

2003 Transportation Technical Committee Meeting Minutes

[January 9](#)

[February 3](#)

[March 3](#)

[April 7](#)

[May 6](#)

[July 7](#)

[August 4](#)

[October 6](#)

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Transportation Technical Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Offices at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on January 9, 2003 at 10:00 a.m.

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

Member Absent: Mike Briddell, City of Petersburg

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

Chairman Scheid called the meeting to order at approximately 10:05 a.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – December 6, 2002

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Ms. Minetree and carried, the minutes of the December 6, 2002 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

Ms. Parker commented regarding a recent recommendation by the Dinwiddie County Planning Commission decision to recommend the rezoning of 16 acres of rail bed from B-1 business to Agriculture. Ms. Parker added also stated this land area would be opened up for a quarry, if the rezoning request is approved by the Dinwiddie Board of Supervisors.

REVIEW OF REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION (RSTP) CANDIDATE PROJECT EVALUATION ALTERNATIVE USING 7 PLANNING FACTORS

Mr. Vinsh reviewed the discussion during the last meeting regarding the potential use of accident and V/C data as rating factors for the selection of RSTP projects. As a follow-up to this discussion, information on using the 7 planning factors contained in TEA-21 was presented for consideration.

Mr. Vinsh added that the CPDC staff suggests the Policy Committee membership do the project ratings and that Technical Committee members focus on the developing information for the project profile sheet.

Ms. Smith asked if the Policy Committee members would do the actual ranking.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Policy Committee would make the decision on which committee would do the ranking. Mr. Vinsh further stated that using the planning factors to rate candidate projects would be more of a subjective process than using V/C and accident data. The Technical Committee can make its recommendations to the Policy Committee regarding candidate projects.

Mr. Vinsh added that all projects will have some merit and that the MPO is in a better position by having a selection process for evaluating potential projects.

Ms. Smith stated that it would be difficult for Policy Committee members to rank the projects because they may not have the time to devote to this task and it would put them in an awkward political position. Ms. Smith suggested that the Technical Committee could do the rating and make recommendations to the Policy Committee.

Mr. Altman stated he thought it should be the role of the Technical Committee to make technical recommendations to the Policy Committee regarding a ranking of candidate projects.

Mr. Altman asked about how the rating would be structured.

Mr. Vinsh stated the ratings could be 1 to 3 or 1 to 10, it would be up to the group to determine. The concept is to develop some priority order to the list of projects.

Ms. Smith stated revenue sharing funds in Chesterfield County are rotated among districts on a regular basis so that each district receives \$1 million during its turn. This method assures each district gets a fair share.

Mr. Morris stated that this process will require a realistic look at the region and a perspective is

needed on how much can be accomplished with a 1 to 1.5 million annual allocation. Mr. Morris further stated that there are a limited number of projects that can be completed with the limited dollars available.

Mr. Morris commented on the need to identify regional projects that can be implemented with these funds.

Mr. Pegram commented on the need for the region to establish some type of rating system where a couple of projects would be brought forward and funded in a reasonable time. Also, consideration may be given to adding funds to projects that have not been completely funded. The RSTP funds can be used in conjunction with other funds, such as CMAQ or Urban funds.

Mr. Vinsh stated effort needs to be made to identify priority projects that can be matched with available RSTP funds. Mr. Vinsh also stated that VDOT is willing to work with the MPO in making the project cost estimates.

Mr. Morris asked about the time frame for receiving the RSTP funds in Tri-Cities.

Mr. Vinsh stated that by July 2003 2 years of RSTP funds should be available in the total amount of 2 to 3 million.

Mr. Altman asked if the project ratings would need to be completed before July 2003?

Mr. Vinsh stated that he hoped the ratings would be completed and ready to go.

Mr. Rucker commented on the need to fit RSTP project selection into the 2025 LRP development process.

Mr. Altman commented on the need to decide on whether or not available RSTP funds would be rotated or used to finance a project of regional significance. Mr. Altman further commented on the need for the Committee to meet on this topic.

Mr. Scheid commented that although all local officials generally want to show improvements in the jurisdictions they represent, use of the RSTP funds for regional projects makes the most sense.

Mr. Scheid also commented that the Technical Committee should make RSTP recommendations to the Policy Committee and the elected officials should make the actual project selection.

Mr. Vinsh asked when would the RSTP estimates be available.

Mr. Pegram stated that the RSTP estimates would probably be available in before the 1st of March 2003.

Upon a motion by Mr. Altman, seconded by Mr. Apostolides and carried, a motion was adopted to recommend use of the 7 planning factors to rate candidate RSTP projects.

REVIEW OF PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT CERTIFICATION FINDINGS

Mr. Vinsh briefly reviewed the proposed revised public involvement procedures authorized for public review by the Policy Committee.

Mr. Vinsh indicated the proposed revised procedures would be advertised for public comment.

Ms. Burton presented a report on local government public review and endorsement actions regarding the constrained projects listed in the 2023 Long Range Transportation Plan.

Ms. Burton stated that information in files at CPDC was reviewed and supplemental information received from local governments. The findings indicate that most projects were subject to public hearings associated with local comprehensive plans or board action on six-year secondary plans prior to inclusion in the regional plan development process.

Mr. Morris suggested local governments provide documentation of public meetings on future improvement projects prior to the next regional plan is developed.

Mr. Vinsh stated that this report concludes the certification requirement for documentation of local government public involvement of 2023 LRP projects.

Mr. Vinsh further stated that the certification required report on why more citizens have not participated in advertised MPO public meetings will be completed in the near future.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED OUTLINE OF MPO WEBSITE AND SELECTION OF A REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING DATE

Mr. Vinsh briefly reviewed an outline of the proposed new MPO website.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Technical Committee by-laws identify the 1st Friday of the odd months as the regular meeting date. Mr. Vinsh further stated that the actual practice has been to schedule Technical Committee meetings a few days prior to the Policy Committee meetings.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that the Policy Committee has recently set the 2nd Monday of each month

as its regular meeting date.

After a period of discussion, it was the consensus of the Committee that the 1st Monday of each month be used as the regular Committee meeting date. The meetings would continue to be held at 10:00 a.m. in the offices of the Crater Planning District Commission. If the regular meeting date should fall on a holiday or other day when the offices of the Crater Planning District Commission are closed, the meeting is to be held on the next workday.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that he would revise the by-laws to reflect this change along with other changes that have occurred since the by-laws were adopted in 1980.

Mr. Vinsh asked Mr. Rucker if the web page changes cited in the certification report should be made to the existing web page at this time or at a later when the new web page is available.

Mr. Rucker indicated that the changes could be made now on the existing web page or later with the new web page.

Upon a motion by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. Hughes and carried, a motion to endorse the new meeting schedule and web site content, as discussed, was adopted.

REVIEW PRELIMINARY SCHEDULE FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE 2026 LRP UPDATE

Mr. Vinsh reviewed the tentative schedule for the update of the 2026 LRP.

Mr. Vinsh commented that the CPDC staff is currently working on the 1999, 2000, 2001 transportation data reports. Technical Committee representatives will be asked to review the annual data estimates along with 2026 projected data.

Mr. Vinsh also requested Committee members to begin local efforts to review and update the project lists contained in the 2023 LRP.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Vinsh distributed summary information on a recent Virginia-Carolina High-Speed Rail Commission meeting held on January 8, 2003 in Richmond.

Mr. Vinsh distributed a profile of transportation bills that have been introduced into the 2003 Session of the General Assembly. Mr. Vinsh indicated the Crater staff would monitor transportation bills and provide periodic updates

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Technical Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Offices at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on February 3, 2003 at 10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Ron Reekes, Petersburg Area Transit; Vicki Minetree, Colonial Heights; Barbara Smith, Chesterfield County; Hebert Pegram, VDOT; Joe Vinsh, CPDC

Members Absent: Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT; Guy Scheid, Dinwiddie; Mike Briddell, City of Petersburg; March Altman, Hopewell; Leon Hughes, Prince George

Others Present: John Hendrickson, Parson, Quade, Brinkerhoff and Douglas

The members present elected Joe Vinsh to be the Chair for the February 3, 2003 meeting. The meeting was called to order at approximately 10:10 a.m.

Mr. Vinsh was elected Chair for the February 3, 2003 meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – January 9, 2003

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Ms. Minetree and carried, the minutes of the January 9, 2003 meeting were approved.

CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION ON RSTP PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Vinsh stated that during previous meetings, the Technical Committee had agreed to recommend use of a project profile sheet for candidate RSTP projects and to use the 7 federal planning factors to rate each candidate project. Mr. Vinsh referred to recent correspondence from VDOT indicating the Tri-Cities FY 2004 RSTP allocation of \$3,082,300. Mr. Vinsh further stated the resources of the VDOT Richmond District office would be available to provide cost estimates for candidate projects and that the next step in this process is for profile sheets to be completed for candidate projects. The completed candidate project profile sheets will be collected by the CPDC staff and forwarded to the Richmond District VDOT office. After the cost estimates are prepared, the Technical Committee would make its recommendations regarding candidate projects to the Policy Committee.

Mr. Vinsh stated a need to move the project identification phase of the RSTP forward and asked committee members how many candidate RSTP projects do they anticipate for available funds.

Mr. Reekes stated PAT would have 1 and the City of Petersburg would have one or two projects.

Ms. Smith stated Chesterfield would have 5 or 6 candidate projects.

Ms. Minetree stated Colonial Heights would have 3 candidate projects.

Ms. Minetree further stated she did not have cost information for candidate projects.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Richmond District Office of VDOT would be providing cost estimates for candidate RSTP projects after the project profile sheets are completed. The Technical and Policy Committees would deal with issues like relating a candidate project to available funds and project phasing.

Mr. Vinsh commented that he would contact Prince George, Dinwiddie and Hopewell representatives to see if these localities may have candidate RSTP projects at this time.

Ms. Smith commented on a need to modify project rating factor number 7 to state a reasonable amount of time instead of a fixed number of years. Ms. Smith also commented on the need to match available funding with a candidate project that has a scope of work that fits available funds.

Mr. Vinsh stated that he would ask VDOT to also provide information on the potential phasing of candidate projects.

Mr. Reekes asked if the Technical Committee would recommend a ranking order for the projects or recommend projects a group of high, medium and low priority.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Technical Committee would need to decide how to make its recommendations to the Policy Committee. Mr. Vinsh further stated that the Policy Committee members are vested with the authority to select projects under RSTP.

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Ms. Minetree and carried, a motion was adopted that the profile sheet on candidate RSTP projects would be completed and sent to CPDC staff within one week; a scale of 0 to 5 would be used to rate candidate projects based on the 7 planning factors with 5 being the highest possible rating for each factor; and a reasonable time frame, instead of 5 years, would be used as the time frame that an RSTP project should be expected to go to construction after RSTP funds have been allocated.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED COMMITTEE BY-LAWS UPDATE

Mr. Vinsh briefly reviewed changes in the by-laws to include changes in membership, agency names and the meeting date. Mr. Vinsh added that existing by-laws were adopted in 1980 and the advisory nature of the committee's purpose had not changed.

Upon a motion by Mr. Reekes, seconded by Ms. Minetree and carried, updated by-laws for the Technical Committee were adopted.

STATUS REPORT OF FREIGHT MOVEMENT OUTREACH PROGRAM

Mr. Vinsh made reference to a letter sent to 24 employers in the Tri-Cities Area that are major shippers. Mr. Vinsh further explained the purpose of this outreach effort is to relay information about the intermodal study efforts in the Richmond metropolitan area. Intermodal study efforts are now one of the joint requirements of the two MPOs. A copy of the Richmond Intermodal Study (Phase II) was sent in CD format.

REVIEW OF TRANSPORTATION LEGISLATION OF THE 2003 GENERAL ASSEMBLY SESSION

Mr. Vinsh briefly reviewed a profile of legislative measures being considered during the current session. Mr. Vinsh stated that most transportation bills involving changes in allocation formulas have been referred to SJR 211 for study and are to be reported on prior to the beginning of the FY 2004 General Assembly Session. Mr. Vinsh indicated the CPDC staff would monitor the activities of SJR 211.

Mr. Vinsh also indicated the CPDC staff would monitor HB 2543 introduced by Delegate McDonnell. This bill would require VDOT to solicit proposals under the Public-Private Partnership Act of 1995 for Route 460 improvements.

REVIEW OF PRELIMINARY INFORMATION ON CMS OPERATIONS PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Vinsh introduced Mr. Hendrickson of Parsons, Brinkerhoff, Quade and Douglas as representing a VDOT on-call consultant that has been assigned the task of revising the 1997 Tri-Cities CMS Operations Plan and providing a 2002 CMS update.

Mr. Hendrickson stated FHWA recommendations on the 1997 Operations Plan were being used to guide the update efforts. Mr. Hendrickson distributed a handout summarizing the status of the project. He stated the CMS roadway network will not change from network used in 1997. The current year will be used for the base line study and a 2015 year will be included as a comparison to the 1997 report. The future year will be 2025.

Mr. Hendrickson stated that VDOT SHIPS data and the Highway Capacity Model are being used for the study process. The initial screening is still going use V/C with the level of service D.

V/C ratios greater than 1.0 will indicate congested conditions. The first screening on freeways, multi and 2 lane rural roads have indicated I-95 as the main congested corridor.

Mr. Hendrickson indicated that transit will be a new element for the Tri-Cities CMS. Reported total passenger miles and number of unlinked passenger trips are being set as the baseline for transit service. Future increases in total passenger miles and number of unlinked passenger trips will be considered an indicator of improving congested conditions on roadways.

Mr. Hendrickson also discussed the results of an occupancy survey conducted by VDOT of specific locations on the CMS network. Generalized a.m. rates are about 1.13 occupants per vehicle and about 1.18 occupants per vehicle in the p.m. Overall the occupancy rate is about 1.16 occupants. This number would be the target to improve. This factor is a major component of what the CMS is suppose to accomplish.

Mr. Hendrickson also indicated the SHIPS data will be mapped similar to the GIS mapping used for CMS in the past. The next steps will include what strategies would fit in the Tri-Cities Area to improve vehicle occupancy. Mr. Hendrickson reviewed a list of potential measures and indicated input from the Technical Committee would be needed to select measures most appropriate.

A suggestion was made on the need to have a Technical Committee work session to identify the strategies most feasible.

Mr. Vinsh asked if there is a requirement for the MPO to use available RSTP funds to address congestion identified in the Operational CMS.

Mr. Hendrickson stated that the requirement is to identify congestion segments on the network along with appropriate strategies to deal with the congestion. Capacity enhancement may be the most feasible choice to deal with the congestion, but it may not be the only way to go.

Mr. Vinsh asked if the strategies would include a recommendation on which agency would be responsible for implementing the various strategies.

Mr. Hendrickson stated recommendations on an implementing agency for the strategies, as well as determining the feasibility of the strategies, for addressing congestion problems listed would need to come from the Technical Committee.

After a brief period of further discussion, it was the consensus of the group that a work session would be scheduled either the 3rd week in February or the 1st week in March. Additional SHIPS data is needed to complete the CMS database.

Mr. Hendrickson asked the membership to look at the list of potential CMS strategies and be prepared to let him know what strategies are already being implemented.

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

Mr. Reekes indicated the City of Petersburg is seeking additional enhancement funds for an expanded scope of work for the Appomattox River Heritage Trail and Union Station Renovation project. The City of Petersburg is submitting a grant request for additional funding for an existing project.

Upon a motion by Mr. Reekes, seconded by Mr. Vinsh and carried, a motion was adopted to recommend Policy Committee approval of this amendment.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:45 a.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Technical Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Offices at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on March 3, 2003 at 10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Ron Reekes, Petersburg Area Transit; Vicki Minetree, Colonial Heights; Barbara Smith, Chesterfield County; Guy Scheid, Dinwiddie; Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT; Mark Petersohn, Hopewell(alternate); Hebert Pegram, Leon Hughes, Prince George; VDOT; Joe Vinsh, CPDC

Member Absent: Mike Briddell, City of Petersburg;

Others Present: Diana Parker, Sierra Club; Mark Riblett, VDOT; Denny Morris, CPDC; John Hendrickson, Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc.

REVIEW OF INFORMATION ON AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT COMPLIANCE AND THE CRATER PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION OFFICE

Mr. Morris stated that recent discussions have been held with VDOT regarding the compliance status of the Crater PDC office building with ADA. Future MPO meetings will need to be held in ADA compliant building(s).

FY 2004 TRI-CITIES MPO BUDGET

Mr. Morris stated that budgets for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2003 are being developed. Because of the urbanized area merger and 3 new MPOs being formed in Virginia, both the

Richmond and Tri-Cities MPOs are anticipating PL funding allocations for FY 2004. Therefore, it is anticipated that some RSTP funds would be requested from the MPO to help finance MPO activities.

Ms. Smith asked if MPO members had discussed this item.

Mr. Morris indicated it was generally mentioned that this request would be forthcoming. Mr. Morris further indicated that the CPDC budget process was about 2 months away from having a specific amount of RSTP funds to request.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – February 3, 2003

Upon a motion by Mr. Pegram, seconded by Ms. Smith and carried, the minutes of the February 3, 2003 meeting were approved. Mr. Scheid abstained from voting.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

Ms. Parker distributed copies and commented on a Sierra Club newsletter featuring an upcoming series of community workshops on bikeways and pedestrian planning.

REVIEW OF INFORMATION ON CMS OPERATIONS PLAN REVISION AND 2002 CMS UPDATE

Mr. Hendrickson distributed the draft CMS document and commented on each section as follows:

- Page 4
 - A CMS update schedule has been incorporated into the document per request by FHWA. The schedule puts CMS update in perspective with the preparation of other documents, such as the TIP and Six-Year Plan.
- Page 6
 - The project GIS mapping has not yet been included in the document.
- Page 8
 - The format for summarizing traffic data supplied by VDOT has been revised. The SHIPS data is still being used. The new classification segments are Arterial, Freeway, Rural Multi-Lane and Rural Two-Lane. Future updates should be able to be accomplished by CPDC staff using new databases provided by VDOT.
- Page 10
 - Level of Service has been made a separate section and used for part of the screening to generate tables using the VDOT SHIPS file.
- Page 12
 - Vehicle occupancy is a new section in the document that is being used to

measure change on how many people are in cars traveling at certain roadway locations on the CMS network. The effectiveness of travel demand management strategies can be measured by vehicle occupancy. Table 6 provides a summary of vehicle occupancy data collected by VDOT for designated Tri-Cities locations. Overall, the Tri-Cities years as the CMS is updated, the new occupancy counts would be compared to the 2002 base year occupancy counts.

- Page 13
 - Transit performance measures to be used in future CMS document updates include reported total passenger miles and number of unlinked passenger trips.
- Page 14
 - Future year traffic used for the CMS database is developed from the LRP modeling effort. Mr. Hendrickson indicated additional conversations with VDOT would be needed to better define the anticipated schedule for future traffic forecast data.
 - The screening years to be used for existing conditions are 1997 and 2003. Future years to be used are 2015 and 2025.
 - Mr. Hendrickson used Table 9 on arterial data to comment on the procedures used to make calculations for V/C and hourly flow rate. Mr. Hendrickson explained that the V/C is based on the worst hourly flow rate for the AM or PM peak for each CMS facility on the network.
- Page 17
 - The final draft document would indicate mapping of congestion conditions for present-day, 2015 and 2025.

Mr. Petersohn asked for clarification on whether or not level of service would be used as a CMS performance measure.

Mr. Vinsh stated V/C was the only highway performance measure agreed upon to use for the CMS.

Mr. Vinsh commented that LOS was selected for use in conjunction with future environmental justice analysis

Mr. Pegram indicated his office could make an assessment to determine how much additional effort would be needed to use LOS. Mr. Pegram further indicated that the data requirements to make LOS calculations are not available for all arterials.

Mr. Petersohn stated there is a need to translate a V/C ratio to LOS.

Mr. Pegram stated that in the LOS calculations may be available in the future and suggested the CMS analysis stay with V/C for the present update, instead of some facilities having both performance measures and some having only V/C.

Mr. Hendrickson indicated the previous CMS analysis used V/C. He also indicated the 2002 Highway Capacity Manual has been changed significantly causing a need for VDOT to change its methods for calculating traffic congestion.

Mr. Pegram stated that the type of information to be shown on the updated CMS map will be the same.

Mr. Petersohn emphasized the importance of using consistent methods to calculate traffic congestion in the entire study area.

Mr. Pegram added that a LOS could be developed for the value a V/C would represent at a specific location.

Ms. Smith stated Crater would be updating this report and not the localities for the entire region.

Mr. Pegram stated that this was correct. The next CMS update would probably include LOS built into the program.

Mr. Vinsh stated the database indicates that Route 1 and Route 36 are showing up as congested facilities today using V/C values.

Mr. Hendrickson stated that a comparison of this region with other regions would be added under page 18.

Mr. Hendrickson then reviewed potential CMS strategies and asked for comments on potential applicability in the Tri-Cities.

Mr. Vinsh asked if the cost for implementing a CMS strategy is considered maintenance or construction cost item.

Mr. Hendrickson stated that many times it is more a maintenance items, but depends on the type strategy being implemented.

Mr. Hendrickson further stated CMS is not a financially constrained plan, but more a set of recommendations to be considered when capacity improvement is being considered for a congested facility.

A period of further discussion followed regarding the potential implementation of alternate CMS strategies in the Tri-Cities.

It was the consensus of the Technical Committee that a final draft CMS document would be considered during the April meeting.

STATUS REPORT ON RSTP CANDIDATE PROJECT PROFILE SHEET AND COST ESTIMATES

Mr. Vinsh stated the Technical Committee members have identified 23 highway and 1 transit candidate RSTP projects. Mr. Vinsh further stated VDOT-Central Office is developing traffic and accident information. The VDOT-Richmond District Office is developing preliminary project cost information for each of the candidate projects.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that the project profile information and the rating information would be put on one sheet for each project. Project rating scores would be recorded on a summary sheet for each rater and the summary sheets would be forwarded to the Policy Committee for consideration.

Mr. Vinsh stated FHWA has indicated the project ratings can be done electronically as long as no decisions are made electronically and opportunity for public comment is provided prior to selection of project(s).

Ms. Smith indicated she would have a hard time rating a project in another jurisdiction.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the purpose of the project profile sheet was to provide background information and allow the projects to be compared.

Mr. Scheid commented on the possibility of visiting some of the sites.

Ms. Smith commented that each of the Technical Committee members could offer comments on their candidate projects.

Ms. Minetree suggested that we could score the projects electronically after the comment information is heard during the April meeting.

There was a consensus that the Technical Committee would pursue this direction.

Mr. Pegram and Mr. Riblett indicated that the project profile information would be available before the April meeting.

Ms. Smith indicated that the Chesterfield Policy Committee member would be more interested in establishing priority projects than in rating each project.

Ms. Smith further indicated a need for the Technical Committee to make a joint rating on the candidate projects.

After a period of further discussion, it was the consensus of the Technical Committee that Technical Committee members would present information on candidate RSTP projects during the April meeting. Technical Committee members would then rate each candidate RSTP project individually and forward the results of his/her ratings to the CPDC to obtain the average rating for each project. The results of the Technical Committee rating would then be presented to the Policy Committee for consideration.

REVIEW OF 1999,2000,2001 TRANSPORTATION DATA REPORTS (TDRs)

Mr. Vinsh briefly explained the procedures used to develop annual housing unit, population, employment and other estimates for the traffic analysis zones (TAZs) in the transportation study area.

Mr. Vinsh distributed draft summary sheets comparing 2000 census information with the 2000 TDR for population and housing units at the TAZ level. Also, summary trend information was distributed for each jurisdiction in the transportation study area for the past several years.

Mr. Vinsh indicated electronic files of the TDRs could be sent to local governments for review prior to the April meeting. Copies of the 2000 TAZ map were also distributed.

Mr. Pegram commented that MPO endorsement of the TDRs is needed.

After a brief period of further discussion, it was decided that electronic copies of the TDRs would be sent to local government for review.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:40 a.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Technical Committee meeting held in the Crater Commission Offices at 1964 Wakefield Street in Petersburg, Virginia on April 7, 2003 at 10:00 a.m.

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

Others Present: Diana Parker, Geri Barefoot, Sierra Club; Mark Riblett, VDOT; Martha Burton, Victor Liu, Denny Morris, CPDC; John Hendrickson, Parsons Brinckerhoff, Quade & Douglas, Inc.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – March 3, 2003

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Ms. Minetree and carried, the minutes of the March 3, 2003 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD – No comments

REVIEW OF DRAFT FINAL 2003 CMS OPERATIONS PLAN REVISION AND 2003 UPDATE

Mr. Hendrickson indicated a final section has been added beginning on page 26 of the draft document reviewed during the March meeting to include different strategies that could be used for congested arterial or freeway segments.

Mr. Hendrickson further indicated maps have been added to indicate present and future congested segments on the CMS network. Background information, including the results of the vehicle occupancy survey, present and future screening of CMS facilities and a profile of the FY 2003-2005 Transportation Improvement Program with CMS data.

Mr. Hendrickson offered to forward an electronic version of the mapping to Technical Committee members.

Mr. Vinsh asked what is the expectation regarding making the CMS document operation between now and the next update requirement 3 years from now?

Mr. Hendrickson stated that it needs to be shown that the MPO is going thru the process of using the CMS process to review project improvements. Narrative needs to be prepared for the TIP updates describing how the CMS process reviewed alternatives strategies prior to recommending capacity improvement projects.

Ms. Smith asked if there were any specific recommendations for the congested routes?

Mr. Hendrickson stated that this level of analysis would be made as the CMS is made operational.

Mr. Morris asked if an executive summary would be included in the final document?

Mr. Hendrickson stated that an executive summary would be prepared.

Upon a motion by Mr. Altman, seconded by Mr. Briddell and carried, a motion was adopted to recommend adoption of the draft CMS document by the Policy Committee.

REVIEW OF FY 2004 CMAQ ALLOCATIONS AND CANDIDATE REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP) PROJECTS

Mr. Vinsh distributed revised copies of the program requirement sheet and the project rating sheet reflecting factors commented on by the Policy Committee Chair.

Mr. Vinsh stated that he had a recent meeting with the Policy Committee Chair to review the status of the RSTP. The Policy Committee Chair indicated a need to modify the proposed RSTP program requirements for the Tri-Cities to include the following: 1) 100% of funds needed to finance regional priority projects be shown by amount and by source; 2) that assurance is given by the project sponsor that the project will be ready for advertisement within 3

years from the time it receives its RSTP allocation and that 100% project financing will be available; 3) that a project receives only 1 RSTP allocation; and 4) a rating factor be used to indicate the regional nature of the candidate project. In addition, the Policy Committee would consider the results of the project ratings by both committees prior to selecting RSTP project(s) for allocations.

Mr. Vinsh asked Mr. Riblett to comment on the amount of time needed to advance a project to the advertisement stage.

Mr. Riblett stated that 2 years would probably not provide enough time to meet review requirements and suggested 3 years be used.

Mr. Vinsh stated that no decisions have been made on RSTP in Tri-Cities and that items on his topic are in draft form.

Mr. Scheid asked if any other Policy Committee members had voiced opinion on this item.

Mr. Vinsh stated that he had briefed the Policy Committee on the status of the progress of the Technical Committee in working on the development of a process for selecting projects. However, the Policy Committee has not discussed an approach on how to distribute the funds.

Ms. Smith asked if any action had been taken on the additional items.

Mr. Vinsh stated that no action has been taken.

Ms. Minetree asked if the Policy Committee would be able to provide direction by our next meeting.

Mr. Vinsh stated that he thought some decision would be made on the RSTP process at the April 14th meeting.

Ms. Smith proposed that the localities rotate the funds using \$2,000,000 over a two-year period. The locality receiving the funds would select the project(s) and be responsible for identifying any additional funds.

Mr. Morris stated the Crater Commission will be requesting \$30,000 in FY 2004 RSTP funds to offset reduced planning funds for MPO activities resulting from the merger of the Richmond and Petersburg urbanized areas. Mr. Morris further stated options to using RSTP funds for MPO planning activities are being explored.

Mr. Altman indicated the Technical Committee needs to get clarification from the Policy Committee on whether or not they are in agreement with the last three items or if they want to change them and provide another direction for the RSTP process.

Mr. Pegram added that project cost do not close out once construction is completed. Additional charges can come in 1 to 3 years after construction is completed. VDOT will be looking to this MPO to make up any deficit that may come in on a project. Therefore, additional costs may come in on a project that has had RSTP funds allocated several years prior.

Mr. Morris asked if information is available on how other MPOs handle RSTP allocations.

Mr. Pegram stated Hampton Roads MPO uses a rating process and the Richmond MPO uses a percentage distribution process based on population. Mr. Pegram added that in Richmond each jurisdiction receives a share of RSTP funds annually and it can take some time to build up enough funds to go to construction.

Mr. Pegram further stated Hampton Roads has several active RSTP projects that receive funding. As one project is completed, a new project is added to the active project list.

Mr. Morris asked if the Hampton Roads projects are funded out to completion?

Mr. Pegram stated that every year Hampton Roads rates candidate projects and selects 5 to 7 projects to receive RSTP funds.

Mr. Pegram further stated the Hampton Roads RSTP process is on-line.

Mr. Altman asked if the Policy Committee has discussed a process for distributing RSTP funds?

Mr. Vinsh stated that the Policy Committee has been briefed and the Technical Committee was working on a rating method was developing a list of candidate projects. Further information has been conveyed that VDOT has agreed to develop project accident profiles, traffic profile and a preliminary construction cost estimate.

Mr. Morris stated that the Policy Committee was also briefed on the likely future need to use some RSTP funds to support MPO planning activities. However, no action was taken.

Ms. Smith expressed concern about the timing provision because of environmental and other delays a project could encounter.

Mr. Reekes stated that he thought the projects would end up being located in different jurisdictions from year to year, regardless of the process selected. Mr. Reekes also stated a need to get direction from the Policy Committee on what to use for selection criteria.

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Mr. Altman and carried, a motion to recommend to the Policy Committee, as a second alternative, that RSTP funds be rotated among localities annually so that each locality would receive \$2,000,000 over a 2-year period for use in locally determined eligible RSTP projects. (Mr. Pegram, Mr. Apostolides and Mr. Vinsh abstained from voting on the motion.)

Mr. Pegram emphasized the State would consider the MPO would be responsible for any deficit on a project and not the locality where the project is located.

Ms. Smith commented on the missing accident data and cost estimates for some projects.

Mr. Altman expressed concerns about the time limit and local assurances contained in the additional RSTP requirements list.

Ms. Smith stated that it will be hard to fund a regional project for only \$1.5 million.

Ms. Minetree stated that most jurisdictions can find a RSTP project on a major corridor that many people in the region will use.

Mr. Reekes asked what was the timeframe for completing the FY 2004 RSTP allocation process.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that on May 5th VDOT is conducting a meeting with all MPO to discuss the timeline for development of the next TIP development schedule.

Mr. Pegram stated presently the completion date is May 15th. However, the timeline may be discussed during the May 5th statewide meeting. Therefore, it may be advisable to have the next Technical Committee on May 6th because the May 5th meeting may provide some direction on the timing question.

Mr. Morris added that May 21st is the next scheduled Policy Committee meeting.

Mr. Pegram also stated that the MPO, not the localities, will be responsible for allocating RSTP funds for any RSTP project deficits.

Mr. Vinsh asked how the rotational schedule would begin.

Ms. Smith stated there was no suggestion on how to start the rotation, but Chesterfield would go last.

Mr. Altman questioned the ability of a locality to make up the balance of funds needed to complete some projects.

Ms. Smith commented that some of the project accident information and cost estimates were not complete.

Mr. Vinsh stated that VDOT did not have access to accident databases for accidents investigated by the city police departments and that some additional information was needed for several projects before preliminary construction cost could be determined. Mr. Vinsh stated that he would need

additional time to study the accident information available with the cities before including it with the accident data provided by VDOT.

Mr. Vinsh also commented that a factor relating to the regional nature of the project was added to the draft list of rating factors.

Mr. Vinsh stated that he would summarize the two approaches on April 14th for the Policy Committee and get some direction on how to proceed.

Mr. Morris asked for comments on using RSTP funds for supporting MPO planning activities.

Mr. Scheid asked if the use of RSTP for MPO planning activity support would be a reoccurring item.

Mr. Morris stated that the use RSTP funds to support MPO planning activities would likely be needed in future years to meet planning requirements in the Tri-Cities Area.

Mr. Vinsh added that the amount of planning funds made available to Tri-Cities is comparable to Lynchburg but the MPO planning requirements in Tri-Cities is comparable to Richmond and Hampton Roads.

Mr. Scheid asked what was to be done with the candidate RSTP projects at this time.

Mr. Riblett indicated if localities would provide some additional information for projects that do not show a cost estimate, a preliminary cost estimate can be provided for all candidate projects by VDOT.

REVIEW OF 1999, 2000 AND 2001 TRANSPORTATION DATA REPORTS (TDRs)

Mr. Vinsh briefly reviewed the summary sheets comparing data from the 2000 TDR and the 2000 census by jurisdiction in the transportation study area. Also, summary sheets indicating trends in transportation study area employment by place of work by jurisdiction were reviewed.

Mr. Vinsh indicated a copy of these files was sent electronically to local government representatives last month for review.

Mr. Vinsh further indicated action on this item was needed so work can begin on developing 2026 forecast for the next LRP update.

Upon a motion by Ms. Smith, seconded by Ms. Minetree and carried, the 1999, 2000, 2001 TDRs were recommended for Policy Committee approval.

STATUS REPORT ON 2001 FEDERAL CERTIFICATION FINDINGS

Mr. Vinsh reviewed a status report on items cited during the October 2001 federal certification review requiring corrective action. Mr. Vinsh indicated that all items had been addressed with action pending on implementing the new website and adoption of the draft bikeways plan update.

REVIEW OF THE DRAFT 2003 BIKEWAYS PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Liu distributed draft copies of the bikeways plan update and stated the maps of bike routes and paths would be developed later. Mr. Liu thanked Technical Committee members for

comments received regarding the goals and objectives portion of the document.

Mr. Liu stated that information obtained from local comprehensive and recreational plans related to bikeways and pedestrian facilities has been identified beginning on page 13. Updated recommendations for bikeway facilities contained in the 1979 Bikeways Plan begin on Page 20.

Mr. Liu indicated that the May meeting would include the complete draft plan with mapping.

Mr. Liu requested Technical Committee members to review available information contained in the draft plan and provide comments before the May meeting.

Ms. Smith asked when would comments be needed?

Mr. Vinsh stated that the next meeting would be on May 6, 2003.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2003 – 2005 TIP

Mr. Vinsh stated Petersburg has requested the existing TIP be amended to include bridge replacement projects over Lieutenants Run on Route 301 and over Brickhouse Run at Hinton Street.

Mr. Reekes stated Petersburg was requesting funds for the reconstruction of two restricted bridges. In coordination with construction on the Second Street project, Bollingbrook Street will be converted to a two-way street. The Hinton Street bridge was requested during the recent pre-allocation hearing for the 6 Year Program.

Mr. Pegram asked if these projects are ready to move ahead.

Mr. Reekes indicated that minimal right-of-way and utilities relocation would be involved. Mr. Reekes further indicated Petersburg is ready for these projects to begin.

Upon a motion by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. Apostolides and carried, a motion was approved to recommend Policy Committee amend the FY 2003 – 2005 TIP to include these two projects.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2003 UTPWP

Mr. Vinsh indicated the CPDC staff is requesting \$5,000 be transferred from Task #1.1 Route 460 Coordination to Task # 2.1 Bikeways Planning and that \$5,000 be transferred from Task

#3.3 Air Quality Coordination to Task #2.0 Long Range Planning.

Upon a motion by Minetree, seconded by Mr. Altman and carried, a recommendation was made that the Policy Committee approved the recommended amendments to the FY 2003 UTPWP.

REVIEW OF DRAFT FY 2004 UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION WORK PROGRAM

Mr. Vinsh commented that the narrative contained in this document on major transportation planning activities has been updated, including the long-range plan, Route 460, high-speed rail studies, congestion management and the Job Access Program. In addition, focus areas such as environmental justice, public involvement and coordination with the Richmond MPO.

Mr. Vinsh also commented that proposed activities for FY 2004 are the same as for FY 2003.

Mr. Vinsh stated there was a reduction in overall FY 2004 federal transportation planning funds allocated to Tri-Cities, partly because of the merger of the Richmond and Petersburg urbanized areas and partly because 3 new MPOs were formed following the 2000 census.

Mr. Vinsh indicated that Task #2.0 includes the proposed use of \$30,000 in Regional Surface Transportation Program funds to finance a portion of the FY 2004 long-range planning effort.

Mr. Pegram asked if the Route 460 consultant contract was included?

Mr. Vinsh indicated the narrative includes a discussion of the Route 460 project.

Upon a motion by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. Altman and carried, the draft FY 2004 UTPWP was recommended for Policy Committee approval.

DISCUSSION OF A NEW MEETING LOCATION

Mr. Vinsh indicated several different meeting sites were reviewed. The site recommended is the Community Room of the Southside Regional Hospital Building located on South Crater Road in Petersburg. Mr. Vinsh added there would be no charge for using the room and it was available for most of the scheduled Technical Committee meeting times.

After a brief period of further discussion, Ms. Smith and Ms. Minetree volunteered to find a meeting location for the times the Community Room was not available.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Technical Committee meeting held in the Southside Regional Medical Center Rehabilitation Services Building located at 3335 South Crater Road in Petersburg, Virginia on May 6, 2003 at 10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Ron Reekes, Petersburg Area Transit; Vicki Minetree, Colonial Heights; John McCracken, Chesterfield County; March Altman, Hopewell; Hebert Pegram, Leon Hughes, Prince George; VDOT; Joe Vinsh, CPDC.

Members Absent: Mike Briddell, Petersburg; Guy Scheid, Dinwiddie; Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT.

Others Present: Mark Riblett, VDOT; Ivan Rucker, FHWA; Victor Liu, CPDC

Vice-Chair March Altman called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – April 7, 2003

Upon a motion by Mr. Pegram, seconded by Ms. Minetree and carried, the minutes of the April 7, 2003 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD – No comments

REVIEW OF FY 2004 CANDIDATE RSTP PROJECTS

Mr. Vinsh stated the Policy Committee endorsed the use of a rating method for candidate FY 2004 RSTP projects. RSTP projects are to be rated by Technical Committee voting members for consideration by the Policy Committee during the May 21, 2003 meeting.

Mr. Vinsh distributed copies of the rating sheets and asked for them to be completed and mailed by May 9, 2003.

Mr. Vinsh stated that accident data obtained from city police departments for candidate RSTP projects located in the cities had been reviewed by VDOT staff. Mr. Vinsh further stated that an attempt was made by VDOT staff to develop accident rate information using the same methods used to develop accident rate information for RSTP projects located in the counties. However, the results of this attempt were marginal and research on accident reporting procedures used by the cities would need to be made to assure comparability with accident reporting procedures used in the counties.

After a period of further discussion about some of the candidate projects, the consensus of the committee was to use the available preliminary cost and accident information to rate candidate projects.

REVIEW OF DRAFT 2003 TRI-CITIES AREA BIKEWAYS PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Liu distributed copies of the draft bikeways map indicating recommended bike path/trails, bike lanes and bike routes.

Mr. Liu stated bike lanes (dedicated portion of a roadway for preferential or exclusive use by bicyclists) are indicated by red lines, bike routes (wide outside lanes shared by bicyclists and motorists with no strips to delineate a separate lane for bicycles are delineated with blue lines and bike paths or trails (bikeway physically separated from motorized vehicular traffic by an open space or barrier) will need to be located in the field later in May 2003.

Mr. Liu further stated the bike lane and bike route numbers on the map only refer the draft text distributed during the April meeting and are not officially designated route numbers.

Ms. Minetree and Mr. Altman briefly commented on bike path development plans in their respective communities.

Mr. Vinsh asked how the bike paths would be located on the maps.

Mr. Liu stated most likely, high-resolution imagery would be used to find the locations.

Mr. Pegram asked if the red indicates that there is a designated bike lane along these corridors.

Mr. McCracken asked about the significance of an adopted bikeways plan in terms of how project cost could be impacted by a bike lane or route designation should the roadway be selected for future improvement.

Mr. Pegram stated VDOT is preparing new guidance for bikeways planning. Mr. Pegram further stated consideration is being given to the policy that any new roadway proposal would include a bikeway facility.

Mr. Pegram stated that the report is not coming out until Fall 2003.

Mr. Vinsh asked what would be the requirement today.

Mr. Pegram stated he did not know.

Mr. Rucker stated his office has a position paper on bikeways planning and would forward a copy. Mr. Rucker further stated he thought the VDOT policy would be fairly consistent with the FHWA guidance.

Mr. Pegram stated the bikeways plan could be included in the 2026 LRP update document. Therefore, the new policy would most likely apply and be binding for the next 3 years.

Mr. McCracken expressed concerns about bikeway designations on facilities with high traffic volumes and neighborhood impacts of additional right-of-way needs associated with bike lanes. Mr. McCracken stated he wanted to know if the designation of a bike lane on the Tri-Cities Bikeways Plan update would obligate the project sponsor to incur additional costs if the project is selected for improvement in the future.

Mr. Vinsh stated the question has implications for the entire study area and would be researched.

Mr. McCracken suggested holding off action on this item until clarification is received.

Mr. Altman suggested the proposed map be modified to identify bike lanes only on those roadways where the additional right-of-way is dedicated for that purpose.

Otherwise the roadway would be designated as a bike route. The designation of a roadway in red as a bike lane indicates an intention to include a bike lane in the future. Mr. Altman further suggested designating a roadway in blue as a bike route would indicate there is no intent to construct a bike lane in the future.

Mr. McCracken expressed concern that when citizens see a map of a bikeway plan, they assume these facilities are fully developed. Mr. McCracken stated language needs to be included that a map from the bikeways plan is not intended to be used as roadway map for bicyclists.

Mr. Vinsh commented that bikeway lane costs would need to be considered in the development of a financially constrained long-range plan.

Mr. Pegram suggested some information be could included about individual bikeway facilities in order to give bicyclist some indication about the roadway conditions to expect, such as traffic volume and roadway width.

Ms. Minetree suggested recommendations on route safety could be included.

Ms. Minetree stated that on projects #13 & #14 funding has been secured to construct a

footbridge along a vacated rail right-of-way.

Mr. McCracken commented on the need to distinguish existing from proposed bikeway facilities.

Mr. Liu stated existing facilities could be shown with a solid line and proposed facilities with a dashed line.

Mr. Pegram asked if there were any U.S. designated bike routes in Tri-Cities?

Mr. Liu stated that he was not aware of any.

Mr. Pegram stated that if there were any U.S. designated routes, the designations should be reflected on the map.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FY 2003-2005 TIP

Mr. Vinsh stated that additional information had been received on this item to indicate the request is actually to endorse the inclusion of the Halloway Avenue Sidewalk Enhancement project in the amended FY 2003-2005 TIP if the project is selected by the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

Mr. McCracken commented on the need for the Section III sidewalk project on Halloway Avenue.

Ms. Minetree added that VDOT has recently opened the Enhancement Program up for new applications and that representatives from Colonial Heights were working on an enhancement grant proposal.

Ms. Minetree made a motion that the Chesterfield enhancement project be endorsed along with any other local government enhancement grant proposal under the current application cycle. Mr. McCracken seconded the motion and the motion carried.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Vinsh distributed schedules developed by VDOT for processing amendments to the FY 2003-2005 Tri-Cities TIP and the Statewide TIP and for the FY 2005 – 2007 Tri-Cities TIP and the Statewide TIP.

Mr. Vinsh stated VDOT is moving in the direction of using amendments for these documents for even allocation years, such as FY 2004, and preparing new documents for odd allocation

years, such as FY 2005.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:25 a.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Technical Committee meeting held in the Southside Regional Medical Center Rehabilitation Services Building located at 3335 South Crater Road in Petersburg, Virginia on July 7, 2003 at 10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT; Vicki Minetree, Colonial Heights; John McCracken, Chesterfield County; March Altman, Hopewell; Hebert Pegram, Leon Hughes, Prince George; VDOT; Joe Vinsh, CPDC.

Members Absent: Guy Scheid, Dinwiddie; Ron Reekes, Mike Briddell, Petersburg;

Others Present: Diana Parker, Sierra Club; Mark Riblett, VDOT; Victor Liu, CPDC

Vice-Chair March Altman called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – May 6, 2003

Upon a motion by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. Pegram and carried, the minutes of the May 6, 2003 meeting were approved.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

Ms. Parker commented that the Tier II phase of the Southeast High Speed Rail (SEHSR) Environmental Impact Statement is underway and that a public meeting on July 10th from 4 to 7 p.m. in the Dinwiddie Elementary School has been scheduled. Ms. Parker further commented that the Sierra Club was concerned about possible impact on civil war era earthworks in the project study corridor.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FY 2004 UNIFIED TRANSPORTATION PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UTPWP)

Mr. Vinsh stated the FY 2004 UTPWP prepared last spring included a preliminary PL funding total amount of \$203,970. Mr. Vinsh further stated the final PL funding total amount has changed and the new amount is \$210,959.

Upon a motion by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. Apostolides and carried a recommendation

to the Policy Committee was made to amend the FY 2004 PL funding total amount.

STATUS REPORT ON THE U.S.ROUTE 460 LOCATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

Mr. Vinsh stated he had presented a report to the Crater Commission on May 21st regarding the study. Mr. Vinsh indicated that the study appears to be about 3 – 4 months behind the schedule present to the Route 460 Communications Commission by VDOT.

The study window includes that portion of Route 460 from Bowers Hill to I-295 in Prince George. The study window is 62 miles long and covers 5 miles on either side of the existing U. S. Route 460. Within this corridor, several alignments 350' wide will be evaluated under the new location project alternative. The 3-year study is being financed at cost of \$6.4 million. The options include no-build, local improvement and new location. The local improvement option may include a variety of improvements such as widening, congestion management, access management, by-passes, etc. The 460 project also includes a \$960,000 high speed rail component. No information has been available from VDOT on public a meeting schedule.

Mr. Riblett indicated that information on the public meetings will be coming out in the near future.

Mr. Vinsh also indicated that the Crater Commission would be monitoring the progress of the study and may form a position on a design alternative and funding approach for this project.

Mr. Hughes asked who was representing this area on the Route 460 Communications Commission.

Mr. Vinsh stated that Senator Marsh and Delegate Ingram were our representatives. Also, the executive directors of the Hampton Roads PDC and Crater PDC serve as nonvoting members.

STATUS REPORT ON THE SOUTHEAST HIGH SPEED RAIL – TIER II EIS

Mr. Vinsh briefly commented that the North Carolina DOT and the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation have begun the TIER II EIS phase for the project segment from Collier Yard in Petersburg to Raleigh. This phase will focus on the old rail corridor alignment with modification to realign curves.

STATUS REPORT ON BIKEWAYS PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Liu stated information has been received from VDOT regarding a question raised during the last meeting on the implications of showing bikeway facility improvement recommendations in a plan. Mr. Liu indicated that VDOT has indicated recommended improvements can be reconsidered at the time a project is in the design phase. Further, recommended

improvements should be shown with dashed lines and existing improvements should be shown with solid lines. Mr. Liu added that none of the local governments currently have bikeway facilities that need to be shown with a solid line.

Mr. Liu further circulated a draft bikeways map and indicated a preliminary map would be presented during the August meeting for consideration.

REVIEW OF 2026 SOCIO-ECONOMIC FORECAST

Mr. Vinsh distributed the summary page for the 2026 forecast dated 06/26/03 and commented that changes were in the earlier version dated 06/10/03. The changes were in Chesterfield County and involved using more recent historical data than was used in the 06/10/03 version. Also, TAZs 328, 329 and 330 were added in the Chesterfield database to correspond with 2000 TAZs numbering submitted to the Census Bureau.

Mr. Vinsh briefly reviewed how the projections were prepared.

Ms. Minetree questioned the 2010 employment numbers for Colonial Heights.

Mr. Vinsh indicated he would review the data and find out reason for the change.

Mr. McCracken commented on the increasing number of autos in the study area.

After a period of further discussion, it was decided to put this item on the August agenda.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED ADJUSTMENT OF THE 2000 CENSUS URBANIZED AREA BOUNDARY

Mr. Pegram indicated that VDOT is proposing to use the existing study area boundary between Richmond and Tri-Cities MPOs for the functional classification of highways.

Mr. Pegram stated that this process did not have anything to do with funding. It is a process we need to do every 10 years.

Mr. Hughes identified a need to include the Prince George Industrial Park in the adjusted 2000 urbanized area boundary used for functional classification.

Mr. Pegram indicated he would review this item and get back with the committee.

After a period of further discussion, the item was table until the August 4th meeting.

STATUS REPORT ON FY 2004-2006 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Mr. Vinsh stated information is needed on some secondary projects and transit-operating projects was still needed to complete the draft document. Action on this item would definitely be during the August Policy Committee meeting. A public meeting would need to be scheduled and advertised after Policy Committee authorization is received.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Upon a motion by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. McCracken and carried, Mr. Altman was voted Chair and Mr. Hughes Vice-Chair.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:40 a.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Technical Committee meeting held in the Southside Regional Medical Center Rehabilitation Services Building located at 3335 South Crater Road in Petersburg, Virginia on August 4, 2003 at 10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Guy Scheid, Dinwiddie; Vicki Minetree, Colonial Heights; John McCracken, Chesterfield County; Hebert Pegram, Leon Hughes, Prince George; VDOT; Joe Vinsh, CPDC.

Members Absent: Jack Apostolides, VDR&PT; March Altman, Hopewell; Ron Reekes, Mike Briddell, Petersburg;

Others Present: Diana Parker, Sierra Club; Victor Liu, CPDC

Vice-Chair Leon Hughes called the meeting to order.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES – July 7, 2003

Upon a motion by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. McCracken and carried the minutes of the July 7, 2003 meeting was approved. Mr. Scheid and Mr. Pegram abstained from voting on approval of the minutes.

CITIZEN INFORMATION PERIOD

Ms. Barefoot inquired about the status of an enhancement grant involving the acquisition of a historical battlefield site in Dinwiddie County. Ms. Barefoot also requested information on the status of the Route 460 Study between Route 226 in Dinwiddie and Route 460 in Prince George.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the portion of the Route 460 project between Route 226 in Dinwiddie and Route 460 in Prince George had been deleted by VDOT from further study at this time.

Mr. Pegram indicated he would check on the status of the enhancement project and forward his findings to Mr. Vinsh.

REVIEW OF DRAFT BIKEWAYS PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Liu commented that all local comprehensive plans have been reviewed and the draft Tri-Cities Bikeways Plan indicates no existing bike lanes in the Tri-Cities Area. New high-resolution photography from the State will be used to show existing bike trails and paths in the Tri-Cities Area. The plan will show recommended bikeway facilities for future development. Examples of bike trails and paths would include the Pocahontas Heritage Trail in Petersburg; Point of Rocks Park in Chesterfield; and trails in Lee Park in Petersburg.

Mr. Vinsh commented on the large number of recommended bikeway facilities. Mr. Vinsh further stated that the recommendations of the bikeways plan update would be incorporated into the 2026 Transportation Plan update.

Mr. Vinsh asked if bikeways are a frequent topic raised by citizens at local government meetings.

Ms. Minetree stated she had recalled this topic being discussed in Colonial Heights.

Mr. Hughes stated Prince George has a transportation subcommittee working with the comprehensive plan update effort that will likely consider bikeways.

Mr. Scheid stated the Dinwiddie Department of Parks and Recreation does consider bikeways, but citizens have not expressed the need for these facilities.

Mr. Liu indicated that based on his discussions with local staffs, there has been no demand by citizens for bikeway facilities in the Tri-Cities Area. However, Mr. Liu further indicated there has been some expression of interest in Hopewell for bikeway facilities.

Ms. Parker inquired about a public workshop on bikeways in the Tri-Cities.

Mr. Vinsh stated that the MPO will be sponsoring a public meeting on the TIP in early September. The purpose of the meeting is advertised broadly to include most any topic related to transportation in the Tri-Cities.

Mr. Liu indicated the recommended bikeways facility map should be completed later this month.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED ADJUSTMENT OF THE 2000 CENSUS URBANIZED AREA BOUNDARY

Mr. Vinsh distributed a map indicated VDOT's proposed modification of the 2000 urbanized area boundary for the purpose of functional classifying highways as urban or rural.

Mr. Pegram indicated the yellow area the proposed urban area for classifying roadways as urban. The roadways outside the yellow area would be functionally classified as rural.

Mr. Pegram further indicated that this classification procedure did not pertain to project funding eligibility.

After a period of further discussion, a motion was made by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. Scheid and carried, that the VDOT proposal be recommended for endorsement by the Policy Committee, including the addition of land area West of Route 156 to Route 460.

REVIEW OF 2026 SOCIO-ECONOMIC FORECAST

MR. Vinsh briefly commented that one comment had been received since the last meeting on this item. The future year employment for TAZ 147 was raised to the current level and held constant.

Upon a motion by Ms. Minetree, seconded by Mr. McCracken and carried a motion to recommend Policy Committee adoption of the proposed 2026 socio-economic forecast was adopted.

REVIEW OF THE FY 2004 AMENDMENTS TO THE FY 2003–2005 TIP

Mr. McCracken inquired about the location of the Meadowville Road interchange.

Mr. Pegram stated that this interchange was located in the Richmond MPO study area and improvements in this area needed to be in the Richmond TIP and not Tri-Cities TIP.

Upon a motion by Mr. Scheid, seconded by Ms. Minetree and carried, the proposed FY 2004 amendments to the FY 2003-2005 TIP were recommended for Policy Committee adoption with Mr. Pegram's comment regarding the Meadowville Road interchange.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:56 a.m.

Minutes of the Tri-Cities Area Metropolitan Planning Organization Transportation Technical Committee meeting held in the Southside Regional Medical Center Rehabilitation Services Building located at 3335 South Crater Road in Petersburg, Virginia on October 6, 2003 at 10:00 a.m.

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

Members Absent: Guy Scheid, Dinwiddie; Mike Briddell, Petersburg;

Others Present: Ivan Rucker, FHWA

Vice-Chair Hughes called the meeting to order.

DISCUSSION OF 2026 TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE SCHEDULE

Mr. Vinsh distributed draft copies of the 2026 update schedules for the Tri-Cities and Richmond transportation plans.

Mr. Vinsh indicated he had begun work on the update and reviewed selected portions of the schedule for the 2026 Tri-Cities Transportation Plan.

Mr. Vinsh indicated arrangements are being made to use the services of a VDOT on-call consultant to evaluate appropriate strategies to improve present-day congested segments on the Tri-Cities CMS network, including the Route 36 corridor.

Mr. Riblett indicated a meeting would be arranged with the on-call consultant in the near future to begin the project.

Mr. Vinsh requested local government representatives to begin reviewing the constrained project list in the 2023 Transportation Plan and indicate any changes needed and a time frame for obtaining local authorization for making changes. Mr. Vinsh also stressed the importance for priority projects to be listed first because projected highway construction revenues would be used to develop the 2026 constrained project list. Also, local governments were requested to identify the need for any alternatives analysis of potential improvements for testing by the project consultant.

Mr. Vinsh asked Mr. Reekes about the timing of the next Transit Development Program (TDP)

update and the 2026 Transportation Plan.

Mr. Reekes indicated that a draft TDP update would probably be available around February of next year.

Mr. Apostolides indicated that the main information needed from the TDP update for the 2026 Plan were the improvement projects planned for the Tri-Cities.

Mr. Pegram commented that the Route 460 consultant is preparing a combined model for the Richmond and Hampton areas. In addition, the same firm is developing a stand-alone Richmond/Tri-Cities model in conjunction with the Route 460 project.

Mr. Pegram also commented that he thought both the Richmond and Tri-Cities 2026 plans needed to be adopted by May 2004. Mr. Pegram indicated he would check on the completion date.

DISCUSSION OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING FUND FORMULA

Mr. Vinsh stated VDOT is in the process of evaluating several alternative formulas for allocating planning funds among the 14 MPOs in the Commonwealth. VDOT requested MPO comment on the alternatives. The CPDC staff has commented that the formula should allow for a base allocation for both MPOs in the Richmond Urbanized Area instead of one allocation per urbanized area. Further, CPDC staff has commented that the formula should take into consideration the level of planning requirements a MPO is expected to comply.

Mr. Rucker indicated that FHWA expects VDOT will respond to the comments before the allocation formula for FY 2005 funds is approved by FHWA.

EVALUATION PRESENT-DAY CONGESTED SEGMENTS IDENTIFIED IN THE 2003 TRI-CITIES CMS OPERATIONS PLAN

Mr. Vinsh stated that the use of a VDOT on-call consultant is planned to evaluate the congested segments listed on pages 26 – 28 in the 2003 CMS update. The present-day congested Urban Arterial facilities include portions of routes 1, 36 and 144. The present-day congested Freeway facilities include segments of I-95. The present-day congested Rural 2-lane facility includes a segment of Rt.1.

Mr. Riblett indicated that a meeting would be held with the on-call consultant, the CPDC staff and VDOT in the near future to begin this project.

RICHMOND INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM (ITS) REGIONAL ARCHITECTURE

Mr. Vinsh commented that VDOT has engaged a consultant to develop a regional ITS architecture for the Richmond and Tri-Cities Area. The ITS regional architecture is an integrated approach to technology based transportation projects. Compatibility issues regarding data and communication are examined to assure compatibility.

Mr. Vinsh added the ITS regional architecture was a certification requirement and that VDOT was considering extending it to cover the entire Richmond Construction District.

ROUTE 460 COMMUNICATION COMMISSION

Mr. Vinsh indicated that the U.S. Route 460 Communication Commission met on September 29th. VDOT staff reviewed the results of the 2 public meetings held on purpose and need and emphasized the study area window was flexible. The next round of public meetings will be held during Spring 2004. The topic of these meetings will be project alternatives. The PDC staffs from Hampton Roads and Crater have been added to the project team.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:00 a.m.