Fredericksburg City
Spotsylvania County
Stafford County
King George County
Caroline County

Meg Bohmke
Chair

Ian Ollis
FAMPO Administrator

RTA SUBCOMMITTEE DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

March 21, 2024 – 6:00 p.m.
406 Princess Anne Street, Fredericksburg, VA 22401
Video Recording: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZtA-g-QsZPk

Committee Members Present: *(V) indicates voting member*
Ms. Meg Bohmke, Chair, Stafford County (V)
Ms. Lori Hayes, First Vice-Chair Spotsylvania County (V)
Mr. Drew Mullins, Spotsylvania County (V)
Mr. Chris Yakabouski, Spotsylvania County (V) (online)
Ms. Monica Gary, Stafford County (V)
Mr. Deuntay Diggs, alternate Stafford County (V)
Mr. Jason Graham, Second Vice-Chair, City of Fredericksburg (V)
Ms. Jannan Holmes, City of Fredericksburg (V)
Mr. Will Mackintosh, City of Fredericksburg (V)
Ms. Cathy Binder, King George County
Mr. David "Sully" Sullins, alternate King George County
Mr. Steven Minor, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) (online)
Dr. Robert Schneider, PRTC (V) (online)
Mr. Timothy Welsh, Vice Chair CTAC

Committee Members Absent:
Ms. Crystal Vanuch, Stafford County (V)
Mr. Gerald Childress, alternate Spotsylvania County (V)
Mr. Jacob Lane, alternate Spotsylvania County (V)
Mr. Jeffery Black, Caroline County
Ms. Nancy Long, alternate Caroline County
Mr. David Brown, alternate City of Fredericksburg (V)
Ms. Marcie Parker, Representative from the Secretary of Transportation (V)
Dr. Pamela Yeung, alternate Stafford County (V)
Ms. Cathie Coffey, alternate Representative from the Secretary of Transportation (V)
Mr. Joe Stainsby, alternate PRTC (V)
Mr. Daniel Koenig, Federal Highway Administration (FTA)
Ms. Chelsea Beytas, alternate Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
Ms. Laura Sellers, Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB)
Ms. Susan Gardner, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)
Ms. Casandra Lord, alternate Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)
Ms. Amy Garbarini, Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT)
Mr. Todd Horsley, alternate Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT)
Ms. Jamie Jackson, Fredericksburg Go! (FXBGO!)
Ms. Melody Fowler, alternate Fredericksburg Go! (FXBGO!)
Mr. Matthew Lehane, Chair BPAC
Mr. Chris Clarke, Vice Chair BPAC

Others Present:
Gavin Gardon
Diana Mae Jannet
Yolanda Hipski
Allen Watkins (online)

Staff Present:
Mr. Ian Ollis, FAMPO Administrator
Dr. John Ridout, Transportation Planner II
Mr. Connor Anderson, Transportation Planner/GIS Technician
Mx. Colie Touzel, Public Involvement/Title VI Coordinator

1. **Call RTA Subcommittee Meeting to Order**

   Chair Bohmke called the meeting to order at 6:05 pm.

2. **Roll Call**

   Mx. Touzel conducted roll call.

3. **Questions received from Policy Committee Members for discussion**

   a. What are the options for the makeup of the RTA Board?

   b. How would the RTA prioritize projects to fund or support?

   c. Please can we have an example of what the funding splits would look like?

   d. What would happen if we had no more projects to fund?

   Mr. Ollis introduced these questions which were addressed in Item 4, staff presentations and responses.

4. **Staff presentations and responses**

   a. Makeup of RTA Board – options – Ian Ollis

   Mr. Ollis reviewed the board make-up of other transportation authorities within the commonwealth. After his review, Mr. Ollis shared the draft bill proposal that board membership voting members include two representatives per jurisdiction, one representative from the Virginia House, one representative from the Virginia Senate, and one representative from the Commonwealth Transportation Board. The proposed four non-voting members include representatives of VDOT, DRPT, FAMPO, and GWRC.

   The second part of Mr. Ollis's presentation raised the issue of voting. He reviewed the voting procedures and thresholds of other transportation authorities within the commonwealth. He evaluated these procedures, commenting on HRTAC's low threshold for approval of funding and CVTA's weighted voting between localities. After his review, Mr. Ollis shared the draft RTA proposal that 4/5 jurisdiction representatives would constitute a majority and a single jurisdiction may only veto projects in their own jurisdiction. He also reviewed points to consider for potentially

DRAFT

weighting votes between jurisdictions. He clarified that jurisdictions may veto regional projects that have portions within their jurisdiction.

The committee discussed weighting votes and what role population should play in voting power. Mr. Yakabouski advocated that Spotsylvania's population, and likely significant monetary contribution to an RTA, should justify their increased influence over regional matters. He argued that a 4/5 threshold, and no single district's veto power beyond their jurisdiction, could imbalance locality influence with respect to their contribution to an RTA. Mr. Graham and Ms. Gary both responded, advocating that regionalism should be the primary goal of the RTA.

Mr. Ollis reminded the subcommittee that many of the sales and gas taxes raised in jurisdictions, and would go to funding an RTA, do not come from those individual localities' residents. Vice Chair Hayes argued that these funds were still generated within the locality.

Ms. Binder argued that if King George is to be a part of the RTA, they should also be a member of FAMPO. Ms. Gary expressed the importance of understanding how FAMPO and an RTA would interact and work together. Mr. Ollis reviewed how the Richmond MPO, PDC, and CVTA all interact and work together.

Mr. Yakabouski advocated that the legal construction of an RTA and its bylaws should function to protect each locality from being steamrolled by regional interests. He also proposed creating the RTA with a set project list and timeline. He expressed his concern that making the RTA indefinite would make it less efficient. Mr. Graham continued to advocate for regionalism and the continuous need for transportation projects. Mr. Mackintosh argued that setting the RTA's intentions and timeline at its creation would give current elected officials an inappropriate amount of power.

Mr. Ollis reminded the committee that a scoring methodology is used for objective project selection by transportation authorities.

Mr. Mackintosh advocated for a high voting threshold as insurance for regional cooperation. He also argued that any weighted votes should be weighted through revenue raised rather than population.

Vice Chair Hayes expressed her concern that creating an RTA would create another indefinite bureaucracy. Mr. Ollis pointed to the CVTA's staff of one person as an example where Transportation Authorities do not create a gross or gratuitous expansion of bureaucracy.

Ms. Gary spoke to the future of an RTA in the region and appreciated objective scoring processes for project selection. She also reminded the committee that the state government can institute a transportation authority in the region, regardless of local support. She identified these work sessions as an opportunity to influence a regional transportation authority and create something beneficial to the region.

Vice Chair Hayes noted that an RTA is not inevitable. She identified the responsibility state representatives have to listen to local officials should jurisdictions not support the RTA.

DRAFT

Mr. Ollis emphasized that the proposed voting threshold is the highest of any transportation authorities in the commonwealth.

b. Prioritizing projects – Mr. Ian Ollis & Mr. Connor Anderson

Mr. Ollis outlined several considerations for project selection including an objective prioritization methodology based on objective analysis, benefits relative to cost, and projects being a part of a long-range type plan. He also proposed that the region use RTA funding as the local match in applications for federal and state funding. Chair Bohmke reflected on Northern Virginia and the Hampton Roads area outscoring FAMPO projects in the past, and spoke to the SMART SCALE scoring process. Mr. Yakabouski asked whether or not the local match funding could come from the localities' share of RTA funds. Mr. Ollis answered by describing the potential funding for a project like the River Crossing, where Stafford, the more enthusiastic jurisdiction compared to Spotsylvania, could contribute a greater share of leveraging funds from their local share of RTA funding.

The committee discussed Harrison Road projects, previous attempts, and possible solutions to address congestion on Route 3. Mr. Ollis described the difference in project type that influences FAMPO's involvement in both the Harrison Road interchange project and the River Crossing.

Ms. Binder shared with the committee how King George has no transportation studies since 2017/2018. She also shared that the county's comprehensive plan includes no transportation planning. Mr. Ollis claimed that the county needs a new study that could be funded with RTA funds. He also shared that, in his personal opinion, King George and Caroline County should be a part of FAMPO if only for the fact that their membership would help to prevent a gridlock that currently occurs when two membership jurisdictions are in disagreement. He reviewed the process for both counties to become members of FAMPO.

Mr. Anderson presented the different criteria for project scoring, and their percentage of the total score, for five different scoring methodologies. These methodologies were FAMPO CMAQ Roadway, FAMPO CLRP Roadway, the CVTA, I-81 Corridor, and SMART SCALE Category B. He also provided a more in-depth description of CVTA's scoring methodology and presented its project scoring weights. Chair Bohmke asked if there were any perceived advantages or disadvantages to CVTA's scoring methodology. Dr. Ridout answered that it is a less complicated process than SMART SCALE scoring. However, he mentioned that project volume and cost should be considered. Smaller projects will score better than projects that are greatly beneficial but are more expensive.

Mr. Yakabouski asked whether or not projects were compared with one another for scoring. Dr. Ridout answered that the FAMPO methodology does score projects with respect to other projects. Mr. Ollis described how an RTA will create fewer yet larger projects. In project selection, one could run select projects through a travel demand model and evaluate the impact on congestion. Dr. Ridout also mentioned how, in the CMAQ scoring process, there was no way to link similar Route 1 projects across jurisdictions. An RTA could make linking these projects possible and improve their scoring.

Mr. Mackintosh asked which parts of CVTA's scoring methodology are explicitly outlined in the legislation and which are not. Mr. Ollis answered that the categories are a part of the legislation while actual percentages are not, as they may need to change with changing circumstances.

Dr. Ridout reviewed the I-81 scoring. In summary, I-81 scoring methodology is similar to a stripped-down SMART SCALE process. Finally, he presented the key-takeaways that encourage establishing clear and objective criteria for project scoring and leaving flexibility for scoring in legislation.

c. Funding splits based on likely income – Dr. John Ridout

Dr. Ridout presented distribution changes and updates, population and verification, model input and verification, and the fuel tax clawback. Finally, he presented the total collection and distribution of different funding splits with a $15 million allocation distributed by population share from 2025 - 2030. The funding splits presented were 50 Regional/50 Local Distribution, 60 Regional/40 Local Distribution, 70 Regional/30 Local Distribution,

5. **Discussion etc.**

Members briefly discussed the process for finalizing the Regional Transportation Authority Subcommittee and potential discussions of members with colleagues in their jurisdictions to take the matter further. At the next meeting, the committee will finalize a recommendation for an RTA to present to their boards for input and approval and for FAMPO to consider at the next RTA subcommittee in April.

Chair Bohmke asked FAMPO staff to provide simulated project funding scenarios with various funding splits.

6. **Future Subcommittee Meeting dates:**

a. April 25, 2024, at 6 p.m.

b. May ……. At 6 p.m.

7. **Adjourn/Next RTA Subcommittee Meeting April 25, 2024, at 6:00pm.**

Chair Bohmke adjourned the meeting at 8:53pm.

DRAFT