



MEMORANDUM

TO: TPB Technical Committee
FROM: John Swanson, TPB Staff
Andrew Austin, TPB Staff
Benjamin Hampton, TPB Staff
SUBJECT: Proposed methodology for CLRP-RTPP project-level assessment
DATE: December 3, 2015

In recent months, TPB members have expressed an interest in receiving an assessment of how individual new projects submitted for inclusion in the Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP) support established regional goals, especially those identified in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP).

This memo proposes a methodology for assessing project submissions for the 2016 CLRP Amendment using information that TPB staff is already planning to collect.

RECENT PRIORITIES PLAN ASSESSMENTS OF THE CLRP

At the direction of the TPB, staff in 2014 developed a comparative assessment of the CLRP that looked at the entire plan's performance relative to RTPP priorities. The document used the best available information about the CLRP – including system performance analysis and the 2014 CLRP financial plan – to assess the degree to which the plan, taken as a whole, supports the goals and strategies spelled out in the RTPP. The 2014 Assessment was released in two phases, in April and September. It did not include project-level assessments, nor did it collectively evaluate new projects.

For the 2015 CLRP Amendment, staff provided a similar assessment of the degree to which the entire plan supports the goals and strategies spelled out in the RTPP. Again, it only provided an evaluation of the plan as a whole, not for individual projects.

2015 PROJECT-LEVEL INFORMATION COLLECTION ON REGIONAL PRIORITIES

In 2015, TPB staff began collecting additional information on how individual new CLRP projects are anticipated to support the RTPP goals. The 2015 revised CLRP project description form, which implementing agencies completed as part of their CLRP submissions, included a series of questions related to the six goals of the RTPP. At the time the TPB voted on the project submissions in February of 2015, completed description forms for individual projects were made available to the public. While this new information was used in the overall assessment of the CLRP against the RTPP goals, this new information was not summarized at the individual project level nor was it highlighted in the information presented to the TPB in February of 2015.

PROPOSAL FOR 2016 CLRP AMENDMENT

Using essentially the same type of information that was collected on the 2015 revised project description forms, TPB staff is well positioned to develop an assessment of how individual project submissions for the 2016 CLRP Amendment support regional priorities. **Attachment A** provides the proposed project description form for the 2016 CLRP Amendment. Largely unchanged from 2015, it again includes a series of questions (#22 thru #28) that target key features of each RTPP goal.

In order to learn more about the approval and planning processes that have preceded a project's submission, Question 17 has been changed to request information on a project's standing, including the names of any adopted plans in which the project is included, approval actions by local, state, or subregional agencies, or any other documentation of the project's prioritization at the local or subregional level.

Improving upon last year, however, we propose to distill and better communicate the information we receive about regional priorities. **Attachment B** provides a sample table that summarizes the answers to the questions related to the RTPP that were submitted for new projects in 2015. This document also includes a table on how the projects are expected to support MAP-21 planning factors.

The table is designed to portray in a summary format how the new projects are anticipated to support both the federal Planning Factors and the TPB's RTPP Goals. It should be emphasized that information on the table is self-reported by the project implementers and is not based upon a review by TPB staff.

In order to provide succinct information about major projects, staff proposes that we also develop project profiles for each new major project. **Attachment C** is a rough mockup of such a project profile that uses Virginia's US 1 BRT project as an example. The profile includes a narrative section on how the project supports the RTPP. This text provides an opportunity to better understand how priorities relate to each other and to emphasize regional objectives that may be overarching or multi-faceted. It should be noted that these fact sheets will only be developed for major projects which are defined as changes to interstates, major arterials, and expressways or freeways with at-grade intersections, as well as dedicated transit facilities. For all other new projects, the project description forms will be made available, as in the past.

The timeframe for developing these new products is tight, but achievable. Staff is proposing to release this information in early February as part of the public comment period that precedes the TPB's approval of project submissions for the CLRP conformity analysis. The information packet that will be released at the time will include a table similar to Attachment B and project profiles similar to Attachment C.

In the fall of 2016, as was done in past years, staff will develop a Priorities Plan assessment for the entire plan that will accompany the performance analysis of the 2016 CLRP Amendment.

FINANCIALLY CONSTRAINED LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN FOR 2040 PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM



BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Submitting Agency:
2. Secondary Agency:
3. Agency Project ID:
4. Project Type: Interstate Primary Secondary Urban Bridge Bike/Ped Transit CMAQ
 ITS Enhancement Other Federal Lands Highways Program
 Human Service Transportation Coordination TERMS
5. Category: System Expansion; System Maintenance; Operational Program; Study; Other
6. Project Name:

Prefix	Route	Name	Modifier

7. Facility:
8. From (at):
9. To:
10. Description:

11. Projected Completion Year:
12. Project Manager:
13. Project Manager E-Mail:
14. Project Information URL:
15. Total Miles:
16. Schematic (file upload):
17. State/Local Project Standing (file upload):
18. Jurisdictions:
19. Baseline Cost (in Thousands): cost estimate as of MM/DD/YYYY
20. Amended Cost (in Thousands): cost estimate as of MM/DD/YYYY
21. Funding Sources: Federal; State; Local; Private; Bonds; Other

Regional Policy Framework

22. Provide a Comprehensive Range of Transportation Options

Please identify all travel mode options that this project provides, enhances, supports, or promotes.

- | | | | |
|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Single Driver | <input type="checkbox"/> Carpool/HOV | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Metrorail | <input type="checkbox"/> Commuter Rail | <input type="checkbox"/> Streetcar/Light Rail | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> BRT | <input type="checkbox"/> Express/Commuter bus | <input type="checkbox"/> Metrobus | <input type="checkbox"/> Local Bus |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bicycling | <input type="checkbox"/> Walking | <input type="checkbox"/> Other | |

Does this project improve accessibility for historically transportation-disadvantaged individuals (i.e., persons with disabilities, low-incomes, and/or limited English proficiency?)

CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

23. Promote Regional Activity Centers

- Does this project begin or end in an Activity Center?
- Does this project connect two or more Activity Centers?
- Does this project promote non-auto travel within one or more Activity Centers?

24. Ensure System Maintenance, Preservation, and Safety

- Does this project contribute to enhanced system maintenance, preservation, or safety?

25. Maximize Operational Effectiveness and Safety

- Does this project reduce travel time on highways and/or transit without building new capacity (e.g., ITS, bus priority treatments, etc.)?
- Does this project enhance safety for motorists, transit users, pedestrians, and/or bicyclists?

26. Protect and Enhance the Natural Environment

- Is this project expected to contribute to reductions in emissions of criteria pollutants?
- Is this project expected to contribute to reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases?

27. Support Interregional and International Travel and Commerce

Please identify all freight carrier modes that this project enhances, supports, or promotes.

- Long-Haul Truck Local Delivery Rail Air

Please identify all passenger carrier modes that this project enhances, supports, or promotes.

- Air Amtrak intercity passenger rail Intercity bus

28. Additional Policy Framework

In the box below, please provide any additional information that describes how this project further supports or advances these and other regional goals.

MAP-21 PLANNING FACTORS

29. Please identify any and all planning factors that are addressed by this project:

- a. Support the **economic vitality** of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
- b. Increase the **safety** of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users.
 - i. Is this project being proposed specifically to address a safety issue? Yes; No
 - ii. If yes, briefly describe (in quantifiable terms, where possible) the nature of the safety problem:
- c. Increase the ability of the transportation system to support **homeland security** and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.
- d. Increase **accessibility and mobility** of people.
- e. Increase accessibility and mobility of **freight**.
- f. Protect and enhance the **environment**, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
- g. Enhance the **integration and connectivity** of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.
- h. Promote efficient system **management and operation**.
- i. Emphasize the **preservation** of the existing transportation system.

CLRP PROJECT DESCRIPTION FORM

ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION

30. Have any potential mitigation activities been identified for this project? Yes; No
- a. If yes, what types of mitigation activities have been identified?
- Air Quality; Floodplains; Socioeconomics; Geology, Soils and Groundwater; Vibrations;
 - Energy; Noise; Surface Water; Hazardous and Contaminated Materials; Wetlands

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT INFORMATION

31. Congested Conditions
- a. Do traffic congestion conditions necessitate the proposed project or program? Yes; No
- b. If so, is the congestion recurring or non-recurring? Recurring; Non-recurring
- c. If the congestion is on another facility, please identify it:
32. Capacity
- a. Is this a capacity-increasing project on a limited access highway or other principal arterial? Yes; No
- b. If the answer to Question 32.a was "yes", are any of the following exemption criteria true about the project? (Choose one, or indicate that none of the exemption criteria apply):
- None of the exemption criteria apply to this project – a Congestion Management Documentation Form is required
 - The project will not use federal funds in any phase of development or construction (100% state, local, and/or private funding)
 - The number of lane-miles added to the highway system by the project totals less than one lane-mile
 - The project is an intersection reconstruction or other traffic engineering improvement, including replacement of an at-grade intersection with an interchange
 - The project, such as a transit, bicycle or pedestrian facility, will not allow private single-occupant motor vehicles
 - The project consists of preliminary studies or engineering only, and is not funded for construction
 - The construction costs for the project are less than \$10 million.
- c. If the project is not exempt and requires a Congestion Management Documentation Form, click here to open a blank Congestion Management Documentation Form.

RECORD MANAGEMENT

33. Completed Year:
34. Project is being withdrawn from the CLRP.
35. Withdrawn Date: MM/DD/YYYY
36. Record Creator:
37. Created On:
38. Last Updated by:
39. Last Updated On:
40. Comments:

8. *From (At)*The beginning project limit or location of a spot improvement. Use the *(At)* checkbox to indicate a spot or interchange improvement. Follow the conventions above for *Prefix, Number, Name* and *Modifier*.
9. *To*.....Terminal project limit. Follow conventions above for *Prefix, Number, Name* and *Modifier*.
10. *Description*Describe the project as clearly as possible. Use public-friendly phrasing and avoid technical jargon where possible.
11. *Projected Completion Year*.....Estimated year that the project will be open to traffic or implemented.
12. *Project Manager*Name of project manager or point-of-contact for information
13. *E-mail*E-mail address for project manager or point-of-contact for information
14. *Web Site*URL for further project information from implementing agency
15. *Total Mileage*If available; enter the total length of the project to the closest tenth of a mile.
16. *Map Image*If available, upload an image file to assist
17. *State/Local Project Standing*..Upload a brief memo describing the project's status in the local and/or state planning process. This should include the names of any adopted plans in which the project is included, or approval actions by local, state, or sub-regional agencies, or any other documentation of the project's prioritization at the local or sub-regional level.
18. *Jurisdiction*Select the appropriate jurisdictions for the project. Multiple jurisdictions can be selected by pressing the **CTRL** key while clicking.
19. *Baseline Cost/As of*Initially estimated cost of project (in \$1,000s) and approximate date of that estimate.
20. *Amended Cost/As of*.....Updates to project cost (in \$1,000s) can be entered here with date of the amended cost estimate.
21. *Sources*Indicate the sources of funds: Federal, State, Local, Private, Bonds, Other. Hold the **CTRL** key down to select multiple sources.

Assessing CLRP Project Submissions against the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan and MAP-21

The CLRP Project Description form includes a set of questions under the Regional Policy Framework section. These questions are intended to examine how projects support the goals set forth in the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). The six RTPP goals are described here and are matched up with the corresponding questions from the CLRP Project Description form. The responses provided by the submitting agencies for all new projects proposed for amendment to the CLRP this year have been summarized in the attached table, along with their responses as to how the projects support the federal planning factors prescribed under MAP-21.



Goal 1

Provide a Comprehensive Range of Transportation Options

Question
22

- Please identify all travel mode options that this project provides, enhances, supports, or promotes.
- Does this project improve accessibility for historically transportation-disadvantaged individuals (i.e., persons with disabilities, low-incomes, and/or limited English proficiency?)



Goal 2

Promote a Strong Regional Economy, Including a Healthy Regional Core and Dynamic Activity Centers

Question
23

- Does this project begin or end in an Activity Center?
- Does this project connect two or more Activity Centers?
- Does this project promote non-auto travel within one or more Activity Centers?



Goal 3

Ensure Adequate System Maintenance, Preservation, and Safety

Question
24

- Does this project contribute to enhanced system maintenance, preservation, or safety?



Goal 4

Maximize Operational Effectiveness and Safety of the Transportation System

Question
25

- Does this project reduce travel time on highways and/or transit without building new capacity (e.g., ITS, bus priority treatments, etc.)?
- Does this project enhance safety for motorists, transit users, pedestrians, and/or bicyclists?



Goal 5

Enhance Environmental Quality, and Protect Natural and Cultural Resources

Question
26

- Is this project expected to contribute to reductions in emissions of criteria pollutants?
- Is this project expected to contribute to reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases?



Goal 6

Support Inter-Regional and International Travel and Commerce

Question
27

- Please identify all freight carrier modes that this project enhances, supports, or promotes.
- Please identify all passenger carrier modes that this project enhances, supports, or promotes.

THE 2015 CLRP PROJECT SUBMISSIONS AND THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES PLAN GOALS

			Goal 1													Goal 2			Goal 3		Goal 4		Goal 5		Goal 6					
			SOV	HOV	MetroRail	Commuter Rail	Streetcar/LT-Rail	BRT	Exp. Bus	Metrobus	Local Bus	Bicycling	Walking	Other	Disadvantaged Groups	Begin/End in AC	Connect ACs	Non-Auto w/in AC	Maintenance	Reduce Time w/o Capacity	Enhance Safety	Criteria Pollutants	Greenhouse Gases	Long Haul Truck	Local Delivery	Freight Rail	Freight Air	Air Passenger	Amtrak	Intercity Bus
MAJOR PROJECTS*																														
1. Dedicated Bike Lanes	\$470,000	2015									<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
2. I-66 Inside the Beltway	\$350 million	2017, 2040	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. I-66 Outside the Beltway	\$2-3 billion	2022	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. US 1 Bus Rapid Transit	\$1 billion	2032					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
OTHER PROJECTS																														
5. Centerville Rd. Widening	\$47 million	2025	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
6. Connector Rd.	\$21 million	2020	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
7. Frontier Drive Extended	\$84.5 million	2024	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
8. Frying Pan Road	\$54 million	2025	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
9. Hooes Road	\$21 million	2025	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
10. River Heritage Blvd.	\$5 million	2020	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>									<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
11. Rt. 28 Expansion/HOV	\$100 million	2040		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											
12. Rt. 287/Rt. 9 Int. Imp.	\$7.5 million	2018	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
13. Soap Stone Dr.	\$2.5 million	2020	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
14. Lee Highway Widening	\$33 million	2025	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
15. Potomac Shores Pkwy	\$11 million	2020	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>									<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

* Major projects are defined as changes to interstates, major arterials, and expressways or freeways with at-grade intersections, as well as dedicated transit facilities.

THE 2015 CLRP PROJECT SUBMISSIONS AND THE MAP-21 PLANNING FACTORS

Economic Vitality
 Safety
 Homeland Security
 Accessibility/Mobility/People
 Environment
 Integration/Connectivity
 Management & Operation
 Preservation

MAJOR PROJECTS*												
1. Dedicated Bike Lanes	\$470,000	2015				✓		✓	✓			
2. I-66 Inside the Beltway	\$350 million	2017, 2040	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	
3. I-66 Outside the Beltway	\$2-3 billion	2022	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
4. US 1 Bus Rapid Transit	\$1 billion	2032	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓		
OTHER PROJECTS												
5. Centerville Rd. Widening	\$47 million	2025	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
6. Connector Rd.	\$21 million	2020	✓			✓			✓			
7. Frontier Drive Extended	\$84.5 million	2024	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
8. Frying Pan Road	\$54 million	2025	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
9. Hooes Road	\$21 million	2025	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
10. River Heritage Blvd.	\$5 million	2020	✓			✓			✓			
11. Rt. 28 Expansion/HOV	\$100 million	2040				✓			✓	✓		
12. Rt. 287/Rt. 9 Int. Imp.	\$7.5 million	2018		✓		✓				✓	✓	
13. Soap Stone Dr.	\$2.5 million	2020	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓		
14. Lee Highway Widening	\$33 million	2025	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
15. Potomac Shores Pkwy	\$11 million	2020	✓			✓			✓			

MAP-21 Planning Factors

- Support the **economic vitality** of the metropolitan area, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency.
- Increase the **safety** of the transportation system for all motorized and non-motorized users.
- Increase the ability of the transportation system to support **homeland security** and to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.
- Increase accessibility and mobility of **people**.
- Increase accessibility and mobility of **freight**.
- Protect and enhance the **environment**, promote energy conservation, improve the quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and State and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
- Enhance the **integration and connectivity** of the transportation system, across and between modes, for people and freight.
- Promote efficient system **management and operation**.
- Emphasize the **preservation** of the existing transportation system.

* Major projects are defined as changes to interstates, major arterials, and expressways or freeways with at-grade intersections, as well as dedicated transit facilities.

2015 CLRP Amendment

PROJECT PROFILE

US 1 Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

Between Huntington Metro Station and Woodbridge VRE Station

Project Length: **15 miles**
 Anticipated Completion: **2032**
 Estimated Cost of Construction: **\$1 billion**
 Total additional miles of premium transit: **15 miles**

<input type="checkbox"/>	HIGHWAY
<input type="checkbox"/>	TRANSIT
<input type="checkbox"/>	BICYCLE OR PEDESTRIAN
<input type="checkbox"/>	OTHER <small>(see Project Details)</small>

MAP OF REGION WITH SUBMITTING JURISDICTION COLORED

LOCAL/STATE/SUB-REGIONAL PLANS AND/OR APPROVALS

<input type="checkbox"/>	ADDS CAPACITY W/ NEW FACILITY	<input type="checkbox"/>	ADDS CAPACITY ON EXISTING SYSTEM	<input type="checkbox"/>	MAINTAINS EXISTING SYSTEM	<input type="checkbox"/>	IMPROVES OPERATIONS	<input type="checkbox"/>	OTHER <small>(see Project Details)</small>
--------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------	--------------------------	---

<p>PROJECT DESCRIPTION By 2026, the new BRT route will operate in dedicated median lanes between the Huntington Metro Station and an interim terminal at Hybla Valley. The service will be extended to Fort Belvoir by 2028 and Woodbridge VRE Station by 2032.</p> <p>PROJECT MANAGER Not available</p> <p>PROJECT WEBSITE Not available</p>	<p><i>PROJECT MAP</i></p>
---	---------------------------

HOW DOES THIS PROJECT ADVANCE REGIONAL GOALS?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Provide a Range of Transportation Options
<input type="checkbox"/>	Promote Dynamic Activity Centers
<input type="checkbox"/>	Ensure System Maintenance, Preservations, and Safety
<input type="checkbox"/>	Maximize Operational Effectiveness and Safety
<input type="checkbox"/>	Protect and Enhance the Natural Environment
<input type="checkbox"/>	Support Interregional and International Travel and Commerce

By expanding high-quality transit for 15 miles along a heavily traveled corridor, the Richmond Highway BRT project directly supports **Goal 1** in the Priorities Plan, which calls upon the region to provide a comprehensive range of transportation options. Recognizing that much of the region cannot be directly served by rail, the Priorities Plan specifically called for the implementation of cost-effective transit alternatives like bus-rapid transit.

VDOT has indicated the project will connect X regional Activity Centers (supporting **Goal 2**), which are the region’s primary engines for economic growth, and will provide increased access for economically disadvantaged communities. By decreasing auto-dependency in the Route 1 corridor, the project is expected to yield environmental benefits (**Goal 5**) by helping to reduce emissions of criteria pollutants and greenhouse gases.

For more information about how this project advances regional goals and addresses other federal requirements, please see reverse side of this form.

HOW DOES THIS PROJECT ADVANCE REGIONAL GOALS?

[Introductory text]

*GRAPHICAL DISPLAY
OF ANSWERS FROM CHECKLIST/FORM*

ADDRESSING FEDERAL PLANNING FACTORS

[Introductory text]

*GRAPHICAL DISPLAY
OF ANSWERS FROM CHECKLIST/FORM*

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT DOCUMENTATION

[Introductory text]

*GRAPHICAL DISPLAY
OF ANSWERS FROM CHECKLIST/FORM*

WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THIS PROJECT?

[Introductory text]

*COMMENT PERIODS AND
HOW TO SUBMIT COMMENTS*