



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Commonwealth Transportation Board

Aubrey L. Layne, Jr.
Chairman

1401 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

(804) 786-2701
Fax: (804) 786-2940

Agenda item # 8

RESOLUTION **OF THE** **COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

April 20, 2016

MOTION

**Made By: Mr. Kasprowicz, Seconded By: Mr. Connors
Action: Motion Carried**

Title: Adoption of HB2 Recommendations for Preparation of the Draft FY 2017 -2022 Six-Year Improvement Program.

WHEREAS, section 33.2-214.1 of the *Code of Virginia*, provides that the Commonwealth Transportation Board (“Board”) shall develop a statewide prioritization process for certain projects funded by the Board, including those projects allocated funds pursuant to section 33.2-358 of the *Code of Virginia*, and

WHEREAS, Chapter 726 of the 2014 Acts of Assembly, requires the Board to select projects for funding utilizing the project prioritization process beginning July 1, 2016; and

WHEREAS, effective July 1, 2015, Chapter 684 of the 2015 Acts of Assembly (HB 1887) modified section 33.2-358 and set forth the requirements relating to the allocation of funds to, and the establishment of a High Priority Projects Program and a District Grant Program with candidate projects under these programs to be screened, evaluated and selected according to the prioritization process established pursuant to section 33.2-214.1; and

WHEREAS, the Board adopted a policy and process on June 17, 2015 to govern screening, scoring and selecting projects for funding pursuant to section 33.2-214.1 (“Project Prioritization Process”); and

WHEREAS, the Board adopted a policy on October 27, 2015, *Six-Year Improvement Program Policy Related to HB2 (2014) and HB1887 (2015)*, which among other things, required the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (“OIP”) to present to the Board funding

scenarios relating to the Project Prioritization Process and development of the Six Year Improvement Program for the Board's consideration, with each scenario providing full funding for each project funded; and

WHEREAS, over 300 applications were submitted and screened pursuant to the Project Prioritization Process with the 288 validated applications being found to propose projects that are consistent with or meet one or more VTrans needs, thus satisfying the requirement in section 33.2-214.1 (B)(2) that candidate projects "be screened by the Commonwealth Transportation Board to determine whether they are consistent with the assessment of capacity needs for all for corridors of statewide significance, regional networks, and improvements to promote urban development areas established pursuant to § 15.2-2223.1, undertaken in the Statewide Transportation Plan in accordance with § 33.2-353"; and

WHEREAS, at its January 19, 2016 Workshop, the Board was presented with information relating to the outcome of the prioritization process along with a list of projects recommended for funding based on a four step scenario ("Recommended/Base Scenario") consisting of the following steps (collectively, "Funding Steps"):

Step 1: Fund District Grant Projects first based on Scores/HB2 Cost

Step 2: Fund projects that otherwise would have been funded based on rank, but did not receive funding because they were not eligible for the District Grant Program, using High Priority Funds

Step 3: Combine remaining District Grant funds with Statewide High Priority funds to fund the next highest ranked project eligible for both programs

Step 4: Allocate remaining Statewide High Priority funds based on highest project benefit score and Score/HB2 cost > 1, until funds are insufficient to fund the next project with the highest benefit score; and

WHEREAS, at its March 15, 2016 Workshop, the Board received additional information regarding the Recommended/Base Scenario along with recommendations to revise that Scenario based on issues associated with the congestion, cost estimates and/or environmental impact scoring factors that had the potential to impact scores of some projects and their funding under the Recommended/Base Scenario; and

WHEREAS, in the March 15, 2016 Workshop, the Board was presented two alternatives for revising the Recommended/Base Scenario ("Scenario Alternatives"), namely: (1) the Revised Base Scenario which would correct the congestion score for several new location facilities, correct costs for several projects, and would not provide funding for any project where a previous recommendation to fund the project was based on the lack of an environmental impact, or (2) Scenario #2 which would include the above-referenced changes associated with the Revised Base Scenario and which would eliminate Step 3 in the Recommended/Base Scenario; and

WHEREAS, the Recommended/Base Scenario was released in January and the Scenario Alternatives were released in March, thereby affording transparency in the project prioritization and funding recommendation process; and

WHEREAS, in accord with the requirement set forth in the *Six-Year Improvement Program Policy Related to HB2 (2014) and HB1887 (2015)*, adopted by the Board October 27, 2015, full funding has been identified for all projects subjected to the Recommended/Base Scenario as well as the Scenario Alternatives; and

WHEREAS, the Board has given due consideration to the Scenario Alternatives presented at the March 15, 2016 Workshop.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Board finds that the Revised Base Scenario as presented in the March 15, 2016 Workshop is the approach to be used in funding projects scored pursuant to the Project Prioritization Process for purposes of preparing the Draft FY 2017-2022 Six-Year Improvement Program, with the exceptions/modifications and conditions as noted in the Attachment A.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, by the Board that, due to the evolving nature of the new statewide project prioritization process, to the extent that the process utilized in developing the Revised Based Scenario and the exceptions/modifications set forth in Attachment A differed from the Board's policies and processes as envisioned and adopted June 17, 2015 and October 27, 2015, the process so utilized is hereby ratified for purposes of preparing the Draft FY 2017-2022 Six-Year Improvement Program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board hereby adopts the Revised Base Scenario as presented in the March 15, 2016 Workshop, subject to the exceptions/modifications and conditions set forth in Attachment A, as the approach to be used in funding projects scored pursuant to the Project Prioritization Process for the Draft FY 2017-2022 Six-Year Improvement Program and directs that the Revised Base Scenario with the exceptions/modifications and conditions set forth in Attachment A, the results of which are summarized in the Revised Base Scenario with Exceptions and Modifications Summary set forth in Attachment B, be used in preparing the Draft FY 2017-2022 Six-Year Improvement Program.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that given the sunset of January 1, 2017, established by the Board for the *Six-Year Improvement Program Policy Related to HB2 (2014) and HB1887 (2015)*, the Board hereby directs VDOT and OIPI staff to review said policy and to develop a recommendation/draft policy addressing HB2 funding recommendations for future Six-Year Improvement Programs, which shall include but not be limited to review, inclusion and/or possible modification/revision of the Funding Steps included in the Revised Based Scenario, and to provide their recommendation/draft policy to the Board no later than the September 2016 meeting of the Board.

###

Adoption of HB2 Recommendations for Preparation of the Draft FY 2017 -2022 Six- Year Improvement Program.

ATTACHMENT A-EXCEPTIONS AND MODIFICATIONS

- US Route 15/17/29 (App ID 547) in Fauquier County- Fund to a reduced budget of \$26,000,000 using District Grant and High Priority Program Funds. (Step 3)
- Northstar Boulevard (US SO to Shreveport Drive) (App ID 516) in Loudoun County- Do not Fund
- Route 7 Widening (Phase I) (App ID 428) in Fairfax County- Fund using District Grant Program Funds only. (Step 1)
- Route 7 Widening (Phase II) (App ID 429) in Fairfax County- Add and fund to a reduced budget of \$42,000,000 using District Grant and High Priority Program Funds. (Step 3)
- 1-95/1-64 Overlap: Roadway Lighting (App ID 446) in the City of Richmond- Do not Fund.
- 1-95/1-64 Overlap: Broad Street Exit Improvements (App ID 449) in the City of Richmond -Fund using District Grant Program Funds only. (Step 1)
- 1-64 Widening (1-295 to Exit 205 Bottoms Bridge) (App ID 542) in Henrico County- Add and fund to a reduced budget of \$59,910,388 using District Grant and High Priority Program Funds, subject to the condition that Henrico County agrees to submission of the project in partnership with the CTB. (Step 3)
- 1-81 Safety Improvements from MM 166.5-168.5 (App 10 678) in Botetourt County- Do not Fund.
- US 460 "S" Curves (App 10 439) in Bedford County- Add and fund using District Grant Program Funds only. (Step 1)
- N. Franklin Street- Peppers Ferry Road Connector Phase II (App ID 465) in the Town of Christiansburg- Do not Fund.
- 1-81 Northbound Auxiliary Lane from Exit 141 to 143 (App ID 525) in Roanoke County- Add and fund using District Grant and High Priority Program Funds, subject to the condition that Roanoke County agrees to submission of the project in partnership with the CTB. (Step 3)
- Full Southern Corridor Project - No Revenue Sharing (App ID 582) in the City of Waynesboro- Replace with Full Southern Corridor Project (App ID 581) to account for the recommended Revenue Sharing Award.

Attachment B. Revised Base Scenario with Exceptions and Modifications Summary

District	Available		STEP 1			STEP 2			STEP 3			STEP 4			Summary			
	DG	HP	Count	Allocated	Remaining	Count	HP Allocated	HP Remaining	Count	HP Allocated	HP Remaining	Count	HP Allocated	HP Remaining	Count	HP Allocated	DG Allocated	Total
Bristol	\$ 62,239,019		9	\$ 49,964,603	\$ 12,274,416	-	\$ -		1	\$ 8,925,584		-	\$ -		10	\$ 8,925,584	\$ 62,239,019	\$ 71,164,603
Culpeper	\$ 54,872,548		10	\$ 54,432,133	\$ 440,415	-	\$ -		1	\$ 25,559,585		-	\$ -		11	\$ 25,559,585	\$ 54,872,548	\$ 80,432,133
Fredericksburg	\$ 60,504,406		13	\$ 50,371,617	\$ 10,132,789	4	\$ 27,243,596		1	\$ 1,372,171		1	\$ 115,500,000		19	\$ 144,115,767	\$ 60,504,406	\$ 204,620,173
Hampton Roads	\$ 178,033,507		17	\$ 161,131,186	\$ 16,902,321	2	\$ 6,358,850		1	\$ 3,097,679		1	\$ 144,927,753		21	\$ 154,384,282	\$ 178,033,507	\$ 332,417,789
Lynchburg	\$ 63,096,890		19	\$ 61,457,336	\$ 1,639,554	3	\$ 7,106,097		1	\$ 15,562,611		-	\$ -		23	\$ 22,668,708	\$ 63,096,890	\$ 85,765,598
NOVA	\$ 183,055,970		17	\$ 180,524,715	\$ 2,531,255	-	\$ -		1	\$ 39,798,423		1	\$ 300,000,000		19	\$ 339,798,423	\$ 183,055,970	\$ 522,854,393
Richmond	\$ 127,411,522		16	\$ 121,266,122	\$ 6,145,400	5	\$ 18,586,963		1	\$ 53,764,988		-	\$ -		22	\$ 72,351,951	\$ 127,411,522	\$ 199,763,473
Salem	\$ 84,868,412		14	\$ 68,032,666	\$ 16,835,746	5	\$ 15,577,806		-	\$ 12,994,970		-	\$ -		19	\$ 28,572,777	\$ 84,868,412	\$ 113,441,188
Staunton	\$ 68,917,727		13	\$ 63,318,226	\$ 5,599,501	4	\$ 13,319,751		1	\$ 23,535,377		-	\$ -		18	\$ 36,855,128	\$ 68,917,727	\$ 105,772,855
Total	\$ 883,000,000	\$ 833,000,000	128	\$ 810,498,604	\$ 72,501,396	23	\$ 88,193,063	\$ 744,806,937	8	\$ 184,611,389	\$ 560,195,548	3	\$ 560,427,753	\$ (232,205)	162	\$ 833,232,205	\$ 883,000,000	\$ 1,716,232,205

- REV Base Scenario Calculate revised benefit score based on excluding environmental impact measure and exclude projects if the new score is less than the lowest scoring funded project
- Step 1 Fund top scoring projects w/ each district eligible for DGP funds using DGP funds until remaining funds are insufficient to fund the next highest scoring project, excluding any project originally included solely because it does not have an environmental impact
- Step 2 Fund top scoring projects using HPP funds within each district that would have otherwise been funded with DGP funds but were not because they are only eligible for HPP (as long as their HB2 cost < total DG funds available)
- Step 3 In any district where unallocated DGP funds are available, co-mingle remaining DGP funds with HPP funds to fund the next highest scoring project eligible for both programs
- Step 4 Fund projects with an HB2 score over 1.0 based on the highest project benefit until funds are insufficient to fund the unfunded project with the highest project benefit

*Includes corrections to App ID 614 in Lynchburg regarding program eligibility, App ID 520, 693 & 731 in Bristol and Lynchburg regarding the HB2 cost, and App ID 516, 587 & 716 in NOVA regarding the congestion score