



SMART SCALE

*Funding the Right
Transportation Projects
in Virginia*

SMART SCALE Updates

Nick Donohue
Deputy Secretary of Transportation
September 19, 2017

Updates




- Recap of proposed Round 3 changes
- Follow-up items from June meeting
 - Economic Development Measure
 - Cap on Square Footage
 - Distressed Communities
 - Congestion Measures
 - Current day demand versus forecasted demand 10 years in future
 - Scaling Throughput
- Summary of Feedback Received

Proposed Changes to Process Recap



Biennial Schedule

- Begin application intake March 1st 2018
- June 1st deadline for creation of an application
- August 1st submission deadline



Proposed Changes to Policy Recap



Application Limits

- Establish 2 tiers based on population

Tier	Localities	MPOs/PDCs/Transit Agencies	Maximum Number of Applications
1	Less than 200K	Less than 500K	4
2	Greater than 200K	Greater than 500K	8

Proposed Changes to Policy Recap



Project Readiness

- Formalize and strengthen policy on required level of project planning
 - ***New interchange on limited access facility***
 - IJR with preferred alternative
 - ***Grade separation of at-grade intersection***
 - At-grade improvement options have been assessed
 - ***New signal***
 - Signal warrants have been met and signal justified
 - ***Major widening***
 - Corridor optimization and alternatives to new lanes have been evaluated
- ***Demonstrate*** that a project has ***public support***, requiring resolution of support from governing body and in MPO areas a resolution of support from the regional entity

Proposed Changes to Policy Recap



Project Eligibility

- Clarify the ineligibility of maintenance and State of Good Repair (SGR) projects
- If project scope is mostly the repair or replacement of existing assets then it is not eligible for SMART SCALE Examples include:
 - **Signal system replacement (mast arms, signal heads)**
 - **Bridge replacement with wider lane widths and/or ped accommodations**

Proposed Changes to Policy Recap



- **Full Funding Policy**
 - Program not intended to replace committed local/regional funding sources, proffers, and/or other committed state/federal funding sources
 - If \$ request is to add components to existing fully funded project then requested components will be analyzed independently
- **Relationship of Major Project Elements**
 - Add guidance that project elements must be associated (contiguous or same improvement type)

Proposed Changes to Measures Recap



Congestion

- **Person throughput – scale based on length**

Safety

- Remove DUI crashes and use blended rate for fatal and severe injury crashes

Accessibility – A.1 and A.2 - Access to Jobs

- Eliminate the 45 and 60 minute cap for auto and transit job access respectively

Land Use

- More specific definitions of mixed-use development
- New methodology - Accessibility to key non-work destinations such as grocery, healthcare, education, etc.

Proposed Changes to Measures Update



Congestion - Person Throughput – scale based on length

- SMART SCALE team has been working on various methods to better scale throughput based on the size of the project
- Challenges remain and center around the different approaches to calculating throughput - modeled vs non-modeled projects
- Additional time, research and development is needed

Moving Forward

- Team will continue to work on items to address between now and October meeting

Proposed Changes to Measures Update



Congestion - Current Day Demand vs. Forecasted Demand

- **Pros**
 - Would focus on areas that are a problem today - as opposed to something that may be problem in the future
 - Eliminates projections and forecasting, simplifies congestion analysis
- **Cons**
 - Accounting for committed projects in SYIP for modeled improvement - non-standard methodology
 - High growth areas would not be reflected in analysis and limits ability to pro-actively address problems

Proposed Changes to Measures Recap



Economic Development - ED.1 - Site Development

- Remove 0.5 points for consistent with local and regional plans - project specifically referenced in local comp plan or regional economic development strategy = 0.5 points
- **Project in areas with economic needs get up to 0.5 points**
- Zoned properties must get primary/direct access from project
- Conceptual (0.5, 1) vs detailed site plans (2, 4 points) – points based on whether submitted or approved
- Reduce buffer to max of 3 miles
- **Considering establishment of maximum square footage based on project type and based on current level of development - cannot exceed x% of total current square footage in jurisdiction(s)**

Economic Development - ED.2 - Intermodal Access

- Scale freight tonnage-based measure by the length of the improvement

Proposed Changes to Measures Update




Economic Development - ED.1 - Site Development

- Project in areas with greater economic needs get up to 0.5 points

Recommendation:

- Utilize data from Economic Innovation Group, data is zip code based
- Values ranges from 100 to 0, with 100 being the most distressed
- Propose calculating points by multiply distress value (as a percentage) by 0.5 points



Distress Score Color Legend



Proposed Changes to Measures Update



Economic Development - ED.1 - Site Development

- Considering establishment of maximum square footage based on project type and based on current level of development - cannot exceed x% of total current square footage in jurisdiction(s)
- **Research and feedback have demonstrated this may not be the best approach**

Recommendation Approach

- Establish statewide limit on amount of square footage, additional documentation required for anything above that amount
 - Conducted review of outliers from previous two rounds
 - 10,000,000 square foot cap appears reasonable, addresses main outliers, and limit impacts

Input Received



Draft Technical Guide made publicly available on August 20, 2017

Application Limits

- Concerns raised on whether the two tier approach provides advantage/disadvantage to populated areas
- Concerns that limit could encourage applicants to submit maximum
- Effect of limits to smaller unincorporated towns - county unwilling to sponsor

Project Eligibility

- Concerns with proposal that proffered improvements not be eligible

Project Readiness

- Requested documentation (IJR, signal warrants, major widening) could be dated by the time funding is available - clarify level of documentation
- Suggestion for templates to document project readiness and alternative evaluation

Input Received



Measures/Methods

- **Congestion**
 - Include weekend analysis
 - Include current year in congestion analysis
- **Safety**
 - Points for preventative treatments
- **Accessibility**
 - Support and Opposition to removing 45/60 minute caps on access to jobs
- **Economic Development**
 - Increase buffer area for larger capacity projects
 - Higher weighting for Intermodal Access and Travel Time Reliability when competing for High Priority Program
 - Clarify definition of “primary access” for zoned only properties
- **Land Use**
 - Larger buffer for larger projects
 - More information on ‘non-work’ accessibility measure

Schedule and Next Steps



September – October - Fall Transportation Meetings

- Training and Outreach on proposed changes
- Receive public comment on proposed changes

October 20, 2017 - Deadline to submit comments on Draft SMART SCALE Technical Guide

October CTB Meeting

- Adopt Revised CTB Policy and Policy/Technical Guides



Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
406 Princess Anne Street
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22401
(540) 373-2890
Fax (540) 899-4808
www.fampo.gvregion.org

Paul Milde
FAMPO Chairman

Paul Agnello
FAMPO Administrator

September 21, 2017

The Honorable Aubrey Layne
Secretary of Transportation
Commonwealth of Virginia
1111 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 232191

RE: Concerns of Draft State Recommendation for Application Limits for Smart Scale Round 3

Dear Secretary Layne:

We are writing to express our concern that the Draft State Recommendation for Smart Scale Round application limits would disproportionately limit the number of applications for localities and MPOs/PDCs compared to transit agencies. Localities and MPOs/PDCs have broader multimodal transportation planning responsibilities than transit agencies, and therefore it does not appear reasonable that transit agencies would have the same number of applications as a locality or MPO/PDC for a given Tier Level. The application limits for localities and MPOs/PDCs also appear a little low. As a result, we request consideration of an alternate application limit approach that would limit the number of applications for Tier 1 localities and MPOs/PDCs at 5 and for Tier 2 at 10, while transit agencies would be limited to 2 at Tier 1 and 4 at Tier 2 as shown below. This alternate application limit approach would reduce the potential maximum number of Smart Scale applications compared to the Draft State Recommendation.

Draft State Recommendation


Tier	Localities		MPOs/PDCs		Transit Agencies	
1	< 200K	4	< 500K	4	< 500K	4
2	> 200K	8	> 500K	8	> 500K	8

FAMPO Input

Tier	Localities		MPOs/PDCs		Transit Agencies	
1	< 200K	5	< 500K	5	< 500K	2
2	> 200K	10	> 500K	10	> 500K	4

I appreciate your consideration of this request. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Paul Milde
Chairman

**Cc: FAMPO Policy Committee
State Legislative Delegation
CTB Members**