems best as an independent project and could be funded based on the remaining $18 million that remains from the state, which needs to be allocated or lost.

Ms. Mallek, Ms. Galvin and Mr. Gallaway all agreed that the work has already been done on this and that is the reason that Zan Road was chosen.

Ms. Shackelford said that when Mr. Boyles returns, he will be more able to receive and respond to concerns. Until then, she wanted to present the opportunity for the MPO to submit additional projects if the Policy Board saw fit to do so.

**FY18-21 TIP Adjustments**
Mr. Proctor said that for information purposes only, there was an adjustment to maintenance systems and preservation. There were projects added to those groupings. The monies have just moved from one project to another in those groups.

**MPO Technical Committee**
Ms. Shackelford said the committee had a similar discussion re: the Hydraulic Road intersection and the options for Smartscale submissions with the same result as the Policy Board.

**Regional Transit Partnership (RTP)**
Ms. Pennington reported that the City and the County voted to pass an MOU re: funding for transit. The committee will meet again in August.

**DRPT**
Ms. Sial reported that the department is offering technical assistance for all Smartscale application submissions until September 1.

**JAUNT**
Ms. Davis reported that JAUNT is simplifying their fare structure. The ADA fare remains the same at $1.50. She reported that there will be a public comment opportunity about their rate change on August 8 from 6 – 8 p.m. at the Northside Library. There are opportunities to call or email with comments as well as in person.

**Other Staff Updates**
Ms. Shackelford reported that the TJPDC will have two new staff members beginning in August and another in September.

Mr. Proctor noted that there will be a VTRANS workshop on August 22 for the Culpeper District. No location has been decided yet. Ms. Sial said it will be important for folks to show up to talk about what is most needed.

**Additional Matters from the Public**
None.

Ms. Mallek adjourned the meeting at 5:31 p.m.
CA-MPO Joint Policy Board with SAW-MPO
Notes: October 1, 2019
DRAFT

Call to Order:
Ann Mallek and Jim Harrington called the joint CA-MPO/SAW-MPO meeting to order at 1:14 p.m. and asked attendees to introduce themselves.

Matters from the Public:
None

Opening Remarks/Framing of the Meeting
Mr. Boyles gave a brief history of the joint meeting between the CA-MPO and the SAW-MPO. He said with less than 12 miles between the borders of the two MPOs, it was decided that it would be best to communicate and coordinate.

Ms. Riesedel stated that the CA-MPO and the SAW-MPO are the only MPOs that meet on a regular basis in Virginia. She said it was important to do so because they both share resources and citizens (as commuters).

Presentations
Afton Express Service Plan
Nancy Gorley, CSPDC Transit Manager, gave background on the Afton Express for those who are new to the information. There has been a feasibility study done on the service and the study revealed that there is great interest in it. It was recommended that the service be implemented in phases with stops in Staunton, Waynesboro and Charlottesville. A plan was put together and submitted in a grant application to the state. The grant required a local match and because the timing of the grant did not match some of the localities’ budget cycle, the grant was not awarded. DRPT saw the value in the service and have contracted with Kimley Horn to study how to move forward. She introduced Ben Chambers, Transportation Planner from Kimley Horn.

Mr. Chambers gave an overview of the study done. He discussed how the Virginia Breeze program might interact with the Afton Express, grants available, community support for the service and where the stops should be positioned. He reported that the DRPT is currently putting forth analysis efforts on identifying transit needs.

DRPT Inter-City Bus Expansion and Other Initiatives
Grant Sparks, DRPT Manager of Transit Planning and Corridor Development, reported on the Virginia Breeze, the state-funded intercity bus service and its goals for the next year. Its main goal is to provide service to under-served areas and populations to connect them from Blacksburg up the I-81 corridor to Staunton and then on to Dulles and Union Station.

Mr. Sparks reported that there was a study commissioned last year to see if there were any unmet needs for intercity bus travel. Ultimately, there were two new routes chosen which will be rolled
out next spring and summer. One originates in South Central Virginia and another comes through the 29 corridor. The Virginia Breeze is the overarching name of the service and the routes are as follows: the I-81 corridor is the Valley Flyer, the 29 corridor is the Piedmont Connector and the Martinsville to Richmond route is the Capitol Express.

He reported on next steps, including procuring a transportation provider, new branding, creating a new mobile app and ticketing synchronization, final stop selection and, finally, tentatively launching the service in Spring/Summer of 2020.

For additional information, go to [www.virginiabreeze.org](http://www.virginiabreeze.org).

**Crozet Tunnel Progress Update**
Allen Hale, President of the Crozet Tunnel Foundation, gave a history of the Crozet tunnel from its inception in the 1850’s to when services ended in 1944. It lies 700 feet below Rockfish Gap and the tunnel (and trails on both sides) was sold to Nelson County for $1 in 2007 from CSX.

He noted that the current tunnel project is an example of what can be done with localities working together. If anyone would like additional information about the project, please visit [www.BlueRidgeTunnel.org](http://www.BlueRidgeTunnel.org). If you would like to become a founding member, please visit [http://blueridgetunnel.org/support-donate/](http://blueridgetunnel.org/support-donate/)

**Perrone Robotics**
Mike Raschid, Chief Legal Officer and VP of Operations of Perrone Robotics, gave an overview of what Perrone Robotics does and what they are doing with the county. Perrone Robotics is focused on the autonomous transit of people and goods in defined zones such as business districts, airports, neighborhoods, etc. They use the application of their technology in existing transit vehicles.

He invited attendees to take a trip in their autonomous vehicle after the meeting and to take a tour of their facility, located in Crozet.

**Next Meeting in Fall 2020**

Ms. Mallek adjourned the meeting at 2:43 p.m.
Memorandum

To: MPO-Policy Board
From: Lucinda Shannon, Transportation Planning Manager
Date: January 22, 2020
Reference: Amendments to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) FY18-21

Purpose: The VDOT and Charlottesville Area Transit requested amendments to the MPO’s Transportation Improvement Plan, to be consistent with the State’s Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The MPO staff conducted public hearings on 1/21 and during this 1/22 Policy Board meeting to allow for public comment.

Background: There are three VDOT amendments that add funds to the project groupings - Maintenance: Preventive Maintenance and System Preservation, Maintenance: Preventive Maintenance for Bridges, and Maintenance: Traffic Safety Operations. The State transferred funding within projects. The STIP adjustments were based on actual obligations and current estimate. Specifically, this adjustment makes the following modifications:

- Add $2,130,713 (NHPP) to Grouping, Maintenance: Preventive Maintenance and System Preservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Charlottesville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GROUPING</td>
<td>Maintenance: Preventive Maintenance and System Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program NOTE</td>
<td>Funding identified to be obligated districtwide as projects are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUTE/STREET</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING SOURCE</td>
<td>MATCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Federal-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STP/STBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Notes</td>
<td>Adjustment 21 12/16/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Add $3,076,190 (STP/STBG) & $1,000,000 (NHPP) to Grouping, Maintenance: Preventive Maintenance for Bridges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPING</th>
<th>Maintenance: Preventive Maintenance for Bridges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program NOTE</td>
<td>Funding identified to be obligated districtwide as projects are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROUTE/STREET</td>
<td>TOTAL COST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING SOURCE</td>
<td>MATCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Federal-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STP/STBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO Notes</td>
<td>Adjustment 22. 12/16/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Add $6,096,711 (STP/STBG) to Grouping, Maintenance: Traffic Safety Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUPING</th>
<th>Maintenance: Traffic and Safety Operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program NOTE</td>
<td>Funding identified to be obligated districtwide as projects are identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, the Charlottesville Area Transit requests the following amendment:

- Charlottesville Area Transit is requesting a TIP amendment to replace one FY20 Project, upgrading its On-Board Surveillance System, with the purchase of an Automatic Passenger Counter System (APC) for its fleet of 36 buses. The amount, $595,000, will stay the same. See attached for the proposed updated copies of the TIP summary tables with the changing cells highlighted.

Once this TIP amendment is reviewed and approved by the MPO Policy Board, the TIP document for FY18-21 will be updated with the modified TIP tables.

**Action Item:** MPO staff recommends a motion to approve the TIP amendments.

If there are any questions or comments, please contact Lucinda Shannon at lshannon@tjpd.org or (434) 979-7310 Ext.113.
January 21, 2020

Memo: Request for TIP Amendment for Charlottesville Area Transit

To: MPO Charlottesville-Albemarle Policy Board

Policy Board Meeting Date: January 22, 2020

CAT is requesting a TIP Amendment to the agency’s FY20 Program of Projects (POP), adding *Purchase Automatic Passenger Counters* (STIP ID CAT0019) and removing *Purchase Surveillance/Security Equipment* (STIP ID CAT0017). CAT is requesting that this new project be added reflecting the funding below. CAT will be pursuing the *Purchase Surveillance/Security Equipment* project in its FY21 POP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Current Project Description</th>
<th>STIP ID</th>
<th>Amendment</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>Purchase Surveillance/Security Equipment</td>
<td>CAT0017</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from FY20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>$595,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>$476,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>$95,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove</td>
<td>$23,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>Purchase Passenger Shelters</td>
<td>CAT0007</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$59,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$11,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add</td>
<td>Acquire Automatic Passenger Counters</td>
<td>CAT0019</td>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>$595,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>$476,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>$95,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add</td>
<td>$23,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sincerely,

Christina Downey

Grants & Procurement Coordinator/Civil Rights Coordinator
Charlottesville Area Transit
downeyc@charlottesville.org
434-970-3849
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Order</th>
<th>Bus Stop</th>
<th>GPS Coordinates</th>
<th>Items to permit</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Labor</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19722 - Hydraulic Rd at Swanson Drive (SB)</td>
<td>38.06399, -78.49327</td>
<td>4x15 Pad, Bench, Shelter</td>
<td>$5,060</td>
<td>$3,520</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15152 - Georgetown Road at Hessian Hills Ridge (SB)</td>
<td>38.06176, -78.50803</td>
<td>4x15 Pad, Bench, Shelter</td>
<td>$5,060</td>
<td>$3,520</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14497 - Commonwealth Drive at Greenbrier Drive (SB)</td>
<td>38.072519, -78.489725</td>
<td>4x15 Pad, Bench, Shelter</td>
<td>$5,060</td>
<td>$3,520</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17282 - Stoney Point Road Turnout</td>
<td>38.03800, -78.44968</td>
<td>4x15 Pad, Bench, Shelter</td>
<td>$5,060</td>
<td>$3,520</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14568 - Four Seasons Drive opposite ACAC</td>
<td>38.07928, -78.48639</td>
<td>4x15 Pad, bench, shelter</td>
<td>$5,060</td>
<td>$3,520</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13072 - Commonwealth Drive at Peyton Drive</td>
<td>38.07102, -78.49116</td>
<td>4x9 Pad, Bench</td>
<td>$860</td>
<td>$1,885</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14445 - Hydraulic Rd at Turtle Creek Apts (NB)</td>
<td>38.06796, -78.49687</td>
<td>4x9 Pad, Bench</td>
<td>$860</td>
<td>$1,885</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14677 - Four Seasons Drive at Tennis Drive (SB)</td>
<td>38.08255, -78.48756</td>
<td>4x9 Pad, Bench</td>
<td>$860</td>
<td>$1,885</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19812 - West Rio Rd at Firestone Pl (WB)</td>
<td>38.083304, -78.475042</td>
<td>4x9 Pad, Bench</td>
<td>$860</td>
<td>$1,885</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14450 - Georgetown Road at Hydraulic Road (SB)</td>
<td>38.07067, -78.49982</td>
<td>4x9 Pad, Bench</td>
<td>$860</td>
<td>$1,885</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>17160 - East Rio Rd at Treesdale Apt</td>
<td>38.052855, -78.461722</td>
<td>4x9 Pad, Bench</td>
<td>$860</td>
<td>$1,885</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17720 - Stony Point Rd Winding River Ln</td>
<td>38.035829, -78.453858</td>
<td>4x15 Pad, Bench, Shelter</td>
<td>$5,060</td>
<td>$3,520</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14506 - Commonwealth Drive at Westfield Road (SB)</td>
<td>38.073853, -78.485918</td>
<td>4x15 Pad, Bench, Shelter</td>
<td>$5,060</td>
<td>$3,520</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14478 - Commonwealth Drive at Northwest Drive (SB)</td>
<td>38.069258, -78.493658</td>
<td>4x15 Pad, Bench, Shelter</td>
<td>$5,060</td>
<td>$3,520</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18219 - 5th Street Ext at Old Lynchburg Rd (SB)</td>
<td>38.005470, -78.519910</td>
<td>4x9 Pad, Bench</td>
<td>$860</td>
<td>$1,885</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>19655 - East Rio Rd at Waldorf School Rd</td>
<td>38.056103, -78.460548</td>
<td>4x9 Pad, Bench</td>
<td>$860</td>
<td>$1,885</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$47,360</td>
<td>$43,240</td>
<td>$90,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: MPO-Policy Board
From: Lucinda Shannon, Transportation Planning Manager
Date: January 22, 2020
Reference: MPO Policy Board Meeting Dates for 2020

Purpose: The CA-MPO Policy Board meets the 4th Wednesday of alternating months at 4:00pm at the Water Street Center. This puts the November meeting on the day before Thanksgiving, which can be difficult for members to attend. The proposed dates are listed below for the Policy Board to consider and approve.

Proposed 2020 Meeting Dates:
- January 22, 2020
- March 25, 2020
- May 27, 2020
- July 22, 2020
- September 23, 2020
- November 25, 2020

Summary: MPO staff are informing the MPO Policy Board of the proposed meeting dates for 2020. The board will want to consider changing the November meeting date or directing the MPO staff to keep the meeting dates as is.
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
ON THE JEFFERSON AREA
REGIONAL TRANSIT PARTNERSHIP (RTP)

This agreement is made and entered into as of [Date TBD], by and between the Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization hereinafter referred to as the MPO, the City of Charlottesville hereinafter referred to as the CITY, the County of Albemarle hereinafter referred to as the COUNTY, JAUNT, Inc hereinafter referred to as JAUNT, with JAUNT and Charlottesville Area Transit together hereinafter referred to as the PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS, and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission serving as planning and administrative staff to the MPO, hereinafter referred to as the TJPDC.

WHEREAS, in 2016, the Planning and Coordination Council (PACC) asked TJPDC to review and recommend opportunities for improved communication, coordination and collaboration on transit matters.; and,

WHEREAS, the TJPDC completed work on a Regional Transit Coordination Study, where the main recommendation from this study was to establish a Regional Transit Partnership (RTP) hereinafter referred to as the PARTNERSHIP, consisting of an Advisory Board and whose charge is to provide a venue for continued communication, coordination and collaboration between transit providers, localities and other stakeholders.; and,

WHEREAS, City Council and the Albemarle Board of Supervisors held a joint meeting on February 14th, 2017, where both bodies voted to support development of the PARTNERSHIP and asked TJPDC to develop an MOU; and,

WHEREAS, on October 30, 2017, the Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization, the City of Charlottesville, the County of Albemarle, JAUNT, Inc, and the Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission did enter into an original Memorandum of Understanding defining the vision, roles and responsibilities for the Regional Transit Partnership; and

WHEREAS, on [Date TBD], these parties amend this Memorandum of Understanding to include the University of Virginia hereinafter referred to as UVA among the PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS and signatories of this agreement.

NOW THEREFORE, be it recognized and agreed that the MPO, CITY, COUNTY, JAUNT, and UVA hereby establish the Jefferson Area Regional Transit Partnership (RTP), in accordance with the following articles.

Article 1
Staffing, Funding and Boundaries
The MPO is responsible, as the lead, for staffing and programming for the PARTNERSHIP, with Section 5303 program funding from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT). Funding will be a regular item in the MPO’s Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). The PARTNERSHIP’s program area is limited to the Charlottesville-Albemarle metropolitan transportation planning area (MPA) that includes the CITY and the urbanized portions of the COUNTY.

Article 2
Function and Authority
The PARTNERSHIP will be an advisory board that provides recommendations to CITY, COUNTY, PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS and other stakeholders, such as the University of Virginia (UVA). The
PARTNERSHIP shall not have any inherent decision-making powers and does not supersede management over the PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS.

**Article 3**

**Membership and Voting Structure**

The composition of the PARTNERSHIP may change with time, as the Advisory Board meets and identifies an improved membership structure. At a later date, the PARTNERSHIP may extend to surrounding counties and towns, as needed. Expansion of Advisory Board members will require written amendments to this MOU. The PARTNERSHIP roster includes voting and non-voting membership. Each voting member is permitted one vote on all matters addressed by the PARTNERSHIP. All individuals on the Advisory Board have equal voting powers, with no weighted privileges given to any members.

Voting membership includes eight representatives, including:

- Charlottesville City Council – two representatives
- Albemarle Board of Supervisors – two representatives
- JAUNT Corporation Board – two representatives–one urban & one rural representative with at no time having both serve from the same governmental jurisdiction.
- Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) – one representative
- University of Virginia – one representative

There shall also be a nonvoting representative as designated by the PARTNERSHIP.

The designating body of each member locality or agency, having appointed the appropriate number of representatives to the PARTNERSHIP, as indicated in this ARTICLE, whether voting or nonvoting, may appoint an alternate member(s). Voting privileges for alternates shall be the same as for the regular member in the absence of the regular member.

There are no set term-limits for members of the PARTNERSHIP Advisory Board. Each member locality or agency shall reassess membership to the PARTNERSHIP, according to their own processes.

**Article 4**

**Meeting Schedule and Bylaws**

The PARTNERSHIP will set a meeting schedule that is coordinated with the MPO Policy Board meeting schedule. The PARTNERSHIP shall convene at least four times in a given fiscal year.

This MOU will serve as the main guiding documents for the PARTNERSHIP. The PARTNERSHIP may adopt bylaws, to aid in management of meetings. Unless otherwise determined by the PARTNERSHIP, TJPDC will facilitate and manage meetings. Voting and parliamentary procedure will be conducted according to simplified Robert’s Rules of Order.

**Article 5**

**Deliverables and Roles**

As recurring responsibilities, the PARTNERSHIP will be responsible for the following:

- *Building the CITY/COUNTY Relationship.* The PARTNERSHIP will help the region build relationships and momentum for future successes.
- *Create a formal means of sharing information.* Created by an MOU, the PARTNERSHIP will create and maintain a formal mechanism for exchanging information between transit providers, localities and other stakeholders.
- *Address pressing issues immediately.* The PARTNERSHIP will provide immediate attention to pressing concerns and issues, as laid out in the Regional Coordination Study, conducted by TJPDC.
- *Facilitate transit planning.* The PARTNERSHIP will provide recommendations, assessments and guidance on transit-related matters to the CITY, COUNTY and PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS.
• **Integrating transit into other decision-making.** The PARTNERSHIP will ensure that transit will receive increased consideration in regional and local planning efforts.

• **Test an RTA structure.** The PARTNERSHIP will provide a sample model version of a Regional Transit Authority (RTA) that allows all parties to become more familiar with the concept of a consolidated transit system.

• **Preparing for an RTA.** Within the PARTNERSHIP, the region will have a venue for negotiating and studying an RTA that could benefit all partners in the region.

Specific deliverables include but are not limited to:

• **Drafting Formal Agreements:** The PARTNERSHIP will review existing arrangements and transit relationships, reviewing and drafting if necessary, formal contracts and agreements. The initial and primary task would be to address the most pressing problem, the complicated web of arrangements.

• **Integrating Transit into Decision-Making:** The PARTNERSHIP will work to integrate greater transit considerations into planning efforts around the region. The PARTNERSHIP will have involvement with the MPO’s Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP), vetting transit-related recommendations. It would also provide recommendations to local planning efforts and projects.

• **Coordinated Transit Development Plans and Strategies:** Currently, the three transit providers have entirely separate planning documents. PUBLIC TRANSIT OPERATORS must update their Transit Development Plan (TDP) or Transit Strategic Plans (TSP) every five years. Whether done through the TDP or as a document that later consolidates planning recommendations, the PARTNERSHIP is responsible for overseeing the region’s transit planning process.

• **Update RTA Study:** The PARTNERSHIP, in coordination with the MPO, will update the RTA Study and develop a new report that will help the region determine if an RTA is feasible.

• **RTP Bylaws and Mission:** The PARTNERSHIP may develop bylaws and mission statement.

### Article 6

**Amendments**

Amendments to this AGREEMENT, as mutually agreed to, may be made by written agreement between all parties of this AGREEMENT.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, all concerned parties have executed this AGREEMENT on the day and year first written above.

**Signatures:**

__________________________ WITNESS BY __________________
Ann Mallek, 
Chair  
Charlottesville-Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization

__________________________ WITNESS BY __________________
Ned L Gallaway,  
Chair  
County of Albemarle Board of Supervisors

__________________________ WITNESS BY __________________
Nikuyah Walker,  
Mayor  
City of Charlottesville, and on behalf of the Charlottesville Transit Service
WITNESS BY ____________________
Patricia Thomas,
President
JAUNT, Inc.

WITNESS BY ____________________
Dale Herring,
Chair
Thomas Jefferson Planning District Commission

WITNESS BY ____________________
Jennifer Wagner Davis,
EVP-COO
University of Virginia
Memorandum

To: MPO-Policy Board  
From: Lucinda Shannon, Transportation Planning Manager  
Date: January 22, 2020  
Reference: Safety Performance Target Letter to VDOT from MPO

Purpose: Each year the Charlottesville Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization submits a safety target letter to the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to fulfill the March 2016 FHWA final rulemaking (23 CFR 490) for National Performance Measures for the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) target setting requirements.

Background: The Safety Performance rulemaking requires MPOs to agree to contribute to meeting the State DOT safety targets or to establish safety targets for each of the five safety measures including:

- number of fatalities,
- rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT),
- number of serious injuries,
- rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMT,
- and number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries.

VDOT provides a workbook and letter template for MPOs to use. The completed workbook and letter are attached for the boards review.

Action Item: MPO staff recommends a motion to approve the safety letter and send it to VDOT.

If there are any questions or comments, please contact Lucinda Shannon at lshannon@tjpdc.org or (434) 979-7310 Ext.113.
January 22, 2020

Mr. Raymond Khoury, P.E.
State Traffic Engineer
Traffic Engineering Division
Virginia Department of Transportation
1401 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Mr. Khoury:

The Charlottesville Albemarle Metropolitan Planning Organization submits this letter to the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to fulfill the March 2016 FHWA final rulemaking (23 CFR 490) for National Performance Measures for the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) target setting requirements. The Safety Performance rulemaking requires MPOs to agree to contribute to meeting the State DOT safety targets or to establish safety targets for each of the five safety measures including number of fatalities, rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT), number of serious injuries, rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMT, and number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries.

The selected methodology and selected targets are outlined below acknowledging acceptance to support the VDOT target, to set a numerical target for each performance measure specific to the MPO planning area, or any combination of these two methods for all five safety performance targets.

By supporting any of the VDOT targets we agree to plan and program projects to contribute toward achieving the State target, and must not only consider safety, but increase the safety of the transportation system. Details of the methodology used to estimate VMT for our MPO area within Virginia for establishing our rate targets is provided in the additional information section below.

Methodology Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VDOT</th>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>If MPO, applicable data analysis method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of fatalities</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT)</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of serious injuries</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate of serious injuries per 100 million VMT</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of non-motorized fatalities and non-motorized serious injuries</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Choose an item.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Information on Methodology
Enter data analysis and summary information here if other method was selected above.
Selected Targets

**Future Target Annual Percent Reductions**
The MPO may adopt the statewide percent reductions for 5-year averages if desired.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Description</th>
<th>*Statewide Target Annual Percent Reduction</th>
<th>*MPO Target Annual Percent Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>-4.29%</td>
<td>-4.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injuries</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)</td>
<td>-1.70%</td>
<td>-1.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A positive value represents a reduction and a negative value represents an increase.

**2020 Safety Performance Targets**
The following target values were calculated using the target annual percent reductions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Description</th>
<th>Target Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injuries</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Rate</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We acknowledge MPO targets are reported to VDOT and will be made available to FHWA upon request. Our 2020 safety targets are submitted for each performance measure on all public roads within 180 days after the VDOT reported its statewide targets, which falls on January 27, 2020.

For questions or comments, please contact me at Ishannon@tjpdc.org and 434-979-0654.

Respectfully,

*Lucinda Shannon, Transportation Program Manager*

*Charlottesville Albemarle MPO*
*401 East Water Street Charlottesville, VA 22902*
### Historical Crash Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crash Year</th>
<th>FARS Fatal People</th>
<th>FARS Non-Motorist Fatal People</th>
<th>A People</th>
<th>B People</th>
<th>C People</th>
<th>Persons Injured</th>
<th>K Crash</th>
<th>A Crash</th>
<th>B Crash</th>
<th>C Crash</th>
<th>PDO Crash</th>
<th>Injury Crashes</th>
<th>VMT (100 Million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>1,332</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>1,183</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>1,136</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>1,722</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1,392</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1,629</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1,603</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,649</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Calculated Five-Year Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five-Year Period</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Fatality Rate</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Serious Injuries</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Serious Injury Rate</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2010</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2011</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2012</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-13.2%</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-13.0%</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>-14.4%</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>-14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2013</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-10.3%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
<td>10.93</td>
<td>-19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-13.7%</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>-13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-5.9%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-13.6%</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>-14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-9.5%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2017</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2018</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- The Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), created by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), is used to report fatalities. FARS data is available through 2017.
- The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) crash data is used to report injury (Types A, B, and C) and property damage only (PDO) crashes. DMV data is available through 2018.
- All fatality and injury totals are based on the most recent MPO boundary.

### Directions:
View data in tables and graphs. Set goal percent reductions and resulting targets in yellow cells.

### Click here for more information.
### Projected 5-Yr Average Based on Historical Trendline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Yearly Change</th>
<th>Average Percent Reduction*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injuries</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-2.02</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Rate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
This table projects the five-year average for future years based on the historical trendline.

*A negative number represents a percent increase.

### Goal Percent Reductions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Statewide Percent Reduction</th>
<th>Goal Percent Reduction*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enter a goal percent reduction in the yellow cells. The goal reductions will be used to develop the 2020 MPO safety targets in coordination with historical data in the table below. The statewide percent reductions are provided for reference. The MPO may adopt the statewide percent reductions if desired.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>-4.29%</td>
<td>-4.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injuries</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>-1.70%</td>
<td>-1.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A negative number represents a percent increase.

### Projected 5-Yr Average Based on Goal Reductions and Projected VMT Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VMT (100 Million)*</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>11.62</td>
<td>11.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injuries*</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Rate*</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructions:**
This table projects the five-year average for future years based on the most recent five-year averages and the goal percent reductions. Graphs for this data are shown in the GraphsFatal_SI tab.

**Notes:**
This table projects the five-year average for future years based on the historical trendline.

**Instructions:**
Once goal percent reductions have been agreed upon, enter the resulting 2020 5-year average target values (from the table above).

### 2020 MPO Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injuries</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Rate</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Historical Crash Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Calculated Five-Year Averages

#### Five-Year Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five-Year Period</th>
<th>Fatalities</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Serious Injuries</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Fatalities + Serious Injuries</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2013</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-28.6%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-11.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2017</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-16.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-13.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2018</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- The Fatality Analysis Reporting System (FARS), created by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), is used to report fatalities. FARS data is available through 2017.
- The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) crash data is used to report injury (Types A, B, and C) and property damage only (PDO) crashes. DMV data is available through 2018.
- All fatality and injury totals are based on the most recent MPO boundary.

### Directions:
- View data in tables and graphs. Set goal percent reductions and resulting targets in yellow cells.
- Click here for more information.
**Projected 5-Yr Average Based on Historical Trendline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>Yearly Change</th>
<th>Average Percent Reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorized Fatalities + Serious Injuries</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes:*
This table projects the five-year average for future years based on the historical trendline.

*A negative number represents a percent increase*

---

**Goal Percent Reductions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Statewide Percent Reduction</th>
<th>Goal Percent Reduction*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorized Fatalities + Serious Injuries</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Instructions:*
Enter a goal percent reduction in the yellow cells. The goal reductions will be used to develop the 2020 MPO safety targets in coordination with historical data in the table below. The statewide percent reductions are provided for reference. The MPO may adopt the statewide percent reductions if desired.

*A negative number represents a percent increase*

---

**Projected 5-Yr Average Based on Goal Reductions and Projected VMT Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorized Fatalities + Serious Injuries</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Instructions:*
This table projects the five-year average for future years based on the most recent five-year averages and the goal percent reductions. Graphs for this data are shown in the "Graphs_Bike_Ped" tab.

---

**2020 MPO Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Motorized Fatalities + Serious Injuries</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Instructions:*
Once goal percent reductions have been agreed upon, enter the resulting 2020 5-year average target values from the table above.
Annual Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Annual Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries</th>
<th>5-Year Non-Motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries Average with Future Projection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>#REF!</td>
<td>#REF!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>#REF!</td>
<td>#REF!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Injuries

**K**  Fatal Injury
- A fatal injury is an injury that results in death within 30 days after the motor vehicle crash in which the injury occurred.

**A**  Incapacitating Injury
- Injury which is any injury other than fatal, resulting in one or more of the following:
  a. Severe laceration resulting in exposure of underlying tissues, muscle, organs, or resulting in significant loss of blood
  b. Broken or distorted extremity (arm or leg)
  c. Crush injuries
  d. Suspected skull, chest, or abdominal injury other than bruises or minor lacerations
  e. Significant burns (second and third degree burns over 10 percent or more of the body)
  f. Unconsciousness when taken from the crash scene
  g. Paralysis

**B**  Non-incapacitating Injury
- Minor/Possible Injury = Other Visible Injury, as Bruises, Abrasions, Swelling, Limping, etc.

**C**  Possible Injury
- No Apparent Injury = No Visible Injury, But Complaint of Pain, or Momentary Unconsciousness

**PDO Crash**  Property Damage Only
- Crash resulting in property damage of at least $1500 to the motor vehicle or other property but without injury to any occupants or non-motorists. The damage amount prior to 2009 is $1,000.

### KABCO Scale

A functional measure of the injury severity for any person involved as determined by law enforcement at the scene of the crash.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Injury Type</th>
<th>Common Identification</th>
<th>Full Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Fatal Injury</td>
<td>A fatal injury is an injury that results in death within 30 days after the motor vehicle crash in which the injury occurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Incapacitating Injury</td>
<td>Injury which is any injury other than fatal, resulting in one or more of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Non-incapacitating Injury</td>
<td>Minor/Possible Injury = Other Visible Injury, as Bruises, Abrasions, Swelling, Limping, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Possible Injury</td>
<td>No Apparent Injury = No Visible Injury, But Complaint of Pain, or Momentary Unconsciousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDO Crash</td>
<td>Property Damage Only</td>
<td>Crash resulting in property damage of at least $1500 to the motor vehicle or other property but without injury to any occupants or non-motorists. The damage amount prior to 2009 is $1,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Memorandum

To: MPO-Policy Board
From: Lucinda Shannon, Transportation Planning Manager
Date: January 22, 2020
Reference: Smart Scale Policy and Methods Updates for Round 4

Purpose: Review the changes to VDOT’s upcoming fourth round of the Smart Scale funding application process.

Background: The changes to this round include:
- Reducing the length of time that applications can be submitted for pre-screening from 3 months to 1 month
- Limiting the amount of pre-applications that can be submitted
- Changing the types of transit projects that are eligible (System-wide changes and maintenance facilities would no longer be eligible)

The evaluation criteria for scoring projects is also proposed to be modified, impacting all five categories of measurement: Congestion, Economic Development, Environment, Land Use and Safety. For more information on the proposed changes, view the PowerPoint presentation from the last CTB meeting and CTB’s analysis of how the proposed changes would affect scoring based on last year’s projects.

Action Item: No action needs to be taken; this is an information item.

If there are any questions or comments, please contact Lucinda Shannon at lshannon@tjpdc.org or (434) 979-7310 Ext.113.
SMART SCALE ROUND 4
Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO January 2020 Meeting

Charles Proctor
Meeting Agenda

1. Overview
2. Schedule
3. Potential Applications
   • Albemarle County
   • City of Charlottesville
4. Next Steps
Potential Project

A. Eligibility

1. Must meet a VTRANS Need
   a. Corridor of Statewide Significance (COSS – Rte. 29, 28, 17, 250, I64 & I66)
   b. Regional Network (RN - Multimodal Network within the Urbanized Area)
   c. In a designated Urban Development Area (UDA)
   d. Identified Safety Need Locations

2. Need to be submit by and eligible entity (Locality, MPO, PDC, or Transit Agency)

B. Readiness

1. Clearly define sketch, project description, and cost estimate

2. Completed study (Traffic, Crash, NEPA, SJR, IJR, etc.)
Smart Scale

Project Development Process

Identify Critical Need Locations
Data Review

Identify Potential Need Location
Local Staff, Interested Citizens, and Supervisors
Public Review

Select Preferred Solution from Alternatives
Local Staff, Interested Citizens, and Supervisors
Public Review

Develop Solution
Final Review and Submission by Locality or Regional Body

Application Submission
Smart Scale Application Submission

Studies Bicycle Lanes Crashes Congestion Geometry Sidewalks Park & Ride Transit

Local Staff, Interested Citizens, and Supervisors
Public Review

Develop Needs Lists

Develop Alternatives
Smart Scale Schedule Timeline

- **APRIL–MAY**: Pre-Screening – VTrans and Eligibility
- **MARCH**: Submission of Basic Information
- **JUNE**: Application Refinement
- **JUNE–JULY 30**: Application Refinement
- **AUGUST 3**: Application Submission
- **AUGUST–DECEMBER**: Measures Development and Scoring
- **JANUARY**: Release Evaluation of Projects and Recommended Funding Scenario
- **FEBRUARY–APRIL**: CTB Considers Evaluated Projects for Inclusion in the Six Year
- **MARCH–APRIL**: Hold SYIP Public Hearings to gather input Release Draft SYIP
- **JUNE**: CTB Adopts Final SYIP
- **JULY–DECEMBER**: Lessons Learned From Prior Rounds

2020

2021

VDOT
Albemarle County - Recommended App. Locations

- Access Management on US 250 East from VA 20 (Stoney Point Rd) east to Hanson Rd. (Seg #10, 32)
- Old Lynchburg Rd. / 5th St. Ext. /County Office Bldg. Intersection Improvements (Int. #80, 92, Seg. #16, 112, 171)
- Belvedere / Rio Rd Intersection Improvements (Not a PSI)
- VA 20 / VA 53 Intersection Improvements – Revise/Resubmit (# 47)
- US 29 / Hydraulic Rd Intersection Improvements – Revise/Resubmit (CA-MPO) (Int #5, Seg #2, 8, 24 & 26 & TSN)
- Zan Rd Overpass – Revise/Resubmit (CA-MPO) (VTRANS Need Question)
- Fontaine Ave/29 Bypass Interchange – Revise/Resubmit (CA-MPO) (Not a PSI)
- US 29 / Frays Mill / Burnley Station Intersection Improvements – Revise/Resubmit (TJPDC) (#12)
- Exit 107 Park & Ride lot – Revise/Resubmit (TJPDC)
- US 29 Shared Use Path from Carrsbrook to Seminole Lane – Revise/Resubmit (TJPDC)
City of Charlottesville- Recommended App. Locations

- Preston / Grady Intersection Improvements – Revise/Resubmit
- US 250 / Hydraulic Intersection Improvements – (Revenue Share?) Revise/Resubmit
- West Main St (section 3 and 4) Revise/Resubmit
- 5th Street Multi-modal Improvements (Ridge to Cherry St)
- Emmett Street Multi-Modal Improvements (Arlington Blvd to Barracks Rd)

- US 29 / Hydraulic Rd Intersection Improvements – Revise/Resubmission (CA-MPO)
- Zan Rd Overpass – Revise/Resubmit (CA-MPO)
Next Steps

Select projects to present to the Localities

- Develop alternatives for the proposed location
  - Return to Localities in February with alternative solutions and preferred recommendations to address the needs at each of the identified locations
  - Request concurrence on the preferred solution for each identified location.

- Develop Pre-Application Materials
  - Develop a **Preliminary** Sketch, Project Description, and Cost Estimate of the preferred alternative.
  - Assists applicant with pre application submission.
Summary

- Recap of Proposed Changes
  - Timeline and schedule
  - Project eligibility
  - Project Readiness
  - Analytical methods and weights
  - Other minor changes
Changes to Timeline

- Pre-App intake window reduced from 3 months to 1 month
- NEW - Pre-apps that can be submitted will be based on cap limits
  - Cap limit of 10: will be allowed to submit 12 pre-apps (10+2)
  - Cap limit of 4: will be allowed to submit 5 pre-apps (4+1)
- Pre-application cap limits prevent VDOT/DRPT staff from reviewing applications that will not be submitted while providing cushion in case a project screens out
- Two full months to complete final application - refine cost estimate, enter econ dev sites, upload supporting documents, etc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Localities</th>
<th>MPOs/PDCs/Transit Agencies</th>
<th>Pre-Application Cap</th>
<th>Final Application Cap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 200K</td>
<td>Less than 500K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 200K</td>
<td>Greater than 500K</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Eligibility

- Two areas to clarify/limit eligibility:
  - Transit Maintenance Facilities - propose that stand-alone maintenance facilities not be eligible - must include capacity expansion of transit system
  - Systemwide Investments - improvements that do not have a typical from/to and often cover a larger geographic area
    - **Examples**
      - Jurisdiction-wide implementation of adaptive signal controllers
      - Countywide bus stop upgrades
    - Prohibit project applications that include improvements that are jurisdiction-wide
    - Expansive scope and multi-faceted nature of improvements present considerable challenges for scoring and validation
Project Readiness

- Board has strengthened project readiness requirements each round
- Strengthened policies to-date have focused on highway expansion investments - requiring alternative analysis and planning studies
- Recommend similar policy provisions for corridor level adaptive signal controller upgrades and major transit capital investments such as Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) and light rail
  - Corridor level adaptive signal controllers
    - require detailed corridor study/plan
  - BRT/Light Rail
    - require planning study that shows alternatives considered
    - inclusion in agency’s Transit Strategic/Development Plan
Project Evaluation and Scoring
Congestion

- Feedback - concern that current methods do not account for congestion on both weekdays and weekends
- Implement method to better account for peak period congestion throughout entire week (weekdays and weekends)
- Datasource: INRIX dataset
- OIPI will present more detail on proposed approach in January

Congestion - Recommendation for Round 4
1) Implement method to better account for peak period congestion throughout entire week (weekdays and weekends)
SMART SCALE team has been working on the following areas related to safety

- Targeted Crash Modification Factors (CMFs)
- Weighting of S1 (crash frequency) versus S2 (crash rate) - currently 50/50
  - Recommend changing weight to 70/30
  - Supports Board targets to reduce fatal and injury crashes and pending policy changes related to HSIP program
- Increase weight for Safety factor in Area Type A from 5% to 10%

Safety - Recommendations for Round 4
1) For certain project types a targeted CMF will be used
2) 70/30 split in weighting - more weight to reduction in crash frequency
3) Area Type A - Increase safety weight from 5% to 10%
Economic Development Sites

- Policies adopted by the Board for Round 3 improved the reasonableness of economic development results.
- Zoned only properties has to be adjacent to the proposed transportation improvement.
- In validating zoned properties and conceptual site plans we noticed several examples of high floor area ratios (FAR) - values in range of 5 were not uncommon.
- Applicants uploaded zoning ordinances showing that larger FAR are allowed, but that does not mean they are likely.

Weighting Sites based on Readiness:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved Detailed Site Plan</td>
<td>Zoned Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted Detailed Site Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved Conceptual Site Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted Conceptual Site Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic Development Sites

- Floor Area Ratio (FAR) assumptions for zoned-only properties can be problematic
- Large industrial tracks (250+ acres) with assumed FARs of 1 250 acre would equate to 10,890,000 sq ft building
  - Boeing Everett Factory - 4.28M sqft
- Several tracts with assumed FARs of 5.0 or higher
- Applicants provided documentation of local ordinances allowing FAR value used - just because it is allowed does not mean it is likely

Economic Development - Recommendation for Round 4
1) FAR for zoned only properties capped at 0.3 unless applicant can prove average FAR around project is higher or minimum FAR in local zoning ordinance is higher than 0.3
Virginia Economic Development Partnership (VEDP) Business Ready Sites proposed to be recognized within Urban Development Area need category.

In recognition of this change we proposed change in weighting process used to scale ED1 measure - Project Support for Economic Development.

Proposed changes will not affect eligibility or site identification practices.

Changes would provide additional weight to VEDP Business Ready Sites and additional weight to redevelopment projects.
Economic Development Sites: VEDP Business Ready Sites

Current weighting process
- Development square footage scaled by **up to 5 points**:
  - 0.5 points if proposed project is specifically referenced in comprehensive or development plan, and
  - Up to 0.5 points based on level of economic distress **PLUS**
  - .5 points for Conceptual Site Plan Submitted, or
  - 1 point for Conceptual Site Plan Approved, or
  - 2 points for Detailed Site Plan Submitted, or
  - 4 points for Detailed Site Plan Approved
Proposed weighting process *(changes in orange)*

- Development square footage scaled by *up to 5 points*:
  - 0.5 point if proposed project is specifically referenced in comprehensive or development plan, and
  - Up to 0.5 point based on level of economic distress
    - **PLUS**
      - .5 points for Conceptual Site Plan Submitted, or
      - 0.5 point for Conceptual Site Plan Approved, or
      - 1 points for Detailed Site Plan Submitted, or
      - 2 points for Detailed Site Plan Approved
    - **PLUS**
      - 0.5 points for VEDP Tier 4 (“infrastructure ready”), or
      - 1 points for Tier 5 (“shovel ready”) Business Ready sites, and
      - 1 points for redevelopment of existing site
Environment
Resource Impact Measure

- Problem: treating measure as a benefit
- Significant potential impact = 0 and No impact = 100
- After lessons of Round 1 - potential impact was then scaled by points in all other measures
- Results can be counter intuitive - if you do not consider $
- Example - HRBT, which had the second-highest total impact to sensitive resources received the greatest number of points for this measure due to high benefit score

Environment - Recommendation for Round 4
1) Convert E1 to subtractive measure (subtracting up to 5 points at end of scoring)
2) E2 (Air Quality Energy) measure weight changed to 100%
Proposed method would be subtractive, taking away up to five benefit points based on potential sensitive acres impacted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Impacted Acres</th>
<th>E1 Weighted Score</th>
<th>Benefit Score Before E1</th>
<th>Benefit Score After E1</th>
<th>Requested Amount</th>
<th>SS Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>High score, high cost, large footprint</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>-5.00</td>
<td>59.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>$80,000,000.00</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>High score, moderate cost, moderate footprint</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>$15,000,000.00</td>
<td>16.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Moderate score, moderate cost, large footprint</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$40,000,000.00</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Use

- For Round 3, the Board adopted a new method objective metric to replace subjective metric to measure a project’s support for transportation efficiency of development

- L1 multiplies non-work accessibility by future density; existing dense areas do well in this measure but emerging areas may not due to lack of current non-work destinations

- L2 multiplies non-work accessibility by the change in population and employment; areas that do well in L1 also tend to perform well in L2;

Land Use - Recommendations for Round 4
1) Drop L1 measure and give 100% of weight to L2
2) Area Type A - Land Use weight changed from 20% to 15%
3) Area Type A = Safety weight changed from 5% to 10%
Final Weighted Scores
Per $10M Requested

With proposed changes - eliminate L1 measure and reduce Land Use weight from 20% to 15%, increase safety from 5% to 10% - this would have been the delta in Round 3.
Land Use

- **Top 50 L1 scores vs L2**: Areas with high population and employment density highly correlate with areas with higher density of non-work destinations
  - Projects in these areas do well in both the L1 and L2 measures

- **Top 50 L2 scores vs L1**: Emerging growth areas that need to improve walkability may not have current density of non-work destinations
  - Projects in these areas do well in L2, but do not necessarily do as well in L1
Land Use

- Intent and outcome of proposal to eliminate L1 is not to hurt projects that currently score well in L1 - instead we are trying to give boost to emerging/growth areas that need to invest in walkability

- All other measures look at change or delta - L2 is most consistent with this approach as it looks at anticipated growth
Other Minor Changes

• Area Types
  – Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) has formally passed resolution to request change in Area Type from A to B
  – New River Valley Regional Commission (NRVRC) has expressed desire to change Area Type from C to D - formal resolution has not been received to-date

• Policy resolution in January will clean up and clarify existing policy - example: formalize policy for project cancellation
Treatment of Interstate Projects

- Interstate projects have been outlier projects that have suppressed benefits scores for other investments
- Dedicated funding sources for operational and capacity improvements for Interstates exists now from the 81 legislation
- Intent is to develop Interstate Corridor Plans for each Interstate
  - I-81 Complete
  - I-95 Underway
  - I-64 Next
- Unresolved policy question - How should Interstate projects be handled in SMART SCALE?
COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
Office of the
SECRETARY of TRANSPORTATION

Thank you.
Memorandum

To: MPO-Policy Board  
From: Lucinda Shannon, Transportation Planning Manager  
Date: January 22, 2020  
Reference: Adjustments from VDOT to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) FY18-21

Purpose: The CA-MPO made administrative adjustments to the TIP, to be consistent with the State’s Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The CA-MPO staff informs the committee of the TIP adjustment.

Background: There are two adjustments, one requested from Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and the other from the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT).

The first adjustment applies to the VDOT project groupings - Maintenance: Preventive Maintenance and System Preservation. The State advanced funding from FY-20 to FY-19 to this year’s obligation. The STIP adjustments were based on actual obligations and current estimate. See attached for the previous and updated copies of the TIP summary tables.

The second adjustment was from DRPT, the FTA requested a minor administrative modification to CAT0001 and JNT0001, FTA 5307 operating funding amounts for FY18, 19 and 20. The amounts in FY18 & 19 are decreased to reflect the 5% withholding that was in place at the time. The same amounts are added to FY20, so there is no change to the TIP project total. The corresponding budget tables are attached with the adjustments on the STIP page in blue.

Summary: MPO staff are informing the MPO Policy Board of the administrative modifications made on this TIP project summaries. Once this TIP adjustments from VDOT and DRPT are reviewed by the MPO Policy Board, the TIP document for FY18-21 will be updated with the modified TIP tables.

If there are any questions or comments, please contact Lucinda Shannon at lshannon@tjpdc.org or (434) 979-7310 Ext.113.