STBG/CMAQ Existing Project Requests
TAC Meeting
January 10, 2023
Background

• Existing project applications held in September
• Requests exceed $14M (STBG)
• Estimated $18.2M available for STBG program
• Following October TAC, staff has followed up with sponsors for additional details
• Project history provided along with staff recommendation
#SMART18 - RTE 360 WIDENING
UPC 13551, Hanover County

![Bar chart showing funding request and actual spending for the #SMART18 - RTE 360 WIDENING project in Hanover County. The chart includes years from 2004 to 2024, with funding levels for 2023 and 2024 projected. The chart indicates a significant increase in funding from early years to recent years, with a focus on transportation planning and organization support.]
#SMART18 - RTE 360 WIDENING
UPC 13551, Hanover County

• Cost increase due to recent inflation, bid
• Legacy project, TPO funding stable for a decade until last year
• Locality has noted funding is available locally for this request
• Approval Authority: Policy Board
• Staff recommends not funding this request due to availability of local funding
Commerce Rd Improvements
UPC 15958, City of Richmond
Commerce Rd Improvements
UPC 15958, City of Richmond

• Legacy project, TPO involved for past decade
• Significant cost increase and TPO funding awarded since selection
• Previously bid in 2021
• Approval Authority: **Policy Board**
• Staff recommends not funding this request due to rapid escalation, increase of TPO share
• If funded, staff recommends funds be based on current cost share and contingent on project advancing to CN in FY24
Jahnke Road Improvements
UPC 19035, City of Richmond

• Legacy project with long history
• TPO funding stable for past decade
• Previously bid in 2018, award in 2019
• Cost escalated significantly (56%) since award issues prevented construction in 2019
• Approval Authority: Policy Board
• Staff recommends not funding this request due to post-bid history, escalation in cost
• If funded, staff recommends funds be contingent on project advancing to CN in FY24
Deepwater Terminal Rd Extension
UPC 104281, City of Richmond

• Recent TPO selection (FY19)
• Large increase in TPO funding requested and awarded since selection
• Request ($1.75M) was significantly higher than deficit ($412,000)
• Approval Authority: Policy Board (request) or TAC (deficit)
• Staff recommends not funding this request due to availability of local funding for the small deficit
N. Parham Rd Signal and Sidewalk
UPC 109194, Henrico County
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N. Parham Rd Signal and Sidewalk
UPC 109194, Henrico County

- Smart Scale project
- TPO funding stable until last year
- Funding deficit is largely due to lower Smart Scale estimate than estimate at TPO selection
- Approval Authority: TAC
- Staff recommends not funding this request due to availability of local funding for the small deficit
Route 1 Improvements
UPC 112042, Town of Ashland

Bar chart showing projected funding over years from 2019 to 2024. The chart includes four categories: PE, RW, CN, and TPO Funding. The chart also indicates a request for funding in 2024.
Route 1 Improvements
UPC 112042, Town of Ashland

• Recent selection (FY19)
• Project has seen significant cost increases since selection
• TPO funding nearly entire project
• Approval Authority: Policy Board
• Staff recommends funding this request given the lack of local funding to cover the deficit
• TAC may also want to consider requesting additional local commitment to this project
Early Settlers Rd Sidewalk
UPC 113846, Chesterfield County

TPO Funding Request
Early Settlers Rd Sidewalk
UPC 113846, Chesterfield County

• Recent selection (FY19)
• Funding stable until this year (inflation impact)
• Approval Authority: TAC
• Staff recommends not funding this request due to availability of local funding for the small deficit
Libbie Avenue Road Diet
UPC 115769, Henrico County

TPO Funding Request Deficit
Libbie Avenue Road Diet
UPC 115769, Henrico County

• Recent selection (FY20)
• Cost increases have been covered by no-post to date to continue advancing the project
• Approval Authority: Policy Board
• Staff recommends not funding this request due to availability of local funding for the small deficit
RRTPO Scenario Planning Pilot
UPC 118143, RRTPO
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RRTPO Scenario Planning Pilot
UPC 118143, RRTPO

• Recent selection (FY21)
• Request reflects contract total + contingency
• Deficit is strictly contract total
• Approval Authority: Policy Board
• Staff recommends funding this request due to lack of alternative funding sources and the critical role in preparing the next LRTP
Alternative Funding Source

- **TPO policy**: In general, cost overruns should be addressed through other funding sources available to the locality

- Staff view CVTA local funding as the primary local source for project overruns

- Projected CVTA revenues can cover most requests with small impact to local programs

- Legacy projects have larger impact due to larger deficits; complicated histories and/or available funding lead to local funding recommendation
## CVTA Revenue Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
<th>FY28</th>
<th>FY29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$170.4</td>
<td>$176.2</td>
<td>$180.8</td>
<td>$182.4</td>
<td>$184.4</td>
<td>$186.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuels Tax</td>
<td>$57.6</td>
<td>$60.0</td>
<td>$61.9</td>
<td>$63.7</td>
<td>$65.4</td>
<td>$66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$228.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$236.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$242.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$246.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>$249.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>$253.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated December 2022
## CVTA Local Distribution Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
<th>FY28</th>
<th>FY29</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>$0.38</td>
<td>$0.40</td>
<td>$0.41</td>
<td>$0.41</td>
<td>$0.42</td>
<td>$0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles City</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
<td>$0.73</td>
<td>$0.75</td>
<td>$0.76</td>
<td>$0.77</td>
<td>$0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>$32.30</td>
<td>$33.46</td>
<td>$34.39</td>
<td>$34.88</td>
<td>$35.40</td>
<td>$35.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goochland</td>
<td>$2.70</td>
<td>$2.79</td>
<td>$2.87</td>
<td>$2.91</td>
<td>$2.96</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>$15.84</td>
<td>$16.41</td>
<td>$16.87</td>
<td>$17.10</td>
<td>$17.36</td>
<td>$17.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>$36.90</td>
<td>$38.23</td>
<td>$39.29</td>
<td>$39.84</td>
<td>$40.45</td>
<td>$41.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Kent</td>
<td>$2.54</td>
<td>$2.63</td>
<td>$2.71</td>
<td>$2.74</td>
<td>$2.79</td>
<td>$2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powhatan</td>
<td>$2.53</td>
<td>$2.62</td>
<td>$2.69</td>
<td>$2.73</td>
<td>$2.77</td>
<td>$2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Share</strong></td>
<td><strong>$113.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$117.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$120.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>$122.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$124.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>$126.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assumes FY22 operating budget, local distribution share
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UPC</th>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>CVTA (local)</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>% of CVTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13551</td>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>FY24, FY25</td>
<td>$32,250,000</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15958</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>FY24, FY25</td>
<td>$39,550,000</td>
<td>$3,770,000</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19035</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>FY24, FY25</td>
<td>$39,550,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104281</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>FY25, FY26</td>
<td>$40,810,000</td>
<td>$412,000</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109194</td>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>FY26</td>
<td>$39,290,000</td>
<td>$204,029</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112042</td>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>FY24, FY25</td>
<td>$780,000</td>
<td>$2,759,106</td>
<td>353.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113846</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>FY24</td>
<td>$32,300,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115769</td>
<td>Henrico</td>
<td>FY24, FY25</td>
<td>$75,130,000</td>
<td>$483,500</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Requested Action

• TAC is requested to provide a recommendation on additional funding for each project
• TAC can follow staff recommendation or make a different recommendation
• TAC recommendation will be incorporated into the draft allocations program (tentatively scheduled for February)
FFY24 – FFY27 TIP Development
TAC Meeting
January 10, 2023
Overview

• **No action requested today**
• TPO staff have not received draft obligations & revenue projections from VDOT
• TIP data originally expected in late November or early December
• Data now expected by mid-January
• Staff coordinating with Tri-Cities and VDOT to update schedule for TIP and conformity
## Schedule Update

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone</th>
<th>Original Schedule</th>
<th>Draft Updated Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAC recommend project list</td>
<td>1/10/2023</td>
<td>2/14/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Board approve project list &amp; authorize TAC to open public review</td>
<td>2/2/2023</td>
<td>3/2/2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICG/TAC meeting</td>
<td>2/14/2023</td>
<td>3/14/2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>