



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Commonwealth Transportation Board

Aubrey L. Layne, Jr.
Chairman

1401 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

(804) 786-2701

Agenda item # 14

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD June 17, 2015

MOTION

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

Title: Policy and Guidelines for Implementation of a 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 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) modifies section 33.2-358 and sets forth requirements relating to the allocations and 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, 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 in March 2015, a Draft HB2 Implementation Policy Guide containing a draft/proposed prioritization policy and process was issued and posted at VirginiaHB2.org for purposes of gathering public review and comment; and

WHEREAS, such Draft HB2 Implementation Policy Guide incorporates the requirements and factors identified in Section 33.2-214.1 (B); and

WHEREAS, between February 19 and March 12, 2015, nine workshops were held in each VDOT highway construction district to solicit input from localities, metropolitan planning organizations, transit authorities, transportation authorities, and other stakeholders, and nine public hearings were held on April 21, 2015 in Weyers Cave, April 22, 2015 in Lynchburg, April 23, 2015 in Chesapeake, April 28, 2015 in Fairfax, April 29, 2015 in Roanoke, April 30, 2015 in Fredericksburg, May 4, 2015 in Abingdon, May 5, 2015 in Midlothian, and May 11, 2015 in Culpeper, to receive public comments prior to the Board’s adoption of the final prioritization policy and process; and

WHEREAS, after due consideration of comments received, changes were made to the draft prioritization policy and process 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:

1. Application for Six-Year Improvement Program (SYIP) funding 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 SYIP funding 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 SYIP 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.
4. By majority vote of the Board, the Board may choose to submit up to two projects for funding through the High Priority Projects Program for each 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 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	Land Use Policy Consistency	100%

Note*: 100% for Transit Projects

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

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

Typology Categories

Region in which the Project is Located	Typology	Construction District
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTAA) / Transportation Planning Board (TPB) ²	Category A	Northern Virginia/Culpeper/Staunton
Hampton Roads TPO (HRTPO) ¹	Category A	Hampton Roads/Fredericksburg
Richmond Regional TPO (RRTPO)	Category B	Richmond
WinFred MPO	Category C	Staunton
Fredericksburg Area MPO (FAMPO)	Category A	Fredericksburg
Northern Shenandoah Valley RC	Category D	Staunton
George Washington RC	Category D	Fredericksburg
Richmond Regional PDC	Category D	Richmond
Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO	Category B	Culpeper
Harrisonburg-Rockingham MPO	Category C	Staunton
New River Valley MPO	Category C	Salem
Rappahannock-Rapidan RC ²	Category C	Culpeper
Thomas Jefferson PDC	Category C	Culpeper/Lynchburg
New River Valley PDC	Category C	Salem
Roanoke Valley TPO (RVTPO)	Category B	Salem
Staunton-Augusta-Waynesboro MPO	Category C	Staunton
Tri-Cities MPO	Category C	Richmond
Roanoke Valley-Alleghany PDC	Category D	Salem/Staunton
Bristol MPO	Category D	Bristol
Central Virginia MPO	Category C	Lynchburg/Salem
Crater PDC	Category D	Richmond/Hampton Roads
Region 2000 LGC	Category D	Salem/Lynchburg
Accomack-Northampton PDC	Category D	Hampton Roads
Central Shenandoah PDC	Category D	Staunton

Region in which the Project is Located	Typology	Construction District
Danville MPO	Category D	Lynchburg
Kingsport MPO	Category D	Bristol
Middle Peninsula PDC ¹	Category D	Fredericksburg
Mount Rogers PDC	Category D	Bristol/Salem
Commonwealth RC	Category D	Lynchburg/Richmond
Lenowisco PDC	Category D	Bristol
Northern Neck PDC	Category D	Fredericksburg
West Piedmont PDC	Category D	Salem/Lynchburg
Cumberland Plateau PDC	Category D	Bristol
Hampton Roads PDC	Category D	Hampton Roads
Southside PDC	Category D	Lynchburg/Richmond

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:

1. The portion of Gloucester County within the Hampton Roads TPO boundary shall use the weighting associated with the Middle Peninsula PDC.
2. The portion of Fauquier County within the Transportation Planning Board Boundary shall use the weighting associated with the Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission.

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. Scores for candidate projects will be used by the Board to inform their funding decisions beginning with the Fiscal Year 2017-2022 Six-Year Improvement Program.
8. 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. A project that has been selected for funding must be re-scored if there are significant changes to either the scope or cost of the project, such that the anticipated benefits relative to cost would have substantially changed.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the methodology outlined in the HB2 Implementation Policy 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, including but not limited to issuance of a Policy Guide consistent with the intent of the policy and process adopted herein.

####