

2003 Policy Committtee Meeting Minutes

[February 10](#)

[April 14](#)

[May 21](#)

[August 20](#)

[October 15](#)

[November 19](#)

[December 17](#)

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Office at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on February 10, 2003 at 5:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Floyd Brown, Prince George; Paul Karnes, Hopewell; Ron Reekes, Petersburg Area Transit; John Wood, Colonial Heights; John McCracken, (alternate) Chesterfield; Hebert Pegram, VDOT; Denny Morris, CPDC.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Rosalyn Dance, Petersburg; Don Haraway, Dinwiddie.

OTHERS PRESENT: Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT; Joe Vinsh, CPDC.

Mr. Karnes was elected to serve as Chair for the meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – December 9, 2002

Upon a motion by Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Pegram and carried, the minutes of the December 9, 2002 meeting were approved.

DISCUSSION OF THE REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP)

Mr. Vinsh stated the Technical Committee has endorsed using a project profile sheet and the 7 planning factors to rate potential RSTP projects. Projects would be rated by each voting member on a scale of 0 to 5 for each factor. The projects with the highest number of points would receive the most consideration. Information on the project profile sheet and rating factors were reviewed.

Mr. Vinsh further stated a list of candidate projects is being developed. VDOT has agreed to

provide cost estimates for the projects. The Technical Committee will present its recommendations regarding RSTP projects to the Policy Committee for action.

Mr. Karnes indicated that there was some reference in the Technical Committee minutes that RSTP projects would be of a regional nature and have priority over local projects.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that this would be a decision of the Policy Committee.

Mr. Vinsh stated VDOT has advised the MPO that no Primary funds would be allocated to Tri-Cities Area projects for the next 12 years. Therefore, RSTP funds are very important to the region.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED POLICY COMMITTEE BY-LAWS UPDATE

Mr. Vinsh stated the original Policy Committee by-laws were adopted in 1979 and a need exists to update the by-laws. Vinsh reviewed the following proposed changes to the adopted by-laws: date of current planning agreement pursuant to 23 CFR, Part 450, various agency names, meeting date, and voting status of committee membership.

Mr. Karnes asked if this item would be on the next meeting agenda for action.

Mr. Vinsh stated that action would be requested during the next meeting.

STATUS REPORT ON FREIGHT MOVEMENT OUTREACH PROGRAM

Mr. Vinsh stated that a copy of the Richmond Intermodal Study – Phase II in CD format had been sent to 24 employers in the Tri-Cities Area with major shipping operations. Mr. Vinsh added that this effort was a follow up to the October 2001 federal certification review outlining a need for a freight movement outreach effort. Technical Committee members had supplied the names of contacts with the companies. Along with the CD, an introductory letter explaining relationship of the Richmond and Tri-Cities MPOs and how periodic information would be forwarded regarding future developments associated with joint MPO effort regarding the Intermodal Management System planning requirement.

REVIEW OF TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION INTRODUCED IN THE 2003 General Assembly Session

Mr. Vinsh briefly reviewed the legislative profile attached to the agenda packet and stated there were three major items regarding pending legislation. First, legislative measures relating to changes in the current allocations methods or establishment of new transportation funding

measures have been referred to House Joint Resolution 211. This study group is scheduled to make its report to the General Assembly in November 2003 in conjunction with an on-going study on highway maintenance and the equity and efficiency of how transportation funds are currently allocated in the Commonwealth. Second, HB2543 sponsored by Delegate Robert McConnell, contains provisions requiring VDOT to solicit proposals under the Public Private Partnership Act of 1995 following completion of the environmental impact statement on Route 460. This bill has passed the House and is currently in the Senate. Third, HB771 defines 3 distinct phases and completion dates for the Statewide Transportation Plan.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED ENHANCEMENT GRANT AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2003 – 2005 TIP

Mr. Reekes stated that the City of Petersburg is proposing an amendment to the FY 2003 – 2005 TIP to expand the scope of the Appomattox River Heritage Project for an increased total amount of \$500,000 for a trailhead at Campbell Bridge, landscaping the parking lot at the train station and providing a trail connecting to the train station.

Mr. Brown asked if the application included required matching funds.

Mr. Reekes indicated that the 20% matching funds was included.

Upon a motion by Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Reekes and carried, a motion to approve the request was adopted.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion by Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Reekes and carried, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:50 p.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Office at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on April 14, 2003 at 5:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Floyd Brown, Prince George; Paul Karnes, Hopewell; Ron Reekes, Petersburg Area Transit; John Wood, Colonial Heights; Renny Humphrey Chesterfield; Mike Briddell (alternate) Petersburg; Hebert Pegram, VDOT; Joe Vinsh (alternate), CPDC.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Don Haraway, Dinwiddie.

OTHERS PRESENT: Annie Humphrey, Chesterfield; Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT.

Ms. Humphrey served as Chair for the meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – February 10, 2003

Upon a motion by Mr. Karnes, seconded by Mr. Pegram and carried, the minutes of the February 10, 2003 meeting were approved.

REVIEW OF DRAFT FINAL CONGESTION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM (CMS) OPERATIONS PLAN REVISION AND 2003 CMS UPDATE

Mr. Vinsh stated the Project Consultant has met with the Technical Committee several times as this project has progressed and recommended Policy Committee endorsement during its meeting on April 7, 2003.

Mr. Vinsh stated the CMS is intended to monitor traffic levels on major facilities comprising the Tri-Cities CMS network. As the volume of traffic increases on a facility it approaches the capacity of that facility. If the traffic volume on a highway segment exceeds the facility capacity, the volume to capacity ratio or V/C exceeds 1.0 and the segment is considered congested. As part of the regional planning process, facilities presently congested or projected to be congested in future years are to receive consideration for certain strategies to reduce congestion before capacity improvements are programmed into the Transportation Improvement Program. The implementation of

congestion reduction strategies is the responsibility of implementing agencies such as VDOT and local governments, depending on the location of the congested segment. The CMS database is updated every 3 years.

Upon a motion by Mr. Karnes, seconded by Mr. Brown and carried, the draft final CMS Operations Plan and 2003 CMS update were endorsed.

STATUS REPORTS ON FY 2004 CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AIR QUALITY (CMAQ) PROGRAM AND THE FY 2004 REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP)

Mr. Vinsh stated VDOT had recently provided revised cost estimates for most CMAQ projects going back to FY 1993 and that some Technical Committee members were verifying the new cost information with VDOT. Recommendations for FY 2004 CMAQ allocations would be prepared after adjustments had been made for the revised project cost estimates.

Mr. Vinsh stated no decisions or ratings had been made on how RSTP funds would be

handled in the Tri-Cities Area. The Technical Committee has been discussing this item since January. Direction from the Policy Committee was needed on a process for distributing FY 2004 funds. FHWA does not prescribe how the funds are to be allocated to eligible projects.

Mr. Vinsh made reference to an attachment in the agenda package summarizing two alternatives suggested for consideration regarding a process for selecting RSTP projects in the Tri-Cities Area. Alternative A includes 6 program requirements determined by federal guidance and 3 additional program requirements suggested by the Policy Committee Chair. Alternative A also includes a one page project profile and list of 7 project rating factors and one additional factor suggested by the Policy Committee Chair. Under Alternative A, candidate projects are to be rated with the Policy Committee selecting the project(s) to receive FY 2004 allocation(s). Alternative B includes the 6 program requirements determined by federal guidance and no project rating exercise. Under Alternative B, \$2,000,000 in RSTP funds would be rotated among the 6 jurisdictions over a two-year period. The local government receiving funds would select RSTP eligible project(s).

Mr. Vinsh added during the April 7, 2003 Technical Committee meeting a question was raised on how other MPOs handle RSTP allocations. The Hampton Roads MPO uses a technical rating system to determine priority projects to be selected by the Policy Committee for RSTP allocation. The Richmond MPO distributes available RSTP funds to eligible jurisdictions based on population percentage in the transportation study area. The local governments then select RSTP projects to be implemented.

Mr. Vinsh further added that VDOT requires the MPO to make allocation for any deficit that may occur on a RSTP project. Project costs can occur on a project 1 to 3 years after construction is complete.

Mr. Vinsh then briefly commented on the amount of information that has been assembled for the candidate RSTP projects with the project profile sheet. The preliminary cost estimate provided by VDOT does not include right-of-way or utility cost. In addition to rating factors 1 – 7 previously discussed by the Technical Committee, an additional factor has been suggested by the Policy Committee Chair to consider the regional nature of candidate projects.

Mr. Karnes asked who follows up to make sure items 1 – 6 of the program requirements are met.

Mr. Vinsh added the MPO would be responsible for assuring program requirements were being met.

Mr. Karnes asked if the MPO would need to concur with locally selected projects under Alternative B?

Mr. Vinsh stated that the MPO would need to concur and include the project in the TIP as with other projects using urban funds.

Mr. Vinsh then reviewed the 3 additional program requirements suggested by the Policy Committee Chair as follows: provision for a 3-year project development timeframe, provision that 100% of project cost would be identified and assured by the project sponsor and provision that RSTP projects selected would receive a one-time only 1 RSTP allocation.

Mr. Wood commented that if you have a number of localities involved in the regional program then regional projects that benefit each one of the localities is what is of interest. The rotation of the funds is going to segregate each locality with their projects exclusive of other localities. The rotation basis does not allow for pressing regional problems to be addressed and grants the MPO's authority to select RSTP projects to the localities. It is better to select projects that will have regional impact. The Technical Committee should rate the projects to help with the selection process.

Mr. Wood suggested the Temple Avenue north bound ramp onto I-95 be considered as a regional project for RSTP funding and described how this project would have benefit to localities in the region.

Mr. Wood stated the City of Colonial Heights would provide the difference between the \$2.8 million available in FY 2004 RSTP funds and the total cost of the northbound ramp project.

Mr. Wood further stated that the rotational basis completely abdicates any decision by the Policy Committee for the region as a whole.

Ms. Humphrey asked if this matter has to be voted on today?

Mr. Vinsh indicated the current schedule calls for CMAQ and RSTP allocation information be forwarded to VDOT before May 15, but that he did not think we would be able to make the schedule and VDOT may change the schedule in the near future.

Ms. Humphrey stated that everyone has a project they want funded. The Chesterfield staff does not support Alternative A. Everyone should bring their road ideas to the table before we decide on alternatives A or B. This money is primarily intended to help with road projects on your long-term list. Chesterfield supports alternative B and wanted to know what projects the other localities wanted.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that a list containing 23 tentative highway projects along with 1 transit project was attached to the agenda package. In addition, \$30,000 in RSTP funds

3

is being requested to be used to support FY 2004 MPO planning activities.

Ms. Humphrey asked if these funds could be used to improve roads around the new high school?

Mr. Pegram stated that all projects on the list are eligible for RSTP funds as long as the road is a collector or above within the MPO study area.

Ms. Humphrey asked Mr. Karnes what were the Hopewell priorities.

Mr. Karnes indicated the signalization project with Prince George along the Route 36 corridor.

Mr. Karnes commented that the Colonial Heights ramp project on I-95 may provide some relief for the problem near Fort Lee at Route 36 and expressed interest in some investigation of this prospect.

A period of discussion followed generally related the new Martin Luther King, Jr. Bridge project and need for transportation improvements at Dupuy Avenue and Route 1.

Mr. Karnes asked Mr. Wood if the northbound ramp from Temple Avenue to I-95 was the only thing Colonial Heights was asking.

Mr. Wood stated this was the only thing being asked. The entire problem would not be solved, but the one northbound ramp would alleviate a lot of the problem.

Mr. Karnes asked if the \$3.7 represented one ramp?

Mr. Wood said yes.

Mr. Brown asked if the Colonial Heights Ramp project were selected, how would these funds be handled?

Mr. Vinsh outlined provisions of alternatives A & B and indicated the Policy Committee could come up with another alternative to allocating the funds, if desired.

Mr. Vinsh commented that the Policy Committee Chair has suggested under Alternative A both committees rate candidate projects. The Policy Committee would consider the results of the ratings but not be bound by the results of the ratings as it selects the project(s). Alternative B would be very simple. Accident and traffic information would not be assembled and there would not be a project rating process. The funds would be rotated among the 6 local governments and projects would be determined at the local level.

Mr. Vinsh added that VDOT has stated the MPO is responsible for RSTP project deficits.

Project deficits can occur 1 to 3 years after a project is constructed and these costs would have to be paid before the next jurisdiction got its turn with rotational approach under Alternative B. This process would cause slippage and adjustments in the rotational process would be necessary.

Ms. Humphrey stated she was interested in hearing about PAT's project.

Mr. Reekes commented the transit center is the number 1 Petersburg RSTP priority. Mr. Reekes further commented any RSTP funds used for this project would mostly be supplemented with funds from other sources. Mr. Reekes also commented on the feasibility of the rotation approach.

Ms. Humphrey asked about PAT's route expansion plans.

Mr. Reekes commented that some transit expansion is being proposed under the Job Access Program.

Ms. Humphrey stated that suppose we do this Colonial Heights project and find out its going to take another 2 million to complete.

Mr. Vinsh stated that under provisions contained in Alternative A the local government would need to make up the deficit from whatever funding source(s) available.

Mr. Vinsh stated the idea of program requirements 7 and 8 was to use available RSTP for regional priority project(s) quickly and the local government would give assurance that

any additional funds needed to complete the project would be provided as the project is constructed.

Ms. Humphrey asked if the MPO RSTP pool would be used.

Mr. Vinsh stated that projects would receive only one RSTP allocation under Alternative A.

Mr. Briddell asked if this was item 9 under the Alternative A program requirement sheet.

Mr. Vinsh stated yes.

Ms. Humphrey stated she wanted rules on the table that we would retain.

Mr. Vinsh stated that it was up to the Policy Committee to make the rules on how RSTP funds are allocated in the Tri-Cities. The RSTP program has flexibility. A different method can be

used next year.

Mr. Wood questioned the ability of a smaller locality with a large RSTP project to afford to pay a project deficit. Mr. Wood stated he would go along with this provision, if the board chooses.

Mr. Wood stated Colonial Heights could meet the program requirements contained in Alternative A for the Temple Avenue Ramp project.

Mr. Vinsh stated the Policy Committee determines the rules for handling RSTP funds in the region. The FHWA does not prescribe a rating or rotation method. Also, the Policy Committee has the flexibility to change how the funds are allocated from one year to the next.

Mr. Karnes stated that, as he understood the motion, every project on the list would go thru the evaluation process.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that the Technical Committee representatives may want to take some projects off the list, depending on the requirements the Policy Committee ends up adopting for FY 2004.

Mr. Vinsh stated the Colonial Heights motion was to take off program requirements 7, 8 and 9. Mr. Vinsh further stated he thought the 23 projects would stay on the list if these 3 requirements were taken off Alternative A.

Mr. Wood stated we were deciding on a method to select projects and not selecting a project (s) or eliminating projects from consideration.

Mr. Briddell stated we seem to be developing policy based on discussion of projects.

Mr. Wood stated the method of allocation would not rule out projects from consideration and suggested project merit as the way to go to promote regional projects.

Ms. Humphrey stated that if two or more localities wanted to put their money together on a regional project, they could do this. Ms. Humphrey further stated RSTP funds should be rotated and project selection should be locally determined. This is what Chesterfield is recommending under Alternative B, but to include PAT.

Ms. Humphrey stated a motion was on the floor by Mr. Wood and asked for a second. Mr. Karnes seconded the motion and the motion carried on a 3 to 2 vote with 6 of the 9 voting members present for the vote. Mr. Vinsh, alternate for Mr. Morris, abstained.

Mr. Briddell commented that the Policy Committee Chair's suggestions under Alternative A was not included in the motion.

Mr. Vinsh stated the action on selection method would be conveyed to the Technical Committee and the missing accident and project cost information would try to assembled before the May 6, 2003 Technical Committee meeting. The ratings would start following the May 6th meeting and hopefully would be completed before the May 21st Policy Committee meeting.

STATUS REPORT ON 2001 CERTIFICATION FINDINGS

Mr. Vinsh stated all corrective items cited in the federal review have been completed, except for two. The expanded website information has been completed but the posting of this information is awaiting completion of other functional area information on the Crater Planning District Commission. The draft Bikeways Plan update is presently under review by the Technical Committee.

REVIEW OF 1999,2000 AND 2001 TRANSPORTATION DATA REPORTS

Mr. Vinsh stated Policy Committee endorsement of the socio-economic data used for the transportation planning activities is required. Mr. Vinsh further stated the Technical Committee has recommended endorsement of the 1999, 2000 and 2001 Transportation Data Reports.

Upon a motion by Mr. Karnes, seconded by Mr. Brown and carried, a motion was adopted to endorse the 3 transportation data reports.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2003 – 2005 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

Mr. Vinsh stated the City of Petersburg is requesting amendment to the current TIP to include two bridge projects.

Upon a motion by Mr. Briddell, seconded by Mr. Karnes and carried, the FY 2003 – 2005 TIP was amended to include reconstruction of the Bollingbrook Street Bridge at Route 1/301 over Lieutenants Run and the Hinton Street Bridge over Brickhouse Run.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2003 UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION WORK PROGRAM

Mr. Vinsh stated the Technical Committee has endorsed the CPDC staff recommendation the transfer \$5,000 from Task # 1.1 – Route 460 Coordination to Task #2.1 – Bikeways

Planning and the transfer of \$5,000 from Task #3.3 – Air Quality to Task #2.0 Long Range Planning in the current year work program.

Upon a motion by Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Karnes and carried, a motion to transfer funds was approved, as recommended.

REVIEW OF DRAFT FY 2004 UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION WORK PROGRAM

Mr. Vinsh made reference to the draft FY 2004 work program attached to the agenda package and stated the Technical Committee has recommended Policy Committee endorsement.

Mr. Vinsh commented that the activities for next year are the same as this year. Mr. Vinsh further commented the draft FY 2004 work program includes \$30,000 in Regional Surface Transportation Program funds to be used to support MPO planning activities in Tri-Cities beginning July 1, 2003.

Upon a motion by Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Karnes and carried, the draft FY 2004 Unified Transportation Work Program was endorsed.

STATUS REPORT ON NEW MEETING SITE

Mr. Vinsh indicated the next Policy Committee meeting would be on May 21st at a location to be determined.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Office at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on May 21, 2003 at 5:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Karnes, Hopewell; Ron Reekes, Petersburg Area Transit; John Wood, Colonial Heights; Don Haraway, Dinwiddie; John McCracken (alternate) Chesterfield; Leon Hughes (alternate), Prince George; Mike Briddell (alternate) Petersburg; Hebert Pegram, VDOT; Denny Morris, CPDC

OTHERS PRESENT: Martha Burton, Joe Vinsh CPDC

Mr. Karnes served as Chair for the meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – April 14, 2003

Upon a motion by Mr. Wood, seconded by Mr. Briddell and carried, the minutes of the April 14, 2003 meeting were approved.

REVIEW OF CANDIDATE REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP) RATINGS AND SELECTION OF FY 2004 PROJECT ALLOCATIONS(S)

Mr. Vinsh stated that Technical Committee members shared information regarding the candidate projects during the May 6 meeting. A rating sheet for each project was provided to 7 of the 10 Technical Committee voting members. VDOT, VDR&PT and CPDC members abstained from participating in the rating procedure.

Mr. Vinsh reviewed the project rating averages and stated the Temple Avenue & I-95 Interchange NB Ramp project scored the highest with 27.9 points out of a possible 40 points. Several other projects rated above 20.

Mr. Vinsh further stated that the agreement reached during the April meeting was that the Policy Committee would consider the results of the FY 2004 candidate RSTP project ratings, but would not be bound by the ratings in making their decision on the selection of a project(s).

Mr. Vinsh added that VDOT has notified the MPO that an additional \$351,400 was available for Tri-Cities in FY 2004 RSTP funds making a total of \$ 3,229,000. The inclusion of the \$30,000 MPO planning project discussed during the April meeting would bring this new total down to \$3,199,000 in available funds.

Mr. Wood commented that the purpose RSTP funds were to focus on projects of a regional nature. Mr. Wood further commented on the results of the FY 2004 candidate project ratings and the present-day traffic congestion and safety problems at the I-95 & Temple Avenue interchange.

Mr. Wood further commented that the City of Colonial Heights would fund the difference in available FY 2004 RSTP funds and the total cost of Temple Avenue & I-95 NB Ramp project.

Mr. McCracken commented that the Temple Avenue & I-95 project was an excellent project that would help the region. Mr. McCracken further commented on the need to use a rotational method among the 6 jurisdictions for future RSTP allocations in Tri-Cities with the provision that the locality receiving the funds would select the project. Mr. McCracken suggested the CPDC staff prepare information on a rotational method so that each jurisdiction would benefit from the program.

Mr. Haraway inquired if there was an expectation that the locality would provide additional funds for selected RSTP project(s).

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Policy Committee considered using a program requirement that the locality assure the difference between available funds and total project cost; however, this provision was deleted as a FY 2004 RSTP program requirement during the April meeting.

Mr. Vinsh added that the RSTP candidate project cost estimates provided by VDOT are only preliminary planning cost and would probably not be final project cost.

Mr. Wood commented on the willingness of Colonial Heights to commit funds to assure total funding for the Temple Avenue & I-95 project.

Mr. Wood further commented on the need for future RSTP funds to consider project merit, focus on projects of a regional nature and not rotate available funds among the localities on a "Round Robin" basis. This method allows each jurisdiction to participate.

Mr. Wood stated that the City of Colonial Heights would not be asking for another RSTP project anytime soon if the Temple Avenue & I-95 project was selected for FY 2004.

Mr. Briddell asked about the right-of-way being available for this project.

Mr. Vinsh indicated this project was in the 6 Year Program, but got eliminated because of budget reductions. VDOT has indicated the necessary right-of-way for this project is available and has spent \$139,000 on preliminary engineering before the project was cut from the 6 Year Program.

Mr. Briddell stated he thought it was a very good project that served traffic using the mall, but did not see significant project benefits for Petersburg.

Mr. Reekes commented that this would be a good first project and spoke for the need to consider transit projects for future RSTP allocations.

Chair Karnes indicated that there appears to be consensus on the project to be selected and asked for a motion.

Mr. Wood made a motion that the Temple Avenue project be selected with the following provisions:

1. the City of Colonial Heights will make up the difference between available funding and total project cost;

2. the City of Colonial Heights will not request a RSTP project for consideration during FY 2005;
3. that the \$30,000 RSTP allocation for MPO planning activities be included.

Mr. Hughes asked for clarification if the condition offered by Colonial Heights not to participate in the next funding year would only apply to Colonial Heights next year or during future years for all localities receiving a RSTP allocation.

Mr. Wood indicated that the condition would only apply to Colonial Heights for the next year.

Mr. Morris stated the Technical Committee did a good job with the ratings and suggested a need to evaluate the candidate project list and identify projects of regional significance. Mr. Morris added that the RSTP funds are a small amount of money coming into the region and we need to develop a regional game plan.

Mr. Reekes asked for clarification on the \$30,000 for MPO planning activities.

Mr. Morris stated that VDOT is reevaluating the current statewide formula for distributing planning funds for MPO planning activities. The CPDC staff has forwarded comments requesting additional consideration be given in the development of a new formula which gives more consideration to the planning requirements a MPO is expected to comply.

Mr. McCracken seconded the motion and the motion carried. Mr. Pegram abstained from voting on the motion.

REVIEW OF INFORMATION ON CONGESTION MITIGATION AIR QUALITY (CMAQ) PROGRAM AND SELECTION OF FY 2004 PROJECT ALLOCATIONS

Mr. Vinsh commented action on CMAQ projects needs to be delayed until clarification is obtained from VDOT on CMAQ project cost estimates.

Mr. Wood made a motion to table this agenda item. The motion was seconded by Mr. McCracken and carried.

CONSIDERATION OF ENDORSING A RESOLUTION TO INCLUDE THE PROPOSED HALLOWAY AVENUE ENHANCEMENT PROJECT AND OTHER ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS THAT MAY BE ADVANCED BY AREA LOCAL GOVERNMENTS UNDER THE CURRENT ENHANCE GRANT CYCLE ADMINISTRED BY VDOT

Mr. Vinsh stated the Technical Committee has recommended Policy Committee support for

requests from the County of Chesterfield and the City of Colonial Heights to adopt resolutions of support for enhancement project along with

other area local governments that may submit applications under the current VDOT application cycle.

Mr. Briddell commented that Petersburg is interested in applying for an enhancement grant under the current cycle.

Upon a motion by Mr. Wood, seconded by Mr. Haraway and carried, a motion was adopted to support enhancement grant applications submitted by area local governments under the current application cycle.

REVIEW OF INFORMATION ON THE DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULES FOR FUTURE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM UPDATES

Mr. Vinsh briefly commented on the schedule VDOT is using for future development of regional and the statewide transportation improvement programs in a effort to transition to a 2 year update cycle with even-year allocations being an update year and odd-year allocations including a new document.

Mr. Vinsh also briefly commented on 21 policy measures recently adopted by the Commonwealth Transportation Board to improve the development process for the financial constraint of regional and Virginia's Statewide Six-Year Improvement Program.

REVIEW OF A REQUEST BY VDOT TO AMEND THE FY 2003-2005 TIP TO ADD FUNDING FOR THE RAILS AND WATERWAYS HISTORYWALK AND THE APPOMATTOX RIVER HERITAGE TRAIL ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS

Mr. Vinsh stated VDOT has requested the amendment to include \$190,000 in federal funds and \$48,000 in State funds for the Rails and Waterways Historywalk project #(63590) and \$378,000 in federal funds and \$94,000 in State funds for the Appomattox River Heritage Trail project# (13789).

Upon a motion by Mr. Briddell, seconded by Mr. Wood and carried, a motion to endorse the VDOT request to amend the FY 2003-2005 TIP was approved.

Upon a motion by Mr. McCracken, seconded by Mr. Wood and carried, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:40 p.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Office at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on August 20, 2003 at 5:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Karnes, Hopewell; Ron Reekes, Petersburg Area Transit; Jim Banks (alternate) Chesterfield; Floyd Brown, Prince George; Rosalyn Dance Petersburg; Hebert Pegram, VDOT; Denny Morris, CPDC

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Wood, Colonial Heights; Don Haraway, Dinwiddie;

OTHERS PRESENT: Diana Parker, Sierra Club & TIGRE; Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT, Mark Riblett, VDOT; Joe Vinsh CPDC

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – May 21, 2003

Upon a motion by Mr. Karnes, seconded by Mr. Morris and carried, the minutes of the May 21, 2003 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

Ms. Parker commented on the pending federal transportation reauthorization bill and how funding for Amtrak, enhancement projects, transit projects, including Job Access and Reverse Commute funds, may be negatively impacted.

A period of discussion followed regarding the timing of local government federal and State legislative packages.

REVIEW OF 2001 FEDERAL CERTIFICATION LETTER

Mr. Vinsh commented that the Tri-Cities transportation planning process had recently been fully certified by FHWA and FTA. Corrective actions had been focused in the areas of public involvement, environmental justice and congestion management.

Mr. Vinsh further commented that he would be working with the Technical Committee in identifying corridors in the study area with present-day congestion for study by a VDOT on-call consultant in conjunction with the adopted CMS Operations Plan.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2003 – 2005 TIP

Mr. Vinsh stated VDOT has requested an amendment to the cost estimate for project #18997 (Rt. 460 left turn lane and modify signal 1.1 km East of NBL Route I-295 – 0.2 km East Rt. 629) from \$1,635,000 to \$2,396,000.

Upon a motion by Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Pegram and carried project #18997 was amended as requested by VDOT.

REVIEW OF SUMMARY INFORMATION ON 2026 SOCIO-ECONOMIC FORECAST

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Technical Committee had been reviewing work on this item since last March. The purpose of the socio-economic forecast is to provide small area estimates for population, housing units, employment and other data items at the traffic analysis zone level for use in the travel model for the 2026 transportation plan update.

After a period of discussion about the retail employment numbers for Chesterfield and Prince George, Mr. Brown made a motion, seconded by Mr. Karnes and carried, that the 2026 forecast be approved with the provision that CPDC staff review the retail employment forecast for Chesterfield and Prince George.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED FY 2004 AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2003–2005 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

Mr. Vinsh stated that since May of 2003 information had been collected from several sources on proposed FY 2004 amendments to the FY 2003-2005 TIP. The request was for this item to be authorized to be advertised for public comment prior to the September 24, 2003 Policy Committee meeting.

Mr. Vinsh commented that of the 45 highway projects listed, 20 were projects on Interstate, Primary or Urban systems. Of those 20 projects, 13 had higher cost estimates than this time last year. Of the 13 projects the increase totaled \$15,344,000 over the 12-month period. The 2nd Street Bridge Replacement project accounted for almost half of the total increase.

Mr. Vinsh distributed and reviewed revised information regarding transit projects on pages 8 and 9.

Upon a motion by Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Karnes and carried, a motion was adopted to authorize CPDC staff to advertise the proposed FY 2004 amendments to the FY 2003-2005 TIP for public review prior to the September 24, 2003 Policy Committee meeting.

REVIEW OF VDOT PROPOSAL TO MODIFY THE TRI-CITIES PORTION OF THE RICHMOND URBANIZED AREA BOUNDARY FOR THE PURPOSE OF CLASSIFYING HIGHWAY FACILITIES AS RURAL OR URBAN

Mr. Pegram stated that following each decennial census VDOT undertakes a procedure to modify the urban area boundary, as defined by the U.S. Census Bureau, for the purpose of functionally classifying highway facilities and being located in either urban or rural areas.

Mr. Pegram made reference to a map attached to the agenda package and commented that the Technical Committee had recommended Policy Committee endorsement of the proposed modified urban area boundary with a change in Prince George County to include the land area West of Route 156 and North of Route 460.

Mr. Pegram further stated that the classification of a highway as being located in an urban or rural area would have no bearing on eligibility for improvement funding.

Mr. Rucker commented that functional classification, as urban or rural roadway would have some impact on design characteristics, including posted speeds, as a facility is considered for future improvement.

Upon a motion by Mr. Karnes, seconded by Mr. Brown and carried, the Technical Committee's recommendation regarding the proposed functional classification boundary map was endorsed.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS FOR THE FY 2005-2010 SIX-YEAR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Pegram reviewed the letter attached to the agenda package from Secretary of Transportation Clements about a new public review process for the next six-year plan update. Mr. Pegram explained that public hearings would be held this Fall replacing the hearings that normally have held in the Spring. September 25th is the public hearing date for the Richmond District. The new process includes an information phase and a public hearing phase. Citizens will have the opportunity to discuss needs with VDOT representatives during an information phase and later make formal statements for the record during the public hearing phase on projects they would like to see included in the FY 2005-2010 Six-Year Program Update.

Mr. Pegram explained that this procedure would provide additional time for VDOT to consider public hearing comment.

REVIEW OF INFORMATION PROVIDED BY VDOT FOR ROUTE 460 LOCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY SCOPING MEETINGS

Mr. Vinsh stated that VDOT has held two scoping meetings for the project. Mr. Vinsh reviewed CPDC staff comments regarding information provided by VDOT on the Route 460 project website. These comments included the following: request copy of project management plan, requested national defense and national security be added to the project purpose and need statement, requested study area window be expanded to include additional land area south of existing Route 460 for consideration as an alternative new facility location, requested scoping meeting comment period be extended until the end of September 2003 and commented on the need to clarify narrative on the project website regarding Route 460 and the Tri-Cities 2023 Transportation Plan.

Mr. Karnes asked if the alignment proposal that came from a citizen in Surry is receiving consideration.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the shape of the study window would indicate that new alignments considerably north of the existing facility will be given consideration by VDOT in this study.

Mr. Karnes asked about the study area parameters.

Mr. Vinsh stated the window has been defined as 1 mile south of the railroad and varies 9 to 16 miles between Hopewell and Suffolk.

Mr. Vinsh added that the next meeting of the 460 Communications Commission will be on September 29, 2003.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Upon a motion by Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Karnes and carried, the current officers were reelected.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:20 p.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Office at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on October 15, 2003 at 5:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Renny Humphrey, Chesterfield; Floyd Brown, Prince George; Rosalyn Dance, Petersburg; John Wood, Colonial Heights; Don Haraway, Dinwiddie; March Altman (alternate) Hopewell; Hebert Pegram, VDOT; Denny Morris, CPDC.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ron Reekes, Petersburg Area Transit.

OTHERS PRESENT: Diana Parker, Sierra Club & TIGR; Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT, Ivan Rucker, FHWA; Mark Riblett, VDOT; Joe Vinsh CPDC

Chair Dance called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – August 20, 2003

Upon a motion by Mr. Pegram, seconded by Mr. Brown and carried, the minutes of the August 20, 2003 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

Ms. Parker commented that during a recent public meeting held in Chesterfield County regarding proposed use of the Public-Private Partnership Act to finance a highway improvement project, a number of citizens identified the need for the County and VDOT officials to get more input from citizens on the need for a project on Route 360.

Ms. Parker further commented that zoning is being approved in the vicinity of Route 288 before construction on this facility has been completed.

REVIEW AND ACTION ON PROPOSED FY 2004 AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2003-2005 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Vinsh stated that the annual MPO public meeting was held on September 16, 2003 in the Colonial Heights Municipal Building. Mr. Vinsh further stated the meeting was advertised and no citizens attended.

Mr. Vinsh commented that efforts are being made to contact agencies in the area that serve low-income and minority persons for the purpose of requesting input on regional transportation plans and programs.

Mr. Vinsh stated pages 27 and 28 of the draft document have been modified to reflect a VDOT comment that both CMAQ and Enhancement funding sources for the Halloway Avenue sidewalk project be identified as different funding sources.

Upon a motion by Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Haraway and carried, the proposed amendments to the FY 2003 – 2005 TIP were adopted.

DISCUSSION OF TRI-CITIES FY 2005 REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

Mr. Vinsh stated VDOT is currently conducting public meetings on the 6 Year Improvement Program at the district level and is meeting with local boards of supervisors on the 6 Year Secondary Programs. Input from these programs, along with input from the MPOs in the Commonwealth regarding the CMAQ, RSTP and transit programs, will be used to prepare the next regional and statewide transportation improvement programs. Attempts are being made to put these related efforts in a similar timeframe.

Mr. Vinsh further stated discussions last year regarding the RSTP projects in the Tri-Cities included a decision to review how the RSTP program in the Tri-Cities is to be administered for FY 2005 funds. Mr. Vinsh indicated that VDOT has estimated FY 2005 RSTP funds include \$1,572,000 for Tri-Cities MPO and direction from the Policy Committee was needed on how to allocate these funds.

Mr. Vinsh indicated the rating process conducted last May included 23 candidate projects. The top rated project received 27.9 points, the second rated project received 22.4 and the third rated project rated 22.8. Mr. Vinsh added there are several options available on how to proceed. The Technical Committee could update the candidate list and rate the projects again or the existing ratings could be used and take the next project.

Mr. Haraway asked if anything has changed since the last evaluation.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the number 1 rated project was the ramp on I-95 in Colonial Heights. This project was selected for FY 2004 and VDOT is ready to start work on design as soon as the State TIP is approved. The number 2 project was an intersection and signalization improvement project on Route 36 in Hopewell. This project has received some CMAQ funds, but additional funds were needed. Mr. Vinsh added that the candidate RSTP projects were basically the same as last year.

Mr. Brown asked which project was number 3.

Mr. Vinsh stated it was the transit facility in Petersburg.

Mr. Brown suggested that the previous rating of the projects could continue to be used to select the next project.

Mr. Wood expressed support to continue the use of the project ratings.

Mr. Vinsh asked when should the project list be updated and a new rating be done.

Mr. Wood stated he thought this would depend on whether or not the localities wanted to add or subtract projects from the list.

Ms. Dance stated that ultimately it's a mix of relying heavily on the technicians with flavor from the policy makers with the last word on what happens.

Mr. Wood stated there was no need for a reassessment if no projects are added.

Mr. McCracken stated he did not disagree with anything that was being said and suggested consideration be given to rotating available RSTP funds among the jurisdictions on an annual basis and letting the jurisdiction select the project to be funded.

Mr. Wood stated the localities participate in the rating of all candidate projects and the purpose of the RSTP funds was to fund projects of regional in nature.

Ms. Dance stated it was natural for each of the localities to want the benefits of the RSTP funds.

Mr. Rucker stated that the MPO exist for the purpose of regional transportation assistance where localities come together to discuss projects of regional significance. The approach of each locality taking a turn negates the purpose of meeting as a MPO. Mr. Rucker further stated that from a federal standpoint FHWA would have a difficult time approving the TIP if the project selection followed a rotational approach.

Mr. Vinsh commented that the Policy Committee approved criteria, including safety and congestion, for use in rating the 23 candidate projects for the FY 2004 RSTP funding cycle. Also, a rating vs. rotational approach to RSTP project selection was discussed and the rating approach was selected for the FY 2004 funding cycle with the understanding the matter was to be reconsidered for the FY 2005 RSTP cycle.

Ms. Humphrey commented that Richmond Regional MPO uses a rotational approach and everyone gets a portion of the funds.

Mr. McCracken stated that every road in this area has been determined to be regionally significant by somebody. Therefore, all of the candidate projects are on regionally significant roads.

Mr. Rucker asked how would projects be prioritized for the 3 years required in the TIP if the suggested approach were taken?

Mr. Vinsh stated that only 1 project has been selected from the list of candidate RSTP projects. Mr. Vinsh added that the projects vary greatly in nature and cost. Some projects are on local

facilities and some are on regional facilities.

Ms. Dance stated this was a discussion item, no action was being requested and FHWA will be providing some clarification on how RSTP projects can be selected. As for now, we are continuing to march as we have agreed.

DISCUSSION OF 2026 TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Vinsh briefly reviewed the project outline attached to the agenda packet and stated Technical Committee members have been requested to update the constrained project list used for the 2023 Transportation Plan. Mr. Vinsh emphasized the importance for the most important projects to be at the top of the list because VDOT will be providing new cost estimates to be used for financially constraining the list of projects.

Mr. Vinsh stated the Tri-Cities and Richmond 2026 plan update schedules are required to be the same. The target is to have a draft document completed by January 2004. Mr. Vinsh indicated available staff time for this project was limited.

Mr. Vinsh further stated a VDOT on-call consultant would be working on evaluating present-day congestion highway segments, including portions of routes 36, 1 and I-95, identified in the 2003 Congestion Management System update.

DISCUSSION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FUND ALLOCATION FORMULA USED BY VDOT TO SUPPORT MPOs IN THE COMMONWEALTH

Mr. Vinsh stated VDOT has been reviewing alternative approaches to allocating planning funds for the 14 MPOs in the Commonwealth since last May. The CPDC staff has commented that the allocation formula should include base allocation for each MPO in the Richmond Urbanized Area instead of one base allocation for the one urbanized area. The other major CPDC staff comment forwarded to VDOT for consideration is that the level of funding a MPO receives should be based on the level of planning requirements the MPO was expected to comply.

Mr. Vinsh added that a reduction in federal planning funds was anticipated next year around the \$25,000 level. Mr. Vinsh further added that the Tri-Cities MPO would continue to be dependent on the availability of VDOT on-call consultants and RSTP supplemental.

Upon a motion by Mr. Brown, seconded by Ms. Humphrey and carried, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:20 p.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Office at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on November 19, 2003 at 5:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Renny Humphrey, Chesterfield; Mike Briddell, Petersburg; John Wood, Colonial Heights; Don Haraway, Dinwiddie; Paul Karnes, Hopewell; Ron Reekes, PAT; Hebert Pegram, VDOT; Denny Morris, CPDC.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Floyd Brown, Prince George

OTHERS PRESENT: Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT; Mark Riblett, VDOT; Martha Burton, Joe Vinsh, CPDC

Vice-Chair Humphrey called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – October 15, 2003

Upon a motion by Mr. Haraway, seconded by Mr. Karnes and carried, the minutes of the October 15, 2003 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

Mr. Vinsh commented that he had completed an interview since the October meeting with a representative from the Hopewell Housing and Redevelopment Authority (HH&RA). The subject of the interview was the need for mass transit service to serve low-income and minority persons living property managed by his agency. The key findings of the interview were as follows:

1. A generation of Hopewell residents has emerged since fixed-route transit service was available during the early 1970s. Many residents today are unfamiliar with mass transit service.
2. Low-income and minority residents living on property managed by the HH&RA rely on relatives or other owners of private vehicles for shopping, medical and other trip purposes.
3. Some form of compensation is normally provided for transportation service received. The amount and ability of low-income residents to pay for this service is not known.
4. Previous inquiries by the HH&RA to determine the demand for mass transportation services among low-income and minority persons living on property it manages have received negative results. Limited van service is offered by the

Hopewell Recreation Department.

Mr. Vinsh stated additional interviews would be made with agencies or organizations that represent or serve low-income and minority persons.

Ms. Humphrey suggested the CPDC staff contact the Ettrick Business Council in conjunction with this public involvement outreach effort.

DISCUSSION OF REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP)

Mr. Vinsh made reference to a letter attached to the agenda packet from FHWA regarding the need to use some regionally developed process to evaluate and prioritize candidate RSTP projects.

Mr. Karnes ask if some portion of the annual RSTP allocation can be allocated for a project and some portion be rolled over to the next year or put into a contingency fund.

Mr. Riblett stated he would research the question and Mr. Vinsh would report back to the committee prior to the next meeting.

Mr. Vinsh stated there was a need for RSTP projects, especially large projects, to have sufficient information indicating all funding sources and amount needed to complete the project. Mr. Vinsh further stated it was also important to show how a project could be phased.

Mr. Karnes indicated it was important to get this question answered before proceeding with discussions on the FY 2005 RSTP allocation.

Ms. Humphrey suggested CPDC staff use e-mail to communicate with Policy Committee members. E-mail addresses were collected from the membership present.

STATUS REPORT ON 2026 TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Vinsh stated the Technical Committee membership is developing a preliminary list of projects. Cost estimates will be prepared by VDOT and the Technical Committee will review the list of projects after projected revenues have been used to financially constrain the list.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that work on the narrative update is continuing.

After a period of discussion regarding the plan update schedule, January 21, 2004 was selected as the target date to have the Policy Committee authorized CPDC staff to advertise the draft 2026 plan update and conformity analysis for public review.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2003-2005 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) TO INCLUDE \$30,000 IN FY 2004 RSTP FUNDS TO SUPPLEMENT SECTION 112 FUNDING FOR TASK 2.0 OF THE FY 2004 UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UTPWP)

Mr. Vinsh stated the FY 2004 UTPWP approved on April 14, 2003 identified \$30,000 in RSTP funding to supplemental transportation planning funds received by CPDC. Mr. Vinsh further stated VDOT requires an amendment to the current TIP to include these funds.

Ms. Humphrey asked if VDOT intended to provide additional planning funds to the Tri-Cities in the future.

Mr. Morris stated VDOT has been most helpful in providing on-call consultant services for some projects. However, the planning fund distribution formula used by VDOT puts Tri-Cities at a disadvantage because one of the two base funding amounts for the 2 MPOs were lost after the merger of the 2 urbanized areas following the 2000 Census. VDOT is aware of the funding shortfall in Tri-Cities, but relief is not here yet.

Upon a motion by Mr. Karnes, seconded by Mr. Briddell and carried, a resolution was adopted amending the FY 2003 – 2005 TIP to include \$30,000 in RSTP funds to supplement task 2.0 of the FY 2004 UTPWP.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2004 UTPWP TO INCLUDE THE FINAL FY 2004 SECTION 112 AMOUNT OF \$210,959, TRANSFER \$4,000 FROM TASK 3.1 AND \$4,000 FROM TASK 3.3 TO TASK 1.1

Mr. Vinsh stated information on the final Section 112 funding amount was not available in time for the April 14, 2003 meeting agenda. Mr. Vinsh further stated that the additional amount of \$6,989 Section 112 funding needs to be reflected in the FY 2004 UTPWP under Task 2.1 (Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Planning) and funds from Task 3.1 (Congestion Management System) and Task 3.3 (Air Quality Analysis and Coordination) needs to be shifted to Task 1.1 (Route 460 Coordination).

Upon a motion by Ms. Humphrey, seconded by Mr. Karnes and carried, the recommended resolution was adopted.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FY 2003-2005 TIP TO INCLUDE IMPROVEMENTS TO STRAIGHTEN CURVES ON ROUTE 625 IN CHESTERFIELD COUNTY FROM ROUTE 631 TO 0.20 MILE SOUTH OF ROUTE 619 FOR THE AMOUNT OF

\$8,900,000

Mr. Vinsh stated that VDOT has requested this amendment to the current TIP. Mr. Vinsh further stated information on this project was not available when the FY 2004 amendments were approved during the October meeting.

Upon a motion by Ms. Humphrey, seconded by Mr. Reekes and carried, the amendment was approved as requested.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:15 p.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Office at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on December 17, 2003 at 5:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John McCracken, (alternate) Chesterfield; Mike Briddell, (alternate) Petersburg; John Wood, Colonial Heights; March Altman, (alternate) Hopewell; Leon Hughes, (alternate) Prince George; Mark Ribblet, VDOT; Denny Morris, CPDC.

MEMBERS ABSENT: Don Haraway, Dinwiddie; Ron Reekes, PAT

OTHERS PRESENT: Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT; Amy Costello, VDOT; Bill Vaughan, Fort Lee, Tom Ballou, VDEQ; David Canada, City of Petersburg; Joe Vinsh, CPDC

Mike Briddell was selected as Chair for the meeting of December 17, 2003 and called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – November 19, 2003

Upon a motion by Mr. Riblett, seconded by Mr. McCracken and carried, the minutes of the November 19, 2003 meeting were approved.

Upon a motion by Mr. Altman, seconded by Mr. McCracken and carried a motion was approved to defer discussion on the FY 2005 RSTP funds until the January meeting.

REVIEW OF REQUEST FROM VDOT TO AMEND THE FY 2003–2005 TIP

Mr. Vinsh stated VDOT has requested amendments to the current TIP for one enhancement and 7 rail crossing/safety projects as follows:

- Acquire two parcels of land on the 84-acre site of the Battle of Ream's Station for a total amount of \$250,000.
- At Winston Churchill Drive, install concrete crossing surface at 0.10 Mile N.E. Rt. 36 in Hopewell for the total amount of \$80,000.
- At 15th Avenue, install concrete crossing surface, gates & lights, interconnect w/traffic signals @ Pam for the total amount of \$237,000
- At Route 156, install cantilever flashing lights & dual entrance gates at Norfolk Southern rail crossing for a total cost of \$231,000.
- At Route 617 (Ramblewood Road), install rubber-crossing surface at CSX rail crossing 0.40 Mile N. Rt. 618 for a total cost of \$23,000.
- At Route 617 (Ramblewood Road), install rubber crossing surface at CSX rail crossing 0.31 Mi. E. Rt. 620 for a total cost of \$40,000.
- At Route 617 (Ramblewood Road), install rubber- crossing surface at CSX rail crossing 0.39 Mi. E. Route 618 for a total cost of \$34,000.
- At Route 725, install 12" lens flashing lights W/simultaneous interconnect with traffic signal 225 feet N. Route 144 for a total cost of \$28,000.

Upon a motion by Mr. Riblett, seconded by Mr. Altman and carried, a motion was approved to endorse the amendment request by VDOT.

STATUS REPORT ON EPA'S FINDINGS REGARDING THE 8-HOUR OZONE DESIGNATION AREA

Mr. Vinsh distributed information regarding recent EPA recommendations to designate Prince George County and the City of Petersburg as nonattainment under the new 8-hour ozone standard.

Mr. Vinsh introduced Mr. Ballou from the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.

Mr. Ballou distributed information and provided background on the process EPA began using in the year 2000 to designate nonattainment jurisdictions under the 8-hour standard. The State and MPO recommendations for nonattainment jurisdictions under the 8-hour standard were submitted to EPA in July 2003. These recommendations indicated the 8-hour ozone nonattainment designation should be the old 1-hour nonattainment area, include Colonial Heights, Hopewell and Chesterfield. VDEQ submitted supporting documentation for these recommendations to EPA.

Mr. Ballou further stated EPA has agreed to complete the designation process by April 2004. The EPA did not find sufficient merit in VDEQ's recommendations not to include Prince George and Petersburg. EPA is allowing a final negotiation period where the State or other interested parties can provide information to try to change their recommendations. The deadline for this

comment period is February 5, 2003.

Mr. Ballou stated that VDEQ would take issue with some or all of EPA's recommendations. Mr. Ballou also stated that a representative from EPA will be requested to come to Virginia in January to discuss the findings directly with concerned parties.

Mr. Ballou also stated that VDEQ believes the EPA findings to include Prince George and Petersburg were based on a model based on ozone related criteria. The criteria included actual monitored air quality data or extrapolated data between monitors where monitored data did not exist, emission data provided by VDEQ, population data from the census, growth predications and geographic proximity to a metropolitan area/ozone transport area and consideration of State recommendations. The factors were weighted and ranked. Those jurisdictions above a certain score were rated nonattainment. VDEQ believes that the reason Prince George and Petersburg were identified in the EPA model was because each of the factors were weighted evenly. VDEQ has some concerns regarding the methodology used by EPA, particularly trying to extrapolate ozone data.

Mr. Ballou stated the MPO may want to comment on the proposed designation.

Mr. Vinsh asked what approach would EPA be receptive to regarding comments, such as economic impact.

Mr. Ballou stated it would be unlikely that economic issues would sway EPA. EPA would be swayed by ozone related data, such as low emissions, low population and low growth.

Mr. Briddell stated the population factors were one of few things we could comment on.

Mr. Ballou also mentioned VDEQ has requested a copy of the final version of the model used by EPA. VDEQ only has a copy of the draft version and does not know how EPA weighted the factors.

Mr. Ballou stated that EPA does not get to the level of detail to look below the jurisdiction level, such as Fort Lee and its role in the production of ground level ozone.

Mr. Morris asked to see a copy of the model results from EPA and asked VDEQ to work with this region regarding commenting on the EPA's findings.

Mr. Ballou stated VDEQ would carry forward any recommendations the region may have regarding the designation.

Mr. Morris asked if VDEQ would work with the region on developing the challenges.

Mr. Ballou stated there was only so much digging into the data possible. The 1999 emissions data used came from VDEQ.

Mr. Wood asked about the proximity of the monitors to Prince George/Petersburg Area.

Mr. Ballou stated that the Charles City monitor usually has one of the highest ozone readings in the region and is being affected by transport.

Mr. Briddell asked who develops the ozone extrapolation data.

Mr. Ballou stated that the extrapolated data is entered and is developed by an outside air quality model. This data would be difficult to replicate or review. If the extrapolated data were available, it could be reviewed and any unusual data identified. EPA could then be asked to explain the data and its influence on the model.

Mr. Ballou stated that the VDEQ made the case in 2000 that Prince George and Petersburg should not be designated. EPA has based its decision making process on something different than what was used by VDEQ. The key is to find out what that difference is.

Mr. Ballou offered to continue to respond to questions.

STATUS REPORT ON ROUTE 460 RSTP ALLOCATION

Mr. Vinsh briefly stated the Route 460 Location and Environmental Studies Study would be sponsoring a second round of public meetings next February on conceptual build alternatives. Mr. Vinsh added that recent project information indicates the study area window may have been modified to include additional land area South of the existing corridor and reduced the amount of land area under consideration on the North side of the existing corridor.

Mr. Vinsh indicated the Richmond to Hampton Roads High-Speed Rail Study had begun. The Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation is planning to conduct 4 public scoping meetings throughout the project study area. The study area for this project includes both the Route 460 and I-64 corridors. The intent of VDR&PT is to determine how higher-speed passenger rail service can be planned to best serve the Tidewater portion of the Commonwealth.

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY DRAFT 2026 TRANSPORTATION PLAN PROJECT LIST

Mr. Vinsh stated the Tri-Cities long-range plan update process is on a 3-year update cycle and also needs to be completed within the same time frame as the Richmond MPO.

Mr. Vinsh reviewed the process used to prepare the draft project listing.

- VDOT provided annual revenue projections for 7 funding categories, including NHS/ Interstate, NHS/NonInterstate, Primary, Secondary, Urban, CMAQ and RSTP. The revenue projections between FY 2005 and FY 2026 were summed.
- Any “Project Allocations” appearing in the current Six-Year Improvement Program were added to the funding categories and any “Required Project Allocations” were subtracted to yield available funds to allocate.
- Technical Committee members provided listings of priority projects based on local comprehensive plans and local review process.
- CPDC staff allocated available funds by categories to priority projects. Projects appearing in bold print are considered “Constrained Projects” because a projected funding source has been identified. Projects appearing in italics are considered “Vision Projects” because no funding source has been identified.
- Funding balances are shown on the budget summary on page 7.

Mr. Vinsh reviewed assumptions used to identify NHS/Interstate, NHS/Noninterstate and Primary project listings.

Mr. Vinsh indicated transit project information is being developed by PAT and will be incorporated into the constrained 2026 Transportation Plan in January.

Mr. Vinsh indicated jurisdictional revenue estimates for urban and secondary programs were used to fund projects, as shown in the listings, along with a balance of funds available.

Mr. Vinsh indicated funds were shown for identified CMAQ projects. Because only 2-3 years of CMA projects have been identified, a significant amount of available CMAQ funding is shown as a CMAQ program balance.

Mr. Vinsh indicated the RSTP project rating completed in May 2003 were used to allocate project RSTP funds available to the Tri-Cities MPO.

Mr. Vinsh indicated this information needs to be forwarded to VDOT and entered into the traffic model and used for the air quality conformity analysis. The draft plan and results of the conformity analysis would then be advertised for public review and comment. The MPO would then take action on the draft documents after consideration of public comments.

Upon a motion by Mr. Altman, seconded by Mr. Wood and carried, the preliminary 2026 project listing was endorsed.

Upon a motion by Mr. Hughes, seconded by Mr. Altman and carried, the meeting was

adjourned at approximately 6:15 p.m.