

**MINUTES
OF
MEETING OF THE COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD**

Central Office Auditorium
1221 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia

June 16, 2005
9:00 a.m.

The meeting of the Commonwealth Transportation Board was held in the Central Auditorium of the Department of Transportation in Richmond, Virginia on June 16, 2005. The Chairman, Pierce R. Homer presided, and called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

* * *

Present: Messrs. Bowie, Davies, Keen, Lester, Martin, McCarthy, Sevila, Watson, White and Ms. Connally, Ms. Hanley; Vice Chairman Shucet, Ms. Rae, ex officio, Director of the Department of Rail and Public Transportation.

Absent: Mr. Bailey, Dr. Stone, and Ms. Dragas

* * *

Public Comment Period:

Mr. Jim Rauth - Marsh Island Home Owners' Association -
Mr. Rauth spoke regarding UPC 1896, a replacement bridge at Chincoteague Channel. Mr. Rauth discussed four concerns cost, length, location and the environment. Mr. Rauth disagrees with all aspects of UPC 1896; especially the location, which he feels, will cause environmental issues. Mr. Rauth would like the Board to reconsider the current description of UPC 1896 and return to the 1987 project description.

* * *

Mr. Michael O'Connor – Virginia Petroleum and Convenience Association
Mr. O'Connor spoke regarding the gas logo signs program (Integrated Directional Signing Program) criteria expressing his appreciation that most of the comments submitted by his organization on June 5, 2005 were incorporated into the proposal before the Board. Assurances have been given to VPCA by the program vendor and staff that this proposal will impact no

more than two signs and only a handful of business. VPCA would have preferred that no business be eliminated. During the next six weeks and afterwards VPCA will monitor the situation to assure the impact on the Virginia based businesses occurs as described in the proposal. Mr. O'Connor thanked the program vendor, Virginia Logos, for their high level of professionalism with what can be a controversial issue. Mr. O'Connor also recognized VDOT employees, Phil Hopkins, Ray Khoury and Connie Sorrell for their time and courtesy they extended to VPCA. Mr. O'Connor indicated he looked forward to serving on the Advisory Committee on Logo Signs.

* * *

Mr. Hugh Fain – SpottsFain Consulting

Mr. Fain represents WAWA Food Markets, and supports the proposal (Integrated Directional Signing Program) before the Board today. Mr. Fain indicated it was a matter of safety for the traveling public. Mr. Fain stated the very essence of the logo program is about the safety of the public not advertisement. Mr. Fain urged the Board to vote in favor of this proposal.

* * *

Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting:

Action on Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of May 19, 2005. Copy of approved minutes on file with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) Commissioner's Office and posted on the VDOT Internet website: www.virginiadot.org and the Virginia Regulatory Town Hall.

Prior to approval Ms. Hanley asked for clarification on page 5 of the minutes, specifically that the statement made by Secretary Homer "we have this today at VDOT", be changed to "we have this information at VDOT today" to clarify that a presentation was not available but the information was. Ms. Hanley also asked that the word "here" in the third to last exchange on page 5 be changed to "hear".

Moved by Ms. Hanley, seconded by Mr. Bowie, Motion Carried, minutes approved

* * *

TRAFFIC ENGINEERING DIVISION:

Agenda Item 1: Action on Abandonments and Discontinuances, changes in the Primary System due to Relocation and Construction, specifically (A) Old Route 208 – Louisa County Discontinue one section of Old Route 208 due to construction and relocation of Project No.: 0208-054-106,C-501. (B) Old Route 13 – Powhatan County Abandonment of one section of Old Route 13 due to construction and relocation for Project No.: 1002-072-154,C-501. Referenced by attachment of Resolutions and Decision Brief.

Route 372 – Washington County – Abandonment of Route 372 in the Town of Abingdon within the grounds of Virginia Highlands Community College so that the town can take over the maintenance.

(A & B) Moved by Ms. Hanley, seconded by Ms. Connally. Motion carried, resolutions approved.

(C) Motion to reconsider by Mr. Bowie, seconded by Mr. Keen. Item was deferred to the July 2005 Board Meeting.

* * *

Action on Bridge Designation specifically, (D) Interstate 95- Stafford County Designation of the bridge on Interstate 95 over the Rappahannock River in Stafford County as the “Pearl Harbor Memorial Bridge”. **Removed from Agenda.** (E) Route 663- Amherst County Designation of the bridge over the new Route 29 Bypass in Amherst County as the “Mac Lindsay Bridge” Referenced by attachment of Resolutions and Decision Briefs.

(E) Moved by Mr. Keen, seconded by Mr. Bowie. Motion carried, resolution approved.

* * *

ASSETT MANAGEMENT DIVISION:

Agenda Item 2: Action on Action General Assembly Allocation of \$20,000,000 for Rest Area Improvements. Referenced by attachment of Resolution and Decision Brief.

Moved by Mr. Bowie, seconded by Ms. Connally. Motion carried, resolution approved

TRAFFIC ENGINEERING DIVISION:

Agenda Item 3: Action on Action on the Integrated Directional Signing Program. Referenced by attachment of Resolution and Decision Brief.

Moved by Mr. Davies, seconded by Mr. Bowie. Motion carried, resolution approved.

Mr. Watson and Mr. White voted no on this resolution.

* * *

RIGHT OF WAY AND UTILITIES DIVISION:

Agenda Item 4: Action on Land Conveyance, specifically (A) Route 64 and East Jackson Street - City of Richmond, Project 0064-127-071, RW-201. Referenced by attachment of Resolution and Decision Brief.

Moved by Mr. White, seconded by Mr. Bowie. Motion carried, resolution approved

* * *

LOCAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION:

Agenda Item 5: Action on Industrial Access program, specifically (A) Louisa Industrial Park West, Project No.: 0807-054-273,N501. Referenced by attachment of resolution and decision brief.

Moved by Mr. White, seconded by Mr. Bowie. Motion carried, resolution approved.

* * *

Action on Action on Recreational Access, specifically (B) Prince George County – Appomattox River Park, Project No.: 0727-074-205,N501. Referenced by attachment of resolution and decision brief.

Moved by Mr. McCarthy seconded by Mr. Davies. Motion carried, resolution approved.

Prior to approval Mr. McCarthy indicated he felt it would be helpful if Mr. Estes would explain to the Board the continuing interest in bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.

Mr. Estes responded that last month (May 2005) Mr. McCarthy asked the question for a Chesterfield recreational project last month, if VDOT had considered bicycle and pedestrian accommodations for the project. Based on Mr. McCarthy's recommendations, VDOT went back to the county (Chesterfield) to discuss with the county. Mr. Estes indicated he does anticipate coming back to the Board with a revised resolution to the Chesterfield project. The resolution in front of the Board today, one of the items looked at was whether there were any other bicycle and pedestrian accommodations in the area.

Mr. McCarthy stated that the CTB policy's default position would be to include bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, unless there is a case to be made for not doing so. Due to the short amount of road in this project and the fact that it does not connect to any other bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, he (Mr. McCarthy) is comfortable with the resolution.

Ms. Hanley questioned where the other money, the difference between the \$379,000 and \$314,500, was coming from.

Mr. Estes indicated that the County (Prince George) has to cover this cost.

* * *

Action on Revenue Sharing Program, specifically, (C) FY05 Supplemental Allocation (D) Mathews and Surry Counties. Reallocation of funds as outlined in attached resolution. Referenced by attachment of resolutions and decision briefs.

(C) Moved by Ms. Hanley, seconded by Mr. Davies. Motion carried, resolution approved.

(D) Moved by Mr. Bowie, seconded by Mr. Davies. Motion carried, resolution approved.

Prior to approval Ms. Hanley asked if these ever ran out, some of the reallocations are from 1993 and 1994.

Mr. Estes responded that this is a result of the reconciliation of completed projects that had small dollar amounts on them so they are now being pulled up to a new project.

Ms. Hanley asked if we (VDOT) now had a process to close these projects out sooner.

Mr. Estes responded that yes we do, we are making strides in our reconciliation efforts.

* * *

Action on the Enhancement Program specifically, (E) Fiscal Year 2005 – 2006 Projects Approval. Referenced by attachment of resolution and decision brief.

Moved by Mr. Bowie, seconded by Mr. Keen. Motion carried, resolution approved.

* * *

Action on County Maintenance Payments, specifically, (F) Arlington and Henrico Counties, FY 2005-2006. Referenced by attachment of resolution and decision briefs.

Moved by Ms. Hanley, seconded by Ms. Connally. Motion carried, resolution approved

* * *

Action on Street Mileage, Additions and Deletions specifically, (G) Town of Abingdon; (H) City of Alexandria; (I) City of Charlottesville; (J) Town of Christiansburg; (K) City of Colonial Heights; (L) City of Hampton y; (M) City of Petersburg (N) City of

Portsmouth; (O) Town of Purcellville; (P) City of Roanoke; (Q) Town of Vinton; (R) Town of Warrenton. Referenced by attachment of Resolutions and Decision Briefs.

Moved by Mr. Bowie, seconded by Mr. White. Motion carried, resolutions approved

* * *

Action on Urban Maintenance Programs, specifically (S) Payments to Cities, Certain Towns and the Chesapeake Bay, Bridge Tunnel Commission for Maintenance to Certain Roads and Streets, FY 2005-20006. Referenced by attached resolution, brief and tabulation.

Moved by Mr. White, seconded by Mr. Lester. Motion carried, resolution approved.

Prior to approval Secretary Homer pointed out an initiative that Mr. Estes has undertaken based on actions of the 2003 General Assembly. This is probably the third largest single program in the transportation secretariat. It is for payments to cities, towns and two counties, to maintain their streets. Legislation in 2003 required the development of common reporting and performance goals. The goal of that would be to get the maintenance of these cities and two county assets up to the same level of the three and a half years that was spent in developing a needs-based allocation for maintenance to do something similar for the cities, towns and two counties. This is a pure formula driven exercise, in some cases it may work, and in other it may not. But it is very big and this is an important part of the accountability work that has been undertaken by the department over the last year and a half. I know that is going to take a lot more work with all the various entities, but it has been a good project.

* * *

LOCATION AND DESIGN DIVISION:

Agenda Item 6: (A) Action on Limited Access Modification, specifically, Route 168 – City of Chesapeake. Referenced by attachment of resolution and decision brief.

Moved by Mr. White, seconded by Mr. Lester. Motion carried, resolution approved.

* * *

DEPARTMENT OF RAIL AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION:

Agenda Item 7: (A) Action on Rail Industrial Access Program, specifically Allocation of Funds – Buchanan County, Austin Sales LLC/Virginia Drilling Co., Construction of 650+/- track feet associated with the proposed expansion of its distribution and drilling operation. Referenced by attachment of resolution and decision brief.

Moved by Mr. Bowie, seconded by Ms. Connally, with Mr. Keen abstaining.
Motion carried, resolution approved.

* * *

Agenda Item 8: Action on Fiscal Year 2006 Federal and State Grants by the Department of Rail and Public Transportation. Referenced by attachment of resolution and decision brief.

Moved by Ms. Hanley, seconded by Mr. Bowie. Motion carried, resolution approved.

Prior to approval Mr. McCarthy asked if this resolution involved the \$200 million in the plan or just this year.

Mr. Pittard indicated that this was the one year allocation.

Mr. McCarthy indicated that he would have like to have seen that information attached to the resolution.

Ms. Rae indicated this information was handed out at the CTB workshop on June 20, 2005.

Ms. Hanley asked if this was a grant request.

Secretary Homer indicated that this resolution was more than a grant request. Secretary Homer asked if there was a piece of paper that could be attached to the resolution, which would explain the items pertaining to this resolution.

Mr. McCarthy stated that his understanding was that everything the Board was being asked to approve in this resolution is in the Six Year Plan, but the Six Year Plan covers six years. Mr. McCarthy indicated that he did not understand why it was so difficult to attach a list to the resolution, which would allow the Board members to clearly see what they are voting on.

Ms. Reese indicated that if you go to Page 761 of the Six Year Program you can see FY'06 and all the detail behind that section are the FY 06 Grants that you are awarding in this resolution.

Ms. Hanley asked if it was possible that it was Page 799.

Mr. Pittard indicated the information was from Page 763 to 815.

Mr. McCarthy asked that the minutes reflect that pages 763 to 815 of the Six Year Program contain the detailed information regarding the list of grants.

* * *

Agenda Item 9: Action on the Fiscal Year 2006 Budget for the Department of Rail and Public Transportation. Referenced by attachment of resolution and decision brief.

Moved by Mr. Keen, seconded by Mr. Bowie. Motion carried, resolution approved

Prior to approval Mr. McCarthy reiterated his request that a list of projects involved in this type of resolution be attached so that the Board members know exactly what they are voting on.

* * *

INNOVATIVE FINANCE AND REVENUE OPERATIONS:

Agenda Item 10: Action on the George Coleman Bridge Toll Structure. Referenced by attachment of Resolution and Decision Brief.

Moved by Mr. Keen, seconded by Mr. White. Motion carried, resolution approved

Prior to approval Secretary Homer read a letter from William H. Whitley, County Administrator for the County of Gloucester, opposing this resolution. This letter has been made part of the minutes.

Ms. Reese indicated that she contacted the Middle Peninsula Planning District Commission, the County Administrators for Middlesex, Mathews and York Counties to present to them the same information regarding this resolution she presented to Gloucester County. None of the individuals she contacted chose to have her come.

Mr. Shucet indicated that VDOT took a serious look at all comments received and certainly support public comment, however, VDOT's position remains strongly the same that the Board has a fiduciary duty to adopt this resolution favorably.

Ms. Hanley indicated she was sympathetic to those who oppose toll increases. Ms. Hanley asked that the Board revisit the discussion at the June 15, 2005 workshop, regarding bond requirements for toll facilities and the equity on how the toll facilities are treated. The bond instruments were created by be paid off by the tolls, and if we don't correct the situation that I (Ms. Hanley) identified yesterday, where some of the toll facilities are not paying their bonds and must be paid in another way, that is an inequity across the Commonwealth. While she (Ms. Hanley) is never happy to raise tolls, she feels it must be done.

Mr. Watson asked what the old rate for non-commuters was.

Ms. Reese indicated the non-commuter rate did not change, it is still \$2.00. The only rate that is changing is the commuter rate, which is going from \$.50 to \$.85.

Mr. Lester indicated he had received many comments and he is certainly interested in those thoughts. But as far back as last fall Ms. Reese made the communities aware of this need, so the communities have been given reasonable time to comment on this resolution.

Secretary Homer noted that we did defer action on this item for 30 days from the May 2005 CTB meeting to allow additional comments.

* * *

Agenda Item 11: Action on FRAN Sale Resolution. Referenced by attachment of Resolution and Decision Brief.

Moved by Mr. Bowie, seconded by Mr. Keen. Motion carried, resolution approved.

Secretary Homer asked if this dates back to the Virginia Transportation Act of 2000 and if this was the last FRAN sale under that authorization.

Ms. Reese responded that no, the FRAN authorization still exists, it is 1.2 billion in revolving debt, unless the entire FRAN authorization disappears it will continue in perpetuity.

Secretary Homer asked if this is the only FRAN sale contemplated in the current Six Year Program.

Ms. Reese indicated yes in the current Six Year Program this is the only FRAN contemplated. Ms. Reese did indicate that in January of 2002, when this Board took over, there were more FRAN's allocated to projects than VDOT had the authority to sell. This is the last sale under cleaning up that whole process.

Secretary Homer asked Ms. Reese to advise the Board regarding the General Assembly actions with respect to FRAN's and project designations.

Ms. Reese responded that during the 2005 General Assembly they did take action to eliminate the specific project list of the Virginia Transportation Act of 2000 on what projects FRAN's could be used for. In that original legislation there was the ability for the Board to put them on other projects for cash flow needs, but now there is no limitation on what project can be bond financed. Which is a positive move as priorities and situations change in the future.

Secretary Homer asked if it would be fair to say that with the financial restructuring and the efforts to minimize debt FRAN's become more a tool that can be used in specific situations at the direction and discretion of the CTB.

Ms. Reese responded yes.

Secretary Homer stated that is a very important evolution in the management of debt for transportation projects.

Ms. Connally asked what the relationship of FRAN's was to the Treasury Board.

Ms. Reese indicated that FRAN's are sold under the Commonwealth Transportation Board. Next month VDOT will go to the Treasury Board and seek their authorization as well. No state debt is authorized until the Treasury Board also concurs.

* * *

FINANCIAL PLANNING DIVISION:

Agenda Item 12: Action on Fiscal Year 2006 Annual Budgets, Commonwealth Transportation Fund and the Department of Transportation. Referenced by attachment of Resolution and Decision Brief.

Moved by Mr. Keen, seconded by Mr. White. Motion carried, resolution approved.

Ms. Hanley made reference to page 6 of the Commonwealth Transportation Fund handout passed out at the CTB Workshop on June 15, 2005, specifically the HMOF, State Revenue Sources, Other, which shows a loss of \$24 million.

Ms. Reese indicated that is actually a negative 5.2 million in fiscal year 2006, the 24 million related to the change from year to year. That be situations for example, VDOT is required to pay to the Attorney General's office an amount of money each year. If at the end year end when we close the books for the prior year there has been more paid that what was budgeted this is for the corrections that have to occur. Some years that is a positive number, some years it is a negative.

Ms. Hanley asked about the NOVA Bond Fund, in a couple of places there is a decrease of about \$5 million dollars either in the deposit to debt service or deposit to the fund. Are we not going to sell any NVTD bonds this year or are we just aging out of the other ones?

Ms. Reese indicated VDOT was looking at a possible sale of NVTD bonds later this year. This is related to project schedules. This change reflects the refunding of some of the NVTD bonds last year.

Ms. Hanley asked if that meant VDOT refunded the bonds and is now paying less, so this is an accounting issue.

Ms. Reese confirmed Ms. Hanley's statement.

The CMAQ RSTP, but particularly CMAQ, there seems to be less money overall. On page 23 of the VDOT annual budget there is \$2 million less in state match, why is that?

Ms. Reese directed the Board to page 20 of the VDOT annual budget it shows \$30.4 million, the reason it is sitting in that account right now is because VDOT has not received the information from the MPO's to distribute the money between transit and highway projects. We are working on that now, the money will sit in a holding pot until they (MPO's) take their actions.

Ms. Hanley asked if the CTB would see how the money is distributed.

Ms. Reese responded that that information could be provided to the CTB as it became available. This is a federal action that the MPO's take.

Ms. Hanley asked if STP was the same situation as Ms. Reese described with CMAQ funds.

Ms. Reese responded it was the same situation if you look at the revenue estimate.

Ms. Hanley commended the labels in the budget of revenue, estimate of revenue and estimate of distribution.

Ms. Reese directed the Board to Page 19 of the VDOT budget, under federal sources, that fund is almost \$43 million in FY06; it is actually up about \$20 million.

Ms. Hanley asked if that was the holding place for the STP funds.

Ms. Reese stated that is the total amount and may be in different places depending on MPO actions.

Ms Hanley asked if there was a chart in the future that shows how this money was distributed.

Ms. Hanley referenced the Secondary Road System on page 8 of the Commonwealth Transportation Fund, seems to be down no matter where I found it, why?

Part of it is because in the 2005 Appropriation Act allows VDOT to pay off project deficits by taking money off the top to accomplish that work. To the systems themselves through the 40-30-30 formula there were changes. It also could be that last year there may have been some federal bridge money on the secondary system that isn't there today. If you look in the VDOT budget you see the details of the funding going to the secondary program on page 21, where you can see the pluses and minuses.

Ms. Hanley asked if VDOT paid off some of those debts out of the Secondary Road Fund off the top

Ms. Reese responded, yes, off the top of the Construction Fund, right.

Ms Reese stated that if you look at the Secondary Construction Program on page 21 where the negatives are in terms of what's been allocated is not in the formula dollars as much as it is in the STP regional and CMAQ fund which may be distributed by the MPO's in the next couple of months, but today have not been to projects on the Secondary system.

Ms. Hanley asked if we (VDOT) knew how many of the projects VDOT paid off actually came out of the Secondary Road Fund to start with. Are they primarily secondary roads?

Ms. Reese responded there were no Secondary Road Projects that were in deficit.

Ms. Hanley stated, I think you just made my point. I just discovered this and I am unhappy about that. But in other words we (VDOT) took secondary road money to pay off projects that were not secondary roads in the first place. For those localities that have a lot of secondary roads that is probably not a happy observation.

* * *

Agenda Item 13: Action on Six Year Improvement Program and Allocations for Fiscal Years 2006-2011. Referenced by attachment of Resolution and Decision Brief.

Mr. Keen moved that UPC 76503 be voted on separately, seconded by Mr. White, with Mr. Bowie abstaining. Motion carried, resolution approved

Mr. White moved for approval on the remaining items of the Six Year Program seconded by Mr. Watson. Motion carried, resolution approved.

Prior to approval Mr. Keen asked that in light of the previous discussion where the restrictions are less on the FRAN's where they are not project specific, moving forward and looking at the allocation for FRAN's and beyond this \$250 million sale, what is the criteria, does it go back to the formula for district distribution, is it the criteria needs based concept we would use moving forward.

Ms. Reese responded that starting next week staff is going to sit down to look at what would be the best utilization of all of our (VDOT) funding. One of the things we plan to do over the next few months, along with some legislative staff, is look at different ways to use all the funds. Whether or not federal funds should even go to the secondary or urban system, the reality is they have very few roads that qualify for federal funding. FRAN's one of the things we would like to see happen, as the Commissioner mentioned yesterday, we have 103 new projects in the program but we need to find a way to fund some preliminary engineering work to get things started so that we can continue to move projects forward. FRAN's may be the tool for that. We want to spend some time this summer, outside of putting a program together, and a budget together, to figure out the best way to do all of this and come back to the Board with those concepts.

Secretary Homer stated the bottom line is there is a great deal of discretion in the use of FRAN's. It is important and maybe deserving of some policy to make sure that they are used properly, if at

all. The conclusion may be it is not a good tool and I would anticipate we could have those discussions in the fall.

Mr. White asked if in 6 Year Program we are getting ready to approve, has there been any assumption built in on the \$250 million bond issue as far as the use of the proceeds in the six year plan.

Ms. Reese indicated that if you look under FRAN's, there is a category that says FRAN and FRAN Match. All we have done with FRAN's over the last three years is continue to commit to projects that have been in the program financed partially with those back in 2001 and 2002. We haven't really added anything new, because there was not enough to do that. We are now at a stable point, this goes back to the accountability and stability that you brought to the program, to start looking at new ways on how we can use them. This is the last cleaning up of the books, I hope.

Mr. White asked if we (VDOT) are getting ready to bring on an additional revenue stream of \$250 million in the fall, if we approve the Six Year Plan now is that money committed?

Ms. Reese indicated that the money is already committed. These FRAN's may have already been budgeted to a project two years ago and the project is now at a point when it needs the money.

Secretary Homer stated that over the long term if you look out ten year there are a couple of questions. One, should we continue to use FRAN's. I think a healthy decree of skepticism is in order, but with taking up the legislative rules if the decision is that FRAN's are a good product to use what, what is the best way to use them.

Ms. Hanley asked how the cost of paying the FRAN's off is allocated.

They are paid by federal reimbursement. In terms of a budgetary view the priority transportation is the first call for debt service. If you will recall yesterday, I told you that there was enough cash in the Priority Transportation Fund to pay for FRAN services in FY06. Insurance premiums is a critical component of that, we have got those for FY06. What can't be paid for comes off the top of the Highway Construction Fund, if affect the secondary, urban and primary systems between the period of FY07 and FY11. The last five years of your Six Year Program that is about a half a billion dollars that has to be budgeted to FRAN debt services.

Ms. Hanley asked does it come off the top without having the debt allocated directly too the district where the project was.

That was originally the way the Virginia Transportation Act of 2000 was written. It got into concerns about, The VTA allocated the money in a certain way in certain amounts to certain projects for each district but then if your project wasn't moving forward fast enough to actually have spending of those bonds should you already be paying debt service on money you weren't spending. It became much more complicated and much more difficult and it would have meant that every year as we looked at spending patterns, you could have a terrible detrimental impact

on a district. For example, if the Dulles Rail project is moving forward in that particular year spent a \$100 million in FRAN's all of the sudden the Northern Virginia district would have to pay the cost for that. This is a way of trying to keep it stable, not saying it is good or bad, but it was the best way to keep things stable and predictable.

Ms. Hanley responded that was a good process, otherwise we would all be scrambling to make sure our projects were not funded by FRAN's. Which is sort of what I thought was going on in the past.

Ms. Reese stated there is a new level of accountability in the Six Year Program, this year for the first time, it is broken down by fund source, every person can see exactly what type of money is funding a project. Ms. Reese recognized Diane Mitchell, Craig Ahlin, Dane Lewis, Jennifer Watson, and Bernie Campbell for their work on the Six Year Program.

Secretary Homer recognized Steve Pittard at DRPT for his work on the Six Year Program.

Ms. Reese pointed out that a project in Northern Virginia, on I-66; it is Idea -66 that was corrected in terms of the project description to say I-66 spot improvement instead of studies. It will not be in the hard copy, there are very few of these, but it is going to be in the Internet one that will be available.

* * *

SCHEDULING AND CONTRACT DIVISION

Agenda Item 14: Action on Bids for Interstate, Primary, Secondary, Urban and Miscellaneous Projects Received April and May 2005, for projects in excess of \$2 million for award and authorized execution of contracts by the Commissioner, or Chief Engineer. Referenced by attachment of Bid Results Report.

Approval for Project 475-CH provided that the option renewal period is subject to review by the Board, moved by Mr. Bowie, seconded by Mr. Keen. Motion carried, report approved.

Approval for remaining Bids made by Mr. Keen, seconded by Mr. Bowie. Motion carried, report approved

A general discussion ensued among the Board members regarding the lack of competition regarding the bids that the department receives.

Prior to approval Mr. McCarthy directed the Board to the Bid Results from May 5th, Project 475-CH, specifically the renewal periods and whether or not the contract renewal would be brought back to the Board when it's first time period was finished. Mr. McCarthy made a motion to approve but on the condition that any renewal options are exercised only after the Board has approved them. Mr. Bowie seconded the motion made by Mr. McCarthy.

Byron Coburn stated for the record that this contract would indeed be brought back to the Commonwealth Transportation Board for approval before it could be renewed.

A general discussion ensued among the Board members regarding the appropriateness of an automatic renewal options attached to a contract.

* * *

NEW BUSINESS

Secretary Homer read a letter from Dr. Phil Stone, who was unable to attend due to a business conflict. Letter is attached to the minutes for reference.

Mr. Lester expressed his appreciation to VDOT staff and the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

* * *

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m. The next workshop and meeting will be held on Thursday, July 21, 2005, beginning at 9:00 a.m. in the VDOT Central Auditorium, 1221 East Broad Street, Richmond, VA

Approved:

Chairman

Attested:

Secretary