Has any consideration been given to providing preliminary scores prior to the final scoring to give applicants a sense of where its application ranks and to be able to make adjustments to improve their score?
Question 2

For Hanover’s current applications, how much local funding would need to be contributed in order to be awarded SS funding.
Question 3 and 15

Talk specifically about the Fall Line applications, why they didn’t score well, and what options exist to move this regional priority forward.

What changes in SMART SCALE scoring measures are needed to successfully fund multi-use trails, such as the Fall Line, in future rounds of the program?
Question 4

Why are rural county projects like Powhatan’s not getting funded?
Question 5

I-64 expansion has not been on the receiving end of SMART SCALE for multiple cycles. The approach has been changed to address smart scale concerns and the scoring has not improved. Cost estimates this cycle were overinflated by VDOT and hurt the CBA. What is OIPI’s advice on next steps for I-64?
In previous SMART SCALE rounds, additional funding is usually released and additional projects are added in the April / May time frame after the public hearings. Is it likely that the same thing will happen for Round 4?
There appears to be $14.4M more in Richmond district grant funds and $20M in statewide high priority funding still available. What is the process to program that funding within the Richmond District?

It appears that Henrico County’s Staples Mill Road Improvement project is the next in line to be funded for $27M. Currently the delta between the remaining district funding is $12.6M to fully fund. What is the likelihood of this amount being added like previous rounds?

After Henrico County’s project, there are two projects: Chesterfield’s Matoaca at Woodpecker Roundabout ($7M) and Prince George’s Middle Road Roundabout ($5.6M). Taken together, these two projects could be funded with the remaining district grant funds, correct?

From a regional perspective, the SB Powhite Parkway Capacity and Safety Improvements project ($9.4M) falls just behind Henrico, Chesterfield, and Prince George projects, would this be a candidate for the remaining district grant funds?
Are any changes being investigated to improve how cost estimates are validated across the state? Overly risk averse estimates have a direct impact on which projects get funded and the way the process was handled this year did not take into account efforts that occurred before the applications were submitted.
Question 12

Please consider reinstating the previous policy that allows for the delineation between locally administered projects and VDOT administered projects with respect to estimates and schedules. Some projects administrative costs are lower than others. This should be rewarded as a way to buy project costs down just like completing earlier phases, acquiring R/W or localities directly bring money to the table.
SMART SCALE Dashboard
Changing how we track performance

Impact of business rule changes on performance

- **Completed Early** (Never Yellow)
- **Yellow but Completed On-Time**
- **Completed Late** (>12 days or awarded late)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Completed Early</th>
<th>Yellow but Completed On-Time</th>
<th>Completed Late</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2013 - Feb. 2017</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Scale Completed Feb. 2017-May 2018</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Scale Completed June 2018-May 2019</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SMART SCALE Dashboard

Changing how we track performance

- Impact of business rule changes on performance

#### Project on Development Time - SMART SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMIN BY</th>
<th>% ON TIME (OT)</th>
<th>#OT</th>
<th>$OT</th>
<th>% ON BUDGET (OB)</th>
<th>#OB</th>
<th>$OB</th>
<th>TOTAL PROJECTS</th>
<th>TOTAL BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$111.4 M</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>$221.7 M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$340.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDOT</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$1.22 B</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$753.3 M</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$1.38 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$1.34 B</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>$971.0 M</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$1.72 B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Milestones are being completed earlier but challenges to meeting established targets exist
- Localities awarded 48% of projects on-time (33% of award dollar value)
- VDOT awarded 80% of projects on-time (89% of the award dollar value)
SMART SCALE Dashboard
Changing how we track performance

- Impact of business rule changes on performance

Project Delivery - SMART SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMIN BY</th>
<th>% ON TIME (OT)</th>
<th># OT</th>
<th>$ OT</th>
<th>% ON BUDGET (OB)</th>
<th># OB</th>
<th>$ OB</th>
<th>TOTAL CONTRACTS</th>
<th>TOTAL AWARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Locally</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$11.8 M</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$11.8 M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$87.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VDOT</td>
<td>87.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$176.5 M</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$117.1 M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$222.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$188.4 M</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$128.9 M</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$310.5 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Localities completed 57% of projects on-time (13% of dollar value scheduled for completion)
- VDOT has completed 87% of projects on-time (79% of the dollar value scheduled for completion)
Is consideration being given to modify the Land Use factor to more adequately capture a project's ability to help improve land use and density versus crediting existing land use and density that are not necessarily being enhanced by a project?

Some measures (e.g. land use) are disproportionately impacting the outcomes of which projects are being selected. Are you looking into any changes to help address the impacts normalization has on the factor weights?
Question 14

The Economic Development factor does not sufficiently account for proposed new development/redevelopment in advance of approved plans. Based on the SMART SCALE project funding and delivery, this often results in a lag effect of transportation infrastructure improvements needed to support these developments. Are there other measures that can be used to capture economic development benefits to better align project delivery with development schedules?