



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Commonwealth Transportation Board

Aubrey L. Layne, Jr.
Chairman

1401 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

(804) 786-2701

Agenda item # 5

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD

July 28, 2016

MOTION

Made By: Ms. DeTuncq, Seconded By: Mr. Rosen
Action: Motion Carried, Unanimously

Title: Adoption of Revised Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SMART SCALE Project Prioritization Process

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 sections 33.2-358, 33.2-370 and 33.2-371 of the *Code of Virginia*, and

WHEREAS, Section 33.2-358 sets forth requirements relating to the allocations and establishment of a High Priority Projects Program established pursuant to section 33.2-370 and a Highway Construction District Grant Program established pursuant to section 33.2-371; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 726 of the 2014 Acts of Assembly, required the Board to select projects for funding utilizing the project prioritization process established pursuant to section 33.2-214.1 beginning July 1, 2016; and

WHEREAS, Section 33.2-214.1 (B) requires the Board to solicit input from localities, metropolitan planning organizations, transit authorities, transportation authorities, and other stakeholders in its development of the prioritization process; and

WHEREAS on June 17, 2015 the Board adopted a statewide prioritization policy and process pursuant to Section 33.2-214.1 and directed the Commissioner of Highways, the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) and the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIPI) to take all actions necessary to implement and administer the policy and process adopted on June 17, 2015 (collectively the HB2 Prioritization Policy and Process), including but not limited to issuance of a Policy Guide consistent with the intent of the policy and process; and

WHEREAS since adoption of the HB2 Prioritization Policy and Process, VDOT, OIPI and DRPT have conducted extensive outreach to identify opportunities to improve the prioritization process in subsequent rounds; and

WHEREAS, in its May 17, 2016 workshop, the Board was presented with information and recommendations relating to the HB2 Prioritization Policy and Process, gathered from internal and external stakeholders, to include the following proposed key changes: encourage early creation of applications; require documentation of other sources of funding used to leverage funding requests submitted for prioritization; clarify process if the project scope changes significantly or the estimate exceeds the sliding scale requiring re-scoring; scale the Environmental Factor score based on impact to the environment; modify the Economic Development Factor to limit the distance around certain types of projects where benefits may be considered for the Project Support for Economic Development Measure and eliminate the extra scaling point for having zoning in place, adjust the Travel Time Reliability Measure where there is no data available and include a scaling factor based on vehicle miles traveled, and adjust the Intermodal Access and Efficiency Measure to adjust tonnage for ramps; modify the Safety Factor to include fatal and all injury crashes and to recognize higher social impacts of fatalities and severe injuries; adjust the Land Use Factor to address future density and the change in density between today and the future; and for fixed guideway projects analyze the full corridor improvements and take ten percent of the ultimate benefit.

WHEREAS, a revised draft policy guide (2016 SMART SCALE Policy Guide) and draft technical guide (2016 SMART SCALE Technical Guide) has been developed, based on said information and recommendations; and

WHEREAS in June 2016, the draft 2016 SMART SCALE Policy Guide and draft 2016 SMART SCALE Technical Guide containing a proposed revised prioritization policy and process were issued and posted at SmartScale.org for purposes of gathering public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, such draft 2016 SMART SCALE Policy Guide and draft 2016 SMART SCALE Technical Guide incorporate the requirements and factors identified in Section 33.2-214.1 (B); and

WHEREAS, after due consideration of comments received, changes were made to the draft prioritization policy and process as set forth in the draft 2016 SMART SCALE Policy Guide and draft 2016 SMART SCALE Technical Guide and the Board believes the prioritization policy and process as set forth below should be adopted.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Commonwealth Transportation Board hereby adopts the following policy and process to govern screening, scoring and selecting projects for funding pursuant to Section 33.2-214.1 (SMART SCALE Prioritization Process):

1. Application for funding through the SMART SCALE Prioritization Process must be made by qualifying entities based on project type and as follows:

Project Type	Regional Entity (MPOs, PDCs)	Locality (Counties, Cities, Towns)	Public Transit Agencies
Corridor of Statewide Significance	Yes	Yes, with a resolution of support from relevant regional entity	Yes, with resolution of support from relevant regional entity
Regional Network	Yes	Yes	Yes, with resolution of support from relevant entity
Urban Development Area	No	Yes	No

2. Application for funding through the SMART SCALE Prioritization Process must be made for a qualifying need and, pursuant to Section 33.2-214.1 (B)(2) and 33.2-358, for the High Priority Projects Program applications must be consistent with the assessment of needs undertaken in the Statewide Transportation Plan in accordance with Section 33.2-353 for all corridors of statewide significance and regional networks, and for the construction District Grant Program applications must be consistent with the assessment of needs undertaken in the Statewide Transportation Plan in accordance with Section 33.2-353 for corridors of statewide significance, regional networks, improvements to promote urban development areas established pursuant to Section 15.2-2223.1, and safety improvements.
3. Applications for funding through either the High Priority Projects Program or the Construction District Grant Programs must relate to projects located within the boundaries of the qualifying entity. Localities and regional planning bodies may submit joint applications for projects that cross boundaries.
4. By majority vote of the Board, the Board may choose to submit up to two projects to be evaluated for funding in each biennial application cycle.

5. The factors specified in Section 33.2-214.1 will be measured and weighted according to the following metrics:

ID	Measure Name	Measure Weight
Safety Factor		
S.1	Number of Fatal and Injury Crashes	50%
S.2	Rate of Fatal and Injury Crashes	50%
Congestion Mitigation Factor		
C.1	Person Throughput	50%
C.2	Person Hours of Delay	50%
Accessibility Factor		
A.1	Access to Jobs	60%
A.2	Access to Jobs for Disadvantaged Populations	20%
A.3	Access to Multimodal Choices	20%
Environmental Quality Factor		
E.1	Air Quality and Energy Environmental Effect	50%
E.2	Impact to Natural and Cultural Resources	50%
Economic Development Factor		
ED.1	Project Support for Economic Development	60%
ED.2	Intermodal Access and Efficiency	20%
ED.3	Travel Time Reliability	20%
Land Use Factor		
L.1	Transportation Efficient Land Use	100%

Note*: 100% for Transit Projects

6. The factors will be evaluated according to the following typology categories and weighting frameworks within the state's highway construction districts:

Region in which the Project is Located	Typology	Construction District
Accomack-Northampton PDC	Category D	Hampton Roads
Bristol MPO	Category D	Bristol

Resolution of the Board
 Adoption of Revised Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SMART SCALE
 Project Prioritization Process
 July 28, 2016
 Page Five

Region in which the Project is Located	Typology	Construction District
Central Shenandoah PDC	Category D	Staunton
Central Virginia MPO	Category C	Lynchburg/Salem
Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO	Category B	Culpeper
Commonwealth RC	Category D	Lynchburg/Richmond
Crater PDC	Category D	Richmond/Hampton Roads
Cumberland Plateau PDC	Category D	Bristol
Danville MPO	Category D	Lynchburg
Fredericksburg Area MPO (FAMPO)	Category A	Fredericksburg
George Washington RC	Category D	Fredericksburg
Hampton Roads PDC	Category D	Hampton Roads
Hampton Roads TPO (HRTPO) ¹	Category A	Hampton Roads/Fredericksburg
Harrisonburg-Rockingham MPO	Category C	Staunton
Kingsport MPO	Category D	Bristol
Lenowisco PDC	Category D	Bristol
Middle Peninsula PDC ¹	Category D	Fredericksburg
Mount Rogers PDC	Category D	Bristol/Salem
New River Valley MPO	Category C	Salem
New River Valley PDC	Category C	Salem
Northern Neck PDC	Category D	Fredericksburg
Northern Shenandoah Valley RC	Category D	Staunton
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) / Transportation Planning Board (TPB) ²	Category A	Northern Virginia/Culpeper/Staunton
Rappahannock-Rapidan RC ²	Category C	Culpeper
Region 2000 LGC	Category D	Salem/Lynchburg
Richmond Regional PDC	Category D	Richmond
Richmond Regional TPO (RRTPO)	Category B	Richmond
Roanoke Valley TPO (RVTPO)	Category B	Salem
Roanoke Valley-Alleghany PDC	Category D	Salem/Staunton
Southside PDC	Category D	Lynchburg/Richmond
Staunton-Augusta-Waynesboro MPO	Category C	Staunton
Thomas Jefferson PDC	Category C	Culpeper/Lynchburg

Region in which the Project is Located	Typology	Construction District
Tri-Cities MPO	Category C	Richmond
West Piedmont PDC	Category D	Salem/Lynchburg
WinFred MPO	Category C	Staunton

Note*: PDC is defined as the remainder of the region outside the MPO boundary. In many cases, these regions include partial counties (e.g. Goochland County is partially within RRTPO and the Richmond Regional PDC). If a project is within the MPO boundary in a partial county, the project shall use the weighting associated with the MPO with the following exceptions:

- i. The portion of Gloucester County within the Hampton Roads TPO boundary shall use the weighting associated with the Middle Peninsula PDC.
- ii. The portion of Fauquier County within the Transportation Planning Board Boundary shall use the weighting associated with the Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission.
- iii. For projects that cross multiple typology boundaries, the project shall use the weighting associated with the typology for which the majority of the project is located.

Weighting Frameworks

Factor	Congestion Mitigation	Economic Development	Accessibility	Safety	Environmental Quality	Land Use
Category A	45%**	5%	15%	5%	10%	20%*
Category B	15%	20%	25%	20%	10%	10%*
Category C	15%	25%	25%	25%	10%	
Category D	10%	35%	15%	30%	10%	

Note* - Pursuant to Chapter 726 of the 2014 Acts of Assembly, 6th enactment clause, for certain metropolitan planning areas with a population over 200,000, the prioritization process shall also include a factor related to Land Use.

Note** - Pursuant to Chapter 726 of the 2014 Acts of Assembly, 6th enactment clause, for certain highway construction districts congestion mitigation must be weighted highest among the factors.

7. Candidate projects will be scored based on the factors and weights identified above relative to other projects submitted for evaluation, the cost of the project and based on information included in the project application.

8. The final project score is determined by calculating the anticipated benefits relative to the amount of funding requested pursuant to section 33.2-358 of the *Code of Virginia*.
9. A project that has been selected for funding must be re-scored and the funding decision re-evaluated if there are significant changes to either the scope or cost of the project, such that the anticipated benefits relative to funding requested would have substantially changed.
 - a. If an estimate increases prior to project advertisement or contract award that exceeds the following thresholds, and the applicant is not covering the increased cost with other funds, Board action is required to approve the budget increase:
 - i. Total Cost Estimate <\$5 million: 20% increase in funding requested
 - ii. Total Cost Estimate \$5 million to \$10 million: \$1 million or greater increase in funding requested
 - iii. Total Cost Estimate > \$10 million: 10% increase in funding requested; \$5 million maximum increase in funding requested.
 - b. If the project scope is reduced or modified such that the revised score is less than the lowest ranked funded project in the district for that cohort of projects, Board action is required to approve the change in scope. If the scope is increased in a manner that results in an associated budget increase, the applicant is responsible for funding the increase. The scope of a project may not be substantially modified in such a manner that the proposed improvements do not accomplish the same benefits as the original scope.
10. A project that has been selected for funding must be initiated and at least a portion of the programmed funds expended within one year of the budgeted year of allocation or funding may be subject to reprogramming to other projects selected through the prioritization process. In the event the Project is not advanced to the next phase of construction when requested by the Commonwealth Transportation Board, the locality or metropolitan planning organization may be required, pursuant to § 33.2-214 of the *Code of Virginia*, to reimburse the Department for all state and federal funds expended on the project.
11. A project that has been selected for funding cannot be resubmitted to address cost increases or loss of other sources of funding.
12. Once a project is selected for funding, an entity must wait for two rounds of SMART SCALE following the end date of construction before submitting a new project application for the same location that meets the same need as the project that was selected for funding.
13. Once a project is selected for funding, an entity may not resubmit the project with a revised scope in a subsequent round unless the previously selected project has been cancelled.

14. In the cases where a project has been selected for funding which identified other sources of funding, the qualifying entity is committed to pay the difference if other sources of funding are not provided.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the methodology outlined in the SMART SCALE Policy Guide and SMART SCALE Technical Guide shall direct the screening, scoring and selection of projects for funding and may continue to evolve and improve based upon advances in technology, data collection and reporting tools, and to the extent that any such improvements modify or affect the policy and process set forth herein, they shall be brought to the Board for review and approval.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board hereby directs the Commissioner of Highways, the Director of the Department of Rail and Public Transportation, and the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment to take all actions necessary to implement and administer this policy and process.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the HB2 Prioritization Policy and Process previously adopted on June 17, 2015 by the Board is hereby rescinded.

####

CTB Decision Brief

Title: Adoption of Revised Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SmartScale Project Prioritization Process

Issue: The Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT), and the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIPI) implemented and administered the Commonwealth Transportation Board's (Board) policy and process for the first round of Virginia's project prioritization process. VDOT, DRPT, and OIPI conducted extensive outreach from internal and external stakeholders to identify opportunities to improve the prioritization process in subsequent rounds. Through such outreach, several opportunities to improve both the process and the evaluation process were identified. Robust analysis of the proposed improvements has been conducted and several items are recommended for implementation to further enhance the prioritization process for subsequent rounds. Accordingly, Board approval/adoption of a new prioritization policy and process is sought.

Facts: Section 33.2-214.1 of the *Code of Virginia* requires the Board to develop a prioritization process for certain projects funded by the Board. Section 33.2-214.1 (B) of the Code of Virginia requires the Board to solicit input from localities, metropolitan planning organizations, transit authorities, transportation authorities, and other stakeholders in its development of the prioritization process. In June 2015, the Board adopted a statewide prioritization policy and process and directed VDOT, DRPT, and OIPI to implement and administer the policy and process. In June 2016, the CTB adopted a Six-Year Improvement Program to include projects selected through the first round of the prioritization process. Since adoption of the prioritization policy and process, VDOT, DRPT, and OIPI have conducted extensive outreach to identify opportunities to improve the prioritization process in subsequent rounds. At its May 2016 workshop, the Board was presented with information and recommendations relating to the prioritization policy and process gathered from internal and external stakeholders. Based on the feedback gathered and robust analysis of proposed improvements, the following revisions to the Board's policy are recommended:

- Encourage early creation of applications by providing a non-mandatory "notice of intent to apply";
- Require documentation of other sources of funding used to leverage requests submitted pursuant to the prioritization policy and process;
- Clarify process for re-scoring as a result of scope or budget changes that exceed the sliding scale;
- Clarify process for re-submission of projects;
- Scale the Environmental Factor score based on impact to the environment;
- Modify the Economic Development Factor to:
 - limit the distance around certain types of projects where benefits may be considered for the Project Support for Economic Development Measure and eliminate the extra scaling point for having zoning in place,
 - adjust the Travel Time Reliability Measure where there is no data available and include a scaling factor based on vehicle miles traveled, and
 - adjust the Intermodal Access and Efficiency Measure to adjust tonnage for ramps;
- Modify the Safety Factor to include fatal and all injury crashes;
- Adjust the Land Use Factor to address future density and the change in density between today and the future; and

- Analyze the full corridor improvements for fixed guideway projects and assign ten percent of the full benefit to partial improvements.

A resolution bearing a revised, newly branded project prioritization policy and process (SmartScale Prioritization Process) reflecting the above referenced recommendations has been prepared for consideration by the Board. A draft policy guide (2016 SmartScale Policy Guide) and draft technical guide (2016 SmartScale Technical Guide) include the recommended changes and have been made available for public review and comment. These documents have been updated to incorporate public comment.

Recommendation: VDOT, DRPT, and OIPI recommend that the Board rescind its project prioritization policy and process adopted in June 2015 and adopt the revised prioritization policy and process (SmartScale Prioritization Process) to govern screening, scoring and selecting projects for funding with such modifications to be implemented for the second round of the prioritization process, which begins August 1, 2016. VDOT and DRPT further recommend that the Board direct that the revised 2016 SmartScale Policy Guide and 2016 SmartScale Technical Guide incorporate the Board's policy and process be utilized for implementing and administering the policy and process and serve to direct the screening, scoring and selection of projects for funding. Further it is requested that the Commissioner of Highways and the Director of DRPT be authorized to take all actions necessary to implement and administer the prioritization policy and process.

Action Required by the CTB: The Board will be presented with a resolution for a formal vote to rescind its policy adopted in June 2015 and to adopt the SmartScale Prioritization Process bearing proposed improvements to the Board's policy and process and to direct use of the 2016 SmartScale Policy Guide and 2016 SmartScale Technical Guide in implementation of the new prioritization policy and process.. Approval by majority vote of the resolution is required.

Result, if Approved: VDOT, DRPT, and OIPI will implement the SmartScale Prioritization Process in accord with the 2016 SmartScale Policy Guide and 2016 SmartScale Technical Guide.

Options: Approve, Deny or Defer

Public Comments/Reactions: N/A



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
Commonwealth Transportation Board

Aubrey L. Layne, Jr.
Chairman

1401 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

(804) 786-2701

Agenda item #

**RESOLUTION
OF THE
COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

July 28, 2016

MOTION

Made By: Seconded By:

Action:

Title: Adoption of Revised Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SMART SCALE Project Prioritization Process

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 sections 33.2-358, 33.2-370 and 33.2-371 of the *Code of Virginia*, and

WHEREAS, Section 33.2-358 sets forth requirements relating to the allocations and establishment of a High Priority Projects Program established pursuant to section 33.2-370 and a Highway Construction District Grant Program established pursuant to section 33.2-371; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 726 of the 2014 Acts of Assembly, required the Board to select projects for funding utilizing the project prioritization process established pursuant to section 33.2-214.1 beginning July 1, 2016; and

WHEREAS, Section 33.2-214.1 (B) requires the Board to solicit input from localities, metropolitan planning organizations, transit authorities, transportation authorities, and other stakeholders in its development of the prioritization process; and

WHEREAS on June 17, 2015 the Board adopted a statewide prioritization policy and process pursuant to Section 33.2-214.1 and directed the Commissioner of Highways, the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) and the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIPI) to take all actions necessary to implement and administer the policy and process adopted on June 17, 2015 (collectively the HB2 Prioritization Policy and Process), including but not limited to issuance of a Policy Guide consistent with the intent of the policy and process; and

WHEREAS since adoption of the HB2 Prioritization Policy and Process, VDOT, OIPI and DRPT have conducted extensive outreach to identify opportunities to improve the prioritization process in subsequent rounds; and

WHEREAS, in its May 17, 2016 workshop, the Board was presented with information and recommendations relating to the HB2 Prioritization Policy and Process, gathered from internal and external stakeholders, to include the following proposed key changes: encourage early creation of applications; require documentation of other sources of funding used to leverage funding requests submitted for prioritization; clarify process if the project scope changes significantly or the estimate exceeds the sliding scale requiring re-scoring; scale the Environmental Factor score based on impact to the environment; modify the Economic Development Factor to limit the distance around certain types of projects where benefits may be considered for the Project Support for Economic Development Measure and eliminate the extra scaling point for having zoning in place, adjust the Travel Time Reliability Measure where there is no data available and include a scaling factor based on vehicle miles traveled, and adjust the Intermodal Access and Efficiency Measure to adjust tonnage for ramps; modify the Safety Factor to include fatal and all injury crashes and to recognize higher social impacts of fatalities and severe injuries; adjust the Land Use Factor to address future density and the change in density between today and the future; and for fixed guideway projects analyze the full corridor improvements and take ten percent of the ultimate benefit.

WHEREAS, a revised draft policy guide (2016 SMART SCALE Policy Guide) and draft technical guide (2016 SMART SCALE Technical Guide) has been developed, based on said information and recommendations; and

WHEREAS in June 2016, the draft 2016 SMART SCALE Policy Guide and draft 2016 SMART SCALE Technical Guide containing a proposed revised prioritization policy and process were issued and posted at SmartScale.org for purposes of gathering public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, such draft 2016 SMART SCALE Policy Guide and draft 2016 SMART SCALE Technical Guide incorporate the requirements and factors identified in Section 33.2-214.1 (B); and

WHEREAS, after due consideration of comments received, changes were made to the draft prioritization policy and process as set forth in the draft 2016 SMART SCALE Policy Guide and draft 2016 SMART SCALE Technical Guide and the Board believes the prioritization policy and process as set forth below should be adopted.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Commonwealth Transportation Board hereby adopts the following policy and process to govern screening, scoring and selecting projects for funding pursuant to Section 33.2-214.1 (SMART SCALE Prioritization Process):

1. Application for funding through the SMART SCALE Prioritization Process must be made by qualifying entities based on project type and as follows:

Project Type	Regional Entity (MPOs, PDCs)	Locality (Counties, Cities, Towns)	Public Transit Agencies
Corridor of Statewide Significance	Yes	Yes, with a resolution of support from relevant regional entity	Yes, with resolution of support from relevant regional entity
Regional Network	Yes	Yes	Yes, with resolution of support from relevant entity
Urban Development Area	No	Yes	No

2. Application for funding through the SMART SCALE Prioritization Process must be made for a qualifying need and, pursuant to Section 33.2-214.1 (B)(2) and 33.2-358, for the High Priority Projects Program applications must be consistent with the assessment of needs undertaken in the Statewide Transportation Plan in accordance with Section 33.2-353 for all corridors of statewide significance and regional networks, and for the construction District Grant Program applications must be consistent with the assessment of needs undertaken in the Statewide Transportation Plan in accordance with Section 33.2-353 for corridors of statewide significance, regional networks, improvements to promote urban development areas established pursuant to Section 15.2-2223.1, and safety improvements.
3. Applications for funding through either the High Priority Projects Program or the Construction District Grant Programs must relate to projects located within the boundaries of the qualifying entity. Localities and regional planning bodies may submit joint applications for projects that cross boundaries.
4. By majority vote of the Board, the Board may choose to submit up to two projects ~~for funding to be evaluated for funding in each biennial through the High Priority Projects Program for each~~ application cycle.

4.5. The factors specified in Section 33.2-214.1 will be measured and weighted according to the following metrics:

ID	Measure Name	Measure Weight
Safety Factor		
S.1	Number of Fatal and Severe Injury Crashes	50%
S.2	Rate of Fatal and Severe Injury Crashes	50%
Congestion Mitigation Factor		
C.1	Person Throughput	50%
C.2	Person Hours of Delay*	50%
Accessibility Factor		
A.1	Access to Jobs	60%
A.2	Access to Jobs for Disadvantaged Populations	20%
A.3	Access to Multimodal Choices	20%
Environmental Quality Factor		
E.1	Air Quality and Energy Environmental Effect	50%
E.2	Impact to Natural and Cultural Resources	50%
Economic Development Factor		
ED.1	Project Support for Economic Development	60%
ED.2	Intermodal Access and Efficiency	20%
ED.3	Travel Time Reliability	20%
Land Use Factor		
L.1	Transportation Efficient Land Use Policy Consistency	100%

Note*: 100% for Transit Projects

~~Note***: Only travel below the posted speed limit is determined to be delayed by the Board.~~

5.6. The factors will be evaluated according to the following typology categories and weighting frameworks within the state's highway construction districts:

Region in which the Project is Located	Typology	Construction District
Accomack-Northampton PDC	Category D	Hampton Roads
Bristol MPO	Category D	Bristol
Central Shenandoah PDC	Category D	Staunton
Central Virginia MPO	Category C	Lynchburg/Salem
Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO	Category B	Culpeper
Commonwealth RC	Category D	Lynchburg/Richmond
Crater PDC	Category D	Richmond/Hampton Roads
Cumberland Plateau PDC	Category D	Bristol
Danville MPO	Category D	Lynchburg
Fredericksburg Area MPO (FAMPO)	Category A	Fredericksburg
George Washington RC	Category D	Fredericksburg
Hampton Roads PDC	Category D	Hampton Roads
Hampton Roads TPO (HRTPO) ¹	Category A	Hampton Roads/Fredericksburg
Harrisonburg-Rockingham MPO	Category C	Staunton
Kingsport MPO	Category D	Bristol
Lenowisco PDC	Category D	Bristol
Middle Peninsula PDC ¹	Category D	Fredericksburg
Mount Rogers PDC	Category D	Bristol/Salem
New River Valley MPO	Category C	Salem
New River Valley PDC	Category C	Salem
Northern Neck PDC	Category D	Fredericksburg
Northern Shenandoah Valley RC	Category D	Staunton
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) / Transportation Planning Board (TPB) ²	Category A	Northern Virginia/Culpeper/Staunton
Rappahannock-Rapidan RC ²	Category C	Culpeper
Region 2000 LGC	Category D	Salem/Lynchburg
Richmond Regional PDC	Category D	Richmond

Region in which the Project is Located	Typology	Construction District
Richmond Regional TPO (RRTPO)	Category B	Richmond
Roanoke Valley TPO (RVTPO)	Category B	Salem
Roanoke Valley-Alleghany PDC	Category D	Salem/Staunton
Southside PDC	Category D	Lynchburg/Richmond
Staunton-Augusta-Waynesboro MPO	Category C	Staunton
Thomas Jefferson PDC	Category C	Culpeper/Lynchburg
Tri-Cities MPO	Category C	Richmond
West Piedmont PDC	Category D	Salem/Lynchburg
WinFred MPO	Category C	Staunton

Note*: PDC is defined as the remainder of the region outside the MPO boundary. In many cases, these regions include partial counties (e.g. Goochland County is partially within RRTPO and the Richmond Regional PDC). If a project is within the MPO boundary in a partial county, the project shall use the weighting associated with the MPO with the following exceptions:

- i. The portion of Gloucester County within the Hampton Roads TPO boundary shall use the weighting associated with the Middle Peninsula PDC.
- ii. The portion of Fauquier County within the Transportation Planning Board Boundary shall use the weighting associated with the Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission.
- iii. For projects that cross multiple typology boundaries, the project shall use the weighting associated with the typology for which the majority of the project is located.

Weighting Frameworks

Factor	Congestion Mitigation	Economic Development	Accessibility	Safety	Environmental Quality	Land Use
Category A	45%**	5%	15%	5%	10%	20%*
Category B	15%	20%	25%	20%	10%	10%*
Category C	15%	25%	25%	25%	10%	
Category D	10%	35%	15%	30%	10%	

Note* - Pursuant to Chapter 726 of the 2014 Acts of Assembly, 6th enactment clause, for certain metropolitan planning areas with a population over 200,000, the prioritization process shall also include a factor related to Land Use.

Note** - Pursuant to Chapter 726 of the 2014 Acts of Assembly, 6th enactment clause, for certain highway construction districts congestion mitigation must be weighted highest among the factors.

6-7. Candidate projects will be scored based on the factors and weights identified above relative to other projects submitted for evaluation, the cost of the project and based on information included in the project application.

7-8. The final project score is determined by calculating the anticipated benefits relative to the amount of funding requested pursuant to section 33.2-358 of the *Code of Virginia*.

9. A project that has been selected for funding must be re-scored and the funding decision re-evaluated if there are significant changes to either the scope or cost of the project, such that the anticipated benefits relative to funding requested would have substantially changed.

a. If an estimate increases prior to project advertisement or contract award that exceeds the following thresholds, and the applicant is not covering the increased cost with other funds, Board action is required to approve the budget increase; the project will be re-evaluated:

- i. Total Cost Estimate <\$5 million: 20% increase in funding requested
- ii. Total Cost Estimate \$5 million to \$10 million: \$1 million or greater increase in funding requested
- iii. Total Cost Estimate > \$10 million: 10% increase in funding requested; \$5 million maximum increase in funding requested.

- b. If the project scope is reduced or modified such that the revised score is less than the lowest ranked funded project in the district for that cohort of projects, Board action is required to approve the change in scope. If the scope is increased in a manner that results in an associated budget increase, the applicant is responsible for funding the increase. The scope of a project may not be substantially modified in such a manner that the proposed improvements do not accomplish the same benefits as the original scope.
10. A project that has been selected for funding must be initiated and at least a portion of the programmed funds expended within one year of the budgeted year of allocation or funding may be subject to reprogramming to other projects selected through the prioritization process. In the event the Project is not advanced to the next phase of construction when requested by the Commonwealth Transportation Board, the locality or metropolitan planning organization may be required, pursuant to § 33.2-214 of the Code of Virginia, to reimburse the Department for all state and federal funds expended on the project.
11. A project that has been selected for funding cannot be resubmitted to address cost increases or loss of other sources of funding.
12. Once a project is selected for funding, an entity must wait for two rounds of SMART SCALE following the end date of construction before submitting a new project application for the same location that meets the same need as the project that was selected for funding.
13. Once a project is selected for funding, an entity may not resubmit the project with a revised scope in a subsequent round unless the previously selected project has been cancelled.
14. In the cases where a project has been selected for funding which identified other sources of funding, the qualifying entity is committed to pay the difference if other sources of funding are not provided.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the methodology outlined in the SMART SCALE Policy Guide and SMART SCALE Technical Guide shall direct the screening, scoring and selection of projects for funding and may continue to evolve and improve based upon advances in technology, data collection and reporting tools, and to the extent that any such improvements modify or affect the policy and process set forth herein, they shall be brought to the Board for review and approval.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board hereby directs the Commissioner of Highways, the Director of the Department of Rail and Public Transportation, and the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment to take all actions necessary to implement and administer this policy and process.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the HB2 Prioritization Policy and Process previously adopted on June 17, 2015 by the Board is hereby rescinded.