Today’s Discussion

• Chapter 896 Mandate
• Background
• Addressing the Challenge of Chapter 896 Mandate
• Description of the Plan
• Implications of the Plan
• Concluding Remarks
Chapter 896 Road Reassignment Mandate

• Develop a Plan to reassign roads to the Primary, Secondary and Urban Systems, using functional classification.

• Analyze implications of the Plan.

• Present plan to CTB for advice and consent.

• Present plan to Governor and General Assembly before January 1, 2009.
Overview of Classification Systems

• Administrative Classification
  – Emerged between 1918 and today, one route at a time.
  – Continuous Primary, Secondary, and Urban systems.
  – Based on routes or corridors.
  – Not functionally defined.

• Functional Classification
  – Has been required to receive Federal Funding since 1973.
  – Documented method; results approved by FHWA
  – Based on road segments, not complete routes or corridors.
  – 10 year updates conducted by VDOT staff.
Functional Classification Categories

All U.S. Roads

Rural
- Arterials
  - Principal
    - Interstate
    - Other Principal Arterial
  - Minor
- Collectors
  - Major
- Local

Urban
- Arterials
  - Principal
  - Interstate
  - Other Freeway & Expressway
  - Other Principal Arterial
- Collectors
- Local

Source: Federal Highway Administration
Working Assumptions for a Candidate Plan

• Numerous alternatives examined
• Candidate plan designed to be a “low impact plan”
• The plan presented here maintains city responsibility for roads within municipal boundaries.
  – Consistent with first cities initiative
• The Plan is based on similarities between the Federal criteria and the most logical apparent function of Primary, Secondary and Urban Systems.
  – Principal Arterials are most similar in function to the Primary System, but not always
  – Collectors and Locals are most similar in function to the Secondary and Urban Systems, but not always
# Results of Candidate Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principal</strong></td>
<td>In counties</td>
<td></td>
<td>In cities and towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rural</strong></td>
<td>Minor Arterials within counties.</td>
<td>Urban Minor Arterials within counties.</td>
<td>In cities and towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collectors</strong></td>
<td>Within counties.</td>
<td></td>
<td>In cities and towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Locals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Impact on Centerline Mileages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current</strong></td>
<td>8,080</td>
<td>48,980</td>
<td>11,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ch 896 Plan</strong></td>
<td>5,480</td>
<td>51,470</td>
<td>11,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>-2,600</td>
<td>+2,490</td>
<td>+110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Implications for Primary Allocations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Current Percent Input</th>
<th>Ch 896 Plan Percent Input</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>-18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>-10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynchburg</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>+5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Roads</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericksburg</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culpeper</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>+7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staunton</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>-18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>+16.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidate Plan & Haymarket Area Primary System
A Possible Alternative Approach

- Connect the Commonwealth without regard for previous mandates and functional or administrative class
- Base the system on connecting important locations such as towns, county seats, hospitals, schools, fire and rescue, distribution and inter-modal centers, etc.
- Ensure continuity between and through localities without being constrained by jurisdiction boundaries
- Ensure redundancy for safety—Rte 1 & I-95, Rte. 11 & I-81, etc.
A Possible Alternative (continued)

- Network identified at request of Commissioner Ekern by a multidisciplinary team
  - Research Council
  - Central Office Planning Staff
  - Central Office System Operations Staff
  - District Planning Staff

- Result is a seamless statewide network of significant roads.
  - Incorporates all functional classes
  - Likely require some change of administrative classifications
  - Addresses 85% of all activity on the state system
  - Approximately 20,000 centerline miles
  - Supports Access Management and Land use & transportation linkages
Alternative: Haymarket Area—Roads of Statewide Significance
Concluding Remarks

• The Chapter 896 assignment does not result in a logical, seamless network.
  – Segments of less significant roads will become “significant” and segments of significant roads will be placed into the secondary system

• There is no way to comply with the Chapter 896 road reassignment mandate while retaining a seamless network of significant roads.

• There is no reasonable plan, based on functional classification, that can be used to assign roads to administrative class.

• Next Month the CTB will be offered a resolution based on your input regarding the response to Chapter 896.