

Appendix B: Use of PlanWorks

Use of PlanWorks

USE OF THE PLANWORKS MODULES

COR-1 Approve Scope of Corridor Planning Process

PROCESS: coordinating partners and establishing formal lines of communications between groups that communicate infrequently. Evaluation of decision points and creating collaborative decision-making across multiple disciplines and tiers of government will be included.

LINK TO PROJECT DELIVERABLES: Draft Scope to guide planning process; Aggregate data repository

OUTPUTS:

- 1. Geographic Scope** for the corridor planning process is defined as Interstate 64 from mile marker 118 to mile marker 87. US250 from the Charlottesville US250/US29 bypass to Interstate 81 and the CSX/Buckingham Branch rail line from the Charlottesville Amtrak station to the Staunton Amtrak station.
- 2. Temporal Scope** is a twelve-month study, with the goal being to have a draft corridor plan to help inform MPOS and VDOT on possible problem areas and improvement areas within the geographic corridor area.
- 3. Technical Scope** is based on meeting the regional need of improving the safe efficient movement of goods and people through the study corridor. Due to the corridor regional in nature the technical aspects of the corridor study focus heavily on improving inter-governmental and inter-agency communication, coordination, and facility management.
- 4. Data Repository** A project specific web page has been set up within the Charlottesville Albemarle MPO domain: http://campo.tjpcdc.org/i64_corridor/. The site includes information about the project, an interactive map, and a growing inventory of corridor-

related studies GIS and reports.

DISCUSSION:

COR-1 was largely defined as part of developing the project application for the grant process. The CA-MPO and the VDOT Culpeper District had identified the I-64 corridor as important regional corridor that had received only minimal planning and no recent coordinated efforts to look at the function of the corridor as a whole. It was then that the CA-MPO collaborate with SAWMPO about the possibility of extending the study to the I-81/I-64 interchange.

COR-2 Approve the Problem Statement and Opportunities

PROCESS: SPaCE will engage facilitated collaborative meetings, focused stakeholder groups, public input sessions and multi-media engagement to identify a common understanding of the issues and seek partner and stakeholder identification of problems and opportunities.

LINK TO PROJECT DELIVERABLES: Work towards agreement among stakeholders on the deficiencies and potential opportunities.

OUTPUTS:

- 5. Deficiencies:** Working collaboratively with the working group staff identified the following deficiencies/areas of opportunity:
 - o Reducing congestion at peak travel times
 - o Improving facility performance by improving communication with the traveling public
 - o Maintaining the current high state of good repair
 - o Improving safety by reducing vehicle wildlife collisions
- 6. Problem Statement:** The Interstate 64 corridor is a multi-modal corridor that is the primary connection between the Piedmont and the Shenandoah Valley regions of Virginia. The corridor has unique challenges and opportunities. Challenged include; terrain, weather, and capacity at key points, and a growing demand on the corridor during daily peak travel times. Opportunities include; a good state of repair, available capacity during off-peak hours, interest in transit and a willingness of stakeholders to collaborate.

DISCUSSION:

To adequately identify deficiencies and opportunities within the corridor study area the project team conducted a thorough rough review of existing plans, recommendations, studies and reports. The project team also gathered and reviewed all available data on the corridor. This included, collecting available data on roadway performance, safety, pavement conditions, bridge sufficiency, environmental and cultural resources, land use and freight. Results from this analysis were mapped and are presented in the existing condition section of the report. To further refine deficiencies and opportunities the project team solicited input from the working group and the traveling public. The working group included experts from public safety departments, local governments, MPOs, VDOT Districts, DRPT, resource agencies and TDM agencies. Matrices below show the relationship of the deficiencies and opportunities to each of the key players involved in the planning process.

Deficiency	MPO	VDOT Urban	VDOT Rural	Local	Public Safety	TDM	DRPT	Freight	ENV Agencies
Safety	A,D	A,D	A,D		A				
Peak hour congestion	A,D	A,D	A,D						
Emergency Response and Detours		D	D		D				
Challenging grades	A		D						
Lack of transportation alternatives	D			A		A	D		
State of Good Repair	A,D	A,D	A,D						
Vehicle Wildlife conflict	A,D	A,D	A,D						A

Role codes: A=Advisor D=Decision maker.

In Virginia VDOT is responsible for maintenance of all roadways within the state system. This includes most paved roads that are outside of Cities. In the study area corridor maintenance and decision making is split between three VDOT construction Districts Culpeper, Lynchburg, and Staunton.

Opportunities	MPO	VDOT Urban	VDOT Rural	Local	Public Safety	TDM	DRPT	Freight	ENV Agencies
Increase TDM	D	A	D			A	D		
Improve safety	A,D	D	D						
Reduce congestion	A,D	D	D						
Maintain a and improve state of good repair	A,D	D	D						
Multi modal freight									
Improving wildlife connectivity	A,D	A,D	A,D	A					A

Role codes: A=Advisor D=Decision maker

COR-3 Goals for the Corridor

PROCESS: elicit stakeholder perspective and partner approval on the comprehensive set of transportation, community and environmental goals. Focus on regional outcomes of reducing congestion, improving safety and enhancing multi-modal options in the corridor supported by access to comprehensive data. Outcome: Develop a list set of goals guiding the selection of a set of solutions addressing opportunities and deficiencies.

LINK TO PROJECT DELIVERABLES: Setting goals and objectives for the corridor study.

OUTPUTS:

Goals and Objectives:

Goal 1. Improve the overall function of the corridor by increasing the efficiency and safety people and goods move through the corridor.

- Enhance user experience through improved communications about weather conditions, detours, accidents and congestion. (Active safety management system)
- Identify key hotspots and suggest actions to mitigate, congestion, safety and access issues at these key locations (East and West approach to Afton, Ivy, Charlottesville exits and Waynesboro area exits)

- Further integrate transit into corridor through supporting research and development of inter-regional transit options. (JAUNT Crozet transit, Inter-Regional Transit)
- Improve corridor access by focusing on projects that reduce congestion at intersections and access points. (US-250 in Waynesboro, Crozet, Ivy)
- Improve freight performance by providing additional roadway capacity at key locations (Truck climbing lanes, improved interchange geometry)

Goal 2. Enhance communication among MPOs, Local Governments, VDOT and DRPT on planning issues in the corridor.

- Develop an MOU that spells out a framework for continued cooperation between the SAW MPO and the CA-MPO on corridor related planning activities (MOU)
- Host an annual Joint MPO meeting that includes a report on the state of the corridor and key projects
- Work collaboratively to identify corridor specific project improvements for inclusion in long range plans and future studies.

Goal 3. Minimize the impact that new projects have on natural resources and the environment.

- Reduce impacts to sensitive habitats and natural resources
- Limit road profile in areas of concern such as Afton mountain
- Improve habitat connectivity by utilizing existing stream corridors to reduce the conflict between vehicles and wildlife

OUTPUTS:

7. Problem Statement: the Interstate 64 corridor is a multi-modal corridor that is the primary connection between the Piedmont and the Shenandoah Valley regions of Virginia. The corridor has unique challenges and opportunities. Challenged include; terrain, weather,

and capacity at key points, and a growing demand on the corridor during daily peak travel times. Opportunities include; a good state of repair, available capacity during off-peak hours, interest in transit and a willingness of stakeholders to collaborate.

DISCUSSION:

MPO staff developed framework goals through a collaborative process and then presented them to the corridor working group. Members then provided some input and the goals were further refined. The goals and the subsequent objectives were also presented to each MPOs Technical committees and policy boards for additional input. The corridor goals are reflective of the project and are focused on providing the higher level overview of the corridor.

COR-4 Reach Consensus on Scope of Environmental Review and Analysis

PROCESS: The Eco-Logical tool will guide the determination of the data, information and level of analysis needed to review conceptual solutions; Eco-logical related datasets will be gathered for the corridor study area Regional Ecological Framework (REF). Outcome: Agreement on data needs and future analysis level required for the planning process/NEPA review.

LINK TO PROJECT DELIVERABLES: Draft corridor study

OUTPUTS:

8. Eco-Logical: Mapping of environmental resources within the project area. MPO staff used available data to map important and sensitive environmental resources within the project corridor. The mapped information was used to determine potential environmental impacts associated with proposed projects within the corridor.

9. Collaboration with other Agencies: The working group reached out to Shenandoah National Park who participated in the working group and provided input regarding the parks transportation needs around visitor access and the parks proximity to the corridor.

10. Special Considerations: During the corridor plan the Virginia Transportation Research Council (VTRC) provided data on a pilot study

of crashes involving vehicles along Interstate 64. Project staff collaborate and got access to animal carcass removal data. The data allowed the project team to identify a number of hotspot areas for wildlife crashes. Some of the recommendations from the analyses are presented in the Recommendations section and include opportunities for projects that include wildlife exclusion fencing and wildlife crossings.

DISCUSSION:

Since the corridor plan is general in nature it was determined that mapping individual projects against available environmental data was unnecessary since most project recommendations are located within the existing rights-of-way. More details on the environmental review process are included in the Existing Conditions section.

For the environmental review project staff utilized GIS data and tools from the Virginia Department of Conservation (DCR) Natural Heritage Program to locate and map sensitive environmental habitats present within the project corridor area.

For the cultural and historic review project utilized GIS data from the Department of Historic Resources and VDOT to help identify historic and cultural resources within the corridor area.

COR-5 Approve Evaluation Criteria, Methods and Measures

PROCESS: The CA-MPO will adapt performance measures developed in the previous Transportation for Communities-Advancing Projects through Partnerships (TCAPP) effort, for use in this project. Outcome: Specific criteria, methods, and performance measures for selecting solutions.

LINK TO PROJECT DELIVERABLES: Hotspot analyses and existing transportation conditions.

OUTPUTS:

11. Criteria: The project team worked with VDOT to source data for the corridor evaluation criteria. Much of the criteria used for hotspot identification and analyses was based on Virginia's Smart Scale process. Specifically, the guidance developed for the Smart Scale Round two. Many of the measures are very similar to those used by the CA-MPO in

the development of the 2040-LRTP, a plan that was developed with the guidance of the TCAPP process (now a part of the PlanWorks LRTP guide) A list of the corridor evaluation criteria is included below:

- o Current and Future Average Annual Daily Traffic
- o Current and Future Volume to Capacity Ratio (VC Ratio)
- o Percentage of heavy Vehicles
- o Pavement Conditions
- o Bridge Sufficiency ratings
- o Crash Rates

12. Methods: The methods for each measure are detailed in the Existing Conditions section of the plan and are based on standard approaches used in Virginia.

DISCUSSION:

Project staff relied on available data and guidance from the Virginia SmartScale process to identify appropriate criteria for evaluating the performance of the roadways in the corridor. This included looking at safety, congestions, and roadway conditions. Details about the criteria is discussed in Existing Conditions section.

COR- 6 Approve Range of Solution Sets + COR-7 Adopt Preferred Solution Set

PROCESS: Using goals identified, SPaCE will develop an innovative set of conceptual solutions to improve all forms of travel along the I-64 corridor. Based on an assessment of the solution concepts using draft evaluation criteria, methods, measures, and stakeholder input, a draft preferred solution set will be recommended for adoption. Outcomes: Approve solution sets. Adopt preferred solution set; document of reasons for eliminating solutions not selected.

LINK TO PROJECT DELIVERABLES: Project Recommendations.

OUTPUTS:

13. Project Recommendations List: The project recommendations list was developed from the deficiencies analyses carried out as part of COR-2 and from input of the working group. The draft project list was reviewed by the working group at their final meeting in September. The

project list is included in Recommendations section

14. Methods: for evaluating corridor performance were implemented as part of the hotspots analyses discussed in Existing Conditions section.

DISCUSSION:

Based on the results of the deficiencies analyses and input from the working group a set of draft project recommendations was identified. This list was then reviewed and vetted by the working group and a special meeting with the VDOT districts. Once the list was narrowed down by the group staff developed profiles of each project recommendation and mapped them. The narrowed down list was then approved by the working group at the September meeting. Further vetting of project lists was done at a joint MPO policy Board meeting in September.