RESOLUTION OF THE

COMMONWEALTH TRANSPORTATION BOARD

~~**October 30, 2018**~~**September 21, 2022**

MOTION

Made By: ~~**Mr. Johnson**~~**, Seconded By:** ~~**Ms. Hynes**~~

Action: ~~**Motion Carried, Unanimously**~~

Title: Policy for the Implementation of State Transit Capital Prioritization (2022 Update)

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;~~ Capital projects or programs to replace or rehabilitate an existing asset, excluding major capital construction projects with a total cost over $3 million;
- 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.~~ Capital projects or programs that add capacity or include the purchase of new assets meeting the following criteria: Total project cost of less than $3 million, or for expansion vehicles, an increase of 5 vehicles or less or 5% or less of the fleet size, whichever is greater, or all projects for engineering and design;
- 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.~~ Capital projects or programs to add, expand, or improve transit services or facilities, with a total cost exceeding $3 million, or for expansion vehicles, an increase of greater than 5 vehicles or 5% of fleet size, whichever is greater, or all projects that include the replacement of an entire existing facility;
- In the rare instance that a project submitted for DRPT funding fits the definition of a Major Expansion project based solely on total project cost, but does not add, expand, or improve transit services or facilities, the DRPT Director shall determine the appropriate project category for project evaluation.

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 except those that have been awarded federal discretionary

grant funding. DRPT may allow for a lower local match for a capital project that has been awarded funding through a federal discretionary grant program.

4. DRPT may recommend to the Board an allocation of capital funding reserved to provide matching funds for projects awarded federal discretionary grants throughout the fiscal year. Projects will be evaluated using the MERIT prioritization methodology and allocations reported to the Board when the reserve funds are utilized.

~~3.~~5. State of Good Repair projects will be evaluated considering asset condition (up to 60 points) ~~and~~, service impact (up to 40 points), and incentive scoring (up to 10 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~~

Age of Asset Relative to Service Life	**Points**	**Mileage of Vehicle Relative to Service Life**	**Points**
< 80% of ESL Age	0	< 80% of ESL Mileage	0
80-89.9% of ESL Age	25	80-89.9% of ESL Mileage	25
90-99.9% of ESL Age	30	90-99.9% of ESL Mileage	30
0-9.9% > ESL Age	35	0-9.9% > ESL Age	35
10-19.9% > ESL Age	40	10-19.9% > ESL Mileage	40
20-29.9% > ESL Age	45	20-29.9% > ESL Mileage	45
30-39.9% > ESL Age	50	30-39.9% > ESL Mileage	50
40-49.9% > ESL Age	55	40-49.9% > ESL Mileage	55
50% or more > ESL Age	60	50% or more > 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 = 10~~8~~, medium = ~~5~~6, and low =~~2~~3. ~~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~~.

~~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~~

Primary Project Types	Secondary Project Types	Operating Efficiency	Frequency, Travel Time and/or Reliability	Accessibility and/or Customer Experience	Safety and Security	Total Default Score
Admin/Maintenance Facilities	Supports Operations	High Impact	Medium Impact	Low Impact	Medium Impact	25
Admin/Maintenance Facilities	Non-Operational	Low Impact	Low Impact	Low Impact	Medium Impact	15
Customer Facilities	Transit Centers/Stations	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	High Impact	Medium Impact	28
Customer Facilities	Bus Stop/ Shelter Improvements	Low Impact	No Impact	High Impact	High Impact	23
Capital Finance Strategies	All	High Impact	High Impact	High Impact	Medium Impact	36
Maintenance Equipment & Parts	Vehicle and Vehicle Support Equipment	High Impact	High Impact	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	32
Maintenance Equipment & Parts	Property and Facilities	Medium Impact	Low Impact	Low Impact	High Impact	22
System Infrastructure	All	High Impact	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	28
Technology/Equipment	Onboard Systems—ITS/Communications	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	High Impact	Medium Impact	28
Technology/Equipment	Operations Support	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	24
Technology/Equipment	Onboard Systems—Safety	No Impact	No Impact	Medium Impact	High Impact	16
Technology/Equipment	Administrative	Low Impact	Low Impact	Low Impact	Low Impact	12
Vehicles	Revenue Vehicles	High Impact	High Impact	High Impact	High Impact	40
Vehicles	Overhaul/Engine Replacement	High Impact	High Impact	Medium Impact	High Impact	36
Vehicles	Support Vehicles	Medium Impact	Medium Impact	Low Impact	Low Impact	18

Incentive scoring prioritizes specific statewide goals and program requirements, and allows for further differentiation in project scores. Incentive points are awarded within four criteria areas: Zero-Emissions Technology, Innovation, Safety and Comfort around Customer Facilities, and Agency Accountability. The maximum score in each criteria area will be 5 points not to exceed a maximum of 10 points total.

~~Project Type~~	~~Additional Considerations in Scoring~~
~~**Operating Efficiency**~~	~~• LEED certification (reduced facility operating costs).~~ ~~• Electric or Hybrid Technology~~ • ~~Expansion buses, if the agency spare ratio is below 15%~~
~~**Travel Time & Reliability**~~	~~• Agency on-time performance (OTP) is greater than 80%~~ • ~~Agency Mean Distance between Failures > 10,000 miles~~
~~**Accessibility and Customer Experience**~~	~~• Investments that add new stops or expand service coverage~~ • ~~Software/hardware to provide real-time arrival information~~

~~**Safety and Security**~~	~~• On-board technology to enhance passenger safety.~~ ~~• Improved lighting or other crime prevention features.~~ • ~~Pedestrian safety improvements.~~

Criteria	**Points**	**DRPT Incentive Points: SGR and MIN Projects** *Incentives for projects that satisfy DRPT Goals* *(Not to exceed 10 points total per project)*
Zero - Emissions Technology	5 Points, if project includes one of the following:	· Procurement of Zero-Emissions Vehicles, or · Installation of Zero-Emissions Infrastructure
Innovation	5 Points, if project includes one of the following:	· Installation of Real-Time Departure/ Arrival Information, or · Automated Data Collection, Scheduling and Dispatch technology acquisition, or · Utilization of Transit Signal Priority, or · Installation of safety technology, or · Mobile Ticketing
Safety and Comfort Around Customer Facilities	5 Points, if project includes one of the following:	· Enhanced Lighting at Transit Stations or Stops, or · Enhancements for Pedestrians/ Accessibility connecting passengers to Transit, or · Projects that include benches or shelters
Agency Accountability	5 point, if all requirements are met:	· Compliance with State Asset Management Requirements (TransAM Updates on time) · Compliance with State Strategic Planning Requirements (TSP/TDP Up to Date) · Compliance with State Capital Planning Requirements (5-year Capital Budgets) · Compliance with State Performance Reporting (On-time reporting in OLGA)

~~4.~~6. Minor Enhancement projects will be evaluated considering the same service impact and incentive scoring methodology that is applied to State of Good Repair projects.

~~5.~~7. 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.

~~6.~~8. 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%

~~7. 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.~~

~~8.~~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.

~~9.~~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.

~~10.~~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.

# # #