

SUMMARY
COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD
SUBCOMMITTEE ON VTRANS 2035 UPDATE WORKSHOP

Patrick Henry Building Conference room 3 (Rm. 1006)
1111 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Friday, October 26, 2012

Members in Attendance: Aubrey Lane, Chair, Dana Martin, Cord Sterling, J. Douglas Koelemay

This meeting was called to order at 9:00 AM.

Deputy Secretary Tyeryar, Director of the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment discussed the VTrans 2035 Update, as the document serving as a segway between Vtrans2035 and Vtrans2040; which transitions Virginia to performance-based planning. He said this performance based planning system is not intended to prescribe a course of action for the CTB, but will give them guidance and serve as a tool to help them make decisions.

The two objectives for the meeting were discussed as follows: 1. Discuss and achieve consensus on the Investment Priorities as a core component of the Performance-Based Planning Framework and 2. Discuss the process of rating investment priorities and ways that the information can be useful to the CTB and others. The status of the Update was discussed; with the last step to be completed public input on the draft document.

A timeline of previous CTB involvement in the update was reviewed.

Lorna Parkins, consultant to the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment, presented an update on why and how the VTrans 2035 update will incorporate Performance Based Planning into the statewide transportation planning process. This included introducing the Vision – Goals – Investment Priorities – Investment Strategies hierarchy and noting that Investment Priorities introduced in the original VTrans 2035 plan were significantly changed. Dana Martin noted that having a simple explanation for the process was an important outcome. Several concerns, including implicit bias towards certain modes and/or certain parts of the state and consequences of low performance, were raised by the CTB members. These were addressed by noting that the framework is required for compliance with federal funding regulations and that the focus was on projects beyond basic safety and maintenance.

Lorna then introduced the updated set of Investment Priorities in more detail. This included an overview of the public involvement process that linked Goals and Investment Priorities and a review of the verbiage for each Investment Priority. It was noted that the priorities were not yet rated. Several CTB members raised concerns as to the conformance of these priorities with existing State and Federal legislation, these were addressed by noting that the purpose of the rating process was only to aid

funding decisions being made within what is currently allowed by State law and Federal regulation. A concern was also raised that adoption of newer technology can fall under a number of Priorities, and it was noted that the current framework will accommodate this. All present CTB member expressed approval of the Investment Priorities as presented.

Lorna then presented an overview of how Investment Priorities were to be rated, included a description of the four aspects of the rating framework – addressing needs, affordability, ease of implementation, and the downside of not investing. A concern was raised as to when the results of these ratings would be implemented; the answer given was that this framework was for projects not yet begun. Several CTB members noted that since much of the decision making will happen on the regional level, the statewide framework may not be applied. This was addressed by noting that Federal regulations require consistency between statewide and regional performance based planning, and that this framework can provide a common language for regional bodies to conduct their own prioritizations.

Lorna then presented how rated Investment Priorities can be used to prioritize investment strategies, projects, and programs. The Corridors of Statewide Significance were used as an example.

Lorna then presented an overview of the changes to OIPI's performance reporting process, including creation of more technologically sophisticated system, potential changes to measures being used, setting more targets, and more frequent reporting. This was related back to performance based planning as a way of seeing if programs selected were actually accomplishing goals. A concern was raised that a "reality check" was needed to ensure projects were really addressing goals, and it was noted that guidance will be issued on this subject. Implementation of the performance reporting changes was presented as more appropriate for VTrans 2040.

Linda, consultant to the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment, reiterated the four components used to rate the Investment Priorities (IPs) once again, being Need, Affordability score, Implementation score, and Impact of Not Making the Investment Score. She stated that the CTB had really been intuitively rating the IPs all along, but now rating these IPs allow the board to truly tie priorities back to performance.

Linda discussed how the 'Need' score was computed using the performance measures. It was pointed out that many IPs influence several goals earlier in the workshop; the needs analysis chart on slide 24 reflects this overlap and shows where the correlations are strongest. 'Need' scores were then developed in order to show how much an investment priority 'moves the needle.' It was noted this was created using input from a workshop that included both citizens and staff level providers. Aubrey Lane mentioned the problematic nature of the system in that it could be manipulated to support specific projects. Mr. Tyeryar responded that this is not a prescriptive system, that the CTB can still look at projects on a case by case basis so that problem shouldn't arise. There was a discussion regarding the concern that federal funding may be lost if we don't meet these metrics for performance, but it was noted that the implementation of these new federal regulations may not happen on a time frame that would even affect this update.

Linda discussed how Affordability was computed – order of magnitude relative cost and ability to leverage funds were the two measures used. The importance of how PPTA funding leverage was incorporated into this score was noted by several CTB members. Reta was concerned that VDOT's 'mega-projects' that could get P3 funding were less common than the smaller projects. Linda reiterated that the process rates investment priorities, not projects. Doug was concerned that this may inhibit projects from being completed that have a private partnership offer but are not ranked high enough to complete. Lorna restated that this is not a prescriptive system, they can still evaluate on a case by case basis.

Linda discussed how Implementation Score was computed – ease of coordination and readiness were the two measures used.

Linda discussed how Not Making the Investment Score was computed – timing of downside and degree of ripple effect were the two measures used. This scoring criterion was also created with multi-modal input. Aubrey pointed out this component of the IP process was unique to this system and the general consensus was that the inclusion of this was important.

Example Results were discussed by Linda. These were intentionally not 'rolled up' into one investment priority score, although they could have been, so that the CTB can still use it as a guideline and see how these four factors weigh on the IPs overall ranking. Tyeryar noted that this would enable the CTB to have more of a decision making role using this and not just put 'the rubber stamp' on projects. Doug noted that this system was very relevant and that he could see this administration's strategies embedded in it. The potential for this to be used as a guideline for MPOs and other regional bodies across VA was exciting to Doug and the other CTB members in general. Lorna pointed out it was a 'language' they could all use to communicate about these IPs.

The uses of these ratings were further discussed by Lorna in terms of both immediate and long-term potential uses.

The next steps were discussed by Lorna and a date for the next subcommittee meeting was set for November 5th.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM