

AGENDA

RICHMOND REGIONAL
TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
REGIONAL FUNDING GUIDELINES SUBCOMMITTEE

Monday, February 8, 2021

3:00 p.m.

Members of the public may observe the meeting via YouTube Live Streaming on the [PlanRVA YouTube Channel](#). Opportunities for sharing comments are described in the [Public Participation](#) guide.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

(Busching).....

STATEMENT REGARDING VIRTUAL MEETINGS

(Busching)..... page 1

ATTENDANCE BY ROLL CALL

(Busching).....

1. Consideration of Amendments to the Agenda

(Coleman/Vidunas)

2. Approval of January 11, 2021 Meeting Summary

(Coleman/Vidunas) page 2

Action Requested

3. Task 2: Feedback Summary and Revisions - Discussion

(Busching)

4. Task 3: Project Allocations and Funding - Discussion

(Busching) page 5

5. Next Meeting: March 8, 2021

(Coleman/Vidunas)

6. Adjournment

(Coleman/Vidunas)

MAB/nm
Attachments

Opening Statement for Electronic Meetings

Due to the 2020 COVID-19 virus and current guidance regarding physical distancing to reduce the potential for spread, meetings of the Richmond Regional Planning District Commissions have transitioned to a virtual format in accordance with provisions of Virginia Code § 2.2-3708.2 and related legislation approved by the General Assembly of Virginia during the period of the Governor's State of Emergency Declaration for COVID-19.

While we meet in a remote/virtual format, we remain committed to public accessibility and opportunity to participate. Staff provided notice of this meeting to members and the public on February 1, 2021 through electronic posting on the PlanRVA website and email distribution of notice to members, alternates, and known interested parties, including the media.

This meeting will be recorded. Audio and visual recordings of the meeting and materials will be posted on the PlanRVA website within 48 hours of this meeting.

Any member of the public participating as an observer during the meeting today may submit comments or questions at any time prior to or during the meeting via email at rrtpoinput@PlanRVA.org. All comments and questions submitted at this time will be reviewed following the meeting and to the extent practical, responses will be provided or posted on the PlanRVA website.

We ask that members identify themselves first when speaking so we can more accurately record the activities of the meeting. All lines should be muted to minimize additional noise and feedback. You may unmute your line at any time to request acknowledgement from the Chair.

Please let us know if you have any questions regarding the process for assuring effective facilitation of this meeting or for how members of the public may participate.

By providing this statement, staff certifies that we have followed the approved procedures for appropriate notice of this meeting and the means by which we are convening.

Please indicate your presence by saying "HERE" when your name is called during a roll call. Anyone who wishes to identify themselves following the roll call of members will be invited to do so.

**RICHMOND REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION
REGIONAL FUNDING GUIDELINES SUBCOMMITTEE**

**MEETING SUMMARY
Zoom Virtual Meeting
January 11, 2021
3:00 p.m.**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

City of Richmond		Goochland County		Hanover County	
Dironna Moore Clarke		Tom Coleman	x	Joe Vidunas	x
Henrico County		DRPT (non-voting)		GRTC	
Sharon Smidler	x	Tiffany Dubinsky	x	Emily DelRoss (A)	x
VDOT (non-voting)					
Liz McAdory	x				

The RRTPO RSTP/CMAQ Subcommittee meeting was held by electronic communication means as set forth by the April 22, 2020 actions of the General Assembly in response to the continued spread of novel coronavirus, or COVID-19. The technology used for this 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 the [Plan RVA YouTube Channel](#).

CALL TO ORDER

Myles Busching, Richmond Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RRTPO) Associate Planner, presided and called the January 11, 2021 Regional Funding Guidelines Subcommittee meeting to order at 3:02 p.m.

1. Considerations of Amendments to the Agenda

There were no requested changes to the meeting agenda. Seeing and hearing no objections, the agenda was approved by acclamation as presented.

2. Approval of October 13, 2020 Meeting Summary

The following correction was made to the October 13, 2020 meeting summary: Jacob C. Herrman (alternate) was in attendance representing VDOT.

On motion of Tom Coleman, seconded by Sharon Smidler, the RRTPO Regional Funding Guidelines Subcommittee unanimously approved the meeting summary of the October 13, 2020 meeting by acclamation as amended.

3. Task 1: Feedback Summary and Revisions

Myles Busching, RRTPO staff planner, presented a summary of the comments received on the draft section for Task 1. Comments were received from three (3) subcommittee jurisdictions – Hanover, Henrico, and Richmond and generally covered four (4) primary topics. The subcommittee discussion of each topic is summarized below:

1. LRTP Consistency: Several comments were received regarding the process for amending the LRTP. Myles Busching laid out a generalized process for amending

the LRTP and explained that consistency with the LRTP is already a part of the RSTP/CMAQ program guidelines. The subcommittee had no additional concerns with this topic.

2. **Cost and Schedule Validation for Projects:** Concerns were raised regarding the process of validating costs and the appropriateness of VDOT validating costs for locally administered costs. Myles Busching presented an alternative where locally administered projects would not be validated by VDOT but requested input from the subcommittee on alternative approaches to ensure cost and schedule submitted are realistic. The subcommittee expressed generally agreement with VDOT validation but had concerns about the process for implementation and how disagreements would be handled. The subcommittee also expressed concern with the needs to complete studies or bring in outside consultants to submit project applications. RRTPO staff agreed to work with VDOT and bring a proposal back along with the final draft guidelines.
3. **Caps on Applications:** Concerns were also raised about the caps on the number of applications and the amount of funding requested for each program. The subcommittee was generally in favor of limiting the number of submissions by each sponsor. Myles Busching presented several options for implementing the cap on the dollar value of requests. Subcommittee members requested additional time to review the alternatives and agreed to submit additional comments in writing.
4. **Supplemental Material:** The final area of concern raised by Task 1 was the required supplemental materials. Myles Busching presented a set of proposed minimum requirements; the subcommittee had not additional comments on this subject.

4. Task 2: Project Scoring and Prioritization

Myles Busching, RRTPO staff planner, presented the proposed scoring and prioritization process for RSTBG, CMAQ, and TA projects. For each program, the current guidelines were summarized, and the new scoring was presented.

For the RSTBG program, four (4) categories were proposed for scoring: studies, new projects, operational improvements, and preservation and maintenance projects. The new projects were proposed to be scored using the methodology proposed for the ConnectRVA 2045 long-range transportation plan which can be [found here](#). The operational improvements and preservation and maintenance categories were presented as potential additions without proposed scoring. The subcommittee did not indicate any interest in the additional categories.

For the CMAQ program, scoring was proposed to follow the new projects scoring for RSTBG as improvements to air quality are already included in the calculations. Subcommittee members appreciated the effort to consolidate the programs and saw potential benefits to streamlining scoring.

Finally, the TA program was introduced for inclusion in the scoring guidelines. The proposed scoring would follow [the statewide scores](#) (80%) but would also include equity impacts (10%) and the regional bicycle and pedestrian plan (10%). The subcommittee requested additional time to review the proposals and agreed to submit written comments by January 22, 2021.

5. Next Subcommittee Meeting: February 8, 2021

Chair Vidunas noted the next meeting will be held on February 8, 2021, beginning at 3:00 p.m. in Richmond, Virginia.

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:04 p.m. on January 11, 2021.

MAB/nm

Regional Project Selection and Allocation Framework

DRAFT



Table of Contents

Overview.....	4
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	4
Regional Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG).....	4
Transportation Alternatives (TA) Set-Aside	5
Project Selection Process.....	6
Project Submissions	6
Project Screening	6
Project Scoring and Prioritization.....	7
Project Selection	7
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program	9
What projects are eligible for CMAQ funding?	9
What jurisdictions or agencies are eligible for CMAQ funding?	9
How are CMAQ projects scored and prioritized?	9
Regional Surface Transportation Block Grant Program	10
What projects are eligible for STBG funding?.....	10
What jurisdictions or agencies are eligible for STBG funding?.....	10
How are STBG projects scored and prioritized?	10
Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside Program	11
What projects are eligible for TA funding?	11
What jurisdictions or agencies are eligible for TA funding?	11
How are TA projects scored and prioritized?.....	11
Project Allocations.....	13
Allocations Process.....	13
Cost Overruns	14
Surplus Funds.....	15
Funding Swaps	15
Project Development and Reporting.....	17

Project Selection Process

The process for obtaining regional funding for transportation projects is competitive as regional needs surpass the available funding. To ensure a fair and transparent process, the RRTPO has adopted a four-step project selection process. A general description of each step is included below. A calendar of the project selection process will be published each cycle with the call for projects.

Project Submissions

CMAQ/RSTBG

In the month before the application window, staff will present the project selection schedule to the RRTPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) as well as any changes to the application process from the previous year. If the existing allocations and future commitments (discussed more in depth under “Allocation Process”) leave little funding to be allocated, staff may recommend that only applications for additional funding on existing active projects be accepted that cycle. TAC agreement is sufficient to limit the scope of applications for a given cycle.

A call for projects, including a calendar for the selection process and a guide to required supplemental data for applications, will be posted to the RRTPO website. The application period is a month long. The RRTPO will provide an electronic application on the RRTPO website and all applications must be submitted using this application. All applications and supplemental materials are due by the application deadline.

TA Set-Aside

The TA Set-Aside application process is administered by VDOT via the Smart Portal. The RRTPO still has a role in the application process as all projects within the TPO study area are required to have a resolution of endorsement from the TPO. Toward this end, all project sponsors must submit a project description (including termini), total cost estimate, and request amount to the TPO at least 2.5 months ahead of the submission deadline.

TPO staff will provide a reminder to TAC before the deadline and indicate the preferred method of submission. All requests are provided to TAC for recommendation and the policy board for approval prior to the submission deadline.

Project Screening

CMAQ/RSTBG

Preliminary Screening

All projects requesting CMAQ or RSTBG funding will be screened to ensure that the project is eligible for funding and ready to proceed. Project screening will include:

- Eligibility under federal regulations
- Consistency with the Long-Range Transportation Plan (see Appendix I for more details)

- If the project is regional, the project must be included in the constrained long-range plan in an appropriate time band
- If the project is local, the project must be consistent with LRTP goals
- Project scope is well-defined
- Project schedule is defined and has been vetted by VDOT Richmond District
- Project cost is reasonable and has been vetted by VDOT Richmond District
- Submission includes all required supplemental data

Project Presentations

In addition to the project screening, project sponsors will have the opportunity to present their new project applications to the scoring team consisting of DRPT, TPO, and VDOT staff. The project sponsor will have 10 minutes to present the project followed by 10 minutes of questions from the scoring team. This presentation is the opportunity to explain the project in more detail and clarify any questions from the scoring team which may impact the scoring. Presentations will be held at the PlanRVA offices and will be scheduled during the application window.

TA Set-Aside

Screening for TA Set-Aside projects is completed by VDOT's Local Assistance Division consistent with their adopted guidelines.

Project Scoring and Prioritization

CMAQ/RSTBG

All projects are scored using a data-driven process first adopted as part of the ConnectRVA 2045 plan. This regional scoring methodology is described in more detail in the follow sections. Both CMAQ and RSTBG applications are scored using the same methodology; CMAQ applications must additionally demonstrate a reduction in emissions of ozone precursors (VOC and NOx).

TA Set-Aside

All TA Set-Aside projects undergo two rounds of scoring. First, VDOT evaluates the projects using a statewide scoring process. The TPO then evaluate the projects for equity impacts and consistency with the regional bicycle and pedestrian plan. The scoring process is described in more detail in following sections.

Project Selection

Projects are prioritized and programmed based on the project scores. For CMAQ/RSTBG funds, a draft program is produced to show years of allocations prior to adoption.

CMAQ/RSTBG

Staff will provide the scored CMAQ/RSTBG projects to TAC along with a draft allocations table. The draft program will follow the allocation process described later in these guidelines with projects generally prioritized based on their score. TAC will review the recommended new selections and provide a recommendation to the policy board.

After TAC has made a recommendation, a public comment page with a story map showing all projects and the recommended selections will be provided on the RRTPO website. This comment page will remain open for 15 days, consistent with the Public Engagement Plan. All comments will be provided to the policy board before they take a final vote on the project selections and allocations.

TA Set-Aside

Staff will provide the scored TA Set-Aside projects to TAC ranked in order of score. Considering the CTB member selections (if available), staff will recommend projects for funding in rank order until there is insufficient funding available to fully fund the next project. TAC will review the recommended selections and make a recommendation to the policy board.

After TAC has made a recommendation, a public comment page with a story map showing all projects and the recommended selections will be provided on the RRTPO website. This comment page will remain open for 15 days, consistent with the Public Engagement Plan. All comments will be provided to the policy board before they take a final vote on the project selection.

Project Allocations

Projects selected by the TPO will be programmed for funding according to the project schedule and needs. The allocation of funds by the RRTPO is the final step in the project selection process. The following section outlines the TPO's approach to allocating available funds, funding shortfalls on existing project, surplus funding, and changing project schedules.

Allocation Process

CMAQ/RSTBG

Order of Allocations

The RRTPO has adopted the following order of allocations to ensure existing, active projects are funded and prioritized over new projects while maintaining a reserve fund to account for cost overruns and changes in available funding.

1. Ten percent (10%) from Year 6 to balance entry (UPC 101492) to cover future reductions in funding and project cost overruns
2. Cost overruns for programmed phases of active projects in Years 1-5, starting with Year 1
3. Next phase of active projects already approved by the TPO for Year 6
4. New projects in order of priority and based on available funding

General Programming Guidance

Funds are allocated to projects based on the project schedule and the availability of funds. In general, the allocated funds should cover the entire amount requested for a phase (PE, RW, CN). In the case of more expensive projects where a phase costs more than 25% of the average annual program funding, funds for the phase may be split over two (2) or more years.

Allocations cover a six-year period consistent with CTB policy. The goal of the allocation process is to fully allocate all six years of funding. A balance of 10% should be added to Regionwide Traffic Operations (UPC 101492) for Year 6 to cover any cost overruns or changes to the expected amount of funding. The balance may be less in Years 1-5 if previous requests have reduced the total. No balance should remain for previous years. If the cost overruns on existing projects do not result in zero balance for previous years, regional and local planning studies are prioritized to receive the available STBG funds, and TDM programs are prioritized for CMAQ funds.

Beyond the sixth year of allocations, the TPO will also maintain a table of future commitments. These commitments are future phases of selected projects which will be allocated in later years based on the project schedule and the reasonably expected availability of funding. If the TPO decides not to fund to all phases of a project, this decision is noted in the allocations and future commitments tables.

Consistent with Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) policy, allocated funds are expected to be obligated within one (1) year of allocation and fully expended within three (3) years of obligating. For example, FY22 funds for a project phase must

be obligated by July 1, 2022 and fully spent no later than July 1, 2025. If a project is behind schedule and unable to obligate on time, the project sponsor must request a funding swap (see Funding Swaps section for details). Projects that fail to obligate on time are ineligible for additional TPO funding to cover cost overruns and, if not yet started, may be subject to deselection and deallocation.

Future Commitments

If a project cannot be fully funded within the six (6) years period covered by the SYIP, the necessary funding for future phases should be documented by year as “future commitments.” If the TPO decides not to commit to funding subsequent phases (as in the case of leveraging funds), this decision should be noted in the allocations tables. Documenting future phases and commitments allows for better estimation of available funding prior to the application period. If the available funding for is insufficient to cover any new projects, the TPO may elect to only accept applications for cost overruns of existing active projects for the year or to limit new applications by project type or total cost.

TA Set Aside

Consistent with the statewide TA program, allocations for the TA Set-Aside funded projects cover a two-year period. Funds are allocated to projects in order of priority. No balance should remain for Year 1 or previous years. Funds may be held in Year 2 as a balance.

Leveraging Funds

Applicants for CMAQ and RSTBG funds are encouraged to leverage TPO funds for outside funding such as Smart Scale and Central Virginia Transportation Authority (CVTA) regional funds wherever possible. When a selected project request is intended to support leveraging, the TPO will only allocate funds for the first phase of the project (generally PE). The use of the funds for leveraging will be documented in the allocations table. Projects with leveraging funds are not considered active projects until fully funded.

If the project sponsor is unsuccessful in obtaining additional funds to complete the project, the sponsor may request a single funding swap to allow for more time to obtain the needed funding. If the sponsor does not request a swap, or if the project has already been postponed once, the project funds will be deallocated and used on other projects. The project sponsor may submit a new application for the entire project cost to be scored with other new projects; a partial funding request will only be accepted if the sponsor can show other committed and reasonably expected funding is available to cover the difference (See Appendix II for a definition of “committed and reasonably expected funds”).

Cost Overruns

All active projects are initially eligible to request additional funding to cover cost overruns. Eligibility may be lost as described in the “Funding Swaps” and “Quarterly Reporting” sections. Additional funding requests must be submitted during the

annual application window; requests outside the normal application window will only be accepted for the construction phase where bids are over budget. Expanded project scope will not be accepted as a justification for additional funding.

If the request results in a cumulative allocation increase of up to 10% relative to the initial TPO approved allocation for the phase, TAC may approve additional allocations. TAC may only approve use of balance entry funds for the allocated fiscal year (i.e. FY22 balance for RW funded in FY22) or previous fiscal years.

If the request results in a cumulative allocation increase of more than 10% relative to the initial TPO approved allocation for the phase, or if sufficient funding is not available in the balance entry fund for the allocated fiscal year or previous years, TAC will review the request and recommend to the policy board any combination of the following options for their approval:

- Scale back the project
- Use local or other non-TPO funds
- Use balance entry from the allocated fiscal year or previous years
- Use balance entry from future fiscal years
- Deselect and deallocate the project

Surplus Funds

All surplus funds are returned to TPO balance entry (UPC 101492) to be reallocated through the TPO selection and allocation process. Funds are deemed surplus upon project completion or cancellation. Projects that are completed or cancelled are no longer considered active projects and cannot request additional funding in the future.

Any CMAQ/RSTBG funding on a project that receives additional committed funding from another source is also deemed surplus if the total allocation exceeds the estimated project cost. The TPO will work with VDOT to identify overfunded projects and reallocate surplus funding. Unlike completed or cancelled projects, projects which are overfunded are still considered active projects, even if all regional funding is removed from the project. As active projects, these projects are eligible for additional funding in accordance with the cost overrun guidelines in the previous section.

Funding Swaps

To minimize the risk of rescission and in conformity with CTB policy and state law, project phases are expected to be obligated within a year of allocation. Sponsors of projects that are unable to obligate on schedule (based on the year of planned allocations) must submit a swap request no later than the year before the planned allocation to allow for adjustments to the allocation program. Project sponsors may, but are not required to, inform the TPO of projects that can advance ahead of schedule. Swap requests should be submitted during the annual application window.

VDOT and TPO staff will identify potential swaps based on project schedule and funding. With concurrence of both project sponsors, the swap will be programmed in a new allocation plan. Alternatively, two project sponsors may agree to a swap and bring the proposed swap to the TPO. With VDOT and TPO staff concurrence, the swap will be programmed in the new allocation table.

If a project fails to obligate on time for any phase and the project sponsor fails to inform the TPO of the need for a funding swap in advance, the project will no longer be eligible for regional funding to cover any cost overruns. If the project fails to obligate on time for the first phase of the project (generally PE) and the sponsor fails to request a funding swap, the project may be deselected and any funding reallocated.

Project Development and Reporting

To provide oversight in the use of regional funds, the RRTPO has implemented a quarterly reporting requirement for CMAQ and STBG funded projects. VDOT's Local Assistance Division (LAD) has similar requirements for TA Set-Aside funded projects. Project sponsors are expected to complete the quarterly report for each active project every January, April, July and October until the project is closed out, beginning in October of the first year in which funds are allocated. The report can be filed at any time during the required month. A reporting form will be made available on the RRTPO website. The report should, at minimum, include the following items:

- Current cost estimate and schedule
- Current phase(s) authorized
- Next major milestone (task 10, 12, 22, 70, 52, 69, 80, 84)
- Any delays or challenges in implementation

Projects that miss the quarterly reporting deadline will not be eligible for additional funding for cost overruns.

The RRTPO will maintain a CMAQ/RSTBG program database on the RRTPO website. This page will include a summary of all active projects and their progress toward implementation as well as selected but not yet active projects. This page will be updated with the quarterly reports and after new project selection each year.