



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Commonwealth Transportation Board

W. Sheppard Miller, III
Chairperson

1401 East Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219

(804) 482-5818
Fax: (804) 786-2940

Agenda item # 12

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD

December 4, 2023

MOTION

Made By: see below **Seconded By:** see below

Action: see below

Title: Adoption of Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SMART SCALE 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 sections 33.2-358, 33.2-370 and 33.2-371 of the *Code of Virginia*, and

WHEREAS, it is the responsibility of the Office of Intermodal Planning and Investment (OIPI), in coordination with the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT), to implement the statewide prioritization process developed by the Board pursuant to Section 2.2-229; and

WHEREAS, Section 33.2-358 sets forth requirements relating to the allocations and establishment of a High Priority Projects Program established pursuant to section 33.2-370 and a Highway Construction District Grant Program established pursuant to section 33.2-371; and

WHEREAS, the factors specified in Section 33.2-214.1 will be weighted for each of the state's highway construction districts based on the unique needs, according to the metrics attached hereto in Appendix A; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 726 of the 2014 Acts of Assembly required the Board to select projects for funding, utilizing the project 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, Section 33.2-214.2 requires OIPI to make public, in an accessible format,(i) a recommended list of projects and strategies for inclusion in the Six-Year Improvement Program based on results of the evaluation of submitted projects, (ii) the results of the screening of such projects and strategies, including whether such projects are located on a primary evacuation route, (iii) whether a project has been designed to be or the project sponsor has committed that the design will be resilient, and (iv) the results of the evaluation of candidate projects and strategies, including the weighting of factors and the criteria used to determine the value of each factor, no later than 150 days prior to the Board’s vote to adopt the Six-Year Improvement Plan; and

WHEREAS, since adoption of the most recent SMART SCALE Prioritization Policy on December 8, 2021, modifications to improve and strengthen the policy have been identified and recommended to the Board by OIPI; and

WHEREAS, the SMART SCALE Process Review, (summary attached hereto in Appendix B), identified issues that were analyzed and recommended to the Board by OIPI for policy consideration; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, pursuant to Section 33.2-214.1, and Chapter 726 of the 2014 Acts of Assembly, the Commonwealth Transportation Board hereby updates the SMART SCALE Prioritization Policy to address the issues identified in the SMART SCALE Process Review and adopts the SMART SCALE Prioritization Policy, attached hereto as Appendix A, which reflects those modifications adopted by the Board during this Action Meeting, as set out below.

- A. Calculate Congestion Factor ten years in the Future:
The Board amended staff recommendation to seven years in the Future
Moved by Mr. Merrill, Seconded by Dr. Smoot, Passed
- B. Utilize a Forward-Looking Economic Development Measure as recommended by OIPI but replace the term “site” with “property” or “properties” in all documentation with the exception of the reference to “Virginia Business Ready Sites Program” of the VEDP:
Moved by Mrs. Sellers, Seconded by Mrs. Green, Passed

Resolution of the Board

Adoption of Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SMART SCALE Project
Prioritization Process

December 4, 2023

Page 3 of 4

- C. Refine the High Priority Projects (HPP) definition and eliminate Step 2 such that all HPP funds are based on statewide rankings as presented in the staff recommendation. The Board agreed with eliminating Step 2 and made the following modifications to the staff recommended HPP definition:
- i. regarding New Capacity Highway Improvements, delete “Through” from “New Through Lanes”
 - ii. regarding Transit and Freight Improvements, delete “Service” from “New or Improved Passenger Rail Stations or Service” and replace with “Corridor Improvements.” Also add “New Bridge”
 - iii. regarding the addition of “entire corridor improvements...in a STARS, Pipeline Study or Arterial Management Plan” revise the additional projects to read “or Improvements recommended as the preferred alternative in a STARS, Pipeline Study, Arterial Management Plan or MPO/Transit/Local studies with equivalent study components; in coordination with the Commonwealth and is as defined as Regionally significant in accordance with 23 CFR 450.104.”

Moved by Mr. Merrill, Seconded by Mr. Laird, Passed

- D. Staff Recommendation to Create a Three-Tier Application Limit by adding a new middle tier and modifying application limits/caps (upon reconsidered vote):

Moved by Mr. Fowlkes, Seconded by Mr. Byers, Failed

- E. Modification of Land Use Factor to a Multiplier: The Board recommended the *Removal of the Land Use Factor/Consideration* as presented and defined

Moved by Mr. Lawson, Seconded by Mrs. Sellers, Passed

- F. Modification of Factor Weightings for each typology: The Board amended the Staff Recommendations as follows:

- a. Typology A amended: Safety 15%| Congestion 45%| Accessibility 25%| Economic Development 5%| Environmental 10%|

Moved by Mr. Kasprowicz, Seconded by Mr. Coleman, Passed

- b. Typology B amended: Safety 20%| Congestion 25%| Accessibility 25%| Economic Development 20%| Environmental 10%|

Moved by Mrs. Sellers, Seconded by Mr. Fowlkes, Passed

- c. Typology C: Safety 30%| Congestion 20%| Accessibility 15%| Economic Development 25%| Environmental 10%|

Moved by Mr. Merrill, Seconded by Mr. Smoot, Passed

- d. Typology D: Safety 40%| Congestion 10%| Accessibility 10%| Economic Development 30%| Environmental 10%|

Moved by Mr. Merrill, Seconded by Mr. Fowlkes, Passed

Resolution of the Board

Adoption of Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SMART SCALE Project
Prioritization Process

December 4, 2023

Page 4 of 4

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the methodology outlined in the SMART SCALE Technical 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 SMART SCALE Project Change Guide shall direct the evaluation of changes to the scope and/or budget of projects selected for funding through SMART SCALE.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the development and management of the SMART SCALE portion of the SYIP shall be conducted in accordance with the Board's Six-Year Improvement Program Development Policy, as revised to incorporate revisions herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Board hereby directs OIPI, in coordination with VDOT and DRPT, to take all actions necessary to implement and administer this policy and process, including but not limited to update of technical and policy documents consistent with the SMART SCALE Prioritization Policy adopted herein.

####

Appendix A

SMART SCALE Project Prioritization Policy and Process Effective for Round 6

I. Application Submission and Evaluation

1. Application for funding through the SMART SCALE Prioritization Process must be made by qualifying entities based on project type and as follows:

Eligibility to Submit Projects

Project Type	Regional Entity (MPOs, PDCs)	Locality* (Counties, Cities, and 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, with a resolution of support from the MPO*	Yes, with resolution of support from relevant entity
Urban Development Area	No	Yes, with a resolution of support from the relevant MPO*	No
Safety	No	Yes, with a resolution of support from the relevant MPO*	No

Note*: Projects within established MPO study areas that are identified in or consistent with the regionally adopted Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) do not require a resolution of support from the respective MPO Policy Board. For projects outside MPO areas only a local resolution of support is required.

2. Application for funding through the SMART SCALE Prioritization Process must be made for a qualifying need. 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. The 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, and regional networks, improvements to promote urban development areas established pursuant to Section 15.2-2223.1 and identified safety needs.
3. Applications for funding through either the High Priority Projects Program or the Construction District Grant Programs must relate to projects located, in part or wholly, within the boundaries of the qualifying entity. In the case of an application that crosses

Adoption of Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SMART SCALE Project
Prioritization Process
December 4, 2023

the submitting entity's boundaries, the submitting entity must provide resolution(s) of support from the affected jurisdiction(s) or regional planning organization(s).

Eligibility for the High Priority Projects Program is limited to the following project characteristics:

- i. New Capacity Highway capacity improvements including adding a New Lane, Roadway on a New Alignment, Managed Lanes (HOV/HOT/Shoulder), or New Bridge;
- ii. New or Improved Interchanges including New Interchange-Non-Limited Access Facility, Improve Grade-Separated Interchange, New Interchange-Limited Access Facility, and Ramp Improvements;
- iii. Transit and Freight improvements including New or Improved Passenger Rail Stations or Corridor Improvements (including New Bridge), Freight Rail Corridor Improvements, High Capacity/Fixed Guideway Transit (including Light Rail Transit and Bus Rapid Transit), and Transit Transfer Stations; or
- iv. Improvements recommended as the preferred alternative in a STARS, Pipeline Study, Arterial Management Plan, or MPO/Transit/Local studies with equivalent study components; in coordination with the Commonwealth and is as defined as Regionally significant, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.104.

Additionally, projects eligible for the High Priority Projects Program will be considered in the preliminary funding scenario based on statewide rankings of SMART SCALE scores. The two steps process will be as follows:

- Step 1 - Fund top scoring projects within each district based on SMART SCALE Score eligible for Highway Construction District Grant Program funds using Highway Construction District Grant Program funds until the remaining funds are insufficient to fund the next highest scoring project.
 - Step 2 - Fund remaining top scoring projects statewide based on SMART SCALE Score for High Priority Projects Program funds using High Priority Projects Program funds until the remaining funds are insufficient to fund the next highest scoring project.
4. A resolution of support from the relevant governing body or policy board, approved in a public forum with adequate public notice, is required at the time of application.
 5. By majority vote of the Board, the Board may choose to submit up to two projects to be evaluated for funding in each biennial application cycle.
 6. In the event the CTB elects to submit up to two projects to be evaluated and considered for funding, the projects will be considered for funding in the Construction District Grant Program with the endorsement of the applicable local government(s) and/or the High Priority Projects Program.
 7. Qualifying entities are limited in the number of pre-applications and full applications they may submit. The limits are based on population thresholds as defined in the table below. A Board member may allow one additional application from one county within their district if (i) the project is located within a town that is ineligible to submit projects and

Adoption of Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SMART SCALE Project
 Prioritization Process
 December 4, 2023

(ii) the county in which the town is located submitted the maximum number of applications allowed. Only one such additional application is allowed per district.

Application Limits

Tier	Localities*	MPOs/PDCs/ Transit Agencies*	Max # of Pre- Applications	Max # of Full Applications
1	< 200K	< 500K	5	4
2	>= 200K	>= 500K	12	10

The source of population data for localities, MPOs and PDCs is the last available data from the University of Virginia Weldon Cooper Center. Application limits for transit agencies were determined based on service area population in the 2010 National Transit Database (NTD). If service area population was not available in NTD, the latest data available from the Weldon Cooper was used to determine population in jurisdictions served by transit agency.

Note*: Based on designated Transportation Management Area (TMA) as defined by the Bureau of the Census and designated by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation, for an urbanized area with a population over 200,000.

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.
9. The final project score is determined by calculating the anticipated benefits relative to the amount of funding requested pursuant to section 33.2-358 of the *Code of Virginia*.
10. A project that has been selected for funding must be initiated and at least a portion of the programmed funds expended within one year of the budgeted year of allocation or funding may be subject to reprogramming to other projects selected through the prioritization process. In the event the Project is not advanced to the next phase of construction when requested by the Commonwealth Transportation Board, the locality or metropolitan planning organization may be required, pursuant to § 33.2-214 of the *Code of Virginia*, to reimburse the Department for all state and federal funds expended on the project.
11. A project that has been selected for funding cannot be resubmitted to address cost increases or loss of other sources of funding.

II. Factor Measures and Weighting

The factors specified in Section 33.2-214.1 will be measured and weighted according to the following metrics:

Adoption of Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SMART SCALE Project
 Prioritization Process
 December 4, 2023

ID	Measure Name	Measure Weights
Safety Factor		
S.1	Number of Fatal and Injury Crashes*	70%
S.2	Rate of Fatal and Injury Crashes	30%
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	100%
E.2	Impact to Natural and Cultural Resources	**
Economic Development Factor		
ED.1	Project Support for Economic Development	60%***
ED.2	Intermodal Access and Efficiency	20%****
ED.3	Travel Time Reliability	20%

Note: Congestion will be calculated 7 years into the future.

Note*: 100% for Transit and Transportation Demand Management Projects

Note**: E2 will serve as a subtractive measure (subtracting up to 5 benefit points) based on the acreage of sensitive areas potentially impacted.

Note*** ED.1: After determining project eligibility based on identification in VirginiaScan, the following forward-looking economic development factors developed by Virginia Economic Development Partnership (VEDP) for the ED.1 score; (i) 40% estimated jobs, (ii) 25% estimated capital investment, (iii) 15% recognize property / site funding, (iv) 10% property visits received, and (v)10% distinguish property readiness.

Note****ED.2: Freight impact will be calculated based on volume moved.

Adoption of Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SMART SCALE Project
 Prioritization Process
 December 4, 2023

III. Typology Categories and Weighting Frameworks

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

Region in which the Project is Located	Typology	Construction District
Accomack-Northampton PDC	Category D	Hampton Roads
Bristol MPO	Category D	Bristol
Central Shenandoah PDC	Category D	Staunton
Central Virginia MPO	Category C	Lynchburg/Salem
Charlottesville-Albemarle MPO	Category B	Culpeper
Commonwealth RC	Category D	Lynchburg/Richmond
Crater PDC	Category D	Richmond/Hampton Roads
Cumberland Plateau PDC	Category D	Bristol
Danville MPO	Category D	Lynchburg
Fredericksburg Area MPO (FAMPO)	Category B	Fredericksburg
George Washington RC	Category D	Fredericksburg
Hampton Roads PDC ⁱ	Category D	Hampton Roads
Hampton Roads TPO (HRTPO) ^{i,iii}	Category A	Hampton Roads/Fredericksburg
Harrisonburg-Rockingham MPO	Category C	Staunton
Kingsport MPO	Category D	Bristol
Lenowisco PDC	Category D	Bristol
Middle Peninsula PDC ⁱⁱ	Category D	Fredericksburg
Mount Rogers PDC	Category D	Bristol/Salem
New River Valley MPO	Category C	Salem
New River Valley PDC	Category D	Salem
Northern Neck PDC	Category D	Fredericksburg
Northern Shenandoah Valley RC	Category D	Staunton
Northern Virginia RC	Category A	Northern Virginia
Northern Virginia Transportation Authority (NVTA) / Transportation Planning Board (TPB) ⁱⁱⁱ	Category A	Northern Virginia/Culpeper
Rappahannock-Rapidan RC ⁱⁱⁱ	Category D	Culpeper
Region 2000 LGC	Category D	Salem/Lynchburg
Richmond Regional PDC	Category D	Richmond
Richmond Regional TPO (RRTPO)	Category B	Richmond

Adoption of Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SMART SCALE Project
 Prioritization Process
 December 4, 2023

Region in which the Project is Located	Typology	Construction District
Roanoke Valley TPO (RVTPO)	Category B	Salem
Roanoke Valley-Alleghany PDC	Category D	Salem/Staunton
Southside PDC	Category D	Lynchburg/Richmond
Staunton-Augusta-Waynesboro MPO	Category C	Staunton
Thomas Jefferson PDC	Category C	Culpeper/Lynchburg
Tri-Cities MPO	Category C	Richmond
West Piedmont PDC	Category D	Salem/Lynchburg
WinFred MPO	Category C	Staunton

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:

- i. The portion of Southampton County and the City of Franklin within the Hampton Roads TPO boundary shall use the weighting associated with the Hampton Roads PDC.
- ii. The portion of Gloucester County within the Hampton Roads TPO boundary shall use the weighting associated with the Middle Peninsula PDC.
- iii. The portion of Fauquier County within the Transportation Planning Board Boundary shall use the weighting associated with the Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission.

Note** 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.

IV. Weighting Frameworks

Factor	Safety	Congestion Mitigation	Accessibility	Economic Development	Environmental Quality
Category A	15%	45%*	25%	5%	10%
Category B	20%	25%	25%	20%	10%
Category C	30%	20%	15%	25%	10%
Category D	40%	10%	10%	30%	10%

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.

V. Post Project Selection and Programming

1. Once a project is selected for funding, an entity must wait for two rounds of SMART SCALE following the end date of construction before submitting a new project application for the same location that meets the same need as the project that was selected for funding.

Adoption of Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SMART SCALE Project
Prioritization Process
December 4, 2023

2. Once a project is selected for funding, an entity may not resubmit the project with a revised scope in a subsequent round unless the previously selected project has been cancelled.
3. A project that has been selected for funding may be cancelled only by action of the Board. If a project is not advanced to the next phase of construction when requested by the Board, the locality or metropolitan planning organization may be required, pursuant to § 33.2-214 of the Code of Virginia, to reimburse the Department for all state and federal funds expended on the project.
4. In the cases where a project has been selected for funding which identified other sources of funding, the qualifying entity is committed to pay the difference if other sources of funding are not provided. An applicant may only identify State of Good Repair, Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside, Highway Safety Improvement Program and Revenue Sharing funds as committed funds if the funding has already been approved by the Board. Applicants must have an approved or pending application for other sources of committed funds, such as local/regional or other federal funds, at the time of the SMART SCALE application submission.
5. Pursuant to 33.2-214 E, any project added to the SYIP funded wholly or in part with funding from the High Priority Projects Program or Construction District Grants Program shall be fully funded within the six-year horizon of the SYIP.
6. Applications for funding through the SMART SCALE Prioritization Process may not request funding to replace other committed funding sources identified in a local capital improvement program or a transportation improvement program or required to be paid by a developer as a result of a local zoning process.
 - a. The CTB may waive this requirement for projects that:
 - i. have an anticipated total cost more than \$1 billion; and
 - ii. were not eligible for submission in the previous round of SMART SCALE due to readiness considerations, but initiated procurement prior to award of the current round of SMART SCALE.
 - b. If a fully funded project is submitted with additional features that are not yet funded, the benefits associated with the fully funded or committed project element(s) will be excluded from consideration in evaluating and rating the project benefits for SMART SCALE.
7. The Board may adjust the timing of funds programmed to projects selected in previous SMART SCALE cycles to meet the cash flow needs of the individual projects, but will not (1) reduce the total amount of state and federal funding committed to an individual project unless it is no longer needed for the delivery of the project or the project sponsor is unable to secure permits and environmental clearances for the project or (2) increase the total amount of state and federal funding committed to an individual project beyond the thresholds established in VI.2. Projects from a subsequent round will not be advanced or accelerated by delaying projects selected in a previous SMART SCALE cycle.

Adoption of Policy and Approval of Guides for Implementation of the SMART SCALE Project
Prioritization Process
December 4, 2023

8. In cases where programmed funds are no longer needed for delivery of a project due to estimate decreases, contract award savings, schedule changes, etc., the unexpended surplus funds are SMART SCALE unless superseded by the terms of a signed project agreement.
 - a. Surplus Construction District Grant Program funds no longer needed for delivery of a project will remain within the applicable Construction District Grant Program and may not be used in other districts.
 - b. Surplus High Priority Projects Program funds will remain within the High Priority Projects Program.
 - c. Such surplus funds will be reserved to address budget adjustments on existing SMART SCALE projects or reserved for allocation in the next solicitation cycle for SMART SCALE.

VI. Changes in Project Cost or Scope

1. A project that has been selected for funding must be re-scored and the funding decision re-evaluated if there are significant changes to either the scope or cost of the project, such that the anticipated benefits relative to funding requested would have substantially changed.
2. If an estimate increases prior to project advertisement or contract award that exceeds the following thresholds, and the applicant is not covering the increased cost with other funds, Board action is required to approve the budget increase:
 - a. Total Cost Estimate <\$5 million: 20% increase in funding requested.
 - b. Total Cost Estimate \$5 million to \$10 million: \$1 million or greater increase in funding requested.
 - c. Total Cost Estimate > \$10 million: 10% increase in funding requested; \$5 million maximum increase in funding requested.
3. If the project scope is reduced or modified such that the revised score is less than the lowest ranked funded project in the district for that cohort of projects, Board action is required to approve the change in scope.
4. If the project scope is increased, then the applicant is responsible for the additional cost attributable to the increase in scope regardless of budget impact. The scope of a project may not be substantially modified in such a manner that the proposed improvements do not accomplish the same benefits as the original scope.

The following items 1-5 represent staff recommendations proposed to the Commonwealth Transportation Board to support revisions to SMART SCALE policy and the resulting policy based on the actions by the Board.

- 1. Calculate Congestion factor 10 years in the future. (Reference Article II, page 4)**
 - a. Staff recommended 10 years in the future
 - b. Board agreed to calculate Congestion 7 years in the future.

- 2. Utilize a forward-looking Economic Development measure. (Reference Article II, page 4)**
 - a. Staff recommended a new ED.1 measure that was developed by VEDP and a change in how Freight impact is calculated.
 - b. Board agreed with the staff recommendation for ED. 1
 - i. Determining project eligibility based on identification in VirginiaScan,
 - ii. 40% estimated jobs,
 - iii. 25% estimated capital investment,
 - iv. 15% recognize property / site funding,
 - v. 10% property visits received, and
 - vi. 10% distinguish property readiness.

- 3. Refine High-Priority Projects (HPP) Program Eligibility and Eliminate Step 2**
 - a. Staff recommended refining the definition of High Priority Projects and eliminating the existing step 2.
 - b. Board agreed to refining the High Priority Projects program by limiting it to the following characteristics: **(Reference section I.3, page 2)**
 - i. New Capacity Highway capacity improvements including adding a New Lane, Roadway on a New Alignment, Managed Lanes (HOV/HOT/Shoulder), or New Bridge;
 - ii. New or Improved Interchanges including New Interchange-Non-Limited Access Facility, Improve Grade-Separated Interchange, New Interchange-Limited Access Facility, and Ramp Improvements;
 - iii. Transit and Freight improvements including New or Improved Passenger Rail Stations or Corridor Improvements (including New Bridge), Freight Rail Corridor Improvements, High Capacity/Fixed Guideway Transit (including Light Rail Transit and Bus Rapid Transit), and Transit Transfer Stations; or
 - iv. Improvements recommended as the preferred alternative in a STARS, Pipeline Study, Arterial Management Plan, or MPO/Transit/Local studies with equivalent study components; in coordination with the Commonwealth and is as defined as Regionally significant, in accordance with 23 CFR 450.104.
 - c. The Board also agreed to Eliminating Step 2 therefore, the following steps will be considered in the preliminary staff funding scenario: **(Reference section I.3, page 2)**
 - i. Step 1 - Fund top scoring projects within each district based on SMART SCALE Score eligible for Highway Construction District Grant Program funding using Highway Construction District Grant Program funds until the remaining funds are insufficient to fund the next highest scoring project.
 - ii. Step 2 - Fund remaining top scoring projects statewide based on SMART SCALE Score for High Priority Projects Program funds using High Priority Projects Program funding until the remaining funds are insufficient to fund the next highest scoring project.

4. Create a three-tier application limit. (Reference section I.7, page 2,3)

- a. Staff recommended creating a new three-tier application limit, which reduced the number of applications that could be submitted.
- b. Board did not agree to a three-tier structure or to reduced application limits, therefore, application limits remain unchanged:

Tier	Localities*	MPOs/PDCs/ Transit Agencies*	Max # of Pre- Applications	Max # of Full Applications
1	< 200K	< 500K	5	4
2	>= 200K	>= 500K	12	10

5. Modify Land Use factor to a multiplier and modify factor weightings. (Reference Article IV, page 6)

- a. Staff recommended converting the Land Use factor to a multiplier and existing transferring the Land Use weights to the safety and congestion factors.
- b. Board rejected the Staff recommendation,
 - i. Removed the Land Use factor from consideration in the SMART SCALE program.
 - ii. Redistributed the Land Use weights as shown below.

Typology		Economic					
		Safety	Congestion	Accesibility	Land Use	Development	Environment
A	Weights	15%	45%	25%	0%	5%	10%
	Change	10%		10%	-20%		
B	Weights	20%	25%	25%	0%	20%	10%
	Change		10%	5%	-15%		
C	Weights	30%	20%	15%	0%	25%	10%
	Change	5%	5%		-10%		
D	Weights	40%	10%	10%	0%	30%	10%
	Change	10%			-10%		