AGENDA

RICHMOND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION POLICY BOARD

Thursday, May 5, 2022
9:30 a.m.

PlanRVA James River Board Room

This meeting is open to the public. Members of the public are invited to attend in-person or virtually.

If you wish to participate in this meeting virtually, please register via Zoom at https://planrva.org.zoom.us/webinar/register/YN_BbNPTM6RS42_U2A7MIUCug.

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.

Call to Order (Williams)

Pledge of Allegiance (Williams)

Welcome and Introductions (Williams)

Certification of a Quorum (Firestone)

A. ADMINISTRATION

1. Consideration of Amendments to the Action Meeting Agenda (Williams)

2. Approval of April 7, 2022, RRTPO Policy Board Meeting Minutes - page 3 (Williams)
   Action requested: approval of minutes as presented

3. Open Public Comment Period (Williams/5 minutes)

4. RRTPO Chair’s Report (Williams/5 minutes)

5. RRTPO Secretary’s Report
(Parsons/5 minutes)

a. Current Work Efforts - page 8

b. RRTPO Work Status and Financial Report for March 2022 – page 10

c. Annual Meeting Update

B. NEW BUSINESS

1. BikePed 2045 – page 22
   (Jacocks/10 minutes)
   Action requested: motion to recommend RRTPO Policy Board adoption of BikePed2045

2. CMAQ Project Request – Chesterfield County – page 24
   (Busching/10 minutes)
   Action requested: motion to approve selection of the replacement projects for the CMAQ program.

3. FTA 5310 Application Endorsement – page 41
   (Lantz/10 minutes)
   Action requested: motion for endorsement of FTA 5310 applications

4. Proposed Amendment to Bylaws and Policy- Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization – page 43
   (Parsons/Gregory/ 10 minutes)
   Action requested: motion to approve bylaw amendments as presented.

C. AGENCY AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Transportation Agency Updates
   (VDOT, DRPT/10 minutes)
   a. VDOT – Mann
   b. DRPT – DeBruhl

D. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Future Meeting Topics – page 58
   (Williams/5 minutes)

2. RRTPO Member Comments
   (Williams/5 minutes)

3. Next Meeting: June 2, 2022
   (Williams)

E. ADJOURNMENT

CAP/jf

Attachments
RICHMOND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY BOARD

MEETING MINUTES
Thursday, April 7, 2022
9:30 a.m.

MEMBERS and ALTERNATES (A) PRESENT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of Ashland</th>
<th>Charles City County</th>
<th>Chesterfield County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John H. Hodges</td>
<td>William G. Coada</td>
<td>Kevin P. Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Barnhart (A)</td>
<td>Vacant (A)</td>
<td>James M. Holland (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Winslow (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leslie Haley (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goochland County</td>
<td>Hanover County</td>
<td>Henrico County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair Susan F. Lascolette</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Sean M. Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John L. Lumphkins Jr.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>W. Canova Peterson IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (A)</td>
<td>Faye O. Prichard (A)</td>
<td>Thomas Branin (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (A)</td>
<td>Vacant (A)</td>
<td>Vacant (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kent County</td>
<td>Powhatan County</td>
<td>City of Richmond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia A. Paige (virtual)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Chair David T. Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Thomas Tiller Jr.</td>
<td>Karin M. Carmack (virtual)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas W. Evelyn (A)</td>
<td>Vacant (A)</td>
<td>Stephanie A. Lynch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (A)</td>
<td>Vacant (A)</td>
<td>Cynthia I. Newbille (virtual) (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael J. Jones (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kristen Nye Larson (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen F. Robertson (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vacant (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region Airport Commission</td>
<td>GRTC Transit System</td>
<td>RIC Metropolitan Transp. Authority (RMTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B. Rutledge</td>
<td>Julie E. Timm</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant (A)</td>
<td>Sheryl Adams (A)</td>
<td>Vacant (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary of Trans. or Designee</td>
<td>CTAC</td>
<td>DRPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDOT, R. Shane Mann</td>
<td>Upton S. Martin (non-voting)</td>
<td>Jennifer B. DeBruhl (non-voting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDOT, Mark E. Riblett (A) (virtual)</td>
<td>Lisa M. Guthrie (A) (non-voting)</td>
<td>Tiffany T. Dubinsky (A) (non-voting) (virtual) (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)</td>
<td>Federal Transit Administration (FTA)</td>
<td>RideFinders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas L. Nelson Jr. (non-voting)</td>
<td>Daniel Koenig (Liason)</td>
<td>Von S. Tisdale (non-voting) (virtual) (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Duran (A) (non-voting)</td>
<td>Vacant (A)</td>
<td>Cherika N. Ruffin (A) (non-voting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA Dept. of Aviation (DOAV)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Clifford Burnette Jr. (non-voting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The technology used for the RRTPO Policy Board 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.

**CALL TO ORDER**
The Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) Policy Board Chair, David T. Williams, presided and called the April 7, 2022, RRTPO Policy Board action meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. in PlanRVA’s James River Board Room.

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**
Chair Williams welcomed all the attendees.

Chet Parsons, PlanRVA, announced that Tiffany Dubinsky is the new RRTPO representative for DRPT. Ms. Dubinsky addressed the board and thanked them for welcoming her.

**ATTENDANCE, ROLL CALL & CERTIFICATION OF MEETING QUORUM**
Janice Firestone, Program Coordinator, took attendance by roll call and certified that a quorum was present.

**A. ADMINISTRATION**

1. **Consideration of Amendments to the Meeting Agenda**
   There were no amendments to the meeting agenda. On motion duly made and seconded, the RRTPO Policy Board unanimously approved the April 7, 2022, agenda by roll call vote.

2. **Approval of the March 3, 2022, meeting minutes**
   On motion by Susan F. Lascolette, seconded by James M. Holland, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) Policy Board approved the minutes of the March 3, 2022, RRTPO meeting by roll call vote with Mr. Davis abstaining from the vote.

3. **Open Public Comment Period**
   There were no requests to address the RRTPO Policy Board.

4. **RRTPO Chair’s Report**
   Chair Williams asked Mr. Parsons to provide an update on efforts to extend an invitation to the Secretary of Transportation to attend a future TPO meeting. Mr. Parsons reported that staff has made every effort to extend the invitation. The Executive Committee recommended a formal letter be drafted inviting the Secretary to attend the meeting in June, which will be the joint meeting between the TPO, CVTA and PlanRVA. Chair Williams gave an explanation on the purpose of that joint meeting, which is to show how the three organizations work together.
5. RRTPO Secretary’s Report

a. Annual Meeting Update
   Mr. Parsons reported that staff will be working closely with TPO members and their staff to make sure the event is a success.

b. Current Work Efforts
   Mr. Parsons provided this report and offered to answer any questions.

c. RRTPO Work Status and Financial Reports for February 2022
   Mr. Parsons provided these reports and offered to answer any questions.

Dr. Newbille asked for an update and clarification on the Public Outreach and Equity Analysis. Mr. Parsons reported that staff efforts on a number of other work tasks can now be reported under public outreach and equity analysis. It has been added to the status report as a tool to track staff’s efforts to increase public outreach.

B. NEW BUSINESS

1. STBG/CMAQ Program Development FY23-28 Draft Allocations
   Myles Busching presented this request. Following the presentation board members had comments about considering design elements in bridges and the importance of including architectural details, etc. to make the structures more visually appealing. Including pedestrian and bike and bus infrastructure support (beyond just for cars).

   There was a discussion about the lack of new projects under STBG even though there is increased funding. Mr. Busching explained that inflation has played a large role in where the additional funds will go. The transition of several projects from a locally administered to VDOT administered has resulted in higher estimates. It was noted that one project’s estimated cost has tripled. Staff was asked to bring back recommendations to address the issues that have resulted in the increased estimates.

   Board members discussed changing the language that is used with respect to mobility. Terms such as transportation alternatives and road enhancements amenities can underserve citizens for which these are their primary mode of transportation. Mr. Parsons was asked to report back on how projects are scored on mobility and accessibility.

   Board members expressed further concern about project estimate increases on the CMAQ request. It was noted there have been past projects that the board has voted not to fully fund due to cost increases.

   Ms. Jordan left the meeting at approximately 10:40 a.m.

On motion by Christopher Winslow, seconded by Julie E. Timm, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) Policy Board approved the following resolution by roll call vote (see Appendix A).
Resolved, that the RRTPO selects the following new projects for the regional CMAQ program:

- Signal System Retiming Improvements – Richmond
- Alverser Dr/Old Buckingham Rd Roundabout – Chesterfield
- Creighton Rd/Creighton Pkwy & Walnut Grove Rd Roundabout – Hanover; and

Further Resolved, that the RRTPO approves the allocation plans for FY23 – FY28 STBG and CMAQ funds as presented; and,

Finally Resolved, that the RRTPO approves the transfer of previous funds included in the allocation plans and directs staff to take the necessary steps to complete these transfers.

2. RAISE Grant Letters of Support

Mr. Parsons presented the request for the TPO’s support of the RAISE Grant letters for Henrico County and the City of Richmond. Board members had questions about the Scott Road bridge, which is replacing a current vehicle bridge with a bridge that is just for bikes and pedestrians. A new vehicle bridge will be built at a later date.

On motion by John L. Lumpkins Jr., seconded by W. Canova Peterson, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) Policy Board approved letters of support for Henrico County and the City of Richmond by roll call vote (see Appendix A).

3. Richmond Regional Transportation Safety Plan

Mr. Parsons reported that the plan is posted on the TPO meeting page. The document will be useful to jurisdictions looking at safety issues as it addresses safety from a regional perspective. Additional mapping online and datasets will be posted.

Mr. Hodges expressed concerns that the plan does not include railway/highway intersection safety concerns. He noted one such intersection in the Town of Ashland that is located near a school and fire station. He asked that staff look into how these intersections can be included in the plan. It was suggested the plan be reviewed after the first year, rather than the proposed review after three to five years.

On motion by John H, Hodges, seconded by Frank J. Thornton, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) Policy Board adopted the Richmond Regional Transportation Safety Plan with the request that the Transportation Safety Plan Committee and the jurisdictions review and consider amendments to address safety and railroad intersection concerns, referencing the DC to RVA EIS Safety Benefits, VDOT Rail Grade Crossing Action Plan and the CSX 2017 Reported Safety Recommendations, within a year by roll call vote.
4. Proposed Amendment to Bylaws and Policy - Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

Mr. Parsons explained the proposed amendments to the bylaws and the policy document. There was a discussion about the need to have a two-thirds majority present for action on a bylaws change. Greta Ryan, PlanRVA, certified that the two-thirds majority was present.

Mr. Winslow left the meeting at approximately 11:00 a.m.

On motion by John L. Lumpkins Jr., seconded by Cynthia I. Newbille, the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) Policy Board approved the bylaws amendment as proposed roll call vote (see Appendix A).

B. AGENCY AND COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Transportation Agency Updates
   a. Shane Mann, VDOT, provided an update on VDOT agency activity. A copy of the update is available on the TPO meeting web page.

   b. Tiffany Dubinsky, DRPT, provided an update on DRPT agency activity. A copy of the update is available on the TPO meeting web page.

C. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Future Meeting Topics
   There were no additional meeting topics suggested by members.

2. RRTPO Member Comments
   Mr. Holland commented on the Chesterfield Board of Supervisors' adoption of the County budget and reduced the vehicle registration fee for Chesterfield County residents.

3. Next RRTPO Policy Board Meeting
   The next action meeting will be held on Thursday, May 5, 2022, beginning at 9:30 a.m., in the James River Board Room at PlanRVA, Richmond, Virginia.

D. ADJOURNMENT:
   Chair Williams adjourned the meeting at approximately 11:14 a.m.
Current Work Efforts Update – Item A.-5.-b.

**Active Transportation Work Group (ATWG)**

The ATWG will be an important driver for implementation of the BikePedRVA Plan. In addition to the regular quarterly meetings which will start again in June upon review/approval of BikePedRVA 2045 plan, staff continues to work with partners to advance the goals of Active Transportation in the region:

Henrico County’s ATWG to develop the bicycle and pedestrian chapter of the county’s comprehensive plan. Committee continues to submit comments on related planning efforts by Henrico staff.

East Coast Greenway Alliance (ECG) on potential designations of segments of the future route of the trail through the Richmond region. ECG has hired a new Virginia coordinator, Elliot Caldwell. PlanRVA staff met with Elliot last week to brief him on Virginia and Richmond area ECG projects.

**Ashland Trolley Line Trail Study**

PlanRVA staff continues working with Ursula Lemanski and Mallory Zink, NPS public historian and a history team of experts from Ashland, Hanover, and Henrico counties on concepts that will depict the trolley line’s former role (ca. 1907-1938) and community connections. Concepts include interpretative signage that can supplement 3 signs already being installed in Ashland, audio stories via app tied to different segments of the trail as it developed, and way-finding signage or mapping that will take trail users to adjacent sites of community interest. We are planning another meeting/site visit in June with NPS and local history team. Two story maps for the project illustrate the importance and potential for the 14-mile Trolley Line Trail, now a segment of the Fall Line, and includes [history of the trolley line](#) and a [design sketchbook](#).

**Central Virginia Transportation Authority**

Continued staff support for the daily function of the Authority. Supported meetings of the Finance Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, Fall Line Working Group and jurisdiction legal counsel. Specific administrative work tasks included meeting administration and coordination, continued review of FY23 to FY26 Regional Fund Projects applications, presenting overview of requests, timeline updates, funding scenario options to the Authority, which approved the revised regional funding projections from FY23 to FY26 for the purposes of establishing a 6-year funding plan and authorized the FY23 to FY26 draft funding scenario public hearing to be held April 29, 2022, following a 15-day public comment period from April 13, 2022, until April 28, 2022.

**Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Update**

The public review of DRAFT of the *BikePedRVA 2045* plan is complete and input incorporated into the review copy of the plan. The Bike Ped PlanRVA team continues to meet with the community, including Mr. Thornton’s constituent meeting for the Fairfield District of Henrico on April 18. This will be the first major update since the 2004 Richmond Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. It represents a more robust digital plan hosted on the website which includes the plan document, story map, ArcGIS map layers, and other resources which will be frequently updated to guide planning, design, and implementation of the plan. PlanRVA staff to work closely with partner agencies and localities. The Complete Streets toolbox or illustrated [story map](#) continues to be updated as one resource intended to implement *BikePedRVA 2045*. The schedule calls for the plan to be considered for adoption by the TPO on May 5, 2022.
Scenario Planning
Staff, through various in-house meetings finalized the scope of work for an executable scenario planning process design/tool for PlanRVA and is working on the draft Request for Proposal (RFP) for consultant services required for scenario planning. The RFP is scheduled to be advertised by early May.

Long Range Transportation Plan
Staff participated in the Eno Transportation Foundation webinar, “A Debrief on the Omnibus Appropriations Package”.

Public Transportation Services

Reviewed and provided comments on the Scopes of Work for the GRTC BRT Expansion Study and Engagement Plan.

Participated in the RVA Transit Talk panel discussion, “Transit Governance for Dummies.”

Elderly and Disabled Outreach
Participated in the Richmond History Makers Celebration at Virginia Union University. Senior Connections was recognized for its work to improve regional transportation
Met with the Chickahominy Health District to answer questions concerning health-related needs in the region and the intersection of health and transportation.
Participated in quarterly meeting of the longevity project.
Reviewed and provided suggested edits on a draft Senior Connections transportation survey.

Regional Housing
Staff participated in the following meetings and webinars: Virginia Housing monthly virtual discussion, Housing and Services Resource Center webinar, “State and Local Partnerships for Housing stability”, Better Together presentation, video call with representatives of Partnership for Housing Affordability concerning the regional housing grant and a meeting with representatives of Virginia Housing, Goochland Habitat, and Partnership for Housing Affordability.
Work Program Status Report
March 2022
The RRTPO Work Program Progress Report provides a short summary of each activity for the month of March 2022. Please reference the FY 2022 UPWP (amended 3-3-22) for details concerning the approved budget and work description for each task. Table 1 identifies all the tasks in the UPWP and the associated budget.

Table 1 summarizes overall federal and local revenues budgeted by PlanRVA in FY 2022 to support the work of RRTP. Federal funds budgeted constitute 80 percent of the total; State and local matching funds constitute 20 percent, unless otherwise noted.

### TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF FY 2022 RRTPO UPWP BUDGET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Task</th>
<th>RRTPO Budget</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>OTHER (1)</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL Approved</td>
<td>5303 Approved</td>
<td>CO 5303 Approved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7110 MPO Prog Mgmt.</td>
<td>$128,885</td>
<td>$32,221</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$161,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7120 UPWP Budget &amp; Contracts</td>
<td>$32,314</td>
<td>$8,079</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$40,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7210 Public Outreach/Equity Analysis</td>
<td>$156,090</td>
<td>$66,896</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$222,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7315 Scenario Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$243,550</td>
<td>$243,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7230 Special Planning Efforts</td>
<td>$51,472</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$51,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7235 Contingency Funding</td>
<td>$84,749</td>
<td>$18,970</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$103,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7310 Long Range Transp Plan</td>
<td>$188,088</td>
<td>$52,921</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$241,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7320 Travel Demand Model</td>
<td>$119,756</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$119,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7330 Transit</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$239,087</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$239,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7340 Act Transp-Bike/Ped</td>
<td>$254,338</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$254,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7350 System Resiliency</td>
<td>$130,051</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$130,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7410 Perf Based Transp Planning</td>
<td>$192,149</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$192,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7420 Financial Prog/TIP</td>
<td>$264,070</td>
<td>$57,967</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$322,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7430 Rail &amp; Freight</td>
<td>$37,746</td>
<td>$9,437</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$47,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ($)</td>
<td>$1,639,708</td>
<td>$485,578</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$693,550</td>
<td>$2,818,836</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 7310 funds are direct carryover from FY21, 7315 and 7320 funds are RSTBG funds for travel demand model development.
Program Management

| 7100 Program Management | BUDGET $201,499 | Billed this month $17,454 | Total Funds Expended $126,390 | % Total Funds Expended 63% | UPWP Page 11 |

- Developed agenda packages for meetings of the RRTPO Executive Committee, Policy Board, two Technical Advisory Committee, two Transportation Forum Working Group and Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and CTAC Membership sub-committee.
- Participated in meetings of the RRTPO Executive Committee, Policy Board, two Technical Advisory Committee, two Transportation Forum Working Group and a Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and CTAC Membership sub-committee.
- Met virtually with CTAC Chair Upton Martin on March 1 to review the agenda for the March 17 meeting. Finalized the agenda based on the meeting discussion. Assisted with the March 17 virtual CTAC meeting and prepared a staff report for inclusion in the TAC and TPO agenda packages.
- Observed the March 3 TPO meeting. Principle meeting topics included amendments to the TPO bylaws and policy to permit members to participate in meetings via electronic communications; approval of Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside projects; approval of regional Smart Scale applications; and a report from the Fall Line Trail Working Group.
- Observed the March 4 virtual meeting of the Tri-Cities TAC. Principle meeting topics included recommendation of Policy Committee approval of draft FY23-28 RSTP/CMAQ allocations; recommendations for submission of up to five SMART SCALE applications; approval of a request for carryover of FY22 PL funds; and report on comments received on Plan2045.
- Observed the March 8 virtual meeting of the RRTPO Technical Advisory Committee. The primary meeting topic was the presentation and adoption of the regional transportation safety plan.
- Participated in the March 8 tornado readiness drill. Followed up by providing staff with links to a National Weather Service severe weather fact sheet and instructions on how to add a tornado alert to a smartphone
- Participated in the March 8 Mindful March Coffee Break. The presentation included a video on guided meditation and an exercise on meditation
- On March 14, forwarded to the members of the CTAC Membership Committee a list of individuals and organizations that may be potential candidates for an expanded CTAC membership. Also provided a summary of responses received from other MPO’s in the state concerning the membership of their advisory committees.
- Participated in the March 17 virtual meeting of the CTAC Membership Committee. The meeting included a discussion of potential additional members for CTAC as well as next steps for adding new members to the Committee. On March 24 prepared a letter of invitation for prospective CTAC members representing the city of Richmond Office of Transit Equitable Transit and Mobility,
RVA Rapid Transit, New Virginia Majority, Virginia Navigator, and Senior Connections.

- On March 17 spoke with Brian Hayes of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments concerning the make-up of his organization's citizens' advisory committee. Added this information to the summary of other Virginia MPOs advisory committees’ practices.
- Reviewed and provided comments of two TPO funding fact sheets.
- Observed the March 21 virtual TAC meeting. The primary topic was a discussion and approval of the FY23-28 STBG and CMAQ allocations new projects, and in particular the funding of new projects and those with cost increases.
- Participated in the March 24 presentation “Fifteen Minutes of Grace” featuring Sheila Battle. In her presentation Ms. Battle spoke of the importance of mindfulness and mood stability. She also presented the following dimensions of wellness, which are drawn from the expression “Please stop and be glad”; physical health, lean inward, eat healthy, avoid mind altering substances, sleep well, exercise, stop and tell yourself, take a break and notice your breathing, observe, plan and proceed skillfully, express gratitude, learn, be mindful of accomplishments, and allow yourself to be delighted.
- Participated in the March 24 meeting of the internal safety team. Among the topics discussed were new workplace COVID-19 regulations, precautions and suggestions for holding in-person meetings, offering training on CPR and the use of the AED, and developing new safety procedures and practice for the new PlanRVA office space.
- Participated in the March 25 virtual VAMPO Peer Exchange and prepared a summary of the major discussion topics. Followed up by sending to convener Ann Cundy of the Central Shenandoah PDC the PlanRVA bylaws and non-binding governance documents regarding MPO voting membership.
- Participated in the March 27 virtual staff meeting. The primary topic was a presentation by Robin Mack of Telework Virginia, “Employee Training for Hybrid and Remote Work.” Among the topics covered were the benefits, considerations, challenges, and traits of workplace remote work policies, suggestions for creating a productive remote work environment, and etiquette tips for remote workers.
- Participated in the March 28 virtual meeting of the Office Space Planning Team. Among the topics discussed were the current status of the office layout plans; ideas for furnishings, floor coverings, and window treatments; and office access and security measures.
- Participated in the March 29 virtual fire extinguisher training. In addition to a brief discussion on fire safety, the training provided an opportunity to practice the steps involved in using an extinguisher to put out a simulated fire.
- On March 30 contacted Julie Timm of GRTC and Tiffany Dubinski of VDRPT concerning their availability to provide presentations at the May 19 CTAC meeting.
## Public Outreach & Equity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7210</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Billed this month</th>
<th>Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>% Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>UPWP Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach &amp; Equity Analysis</td>
<td>$222,986</td>
<td>$22,438</td>
<td>$135,316</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Continued with BikePedRVA 2045 public engagement and stakeholder outreach meetings. March meetings included: Richmond Office of Immigrant and Refugee Engagement, Partnership for Smarter Growth, Hanover County Board of Supervisors, Chesterfield County, Ashland Town Council, CTAC Meeting, and Bike Walk RVA.
- Continued editing and compiling feedback for BikePedRVA 2045 draft plan.
- Social media planning to promote BikePedRVA 2045 public comment period.
- Drafted community engagement report for BikePedRVA 2045 draft plan.

## Special Planning Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7220</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Billed this month</th>
<th>Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>% Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>UPWP Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Planning Efforts</td>
<td>$51,472</td>
<td>$4,204</td>
<td>$33,918</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Data requests from planning partners and peer agencies.
- Continued coordination with the Community Foundation, GRTC, RMTA, GRP, ChamberRVA and RRT on their initiatives and areas of overlap with our agencies.
- Continued coordinated with local staff, elected officials, and congressional representatives.

## Contingency Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7230</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Billed this month</th>
<th>Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>% Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>UPWP Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Funding</td>
<td>$103,719</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No funds expended this period.
Scenario Planning
• Participated in the internal staff meetings to discuss the scenario planning process.
• Finalized the scope of work for an executable scenario planning process design/tool for PlanRVA.
• Worked on the draft Request for Proposal (RFP) for consultant services required for scenario planning.
• Explored open-source existing tools/models to develop an in-house tool to create a Synthetic Population for the Richmond region.

External Transportation Study Meetings
• Attended the Powhite Parkway Extension Traffic Working Group Meeting via Zoom on March 17.

Travel Demand Model (RTDM)
• Worked to develop a framework to develop Interim Years in the RTC Model. The first set of Interim Years would be 2027, 2030, 2033, 2035 and 2039.

Transit
• Participated in the March 1 Eno Transportation Foundation “EV Charging Networks.” Among the topics discussed were the federal goals, mandates and funding for electric vehicle charging infrastructure; state electric vehicle planning efforts; data needs for planning for electric vehicles; and the elements of the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program.
• Observed the March 9 meeting of the CVTA Finance Committee. Among the topics discussed were regional funding levels for FY23-FY26; approval of a contract for financial advisory services; and approval of a public hearing for the draft FY23 administrative and operating expenses budget.
• Participated in the March 9 TRB webinar “Micromobility and Transit: Keys to Successful Collaboration.” Among the topics discussed were how does micromobility impact transit use and operation; key areas of local regulation of micromobility; and the role of transit agencies in partnering with and integrating micromobility services with public transit.

• Observed the March 11 meeting of the VDRPT Transit Services Delivery Advisory Committee (TSDAC). Primary meeting topics included a federal legislative update and the impacts of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act on transportation funding; a review of transportation-related legislature from the 2022 session of the General Assembly; a presentation of the 2022 TSDAC Work plan; a presentation by a JLARC representative on transportation and infrastructure; and a review of the findings and recommendations of the Transit and Equity and Modernization Study.

• Observed the March 14 virtual meeting of the CVTA Technical Advisory Committee. Primary meeting topics included the regional project prioritization process; FY21 annual certification; FY23 expenditure plans; and several actions related to the development of plans and funding for the Fall Line Trail.

• Observed the March 15 meeting of the GRTC Board of Directors and prepared a summary of the primary discussion points.

• Reviewed and provided comments on the Scopes of Work for the GRTC BRT Expansion Study and Engagement Plan.

• Participated in the March 18 Smart Mobility Connection-Traffic 21 webinar, “Self-Driving Technology and Trust-Can a Driving Simulator Help?” The webinar featured an overview of current research that is underway to evaluate the extent to which use of driving simulators may contribute to increasing individual’s trust of autonomous vehicles. The research is being conducted in three steps: (1) integrating a simulator with virtual reality; (2) integrating technology in an actual vehicle; and (3) a mixed reality. Potential deployment scenarios for the simulators include driving schools, auto dealerships, community centers, and rehabilitation centers.

• Observed the March 25 meeting of the Central Virginia Transportation Authority. Primary meeting topics included introduction of a financial advisory services provider, amendments to the FY22 administrative and operating expense budget, authorization of a public hearing for the FY23 administrative and operating expense budget, and approval of several actions related planning and development of the Fall Line Trail.

• Participated in the March 31 Optibus webinar, “Public Transportation in 2022: How to Adapt to Changing Paradigms and Priorities.” The webinar featured a panel discussion on managing driver shortages, responding to changes in ridership, and moving to zero-emissions (electric) bus fleets.

• Participated in the March 31 RVA Transit Talk panel discussion, “Transit Governance for Dummies.” The panel featured Julie Timm and Ben Campbell of GRTC and Hampton Roads Transit CEO William Harrell, and included a discussion of the implications of the expansion of the GRTC Board of Directors, the availability of dedicated funding streams, and the impacts of proposed state gas tax reductions on public transit services.

• Reviewed the following documents:
  - “A Planner’s Guide to the Shared Mobility Galaxy”
**Elderly and disabled**

- Participated in the March 8 Richmond History Makers Celebration at Virginia Union University. Senior Connections was recognized for its work to improve regional transportation.
- Met virtually with Emily Hines of the Chickahominy Health District on March 14 to answer questions concerning health-related needs in the region and the intersection of health and transportation. Followed up by providing links to documents such as the Coordinated Human Service Mobility Plan and ConnectRVA 2045 and contact information for selected individuals.
- Participated in the March 23 virtual quarterly meeting of the longevity project. In addition to a review of 2021 accomplishments and 2022 plans, the meeting included a discussion with new Senior Connections Executive Director Amy Strite concerning her agency’s vision and goals and approaches to supporting the needs of the region’s seniors.
- On March 29 reviewed and provided suggested edits on a draft Senior Connections transportation survey.
- Reviewed the following documents:
  - Will Ride-Hailing Enhance Mobility for Older Adults? A California Survey

### Active Transportation: Bicycle and Pedestrian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7340</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Billed this month</th>
<th>Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>% Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>UPWP Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Transportation</td>
<td>$254,338</td>
<td>$25,711</td>
<td>$176,383</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Active Transportation Work Group**

- Staff continues to work with Henrico staff on the County’s ATWG and efforts to develop the bicycle and pedestrian chapter of the county’s comprehensive plan.
- Staff continued to work with Virginia Department of Health and their Complete Streets work group.

**East Coast Greenway**

- PlanRVA staff is assisting the new Virginia coordinator for the East Coast Greenway Alliance (ECG) to plan for a Virginia summit in April.
- Work continues with ECG on updates to designated sections of the trail the Richmond region and to help track funding grants for improvements to sections of the trail.

**Richmond Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan**

- Public comment period closed on March 23. Staff continues to work with AvidCore consultants to produce the document for the draft plan and will continue to make updates and corrections.
- Staff continues to schedule in-person and virtual presentations of the draft plan with advocacy and community groups and with local government meetings.
- Staff continues to consult with regional partners to make additions and revise the interactive GIS story map data collected for the draft plan.
As part of the Bike/Ped plan, staff continues to develop and revise the regional plan story map. The map and data have been presented to the steering committee and staff will continue to revise.

**Town of Ashland Pilot Project and Regional Guidance for Complete Streets**

- Complete streets guidelines, or a “tool-box” of resources, depicted through graphic and photographic examples to serve as implementation support for the regional bike/ped plan. The illustrated story map is available for review and continues to be updated in conjunction with the bike ped plan update.

**Fall Line (formerly Ashland to Petersburg Trail)**

- The project coordinator (Ursula Lemanski) and historian (Mallory Zink) from the National Park Service (NPS) Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance (RTCA) has been working on follow-up meetings and planning coordination with NPS staff. These efforts have led to the development of design mockups and phasing plans for potential historical markers and wayfinding. This assistance has been extended by the NPS.

### Systems Resilience Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7350</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Billed this month</th>
<th>Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>% Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>UPWP Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systems Resil. Plan</td>
<td>$130,051</td>
<td>$14,113</td>
<td>$43,882</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Continued Coordination with coastal program initiatives, and hazard mitigation plan effort, including data mapping and overlap in programs among the eastern counties in the MPO study area.
- Coordination through participation of the transportation work group for the RVA Green 2050 plan being prepared by the City of Richmond Office of Sustainability.
- Internal staff coordination of next steps for development of performance data and tracking of resilience metrics. Discussion included integration of scenario planning effort into program, best practices from peer agencies, and research on methodologies for operationalizing resilience such as GHG inventories and network redundancy.
- Worked with recruitment team to solicit, evaluate, and interview candidates for the Resilience Planner position

### Performance Based Transportation Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7410</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Billed this month</th>
<th>Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>% Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>UPWP Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perf. Based Transp. Planning.</td>
<td>$192,149</td>
<td>$11,190</td>
<td>$53,346</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal Performance Measures:
- Attended a FHWA NPMRDS webinar
- Attended a CTTP Software interactive training.
- Attended a Complete Streets webinar.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7420</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Billed this month</th>
<th>Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>% Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>UPWP Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIP</td>
<td>$322,037</td>
<td>$37,940</td>
<td>$243,073</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maintenance:
- Placed the updated tracking sheets with STBG fund ($88,857) transfers from the TPO Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Charles City Rt 155 shared-use path project (#97688) on the PlanRVA web site on 3/14/22.
- On 3/14/22, completed STBG transfers from TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) funds ($3,253,118 = Previous $926,502 + FY23 $1,309,898 + FY24 $1,016,718) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958) and placed transfer tracking sheets on the PlanRVA web site as follows:
  - Shifted $315,981 ($86,828 + $19,189 + $209,964) FY04 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
  - Shifted $53,023 ($18,746 + $34,277) FY03 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
  - Shifted $1,026 FY00 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
  - Shifted $1,000 FY05 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
  - Shifted $276,975 FY01 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
  - Shifted $1,034 FY09 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
  - Shifted $3,913 FY11 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
  - Shifted $71 FY08 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
  - Shifted $214,363 FY10 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
  - Shifted $54,341 FY13 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
  - Shifted $4,613 FY15 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
  - Shifted $69 FY16 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
Shifted $93 FY17 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
Shifted $1,309,898 FY23 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).
Shifted $1,016,718 FY24 STBG funds from the TPO STBG Balance Entry Account (#70721) to the Richmond Commerce Road improvement project (#15958).

Received a TIP adjustment request from VDOT on 3/23/22 for the following project:
UPC 113832: Richmond Marine Terminal (RMT) gate improvements & new drop-off lot---Port of Richmond.

After receiving concurrence from RMT, TIP adjustment documents were prepared and submitted to VDOT on 3/28/22.

Received two TIP adjustment requests from VDOT on 3/24 and 3/28/22 for the following projects:
UPC 103393: Ashland Trolley Line Trail—Town of Ashland
UPC 104889: Route 10 Widening from Whitepine Road to Frith Lane---Chesterfield County
UPC 13551: Route 360 Widening from 0.61 mile west of Route 643 (Lee Davis Rd) to 0.19 mile east of Route 643---Hanover County
UPC 97565: I-64 Replace Bridge over Route 156---Henrico County
UPC 93087: Route 195 Bridge Repair over Route 76---City of Richmond
UPC 109988: Route 715 (Beaver Dam Rd) Bridge only over Newfound River---Hanover County

After receiving local concurrences, TIP adjustments will be conducted.

Received a TIP amendment request from VDOT for the following project on 3/31/22. After receiving concurrence from a Richmond staff, TIP amendment documents will be prepared for TAC discussion and recommendation to TPO.

UPC 118148: Richmond Signal System-Phase IV --- City of Richmond.

### Rail, Freight, Intermodal Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPWP Page</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>Billed this month</th>
<th>Total Funds Expended</th>
<th>% Total Funds Expended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rail, Freight, Interim. Planning.</td>
<td>$47,183</td>
<td>$10,951</td>
<td>$17,607</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staples Mill Road Station Advance Planning and Design Study**

No new update—but the background for this soon-to-be launched VDOT study remains:

- DRPT and their consultant are in the final stage of completing 30% design documents for the replacement of the Staples Mill Amtrak Station. The final
- Staples Mill Road Station Area Transit-Oriented Development Concept Plan recommended a corridor working group be formed that consists of Henrico, VDOT, DRPT, and PlanRVA to guide the VDOT sub-area plan and more detailed traffic studies of Staples Mill Road to improve both multimodal access to the station and usher in a more supportive land use pattern within the corridor.
The working group is being formed by VDOT for the next stage of the sub-area plan.

RRTPO Freight Planning Program
• Outreach to the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIPi), Port of Virginia (POV) and Hampton Roads TPO to know the requirements of freight planning at the MPO level and the best practices to implement.
• Reviewed various proprietary data like Replica and Transearch to explore freight-related data.
• Worked to develop a detailed scope of work for Freight Planning Program in the MPO and related multi-year tasks and deliverables.
REQUESTED ACTION: Motion to recommend RRTPO Policy Board adoption of the Richmond Regional Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan (BikePedRVA 2045).

BACKGROUND: The 2017 Federal Certification Report recommended an update of the 2004 Richmond Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. The FY19 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) responded by calling for the establishment of a RRTPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Work Group to “expand the network and opportunities of bicycling and walking as a core component of the transportation network, including regional discussion on Complete Streets policies and implementation strategies”. The FY20 UPWP called for the work effort for the BP Plan update to begin and subsequent work programs reinforced the importance of this plan update.

A steering committee made up of local, state, regional, and advocacy representatives was formed in January 2020 to guide the Bike Ped Plan update to be performed in-house concurrent with the Long-Range Transportation Plan (ConnectRVA 2045) update. Active engagement through the steering committee, the Active Transportation Work Group, with individual localities and virtual public meetings for the long-range plan largely guided this work effort up to the adoption of ConnectRVA 2045 in October 2021.

PlanRVA staff continued work on the BikePedRVA plan as a separate element and shared a draft with the steering committee on February 2, 2022 as the basis for extended public review through the BikePedRVA web site. The RRTPO policy board set official public review of the document from February 9-March 23, 2022. To supplement the mostly virtual opportunities during COVID, the team identified over 60 stakeholders and individuals for outreach and was able to meet with 20 including the following: Virginia Community Voice/Greening Team, Rivers Friends groups, Black Girls Do Bike, Hollybrook Apartments at St. Joseph’s Villa, Partnership for Smarter Growth, City Office of Immigrant and Refugees, BikeWalk RVA, and other advocacy groups. Presentations were also made to the boards of New Kent and Charles City counties, and Ashland Town Council. PlanRVA staff also featured highlights of the plan as part of Mr. Thornton’s Fairfield Constituent meeting on April 18, 2022.

Review of the DRAFT plan garnered 309 public comments from 32 distinct commenters. Thirty-eight total surveys about the DRAFT plan were submitted. The proposed BikePedRVA 2045 plan reflects these public comments and those received during stakeholder meetings. More extensive public engagement provided the opportunity to establish good lines of communication with more diverse representatives of the region’s population with an emphasis on equity and
access through active transportation. The draft plan is only one element of the on-going work of PlanRVA which will provide updated and accessible resources for implementation. The full extent of these resources is available through the Story Map https://arcg.is/LTTnL.

The purpose of the presentation today is to provide an executive level summary of the project, including the Community Engagement Report, key recommendations for plan implementation, and provide an opportunity for RRTPO Policy Board members to ask questions.

**TAC RECOMMENDATION:** The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the proposed resolution at their April 12 meeting. TAC recommends approval of the resolution as presented.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff agrees with the TAC recommendation.

**WHEREAS,** the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization Policy Board acknowledges the critical importance of alternative transportation modes for safe and equitable regional growth and development, and

**WHEREAS,** a well-planned and connected active transportation network represented by BikePedRVA 2045 and ConnectRVA 2045 will provide an essential resource for stakeholders and decision-makers to implement infrastructure priorities, and

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,** that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization Policy Board adopts BikePedRVA 2045.
CMAQ PROJECT REQUEST - CHESTERFIELD

Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization

REQUESTED ACTION: Review the request from Chesterfield County to swap the selected Alverser Dr/Old Buckingham Rd Roundabout CMAQ project for two higher ranked CMAQ projects.

BACKGROUND: Prioritizing and selecting 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). This process usually takes place from October to April each fiscal year. The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) program is a source of funding dedicated to projects that improve air quality in the region.

At the April policy board meeting, the policy board reviewed the draft allocations plans and approved the draft allocations and project selections for the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funding and CMAQ programs. One of the new CMAQ projects is the Alverser Dr/Old Buckingham Rd Roundabout in Chesterfield County.

The county has recently been made aware that this project was also successful in the Revenue Sharing program and is effectively double funded. To avoid losing the revenue sharing funds, Chesterfield County has requested this project be removed from the CMAQ program and the funding be applied to the two highest ranked CMAQ project which are unfunded.

The project ranking table is included as Attachment A to this staff report. Both projects are also located in Chesterfield County and have a slightly lower combined estimate relative to the original roundabout.

ALTERNATE PROJECTS: The two alternate projects are (A) Lewis Rd at Rte 10 Left Turn Lane and (B) Woodlake Village Pkwy at 360 Triple Lefts. Both projects are higher ranked in the CMAQ program than the originally selected Alverser roundabout. Lewis Rd was included in the STBG program presented to TAC in March but was removed to address the existing project deficits as requested by the TAC. The Woodlake Village Pkwy project was included in early drafts of the STBG program but ultimately skipped due to funding constraints and for regional balance. The applications and sketches for each project are included in Attachment B.

REVISED ALLOCATIONS: A revised allocation plan with the new projects is included as Attachment C for consideration. The proposed swap only uses the funding from the roundabout project to fund these alternate projects. All other projects remain funded as originally presented.
**TAC RECOMMENDATION:** TAC has reviewed this request and recommends approval as presented.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff supports the TAC recommendation.

**TAC REQUESTED ACTION:** The following resolution is recommended for RRTPO policy board approval:

Resolved, that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) removes the following projects from the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program:

- Alverser Dr/Old Buckingham Rd Roundabout – Chesterfield

Further Resolved, that the RRTPO selects the following replacement projects for the CMAQ program:

- Lewis Rd at Rte 10 Left Turn Lane - Chesterfield
- Woodlake Village Pkwy at 360 Triple Lefts - Chesterfield

Finally Resolved, that the RRTPO approves the revised CMAQ allocations plan as presented.

**Attachments**

A – Project Ranking Summary  
B – Alternate Project Applications and Sketches  
C – Revised Allocations Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project_ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Safety Score</th>
<th>Mobility Score</th>
<th>Accessibility Score</th>
<th>Economic Development Score</th>
<th>Land Use / Environment Score</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Cost (FY23 $)</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>STBG Rank</th>
<th>CMAQ Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY23-01</td>
<td>Hull street Project Phase II from Chippenham Parkway to Hey Rd</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>$ 9,950,000</td>
<td>35.37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-02</td>
<td>D Richmond Signal System - Phase VI</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>29.81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-04</td>
<td>Whitehead Road Improvements</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>$ 12,000,000</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-05</td>
<td>F Richmond Signal System Retiming Improvements</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>88.65</td>
<td>$ 1,713,425</td>
<td>517.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-06</td>
<td>GRTC 1: Richmond Signal System Phase V Transit Signal Priority Emergency Vehicle Preemption Connected Autonomous Vehicle - Traffic Signal Controller Upgrade</td>
<td>GRTC</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>$ 9,088,920</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-07</td>
<td>C Hull Street Shared Use Path Extension to James River Branch Trail</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>$ 3,352,000</td>
<td>48.73</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-08</td>
<td>Billey Road Improvement</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>8.23</td>
<td>$ 4,495,375</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-09</td>
<td>Hey Road Improvement</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>13.95</td>
<td>$ 7,712,091</td>
<td>18.08</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-10</td>
<td>Alverser Drive/Old Buckingham Road Roundabout</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>33.94</td>
<td>$ 4,260,749</td>
<td>79.65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-11</td>
<td>Route 1 at Route 10 Bike and Ped Improvements</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>$ 4,150,000</td>
<td>16.38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-12</td>
<td>Route 360 at Turner Road Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>15.73</td>
<td>$ 2,766,800</td>
<td>56.85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-13</td>
<td>RT 60 (Ruthers Rd - Providence Rd) Bike &amp; Ped Improvements</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>$ 6,946,000</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-14</td>
<td>Lewis Road at Route 10 Dual-Left Turn Lanes</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>25.44</td>
<td>$ 1,198,825</td>
<td>212.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-15</td>
<td>Busy Street Extended</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>12.51</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td>$ 2,503,000</td>
<td>105.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-16</td>
<td>Route 360/Courthouse Road R-Cut</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>30.22</td>
<td>$ 4,522,191</td>
<td>66.83</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-17</td>
<td>Creighton Rd/Creighton Pkwy &amp; Walnut Grove Rd Roundabout</td>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>32.01</td>
<td>$ 3,707,173</td>
<td>86.36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-18</td>
<td>Atlee Station Rd Widening (Phase 3)</td>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>25.14</td>
<td>$ 10,000,000</td>
<td>25.14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-19</td>
<td>U.S. Route 60 at Holy Hills Road: Eastbound Right-Turn Lane</td>
<td>Powhatan</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>29.13</td>
<td>$ 1,822,778</td>
<td>159.84</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-20</td>
<td>U.S. Route 60 at Stavemill Road: Westbound Left-Turn Lane</td>
<td>Powhatan</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>25.88</td>
<td>$ 2,011,756</td>
<td>128.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-21</td>
<td>Carter Gallier Boulevard Extension: Phase II</td>
<td>Powhatan</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>28.05</td>
<td>$ 10,567,151</td>
<td>26.54</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-22</td>
<td>Hill Carter Parkway Extension</td>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>12.89</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td>32.38</td>
<td>$ 9,198,119</td>
<td>35.20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-23</td>
<td>Vaughan Road/Archie Cannon Grade Separated Crossing</td>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>15.57</td>
<td>$ 1,784,250</td>
<td>87.24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-24</td>
<td>I-64 / Ashland Road DDI</td>
<td>Goochland</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>$ 15,005,840</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-25</td>
<td>Vaughan Road Extended</td>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>$ 6,565,000</td>
<td>51.79</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-26</td>
<td>Route 360 at Brad McNeer Parkway - CGT</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>27.76</td>
<td>$ 6,038,400</td>
<td>45.97</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-27</td>
<td>Belmont Road at Cogbill Road Roundabout</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>33.31</td>
<td>$ 4,866,424</td>
<td>68.16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-28</td>
<td>RT 360/Woodlake Village Parkway - Turn Lane Improvements</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>24.95</td>
<td>$ 2,785,000</td>
<td>89.58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project_ID</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Safety Score</td>
<td>Mobility Score</td>
<td>Accessibility Score</td>
<td>Economic Development Score</td>
<td>Land Use / Environment Score</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Cost (FY23 $)</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>STBG Rank</td>
<td>CMAQ Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-30</td>
<td>Wilcox Neck Road</td>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>$9,366,257</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-31</td>
<td>Roxbury Road Turn Lanes</td>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>$3,146,238</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-32</td>
<td>Historic Main Street Station Preventive Maintenance</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>$425,000</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY23-33</td>
<td>Replacement Rolling Stock- CNG Replacement Buses (6 buses)</td>
<td>GRTC</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>$3,300,000</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Widen Lewis Rd to provide an additional left turn lane at the intersection with Rt 10.
Complete the application with as much detail as possible. Requests will be evaluated based on answers provided. The application can be edited after submission until the deadline of 11:59 PM on Friday, October 29, 2020.
If you need to save your application without finishing, click the save button. On the popup, click skip account creation and enter your email on the next page. A link to resume the application will be sent to you.
A confirmation email and link to edit your answers will be sent to you upon submission. For any questions or problems, contact Myles Busching (mbusching@planrva.org).

**General**

**Project Sponsor**
Chesterfield

**Sponsor Point of Contact**
Barb Smith

**Point of Contact Email**
smithbk@chesterfield.gov

**Point of Contact Phone Number**
(804) 748-1037

**Project Title**
Lewis Road at Route 10 Dual-Left Turn Lanes

**Project Description**
Construct dual left-turn lanes on Lewis Road at the Route 10 intersection.

**Project Type**
Project or Program

**Location**

**Project Scale**
Intersection/Interchange

**Primary Route**
Lewis Road

**Secondary Route(s)**
Route 10

**Features**

**Select all improvements that apply to this project**
Highway Improvements

**Features**
Describe the improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian network. If any bridge improvements are proposed, include the structure identification number.

This project will improve the bike and pedestrian network along Route 360 by providing sidewalk of both sides of Route 360 between Rockwood Square Shopping Center (RSSC) and Oxbridge Road. The project will also install pedestrian signals at RSSC and Oxbridge Road.

Features

Describe the improvements to roads including intersection and interchange improvements. If any bridge improvements are proposed, include the structure identification number.

This project will add dual left-turn lanes to Lewis Road at Route 10 which will allow more traffic to move through the intersection, result less delay to traffic on Route 10 and Lewis Road.

Features

Project Delivery

Who is expected to administer this project? [Locality/Agency]

Is this project in the local Comprehensive Plan? [Yes]

Is this project in the local Capital Improvement Plan? [Yes]

Describe any public outreach related to this project including the level of public participation

The project will include a public involvement phase. This project is minor in scope and impact to adjacent properties. We expect full support of this project.

The following questions are based on the regional long-range transportation plan, ConnectRVA 2045. See the following links for more information:

- Regional Significance
- Goals and Objectives

Is this project regionally significant based on the project inclusion guidelines? [No]

How does this project address Goal A: Safety?

This project will improve safety by allowing more left turning vehicles to turn from Lewis Road to Route 10 so that drivers are less likely to run the red light, reducing the potential for angle crashes. The project will also reduce the number of rear-end crashes which can occur when drivers incorrectly anticipate the car in front to continue through the intersection after the light changes to yellow.

How does this project address Goal B: Environment and Land Use?
This project will reduce transportation-related pollutants by reducing the traffic delay on all legs of the intersection of Route 10 and Lewis Road.

**How does this project address Goal C: Equity and Accessibility?**
This project will reduce trip lengths for those traveling on Route 10 and Lewis Road by making this intersection function more efficiently.

**How does this project address Goal D: Economic Development?**
By making the Route 10/Lewis Road intersection function more efficiently, Route 10 will function more reliably, and peak period travel times will be reduced. The Route 10/Lewis Road intersection is less than two miles from the Chesterfield Government Center complex, a regional activity center, and this project will ensure that this important destination is easily and safely accessible.

**How does this project address Goal E: Mobility?**
This project will make the Route 10/Lewis Road intersection function more safely, efficiently and reliably.

### Project Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering (PE)</td>
<td>Saturday, October 1, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (RW)</td>
<td>Sunday, October 1, 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (CN)</td>
<td>Tuesday, October 1, 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (CN) End</td>
<td>Sunday, June 1, 2025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering (PE)</td>
<td>$168,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way (RW)</td>
<td>$406,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction (CN)</td>
<td>$624,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$1,198,825.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Is this a request for funds to leverage to obtain other funding sources such as Smart Scale? **No**

The following questions are based on the adopted definitions for "committed" and "reasonably expected" funds. For more information, see [Appendix II: Outside Funding](#) of the project selection framework.

Does this project have any other committed funding? **No**

Does this project have any other reasonably expected funding? **No**
Total Funding Request

$1,198,825.00

Funding Program

STBG  CMAQ

Supplemental Material

Project Sketch

Lewis-10 LTL - Sketch.pdf

Detailed Estimate

Lewis-10 LTL - Estimate.pdf

Comprehensive Plan Excerpt

Comp Plan Unfunded Projects.pdf

Capital Improvement Plan Excerpt

CIP, FY22-FY26.pdf

Project Presentation

Select a time and date

Tuesday, Nov 16, 2021 3:30 PM - 4:00 PM
US 360 AT WOODLAKE VILLAGE PKWY TURN LANE IMPROVEMENTS

LEGEND
- EXISTING RIGHT OF WAY
- EXISTING PROPERTY LINES
- PROPOSED GRASS MEDIUM
- PROPOSED CONCRETE ITEMS
- PROPOSED FULL DEPTH PAVEMENT
- PROPOSED MILL AND OVERLAY
- PROPOSED CURB

SCALE
0 150' 300'

THESE PLANS ARE UNFINISHED AND UNAPPROVED AND ARE NOT TO BE USED FOR ANY TYPE OF CONSTRUCTION OR THE AQUISITION OF RIGHT OF WAY.

PRELIMINARY

06/30/2021
**US 360 at Woodlake Village Parkway**

**Turn Lane Improvements**

**Description**

Construct one additional southbound left-turn lane and extend the eastbound left-turn storage length at the Woodlake Village Parkway intersection. In addition, install crosswalks and a median refuge island across the west leg of the intersection.

**Traffic Operations Benefits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Intersection Delay</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>33.3 (LOS C)</td>
<td>15.5 (LOS B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 No-Build</td>
<td>48.3 (LOS D)</td>
<td>28.8 (LOS C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Build</td>
<td>24.7 (LOS C)</td>
<td>20.8 (LOS C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Safety Benefits**

- A crash reduction of 3% would be expected by constructing an additional turn lane.
- Accessible north/south pedestrian crossing.

**Cost**

- Preliminary Engineering: $764,000
- Right of Way and Utility Relocation: $50,000
- Construction: $1,971,000
- **Total**: $2,785,000
New Project Funding Application

Complete the application with as much detail as possible. Requests will be evaluated based on answers provided. The application can be edited after submission until the deadline of 11:59 PM on Friday, October 29, 2020.

If you need to save your application without finishing, click the save button. On the popup, click skip account creation and enter your email on the next page. A link to resume the application will be sent to you.

A confirmation email and link to edit your answers will be sent to you upon submission. For any questions or problems, contact Myles Busching (mbuschning@planrva.org).

**General**

**Project Sponsor**
Chesterfield

**Sponsor Point of Contact**
Chessa Walker

**Point of Contact Email**
walkerch@chesterfield.gov

**Point of Contact Phone Number**
(804) 748-1037

**Project Title**
RT 360/Woodlake Village Parkway - Turn Lane Improvements

**Project Description**
Construct one additional southbound left-turn lane and extend the eastbound left-turn storage length at the Woodlake Village Parkway intersection. In addition, install crosswalks and a median refuge island across the west leg of the intersection.

**Project Type**
Project or Program

**Location**

**Project Scale**
Intersection/Interchange

**Primary Route**
Route 360

**Secondary Route(s)**
Woodlake Village Parkway

**Features**

Select all improvements that apply to this project
Active Transportation Improvements
**Highway Improvements**

### Features

**Describe the improvements to the bicycle and pedestrian network. If any bridge improvements are proposed, include the structure identification number.**

This project will construct pedestrian crossings (crosswalk and pedestrian-actuated signals) on the west and north legs of the Route 360/Woodlake Village Parkway intersection. These improvements will improve the bike/pedestrian network by tying into the existing sidewalk network along Route 360 to the east and west. The bike/pedestrian crossings at the intersection will be designed to accommodate a future trail crossing at the intersection as shown in the county's Bikeways and Trail Plan, see attached. These improvements will increase bike/pedestrian access to land uses along the Route 360 corridor.

### Features

**Describe the improvements to roads including intersection and interchange improvements. If any bridge improvements are proposed, include the structure identification number.**

This project will construct one additional southbound left-turn lane and extend the eastbound left-turn storage length at the Woodlake Village Parkway intersection. Pedestrian accommodations (crosswalks, pedestrian-actuated signals, median refuge island) will be constructed at the intersection.

### Features

**Project Delivery**

**Who is expected to administer this project?**

- **Locality/Agency**

**Is this project in the local Comprehensive Plan?**

- **No**

**Is this project in the local Capital Improvement Plan?**

- **No**

**Describe any public outreach related to this project including the level of public participation**

This recommendation is from the Route 360 Arterial Management Plan (2021) conducted by VDOT. A MetroQuest survey was conducted to collect feedback on intersection alternatives considered as part of the study. The turn lane improvements at Route 360/Woodlake Village Parkway received favorable reviews, with an average score of 3.7 on a scale of 1 to 5 [report attached, link to download Appendix sent via email to Myles due to file size]. Staff will also engage the community and adjacent property owners early in the project development.

The following questions are based on the regional long-range transportation plan, [ConnectRVA 2045](#).

See the following links for more information:
- [Regional Significance](#)
Goals and Objectives

Is this project regionally significant based on the project inclusion guidelines? No

How does this project address Goal A: Safety?
A high number of crashes are occurring at the Route 360/Woodlake Village Parkway intersection. The estimated reduction in fatal and injury crashes with the addition of a third southbound left-turn lane is 3% (see attached Route 360 Arterial Management Plan). Additionally, the safe bike/pedestrian crossings of the intersection will enhance safety/comfort for users.

How does this project address Goal B: Environment and Land Use?
The additional southbound left-turn lane will delay at the intersection of Route 360/Woodlake Village Parkway reducing idling and resulting in a reduction of transportation related pollutants and fewer emissions.

How does this project address Goal C: Equity and Accessibility?
This project will reduce trip lengths for those traveling along the Route 360 corridor by making this intersection function more efficiently. This project will also provide safe bike/pedestrian crossings of the intersection and connect to the existing sidewalk network along Route 360 increasing access to jobs and services in the area.

How does this project address Goal D: Economic Development?
The additional southbound left-turn lane will make the Route 360/Woodlake Village Parkway intersection function more efficiently and improve transportation reliability and accessibility along the Route 360 corridor. The improvement to peak period travel times will ensure the Swift Creek regional activity center, located east of this intersection, is more easily and safely accessible.

How does this project address Goal E: Mobility?
This project will make the Route 360/Woodlake Village Parkway intersection function more safely, efficiently and reliably and will benefit both vehicular and bike/pedestrian traffic.

Project Delivery

| Preliminary Engineering (PE) Start | Saturday, October 1, 2022 |
| Right-of-Way (RW) Start           | Sunday, October 1, 2023  |
| Construction (CN) Start           | Tuesday, October 1, 2024 |
| Construction (CN) End             | Wednesday, October 1, 2025|

Project Delivery

| Preliminary Engineering (PE) Cost  | $764,000 |
| Right-of-Way (RW) Cost             | $50,000  |
| Construction (CN) Cost             | $1,971,000|
| Total Cost                         | $2,785,000.00 |
Project Delivery

Is this a request for funds to leverage to obtain other funding sources such as Smart Scale?

No

The following questions are based on the adopted definitions for "committed" and "reasonably expected" funds. For more information, see Appendix II: Outside Funding of the project selection framework.

Does this project have any other committed funding?

No

Does this project have any other reasonably expected funding?

No

Total Funding Request

$2,785,000.00

Funding Program

STBG  CMAQ

Supplemental Material

Project Sketch

RT 360 at Woodlake_Turn Lanes - Sketch_RE...

Detailed Estimate

RT 360 at Woodlake_Turn Lanes - Estimate.pdf

Supporting Studies

BIKEWAYS & TRAILS PLAN_MATOACA WES...

US 360 Arterial Management Plan Final Repor...

Project Presentation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>UPC</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Total Est</th>
<th>Previous (all sources)</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
<th>FY28</th>
<th>STBC</th>
<th>FY23 - FY28</th>
<th>Other FY23 - FY28</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Balance</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>11765</td>
<td>281 Bermuda Hundred Road at Remlewood Drive Roundabout</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 5,146,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 525,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 936,000</td>
<td>$ 3,775,000</td>
<td>$ 5,146,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,146,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>11765</td>
<td>281 Brad McNeil Parkway Access Management and Roundabout</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 9,336,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 530,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,554,000</td>
<td>$ 4,100,000</td>
<td>$ 9,336,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 9,336,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>11764</td>
<td>7 Meadowlark Blvd (Dalestock Drive to Beulah Rd) Ped-Bike Impros</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 3,660,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,660,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,160,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,160,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>11564</td>
<td>Route 1(Merrimondale Rd to EPharm Ave) Sidewalk</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 1,573,894</td>
<td>$ 1,250,000</td>
<td>$ 436,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 436,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,686,000</td>
<td>$ 112,126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>11564</td>
<td>Route 60 (Ruthera Rd-Stonebridge Ave) Sidewalk</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 5,504,000</td>
<td>$ 1,566,000</td>
<td>$ 1,548,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,548,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,504,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>11770</td>
<td>#SMART18 - Route 1 (Marina Dr to Merrimondale Rd) SW #FLT</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 3,692,655</td>
<td>$ 3,692,655</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,692,655</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Lewis Rd @ I-10 Left Turn Lane</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 1,496,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 150,000</td>
<td>$ 26,000</td>
<td>$ 216,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 216,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,190,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Woodlake Village Pkwy @ 360 Triple Lefts</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 3,271,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 492,000</td>
<td>$ 426,000</td>
<td>$ 918,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 918,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,335,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRTC</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>GRTC REPLACEMENT OF ROLLING STOCK CHG/BUSES (FY22)</td>
<td>DRPT</td>
<td>$ 3,465,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,465,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Crockett Rd/Crofton Pkwy &amp; Walnut Grove Rd Roundabout</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 6,421,451</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,741,000</td>
<td>$ 948,173</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,707,773</td>
<td>$ 2,714,278</td>
<td>$ 6,421,451</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>78152</td>
<td>Brook Road &amp; H Hard Road Trail #FLT</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 4,757,000</td>
<td>$ 3,273,000</td>
<td>$ 73,149</td>
<td>$ 1,430,851</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,484,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 4,757,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>78151</td>
<td>Wallace Rd Pedestrian improvements</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 2,160,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 332,000</td>
<td>$ 824,000</td>
<td>$ 394,000</td>
<td>$ 670,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,160,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,160,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>78156</td>
<td>RR 2-61-Beulah Roundabout</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 5,039,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 689,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 689,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 689,000</td>
<td>$ 4,330,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>78200</td>
<td>Patterson Avenue Sidewalks</td>
<td>VDOT</td>
<td>$ 3,443,311</td>
<td>$ 778,373</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 634,553</td>
<td>$ 2,033,385</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 2,664,938</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,443,311</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>10990</td>
<td>Henrico County Automated Traffic Management System (ATMS)</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 9,799,000</td>
<td>$ 9,799,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 9,799,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>10990</td>
<td>LABURNUM AVENUE SIDEWALK</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 1,326,246</td>
<td>$ 1,219,203</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,219,203</td>
<td>$ 92,350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>10304</td>
<td>#R2327177 Rte #6 Patterson Ave at Rte 104 RD Intersection</td>
<td>VDOT</td>
<td>$ 13,553,646</td>
<td>$ 15,620,971</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 15,620,971</td>
<td>$ (17,325)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>10629</td>
<td>PEDESTRIAN &amp; SIGNAL IMPROVEMENTS - VARIOUS LOCATIONS (LZALEA)</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 1,655,000</td>
<td>$ 1,655,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,655,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Virginia</td>
<td>71851</td>
<td>64 Express Barge Service Expansion</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 3,000,000</td>
<td>$ 3,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 693,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,000,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>-185</td>
<td>City of Richmond Employee Trip Reduction Program</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 3,506,251</td>
<td>$ 3,506,251</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 3,506,251</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>78141</td>
<td>Richmond Signal System [7] Phase IV</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 5,488,000</td>
<td>$ 1,182,348</td>
<td>$ 193,636</td>
<td>$ 1,846,358</td>
<td>$ 293,888</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 4,545,652</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 5,488,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>10699</td>
<td>SIGNAL SYSTEM</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 7,339,977</td>
<td>$ 7,343,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 7,343,000</td>
<td>$ 17,023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>NEW</td>
<td>Richmond Signal System Retiming Improvements</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>$ 1,765,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,765,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,765,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ 1,765,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- GRTC project in FY22; transferred to County Revenue sharing
- Surplus left on project until award; funding is front loaded
- Funding advanced by a year; project is front loaded and schedule could be accelerated
- Funding request for $524k due to recent cost inflation and transfer to VDOT admin; updated estimate since request; funded to schedule and full estimate
- Transfer previous for PE and RW; Funded to Local Estimate
- New Project - Fully Funded; Sponsor is matched to latest estimate; transfer previous to replace FY23 planned allocation
- Project is large purchase; Transfer previous to advance project and standing sponsor request
- Surplus to be addressed at closeout
- Funding advanced by a year; project is front loaded and schedule could be accelerated
- Funds PE, County to seek funding for other phases from other sources
- New Project - Balance in FY29/30; swapped for Alverser which is funded by Rev Share
- New Project - Balance in FY29/30; swapped for Alverser which is funded by Rev Share
- No change to project estimate; $77k additional previous; CMAQ replace no post; CMAQ funds are largely unmatched and require local funding to use; local commitment for match required
- Surplus left on project until award; funding is front loaded
- Local Estimate
- No change to project estimate; $770k additional previous; CMAQ replace no post; CMAQ funds are largely unmatched and require local funding to use; local commitment for match required
- Front loaded and schedule could be accelerated
- Transfer previous for PE and RW; Funded to Local Estimate
- Local Estimate
- Surplus to be addressed at closeout
- Local Estimate
- Local Estimate
- Local Estimate
- Surplus to be addressed at closeout
- Local Estimate
- Local Estimate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>UPC</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Total Ext</th>
<th>Previous (all sources)</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
<th>FY28</th>
<th>STBG FY22 - FY28</th>
<th>Other FY23 - FY28</th>
<th>Total Balance</th>
<th>Balance Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridefinders</td>
<td>-202</td>
<td>Regionwide Air Pollution Reduction Program</td>
<td>DRPT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$1,518,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>1,518,000</td>
<td>$500k in year 3 per Regional Project Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionwide</td>
<td>107492</td>
<td>Richmond Region-Wide Traffic Operations Improvements</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regionwide</td>
<td>70777</td>
<td>CMAQ Balance Entry</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>818,084</td>
<td>$854,446</td>
<td>$1,737,013</td>
<td>$2,607,203</td>
<td>$3,613,306</td>
<td>$10,511,955</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$10,511,955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Available:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>UPC</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Total Ext</th>
<th>Previous (all sources)</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
<th>FY28</th>
<th>STBG FY22 - FY28</th>
<th>Other FY23 - FY28</th>
<th>Total Balance</th>
<th>Balance Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INCREASED COST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>UPC</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Total Ext</th>
<th>Previous (all sources)</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
<th>FY28</th>
<th>STBG FY22 - FY28</th>
<th>Other FY23 - FY28</th>
<th>Total Balance</th>
<th>Balance Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW PROJECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>UPC</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Total Ext</th>
<th>Previous (all sources)</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
<th>FY28</th>
<th>STBG FY22 - FY28</th>
<th>Other FY23 - FY28</th>
<th>Total Balance</th>
<th>Balance Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TRANSFER PREVIOUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>UPC</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Total Ext</th>
<th>Previous (all sources)</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
<th>FY28</th>
<th>STBG FY22 - FY28</th>
<th>Other FY23 - FY28</th>
<th>Total Balance</th>
<th>Balance Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Required Transfers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>UPC</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Total Ext</th>
<th>Previous (all sources)</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
<th>FY28</th>
<th>STBG FY22 - FY28</th>
<th>Other FY23 - FY28</th>
<th>Total Balance</th>
<th>Balance Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Deficit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>UPC</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Total Ext</th>
<th>Previous (all sources)</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
<th>FY28</th>
<th>STBG FY22 - FY28</th>
<th>Other FY23 - FY28</th>
<th>Total Balance</th>
<th>Balance Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surplus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>UPC</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Total Ext</th>
<th>Previous (all sources)</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
<th>FY28</th>
<th>STBG FY22 - FY28</th>
<th>Other FY23 - FY28</th>
<th>Total Balance</th>
<th>Balance Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transfers from 70777 and 107492 Required**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>UPC</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Total Ext</th>
<th>Previous (all sources)</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
<th>FY28</th>
<th>STBG FY22 - FY28</th>
<th>Other FY23 - FY28</th>
<th>Total Balance</th>
<th>Balance Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mostly unmatched CMAQ**
POLICY BOARD AGENDA 5/5/22; ITEM B.-3.

FTA SECTION 5310 PROGRAM GRANT APPLICATIONS ENDORSEMENT

Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization

REQUESTED ACTION: To review and endorse Board applications submitted by Richmond area local governments, human service agencies, and supporting organizations for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 program grant funds.

BACKGROUND: The FTA 5310 program, Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities, was developed to provide assistance in meeting special transportation needs of elderly persons and persons with disabilities by removing barriers to transportation services and expanding mobility options.

In preparation for the February 1, 2022 application deadline for federal FY22 FTA Section 5310 funding, presentations were made to local human service agencies throughout the calendar year.

During these presentations and meetings, the discussion focused on providing information and answering questions about the application process that would be used to select projects supporting the regional Coordinated Human Services Mobility Plan. This competitive funding process seeks to fund projects that support the mobility and transportation needs of seniors and persons with disabilities.

DRPT Designated Recipient for the Richmond Urbanized Area

At its February 14, 2013 meeting, the RRTPO designated DRPT as the administrator of the FTA Section 5310 program funds apportioned for the Richmond Urbanized Area. As the administering agency for these funds, DRPT is responsible for reviewing, ranking and scoring applications; submitting selected applicants for CTB review and consideration in the state’s draft Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP); conducting the project/program contract process; and conducting the grant program administration of these funds with FTA. Following the selection of projects by DRPT, the FY22- FY25 Transportation Improvement Program will be amended to include the projects and allocations.

FY22 Applications

Eight applications were received and forwarded to DRPT for review and selection consideration. Capital projects are eligible for 80% federal funding and operating programs are eligible for 50% federal funding with the balance of the funds provided by the state and the applicant, with contributions of 40% and 10% respectively.
**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the RRTPO Policy Board approve the following resolution as presented.

**RESOLVED,** that the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization Policy Board endorses the following applications for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 funds:

- GRTC-Mobility Management
- Senior Connections-Operating Assistance and Mobility Management
- Chesterfield Community Services Board-Capital Assistance
- Chesterfield County Citizens Information & Resources-Mobility Management and Operating Assistance
- Hanover County-Mobility Management and Operating Assistance
- Goochland Cares-Capital Assistance

CAP/KEL
BYLAWS OF THE
RICHMOND AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

Ratified April 12, 1990
Amendments to June 28, 2018
Amendments to XXXXX, 2022

ARTICLE I – Name and Authority

Section 1. The name of this organization shall be known as the Richmond Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, hereinafter called the MPO, generally referred to as the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization or RRTPO.

Section 2. The MPO shall have such authority as prescribed by the Governor in his designation of September 11, 1995 and as prescribed in “A Memorandum of Understanding for Conducting the Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Programming Process in the Richmond Urbanized Area” and subsequent revisions to the Memorandum, hereinafter referred to as the MOU.

ARTICLE II - Purpose

Section 1. The purpose of the MPO is to perform policy and technical functions for Richmond Urbanized Area transportation planning reflecting a multimodal process founded upon coordination and cooperation between planning, transit, and service providers. The policy function is designed to make transportation policies to develop and implement the Richmond Regional Metropolitan Transportation Plan and related efforts. The MPO shall:

a. establish policy for continuing, comprehensive and cooperative transportation planning process;

b. annually evaluate the current Transportation Plan, accept it when appropriate, determine when a re-evaluation of the Transportation Plan is necessary, and recommend appropriate action;

c. review the results of the re-evaluation;

d. determine the influence of current data upon the Transportation Plan in relation to previous data and projected trends;

e. cooperate in the evaluation of forecasts of transportation demands;

f. work cooperatively on any proposal, alternate lines, and work performed on the study, location, and design of facilities and programs in the Transportation Plan;
g. assign special or standing committees, or ad hoc working groups to specific assignments;

h. establish priorities for consideration in the development of the areawide Unified Planning Work Program, and to approve the areawide Unified Planning Work Program;

i. approve programs of planning projects and programs of capital expenditures and construction projects, including the annual Transportation Improvement Program, its Annual Element, the Short Range Transportation Plan, the Unified Planning Work Program; and

j. perform and approve other plans and programs as may be required by state and federal regulations, and Executive orders and directives.

The technical function of the MPO is designed to establish, monitor and review the results of the technical process for urban transportation planning in the Richmond Urbanized Area. The MPO shall:

a. establish the technical details of the continuing process through the MOU and pass-through agreements;

b. establish detailed work activities through the Unified Planning Work Program process that fulfilled these agreements;

c. review and certify the satisfactory completion of these activities; and

d. in general, prepare the technical recommendations that the MPO needs to perform its policy functions in either ad hoc working groups, special or standing committees, or at MPO meetings.

**ARTICLE III – Membership**

**Section 1. Membership**

The MPO policy board shall be composed of elected members of the governing bodies of member local governments, officials of public agencies that administer or operate major modes of transportation in the metropolitan planning area, providers of public transportation and appropriate state transportation officials representing the voting member organizations. The membership includes both voting and nonvoting members.

Each member organization may designate one or more alternate member(s), hereinafter referred to as alternate(s), to serve in place of an absent member of that member organization. The maximum number of alternates permitted for each member organization is equal to the number of regular members of that organization. All alternates shall be vested with the same powers and responsibilities as the regular member they are replacing.

**Section 2. Voting Membership**

The MPO policy board voting membership shall be composed of the following member organizations with total votes listed for each in the table below.
Section 3.  Nonvoting Membership
The nonvoting membership of the MPO policy board shall be composed of one representative from each of the agencies or organizations listed below.

Federal Highway Administration
Federal Transit Administration
RideFinders, Inc.
Virginia Department of Aviation
Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
MPO Community Transportation Advisory Committee Chairman

Section 4  Term of Appointment
Member organizations shall have the authority to determine the length of the terms of its member(s) and alternate(s) and whether or not they serve at the pleasure of the appointing member organization, but it is recommended that members and alternates serve for a two-year term and be eligible to be reappointed for successive terms.

ARTICLE IV – Officers and Elections

Section 1.  The officers of the MPO shall consist of a Chairman, a Vice Chairman, and a Secretary. The Chairman and Vice Chairman shall be elected by the voting membership of the MPO. The Chairman and Vice Chairman must be MPO jurisdictional voting members; MPO alternate members are not eligible to serve as MPO officers. The Secretary shall be the Richmond Regional Planning District Commission (RRPDC) staff liaison to the MPO.

Section 2.  The election of officers shall be held no later than June 30 of each year. The newly elected officers shall take office on July 1 and shall serve for a one-year term.

Section 3.  The office of MPO Chairman shall be rotated among the member local governments and the MPO may consider an order of succession incorporated into a nonbinding guidance document approved by the MPO policy board.
Section 4. Duties and Powers of MPO Officers:
   a. Chairman
      The Chairman shall preside over all meetings of the MPO except when not in attendance. The Chairman may address remarks to an issue before the MPO and may request appropriate actions. The Chairman may request an action, however, he or she will not be eligible to move or second any action for a vote. The Chairman shall be eligible to vote on all actions regardless of a tie vote. The Chairman will be responsible for appointing the Chairman for all MPO Committees except for the Community Transportation Advisory Committee and the Technical Advisory Committee. The Chairman is responsible for appointing all committee members, except as noted in Article VII of these Bylaws.
   b. Vice Chairman
      The Vice Chairman shall serve as Acting Chairman of the MPO in the absence of the Chairman. When the Vice Chairman is serving as Acting Chairman, the Vice Chairman shall be vested with authority to perform all the duties and exercise all the powers of the Chairman, including those vested in or delegated to the Chairman in these Bylaws.
   c. Secretary
      The Secretary shall be responsible for the preparation and maintenance of a permanent written record of all MPO actions and proceedings, and shall transmit notices, agendas, monthly status reports, and the minutes of each MPO meeting to each member one week prior to the next regular meeting.

ARTICLE V - Meetings

Section 1. Regular meetings of the MPO policy board shall be held monthly, as necessary, at a suitable meeting time and place, normally on the first Thursday of the month. Special meetings may be called by the Chairman. When a meeting falls on a holiday, the rescheduled meeting shall be determined by the Chairman. Members shall be notified in advance of a rescheduled meeting.

Section 2. A quorum shall exist when a majority of the votes allocated to voting member organizations are represented by members or alternates at the meeting. Vacancies shall not be considered in the establishment of a quorum.

Section 3. Meeting Agendas
   a. The agenda for each MPO policy board meeting shall be prepared jointly by the Chairman and the MPO Secretary.
   b. The agenda shall be transmitted ten (10) days prior to the next meeting.
   d. Additions to the agenda shall be made at the beginning of the meeting upon an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the votes represented at the meeting. An item may be added to the agenda for the next MPO meeting upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the votes represented at the current meeting.
   d. At the discretion of the Chairman, the agenda may include items for consent action. Any voting member shall have the right to request and to have a consent action item removed from the agenda for consent action and placed on that day’s MPO meeting agenda for review and discussion, with the Chairman having the right to determine where to consider the item on the meeting agenda.
Section 4. Parliamentary authority for MPO proceedings not otherwise specified by these bylaws shall be the most recently published edition of Robert’s Rules of Order.

Section 5. Each voting member organization shall have the right to invite technical representatives to participate in meetings and discussions of the MPO as advisors on specific agenda topics.

Section 6. The MPO is a “public body” and subject to the Virginia Freedom of Information Act (§ 2.2-3700, et seq. of the Code of Virginia) (FOIA). In accordance with the provisions of FOIA, all meetings of the policy board or any committees or subcommittees established by the policy board shall be open to the public unless lawfully convened into a closed session in accordance with FOIA. No meeting during which MPO business is discussed shall be conducted through telephonic or electronic means where the members are not physically assembled.

ARTICLE VI - Voting

Section 1. Voting member organizations shall designate one representative to cast all of its votes or multiple representatives to cast any number of its votes, up to the number of representatives prescribed by the Governor of Virginia in the September 11, 1995 designation letter and listed in Article III, Section 2 of these Bylaws. Although member organizations may empower individual representatives with differing numbers of votes, each individual vote shall be cast as a whole vote and may not be split fractionally among multiple representatives.

Section 2. A voting member or alternate voting member of an organization that has more than one vote shall be allowed to cast the vote(s) of any absent voting member(s) of the same voting member organization. If the representative(s) and alternate(s) present at the meeting are unable to unanimously agree upon which of them shall cast the votes of any absent representative(s), then the vote of the absent representative(s) will not be counted.

Section 3. All members and alternates of voting member organizations must be vested with the authority to speak for and act on behalf of the appointing organization in matters concerning regional transportation planning activities.

Section 4. Each member organization shall notify the MPO Secretary of its authorized representative(s) and alternate(s), and the number of votes designated to each of them, in writing at least three business days prior to the first meeting of the MPO policy board in which they will act in their official capacity.

Section 5. Voting on matters before the MPO policy board shall generally be conducted by voice vote. Either before or immediately following a voice vote, any member may request that the vote be conducted (or conducted again) by either a show of hands or a roll call. In conducting such votes, those members or alternates who are present and voting shall, when called upon by the MPO Secretary, announce the number of votes they are casting. It shall be up to the Chairman to determine the order in which voting representatives and alternates are asked to show or announce their vote(s).

Section 6. No proxy votes shall be allowed.
ARTICLE VII – MPO Committees

Section 1. Standing Committees
The MPO is supported by Standing Committees as described below. These Bylaws shall be applicable to all standing committees.

Section 2. Executive Committee
There shall be an Executive Committee, which shall be a Standing Committee of the MPO. The Chairman of the MPO shall serve as a member and as the chairman of the Executive Committee. In addition, the Executive Committee shall consist of the officers of the MPO, the immediate past Chairman of the MPO, and one representative from each jurisdiction not having an officer on the MPO. The Chairman shall appoint these additional members of the Executive Committee. A quorum of the Executive Committee shall consist of a majority of the Executive Committee’s members. In making any recommendation, adopting any plan, or approving any proposal, action shall be taken by a majority vote of all members present, provided a quorum is present.

The Executive Committee shall have the following specific powers and duties:

a. To facilitate work program planning and management of the regional transportation planning process by providing policy guidance and input on future agenda items.

b. Any other power granted to it by an affirmative vote of the MPO policy board in an open meeting, provided a quorum is present at said open meeting, such as but not limited to

   1. recommend amendments to the MPO-adopted Unified Planning Work Program and Transportation Improvement Program;
   2. recommend additions and/or revisions to the highway functional classification system;
   3. approve socioeconomic data and forecasts; and
   4. recommend endorsements of requests from local governments, agencies, and other organizations seeking state and federal grant funds.

Section 3. Technical Advisory Committee
There shall be a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) composed of one technical representative from each of the following local governments and organizations:

City of Richmond
County of Charles City
County of Chesterfield
County of Goochland
County of Hanover
County of Henrico
County of New Kent
County of Powhatan
Town of Ashland
Capital Region Airport Commission
GRTC Transit System
Richmond Regional Planning District Commission
RideFinders, Inc.
Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
Virginia Department of Transportation

Each local government or organization shall be responsible for designating its member and alternate to TAC. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the TAC membership, which shall include, at a minimum, four of the local government representatives. Either TAC members or alternates will be considered in determining TAC meeting quorums, and for voting on actions before TAC.

The purpose of the TAC is to serve as a technical advisory committee to the MPO, providing technical review, comments, and recommendations on specific transportation plans, programs, studies, and other appropriate documents and regional transportation issues. The TAC shall address other matters and concerns if directed by the MPO or the MPO Chairman. TAC shall specifically be responsible for reviewing, and providing technical comments and recommendations to the MPO on the following:

a. Unified Planning Work Program
b. Transportation Improvement Program
c. Long Range Transportation Plan
d. Air Quality Planning

The TAC shall meet as required in the performance of its duties.

Section 4. Community Transportation Advisory Committee
There shall be a Community Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) to the MPO, with both citizen and organizational voting membership as shown in the chart below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEMBER</th>
<th>Appointees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield County</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico County</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Richmond</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles City County</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goochland County</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover County</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kent County</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powhatan County</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Ashland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to twelve (12) at-large member organizations appointed by the MPO</td>
<td>1 vote each</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The officers of CTAC shall consist of a Chairman and Vice Chairman elected by the CTAC voting membership. Only jurisdictional representatives shall be eligible to be Chairman and Vice Chairman. The CTAC officers shall be elected to a one-year term of office beginning July 1 and ending June 30.

To the maximum extent possible, the at-large appointees should represent diverse
organizations with recognized transportation planning concerns including transportation disadvantaged populations.

Each CTAC member jurisdiction or organization may appoint an alternate member to serve in the absence of each appointed CTAC member. Each appointee shall serve a two-year term, and may be reappointed for successive terms. The CTAC should meet as necessary. A quorum shall consist of a majority of the Committee’s current membership.

The purpose of this Committee is to advise the MPO on issues, plans, studies, and matters necessary and appropriate for providing viable and reasonable citizen input. Resolutions approved by the CTAC shall be presented to the MPO.

The CTAC will be supported by a standing subcommittee addressing equity and the needs of the transportation disadvantaged. This subcommittee will be called the CTAC Transportation Equity Work Group. The purpose of this subcommittee is to advise the MPO, through CTAC, on issues, plans, studies, and other matters concerning the MPO’s “3-C” urban transportation planning process that affects transportation disadvantaged populations. This group should have flexible membership to maximize the opportunity for input on issues relative to equity for transportation disadvantaged populations.

Section 5. Other Committees
The MPO may create other committees by a two-thirds vote of those present, assuming a quorum is present. These bylaws apply to the operation of any MPO committee.

ARTICLE VIII – Amendment

Section 1. These bylaws may be amended by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of all votes on the MPO policy board at that time, at two consecutive meetings of the MPO policy board. Proposed changes in the bylaws shall be transmitted to each voting member at least 10 days prior to the meeting when the voting will be conducted.

Section 2. These bylaws shall become effective immediately upon ratification by a vote of the MPO policy board as described in Section 1 above. Each MPO member shall be given a copy.
AMENDMENT NOTES:


5. Bylaws Amendments: Article I, Section 2; Article III, Sections 1, 2, and 3; Article IV, Section 3; Article V, Sections 1, 2, and 3; and Article VI, Section 2; amended by the MPO on November 9, 1995.


8. Bylaws Amendments: Article IV, Section 4, Subsection (a); Article V, Section 1; and Article VI, Section 1; amended by MPO on April 12, 2001.


11. Bylaws Amendments: Article III, Section 3; and Article V, Section 3; amended by MPO on February 10, 2005.

12. Bylaws Amendment: Article VI, Section 1, amended by MPO on February 14, 2013.

13. Bylaws Amendment: Article III, Section 3; and Article V, Sections 2 and 3; amended by MPO on November 7, 2013.

14. Bylaws Amendment: Article I, Section 1; Article III, Sections 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5; Article V, Section 1; Article VI, Sections 1, 2, 4 and 5; and Article VII, Section 1; amended by MPO on October 2, 2014.

15. Bylaws Amendment: Consistent with the 2013 federal certification review report, the RRTPO undertook a comprehensive review of the Bylaws; the last comprehensive review was conducted in 1990. This comprehensive amendment resulted in document reorganization, changes recommended for clarity and consistency, several recommendations included in the 2017 federal certification review report, and re-incorporation of the Elderly and Disability Advisory Committee into the Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee as a standing work group; amended by MPO on June 28, 2018.
RICHMOND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION (RRTPO/MPO)

POLICY AND PROCEDURES
To allow participation in meetings of the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO/MPO) and its committees by a member of the commission from a remote location through electronic communication means.

The Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO/MPO) hereby approves and adopts the following policy and procedures to allow and facilitate participation in commission meetings by members of the commission from a remote location through electronic communication means, as authorized by § 2.2-3708.2 of the Code of Virginia:

Participation in Meetings by Electronic Communications from a Remote Location

Members of the Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO/MPO) may participate in meetings of the RRTPO/MPO by electronic communication means from a remote location that is not open to the public if, on or before the day of a meeting, a commission member notifies the commission chair that:

a. Such member is unable to attend the meeting due to a temporary or permanent disability or other medical condition that prevents the member's physical attendance;

b. Such member is unable to attend the meeting due to a family member’s medical condition that requires the member to provide care for such family member, thereby preventing the member’s physical attendance; or,

c. Such member is unable to attend the meeting due to a personal matter and identifies with specificity the nature of the personal matter.

In addition, (i) such member’s remote participation by electronic communication means shall be approved by a majority vote of those participating in the meeting, (ii) a quorum of the public body is physically assembled at one primary or central meeting location, and (iii) the voice of the remote participant(s) must be able to be heard by all persons at the primary or central meeting location. Remote participation by a commission member pursuant to above paragraph (c) of this policy is limited to two meetings each calendar year or 25 percent of the meetings held per calendar year, rounded up to the next whole number, whichever is greater.
VIRGINIA FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

§ 2.2-3708.2. Meetings held through electronic communication means.

A. The following provisions apply to all public bodies:

1. Subject to the requirements of subsection C, all public bodies may conduct any meeting wherein the public business is discussed or transacted through electronic communication means if, on or before the day of a meeting, a member of the public body holding the meeting notifies the chair of the public body that:

   a. Such member is unable to attend the meeting due to (i) a temporary or permanent disability or other medical condition that prevents the member's physical attendance or (ii) a family member's medical condition that requires the member to provide care for such family member, thereby preventing the member's physical attendance; or

   b. Such member is unable to attend the meeting due to a personal matter and identifies with specificity the nature of the personal matter. Participation by a member pursuant to this subdivision b is limited each calendar year to two meetings or 25 percent of the meetings held per calendar year rounded up to the next whole number, whichever is greater.

2. If participation by a member through electronic communication means is approved pursuant to subdivision 1, the public body holding the meeting shall record in its minutes the remote location from which the member participated; however, the remote location need not be open to the public. If participation is approved pursuant to subdivision 1 a, the public body shall also include in its minutes the fact that the member participated through electronic communication means due to (i) a temporary or permanent disability or other medical condition that prevented the member's physical attendance or (ii) a family member's medical condition that required the member to provide care for such family member, thereby preventing the member's physical attendance. If participation is approved pursuant to subdivision 1 b, the public body shall also include in its minutes the specific nature of the personal matter cited by the member.

If a member's participation from a remote location pursuant to subdivision 1 b is disapproved because such participation would violate the policy adopted pursuant to subsection C, such disapproval shall be recorded in the minutes with specificity.

3. Any public body, or any joint meetings thereof, may meet by electronic communication means without a quorum of the public body physically assembled at one location when the Governor has declared a state of emergency in accordance with § 44-146.17 or the locality in which the public body is located has declared a local state of emergency pursuant to § 44-
146.21, provided that (i) the catastrophic nature of the declared emergency makes it impracticable or unsafe to assemble a quorum in a single location and (ii) the purpose of the meeting is to provide for the continuity of operations of the public body or the discharge of its lawful purposes, duties, and responsibilities. The public body convening a meeting in accordance with this subdivision shall:

a. Give public notice using the best available method given the nature of the emergency, which notice shall be given contemporaneously with the notice provided to members of the public body conducting the meeting;

b. Make arrangements for public access to such meeting through electronic communication means, including videoconferencing if already used by the public body;

c. Provide the public with the opportunity to comment at those meetings of the public body when public comment is customarily received; and

d. Otherwise comply with the provisions of this chapter.

The nature of the emergency, the fact that the meeting was held by electronic communication means, and the type of electronic communication means by which the meeting was held shall be stated in the minutes.

The provisions of this subdivision 3 shall be applicable only for the duration of the emergency declared pursuant to § 44-146.17 or 44-146.21.

B. The following provisions apply to regional public bodies:

1. Subject to the requirements in subsection C, regional public bodies may also conduct any meeting wherein the public business is discussed or transacted through electronic communication means if, on the day of a meeting, a member of a regional public body notifies the chair of the public body that such member's principal residence is more than 60 miles from the meeting location identified in the required notice for such meeting.

2. If participation by a member through electronic communication means is approved pursuant to this subsection, the public body holding the meeting shall record in its minutes the remote location from which the member participated; however, the remote location need not be open to the public.

If a member's participation from a remote location is disapproved because such participation would violate the policy adopted pursuant to subsection C, such disapproval shall be recorded in the minutes with specificity.
C. Participation by a member of a public body in a meeting through electronic communication means pursuant to subdivisions A 1 and 2 and subsection B shall be authorized only if the following conditions are met:

1. The public body has adopted a written policy allowing for and governing participation of its members by electronic communication means, including an approval process for such participation, subject to the express limitations imposed by this section. Once adopted, the policy shall be applied strictly and uniformly, without exception, to the entire membership and without regard to the identity of the member requesting remote participation or the matters that will be considered or voted on at the meeting;

2. A quorum of the public body is physically assembled at one primary or central meeting location; and

3. The public body makes arrangements for the voice of the remote participant to be heard by all persons at the primary or central meeting location.

D. The following provisions apply to state public bodies:

1. Except as provided in subsection D of § 2.2-3707.01, state public bodies may also conduct any meeting wherein the public business is discussed or transacted through electronic communication means, provided that (i) a quorum of the public body is physically assembled at one primary or central meeting location, (ii) notice of the meeting has been given in accordance with subdivision 2, and (iii) members of the public are provided a substantially equivalent electronic communication means through which to witness the meeting. For the purposes of this subsection, "witness" means observe or listen.

If a state public body holds a meeting through electronic communication means pursuant to this subsection, it shall also hold at least one meeting annually where members in attendance at the meeting are physically assembled at one location and where no members participate by electronic communication means.

2. Notice of any regular meeting held pursuant to this subsection shall be provided at least three working days in advance of the date scheduled for the meeting. Notice, reasonable under the circumstance, of special, emergency, or continued meetings held pursuant to this section shall be given contemporaneously with the notice provided to members of the public body conducting the meeting. For the purposes of this subsection, "continued meeting" means a
meeting that is continued to address an emergency or to conclude the agenda of a meeting for which proper notice was given.

The notice shall include the date, time, place, and purpose for the meeting; shall identify the primary or central meeting location and any remote locations that are open to the public pursuant to subdivision 4; shall include notice as to the electronic communication means by which members of the public may witness the meeting; and shall include a telephone number that may be used to notify the primary or central meeting location of any interruption in the telephonic or video broadcast of the meeting. Any interruption in the telephonic or video broadcast of the meeting shall result in the suspension of action at the meeting until repairs are made and public access is restored.

3. A copy of the proposed agenda and agenda packets and, unless exempt, all materials that will be distributed to members of a public body for a meeting shall be made available for public inspection at the same time such documents are furnished to the members of the public body conducting the meeting.

4. Public access to the remote locations from which additional members of the public body participate through electronic communication means shall be encouraged but not required. However, if three or more members are gathered at the same remote location, then such remote location shall be open to the public.

5. If access to remote locations is afforded, (i) all persons attending the meeting at any of the remote locations shall be afforded the same opportunity to address the public body as persons attending at the primary or central location and (ii) a copy of the proposed agenda and agenda packets and, unless exempt, all materials that will be distributed to members of the public body for the meeting shall be made available for inspection by members of the public attending the meeting at any of the remote locations at the time of the meeting.

6. The public body shall make available to the public at any meeting conducted in accordance with this subsection a public comment form prepared by the Virginia Freedom of Information Advisory Council in accordance with § 30-179.

7. Minutes of all meetings held by electronic communication means shall be recorded as required by § 2.2-3707. Votes taken during any meeting conducted through electronic communication means shall be recorded by name in roll-call fashion and included in the minutes. For emergency meetings held by electronic communication means, the nature of the emergency shall be stated in the minutes.
8. Any authorized state public body that meets by electronic communication means pursuant to this subsection shall make a written report of the following to the Virginia Freedom of Information Advisory Council by December 15 of each year:

   a. The total number of meetings held that year in which there was participation through electronic communication means;

   b. The dates and purposes of each such meeting;

   c. A copy of the agenda for each such meeting;

   d. The primary or central meeting location of each such meeting;

   e. The types of electronic communication means by which each meeting was held;

   f. If possible, the number of members of the public who witnessed each meeting through electronic communication means;

   g. The identity of the members of the public body recorded as present at each meeting, and whether each member was present at the primary or central meeting location or participated through electronic communication means;

   h. The identity of any members of the public body who were recorded as absent at each meeting and any members who were recorded as absent at a meeting but who monitored the meeting through electronic communication means;

   i. If members of the public were granted access to a remote location from which a member participated in a meeting through electronic communication means, the number of members of the public at each such remote location;

   j. A summary of any public comment received about the process of conducting a meeting through electronic communication means; and

   k. A written summary of the public body's experience conducting meetings through electronic communication means, including its logistical and technical experience.

E. Nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the use of interactive audio or video means to expand public participation.


The chapters of the acts of assembly referenced in the historical citation at the end of this section may not constitute a comprehensive list of such chapters and may exclude chapters whose provisions have expired.
FUTURE MEETING TOPICS

- DRPT Transit Modernization and Equity Study
- Regional Scenario Planning
- GRTC Microtransit Study
- STBG / CMAQ competitive grants
- Update from RMTA/VDOT on tolls
- Virginia Passenger Rail Authority presentation
- infrastructure program presentation - state and federal funding

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