

# AGENDA

## RICHMOND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Tuesday, October 11, 2022, 9:00 a.m.

Zoom meeting

*This meeting is open to the public. Members of the public are invited to attend virtually. Please alert the RRTPO at [RRTPOinput@planrva.org](mailto:RRTPOinput@planrva.org) if electronic transmission of this meeting fails for the public. If such transmission fails, the committee will take a recess until public access is restored. Please refer to our [Statement Regarding Virtual Meeting Participation by Members of the Public](#) for more information.*

*If you wish to participate in this meeting virtually, please register via Zoom at the following link: [https://planrva-org.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN\\_iido2ED9Q0OLAquJnMm3ww](https://planrva-org.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_iido2ED9Q0OLAquJnMm3ww)*

*Check out our complete [Public Participation Guide](#) online to learn about the different ways you can stay connected and involved. Meetings are also live streamed and archived on our YouTube Channel at [www.youtube.com/c/PlanRVA](http://www.youtube.com/c/PlanRVA).*

1. **Welcome and Introductions**  
(Smidler)
2. **Statement Regarding Virtual Meetings**  
(Parsons)
3. **Roll Call & Certification of a Quorum**  
(Firestone)
4. **Consideration of Amendments to the Meeting Agenda**  
(Smidler)
5. **Approval of September 13, 2022, TAC Meeting Minutes** – page 3  
(Smidler)  
**Action requested: approval of minutes as presented**
6. **Open Public Comment Period**  
(Smidler/5 minutes)
7. **TAC Chairman's Report**  
(Smidler/10 minutes)
8. **RRTPO Update**  
(Parsons/Aryal/15 minutes)
  - a. **2050 Socioeconomic Data Workgroup -Update** (Aryal)
9. **Federal Performance Management Update**  
(Margie Ray, OIPI/20 minutes)

**10. RSTP/CMAQ Existing Project Requests** - page 7

*(Busching/15 minutes)*

**Action requested: authorization of an application period for new projects**

**11. TAP Transfer Request** - page 17

*(Busching/10 minutes)*

**Action requested: approval of a transfer of TAP funds from one City of Richmond project to another**

**12. Transportation Agency Updates**

*(10 minutes)*

**a. DRPT** – Dubinsky

**b. GRTC** – Torres

**c. RideFinders**

**d. VDOT** - Mueller

**13. Future Meeting Topics** – page 19

*(Smidler/5 minutes)*

**14. TAC Member Comments**

*(Smidler /5 minutes)*

**15. Next Meeting: TBD**

*(Smidler)*

**16. Adjournment**

*(Smidler)*

CAP/jf

**RICHMOND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)**

**MEETING MINUTES  
Zoom Meeting  
September 13, 2022, 9:00 a.m.**

**MEMBERS and ALTERNATES (A) PRESENT:**

|  |   |                                       |   |                               |   |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Town of Ashland</b>                       |   | <b>Charles City County</b>            |   | <b>Chesterfield County</b>    |   |
| Nora D. Amos                                 | X | Gary Mitchell                         |   | Barbara K. Smith              | X |
| Vacant (A)                                   |   | Rhonda Russell (A)                    | X | Chessa Walker (A)             | X |
| <b>Goochland County</b>                      |   | <b>Hanover County</b>                 |   | <b>Henrico County</b>         |   |
| Austin Goynes                                | X | Joseph E. Vidunas,<br>FY23 Vice Chair | X | Sharon Smidler, FY23<br>Chair | X |
| Thomas M. Coleman (A)                        | X | J. Michael Flagg (A)                  |   | Todd Eure (A)                 |   |
| <b>New Kent County</b>                       |   | <b>Powhatan County</b>                |   | <b>City of Richmond</b>       |   |
| Kelli Le Duc                                 |   | Bret Schardein                        | X | Dironna Moore Clarke          |   |
|  |   | (vacant) (A)                          |   | Travis A. Bridewell (A)       | X |
| <b>Capital Region Airport<br/>Commission</b> |   | <b>DRPT</b>                           |   | <b>GRTC</b>                   |   |
| John B. Rutledge                             |   | Tiffany T. Dubinsky                   |   | Sam Sink                      |   |
|  |   | Daniel Wagner (A)                     | X | Patricia Robinson (A)         | X |
| <b>PlanRVA</b>                               |   | <b>RideFinders</b>                    |   | <b>RMTA</b>                   |   |
| Chet Parsons                                 | X | Von S. Tisdale                        |   | Theresa Simmons               |   |
| Sulabh Aryal (A)                             | X | John O'Keeffe (A)                     | X |                               |   |
| <b>VDOT</b>                                  |   |                                       |   |                               |   |
| Liz McAdory                                  |   |                                       |   |                               |   |
| Nicole Mueller (A)                           | X |                                       |   |                               |   |

The technology used for the RRTPO Technical Advisory Committee meeting was a web-hosted service created by Zoom and YouTube Live Streaming and was open and accessible for participation by members of the public. A recording of this meeting is available on our [Plan RVA YouTube Channel](#).

Virtual participation of this meeting by members of the committee is authorized under the City of Richmond Res. No. 2020-R025, - declaration of a local emergency due to the potential spread of COVID-19, adopted March 16, 2020. The resolution is available [here](#).

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

The Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Chair, Sharon Smidler, presided and called the September 13, 2022, RRTPO TAC meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.

## 2. Roll Call & Certification of a Quorum

Janice Firestone, Program Coordinator, took attendance by roll call and certified that a quorum was present.

## 3. Consideration of Amendments to the Meeting Agenda

There were no requested amendments to the agenda.

## 4. Approval of August 9, 2022, Meeting Minutes

On motion of Nora Amos, seconded by John O’Keeffe, the RRTPO Technical Advisory Committee unanimously approved the minutes of the August 9, 2022, meeting as presented (roll call vote)

## 5. Open Public Comment Period

Chet Parsons read a statement regarding the public comment process. There were no requests to address the committee.

## 6. TAC Chairman’s Report

Chair Smidler reported that Henrico County will be hosting a public hearing for the Fall Line Trail tomorrow, September 14<sup>th</sup>, from 5:00 – 6:30 p.m. at Longdale Elementary School.

She offered a reminder to localities about the numerous funding opportunities that are available right now.

## 7. RRTPO Update

### a. Current Work Efforts

Mr. Parsons provided this report and offered to answer any questions.

## 8. FY21 – FY24 Transportation Improvement Program – GRTC Request

Myles Busching, PlanRVA, presented this request and offered to answer any questions.

On motion of Austin Goyne, seconded by John O’Keeffe, the RRTPO Technical Advisory Committee voted to recommend Policy Board adoption of the following resolution:

**RESOLVED**, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization Policy Board amends the *FY21 – FY24 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)* as shown in the attached draft TIP pages, and;

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the new projects are considered exempt from conformity under provisions contained in section 93.126 of the conformity rule for Planning and Technical Studies (roll call vote).

| <b>Jurisdiction/Agency</b>                | <b>Member</b>                    | <b>Aye</b> | <b>Nay</b> | <b>Abstain</b> | <b>Absent</b> |
|---|----------------------------------|------------|------------|----------------|---------------|
| <b>Town of Ashland</b>                    | Nora D. Amos                     | X          |            |                |               |
| <b>Charles City County</b>                | Rhonda Russell                   | X          |            |                |               |
| <b>Chesterfield County</b>                | Barbara K. Smith                 | X          |            |                |               |
| <b>Goochland County</b>                   | Austin Goyne                     | X          |            |                |               |
| <b>Hanover County</b>                     | Joseph E. Vidunas,<br>Vice Chair |            |            | X              |               |
| <b>Henrico County</b>                     | Sharon Smidler,<br>Chair         | X          |            |                |               |
| <b>New Kent County</b>                    | Kelli Le Duc                     |            |            |                | X             |
| <b>Powhatan County</b>                    | Bret Schardein                   |            |            | X              |               |
| <b>City of Richmond</b>                   | Travis Bridewell (A)             | X          |            |                |               |
| <b>Capital Region Airport Commission</b>  | John B. Rutledge                 |            |            |                | X             |
| <b>DRPT</b>                               | Daniel Wagner (A)                | X          |            |                |               |
| <b>GRTC Transit System</b>                | Patricia Robinson (A)            | X          |            |                |               |
| <b>PlanRVA</b>                            | Chet Parsons                     | X          |            |                |               |
| <b>RideFinders</b>                        | John O’Keeffe (A)                | X          |            |                |               |
| <b>RIC Metropolitan Transp. Authority</b> | Theresa Simmons                  |            |            |                | X             |
| <b>VDOT</b>                               | Nicole Mueller (A)               | X          |            |                |               |
| <b>Totals</b>                             |                                  | 11         | 0          | 2              | 3             |

**9. Revised FY24 – FY29 STBG/CMAQ Schedule**

Mr. Busching presented the revised schedule and offered to answer any questions.

**10. Transportation Agency Updates**

**a. DRPT**

Daniel Wagner, DRPT, provided an update on DRPT activities, which is posted with the [meeting documents](#).

**b. GRTC**

Patricia Robinson, GRTC, provided an update on recent and upcoming activities at GRTC.

**c. RideFinders**

John O’Keeffe, RideFinders, provided an update on RideFinders’ recent and upcoming activities.

**d. VDOT**

Nicole Mueller, VDOT, provided this update, which is posted with the [meeting documents](#).

**11. Future Meeting Topics**

Chair Smidler reviewed the future meeting topics.

**12. TAC Member Comments**

There were no comments from TAC members.

**13. Next Meeting: October 11, 2022**

Chair Smidler noted that the next regular RRTPO TAC meeting will be held on October 11, 2022, beginning at 9:00 a.m.

**14. Adjournment**

Chair Smidler adjourned the meeting at 9:41 a.m.

## TAC AGENDA 10/11/22; ITEM 10

### FY24 – FY29 STBG/CMAQ EXISTING PROJECT REQUESTS

#### Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization

**REQUESTED ACTION:** Review existing project requests and gain consensus on the limits for new projects applications for FY24 – FY29 STBG/CMAQ funding

**BACKGROUND:** Selecting and prioritizing projects for funding is one of the primary roles of the RRTPO in developing the regional transportation system. Projects selected by the TPO to receive funding are included in the Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP) for adoption by the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB).

In June of 2021, the RRTPO Policy Board adopted new guidelines for project selection and allocation of regional Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. The newly adopted guidelines can be reviewed [on the PlanRVA website](#).

Based on a review of existing allocations and commitments and currently projected funding levels, staff has prepared estimates of available funding for this round. Staff expects to be able to allocate approximately **\$18.2 million in additional STBG** and **\$7 million in additional CMAQ** funding this round. Approximately half of the expected CMAQ funding is *unmatched* and requires a 20% local match. This funding is available for cost increases on existing projects and for new projects.

**EXISTING PROJECT REQUESTS:** At TAC direction, an application period was held for existing projects only between September 19 and September 30. During that period, eleven (11) applications were submitted for increases to cost estimates or changes to project schedules which impact funding. The table below summarizes the requests received for each funding program.

| Program | Projects | Funding Requested |
|---------|----------|-------------------|
| CMAQ    | 1        | \$500,000         |
| STBG    | 10       | \$14,066,815      |

A summary of the requests is included with this report as Attachment A.

**NEW PROJECT OPTIONS:** Based on a review of the existing project requests, staff has identified two options for TAC consideration.

1. *CMAQ Only* – The only CMAQ request was for the annual RideFinders TDM program allocation which is already accounted for in the estimate of available funds. The available CMAQ funding is approximately one year’s worth of funding and supports a new application cycle. This application period would be limited to CMAQ-eligible localities and agencies.
2. *STBG & CMAQ* – Most of the requests were submitted for additional STBG funding. Based on the most conservative assumption that all the requests are fully funded as requested, approximately \$4M will be available for new STBG

projects. This amount is sufficient for one or two smaller projects or the engineering phase of several new projects. If TAC ultimately recommends a lower level of funding for some requests, additional STBG will be available for new projects.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff is reviewing the existing project requests and will provide a recommendation on each project for the TAC meeting. At a high-level, staff is concerned that project sponsors continue to seek STBG funding as a first resort for addressing deficits rather than using local funds or finding other sources as required by the Regional Funding Framework. Given the current inflationary environment, staff understands the need for additional regional support to complete selected projects, however, only one (1) of the nine (9) applications for additional STBG funds provided any local contribution to addressing the project deficit.

Staff feels that both options for new project applications are viable. Staff *strongly* recommends that TAC consider further limiting the number of applications that each locality can submit given the available level of funding.

**TAC ACTION REQUESTED:** The following resolution is presented for TAC consideration:

**WHEREAS,** *Applications were submitted for existing regional Surface Transportation Block Grant and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality projects between September 19 and September 30, 2022; and,*

**WHEREAS,** *Requests for additional STBG funds totaled \$14,066,815; and*

**WHEREAS,** *Staff estimates \$18.2M will be available to address existing project needs and new projects for the six-year program covering fiscal years 2024 to 2029; therefore, be it*

**RESOLVED** *that the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) agrees to hold a new project application window from October 17 to November 4, 2022, for [Option 1: CMAQ funds only/Option 2: CMAQ and STBG funds]; and, be it*

**[Optional] FUTHER RESOLVED** *that the TAC agrees to limit new project applications to [3] applications per sponsor; and, be it*

**FINALLY RESOLVED** *that the TAC recommends funding the existing project requests as [Option 1: proposed in the attached report/Option 2: as submitted].*

## **ATTACHMENTS**

- A. Existing Project Requests



| Project Title   | Project UPC | Has the project estimate increased? | Explain the reasons for the increase in cost   | Total Cost    | Has the project schedule changed? | Explain the reasons for the change to the project schedule  | Does this project need additional funding? | Are you requesting RRTPO funding for the full deficit? | Have you sought funding from other sources? | List the program, amount, and status of any requests for funding to address this deficit. If pending, include expected timeline for a decision   | Do you have CVTA or other local funds which could be allocated to this shortfall? | Additional Funding Requested |
|---|-------------|-------------------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|---|------------------------------|
| RRTPO scenario planning pilot                         | 118143      | Yes                                 | Project proposals returned higher than estimated - scope clarity   | \$ 600,000    | No                                |   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes   | PlanRVA was not able to commit additional funding to this project. CVTA operating budget does not have ability to cover this cost and the project does not qualify for regional funding. | No  | \$ 400,000                   |
| #SMART18 - RTE 360 WIDENING                           | 13551       | Yes                                 | Bids were received on Aug. 19th and came in approximately 30% over the engineer's estimate. Only one bid was received and we don't feel like we will get a better result by rebidding. | \$ 34,752,000 | No                                |   | Yes  | No   | No  |  | Yes   | \$ 1,600,000                 |
| Commerce Rd Improvements                              | 15958       | Yes                                 | Increased costs due to market conditions   | \$ 33,012,000 | Yes                               | to be reauthorized by FHWA/VDOT   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes   | RSTP funding - \$3,770,000. Needed for construction phase. FY2024 or FY 2025   | No  | \$ 3,770,000                 |
| Early Settlers Rd (Robious Rd Hospital/Park) Sidewalk | 113846      | Yes                                 | The cost estimate has been increased to address bid/market risk.   | \$ 1,270,000  | No                                |   | Yes  | Yes  | No  |  | No  | \$ 100,000                   |
| RideFinders Air Pollution Reduction                   | T203        | No                                  |  |               | No                                |   | No   |  |   |  |   |                              |
| Route 1 Improvements: Ashcake Rd to Arbor Oak Dr      | 112042      | Yes                                 | Increased costs, in particular construction  | \$ 14,269,086 | No                                |   | Yes  | Yes  | No  |  | No  | \$ 2,759,106                 |
| Libbie Avenue Road Diet                               | 115769      | Yes                                 | Refined estimate reflecting current construction costs and covering No-Post Local funds.   | \$ 2,180,500  | No                                |   | Yes  | Yes  | No  | N/A  | No  | \$ 483,500                   |
| N. Parham Rd Traffic Signal and Sidewalk Project      | 109194      | Yes                                 | Refined cost estimate to reflect current construction costs and cover the remaining No-Post Local funds.   | \$ 5,244,536  | No                                |   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes   | SMART Scale funding was previously secured during the FY20 application.  | No  | \$ 204,209                   |
| Jahnke Road - @ Lane Improvement                      | 19035       | Yes                                 | Cost escalation due to inflation. (Materials and Labor) City is flexible with funding over the duration of two year construction period, with half each year.                          | \$ 21,800,000 | Yes                               | Utility conflicts and railroad negotiations.  | Yes  | Yes  | Yes   | Federal - Regional STP \$1,000,000. No longer pending.   | No  | \$ 3,000,000                 |
| Deepwater Terminal Rd Project                         | 104281      | Yes                                 | Inflation due to rising costs of materials and labor costs nationwide  | \$ 7,822,698  | Yes                               | challenges with property owners and businesses in the area delayed RW Acquisition process and steps   | Yes  | Yes  | Yes   | Project went to City Council seeking additional funding and it wasn't granted additional funding   | No  | \$ 1,750,000                 |
| Rte 623 - Improve Intersection                        | 105733      | No                                  |  |               | Yes                               | A revised estimate was received from VDOT as a part of the annual SYIP review. After reviewing that estimate with VDOT, there were scope concerns. To remedy those concerns, a Smart Scale application is in process to fully validate the project. As such, the anticipated start date of PE will now be FY24 instead of FY23. | No   |  |   |  |   |                              |

## Attachment B: Existing Project Requests – Staff Analysis

This spring, the Policy Board gave staff direction to reduce the cost of overruns to the TPO, including a review of the cost estimating practices of project sponsors and policies for prioritizing existing project requests. As noted in the main staff report, RRTPO staff have concerns about the use of STBG funds to address project deficits when no other funding sources have been sought. Staff remind localities of the general requirement to address increases using local funds where available.

Staff also remind sponsors of the financial programming practice of fully funding existing projects before funding new projects. As partners in the project funding and development process, the expectation is that local sponsors will also prioritize existing projects in the development pipeline when programming local transportation funding.

Staff has reviewed each project request against the SYIP and TPO allocation history and provided a general recommendation consistent with the *Regional Funding Framework* guidelines and Policy Board direction.

### #SMART18 - RTE 360 WIDENING (UPC 13551)

---

#### *Baseline (SYIP)*

|                                    |              |
|------------------------------------|--------------|
| <b>Total Estimate</b>              | \$29,551,000 |
| <b>Total Funding</b>               | \$31,451,000 |
| <b>Total TPO Funding</b>           | \$15,638,840 |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Estimate</b> | 52.9%        |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Funding</b>  | 49.7%        |

#### *New Estimate and Deficit*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>New Estimate</b>                       | \$34,752,000   |
| <b>Total Deficit (Estimate – Funding)</b> | \$3,301,000  |
| <b>Explanation</b>                        | Bids were received in August and came in approximately 30% over the engineer's estimate. Only one bid was received, and locality staff does not expect a better result by rebidding. |

#### *Request and Funding*

|                                 |                  |
|---------------------------------|------------------|
| <b>Requested TPO Funding</b>    | \$1,600,000      |
| <b>Fiscal Year(s)</b>           | FY23, FY24, FY25 |
| <b>Request Share of Deficit</b> | 48.4%            |
| <b>Other Funds Sought</b>       | CVTA local       |

*Staff Comments:* Staff recognizes the significant local funding commitment to address the escalating cost of this project and appreciates the efforts to address this problem locally. Staff also notes that the locality has indicated that they can cover the full deficit using CVTA local funding. Per the guidance in the Regional Funding Framework, staff recommend the locality cover this cost using available CVTA dollars.

**Commerce Rd Improvements (UPC 15958)**

---

*Baseline (SYIP)*

|                                    |              |
|------------------------------------|--------------|
| <b>Total Estimate</b>              | \$31,023,000 |
| <b>Total Funding</b>               | \$31,023,000 |
| <b>Total TPO Funding</b>           | \$8,746,277  |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Estimate</b> | 28.2%        |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Funding</b>  | 28.2%        |

*New Estimate and Deficit (Application)*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>New Estimate</b>                       | \$33,012,000                             |
| <b>Total Deficit (Estimate – Funding)</b> | See Staff Comments                       |
| <b>Explanation</b>                        | Increased costs due to market conditions |

*Request and Funding (Application)*

|                                 |             |
|---------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Requested TPO Funding</b>    | \$3,770,000 |
| <b>Fiscal Year(s)</b>           | FY24, FY25  |
| <b>Request Share of Deficit</b> | 189.5%      |
| <b>Other Funds Sought</b>       | N/A         |

*Staff Comments:* The RRTPO took midcycle action last year to approve a transfer of more than \$3.2 million to allow this project to be awarded based on a time-sensitive request. The project was ultimately not awarded and is now scheduled for construction in the summer of 2023.

As shown in the tables above, the requested funding exceeds the estimated deficit significantly. The estimate provided does not match the latest estimate in the VDOT dashboard which further complicates analysis of the extent of the deficit and need.

As discussed last year, this project has experienced rapid increases in estimates over the past few years, well beyond the impact of inflation. To this point, the SYIP estimate in FY19 was \$14,460,000 and the current estimate is \$33,012,000. Staff have concerns about continuing to put TPO funding toward projects that have demonstrated continuous delays without certainty that the project will actually use the funding in a timely manner and move forward with construction.

## Jahnke Road – 2 Lane Improvements (UPC 19035)

---

### Baseline (SYIP)

|                                    |              |
|------------------------------------|--------------|
| <b>Total Estimate</b>              | \$17,560,000 |
| <b>Total Funding</b>               | \$15,080,000 |
| <b>Total TPO Funding</b>           | \$13,712,178 |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Estimate</b> | 78.1%        |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Funding</b>  | 90.9%        |

### New Estimate and Deficit (Application)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>New Estimate</b>                       | \$21,800,000  |
| <b>Total Deficit (Estimate – Funding)</b> | See Staff Comments  |
| <b>Explanation</b>                        | Cost escalation due to inflation. (Materials and Labor) City is flexible with funding over the duration of two-year construction period, with half each year. |

### Request and Funding (Application)

|                                 |             |
|---------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Requested TPO Funding</b>    | \$3,000,000 |
| <b>Fiscal Year(s)</b>           |             |
| <b>Request Share of Deficit</b> |             |
| <b>Other Funds Sought</b>       | N/A         |

*Staff Comments:* Similar to the Commerce Rd project above, staff have concerns about the timeline and uncertainty around this project. This project has been previously bid and awarded but ultimately did not start construction. Bids were originally solicited in 2018, but the project has not moved forward in the past four (4) years. As with Commerce Rd, the locality submitted estimate does not match the dashboard estimate for this project, complicating analysis of the needed funding.

## Deepwater Terminal Rd Project (UPC 104281)

---

### Baseline (SYIP)

|                                    |             |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Total Estimate</b>              | \$5,458,000 |
| <b>Total Funding</b>               | \$7,411,000 |
| <b>Total TPO Funding</b>           | \$5,028,890 |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Estimate</b> | 92.1%       |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Funding</b>  | 67.8%       |

*New Estimate and Deficit (Application)*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>New Estimate</b>                       | \$7,822,698   |
| <b>Total Deficit (Estimate – Funding)</b> | \$411,698   |
| <b>Explanation</b>                        | Inflation due to rising costs of materials and labor costs nationwide |

*Request and Funding (Application)*

|                                 |                               |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Requested TPO Funding</b>    | \$1,750,000                   |
| <b>Fiscal Year(s)</b>           | FY25, FY26                    |
| <b>Request Share of Deficit</b> | 425.1%                        |
| <b>Other Funds Sought</b>       | Local funds from City Council |

*Staff Comments:* This project has experienced minor cost increases over the past year, attributable to cost inflation. The requested TPO funding exceeds the cost increase. This project has previously received Revenue Sharing funds which require local funds as a match. The total deficit is estimated at \$412,000. As the balance is not needed until FY26, staff believes this can be addressed locally and does not support additional funding.

**N. Parham Rd Traffic Signal and Sidewalk Project (UPC 109194)**

---

*Baseline (SYIP)*

|                                    |             |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Total Estimate</b>              | \$5,244,536 |
| <b>Total Funding</b>               | \$5,621,014 |
| <b>Total TPO Funding</b>           | \$3,705,507 |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Estimate</b> | 70.7%       |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Funding</b>  | 56.9%       |

*New Estimate and Deficit (Application)*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>New Estimate</b>                       | \$5,244,536   |
| <b>Total Deficit (Estimate – Funding)</b> | \$0   |
| <b>Explanation</b>                        | Locality is seeking to replace the remaining no-post/local commitment with RSTP funds |

*Request and Funding (Application)*

|                              |           |
|------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Requested TPO Funding</b> | \$204,029 |
|------------------------------|-----------|

|                                 |      |
|---------------------------------|------|
| <b>Fiscal Year(s)</b>           | FY26 |
| <b>Request Share of Deficit</b> | N/A  |
| <b>Other Funds Sought</b>       | N/A  |

*Staff Comments:* The TPO awarded over \$580,000 in additional funding to address cost increases on this project which were intended to replace the local commitment on the project at the time. This request is for another \$204,000 to replace additional local commitments. As the requested funds are intended to replace an existing local commitment to the project, staff do not recommend awarding funding to this request.

### **Route 1 Improvements: Ashcake Rd to Arbor Oak Dr (UPC 112042)**

---

*Baseline (SYIP)*

|                                    |              |
|------------------------------------|--------------|
| <b>Total Estimate</b>              | \$11,509,980 |
| <b>Total Funding</b>               | \$11,509,980 |
| <b>Total TPO Funding</b>           | \$11,185,253 |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Estimate</b> | 97.2%        |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Funding</b>  | 97.2%        |

*New Estimate and Deficit (Application)*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>New Estimate</b>                       | \$14,269,086                                |
| <b>Total Deficit (Estimate – Funding)</b> | \$2,759,106                                 |
| <b>Explanation</b>                        | Increased costs, in particular construction |

*Request and Funding (Application)*

|                                 |             |
|---------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Requested TPO Funding</b>    | \$2,759,106 |
| <b>Fiscal Year(s)</b>           | FY24        |
| <b>Request Share of Deficit</b> | 100%        |
| <b>Other Funds Sought</b>       | N/A         |

*Staff Comments:* This project has also experienced significant cost increases over the past few years. Unlike other projects, this project is nearly fully funded by the TPO and the locality’s CVTA funding is not able to cover the costs. This project has experienced several delays, but it is still on target for delivery on schedule. Staff recommend additional funding be awarded as requested.

### **Early Settlers Rd (Robious Rd - Hospital/Park) Sidewalk (UPC 113846)**

---

*Baseline (SYIP)*

|                                    |             |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Total Estimate</b>              | \$1,170,000 |
| <b>Total Funding</b>               | \$1,170,000 |
| <b>Total TPO Funding</b>           | \$1,170,000 |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Estimate</b> | 100%        |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Funding</b>  | 100%        |

*New Estimate and Deficit (Application)*

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| <b>New Estimate</b>                           | \$1,270,000 |
| <b>Total Deficit<br/>(Estimate – Funding)</b> | \$100,000   |
| <b>Explanation</b>                            |             |

*Request and Funding (Application)*

|                                 |           |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Requested TPO Funding</b>    | \$100,000 |
| <b>Fiscal Year(s)</b>           |           |
| <b>Request Share of Deficit</b> |           |
| <b>Other Funds Sought</b>       |           |

*Staff Comments:* The request for this project is small and the TPO has funded the full project to date. Consistent with the other recommendations above, staff recommends the locality look at CVTA local funds to fill this deficit.

**Libbie Avenue Road Diet (UPC 115769)**

---

*Baseline (SYIP)*

|                                    |             |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| <b>Total Estimate</b>              | \$1,942,500 |
| <b>Total Funding</b>               | \$1,942,500 |
| <b>Total TPO Funding</b>           | \$1,725,000 |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Estimate</b> | 88.8%       |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Funding</b>  | 88.8%       |

*New Estimate and Deficit (Application)*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>New Estimate</b>                           | \$2,180,500  |
| <b>Total Deficit<br/>(Estimate – Funding)</b> | \$238,000  |
| <b>Explanation</b>                            | Refined estimate reflecting current construction costs and covering No-Post Local funds. |

*Request and Funding (Application)*

|                                 |            |
|---------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Requested TPO Funding</b>    | \$483,500  |
| <b>Fiscal Year(s)</b>           | FY24, FY25 |
| <b>Request Share of Deficit</b> | 203.2%     |
| <b>Other Funds Sought</b>       | N/A        |

*Staff Comments:* This project has also been funded fully by the TPO with the locality putting a local commitment to keep the project moving forward. Consistent with other recommendations, staff do not recommend additional funding and support the use of local funds to address this deficit.

**RRTPO Scenario Planning Pilot (UPC 118143)**

---

*Baseline (SYIP)*

|                                    |           |
|------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Total Estimate</b>              | \$243,550 |
| <b>Total Funding</b>               | \$243,550 |
| <b>Total TPO Funding</b>           | \$243,550 |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Estimate</b> | 100%      |
| <b>TPO Share of Total Funding</b>  | 100%      |

*New Estimate and Deficit (Application)*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>New Estimate</b>                       | \$600,000  |
| <b>Total Deficit (Estimate – Funding)</b> | \$356,450  |
| <b>Explanation</b>                        | Project proposals returned higher than estimated - scope clarity |

*Request and Funding (Application)*

|                                 |               |
|---------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Requested TPO Funding</b>    | \$400,000     |
| <b>Fiscal Year(s)</b>           | FY23          |
| <b>Request Share of Deficit</b> | 112.2%        |
| <b>Other Funds Sought</b>       | PlanRVA, CVTA |

*Staff Comments:* The RRTPO does not have access to CVTA funding to address this relatively small cost increase and the PDC and CVTA operating budgets do not support the additional cost. The Scenario Planning Pilot is a precursor to the next Long-Range Transportation Plan. Given the lack of other potential funding sources, staff feel it is reasonable to apply additional STBG funding to this deficit.

---



## TAC AGENDA 10/11/22; ITEM 11.

### TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES (TA) TRANSFER REQUEST

#### Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization

**REQUESTED ACTION:** Review and approve a transfer of \$36,902 of FY20 Transportation Alternatives (TA) program funds from Gillies Creek Greenway Phase 2 (UPC 113490) to Gillies Creek Greenway Phase 3 (UPC 113429).

**BACKGROUND:** The Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside program provides capital grant assistance for projects defined as “transportation alternatives” in federal code. The RRTPO TA allocations are directed towards on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving bike and pedestrian access to public transportation, trails that serve a transportation purpose, and Safe Routes to School projects.

Gillies Creek Greenway is a shared-use trail project in the City of Richmond. The two phases considered as part of this request will connect Williamsburg Avenue to Jennie Scher Road and are expected to largely follow the creek. It is part of a larger trail network that is envisioned to connect the Virginia Capital Trail to a north side mixed-income redevelopment at Armstrong High School.

The initial TA allocations for these projects were 2018 funds, which have a 4-year expiration (that has been exceeded – expiration date was 10-1-22) and the City of Richmond has been provided with a formal deallocation letter from VDOT for these funds. Neither project has been scoped or advertised. VDOT is proposing this transfer to fully fund the recipient project so that the City of Richmond could potentially move forward with scoping and advertisement and avoid losing these federal funds.

While transfers are generally administrative, this request would increase the total TA allocation to Gillies Creek Greenway Phase 3 (UPC 113429). As the increase is under 10%, this transfer only requires approval from the TAC.

**POLICY CONSIDERATIONS:** In reviewing this request, TAC should consider the following guidance from the *Regional Funding Framework*.

- **Surplus Funds** – All surplus funds are returned to the TPO balance entry to be reallocated through the TPO selection and allocation process. Funds are deemed surplus upon project completion or cancellation.
- **Cost Overruns** – In general, cost overruns should be addressed through other funding sources available to the locality.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** RRTPO staff recognizes the value of these projects in connecting communities, advancing equitable transportation options, and expanding the reach of the Capital Trail; however, staff have concerns that these projects may not move forward in a timely manner even if the funds are transferred. The donor project was also selected in 2018 and has not moved forward to construction despite having a surplus of funds.

**TAC ACTION REQUESTED:** The following resolution is presented for TAC review and consideration:

***Resolved,*** that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) approves the transfer of \$36,902 of FY20 Transportation Alternatives (TA) program funds from Gillies Creek Greenway Phase 2 (UPC 113490) to Gillies Creek Greenway Phase 3 (UPC 113429).

## TAC AGENDA 10/11/22

### TAC Future Meeting Topics\*

#### **Future Meeting Topics**

- Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) 2023 Safety Targets - Aspirational Safety Performance Goals
- DRPT –Virginia Statewide Rail Plan
- Scenario Planning
- CVTA Project Prioritization Updates
- Transit Modernization Study Update

\*Draft: This is not a comprehensive list of considerations and is subject to change.