



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Commonwealth Transportation Board

Shannon Valentine
Chairperson

1401 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

(804) 786-2701
Fax: (804) 786-2940

Agenda Item # 9

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD

October 30, 2018

MOTION

**Made By: Mr. Johnson, Seconded By: Ms. Hynes
Action: Motion Carried, Unanimously**

Title: Policy for the Implementation of State Transit Capital Prioritization

WHEREAS, Section 33.2-214.4 of the *Code of Virginia* provides that the Commonwealth Transportation Board shall develop a prioritization process for projects capital projects funded pursuant to subdivision C of 33.2-1526.1 of the *Code of Virginia*; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Rail and Public Transportation has consulted with the Transit Service Delivery Advisory Committee in the development of this prioritization process; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Rail and Public Transportation has solicited input from localities, metropolitan planning organizations, transit authorities, and other stakeholders in the development of the prioritization process; and

WHEREAS, the Board's priority for transit capital investment is to allocate funds in order to attain and maintain a state of good repair for transit assets, while also supporting needs beyond state of good repair that would enhance transit utilization, efficiency, and reduce congestion; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the Commonwealth Transportation Board hereby adopts the following policy and process to govern the structure, scoring, and prioritization of projects for capital funding pursuant to subdivision C of 33.2-1526.1 of the *Code of Virginia*:

1. For the purposes of review and prioritization, transit capital projects will be classified into three categories:
 - State of Good Repair: refers to capital projects or programs to replace or rehabilitate an existing asset;
 - Minor Enhancement: refers to capital projects or programs to add capacity, new technology, or customer enhancements meeting the following criteria: total cost of less than \$2 million or, for expansion vehicles, an increase of less than five vehicles or less than 5% of the fleet size, whichever is greater. Increases in paratransit fleets to meet increasing service demands will be evaluated in the same manner as Minor Enhancements.
 - Major Expansion: refers to capital projects or programs to add, expand, or improve service with a cost exceeding \$2 million or for expansion vehicles, an increase of greater than 5 vehicles or 5% of fleet size, whichever is greater.
2. The Transit Capital Program will be structured to provide a minimum of 80% of the annual allocation to State of Good Repair and Minor Enhancement projects with a maximum of 20% available for Major Expansion projects. This structure reflects program trends and the availability of other funding sources to support major expansion projects. The Board retains the discretion to shift funding from Major Expansion to State of Good Repair, based on program needs. The Board also retains the discretion to direct any carryover balances appropriated prior to FY2020, based on program needs.
3. In order to provide predictability and to ensure projects are funded at a level sufficient to move forward, State of Good Repair and Minor Enhancement projects will be matched at a maximum state match rate of 68% of total project cost. Major expansion projects will be funded at a maximum state match rate of 50% of total project cost, providing applicants with funding that can be leveraged against other state and federal funding programs. Local matching funds, at a minimum of 4% of total project cost, are required for all transit capital projects.
4. State of Good Repair projects will be evaluated considering asset condition (up to 60 points) and service impact (up to 40 points). The asset condition score depends upon the asset's age at the time of application. For vehicles, the asset condition score is the average of the age and mileage-based scoring tables. For non-vehicle assets, only the age score is used.

Age of Asset Relative to Expected Service Life (ESL)	Points	Mileage of Vehicle Relative to Expected Service Life (ESL)	Points
< 95% of ESL Age	0	< 95% of ESL Mileage	0
+/- 5% ESL Age	30	+/- 5% ESL Mileage	30
5-10% > ESL Age	35	5-10% > ESL Mileage	35
10-20% > ESL Age	40	10-20% > ESL Mileage	40
20-30% > ESL Age	45	20-30% > ESL Mileage	45
30-40%> ESL Age	50	30-40%> ESL Mileage	50
40-50%> ESL Age	55	40-50%> ESL Mileage	55
>50% ESL Age	60	>50% ESL Mileage	60

Service impact considers the asset impact on service (direct or indirect), and to what extent an asset affects the rider experience and system efficiency. Points for service impact will be awarded in four categories, with up to 10 points awarded per category:

- Service Frequency, Travel Time and/or Reliability – Speeds up transit routes or allows for increased frequency. Significant impact on reliability either through preventing breakdowns or removing vehicles from mixed traffic.
- Operating Efficiency – Provides for a significantly more cost-effective service.
- Service Accessibility and/or Customer Experience – Implements a significant improvement in a customer’s ability to access the system or a significant improvement in the ease of use of the system.
- Safety and Security – Provides a significant improvement in safety or security.

Service impact scoring is primarily qualitative based on project type and takes into consideration specific project features and characteristics. Projects will automatically receive the minimum score for the criteria based on the default values with high = 8, medium = 5, and low =2. In order to differentiate and quantify based on specific characteristics of a project, the additional considerations will be utilized to adjust the default score. The maximum score for each category cannot exceed 10 points, with a maximum of 40 total points available for service impact.

Resolution of the Board
 Policy for the Implementation of State Transit Capital Prioritization
 October 30, 2018
 Page 4 of 7

Primary Project Types	Secondary Project Types	Operating Efficiency	Travel Time and Reliability	Accessibility and Customer Experience	Safety and Security
Admin/Maintenance Facilities	All	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	Low Impact	Medium Impact
Customer Facilities	Bus Stop/ Shelter Improvements	Low Impact	No Impact	High Impact	Medium Impact
Customer Facilities	Transit Centers/Stations	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	High Impact	Medium Impact
Maintenance Equipment & Parts	All	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	High Impact
System Infrastructure	All	High Impact	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	Medium Impact
Technology/Equipment	Administrative	Low Impact	Low Impact	Low Impact	Low Impact
Technology/Equipment	Operations Support	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	Medium Impact
Technology/Equipment	On-Board Systems - ITS/Communications	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	High Impact	Medium Impact
Technology/Equipment	On-Board Systems - Safety	No Impact	No Impact	Medium Impact	High Impact
Vehicles	Revenue Vehicles	High Impact	High Impact	High Impact	High Impact
Vehicles	Support Vehicles	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	Low Impact	Low Impact
Vehicles	Overhaul/Engine Replacement	High Impact	High Impact	Medium Impact	High Impact

Project Type	Additional Considerations in Scoring
Operating Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEED certification (reduced facility operating costs). • Electric or Hybrid Technology • Expansion buses, if the agency spare ratio is below 15%
Travel Time & Reliability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agency on-time performance (OTP) is greater than 80% • Agency Mean Distance between Failures > 10,000 miles
Accessibility and Customer Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investments that add new stops or expand service coverage • Software/hardware to provide real-time arrival information • Improvement in bicycle or pedestrian access to transit facilities
Safety and Security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-board technology to enhance passenger safety.

- Improved lighting or other crime prevention features.
- Pedestrian safety improvements.

5. Minor Enhancement projects will be evaluated considering the same service impact methodology that is applied to State of Good Repair projects.
6. Major Expansion projects will be evaluated based upon the following factor areas identified in 33.2-214.4 of the *Code of Virginia*: congestion mitigation, economic development, accessibility, safety, environmental quality, and land use.
7. The factors specified in 33.2-214.4 of the *Code of Virginia* will be measured and weighted according to the following metrics:

Category	Measure	Measure Weight
Congestion Mitigation	Change in peak period transit system ridership attributed to the project	100%
Economic Development	Project consistency with regional and local economic development plans and policies, and support for local development activity	100%
Accessibility	Project improvement in accessibility to jobs, workforce development, and select non-work destinations	50%
	Disadvantaged population (low-income, minority, or limited English proficiency) within walking distance of project	50%
Safety	Project contribution to improving safety and security, reducing risk of fatalities or injuries	100%
Environmental Quality	Reduction in daily vehicle miles traveled resulting from project	100%
Land Use	Transit supportive land use served by the project	100%

8. The factors will initially be evaluated according to the following typology categories and weighting frameworks within existing MPO and PDC boundaries adopted by the Commonwealth Transportation Board as part of the SMART SCALE process. MPOs or PDCs may, in consultation with Transportation District Commissions (where applicable), examine the weighting framework applicable to its area and determine its appropriateness for the purpose of Transit Capital prioritization and may request that the Board approve a different typology for the purpose of Transit Capital prioritization, by resolution of their policy board.

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%	0%
Category D	10%	35%	15%	30%	10%	0%

Region in which the Project is Located	Typology
Accomack-Northampton PDC	Category D
Bristol MPO	Category D
Central Shenandoah PDC	Category D
Central Virginia MPO	Category C
Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO	Category B
Commonwealth Regional Council	Category D
Crater PDC	Category D
Cumberland Plateau PDC	Category D
Danville MPO	Category D
Fredericksburg Area MPO (FAMPO)	Category A
George Washington Regional Commission	Category D
Hampton Roads PDC	Category D
Hampton Roads TPO	Category A
Harrisonburg-Rockingham MPO	Category C
Kingsport MPO	Category D
Lenowisco PDC	Category D
Middle Peninsula PDC	Category D
Mount Rogers PDC	Category D
New River Valley MPO	Category C
New River Valley PDC	Category C
Northern Neck PDC	Category D
Northern Shenandoah Valley RC	Category D
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTa)/Transportation Planning Board (TPB)	Category A
Rappahannock-Rapidan RC	Category D
Region 2000 LGC	Category D
Richmond Regional PDC	Category D
Richmond Regional TPO (RRTPO)	Category B
Roanoke Valley TPO (RVTPO)	Category B
Southside PDC	Category D

Staunton-Augusta-Waynesboro MPO	Category C
Thomas Jefferson MPO	Category C
Tri-Cities MPO	Category C
West Piedmont MPO	Category D
WinFred MPO	Category C

Note: PDC is defined as the remainder of the region outside an 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, the project shall use the weighting associated with the MPO. For projects that cross multiple typology boundaries, the project shall use the weighting associated with the typology for which the majority of the project is located.

9. Candidate Major Expansion projects will be scored based on the factors and weights identified above, the cost of the project, and based on the information included in the project application.
10. The final score for Major Expansion projects will be determined by calculating the anticipated benefits relative to the amount of funding requested pursuant to 33.2-1526.1 of the *Code of Virginia*.
11. A project that has been selected for transit capital funding (state of good repair, minor enhancement, or major expansion) must be rescored and the funding decision reevaluated if there are significant changes to either the scope or cost of the project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the methodology 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 Director of the Department of Rail and Public Transportation to take all actions necessary to implement and administer this policy and process, including, but not limited to preparation of program guidance and outreach consistent with this resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board hereby directs the Director of the Department of Rail and Public Transportation analyze the outcomes of this process on an annual basis and to revisit the process at least every three years, in consultation with the Transit Service Delivery Advisory Committee, transit agencies, metropolitan planning organizations, and local government prior to making recommendations to the Commonwealth Transportation Board.

###

CTB Decision Brief

Policy for the Implementation of State Transit Capital Prioritization

Issue:

HB 1539 was passed during the 2018 General Assembly Session. This legislation provided dedicated funding for WMATA Capital, restructured the Mass Transit Trust Fund, and enacted a slate of reforms for the statewide transit program. The Policy for the Implementation of State Transit Capital Prioritization provides the policy framework for the implementation of a formal prioritization process in the FY2020 grant application cycle.

Facts:

Section 33.2-214.4 of the *Code of Virginia* provides that the Commonwealth Transportation Board shall develop a prioritization process for projects capital projects funded pursuant to subdivision C of 33.2-1526.1 of the *Code of Virginia* and such a process shall be utilized for the allocation of such funding beginning in FY2020.

The prioritization process was developed based on the principles outlined by the Transit Capital Project Revenue Advisory Board and adopted by the CTB in July 2017. Since that time, DRPT has worked in consultation with the Transit Service Delivery Advisory Committee (TSDAC) and other stakeholders to develop the necessary policies and process to implement transit capital prioritization. The CTB was briefed on this effort in April, July, and September of 2018 and the attached policy has been open for public comment for a period of 45 days.

Recommendation: DRPT recommends that the CTB approve the Policy for the Implementation of State Transit Capital Prioritization.

Action Required by CTB: Approve the Policy for the Implementation of State Transit Capital Prioritization.

Options: Approve, Deny, or Defer.