



**Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
January 28, 2019**

<http://www.fampo.gwregion.org/committees/policy-committee/>

Adopted April 15, 2019

Members Present:

Mr. Matt Kelly, Vice-Chair, City of Fredericksburg
Mr. Tim Barody, City of Fredericksburg
Mr. Billy Withers, City of Fredericksburg
Mr. Kevin Marshall, Spotsylvania County
Mr. David Ross, Spotsylvania County
Mr. Paul Trampe, Spotsylvania County (Alternate)
Mr. Mark Dudenhefer, Stafford County
Ms. Wendy Maurer, Stafford County
Ms. Cindy Shelton, Stafford County
Ms. Nancy Long, Caroline County (Non-voting member)
Ms. Ruby Brabo, King George County (Non-voting member)
Mr. Ivan Rucker, FHWA
Mr. Chuck Steigerwald, PRTC
Ms. Marcie Parker, VDOT

Others Present:

Ms. Meg Bohmke, Stafford County BOS (Alternate)
Mr. Tom Coen, Stafford County BOS (Alternate)
Mr. Todd Horsley, DRPT
Ms. Donna Cloniger, VDOT
Ms. Donna Drewry, VDOT
Ms. Susan Gardner, VDOT
Ms. Kelly Hannon, VDOT
Mr. Stephen Haynes, VDOT
Ms. Linda LaSut, VDOT
Ms. Nicole Reed, VDOT
Ms. Michelle Shropshire, VDOT
Mr. Dave Swan, CTAC Chairman
Mr. Rupert Farley, CTAC
Mr. Paul Milde, Fredericksburg Chamber of Commerce
Mr. Randy Comer, Thrasher Group

Staff Members Present:

Mr. Paul Agnello, FAMPO
Ms. Briana Hairfield, FAMPO

Ms. Kari Barber, FAMPO
Mr. John Bentley, FAMPO
Mr. Colin Cate, FAMPO
Ms. Linda Millsaps, GWRC
Ms. Kate Gibson, GWRC
Ms. Michele Dooling, GWRC
Ms. Samantha Shoukas, GWRC
Ms. Diana Utz, GWRC
Ms. Leigh Anderson, GWRC
Ms. JoAnna Roberson, GWRC

CALL FAMPO POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING TO ORDER

Vice-Chair, Mr. Kelly called the meeting to order at 7:40 p.m. with a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF FAMPO POLICY COMMITTEE AGENDA

Upon motion by Ms. Maurer and seconded by Mr. Ross, with all concurring, the January 28th Policy Committee Agenda was approved as submitted.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT - None

CHAIRMAN's COMMENTS - None

FAMPO ADMINISTRATOR REPORT

Mr. Agnello advised there is a major VDOT meeting to be held this Wednesday for discussion of the Northbound Rappahannock River Crossing project. Mr. Agnello advised the VDOT meeting will be held at James Monroe High School from 5-7:00 p.m. and encouraged everyone who could attend to do so.

Mr. Agnello stated that staff is working with PRTC on the new Commuter Choice funding resource opportunity. Mr. Agnello stated this is a program that will provide \$15m annually for the next 70 years that could be applied to transit/TDM projects on the I-395/95 corridors. Mr. Agnello stated that staff attended the initial meeting and looks forward to working with Mr. Steigerwald on how the funding could potentially be utilized in the FAMPO region.

Mr. Agnello stated that FAMPO recently hired a new intern who is a student at the University of Mary Washington. The intern will be working on the Lafayette Boulevard study. Mr. Agnello stated staff is still looking to fill Mr. Quint's position and advertisements have run for the position. Mr. Agnello stated that at some time later in the year FAMPO is also looking to fill the other 2 vacant FAMPO positions.

CONSENT AGENDA

- a.) Approval of December 10, 2018 Policy Committee Meeting Minutes
- b.) Review of Draft Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 Joint GWRC/FAMPO Title VI Nondiscrimination Plan

- i. Adopted Joint GWRC/FAMPO Title VI Nondiscrimination Plan
 - ii. Draft FY2019 Joint GWRC/FAMPO Title VI Nondiscrimination Plan with Tracked Changes
 - iii. Draft FY2019 Joint GWRC/FAMPO Title VI Nondiscrimination Plan without Tracked Changes
- c.) Approval of Resolution 19-22, Approving the Allocation of Highway Infrastructure Program Funding to UPC 111753: Route 1 at Potomac Creek Drive
- d.) Approval of Resolution 19-23, Approving the Allocation of RSTP Funding from UPC 113914 to a New UPC for Gateway Boulevard Extension Study

Ms. Maurer requested that items A & B be removed from the Consent Agenda – Item A because she was not in attendance at the December Policy Committee meeting so would need to abstain from approving the minutes. Item B was asked to be removed from tonight’s Consent Agenda & deferred for additional discussion to occur at the upcoming February Policy Committee meeting. Ms. Maurer stated this request was to give members ample time to review the Draft Title VI Plan & to make comments accordingly, as well as to allow time for the plan to be reviewed by GWRC as well.

Upon motion by Mr. Dudenhefer and seconded by Mr. Ross, with Ms. Maurer & Mr. Trampe abstaining on Item A, and all others concurring on Item B (to defer to the February meeting) & unanimous approval for items C & D as listed above on consent agenda for tonight’s meeting.

ACTION ITEMS/DISCUSSION ITEMS

- a.) **Federal Certification Review** – Mr. Ivan Rucker, FHWA

Mr. Rucker advised that the Federal law requires that the FHWA and FTA ensures that the metropolitan planning process of a metropolitan planning organization that services a transportation management area is consistent with all federal laws and regulations.

Mr. Rucker stated the certification review is an in-depth, documented review of an MPO’s planning process to ensure that the s planning & programming process is consistent with federal

laws & regulations. Mr. Rucker stated the certification reviews can be done as often as annually; however, must be completed at least every 4 years.

Mr. Rucker advised that a certification review process is not designed to have an MPO fail but rather than to determine what is working; what is not working; & to ensure that an MPO fulfills the TMA requirements. Mr. Rucker stated the review is not just a review of the MPO or its staff but is a review of the planning process that is conducted by all agencies (State, MPO, Transit, etc.)-charged with carrying out the process regulations on a daily basis.

Mr. Rucker stated there are 2 types of MPOs— a TMA and a non-TMA. A TMA MPO is designated for urbanized areas of 200,000 or more in population as determined by the most recent census, and Non-TMA areas which are those urban areas having 50,000 or more in population as determined by the most recent census.

Mr. Rucker stated that the question may arise as to “why” is FAMPO required to be part of the Federal Certification Review of the Transportation Planning Board (TPB), which is the TMA MPO for the DC/MD/Northern Virginia urbanized area? Mr. Rucker stated that following the 2000 census the DC urbanized area are extended south into northern Stafford County which is contained in the FAMPO Planning Area. Mr. Rucker stated at that time, Stafford County had a decision to make – it could have the Northern Stafford County members join the TPB MPO and other members of Stafford County stay with FAMPO or it could decide that it is in Stafford’s best interest that all members remain entirely with FAMPO.

Mr. Rucker advised that with the introduction of risk based certification reviews, there are now basically two types certification reviews: the traditional & risk-based.

The areas of review for the traditional process typically includes all topic areas that the MPO is responsible. These include: Organization Structure (By-laws, Committees, etc.); Planning Boundaries; Agreements/Contracts; Regional Long Range Plan; Regional TIP; UPWP; Financial/Fiscal Constraints; Project Selection process; Public Participation Plan; Travel Demand Model; Performance Based Planning process; Title VI plan; Self-Certification/Procurement procedures; Congestion Management Process; Transit; Consultant procedures; Obligated projects; Bike/Ped planning; Freight planning; & Air Quality/Conformity requirements. (Mr. Rucker stated these are the basic documents and procedures reviewed for each MPO; however, items can also be added/included per recommendation from the Board and/or Staff).

Mr. Rucker stated that the process of reviewing topics in a Risk-Based review are not finalized to date; however, could include the following items for FAMPO: Agreements/Contracts (3-C, Performance, Planning, PL agreement, UPWP, CMP, Performance-based Planning & Title VI Civil Rights plan.

Mr. Rucker stated that FHWA receives the FAMPO Policy Committee meetings and for instance, noticed discussions have occurred in regard to a better understanding of agreements with both GWRC/FAMPO & their respective roles/responsibilities so this would be an item that FHWA would review.

Ms. Bohmke asked when a decision would be made as to whether a traditional or a risk-based review is assigned to a specific MPO. Mr. Rucker advised that these decisions are hoped to be made over the next several weeks; however, as a result of the recent government shut-downs, work has not occurred with FTA so the process has been delayed. Mr. Rucker stated he hopes decisions are made by the middle of February.

Mr. Rucker reiterated that the process is not designed to punish an MPO but instead is to be used to assess what is working, what is not working, and to help make improvement where needed.

Ms. Shelton asked if a TMA has operated without federal certifications in the past, and if so, what occurred to the MPO. Mr. Rucker stated that to his knowledge, no MPO's have operated without a federal certification review process in place.

Ms. Shelton asked what criteria is used for determining risk factors? Mr. Rucker-stated an agency having a new Executive Director in place; a new Title VI Coordinator on board; lack of performance-based planning approach-(which the FAMPO region already does so they are ahead of the curve when compared to other MPO's state-wide); etc.

Mr. Rucker stated that a requirement per federal law is that the certification include a public hearing. Mr. Rucker relayed that FHWA & FTA will provide an opportunity for public involvement and a meeting with the FAMPO CTAC. By law, comments received during the public hearing must be considered in arriving at a certification action. Mr. Rucker advised that in addition to the public hearing, a combined meeting with be scheduled to occur between CTAC committee members from each MPO as well.

Mr. Rucker stated this would be an approximate 2-hour scheduled meeting.

Mr. Rucker stated there are 4 certification finding categories and that most MPO's fall into either the first or second category which is fully meets requirements or substantially meets requirements. Mr. Rucker stated it is very rare for an MPO to receive a certification rating of "not certified" because this means that if the MPO fails, then FHWA has failed as well. Mr. Rucker stated the 3rd category is certified with conditions/restrictions which is also rare.

Mr. Kelly asked if there is a potential for changing current regional boundaries. Mr. Rucker stated that these requests can be made & submitted for review and approved by the Policy Board

Mr. Rucker advised that with MPO support, the FAMPO region could be expanded. Mr. Rucker relayed that if you extend the boundary lines even 1-5 miles a non-voting member on the Board could in fact then become a voting member – i.e. for the FAMPO region, extending the boundary line from 1-5 miles into both the Caroline & King George counties would authorize these 2 localities to then become voting members providing it has MPO support & endorsement. Mr. Rucker stated that both Caroline and King George are part of the structure and fabric of FAMPO and all of its products – including its committees.

Mr. Rucker stated that whether the FAMPO/GWRC region undergoes a traditional or a risk-based certification review process, he believes that FAMPO is doing a good job. Mr. Rucker stated that if any member, staff, entity, etc. has questions or concerns, or just need clarification on the review process to not hesitate to contact him.

b.) Congestion Scoring in Smart Scale, Round 3 – Mr. Chad Tucker, OIPI

Mr. Tucker advised he had been asked to speak tonight to explain the congestion analysis process and to clear-up confusion from information that has been relayed in the past. Mr. Tucker stated that as project results were just released last week, there is still a lengthy review process on-going for the 433 projects that were submitted for Round 3 of the Smart Scale process state-wide. Mr. Tucker stated that decisions on projects selected or rejected are recommended by the central office; however, the CTB makes the final recommendations in June. Mr. Tucker stated the CTB can accept the recommendations; or add/remove projects from the recommended list & they have done all of the above in Rounds 1 & 2 of the Smart Scale process. Mr. Tucker encouraged FAMPO to make their concerns known.

Ms. Parker stated that as currently the region does not have CTB representation, then who should be contacted? Mr. Tucker concurred that currently there is no CTB member appointed for the FAMPO region so until this occurs, he would recommend that contacts be made to the at-large rural & urban appointees.

With more projects submitted & less funding available, the congestion management process focused on projects that reduced volume or increased capacity; were multi-modal in nature; total project cost was considered; project readiness (i.e. – project has planning & right-of-way phases completed & needs funding to finalize construction phase) & leveraged funding that was applied to the project.

Mr. Tucker stated that specifically for the FAMPO region, the question has been asked if weekend traffic congestion data is factored in & considered when determining if a project is selected or rejected.

Mr. Tucker stated that since the 60s, data collection does not include daily averages as 50% of facilities would then be over capacity; it also does not utilize the worst traffic data statistics but instead typically calculates the 30th highest hour of traffic data on segments or roadways which does include weekend end traffic counts being factored in as well.

Mr. Tucker stated that for this region, for I-95 in particular, if there is traffic congestion every Saturday/Sunday for 52 weeks a year then this data is built into the 30th highest hour. Mr. Tucker stated that a significant portion of I-95 from Hanover County line to Route 17 in Stafford County showed 4 of 9 segments studied showed the highest counts occurred on weekends.

Mr. Kelly stated he understands the K factor process; however, but when projects go into the scoring process, the Smart Scale process still does not work. Mr. Kelly stated that even though both the

southbound & northbound Rappahannock River crossing projects are now funded (sb by the CTB & nb by Transurban); however, the 5 I-95 projects submitted for Round 3 selection/consideration were not selected because they are just road segment projects. Mr. Kelly stated even though a smaller segment of transportation improvements they are scored independently, but yet they have benefit to the entire highway system.

Mr. Dudenhefer stated there are more roadway projects needing approval in Stafford County other than I-95 projects & Stafford County is getting hammered. No projects for Stafford County were selected in Round 3 of the Smart Scale application process. Stafford County citizens are not causing the congestion problems; however, local revenue monies are continually being expended to make improvements to secondary roads who incur the impact of traffic being diverted off of I-95 when the interstate remains congested. Mr. Dudenhefer stated the locality needs are not being acknowledged & instead being totally ignored & he does not see how the State can even hold its head up by the continual projects not being selected & it is a major slap to the entire region

Ms. Brabo stated she understands Mr. Dudenhefer's frustration levels; however, possibly some things need to change internally for each locality. Ms. Brabo stated that she realizes the number 1 category of selecting projects regionally is congestion-based projects. However, Smart Scale does require each county/city to prioritize each category. Ms. Brabo stated she is not sure this is why King George County received different results this year or not but they had not been as successful in past Smart Scale cycles. Ms. Brabo stated that for Round 3, King George County did prioritization differently and focused on economic development projects rather than congestion relief projects and King George was successful in getting 2 of 4 applications submitted approved in Round 3.

Mr. Tucker stated that by the CTB basing amount of money being requested for each project versus the total cost of a project has allowed for more projects state-wide to be approved. Mr. Agnello asked if there is any discussion in regard to limiting the amount of leveraged funding that can be applied to a project. Mr. Tucker stated this was discussed in Round 1 and could easily be re-addressed again in Round 3. Mr. Tucker stated that for Round 3, there were 76 projects submitted for consideration that had less than a \$25m total project cost & all had leveraged funding attached to them. Mr. Tucker advised 5 of these requested projects were approved in Round 3.

Mr. Kelly stated he understands that being able to leverage money gets more projects funded; however, currently 2 regions can leverage millions of dollars so they will continually be more likely to get more projects approved. Mr. Kelly asked if consideration can be given to allow regions, if they so choose to do so, to establish a taxing authority to at least allow them to become more competitive state-wide. Mr. Tucker stated that to date, he has not heard this item being discussed.

Mr. Tucker stated the general recommendations for Round 4 is moving toward larger improvement projects & these projects will need to receive points in more than 1 of the 6 scoring categories & have benefit to multi-modal options with projects being combined from a singular project to a larger regional project.

Mr. Tucker stated the review process is still well underway with final recommendations being made in the April/May time frame so he encouraged members to contact him; to contact CTB representatives; etc. if more questions arise or comments on why projects were or were not selected to please do so.

Mr. Kelly asked Ms. Parker if at the February meeting & prior to the meeting date, could members receive a copy of all projects submitted for the FAMPO/GWRC region for Round 3 & have explanation from VDOT as to why or why not a project was or was not accepted. Ms. Parker concurred this request could be accommodated.

c.) Smart Scale Round 3 Draft Results/Update– Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that several handouts are available for tonight's presentation. One handout looked at the best count locations in comparing weekend traffic versus week day traffic on I-95. Mr. Agnello stated the data showed that north of Route 17 the most congested days are weekdays & south of Route 17 most are weekends. Mr. Agnello stated that in cooperation with VDOT, staff still wants to re-address additional alternatives for compiling a more accurate picture of weekend traffic counts for Round 4 of the Smart Scale process.

Mr. Agnello advised that another handout shows a map of the Smart Scale projects & gives a project listing for projects submitted for consideration in Round 3 of the Smart Scale process. Mr. Agnello stated the projects were rated and the varied colored sheets indicate how close a project was to being selected & this data was provided both on a state-wide basis & a district-wide basis.

Mr. Agnello relayed that district-wide, there was approximately \$28m available for allocation & the FAMPO region received \$21m of the \$28m with a \$7m project also awarded to Gloucester County.

On the state-wide project selection, FAMPO submitted five I-95 projects for consideration & they were not close at all to being considered. Mr. Agnello stated the initial results indicate the projects did not score well because they had no leveraged funding, they were not multimodal, and the congestion scores were depressed by a large project in Hampton Roads. Mr. Agnello stated the five I-95 projects that were submitted were not large dollar amount projects and staff was hoping some of them would have been approved; however, the review process is still underway.

Mr. Agnello stated he did not know what the appropriate amount of money is needed to adequately cover the project needs for the state; however, stated that money for Round 3 was very scarce & \$780m state-wide was too low and not adequate.

Ms. Bohmke asked Mr. Agnello for results on the Enon Road project in Stafford County. Ms. Bohmke stated this project was submitted for consideration under Round 2 & was not approved. Ms. Bohmke stated it was re-submitted in Round 3 with leveraged funding applied & the project was still not considered.

Mr. Agnello stated that he too was surprised with the leveraged funding applied the Enon Road project did not receive higher considerations. However, Mr. Agnello stated that the VDOT traffic counts for this project showed there was heavy a.m. & p.m. congestion during the school hours; however, during the remainder of the day the traffic counts were relatively light meaning that the overall daily results were not that high.

Mr. Agnello advised that staff would be continuing to work with VDOT to determine what changes can be made & what the staff & localities need to provide to help the region become more successful in Round 4 of the Smart Scale process.

d.) Lafayette Boulevard, Phase 1 – Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that FAMPO/GWRC have received a \$125,000 grant from DRPT for the Lafayette Boulevard study from Sophia Street/Lafayette Boulevard in the City of Fredericksburg to Route 1 in Spotsylvania County. Mr. Agnello advised Phase 1 of the study will be a transit study & Phase 2 will be a multi-modal highway study that will be completed later this year.

Mr. Agnello stated the purpose of the Phase 1 study will be to provide potential transit improvements for the Lafayette Boulevard corridor that will include improved accessibility for the VRE station; the planned Lee Hill Transfer station for FRED; etc. Mr. Agnello advised the study will develop a prioritized list of projects for future funding considerations from the following funding programs; Smart Scale, CMAQ, RSTP, etc. Mr. Agnello stated the Phase 1 deadline is September 30th, 2019; however, staff is requested a 6-month extension from DRPT.

Mr. Agnello advised the Phase 2 overview will be a study of potential highway & bike/ped improvements for the Lafayette Boulevard corridor between Lafayette Boulevard & Route 1/3 & bike/ped crossing improvements at Route 3. Mr. Agnello stated this also is a \$125,000 study that FAMPO will be funding from FY2020 RSTP allocations and is a request made to FAMPO from the City of Fredericksburg. Mr. Agnello stated study efforts for Phase 2 will begin in the Spring of 2019.

Mr. Agnello advised the current proposed study stakeholders include the following entities: DRPT, the City of Fredericksburg, FRED, Spotsylvania County, VRE, GWRideConnect & other interested FAMPO TAC members. Ms. Parker asked that VDOT be included as a stakeholder as well as state dollars are being utilized. Mr. Agnello advised VDOT would be included.

Mr. Agnello advised that 3 Lafayette Boulevard projects were selected for approval in Round 3 of the Smart Scale process at a cost of \$5.8m. Mr. Agnello stated the projects selected for the Lafayette Boulevard corridor will significantly improve both highway & bik/ped safety & capacity & will also improve accessibility of the Fredericksburg VRE/Amtrak station.

- i. Resolution 19-24, Approving the Scope & Budget for Consultant Services for the Phase 1 Transit Component of the Lafayette Boulevard Multimodal Transportation Study

Mr. Agnello advised that Resolution 19-24 is requesting approval for FAMPO to complete a multimodal study of the Lafayette Boulevard corridor & study will be completed by 2 of the current FAMPO on-call consulting firms. Mr. Agnello advised the study request was submitted to FAMPO from the City of Fredericksburg.

Upon motion by Mr. Withers & seconded by Mr. Dudenhefer, with all concurring, Resolution 19-24 is approved by the FAMPO Policy Committee at January 28th meeting.

- ii. Lafayette Boulevard Transit Study Consultant Budget

Mr. Agnello advised that a draft of the Lafayette Boulevard Phase 1 transit study's consultant budget is included in tonight's agenda packet for informational purposes.

- iii. Resolution 19-17, Approving the use of FAMPO consultants to Complete Lafayette Boulevard, Phase 1 (approved at the December Policy Committee meeting & in packet for Informational purposes only)

e.) I-95 Study Update – Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that the I-95 study update could potentially be a big deal. Mr. Agnello relayed that per General Assembly action in FY2016, it was requested that a joint study between FAMPO & VDOT be completed. The study was to cover the span of distance on I-95 between milepost 145 & 125. Mr. Agnello advised that staff worked with VDOT to complete the study. Mr. Agnello advised study summary is included in tonight's agenda packet for member review. Mr. Agnello stated it is hopeful that the study could result in potentially more I-95 improvement projects from Northern Virginia to Spotsylvania County being awarded & funded from the General Assembly.

- i. Chapter 741 Acts of the General Assembly Executive Summary

In agenda packet for informational purposes & member review.

- ii. INRIX Congestion Hotspot Summary

Mr. Agnello advised that not to anyone's surprise, however INRIX provided a congestion hotspot summary which indicated the worst traffic congestion in the nation occurs from Washington, DC to Fredericksburg. Mr. Agnello relayed the Hotspot summary also went on to note that the most congested portion of roadways between Washington, DC & Fredericksburg occurs at Route 17 in Stafford County.

Mr. Agnello advised this bit of information was posted on FAMPO's web pages & to date, it has received over 238,000 tweets/comments. Mr. Agnello stated this is higher than any other FAMO posting. Mr. Agnello stated it was also interesting to note that the region's population is 360,000 & even though the postings could not specifically determine from what specific locality they came from, it was noted that most came from the State of Virginia.

STAFF AND AGENCY REPORTS

Mr. Agnello advised that the correspondence items in tonight's meeting includes a letter from the CTB announcing Mr. Hap Connors' resignation; an application request for consideration of a new CTAC member from Stafford County; & updated Air Quality/Conformity requirements that the FAMPO region will need to comply with.

Ms. Brabo asked if FAMPO could compile a resolution or letter to be presented to Mr. Connors for his service as a CTB member/representative to the FAMPO region. Mr. Kelly concurred this was appropriate and stated recognition of Mr. Connors' service would be an agenda item on the upcoming February Policy Committee agenda.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Ms. Bohmke advised that members are not a member of VACO, consideration may want to be given to join. Ms. Bohmke stated I-81 efforts have taken extra measures to get things accomplished in their region. Ms. Bohmke stated this region needs to ban together & a more concentrated effort needs to be underway. Ms. Bohmke stated that just talking about issues does not arrive with desired accomplishments.

ADJOURN FAMPO MEETING/NEXT MEETING, FEBRUARY 25, 2019 – The January 28, 2019 meeting adjourned at 9:46 p.m. & the next meeting will be on February 25, 2019 at 7:15 p.m.