COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA STATE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD

OZONE ADVANCE ACTION PLAN HAMPTON ROADS, VIRGINIA

Appendix C: CMAQ Emission Reduction Estimates

HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION



CMAQ/RSTP PROJECTS AND ALLOCATIONS 2011



TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

JANUARY 2012

T12-01

HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION CMAQ/RSTP PROJECTS AND ALLOCATIONS

2011

This report was included in the Unified Planning Work Program for Fiscal Year 2011-2012, which was approved by the Board of the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization on June 16, 2011.

PREPARED BY:



JANUARY 2012

T12-01

HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION

VOTING MEMBERS

Dwight L. Farmer Executive Director/Secretary

CHESAPEAKE

Alan P. Krasnoff

GLOUCESTER COUNTY Vacant

HAMPTON Molly J. Ward

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY Vacant

JAMES CITY COUNTY Vacant

NEWPORT NEWS McKinley Price

NORFOLK Paul D. Fraim

MEMBERS OF THE VIRGINIA SENATE

The Honorable John C. Miller The Honorable Yvonne B. Miller

MEMBERS OF THE VIRGINIA HOUSE OF DELEGATES

The Honorable John A. Cosgrove Vacant

TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT COMMISSION OF HAMPTON ROADS Philip A. Shucet, President/Chief Executive Officer

WILLIAMSBURG AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

Kevan Danker, Acting Executive Director

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Dennis W. Heuer, District Administrator – Hampton Roads District

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF RAIL AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION Thelma Drake, Director

VIRGINIA PORT AUTHORITY

Jerry A. Bridges, Executive Director

POQUOSON W. Eugene Hunt, Jr.

PORTSMOUTH Kenneth I. Wright

SUFFOLK Linda T. Johnson

VIRGINIA BEACH William D. Sessoms, Jr.

WILLIAMSBURG Clyde A. Haulman

YORK COUNTY Thomas G. Shepperd, Jr.

HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION **NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

CHESAPEAKE William E. Harrell

GLOUCESTER COUNTY Brenda G. Garton

HAMPTON Mary Bunting

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

W. Douglas Caskey

JAMES CITY COUNTY Robert C. Middaugh

NEWPORT NEWS Neil A. Morgan

NORFOLK Marcus Jones

POQUOSON J. Randall Wheeler PORTSMOUTH Kenneth L. Chandler

SUFFOLK Selena Cuffee-Glenn

VIRGINIA BEACH James K. Spore

WILLIAMSBURG Jackson C. Tuttle

YORK COUNTY James O. McReynolds

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION Irene Rico, Division Administrator – Virginia Division

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION Brigid Hynes-Cherin, Regional Administrator, Region 3

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION Jeffrey W. Breeden, Airport Planner, Washington Airports District Office

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION Randall P. Burdette, Director

PENINSULA AIRPORT COMMISSION Ken Spirito, Executive Director

NORFOLK AIRPORT AUTHORITY Wayne E. Shank, Executive Director

CHAIR – CITIZEN TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE William W. Harrison, Jr.

CHAIR – FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE William Bell, Co-Chair (Nonvoting Board Member) Vacant, Co-Chair (Voting Board Member)

MILITARY LIAISONS Mary Jackson, Captain, U.S. Navy Mark S. Ogle, Captain, U.S. Coast Guard

REPORT DOCUMENTATION

TITLE HRTPO CMAQ/RSTP Projects and Allocations 2011 **REPORT DATE** January 2012

GRANT/SPONSORINGAGENCY FHWA/FTA/VDOT/DRPT/LOCAL FUNDS

ORGANIZATION NAME, ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE

Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization 723 Woodlake Drive Chesapeake, Virginia 23320 (757) 420-8300 http://www.hrtpo.org

PROJECT MANAGER

Michael S. Kimbrel

AUTHORS

Michael S. Kimbrel Jessica M. Banks, AICP

PROJECT STAFF

Robert B. Case, P.E. Samuel S. Belfield Stephanie L. Shealey

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization 2011 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) Projects and Allocations. As a result of the 2011 CMAQ/RSTP Project Selection Process, selected projects received allocations of CMAQ or RSTP funds through Fiscal Year 2018.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared by the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT), and the local jurisdictions and transit agencies within the Hampton Roads metropolitan planning area. The contents of this report reflect the views of the HRTPO. The HRTPO staff is responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the FHWA, FTA, VDOT, or DRPT. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. FHWA, FTA, VDOT, or DRPT acceptance of this report as evidence of fulfillment of the objectives of this task does not constitute approval of the need for any recommended improvements nor does it constitute approval of their location and design or a commitment to fund any such improvements. Additional project level environmental impact assessments and/or studies of alternatives may be necessary.

REPORT PRODUCTION STAFF

Dwight L. Farmer, P.E.	Executive Director/Secretary
Camelia Ravanbakht, PhD	Deputy Executive Director
Robert B. Case, P.E.	Principal Transportation Engineer
Michael S. Kimbrel	Principal Transportation Engineer
Samuel S. Belfield	Senior Transportation Engineer
Jessica M. Banks, AICP	Senior Transportation Analyst
Stephanie L. Shealey	Transportation Engineer
Michael R. Long	General Services Manager
Christopher Vaigneur	Reprographic Coordinator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I – Executive Summary	2
CMAQ Project Selection and Funding Allocations	2
RSTP Project Selection and Funding Allocations	
Section II - Background	
Introduction	
Project Selection Process	
Public Participation	
Section III – CMAQ Projects and Allocations	20
Section IV – RSTP Projects and Allocations	27
Section V – Appendices	
Appendix A: Project Selection Worksheets: Newly-Selected CMAQ Projects	
Appendix B: Project Selection Worksheets: Newly-Selected RSTP Projects	

LIST OF MAPS AND TABLES

Map 1 Projects Selected for CMAQ Allocations	10
Map 2 Projects Selected for RSTP Allocations	14
Table 1 FY 2012-2018 Allocations to Previously Approved CMAQ Projects	22
Table 2 2011 CMAQ Candidate Projects	23
Table 3 2011 CMAQ Candidate Projects in Ranked Order	24
Table 4 FY 2012-2018 Allocations to New CMAQ Projects	25
Table 5 FY 2012-2018 Allocations to Previously Approved RSTP Projects	
Table 6 2011 RSTP Candidate Projects	29
Table 7 2011 RSTP Candidate Projects in Ranked Order	
Table 8 FY 2012-2018 Allocations to New RSTP Projects	

REPORT ORGANIZATION

This report has been organized into five sections:

Section I – Executive Summary

The Executive Summary summarizes the CMAQ and RSPT projects selected to receive available CMAQ and RSTP funds through FY 2018.

Section II - Background

The Background section of this report includes an introduction, a description of the CMAQ/RSTP project selection process, and public participation.

Section III - CMAQ Projects and Allocations

The CMAQ Projects and Allocations section of this report describes the process by which projects were selected to receive allocations of CMAQ funds.

Section IV - RSTP Projects and Allocations

The RSTP Projects and Allocations section of this report describes the process by which projects were selected to receive allocations of RSTP funds.

Section V – Appendices

The appendices of this report include detailed worksheets used in the analysis of each of the candidate projects submitted by member localities/agencies to receive available CMAQ or RSTP funding.

Section I Executive Summary

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Hampton Roads area, the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) is responsible for project selection and allocation of funds under two federal funding programs – the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program and the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP). The process used by the HRTPO to select projects to receive funds from these two programs is referred to as the CMAQ/RSTP Project Selection Process. Beginning this year, the project selection process will be conducted annually, normally beginning in July and running through December.

This report summarizes the work of selecting CMAQ and RSTP projects during the 2011 CMAQ/RSTP Project Selection Process. Selected projects received allocations of CMAQ or RSTP funds through Fiscal Year (FY) 2018.

CMAQ PROJECT SELECTION AND FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

During the December 15, 2011 meeting, the HRTPO Board approved the following to receive available allocations of CMAQ through FY 2018:

- Adjustments made to the allocations on 15 previously approved CMAQ projects to address changes in cost estimates and to advance funding on some of the projects to allow them to be completed sooner.
- FY 2018 allocations at the previously-agreed upon funding levels for the TRAFFIX program.
- 29 new CMAQ projects selected to receive a total of \$33.8 million in allocations through FY 2018.

The HRTPO Board approved CMAQ projects and allocations are summarized below. In addition, a map showing the locations of the recommended CMAQ projects is included.

<u>Previously Approved CMAQ Projects – Transfers and New Allocations to Cover Funding</u> <u>Shortfalls</u>

- 1. Bicycle-Pedestrian Improvements to Route 17 (UPC# 100626) Gloucester County
 - Advance and increase project CMAQ funding from FY 2015 (\$42,000) and FY 2016 (\$168,000) to FY 2012 (\$53,258) and FY 2013 (\$267,281) to address increases in the phase cost estimates and allow the project to be completed sooner.
- 2. Bicycle-Pedestrian Improvements to Route 216 (UPC# 100625) Gloucester County
 - Allocate an additional \$45,853 in FY 2017 CMAQ funds to address an increase in the construction phase cost estimate for this project.
- 3. Bicycle-Pedestrian Improvements to Route 1216 (UPC# 100624) Gloucester County
 - Allocate an additional \$46,874 in FY 2015 CMAQ funds and \$445,157 in FY 2016 CMAQ funds to address increases in the phase cost estimates for this project.

4. Big Bethel Road/Todds Lane Intersection Improvements (UPC# 83454) - Hampton

• Restore allocation of \$650,000 in FY 2012 CMAQ funds that were approved by the HRTPO Board but later removed by VDOT Programming Division due to an outdated cost estimate for the project.

5. Bridge Road/Bennetts Pasture Road Intersection Improvement (UPC# 100604) – Suffolk

- Advance project CMAQ funding from FY 2016 (\$75,000) and FY 2017 (\$675,000) to FY 2012 (\$75,000) and FY 2013 (\$675,000) to allow the project to be completed sooner.
- 6. Bridge Road/Lee Farm Lane Intersection Improvement (UPC# 100605) Suffolk
 - Advance project CMAQ funding from FY 2016 (\$75,000) and FY 2017 (\$675,000) to FY 2012 (\$75,000) and FY 2013 (\$675,000) to allow the project to be completed sooner.

7. Capitol Landing Bikeway (UPC# 84484) - York County

• Allocate an additional \$92,487 in FY 2012 CMAQ funds to address an increase in the construction phase cost estimate for this project.

8. Emergency Vehicle Preemption (UPC# 100537) – Chesapeake

• Advance a total of \$500,000 in CMAQ funding from FY 2015 (\$50,000) and FY 2016 (\$450,000) to FY 2012 to allow the project to be completed sooner.

9. Godwin Boulevard/Route 58 Park & Ride Lot (UPC# 98815) - Suffolk

• Advance project CMAQ funding from FY 2015 (\$400,000) to FY 2012 to allow the project to be completed sooner.

10. Mounts Bay Route - New Transit Service (UPC# T10862) - WATA

Advance project CMAQ funding from FY 2016 (\$350,000) and FY 2017 (\$327,000) to FY 2014 (\$350,000) and FY 2015 (\$327,000) to allow the new transit service to begin sooner.

11. Portsmouth Boulevard Park & Ride Lot (UPC# 100607) - Suffolk

• Advance project CMAQ funding from FY 2015 (\$75,000) and FY 2016 (\$675,000) to FY 2012 (\$75,000) and FY 2013 (\$675,000) to allow the project to be completed sooner.

12. Purchase 12 Replacement Buses (UPC# T9148) - WATA

- Advance project CMAQ funding to allow WATA to begin purchasing the replacement buses sooner. Change allocations as follows:
 - o From: FY 2013 (\$2,386,000), FY 2014 (\$2,204,000), FY 2015 (\$1,513,000)
 - To: FY 2012 (\$2,386,000), FY 2014 (\$2,204,000), FY 2015 (\$1,513,000)

13. Purchase 38 Replacement 40' Buses (UPC# T9126) - HRT

- Advance project CMAQ funding to allow HRT to begin purchasing the replacement buses sooner. Change allocations as follows:
 - From: FY 2013 (\$1,686,205), FY 2014 (\$6,487,876), FY 2015 (\$6,425,919)
 - To: FY 2012 (\$2,689,477), FY 2013 (\$3,607,260), FY 2014 (\$4,951,032), FY 2015 (\$3,352,231)

14. Regional Opticom Preemption Strategic Plan & Deployment (UPC# 100606) - Regional

Advance project CMAQ funding from FY 2015 (\$150,000), FY 2016 (\$1,000,000) and FY 2017 (\$500,000) to FY 2014 (\$150,000), FY 2015 (\$1,000,000), and FY 2016 (\$500,000) to allow the project to be completed sooner.

15. Traffic Management Center & System Additions (UPC# 100538) – Chesapeake

Advance project CMAQ funding from FY 2015 (\$300,000), FY 2016 (\$1,000,000) and FY 2017 (\$700,000) to FY 2013 (\$700,000), FY 2014 (\$1,000,000), and FY 2015 (\$700,000) to allow the project to be completed sooner.

16. TRAFFIX (UPC# T1823) - HRT

• Allocate \$1.1 million in FY 2018 CMAQ funds to continue this transportation demand management program at the previously agreed-upon level.

New CMAQ Projects

17. Bridge Road Signal Coordination and ITS Network – Suffolk

- The project entails upgrading signal control equipment at four locations and coordinating a total of ten intersections to create a managed and coordinated traffic signal corridor along US Route 17. These improvements will result in reduced delays, which, in turn, result in reduced vehicular emissions.
- Allocate \$150,000 in FY 2017 and \$1,107,000 in FY 2018 to fully fund the project.

18. Centerville Road and News Road - James City County

- The project entails the following improvements to the intersection: improve visibility for left turns onto Centerville Road from News Road, add a right-turn lane on westbound News Road, add a left-turn lane on southbound Centerville Road, and add a right-turn lane on northbound Centerville Road. These improvements will reduce congestion at the intersection and, in turn, reduce vehicular emissions.
- Allocate \$70,000 in FY 2018 to fund the preliminary engineering phase of the project. The County will likely request additional funds in the future to complete the project.

19. Citywide Pedestrian Enhancements - Newport News

• The project entails installing enhanced pedestrian accommodations, including pedestrian signal indicators, pushbutton actuators, and ADA-compliant sidewalk ramps. This project will involve approximately 60 intersections. In addition to improving pedestrian safety, these enhancements will allow for improved signal timing which will, in turn, reduce vehicular delay.

• Allocate \$250,000 each in fiscal years 2016, 2017 and 2018. This will fund 75 percent of the total project cost and the City will likely request the balance in future years to complete the project.

20. Citywide Signal Timing – Newport News

- The project entails developing and implementing new signal timing plans for strategic corridors in the City to improve traffic progression and reduce congestion.
- Allocate \$300,000 each in fiscal years 2015, 2016, and 2017 to fully fund the project.

21. Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade Phase 4 - Hampton

- The project entails upgrading the preemption system into a complete centralized unit, advanced traffic signal cabinet components, advanced video components, computerized interface units, and a TS2 traffic cabinet analyzer. These upgrades will allow for monitoring and troubleshooting signal problems remotely, reducing the use of motorized vehicles in addressing problems in the field.
- Allocate \$553,000 in FY 2015 to fully fund the project.

22. Clifford/Bart/South Street Bike Boulevard - Portsmouth

- The project entails providing a designated route for bicyclists traveling between residential and commercial areas in the central portion of the City. The bike boulevard will provide nearly two miles of continuous bike paths.
- Allocate \$500,000 in FY 2018 to fully fund the project.

23. CNG Bus Replacement – WATA

- The project entails purchasing 7 forty-foot CNG (Compressed Natural Gas) buses to replace similar buses that have reached the end of their useful life. The new vehicles will have improved fuel economy and performance, lower operating costs, and lower emissions than the buses they will replace.
- Allocate 878,000 in FY 2018. This will provide for the purchase of two buses and WATA will likely request additional funds in future years to complete the project.

24. Cunningham Drive Sidewalk Project - Hampton

- The project entails design and construction of sidewalks on both sides of Cunningham Drive between Mercury Boulevard and Todds Lane, providing pedestrian connectivity through the Coliseum Central section of the City, including the Peninsula Town Center.
- Allocate \$920,000 in FY 2018 to fully fund the project.

25. First Colonial Road and Laskin Road - Virginia Beach

- The project entails improvement to the intersection of First Colonial Road and Laskin Road in the form of a second westbound left-turn lane. The additional turn lane will reduce the amount of green time required by the westbound approach to the intersection, thereby reducing overall delay and, in turn, reducing vehicular emissions.
- Allocate \$1 million in FY 2018 to fully fund the project.

26. Green Operator (GO): Truck Replacement Program - Virginia Port Authority

- The project entails encouraging drayage truck owners to replace their pre-2004 heavy duty diesel trucks with low emission and more fuel efficient 2007 or newer models by providing a financial incentive in the form of a rebate or down payment on a GO-approved replacement vehicle. The incentive will equal 25% of the sales price of the replacement vehicle, or \$20,000, whichever is less.
- Allocate \$1 million each in fiscal years 2015, 2016 and 2017 to fully fund the project.

27. Green Operator (GO): Ocean-Going Vessel Hybridization and Fuel Switching Demo Project – Virginia Port Authority

- The project entails encouraging the use of alternative fuel/hybrid technology to reduce emissions from at-berth operations. VPA is prepared to execute two alternatives under this project:
 - 1. FlexGen, which eliminates the need for a commercial container vessel to run its auxiliary diesel engines and eliminates the need for shore-side power at the berth; and
 - 2. Fuel Switching, in which vessels will use ultra-low sulfur marine diesel while at berth at VPA facilities. Both alternatives will result in significant emissions reductions.
- Allocate \$500,000 in FY 2013 reserves, \$500,000 in FY 2015, and \$1 million each in fiscal years 2016, 2017, and 2018 to fully fund the project.

28. Hybrid Bus Capital Replacements – WATA

- The project entails purchasing eight diesel-electric hybrid buses to replace eight diesel buses that have reached the end of their useful life. The new vehicles will have improved fuel economy and performance, lower operating costs, and lower emissions than the buses they will replace.
- Allocate \$3,208,000 in FY 2018. This covers WATA's full request for FY 2018 and will provide for the purchase of four buses. WATA plans to request additional funding in future years to complete the project.

29. Lee Hall Bus Transfer Center – Newport News

- The project entails construction of a curbside bus transfer center with shelters, benches, and trash receptacles near the Lee Hall Shopping Center.
- Allocate \$125,000 in FY 2015 and \$125,000 in FY 2016 to fully fund the project.

30. Main Street at Route 10 Sidewalk Extension – Isle of Wight County

- The project entails extending the sidewalk along the north side of Main Street in Smithfield, connecting existing sidewalks in Smithfield with the Park and Ride lot at Route 10. This project will improve connectivity and safety for pedestrians from a number of multi-family residential areas through the busy intersection.
- Allocate \$165,000 in FY 2015 to fully fund the project.

31. Purchase 29' Buses – HRT

- The project entails purchasing 29 twenty-nine foot buses to replace similar buses that have reached the end of their useful life. The new buses will have improved fuel economy and performance, lower operating costs, and lower emissions than the buses they will replace.
- Allocate \$802,166 in FY 2017 and \$2 million in FY 2018. This will provide for the purchase of approximately seven buses and HRT will likely request additional funds in future years to complete this project.

32. Purchase 40' Buses – HRT

- The project entails purchasing 41 forty-foot buses to replace similar buses that have reached the end of their useful life. The new buses will have improved fuel economy and performance, lower operating costs, and lower emissions than the buses they will replace.
- Allocate \$2 million in FY 2018. This will provide for the purchase of approximately five buses and HRT will likely request additional funds in future years to complete this project.

33. Purchase One Replacement Ferry - HRT

- The project entails the purchase of one passenger ferry to be used on the Elizabeth River service between Norfolk and Portsmouth. The new ferry will replace a ferry that is approaching the end of its useful life.
- Allocate \$2 million in 2017 to fully fund the project.

34. Route 199 and Brookwood Drive - James City County

- The project entails improving the intersection by converting the right lane on northbound Brookwood Drive into a left/through lane and adding a new right-turn lane to the same approach. The improvement will address the current problem of insufficient capacity to accommodate the high number of left turns from northbound Brookwood Drive during rush hour. This will reduce delay at the intersection which will result in reduced vehicular emissions.
- Allocate \$50,000 in FY 2015, \$25,000 in FY 2016, \$125,000 in 2017 and \$75,000 in FY 2018 to fully fund the project.

35. Route 199 West Ramp at Richmond Road – James City County

- The project entails adding a new right-turn lane at the end of the ramp from Route 199 West onto Richmond Road and converting the existing lane into a dedicated left-turn lane. This improvement will address the current problem of the left turn queue blocking vehicles attempting to turn right onto Richmond Road. Reducing the delay will result in reduced vehicular emissions.
- Allocate \$41,172 in FY 2016, \$63,828 in FY 2017 and \$350,000 in FY 2018. This will fund 70 percent of the total project cost and the County will likely request the balance in future years to complete the project.

36. Shoulders Hill Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements - Suffolk

- The project entails improvements to the intersection of Shoulders Hill Road and Bennetts Pasture Park Road to include modification of the signal and controller, pedestrian signals, signage, and pavement markings. A multiuse trail will be constructed extending approximately 1,090 feet south of the intersection along the southbound lane and approximately 250 feet south of the intersection along the northbound lane of Shoulders Hill Road.
- Allocate \$272,000 in FY 2018 to fully fund the project.

37. Shoulders Hill Road/Nansemond Parkway/Wilroy Road Signal Coordination and ITS Network - Suffolk

- The project entails upgrading signal control equipment at six locations and coordinating a total of eight intersections to create a managed and coordinated north-south traffic signal corridor between northern Suffolk and the Downtown Suffolk area. These improvements will reduce delay and, in turn, reduce vehicular emissions. They will also aid in traffic management during incidents on I-664 and in evacuation management during regional emergencies.
- Allocate \$2,748,000 in FY 2018 to fully fund the project.

38. Signal Re-timing Phase 3 – Norfolk

- The project entails traffic data collection, the hiring of a consultant to develop updated signal timing plans, and implementation of those plans. Improved signal timing plans reduce traffic congestion, resulting in decreased vehicle emissions.
- Allocate \$200,000 each in fiscal years 2015, 2016, and 2017 to fully fund the project.

39. Signal System Citywide Upgrades – Portsmouth

- The project entails upgrading signalized intersections to bring the equipment into compliance with current design standards. The improvement will reduce delay at intersections and, in turn, reduce vehicular emissions.
- Allocate \$1.5 million each in fiscal years 2017 and 2018. This will fund half of the total project cost and the City will likely request the remainder in future years.

40. South Lawson Park Bike Path – Poquoson

- The project entails the development and construction of a bike/pedestrian path for South Lawson Park that will accompany the new entrance road and surround the park.
- Allocate \$195,100 in FY 2018 to fully fund the project.

41. Traffic Signal System Retiming – Hampton

- The project entails retiming 133 traffic signals with the intent of reducing travel times, delays, stops, and fuel consumption.
- Allocate \$698,000 in FY 2016 to fully fund the project.

42. Traffic Signal Upgrade – Poquoson

- The project entails upgrading the traffic signal equipment at four intersections and linking the signals to Hampton's traffic signal network. This linkage will provide Hampton traffic technicians the ability to maintain Poquoson's traffic signals remotely. These improvements will result in reduced delays, which, in turn, result in reduced vehicular emissions.
- Allocate \$260,000 in FY 2017 to fully fund the project.

43. Trolley Bus Replacements – WATA

- The project entails purchasing five transit trolleys to replace similar vehicles that have reached the end of their useful life. The new vehicles will have improved fuel economy and performance, lower operating costs, and lower emissions than the buses they will replace.
- Allocate \$432,000 in FY 2018. This covers WATA's full request for FY 2018 and will provide for the purchase of one replacement trolley. WATA plans to request additional funding in future years to complete the project.

44. Roaring Springs Road Shared Roadway Bike Path and Main Street Sidewalk Gap Correction – Gloucester County

- The project entails improving the shoulders along Roaring Springs Road from Main Street to Beaver Dam Park to provide for a bike path and eliminating gaps in sidewalk coverage along Main Street, from where the current sidewalk ends west of Old Gloucester Way to the intersection of US Route 17. These improvements are proposed to encourage non-motorized travel in the County's historic Courthouse Village and between the Village and Beaver Dam Park.
- Allocate \$252,000 in FY 2018 to fund the preliminary engineering phase of the project. The County will likely request additional funds in the future to complete the project.

45. Windsor North Court Street Sidewalk Extension – Isle of Wight County

- The project entails eliminating a gap in sidewalk coverage along North Court Street, south of Joyner Town Road. It is expected that the provision of pedestrian facilities will benefit a significant number of students that will be attending a new middle school scheduled for completion in 2012.
- Allocate \$375,000 in FY 2014 reserves.

sle 0 f Wight County

Hampton Roads MPA

Interstates

Major Roadwavs

Military and Intermodal Facilities

258

460

58

16



HRTPO CMAQ/RSTP Projects and Allocations | 2011 | Executive Summary | 10

[13]

Virg

Beach

n

6

3

12

] Miles

RSTP Project Selection and Funding Allocations

During the November 17, 2011 meeting, the HRTPO Board approved 4 current RSTP projects and 10 new projects to receive available allocations of RSTP through FY 2018. Current RSTP projects in need of additional funding to allow completion of a project or project were addressed first, followed by consideration of new RSTP project proposals. The HRTPO Board approved RSTP projects and allocations are summarized below. In addition, a map showing the locations of the recommended RSTP projects is included.

Previously Approved RSTP Projects with Funding Shortfalls

1. Atkinson Boulevard Construction (UPC# 4483) - Newport News

- Allocate \$6,000,000 in FY 2018 RSTP funds. Although the project was \$10,000,000 short, City staff stated that the City will be able to provide \$4,000,000 to fully fund the project through completion.
- 2. I-64 Interchange Improvements at Norview Avenue (UPC# 17824) Norfolk
 - Allocate \$556,000 from the FY 2012 RSTP Reserve to close a gap in construction funding and allow the project to be completed.
- 3. Skiffes Creek Connector (UPC# 100200) James City County
 - Allocate \$10,000,000 in FY 2018 RSTP funds. The project will still be approximately \$15,000,000 short of being fully funded. The County plans to request additional funds in the future to close the funding gap.
- 4. Stormwater Management Facilities at I-264/Frederick Boulevard Interchange (UPC# 97725) – Portsmouth
 - Allocate \$80,000 from FY 2012 RSTP Reserve to close a gap in construction funding and allow the project to be completed.

New RSTP Projects

- 5. Administration and Operations Facility: Phase 1 WATA
 - The project entails constructing an administration and operations facility for the Williamsburg Area Transit Authority.
 - Allocate \$3,700,000 in FY 2018 RSTP funds to fully fund Phase 1 of the project, which covers everything up to construction.
- 6. Centerville Turnpike Widening, from Kempsville Road to Indian River Road Virginia Beach
 - The project entails widening this section of roadway from two lanes to four or six lanes.
 - Allocate \$7,123,433 in FY 2018 RSTP funds to cover the Preliminary Engineering (PE) and Right of Way (RW) phases.

7. Croaker Road Widening and Multi-Purpose Trail – James City County

- The project entails widening Croaker Road from two to four lanes and an adjacent multi-purpose trail from Richmond Road to the James City County Library (approximately 0.5 mile).
- Allocate \$500,000 in FY 2018 RSTP funds to cover the Construction (CN) phase.

8. Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Upgrades – Suffolk

- The project entails providing fiber optic connectivity and ITS highway management system along the Route 58 corridor from the west end of the downtown Suffolk bypass to the Chesapeake city limits. The project includes installation of traffic sensors and dynamic message sign systems, as well as interoperability with the VDOT Transportation Operations Center.
- Allocate \$135,000 in FY 2018 RSTP funds to cover the PE phase.

9. Nansemond Parkway and Wilroy Road – Suffolk

- The intersection improvement project entails adding a right-turn lane on Nansemond Parkway and adding a left-turn lane on Wilroy Road.
- Allocate \$200,000 in FY 2018 RSTP funds to cover the PE phase.

10. Purchase Forty-Foot Buses – HRT

- The complete project entails the purchase of 41 forty-foot transit buses to replace buses that have reached the end of their useful life.
- Allocate \$1,314,289 in FY 2018 RSTP funds to purchase approximately three buses. HRT will return to request additional funds in future years to complete this project.

11. Regional Signal Preemption Program

- The project entails developing and executing a regional traffic signal preemption coding plan. A regional treatment of these systems, through allocating transponder code ranges by locality, will allow identification of appropriate users and lock out unauthorized users.
- Allocate \$133,000 in FY 2018 RSTP funds to fully fund the project.

12. Route 60 Multi-Modal Corridor Upgrade – James City County

- The project entails upgrading a 1.8 mile segment of Pocahontas Trail (Route 60) with a five-foot sidewalk and a five-foot paved shoulder and to include installation of trees, pedestrian lighting, and bus pull outs.
- Allocate \$800,000 in FY 2018 RSTP funds to cover the PE phase.

13. Turner Drive and Route 10/32 – Isle of Wight County

- The interchange improvement project entails adding a right-turn lane from Turner Drive onto Benns Church Boulevard (Route 10/32).
- Allocate \$300,000 in FY 2018 RSTP funds to fully fund the project.

14. U.S. Route 58 Bypass and Godwin Boulevard - Suffolk

- The interchange improvement project is focused on the westbound Route 58 Bypass offramp onto Godwin Boulevard and entails upgrading the interchange to a dual-right turn, single left-turn ramp along with associated traffic signal modifications.
- Allocate \$1,000,000 in FY 2018 RSTP funds to fully fund the project.





HRTPO CMAQ/RSTP Projects and Allocations | 2011 | Executive Summary | 14

Section II Background

INTRODUCTION

The Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) is the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Hampton Roads region of Virginia. As such, it is a federally mandated transportation policy board comprised of representatives from local, state, and federal governments, transit agencies, and other stakeholders and is responsible for transportation planning and programming for the Hampton Roads metropolitan planning area (MPA). The MPA is comprised of the cities of Chesapeake, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk Poquoson, Portsmouth, Suffolk, Virginia Beach, and Williamsburg; the counties of Isle of Wight, James City, and York; and a portion of Gloucester County. Among its functions, the HRTPO is responsible for project selection and allocation of funds under two federal programs – the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program and the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP).

The CMAQ program provides federal funding to states and localities for transportation projects and programs that help improve air quality and reduce traffic congestion. This funding is intended for areas designated by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as nonattainment or maintenance areas with regard to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). A *nonattainment area* is one that does not meet the NAAQS for one or more pollutant. A *maintenance area* is one that was originally designated a nonattainment area, but later met the NAAQS. Hampton Roads is currently a maintenance area for ozone.

The Surface Transportation Program (STP) provides federal funding that may be used by states and localities for a wide range of highway and transit projects. Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds are STP funds that are apportioned to specific regions within a state.

This report summarizes the work of selecting CMAQ and RSTP projects during the CMAQ/RSTP Project Selection Process of 2011. Projects selected received allocations of CMAQ or RSTP funds over the fiscal years 2012 through 2018.

ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS

Eligible recipients of CMAQ and RSTP funds in Hampton Roads include the localities within the MPA, Hampton Roads Transit (HRT), the Williamsburg Area Transit Authority (WATA), and state transportation agencies.

PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

The process for obtaining CMAQ or RSTP funding for transportation projects is a competitive one. According to the CMAQ/RSTP Project Selection Process that has been approved by the HRTPO Board, all project proposals are analyzed by the HRTPO staff using a specific set of evaluation criteria. The proposed projects are then ranked based on the results of the analyses. All proposed projects must be consistent with the current Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The LRTP is a financially-constrained transportation plan for the Hampton Roads MPA. The LRTP has a planning horizon of at least 20 years.

2011 CMAQ/RSTP PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS: STEPS AND SCHEDULE

Step		Schedule
1.	Solicit input from the Public on potential projects to be considered for CMAQ/RSTP funding.	6/29/11 - 7/31/11
2.	Applications for project proposals submitted by localities, transit agencies and state transportation agencies.	6/29/11 - 8/17/11
3.	Project evaluations completed by HRTPO staff.	By 9/30/11
4.	Transportation Programming Subcommittee (TPS) meeting to review proposed projects and recommend funding allocations.	10/12/11 & 11/9/11
5.	Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) meeting to consider recommendations of the TPS and makes a recommendation for consideration by the HRTPO Board.	11/2/11 & 12/7/11
6.	HRTPO Board meeting to consider TTAC recommendations regarding CMAQ/RSTP projects and funding allocations for final approval.	11/17/11 & 12/15/11

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The general public was invited to submit project ideas for possible CMAQ or RSTP funding. A public notice soliciting CMAQ and RSTP project ideas from the public was posted on June 29, 2011. A special CMAQ/RSTP Project Idea Form was provided for use by the public and posted on the HRTPO website. The deadline for submission of project ideas from the public was July 31, 2011. Project ideas submitted by the public were to be reviewed by HRTPO staff and then forwarded to the appropriate locality or agency for consideration as a possible project proposal. However, no input was received by the public as a result of this invitation.

In addition to the invitation for public involvement at the beginning of the process, all of the meetings associated with the CMAQ/RSTP Project Selection Process – meetings of the Transportation Programming Subcommittee (TPS), Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC), and HRTPO Board - were public meetings that included an opportunity for public comment at the beginning of each meeting. No public comments regarding the project selection process were received, verbally or in writing, during any of those meetings.

Finally, public notices were posted to solicit public comments on proposed amendments to the FY 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add or revise CMAQ and RSTP allocations that were approved by the HRTPO Board. The public review period regarding RSTP allocations ran from October 26, 2011 through November 9, 2011 and the public review period regarding CMAQ allocations ran from November 30, 2011 through December 14, 2011. No public comments were received with regard to the proposed TIP amendments.

Section III CMAQ Projects and Allocations

CMAQ PROJECT SELECTION

In Hampton Roads, projects are selected for funding with Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program funds based on the amount of air quality improvement expected per dollar spent. This is analyzed in terms of reductions in the emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NOx), which are precursors of ozone. The air quality aspect of the CMAQ analysis allows all types of CMAQ projects to be compared against one another.

The original analysis policies and procedures were developed in December 1992 after the passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). Over the years since 1992 the policies and procedures have been reviewed and revised. Details on the policies, procedures, and analysis methodologies used for CMAQ project selection are included in the *Guide to the HRTPO CMAQ and RSTP Project Selection Process*, which may be accessed on the HRTPO website at www.hrtpo.org.

To help insure that all of the necessary information is included with each project proposal, and to provide some uniformity to the way that project information is submitted, the HRTPO staff developed application forms to be used by when submitting CMAQ project proposals. The various *CMAQ Candidate Project Application Forms* may be accessed on the HRTPO website at www.hrtpo.org.

Prior to considering new projects to receive CMAQ allocations, the status of previously approved projects is reviewed to determine whether additional funding is required to allow for the completion of a project or project phase. The review of previously approved projects also includes determining whether those projects are progressing on schedule or whether funds should be:

- 1. reallocated to correspond with updated phase schedules, or
- 2. reallocated to other projects.

As shown in **Table 1**, during the 2011 project selection process, adjustments were made to the allocations on 15 previously approved projects to address changes in cost estimates and to advance funding on some of the projects to allow them to be completed sooner than originally scheduled.

After addressing the needs of previously approved CMAQ projects, new projects to receive CMAQ allocations were evaluated. **Table 2** shows all of the new projects proposed for CMAQ funding during the project selection process of 2011. As shown in the table, 35 candidate projects, with a total request of over \$75 million, were submitted.

Table 3 shows the scoring and ranking of the 35 candidate projects. As shown in the table, each project was scored and ranked based on its cost-effectiveness at reducing VOC and NOx emissions. The ranks for VOC and NOx reduction were summed to produce the composite ranking. The detailed evaluation and scoring worksheets for each of the CMAQ candidate projects are included in **Appendix A**.

Table 4 shows the 29 new projects that were ultimately approved by the HRTPO Board on December 15, 2011 to receive CMAQ allocations in fiscal years 2012 through 2018. It should be noted that the total CMAQ funding expected to be available from FY 2012 through FY 2018, including the 20 percent state match, was approximately \$39.3 million.

Projects
CMAQ
Approved
previously ,
ions to l
Allocat
2-2018
FY 201
Table 1

Project Name FY 2013 FY 2013 FY 2014 FY 2015 FY 2013											
Production FY 2013 FY 2013 FY 2014 FY 2015 FY 2014 FY 2015 FY 2014 FY 2010	Andicat		Project Name				AIIOCe	ations			
mption 5500,000 5500,000 5700,000 <				FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	Total
ker & System Additions image	Chesapeake Emergency Vehicle Preen	Emergency Vehicle Preen	nption	\$500,000			\$0	\$0			\$500,000
wements to Route 17 533,258 526,281 . 5 5 532,05 ements to Route 216 526,000 \$200,000 \$858,583 \$134,58 ements to Route 216 \$567,000 \$575,00	Chesapeake Traffic Management Cent	Traffic Management Cent	er & System Additions		\$300,000	\$1,000,000	\$700,000	\$0	\$0		\$2,000,000
ements to Route 216 i i j	Gloucester Co Bicycle-Pedestrian Improv	Bicycle-Pedestrian Improv	ements to Route 17	\$53,258	\$267,281		\$0	\$0			\$320,539
tersection Improvements §75,000 S75,000 S495,000 S496,000	Gloucester Co Bicycle-Pedestrian Improv	Bicycle-Pedestrian Improv	ements to Route 216				\$260,000	\$200,000	\$885,853		\$1,345,853
40 [°] Buses 52,689,477 53,607,260 54,951,032 53,357,231 ··· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ·· ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ·· ··< ·· ·· ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ··< ·· ··<	Hampton Big Bethel Rd/Todds Ln In	Big Bethel Rd/Todds Ln Ini	tersection Improvements	\$675,000							\$675,000
(1) (2) <td>HRT Purchase 38 Replacement</td> <td>Purchase 38 Replacement</td> <td>40' Buses</td> <td>\$2,689,477</td> <td>\$3,607,260</td> <td>\$4,951,032</td> <td>\$3,352,231</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$14,600,000</td>	HRT Purchase 38 Replacement	Purchase 38 Replacement	40' Buses	\$2,689,477	\$3,607,260	\$4,951,032	\$3,352,231				\$14,600,000
on Strategic Plan & Deployment \$150,000 \$1,650,000 \$500,000 \$500,000 \$500,000 \$500,000 \$1,650,00 R (T9143) \$400,000 \$675,000 \$677,000	HRT TRAFFIX Funding	TRAFFIX Funding		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,100,000	\$7,100,000
(T9143) (400,000	Regional Regional Opticom Preempti	Regional Opticom Preemptic	on Strategic Plan & Deployment			\$150,000	\$1,000,000	\$500,000	\$0		\$1,650,000
Bridge Rd/Bennetts Pasture Rd \$75,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$610,000 \$	Suffolk Godwin Blvd Park & Ride Lot	Godwin Blvd Park & Ride Lot	: (T9143)	\$400,000							\$400,000
Bridge Rd/Lee Farm Ln \$75,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$677,339 \$667,330 \$667,330 \$677,330 \$677,330 \$677,330 \$677,330 \$677,330 \$677,330 \$677,330 \$677,330 \$677,330 \$677,330 \$677,330 \$677,330 \$665,332 \$655,332 \$655,332 \$655,332 \$655,332 \$655,332 \$655,332 \$657,332 \$655,332 \$657,332 \$657,332 \$657,332 \$657,332 \$657,332 \$657,332 \$657,332<	Suffolk Intersection Improvement -	Intersection Improvement -	Bridge Rd/Bennetts Pasture Rd	\$75,000	\$675,000		\$0	\$0	\$0		\$750,000
le Lot \$75,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$675,000 \$677,000 \$671,000 <t< td=""><td>Suffolk Intersection Improvement</td><td>Intersection Improvement</td><td>- Bridge Rd/Lee Farm Ln</td><td>\$75,000</td><td>\$675,000</td><td></td><td></td><td>\$¢</td><td>\$0</td><td></td><td>\$750,000</td></t<>	Suffolk Intersection Improvement	Intersection Improvement	- Bridge Rd/Lee Farm Ln	\$75,000	\$675,000			\$¢	\$0		\$750,000
Route 5320,000 5327,389 50 50 50 50 507,3 Buses \$2,386,000 \$2,204,000 \$1,513,000 \$1 \$6,103,0 \$6,103,0 Buses \$2,386,000 \$2,204,000 \$1,513,000 \$1 \$6,103,0	Suffolk Portsmouth Blvd Park & Ri	Portsmouth Blvd Park & Rid	de Lot	\$75,000	\$675,000		\$0	¢			\$750,000
Buses \$2,386,000 \$0 \$2,204,000 \$1,513,000 \$1,513,000 \$1,513,000 \$6,103,0 \$10,000 \$117,654 \$2,204,000 \$1,513,000 \$1,513,000 \$1,513,000 \$2,204,000 <td>WATA New Service - Mounts Bay</td> <td>New Service - Mounts Bay</td> <td>Route</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>\$350,000</td> <td>\$327,389</td> <td>\$</td> <td>\$0</td> <td></td> <td>\$677,389</td>	WATA New Service - Mounts Bay	New Service - Mounts Bay	Route			\$350,000	\$327,389	\$	\$0		\$677,389
\$10,000 \$117,654 \$317,6 Total Allocations \$8,128,725 \$7,317,195 \$9,655,032 \$8,152,620 \$1,700,000 \$1,885,853 \$1,100,000 \$37,939,4	WATA Purchase 12 Replacement	Purchase 12 Replacement	Buses	\$2,386,000	\$0	\$2,204,000	\$1,513,000				\$6,103,000
Total Allocations \$8,128,725 \$7,317,195 \$9,655,032 \$8,152,620 \$1,700,000 \$1,885,853 \$1,100,000 \$37,939,4	York County Capitol Landing Bike way	Capitol Landing Bikeway		\$199,990	\$117,654						\$317,644
			Total Allocations	\$8,128,725	\$7,317,195	\$9,655,032	\$8,152,620	\$1,700,000	\$1,885,853	\$1,100,000	\$37,939,425

Note: As part of the CMAQ strategy approved by the HRTPO Board on December 15, 2011, the allocations highlighted in green-colored text indicate the adjustments made to previously approved CMAQ projects.

Number	Applicant	Project Name	Total Cost	CMAQ Request
1	Gloucester Co	Shared Roadway Bike Path Along Roaring Springs Road (SR 616) and sidewalk gap correction along Main St (Bus 17)	\$1,619,000	\$1,619,000
2	Hampton	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade Phase 4	\$553,000	\$553,000
3	Hampton	Cunningham Drive Sidewalk Project	\$920,000	\$920,000
4	Hampton	Traffic Signal System Retiming	\$698,000	\$698,000
5	HRT	Purchase 29 Twenty-Nine-Foot Buses	\$10,875,000	\$10,875,000
6	HRT	Purchase 33 Paratransit Vans	\$2,640,000	\$2,640,000
7	HRT	Purchase 41 Forty-Foot Buses	\$16,195,000	\$16,195,000
8	HRT	Purchase One Replacement Ferry	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
9	Isle of Wight Co	Main St at Route 10 sidewalk extension	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
10	Isle of Wight Co	Windsor North Court St sidewalk extension	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
11	James City Co	Intersection Improvements - Centerville Rd & News Rd	\$445,000	\$445,000
12	James City Co	Intersection Improvements - Pocahontas Tr & Blow Flats Rd	\$450,000	\$450,000
13	James City Co	Intersection Improvements - Route 199 & Brookwood Dr	\$275,000	\$275,000
14	James City Co	Intersection Improvements - Route 199 West Ramp at Richmond Rd	\$650,000	\$650,000
15	Newport News	Citywide Pedestrian Enhancements	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
16	Newport News	Citywide Signal Timing	\$900,000	\$900,000
17	Newport News	Ft. Eustis MAX Express Bus	\$150,000	\$150,000
18	Newport News	Lee Hall Bus Transfer Center	\$250,000	\$250,000
19	Norfolk	Citywide Signal Re-timing Phase 3	\$600,000	\$600,000
20	Norfolk	Research Partnership with Virginia Universities	\$300,000	\$300,000
21	Poquoson	Poquoson Traffic Signal Upgrade	\$260,000	\$260,000
22	Poquoson	South Lawson Park Bike Path	\$195,100	\$195,100
23	Portsmouth	Clifford/Bart/South St Bike Boulevard	\$500,000	\$500,000
24	Portsmouth	Signal System Citywide Upgrades	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000
25	Suffolk	Bridge Road Signal Coordination and ITS Network	\$1,257,000	\$1,257,000
26	Suffolk	Route 10 and 13 - Turnouts	\$458,000	\$458,000
27	Suffolk	Shoulders Hill Rd/Nansemond Pkwy/Wilroy Rd Signal Coordination and ITS Network	\$2,454,000	\$2,454,000
28	Suffolk	Shoulders Hill Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	\$272,000	\$272,000
29	Virginia Beach	Intersection Improvements - First Colonial Rd & Laskin Rd	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
30	VPA	Green Operator - Ocean-Going Vessel Hybridization & Fuel Switching Demo Project	\$10,400,000	\$5,000,000
31	VPA	Green Operator - Truck Replacement Program	\$6,400,000	\$3,000,000
32	WATA	ADA Body-n-Chassis Bus Replacements	\$1,083,000	\$1,083,000
33	WATA	CNG Bus Replacement	\$3,073,000	\$3,073,000
34	WATA	Hybrid Bus Capital Replacements	\$6,480,000	\$6,480,000
35	WATA	Trolley Bus Replacements	\$2,018,000	\$2,018,000
		Total (MAQ Requests	\$75,570,100

Table 2 2011 CMAQ Candidate Projects

r
0rde
Ranked
iects in
te Proj
Candida
СМАQ
2011
Table 3

			Cost Effect	tiveness		Ranking	
Number	Applicant	Project Name	Cost per Ton (VOC)	Cost per Ton (NOx)	VOC Rank	NOx Rank	Composite Score ¹
1	Norfolk	Research Partnership with Virginia Universities ^{2,3}	Qualitative	Qualitative	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	VPA	Green Operator - Truck Replacement Program	\$5,356	\$1,243	3	1	4
3	Newport News	Citywide Signal Timing	\$2,213	\$4,416	1	3	4
4	Hampton	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade Phase 4	\$2,717	\$5,421	2	4	9
5	VPA	Green Operator - Ocean-Going Vessel Hybridization & Fuel Switching Demo Project	\$22,337	\$3,606	7	2	6
9	Norfolk	Citywide Signal Re-timing Phase 3	\$7,097	\$14,160	4	5	6
7	Newport News	Citywide Pedestrian Enhancements	\$7,197	\$14,360	5	9	11
8	Hampton	Traffic Signal System Retiming	\$7,384	\$22,627	9	8	14
6	Newport News	Lee Hall Bus Transfer Center	\$35,246	\$37,204	8	10	18
10	HRT	Purchase One Replacement Ferry	\$429,129	\$16,599	15	7	22
11	Poquoson	Poquoson Traffic Signal Upgrade	\$62,887	\$125,482	6	13	22
12	Ja mes City Co	Intersection Improvements - Route 199 & Brookwood Dr	\$92,683	\$291,800	10	15	25
13	Ja mes City Co	Intersection Improvements - Route 199 West Ramp at Richmond Rd	\$96,648	\$304,284	11	16	27
14	Suffolk	Bridge Road Signal Coordination and ITS Network	\$104,943	\$321,585	12	17	29
15	Portsmouth	Signal System Citywide Upgrades	\$230,724	\$460,374	13	18	31
16	HRT	Purchase 29 Twenty-Nine-Foot Buses	\$1,664,208	\$37,393	21	11	32
17	HRT	Purchase 41 Forty-Foot Buses	\$2,182,191	\$33,583	24	6	33
18	Portsmouth	Clifford/Bart/South St Bike Boulevard	\$851,350	\$898,637	17	19	36
19	Suffolk	Shoulders Hill Rd/Nans emond Pkwy/Wilroy Rd Signal Coordination and ITS Network	\$649,363	\$1,989,895	16	22	38
20	Poquoson	South Lawson Park Bike Path	\$1,328,788	\$1,402,592	20	21	41
21	WATA	Trolley Bus Replacements	negative	\$78,825	34	12	46
22	WATA	Hybrid Bus Capital Replacements	\$244,890,000	\$144,053	32	14	46
23	Hampton	Cunningham Drive Sidewalk Project	\$2,128,055	\$2,246,253	23	23	46
24	Newport News	Ft. Eustis MAX Express Bus	\$374,901	negative	14	32	46
25	Virginia Beach	Intersection Improvements - First Colonial Rd & Laskin Rd	\$1,720,624	\$5,417,192	22	25	47
26	WATA	CNG Bus Replacement	\$6,771,650	\$1,053,368	28	20	48
27	Suffolk	Shoulders Hill Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	\$2,565,054	\$2,707,523	25	24	49
28	нкт	Purchase 33 Paratransit Vans	\$857,958	no change	18	31	49
29	WATA	ADA Body-n-Chassis Bus Replacements	\$1,209,855	no change	19	31	50
30	Isle of Wight Co	Main St at Route 10 sidewalk extension	\$6,742,696	\$7,117,203	27	26	53
31	Ja mes City Co	Intersection Improvements - Centerville Rd & News Rd	\$2,999,543	\$9,443,723	26	28	54
32	Gloucester Co	Shared Roadway Bike Path Along Roaring Springs Road (SR 616) and sidewalk gap correction along Main St (Bus 17)	\$7,939,218	\$8,380,183	29	27	56
33	Isle of Wight Co	Windsor North Court St sidewalk extension	\$22,986,463	\$24,263,193	30	29	59
34	Suffolk	Route 10 and 13 - Turnouts	\$58,164,425	\$61,881,441	31	30	61
35	Ja mes City Co	Intersection Improvements - Pocahontas Tr & Blow Flats Rd	no change	no change	33	31	64
1	The Composite Score	is computed as follows:					

Finally, the sequential numbers for VOC reduction and NOx reduction are added together to produce the Composite Score. Lower numbers are better. Second, projects are sorted in ascending order based on the Cost/Benefit for VOC reduction and numbered sequentially. Lower numbers are better. Third, projects are sorted in ascending order based on the Cost/Benefit for NOx reduction and numbered sequentially. Lower numbers are better.

First, projects are evaluated for their estimated impacts on the reduction of VOCs and NOx.

2 This project could not be evaluated quantitatively and, although it appears at the top of the table, it is not actually ranked. ³ This project received funding previously, but the City later requested that all of the funds be transferred to the Norfolk LRT project.

	Total	\$3,000,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 553,000	\$4,000,000	\$ 600,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 698,000	\$ 250,000	\$2,000,000	\$ 260,000	\$ 275,000	\$ 455,000	\$1,257,000	\$3,000,000	\$2,802,166	\$2,000,000	\$ 500,000	\$2,748,000	\$ 195,100	\$ 432,000	\$3,208,000	\$ 920,000	\$1,000,000	\$ 878,000	\$ 272,000	\$ 165,000	\$ 70,000	\$ 252,000	¢ 375,000
	FY 2018				\$1,000,000		\$ 250,000					\$ 75,000	\$ 350,000	\$1,107,000	\$1,500,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$ 500,000	\$2,748,000	\$ 195,100	\$ 432,000	\$3,208,000	\$ 920,000	\$1,000,000	\$ 878,000	\$ 272,000		\$ 70,000	\$ 252,000	
	FY 2017	\$1,000,000	\$ 300,000		\$1,000,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 250,000			\$2,000,000	\$ 260,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 63,828	\$ 150,000	\$1,500,000	\$ 802,166														
cations	FY 2016	\$1,000,000	\$ 300,000		\$1,000,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 698,000	\$ 125,000			\$ 25,000	\$ 41,172																	
Allo	FY 2015	\$1,000,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 553,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 200,000			\$ 125,000			\$ 50,000															\$ 165,000			
	FY 2014																													\$375,000
	FY 2013				\$500,000																									
	FY 2012																													
	Project Name	Green Operator - Truck Replacement Program	Citywide Signal Timing	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade Phase 4	Green Operator - Ocean-Going Vessel Hybridization & Fuel Switching Demo Project	Citywide Signal Re-timing Phase 3	Citywide Pedestrian Enhancements	Traffic Signal System Retiming	Lee Hall Bus Transfer Center	Purchase One Replacement Ferry	Poquoson Traffic Signal Upgrade	Intersection Improvements - Route 199 & Brookwood Dr	Intersection Improvements - Route 199 West Ramp at Richmond Rd	Bridge Road Signal Coordination and ITS Network	Signal System Citywide Upgrades	Purchase 29 Twenty-Nine-Foot Buses	Purchase 41 Forty-Foot Buses	Clifford/Bart/South St Bike Boulevard	Shoulders Hill Rd/Nansemond Pkwy/Wilroy Rd Signal Coordination and ITS Network	South Lawson Park Bike Path	Trolley Bus Replacements	Hybrid Bus Capital Replacements	Cunningham Drive Sidewalk Project	Intersection Improvements - First Colonial Rd & Laskin Rd	CNG Bus Replacement	Shoulders Hill Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements	Main St at Route 10 sidewalk extension	Intersection Improvements - Centerville Rd & News Rd	Shared Roadway Bike Path Along Roaring Springs Road (SR 616) and sidewalk gap lcorrection along Main St (Bus 17)	Windsor North Court St sidewalk extension
	Applicant	VPA	Newport News	Hampton	VPA	Norfolk	Newport News	Hampton	Newport News	нкт	Poquoson	James City Co	James City Co	Suffolk	Portsmouth	нкт	нкт	Portsmouth	Suffolk	Poquoson	WATA	WATA	Hampton	Virginia Beach	WATA	Suffolk	Isle of Wight Co	James City Co	Gloucester Co	Isle of Wight Co
	Number	1	2	Э	4	5	9	7	8	6	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29

 Table 4
 FY 2012-2018 Allocations to New CMAQ Projects

Section IV RSTP Projects and Allocations
RSTP PROJECT SELECTION

Projects selected for funding with Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds must meet certain criteria originally developed in 1992 and reviewed and revised since. Details on the policies, procedures, and analysis methodologies used for RSTP project selection are included in the *Guide to the HRTPO CMAQ and RSTP Project Selection Process*, which may be accessed on the HRTPO website at <u>www.hrtpo.org</u>.

To help insure that all of the necessary information is included with each project proposal, and to provide some uniformity to the way that project information is submitted, HRTPO staff developed application forms to be used when submitting RSTP project proposals. The various *RSTP Candidate Project Application Forms* may be accessed on the HRTPO website at <u>www.hrtpo.org</u>.

Prior to considering new projects to receive RSTP allocations, the status of previously approved projects is reviewed to determine whether additional funding is required to allow for the completion of a project or project phase. The review of previously approved projects also includes determining whether those projects are progressing on schedule or whether funds should be:

- 1. reallocated to correspond with updated phase schedules, or
- 2. reallocated to other projects.

Table 5 shows adjustments were made to the allocations on four previously approved projects to help close funding gaps during the 2011 project selection process.

After addressing the needs of previously approved RSTP projects, new RSTP projects to receive available RSTP funding were considered. **Table 6** shows all of the new projects proposed for RSTP projects for RSTP funding during the project selection process in 2011. As shown in the table, 32 candidate projects, with a total request of \$208 million, were submitted.

The analysis of RSTP project proposals is more qualitative in nature than the CMAQ analysis. Unlike the CMAQ analysis, RSTP projects must be placed into categories and only projects within the same category can be compared against one another. Therefore, a predetermination must be made with regard to the proportions of available funds that will be allocated to the various categories of projects. **Table 7** indicates the scoring and ranking of the 32 candidate projects. The detailed evaluation and scoring worksheets for each of the newly selected RSTP projects are included in **Appendix B**.

Table 8 shows 10 new projects that were ultimately approved by the HRTPO Board on November 17, 2011 to receive RSTP allocations in fiscal years 2012 through 2018 and associated annual allocations. The total RSTP funding expected to be available from FY 2012 through FY 2018, including the 20 percent state match, was approximately \$41.6 million.

Table 5 | FY 2012-2018 Allocations to Previously Approved RSTP Projects

							Allocations			
	A see l'anna									
Numbe	Applicant		FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	Total
1	Portsmouth	Drainage Pond Construction near I-264 & Frederick Blvd	\$ 80,000							\$ 80,000
2	Newport News	Atkinson Blvd - Construct New Road		\$ 955,876			\$ 10,000,000	\$ 31,205,722	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 48,161,598
3	Norfolk	I-64 Interchange Improvements at Norview Ave	\$ 556,000							\$ 556,000
4	James City Co	Skiffes Creek Connector							\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000
		Total Allocations	\$ 636,000	\$ 955,876	÷ ۔	÷ ۲	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 31,205,722	\$ 16,000,000	\$ 58,797,598

Note: The allocations highlighted in green-colored text indicate the adjustments made to previously approved RSTP projects.

					_	
Number	Applicant	Project Name		Total Cost		STP Request
Highway Pı	rojects					
1	Isle of Wight Co	Right turn lane at Turner Dr (Route 644) onto Route 10/32	\$	300,000	\$	300,000
2	James City Co	Croaker Rd Widening & Multi-Purpose Trail	\$	12,550,000	\$	11,000,000
3	Newport News	Atkinson Blvd - Construct New Road	\$	52,000,000	\$	10,000,000
4	Norfolk	I-264/Ballentine Blvd/Light Rail Crossing - Modified Diverging Diamond Interchange	\$	5,000,000	\$	5,000,000
5	Suffolk	Godwin Blvd Interchange Improvement	\$	1,000,000	\$	1,000,000
6	Suffolk	U.S. Route 58/Holland Rd Corridor Improvements	\$	72,500,000	\$	60,000,000
7	Suffolk	Nansmond Pkwy & Wilroy Rd Intersection Improvements	\$	1,420,000	\$	1,420,000
8	Virginia Beach	Centerville Tpke Widening - Kempsville Rd to Indian River Rd	\$	24,000,000	\$	24,000,000
9	Virginia Beach	Centerville Tpke Widening - Lynnhaven Pkwy to Kempsville Rd	\$	38,000,000	\$	38,000,000
Intermodal	Projects					
10	James City Co	Route 60 Multi-Modal Corridor Upgrade	\$	6,100,000	\$	6,100,000
Transit - Pa	issenger					
11	HRT	Evelyn Butts Transfer Station	\$	1,000,000	\$	1,000,000
12	HRT	Install 200 Bus Shelters	\$	1,600,000	\$	1,600,000
13	HRT	Military Circle Transfer Area	\$	750,000	\$	750,000
14	HRT	Oceanview Transfer Area	\$	650,000	\$	650,000
15	HRT	Pacific Ave Transfer Area Upgrades	\$	550,000	\$	550,000
16	HRT	Pleasure House Rd Transfer Area Upgrades	\$	250,000	\$	250,000
17	HRT	Rehabilitate Reon Dr Transfer Center	\$	350,000	\$	350,000
18	HRT	Town Center/Pembroke Mall Transfer Station	\$	750,000	\$	750,000
19	HRT	Victory Crossing Park & Ride Lot	\$	225,000	\$	225,000
Transit - Ve	chicle		-			
20	HRT	Purchase 29 Twenty-Nine-Foot Buses	\$	10,875,000	\$	10,875,000
21	HRT	Purchase 41 Forty-Foot Buses	\$	16,195,000	\$	16,195,000
Transit - Ot	ther		-			
22	HRT	Concrete Pavement Repair/Replacement	\$	600,000	\$	600,000
23	HRT	LEED Existing Building Upgrades	\$	200,000	\$	200,000
24	HRT	Renovate Parks Ave Maintenance Facility	\$	1,000,000	\$	1,000,000
25	HRT	Solar Lights Upgrade	\$	500,000	\$	500,000
26	HRT	Transfer Area Bathroom Design & Construction	\$	1,000,000	\$	1,000,000
27	WATA	Administration & Operations Facility	\$	9,000,000	\$	9,000,000
Plannina St	tudies		L ·			
28	HRT	Completion of Before & After Study of Norfolk LRT Project	\$	800,000	\$	800,000
29	VPA	Economic Analysis of Toll Pricing in Hampton Roads (effect of toll rates on freight bus.)	Ś	400.000	Ś	400.000
ITS Projects	5		<u> </u>	,		
30	Suffolk	Suffolk Bypass, ITS Upgrades	\$	1,650.000	\$	1,650.000
31	Suffolk	Suffolk Traffic Operations Center (TOC)	Ś	3,000.000	\$	3,000.000
32	Virginia Beach	Regional Signal Pre-Emption Program	¢	133,000	Ś	133,000
		Tot	al R	STP Requests	Ś	208.298.000

Table 6 2011 RSTP Candidate Projects

Number	Applicant	Project Name	Score (Max=100)		
Highway P	rojects				
1	Virginia Beach	Centerville Tpke Widening - Kempsville Rd to Indian River Rd	69		
2	Suffolk	Godwin Blvd Interchange Improvement	69		
3	Suffolk	U.S. Route 58/Holland Rd Corridor Improvements	63		
4	Virginia Beach	Centerville Tpke Widening - Lynnhaven Pkwy to Kempsville Rd	54		
5	Isle of Wight Co	Right turn lane at Turner Dr (Route 644) onto Route 10/32	53		
6	Suffolk	Nansmond Pkwy & Wilroy Rd Intersection Improvements	50		
7	Norfolk	I-264/Ballentine Blvd/Light Rail Crossing - Modified Diverging Diamond Interchange	50		
8	Newport News	Atkinson Blvd - Construct New Road	50		
9	James City Co	Croaker Rd Widening & Multi-Purpose Trail	48		
Intermodal	Projects				
10	James City Co	Route 60 Multi-Modal Corridor Upgrade	48		
Transit - Po	issenger				
11	HRT	Install 200 Bus Shelters	50		
12	HRT	Town Center/Pembroke Mall Transfer Station	30		
13	HRT	Military Circle Transfer Area	28		
14	14 HRT Pleasure House Rd Transfer Area Upgrades				
15	15 HRT Pacific Ave Transfer Area Upgrades				
16	16 HRT Oceanview Transfer Area				
17	17 HRT Evelyn Butts Transfer Station				
18	17 INIT Everyin butts framer station 18 HRT Rehabilitate Reon Dr Transfer Center				
19	HRT	Victory Crossing Park & Ride Lot	4		
Transit - Ve	hicle				
20	HRT	Purchase 41 Forty-Foot Buses	50		
21	HRT	Purchase 29 Twenty-Nine-Foot Buses	50		
Transit - Ot	ther				
22	WATA	Administration & Operations Facility	45		
23	HRT	Solar Lights Upgrade	27.5		
24	HRT	Renovate Parks Ave Maintenance Facility	17.5		
25	HRT	Transfer Area Bathroom Design & Construction	17.5		
26	HRT	Concrete Pavement Repair/Replacement	12.5		
27	HRT	LEED Existing Building Upgrades	5		
Planning St	udies				
28	VPA	Economic Analysis of Toll Pricing in Hampton Roads (effect of toll rates on freight bus.)	45		
29	HRT	Completion of Before & After Study of Norfolk LRT Project	42.5		
ITS Projects					
30	Suffolk	Suffolk Bypass, ITS Upgrades	56.5		
31	Suffolk	Suffolk Traffic Operations Center (TOC)	56.5		
32	Virginia Beach	Regional Signal Pre-Emption Program	32		

Table 7 2011 RSTP Candidate Projects in Ranked Order

Projects
RSTP I
New
to
Allocations
FY 2012-2018
Table 8

						AI	locations			
Number	Applicant	Project Name	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	Total
1	Virginia Beach	Centerville Tpke Widening - Kempsville Rd to Indian River Rd							\$7,123,433	\$ 7,123,433
2	Suffolk	Godwin Blvd Interchange Improvement							\$1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000
3	Isle of Wight Co	Right turn lane at Turner Dr (Route 644) onto Route 10/32							\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000
4	Suffolk	Nansmond Pkwy & Wilroy Rd Intersection Improvements							\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000
ß	James City Co	Croaker Rd Widening & Multi-Purpose Trail							\$ 500,000	\$ 500,000
9	James City Co	Route 60 Multi-Modal Corridor Upgrade							\$ 800,000	\$ 800,000
7	нкт	Purchase 41 Forty-Foot Buses							\$1,314,289	\$ 1,314,289
8	WATA	Administration & Operations Facility							\$3,700,000	\$ 3,700,000
6	Suffolk	Suffolk Bypass, ITS Upgrades							\$ 135,000	\$ 135,000
10	Virginia Beach	Regional Signal Pre-Emption Program							\$ 133,000	\$ 133,000

Section V Appendices

APPENDIX A

CMAQ Project Evaluation Worksheets

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

JURISDICTION:Gloucester CountyPROJECT NAME:Roaring Springs Rd and Main Street Bike/Ped Improvements
Roaring Springs Rd from Route 17 to Beaverdam ParkLOCATION:Main Street from Old Gloucester Way to Route 17DESCRIPTION:Add pedestrian/bicycle path to Roaring Springs Rd and connect gaps in sidewalk on Main StreetDATE:8/15/2011 (on application)PROJECT COST:\$1,619,000

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Ground counts for reasonableness check re: CMAQ Post Evaluation study (12).

Bikeway	Bicycle Count	s		Pedestrian Co	ounts	
			Avg. Day			<u>Avg. Day</u>
	Weekday	Weekend	Estimate	Weekday	Weekend	Estimate
Sampled Bikeway	Counts	<u>Counts</u>	(1)	Counts	<u>Counts</u>	(1)
Goodwin Neck	2	4	3	0	0	0
Warwick Blvd	13	31	18	11	10	11
Col. Pkwy Conn.	34	81	47	7	5	6
Average:	16	39	23	6	5	6

Demand estimation for proposed facility re: NCHRP Report 552:

Local Bicycle Commute Share (C):	0.3%	(2)
Facility Length (L):	2.40	mi. ⁽¹³⁾

		2009			<u>Existing</u>			
		Density			Adult		Existing	New
Buffer,		(D),	Area of	Residents in	<u>Cyclists</u>	New	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Adult</u>
Distance from		persons/	<u>Buffer (A),</u>	Buffer	<u>(R*C*0.8)</u>	Adult Cyclists	Pedestrians	Pedestrians
Project	TAZ (13)	sq.mi.	<u>sq.mi</u> . ⁽⁶⁾	(R=D*A)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(5)
0.00-0.25 mi.	1427	553	1.20	664	2	4	1	1
0.25-0.50 mi.	1428	751	1.20	901	2	2	1	1
0.50-1.00 mi.	1446	297	2.40	714	2	1	1	0
				2,279	6	7	3	2

Checking reasonableness of bicycle demand estimation via comparison to ground counts:

Existing Adult Cyclists:	6 above
New Adult Cyclists:	7 above
Total Adult Cyclists:	13
Trips, per day per cyclist:	2 trip to destination + return trip
Total Trips per Day:	26
vs. Trips on Sampled Bikeways:	23 above
	Therefore, the demand calculation results are reasonable

Calculating VMT reduction:

	Biking	<u>Walking</u>	
New Users:	7	2 above	
Trips, per day per user:	2	2 trip to c	lestination + return trip
New Person Trips on Facility:	14	4	
Eliminated Person Trips by Auto:	14	4 above	(7)
Occupancy of Eliminated Auto Trips:	1.25	1.25 ⁽¹¹⁾	
Eliminated Vehicle Trips (Auto):	11	3	
Avg. Alt. Mode Trip Length, mi.:	2	1 ⁽⁹⁾	
Factor (for converting alt. mode trip lengths):	2	2 (10)	
Avg. Eliminated Auto Trip Length, veh-mi.	4	2	
VMT Reduction, mi:	44	6	
		Total:	50 vehicle-miles

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/mi ⁽⁸⁾	VMT Reduction, mi/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, days/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	0.676	50	34	0.034	365	12
NOx	0.640	50	32	0.032	365	12

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Total Cost: Useful life, years: Annual Cost: \$1,619,000 above

15 as assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years \$107,933

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (above)	Cost Effective- ness, \$/kg	Con- version Factor, kg/ton	Cost Effective- ness, \$/ton
VOC	\$107,933	12	\$8,753	907	\$7,939,218
NOx	\$107,933	12	\$9,239	907	\$8,380,183

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ Average Day Estimate = [(Weekday Count * 5) + (Weekend Count * 2)] / 7

⁽²⁾ "A Review of 2000 Census Commute Data for Hampton Roads", HRPDC, Nov. 2005, p. 28

⁽³⁾ "Low" estimate, re: NCHRP Report 552, pg. 38

⁽⁴⁾ "New": i.e. as a result of proposed facility; New = Existing * B, where B varies

by buffer: 0-0.25mi: 1.93; 0.25-0.50mi: 1.11; 0.50-1.00mi: 0.39, re: NCHRP Report 552, pg. 39 ⁽⁵⁾ Pedestrians = Cyclists / 4, based on ground counts at top of page

⁽⁶⁾ Only areas lateral to facility are included in buffers; semi-circular areas at ends of facility are not included in buffers

⁽⁷⁾ Assuming each new alt. mode trip eliminates an auto trip

⁽⁸⁾ Source: VDOT, Hampton Roads average for light duty vehicles and roadway functional classes, 2011, 35mph

⁽⁹⁾ Source: 2001 NHTS Table Designer

⁽¹⁰⁾ It is assumed that the eliminated auto trips will have length lower than regular auto trips (10 miles; source ⁽⁹⁾) and higher than regular alt. mode trips (shown above).

⁽¹¹⁾ All-trip occupancy, based on occupancies assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years: work- 1.1; non-work- 1.3

⁽¹²⁾ HRPDC, Feb. 2003, Appendix C

⁽¹³⁾ From application

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY CITYWIDE SIGNAL SYSTEM

JURISDICTION:	Hampton
PROJECT NAME:	Citywide Traffic Signal Upgrade, Phase IV
LOCATION:	Citywide
DESCRIPTION:	Upgrade preemption system, advanced traffic signal cabinet components, advanced video components, Computerized interface units, and a TS2 traffic cabinet analyzer.
DATE:	8/10/2011 (1)
PROJECT COST:	\$553,000

1 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION		Low Volume Intersections	<u>Medium</u> <u>Volume</u> Intersections	High Volume Intersections	Total Intersections
	veh / pm pk hr:	Less than 2,690	2,690 to 5,900	More than 5,900	
Number of Intersections ^{(1):}	Γ	45	58	7	110
	multiplied by:	2,690	5,900	9,500	veh / pm pk hr ⁽²⁾
	multiplied by:	10.7	10.7	10.7	sec/veh ⁽²⁾
	divided by:	3,600	3,600	3,600	sec/hr
	divided by:	0.17	0.17	0.17	delay factor (3)
Change in Vehicle Delay:		2,116	5,983	1,163	hrs/day

Total Change in Vehicle Delay (sum of 3 col's above):

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/hr ⁽⁴⁾	Change in Veh Delay, hr/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day ⁽⁵⁾	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, wkdays/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	7.973	9,262	73,848	73.8	250	18,462
NOx	3.996	9,262	37,010	37.0	250	9,252

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:		\$553,000 (from above)
Useful Life, years:		10 (2)
	Annual Cost:	\$55,300

		Emissions	Cost		Cost
	Cost, \$/yr	Reduction,	Effectiveness,	Conversion	Effectiveness,
Туре	(above)	kg/yr (above)	\$/kg	Factor, kg/ton	\$/ton
VOC	\$55,300	18,462	\$3.00	907	\$2,717
NOx	\$55,300	9,252	\$5.98	907	\$5,421

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ From application

⁽²⁾ As previously assumed

⁽³⁾ Portion of daily delay represented by peak hour

Source: "Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements", HRPDC, June 1997.

⁽⁴⁾ VDOT, Hampton Roads Average for all vehicle types and roadway functional classes, 2011, idle

⁽⁵⁾ Emission Factor * Change in Vehicle Delay

9,262 hrs/day

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

JURISDICTION:HamptonPROJECT NAME:Cunningham Drive Sidewalk ProjectLOCATION:Cunningham Drive from Todds Lane to Mercury BoulevardDESCRIPTION:Design and installation of a sidewalk on both sides of Cunningham Drive (partial sidewalk exists)DATE:8/9/2011 (on application)PROJECT COST:\$920,000

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Local Bicycle Commute Share (C):

Facility Length (L):

Ground counts for reasonableness check re: CMAQ Post Evaluation study (12).

Bikeway	Bicycle Counts	6		Pedestrian Co	ounts	
						<u>Avg. Day</u>
	Weekday	Weekend	<u>Avg. Day</u>	Weekday	Weekend	<u>Estimate</u>
Sampled Bikeway	Counts	Counts	Estimate (1)	Counts	<u>Counts</u>	(1)
Goodwin Neck	2	4	3	0	0	0
Warwick Blvd	13	31	18	11	10	11
Col. Pkwy Conn.	34	81	47	7	5	6
Average:	16	39	23	6	5	6

Demand estimation for proposed facility re: NCHRP Report 552:

0.3%	(2)
1.70	mi. ⁽¹³⁾

		<u>Density</u>			
Buffer,		<u>(D),</u>	Buffer,		2009 Density
Distance from		persons/	Distance		(D), persons/
Project	<u>TAZ (13)</u>	<u>sq.mi.</u>	from Project	<u>TAZ ⁽¹³⁾</u>	<u>sq.mi.</u>
0.00-0.25 mi.	1018	5,097	0.25-0.50 mi.	1014	2,745
	1023	3,785		1022	4,217
	Average:	4,441		1024	5,905
				1031	3,087
0.50-1.00 mi.	1030	4,648		1040	549
	1049	2,705		1041	1,233
	1051	5,013	_	Average:	2,956
	Average:	4,122			

2009

		2009			<u>Existing</u>			
		Density			<u>Adult</u>		Existing	
		(D),	Area of	Residents in	Cyclists	<u>New (14)</u>	<u>Adult</u>	<u>New (14)</u>
		persons/	Buffer (A),	Buffer	<u>(R*C*0.8)</u>	Adult Cyclists	Pedestrians	Adult
	TAZ	sq.mi.	<u>sq.mi</u> . ⁽⁶⁾	(R=D*A)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Pedestrians (5)
above		4,441	0.85	3,775	9	9	2	1
above		2,956	0.85	2,513	6	4	2	1
above		4,122	1.70	7,008	17	4	4	1
				13,295	32	16	8	2
	above above above	above above above above	2009 Density (D), persons/ TAZ sq.mi. above 4,441 above 2,956 above 4,122	2009 Density (D). Area of persons/ Buffer (A), TAZ sq.mi. sq.mi. ⁽⁶⁾ above 4,441 0.85 above 2,956 0.85 above 4,122 1.70	2009 Density (D). Area of persons/ Buffer (A), TAZ sq.mi. 4,441 0.85 above 2,956 0.85 2,513 above 4,122 12,295 13,295	2009 Existing Density Area of Residents in (D), Buffer (A), Buffer persons/ Buffer (A), Buffer TAZ sq.mi. sq.mi. ⁽⁶⁾ above 4,441 0.85 3,775 above 2,956 0.85 2,513 above 4,122 1.70 7,008 17 13,295 32	2009 Existing Density Area of Adult (D), Area of Residents in Cyclists New ⁽¹⁴⁾ persons/ Buffer (A), Buffer (R*C*0.8) Adult Cyclists TAZ sq.mi. sq.mi. ⁽⁶⁾ (R=D*A) ⁽³⁾ (⁴⁾ above 4,441 0.85 3,775 9 9 above 2,956 0.85 2,513 6 4 above 4,122 1.70 7,008 17 4 13,295 32 16	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $

Existing Adult Cyclists:	32 a	above	
New Adult Cyclists:	16 a	above	
Total Adult Cyclists	: 48		
Trips, per day per cyclist:	2 t	rip to destinat	ion + return trip
Total Trips per Day	: 95		····
vs. Trips on Sampled Bikeways	23 a	above	
	Therefore, the	demand calc	ulation results are reasonable
Calculating VMT reduction:			
	Biking	Walking	
New Users:	16	2 at	oove
Trips, per day per user:	2	2 tri	p to destination + return trip
New Person Trips on Facility	: 31	4	
Eliminated Person Trips by Auto:	31	4 ab	oove (7)
Occupancy of Eliminated Auto Trips:	1.25	1.25 ⁽¹¹)
Eliminated Vehicle Trips (Auto)	: 25	3	
Ava. Alt. Mode Trip Lenath. mi.:	2	1 ⁽⁹⁾	
Eactor (for converting alt, mode trip lengths):	- 2	2 ⁽¹⁰)
Avg. Eliminated Auto Trip Length, veh-mi.	: 4	2	
VMT Peduction mi	· 100	6	
	. 100	Total:	106 vehicle-miles
		i otal.	

Checking reasonableness of bicycle demand estimation via comparison to ground counts:

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

		VMT				
	Emissions	Reduction,	Emissions	Emissions		Emissions
	Factor,	mi/day	Reduction,	Reduction,	Conversion	Reduction,
Туре	g/mi ⁽⁸⁾	(above)	g/day	kg/day	Factor, days/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.676	106	72	0.072	365	26
NOx	0.640	106	68	0.068	365	25

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Total Cost:	\$920,000 above
Useful life, years:	15 as assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years
Annual Cost:	\$61,333

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (above)	Cost Effective- ness, \$/kg	Con- version Factor, kg/ton	Cost Effective- ness, \$/ton
VOC	\$61,333	26	\$2,346	907	\$2,128,055
NOx	\$61,333	25	\$2,477	907	\$2,246,253

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ Average Day Estimate = [(Weekday Count * 5) + (Weekend Count * 2)] / 7

⁽²⁾ "A Review of 2000 Census Commute Data for Hampton Roads", HRPDC, Nov. 2005, p. 28

⁽³⁾ "Low" estimate, re: NCHRP Report 552, pg. 38

⁽⁴⁾ "New": i.e. as a result of proposed facility; New = Existing * B, where B varies

by buffer: 0-0.25mi: 1.93; 0.25-0.50mi: 1.11; 0.50-1.00mi: 0.39, re: NCHRP Report 552, pg. 39

⁽⁵⁾ Pedestrians = Cyclists / 4, based on ground counts at top of page

⁽⁶⁾ Only areas lateral to facility are included in buffers; semi-circular areas at ends of facility are not included in buffers

⁽⁷⁾ Assuming each new alt. mode trip eliminates an auto trip

⁽⁸⁾ Source: VDOT, Hampton Roads average for light duty vehicles and roadway functional classes, 2011, 35mph

⁽⁹⁾ Source: 2001 NHTS Table Designer

⁽¹⁰⁾ It is assumed that the eliminated auto trips will have length lower than regular auto trips (10 miles; source ⁽⁹⁾) and higher than regular alt. mode trips (shown above).

⁽¹¹⁾ All-trip occupancy, based on occupancies assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years: work- 1.1; non-work- 1.3

⁽¹²⁾ HRPDC, Feb. 2003, Appendix C

⁽¹³⁾ From application

⁽¹⁴⁾ Assumes half of new adult cyclists and pedestrians since sidewalk exists on one side currently.

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY HIGHWAY - CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

JURISDICTION:	Hampton
PROJECT NAME:	Traffic Signal System Retiming
LOCATION:	Citywide
DESCRIPTION:	Retiming of arterial streets
DATE:	8/10/2011 ⁽¹⁾
PROJECT COST:	\$698,000

1 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION

Arterial				Delay	Delay	Delay
	Number of		Peak Hour	Savings	Savings	Savings
Intersection(s)	Intersections	AADT ⁽¹⁾	Volume ⁽²⁾	(s/veh) ⁽³⁾	(s / pk hr) ⁽⁴⁾	(hr/dav) ⁽⁵⁾
Big Bethel Rd				(0.1011)	((
HRCP to	4	40.470	4 500	10.7	00.447	110
North Park Ln	4	18,173	1,599	10.7	68,447	112
Old Big Bethel Rd to	F	00,000	0.550	40.7	400 507	000
Michael Woods Dr	5	28,999	2,552	10.7	136,527	223
Saunders Rd	1	18,173	1,599	10.7	17,112	28
Semple Farm Rd	1	14,322	1,260	10.7	13,486	22
Magruder Blvd						
Butler Farm Rd	1	31,147	2,741	10.7	29,328	48
Hardy Cash Dr to HRCP	2	37,994	3,343	10.7	71,550	117
Floyd Thompson Blvd to Semple Farm Rd	2	28,605	2,517	10.7	53,869	88
Hardy Cash Dr						
Hampton Club Dr	1	15 773	1 388	10.7	14 852	24
Wythe Creek	·	10,110	1,000	1011	11,002	
Semple Farm Rd to	_					
Steam Plant	3	16,688	1,469	10.7	47,140	77
Commander Shepard Blvd						
NASA to	0	04 544	0.457	40.7	40.450	75
Research Dr	2	24,511	2,157	10.7	46,159	75
Armistead Ave						
Butler Farm Rd to	0	04.005	0 407	10.7	45 704	75
HRCP	2	24,285	2,137	10.7	45,734	75
Marcella Rd to	c	05 977	2 277	10.7	40 722	90
Tidemill Ln	2	20,077	2,277	10.7	40,732	00
Sweeney Blvd to	2	24 205	0 107	10.7	45 724	75
Sacramento Dr	2	24,200	2,137	10.7	45,754	75
Pembroke Ave to	Λ	12 021	1 1 4 6	10.7	40.042	80
Settlers Landing Rd	4	13,021	1,140	10.7	49,042	00
La Salle Ave to	Λ	10 529	1 719	10.7	73 550	120
Convention Center Blvd	4	19,520	1,710	10.7	73,550	120
Rip Rap Rd	1	16,396	1,443	10.7	15,438	25
Coliseum Dr						
Marcella Rd to	3	19 750	1 730	10 7	55 815	01
Coliseum Crossing South	5	13,755	1,709	10.7	00,010	31
Cunningham Dr to	3	24 681	2 172	10 7	69 710	114
Von Schilling Dr	5	24,001	2,172	10.7	00,719	
Hardy Cash Dr	1	14,025	1,234	10.7	13,206	22

Cunningham Dr						
Executive Dr to	2	20,032	1,763	10.7	37,724	62
Armistead Ave to						
Charlton Dr	2	54,611	4,806	10.7	102,843	168
Coliseum Dr to						
Kilgore Ave	2	55,452	4,880	10.7	104,427	171
Riverdale Ct to	_					
Saville Row	2	45,396	3,995	10.7	85,490	140
Cunningham Dr	1	54,209	4,770	10.7	51.043	83
Langley Sg to	-					
Seldendale Dr	2	57,242	5,037	10.7	107,798	176
Pembroke Blvd to						
Old Buckroe Rd	3	29,743	2,617	10.7	84,018	137
Mallory St to						
Willard Ave	2	8,563	754	10.7	16,126	26
Aberdeen Rd to						
Big Bethel Rd	3	50,124	4,411	10.7	141,590	231
Newmarket Dr to	_			10 -		
Martha Lee Dr	5	45,346	3,990	10.7	213,489	349
Todds Ctr to		00.074	5 400	10.7	475.000	0.07
Power Plant Wy	3	62,071	5,462	10.7	175,338	287
King Street		1 1				
Rip Rap Rd to		00,000	4 0 5 0	40.7	00 740	407
Gilbert St	4	22,226	1,956	10.7	83,712	137
Fox Hill Rd						
Nickerson Blvd to	_	00 5 40	0.070	40.7	140.055	101
Clemwood Pkwy	5	23,546	2,072	10.7	110,855	181
Mercury Blvd to	0	00.007	0.070	40.7	50.044	00
Old Fox Hill Rd	2	26,997	2,376	10.7	50,841	83
Woodland Rd	•					
I-64	1	8,563	754	10.7	8,063	13
County St	1	17,869	1,572	10.7	16,825	27
Pembroke Ave	1	13,133	1,156	10.7	12,366	20
Settlers Landing Rd		-				
Tyler St to	2	15 007	1 200	10.7	20.019	40
Hampton Harbor Ave		10,007	1,390	10.7	29,910	49
Eaton St to	4	12 051	1 1 / 9	10.7	40 155	90
Bridge St	4	13,051	1,140	10.7	49,155	80
Kecoughtan Rd	1	14,781	1,301	10.7	13,918	23
Pembroke Ave						
King St to	2	9 049	796	10.7	17 041	28
Back River Rd	2	3,043	790	10.7	17,041	20
La Salle Ave	1	18,168	1,599	10.7	17,107	28
Settlers Landing Rd	1	11,380	1,001	10.7	10,715	18
G St	1	10,697	941	10.7	10,072	16
Old Aberdeen Rd	1	10,697	941	10.7	10,072	16
Powhatan Pkwy						
Pembroke Pkwy to	3	20 748	1 826	10 7	58 609	96
I-664 Ramp (North)	Ű	20,710	1,020	10.1	00,000	
Shell Rd	1	8,290	730	10.7	7,806	13
La Salle Ave						
Michigan Dr	1	18,168	1,599	10.7	17,107	28
Settlers Landing Rd to	3	12 869	1 132	10 7	36 352	59
Victoria Blvd	Ŭ	,000	.,.02	10.1	00,002	00

County St						
Libbey St to	2	3 0 2 8	346	10.7	7 307	12
Mallory St	2	5,920	540	10.7	7,597	12
Mallory St						
Mellan St to	2	0 106	800	10.7	17 318	28
Segar St		9,190	809	10.7	17,510	20
Mellen St						
Hope St	1	4,844	426	10.7	4,561	7
Victoria Blvd						
Chesterfield Rd to	2	5 742	505	10.7	10 915	10
Powhatan Pkwy	∠	5,745			10,615	10
Aberdeen Rd						
Briarfield Rd to	7	21 022	1,920	10.7	142 022	225
Pembroke Ave		21,022			143,033	200
Todds Ln	-		-	-	-	
Orcutt Ave to	Q	17.063	1 502	10.7	129 522	210
Cunningham Dr	0	17,003	1,502	10.7	120,002	210
Power Plant Pkwy						
Pine Chapel Rd to	4	17 224	1 5 1 7	10.7	64 010	106
Power Plant Wy	4	17,234	1,517	10.7	04,910	
				Total Dalay	Souringo	2 4 2 2

Total Delay Savings

3,133 hr/day

	Emissions	Change in Veb Delay	Emissions	Emissions	Conversion	Emissions
_	Factor,	hr/day	Reduction,	Reduction,	Factor,	Reduction,
l ype	g/nr (°)	(above)	g/day	kg/day	wkdays/yr	кg/yr
VOC	10.948	3,133	34,295	34.3	250	8,574
NOx	3.573	3,133	11,192	11.2	250	2,798

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:	\$698,000 (from above)
Useful Life, years:	10 ⁽³⁾
Annual Cost:	\$69,800

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (above)	Cost Effectiveness, \$/kg	Cost Effectiveness, \$/ton
VOC	\$69,800	8,574	\$8	\$7,384
NOx	\$69,800	2,798	\$25	\$22,627

⁽¹⁾ From application

⁽²⁾VDOT AADT * Regional k factor from 2009 CMP database (0.088)

⁽³⁾As previously assumed

⁽⁴⁾Number of Signals * Peak Hr Volume * Delay Savings

⁽⁵⁾ Delay Savings / Delay Represented by Peak Hour (.17) / 3600 s/hr

Peak Hour Delay Factor Source: "Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements", HRPDC, 6/97 ⁽⁶⁾ VDOT, Hampton Roads Average for all vehicle types, average of principal and minor arterials, 2011, idle

AGENCY: PROJECT NAME: DESCRIPTION: DATE: PROJECT COST: HRT **Purchase 29 - twenty-nine foot buses** Replacement of 29 29-foot buses 8/8/2011 ⁽¹⁾ \$10,875,000

Number of Vehicles Being Retired Number of New Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for Retired Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for New Vehicles

	_
29	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
29	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
45,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾
45,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾

1 - CHANGE IN VEHICLE EMISSIONS

		Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
Current	Emissions Rate	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
Vehicles	g / bhp-hr ⁽¹⁾	g/mi ⁽²⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.08	0.38	45,000	29	502,409	502
NOx	3.8	17.78	45,000	29	23,203,161	23,203

		Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
New	Emissions Rate	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
Vehicles	g / bhp-hr ⁽¹⁾	g/mi ⁽²⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.001	0.01	45,000	29	8,500	8
NOx	0.2	0.94	45,000	29	1,221,219	1,221

2 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION

VOC NOx 493.9 kg/yr 21,982 kg/yr

3 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost: Useful life, years: Annual Cost:

Reduction in Emissions

\$10,875,000 (from above) <u>12</u> ⁽¹⁾ \$906,250

	Cost. \$/vr	Emissions Reduction		
Туре	(above)	kg/yr (above)	Cost Effectiveness, \$/kg	Cost Eff., \$/Ton
VOC	\$906,250	493.9	\$1,835	\$1,664,208
NOx	\$906,250	21,982	\$41	\$37,393

⁽¹⁾ From application; given values for NMHC converted to VOC by factor of .484 (source: fhwa.dot.gov)

 $^{(2)}$ Applying a conversion factor of 4.679 bhp-hr / mi, EPA data for Mobile6

AGENCY: PROJECT NAME: DESCRIPTION: DATE: PROJECT COST: Hampton Roads Transit **HRT Paratransit Replacement** Replacement of 33 paratransit vans 8/8/2011 ⁽¹⁾ \$2,640,000

Number of Vehicles Being Retired Number of New Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for Retired Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for New Vehicles

33	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
33	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
50,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾
50,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾
	33 33 50,000 50,000

1 - CHANGE IN VEHICLE EMISSIONS

		Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
Current	Emissions Rate	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
Vehicles	g / bhp-hr ⁽¹⁾	g/mi ⁽²⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.30	1.42	50,000	33	2,335,406	2,335
NOx	2.5	11.70	50,000	33	19,300,875	19,301

		Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
New	Emissions Rate	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
Vehicles	g / bhp-hr ⁽¹⁾	g/mi ⁽²⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.28	1.30	50,000	33	2,149,345	2,149
NOx	2.5	11.70	50,000	33	19,300,875	19,301

2 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION Reduction in Emissions VOC NOx

0 kg/yr

186 kg/yr

3 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost: Useful life, years: Annual Cost:

\$2,640,000 (from above) <u>15</u> ⁽³⁾ \$176,000

	Cost, \$/yr	Emissions Reduction,		
Туре	(above)	kg/yr (above)	Cost Effectiveness, \$/kg	Cost Eff., \$/1on
VOC	\$176,000	186	\$946	\$857,958
NOx	\$176,000	0	no change	no change

⁽¹⁾ From application; given values for NMHC converted to VOC by factor of .484 (source: fhwa.dot.gov)

⁽²⁾ Applying a conversion factor of 4.679 bhp-hr / mi, EPA data for Mobile6

⁽³⁾ As assumed previously

AGENCY: PROJECT NAME: DESCRIPTION: DATE: PROJECT COST: HRT **Purchase 41 - forty foot buses** Replacement of 41 40-foot buses 8/10/2011 ⁽¹⁾ \$16,195,000

Number of Vehicles Being Retired Number of New Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for Retired Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for New Vehicles

	_
41	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
41	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
50,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾
50,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾

1 - CHANGE IN VEHICLE EMISSIONS

		Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
Current	Emissions Rate	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
Vehicles	g / bhp-hr ⁽¹⁾	g/mi ⁽²⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.07	0.32	50,000	41	649,951	650
NOx	4.0	18.72	50,000	41	38,367,800	38,368

		Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
New	Emissions Rate	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
Vehicles	g / bhp-hr ⁽¹⁾	g/mi ⁽²⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.009	0.04	50,000	41	89,013	89
NOx	0.2	0.94	50,000	41	1,918,390	1,918

2 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION

Reduction in Emissions

560.9 kg/yr 36,449 kg/yr

3 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost: Useful life, years: Annual Cost:

\$16,195,000 (from above) <u>12</u> ⁽¹⁾ \$1,349,583

VOC

NOx

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (above)	Cost Effectiveness, \$/kg	Cost Eff., \$/Ton
VOC	\$1,349,583	560.9	\$2,406	\$2,182,191
NOx	\$1,349,583	36,449	\$37	\$33,583

⁽¹⁾ From application; given values for NMHC converted to VOC by factor of .484 (source: fhwa.dot.gov)

⁽²⁾ Applying a conversion factor of 4.679 bhp-hr / mi, EPA data for Mobile6

AGENCY: PROJECT N DESCRIPTIC DATE: PROJECT C	AME: DN: OST:	Hampton Roads HRT Ferry Repla Replacement of a 8/8/2011 (\$2,000,000	Transit acement a ferry on the	e Elizabeth Ri	ver		
		Number of Vehic	les Being Re	etired	Γ	1	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
		Number of New	Vehicles			1	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
		Average Hours p	er Dav for R	etired Vehicle	es	16	hours ⁽¹⁾
		Average Hours p	er Day for N	ew Vehicles		16	hours ⁽¹⁾
1- FMISSI	IONS RATES	5 1	,		L		
	Old Vehicles:	NOO			Г	40.4	
		VOC			-	40.4	gm/nr`´´
		NOX			L	2330 9	gm/nr ^x /
	New Vehicles:						
		Emissions	Fuel	Brake	e-Specific Fuel	Fuel	Enviroime Date
		Rate	Density		Consumption	Economy	Emissions Rate
		g/pnp-nr 🖓	ib/gai 💛		Ib/bnp-nr ···	nr/gal V	g/nr ` ′
	NOv	0.032	6.99		0.30	10.1	11.4
		4.5	0.99		0.50	10.1	1501.5
2 - CHAN	GE IN VEHICLE E	MISSIONS					
		Emissions	Ferry		Yearly	Yearly	
	Current	Rate	Usage	Number of	Emissions	Emissions	
	Vehicles	g/hr ⁽³⁾	hrs/year	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr	
	VOC	40.37	5,840	1	235,749	236	
	NOx	2330	5,840	1	13,607,200	13,607	
		Emissions	Ferry		Yearly	Yearly	
		Rate	Usage	Number of	Emissions	Emissions	
	New Vehicles	g/hr ⁽³⁾	hrs/year	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr	
	VOC	11.4	5,840	1	66,663	67	
	NOx	1581.5	5,840	1	9,235,887	9,236	
3 - EMISS	IONS REDUCTIC)N			VOC	169	ka/yr
		Reduction in Emi	issions		NOx	4,371	kg/yr
4 - COST	EFFECTIVENES	S					

	Total Cost: Useful life, years	s: Annual Cost:	\$2,000,000 (from above) <u>25</u> ⁽¹⁾ \$80,000		
Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (aboye)	Cost Effectiveness, \$/kg	Cost Eff., \$/Ton	
VOC	\$80,000	169	\$473	\$429,129	
NOx	\$80,000	4,371	\$18	\$16,599	

⁽¹⁾ From application; given values for NMHC converted to VOC by factor of .484 (source: fhwa.dot.gov)

⁽²⁾ Conversion from g/bhp-hr to g/hr using equation:

based off of: http://www.epa.gov/oms/models/part5/p5-awma.pdf ⁽³⁾ From above

$$Rate\left(\frac{g}{hr}\right) = Rate\left(\frac{g}{bhp - hr}\right) * \frac{\rho\left(\frac{lb}{gal}\right)}{BSFC\left(\frac{lb}{bhp - hr}\right)} * FE\left(\frac{gal}{hr}\right)$$

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION:	Isle of Wight County Main Street Sidewalk Extension Main Street from Route 10 to the Park and Install sidewalks to connect the Town of S	d Ride Lo mithfield	ot I to the I	Park and F	Ride Lot
DATE: PROJECT COST:	8/16/2011 (on application) \$165,000				
1- ESTIMATES OF	VMT REDUCTIONS:				
Facility Length (L):		0.15	n	ni. ⁽²⁾	
Demand estimatior	n for proposed facility:				
	Existing Adult Cyclists:		0 (1)	
	New Adult Cyclists:		0 (1)	
	Number of HH within 2 mile radius:		1856 ⁽³	3)	
	Estimated percentage walking before		2% (2	2)	
	Existing Adult Pedestrians, annual		37		
	Existing Adult Pedestrians, daily	1	03	65 days/yr	
	Number of HH within 2 mile radius:		1856 ⁽³	3)	
	Estimated percentage walking after		30% (2	2)	
	New Adult Pedestrians, annual		557		
	New Adult Pedestrians, daily	1	23	65 days/yr	
Calculating VMT re	duction:				
		<u> </u>	Biking	Walking	
New Users:			0	2	above
Trips, per day per ι	Iser:		2	2	trip to destination + return trip
	New Person Trips on Facility:		0	4	
Eliminated Person	Trips by Auto:		0	4	above ⁽⁴⁾
Occupancy of Elim	inated Auto Trips:		1.25	1.25	(8)
	Eliminated Vehicle Trips (Auto):		0	3	
Avg. Alt. Mode Trip	Length, mi.:		2	1	(6)
Factor (for converti	ng alt. mode trip lengths):		2	2	(7)
	Avg. Eliminated Auto Trip Length, veh-mi.:		4	2	
	VMT Reduction, mi:		0	6	
				Total:	6 vehicle-miles

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/mi ⁽⁵⁾	VMT Reduction, mi/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, days/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	0.676	6	4	0.004	365	1
NOX	0.640	6	4	0.004	365	1

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Total Cost: Useful life, years: Annual Cost: \$165,000 above

15 as assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years \$11,000

			Cost	Con-	
	Cost,	Emissions	Effective-	version	Cost Effective-
	\$/yr	Reduction,	ness,	Factor,	ness,
Туре	(above)	kg/yr (above)	\$/kg	kg/ton	\$/ton
VOC	\$11,000	1	\$7,434	907	\$6,742,696
NOx	\$11,000	1	\$7,847	907	\$7,117,203

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ CMAQ application specifies that cycling is not allowed.

⁽²⁾ From application.

⁽³⁾ Isle of Wight assumes 1 pedestrian per household.

⁽⁴⁾ Assuming each new alt. mode trip eliminates an auto trip

⁽⁵⁾ Source: VDOT, Hampton Roads average for light duty vehicles and roadway functional classes, 2011, 35mph

⁽⁶⁾ Source: 2001 NHTS Table Designer

⁽⁷⁾ It is assumed that the eliminated auto trips will have length lower than regular auto trips (10 miles; source ⁽⁶⁾) and higher than regular alt. mode trips (shown above).

⁽⁸⁾ All-trip occupancy, based on occupancies assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years: work- 1.1; non-work- 1.3

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: DATE: PROJECT COST:	Isle of Wight County Windsor North Court Street Sidew North Court Street from Joyner Town Construct sidewalk from Joyner Town 8/16/2011 (on application) \$375,000	alk Extension n Rd to existing n Rd to the Tov	sidewa vn of V	alks in V Vindsor	Vindsor	
1- ESTIMATES OF	VMT REDUCTIONS:					
Facility Length (L):		0.12	mi. ⁽²)		
Demand estimation	for proposed facility:					
	Existing Adult Cyclists:	C	(1)			
	New Adult Cyclists:	C	(1)			
	Number of HH within 2 mile radius:	1561	(3)			
	Estimated percentage walking before	e 3%	(2)			
	Existing Adult Pedestrians, annu	al 47	,			
	Existing Adult Pedestrians, dai	ily C	365 c	days/yr		
	Number of HH within 2 mile radius:	1561	(3)			
	Estimated percentage walking after	30%	(2)			
	New Adult Pedestrians, annu	al 468	5			
	New Adult Pedestrians, dai	ily 1	365 c	days/yr		
Calculating VMT reg	duction:					
		Biking	ı W	/alking		
New Users:)	 1 a	above	
Trips, per day per u	ser:	2	2	2 t	rip to destinatio	n + return trip
	New Person Trips on Facilit	ty: C)	2		
Eliminated Person 1	Trips by Auto:	C)	2 8	above ⁽⁴⁾	
Occupancy of Elimi	nated Auto Trips:	1.25	5	1.25 ⁽ⁱ	8)	
	Eliminated Vehicle Trips (Auto	o): C)	2		
Avg. Alt. Mode Trip	Length, mi.:	2	2	1 (6)	
Factor (for convertir	ng alt. mode trip lengths):	2		2 (7)	
Av	g. Eliminated Auto Trip Length, veh-m	i.: 4		2		
	VMT Reduction, m	ni: C)	4 Total:	4	vehicle-miles

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/mi ⁽⁵⁾	VMT Reduction, mi/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, days/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	0.676	4	3	0.003	365	1
NOx	0.640	4	3	0.003	365	1

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

 Total Cost:
 \$375,000 above

 Useful life, years:
 15 as assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years

 Annual Cost:
 \$25,000

		Emissions	Cost	Con-	
	Cost,	Reduction,	Effective-	version	Cost Effective-
	\$/yr	kg/yr	ness,	Factor,	ness,
Туре	(above)	(above)	\$/kg	kg/ton	\$/ton
VOC	\$25,000	1	\$25,343	907	\$22,986,463
NOx	\$25,000	1	\$26,751	907	\$24,263,193

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ CMAQ application specifies that cycling is not allowed.

⁽²⁾ From application.

⁽³⁾ Isle of Wight assumes 1 pedestrian per household.

⁽⁴⁾ Assuming each n by buffer: 0-0.25mi: 1.93; 0.25-0.50mi: 1.11; 0.50-1.00mi: 0.39, re: NCHRP Report 552, pg. 39

⁽⁵⁾ Source: VDOT, Hampton Roads average for light duty vehicles and roadway functional classes, 2011, 35mph ⁽⁶⁾ Source: 2001 NHTS Table Designer

⁽⁷⁾ It is assumed that the eliminated auto trips will have length lower than regular auto trips (10 miles; source ⁽⁶⁾) and higher than regular alt. mode trips (shown above).

⁽⁸⁾ All-trip occupancy, based on occupancies assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years: work- 1.1; non-work- 1.3

JURISDICTION:	James City County
PROJECT NAME:	Intersection Improvements - Centerville Road and News Road
LOCATION:	Centerville Rd/News Rd
DESCRIPTION:	Add right-turn lane on News Road and add a right-turn and left-turn lane on Centerville Road
DATE:	8/15/2011 (1)
PROJECT COST:	\$445,000

1 - REDUCED AUTO EMISSIONS

Weekday PM Peak Hour

Intersection Delay Before Project Intersection Delay After Project	20 sec/veh ⁽¹⁾ 15 sec/veh ⁽¹⁾
Change In Intersection Delay	5.0 sec/veh, pk hr
Total Vehicles During Peak Hour	600 veh/hr ⁽¹⁾ divided by 3,600 sec/hr
Change In Intersection Delay	0.8 veh hr's, pk hr
Change In Intersection Delay	divided by <u>17%</u> pk hr delay factor ⁽²⁾ 4.9 hours/day

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/hr ⁽³⁾	Delay Change, hr/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, weekdays/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	10.98	4.9	54	0.054	250	13.5
NOx	3.49	4.9	17	0.017	250	4.3

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:	\$445,000 (from above)
Useful life, years:	10 (4)
Annual Cost:	\$44,500

		Emissions			
	Cost, \$/yr	Reduction,	Cost Effective-	Conversion	Cost Effective-
Туре	(above)	kg/yr (above)	ness, \$/kg	Factor, kg/ton	ness, \$/ton
VOC	\$44,500	13.5	\$3,307	907	\$2,999,543
NOx	\$44,500	4.3	\$10,412	907	\$9,443,723

Notes:

(1) From application

(2) pk hr delay factor = pk hr delay / daily delay;

Source: "Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements", HRPDC, Page 8, June 1997.

(3) Source: VDOT, Hampton Roads average for all vehicle types and principal arterials, 2011, idle speed.

JURISDICTION:	James City County
PROJECT NAME:	Intersection Improvements - Pocahontas Trail (Route 60) and Blow Flats Road (Route 1305)
LOCATION:	Pocahontas Trail/Blow Flats Road Intersection
DESCRIPTION:	Realign intersection to improve tractor-trailer movements.
DATE:	<u>8/15/2011</u> ⁽¹⁾
PROJECT COST:	\$450,000

1 - REDUCED AUTO EMISSIONS

Weekday PM Peak Hour

Intersection Delay Before Project Intersection Delay After Project	60 sec/veh ⁽¹⁾ 60 sec/veh ⁽¹⁾
Change In Intersection Delay	0.0 sec/veh, pk hr
Total Vehicles During Peak Hour	950 veh/hr ⁽¹⁾ divided by 3,600 sec/hr
Change In Intersection Delay	0.0 veh hr's, pk hr
Change In Intersection Delay	divided by <u>17%</u> pk hr delay factor ⁽²⁾ 0.0 hours/day

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/hr ⁽³⁾	Delay Change, hr/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, weekdays/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	10.98	0.0	0	0.000	250	0.0
NOx	3.49	0.0	0	0.000	250	0.0

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:	\$450,000 (from above)
Useful life, years:	10 (4)
Annual Cost:	\$45,000

		Emissions			
	Cost, \$/yr	Reduction,	Cost Effective-	Conversion	Cost Effective-
Туре	(above)	kg/yr (above)	ness, \$/kg	Factor, kg/ton	ness, \$/ton
VOC	\$45,000	0.0	no change	907	no change
NOx	\$45,000	0.0	no change	907	no change

Notes:

(1) From application

(2) pk hr delay factor = pk hr delay / daily delay;

Source: "Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements", HRPDC, Page 8, June 1997.

(3) Source: VDOT, Hampton Roads average for all vehicle types and principal arterials, 2011, idle speed.

JURISDICTION:	James City County
PROJECT NAME:	Intersection Improvements - Route 199 and Brookwood Drive
LOCATION:	Route 199/Brookwood Dr Intersection
DESCRIPTION:	Convert right-turn lane from Brookwood Dr onto Route 199 East into a left/through lane and add new right-turn lane on Brookwood Dr
DATE:	8/15/2011 ⁽¹⁾
PROJECT COST:	\$275,000

1 - REDUCED AUTO EMISSIONS

E	100 sec/veh ⁽¹⁾ 50 sec/veh ⁽¹⁾
	50.0 sec/veh, pk hr
divided by	1,200 veh/hr ⁽¹⁾ 3,600 sec/hr
	16.7 veh hr's, pk hr
divided by	17% pk hr delay factor ⁽²⁾ 98.0 hours/day
	divided by

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/hr ⁽³⁾	Delay Change, hr/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, weekdays/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	10.98	98.0	1,076	1.076	250	269.1
NOx	3.49	98.0	342	0.342	250	85.5

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:	\$275,000 (from above)
Useful life, years:	10 (4)
Annual Cost:	\$27,500

		Emissions			
	Cost, \$/yr	Reduction,	Cost Effective-	Conversion	Cost Effective-
Туре	(above)	kg/yr (above)	ness, \$/kg	Factor, kg/ton	ness, \$/ton
VOC	\$27,500	269.1	\$102	907	\$92,683
NOx	\$27,500	85.5	\$322	907	\$291,800

Notes:

(1) From application

(2) pk hr delay factor = pk hr delay / daily delay;

Source: "Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements", HRPDC, Page 8, June 1997.

(3) Source: VDOT, Hampton Roads average for all vehicle types and principal arterials, 2011, idle speed.

JURISDICTION:	James City County
PROJECT NAME:	Intersection Improvements - Route 199 West Ramp at Richmond Road (Route 60)
LOCATION:	Route 199/Route 60 Intersection
DESCRIPTION:	Add dedicated right and left-turn lanes from Route 199 West Ramp onto Richmond Rd
DATE:	8/15/2011 ⁽¹⁾
PROJECT COST:	\$650,000

1 - REDUCED AUTO EMISSIONS

Weekday PM Peak Hour

Intersection Delay Before Project Intersection Delay After Project	180 sec/veh ⁽¹⁾ 100 sec/veh ⁽¹⁾
Change In Intersection Delay	80.0 sec/veh, pk hr
Total Vehicles During Peak Hour	1,700 veh/hr ⁽¹⁾ divided by 3,600 sec/hr
Change In Intersection Delay	37.8 veh hr's, pk hr
Change In Intersection Delay	divided by <u>17%</u> pk hr delay factor ⁽²⁾ 222.2 hours/day

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/hr ⁽³⁾	Delay Change, hr/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, weekdays/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	10.98	222.2	2,440	2.440	250	610.0
NOx	3.49	222.2	775	0.775	250	193.8

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:	\$650,000 (from above)
Useful life, years:	10 (4)
Annual Cost:	\$65,000

		Emissions			
	Cost, \$/yr	Reduction,	Cost Effective-	Conversion	Cost Effective-
Туре	(above)	kg/yr (above)	ness, \$/kg	Factor, kg/ton	ness, \$/ton
VOC	\$65,000	610.0	\$107	907	\$96,648
NOx	\$65,000	193.8	\$335	907	\$304,284

Notes:

(1) From application

(2) pk hr delay factor = pk hr delay / daily delay;

Source: "Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements", HRPDC, Page 8, June 1997.

(3) Source: VDOT, Hampton Roads average for all vehicle types and principal arterials, 2011, idle speed.

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY CITYWIDE SIGNAL SYSTEM

JURISDICTION:	Newport News
PROJECT NAME:	Citywide Pedestrian Enhancements
LOCATION:	Citywide
DESCRIPTION:	Install pedestrian accomodations at signalized intersections that currently provide crosswalks only in order to remove the required pedestrian walk and clearance intervals from the signal timing plan when pedestrians are not present.
DATE:	8/17/2011 ⁽¹⁾
PROJECT COST:	\$1,000,000
	Medium

1 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION		Low Volume Intersections	Volume Intersections	High Volume Intersections	Total Intersections
	veh / pm pk hr:	Less than 2,690	2,690 to 5,900	More than 5,900	
Number of Intersections (1):	Γ	16	54	0	70
	multiplied by:	2,690	5,900	9,500	veh / pm pk hr (2)
	multiplied by:	10.7	10.7	10.7	sec/veh ⁽²⁾
	divided by:	3,600	3,600	3,600	sec/hr
	divided by:	0.17	0.17	0.17	delay factor (3)
Change in Vehicle Delay:		752	5,570	0	hrs/day

Total Change in Vehicle Delay (sum of 3 col's above):

Emissions Emissions Change in Veh Emissions Conversion Emissions Factor, Reduction, Delay, hr/day Reduction, Factor, Reduction, g/hr (4) g/day⁽⁵⁾ (above) kg/day wkdays/yr kg/yr Туре 7.973 6,323 50,413 50.4 250 12,603 VOC 25,265 25.3 NOx 3.996 6,323 250 6,316

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:		\$1,000,000	(from above)
Useful Life, years:		10	(2)
	Annual Cost:	\$100,000	

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (above)	Cost Effectiveness, \$/kg	Conversion Factor, kg/ton	Cost Effectiveness, \$/ton
VOC	\$100,000	12,603	\$7.93	907	\$7,197
NOx	\$100,000	6,316	\$15.83	907	\$14,360

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ From application

⁽²⁾ As previously assumed

⁽³⁾ Portion of daily delay represented by peak hour

Source: "Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements", HRPDC, June 1997.

⁽⁴⁾ VDOT, Hampton Roads Average for all vehicle types and roadway functional classes, 2011, idle

⁽⁵⁾ Emission Factor * Change in Vehicle Delay

6,323 hrs/day

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY **CITYWIDE SIGNAL SYSTEM**

JURISDICTION:	Newport News
PROJECT NAME:	Citywide Signal Retiming
LOCATION:	Citywide
DESCRIPTION:	
	Analysis of existing and development of new signal

DATE: PROJECT COST:

timings for strategic corridors in Newport News. (1) 8/17/2011 \$900,000

I - EMISSIONS REDUCTION		Low Volume Intersections	<u>Medium</u> <u>Volume</u> Intersections	High Volume Intersections	Total Intersections
	veh / pm pk hr:	Less than 2,690	2,690 to 5,900	More than 5,900	
Number of Intersections (1):	Γ	139	116	0	255
	multiplied by:	2,690	5,900	9,500	veh / pm pk hr ⁽²⁾
	multiplied by:	10.7	10.7	10.7	sec/veh ⁽²⁾
	divided by:	3,600	3,600	3,600	sec/hr
	divided by:	0.17	0.17	0.17	delay factor (3)
Change in Vehicle Delay:		6,537	11,966	0	hrs/day

Total Change in Vehicle Delay (sum of 3 col's above):

Emissions Emissions Change in Veh Conversion Emissions Emissions Factor, Reduction, Delay, hr/day Factor, Reduction, Reduction, g/day (5) g/hr (4) (above) kg/day wkdays/yr kg/yr 36,882

Type 147,529 18,503 147.5 250 VOC 7.973 NOx 3.996 18,503 73,937 73.9 250

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:		\$900,000	(from above)
Useful Life, years:		10	(2)
	Annual Cost:	\$90,000	

		Emissions	Cost		Cost
	Cost, \$/yr	Reduction,	Effectiveness,	Conversion	Effectiveness,
Туре	(above)	kg/yr (above)	\$/kg	Factor, kg/ton	\$/ton
VOC	\$90,000	36,882	\$2.44	907	\$2,213
NOx	\$90,000	18,484	\$4.87	907	\$4,416

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ From application

⁽²⁾ As previously assumed

⁽³⁾ Portion of daily delay represented by peak hour

Source: "Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements", HRPDC, June 1997.

⁽⁴⁾ VDOT, Hampton Roads Average for all vehicle types and roadway functional classes, 2011, idle

⁽⁵⁾ Emission Factor * Change in Vehicle Delay

18,503 hrs/day

18,484

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY TRANSIT AND FIXED GUIDEWAY PROJECTS - NEW OR EXPANDED TRANSIT SERVICE

JURISDICTION:	Ft. Eustis/Newport News
PROJECT NAME:	Ft. Eustis MAX Express Bus
LOCATION:	From Hampton to Ft. Eustis
DESCRIPTION:	Express bus for military personnel working at Ft. Eustis
DATE:	7/27/2011 (on application)
PROJECT COST:	\$150,000 ⁽¹⁾

1 - INCREASED BUS EMISSIONS:

Route Length (one-way): Bus Trips per day (round trips): Factor: Bus VMT: 20 mi/trip ⁽²⁾ 4 round trips / day ⁽²⁾ 2 trips / round trip 160 mi/day

	Emissions		Emissions		Conversion	Emissions
	Factor,	Bus VMT,	Increase,	Emissions	Factor,	Increase,
Туре	g/mi ⁽³⁾	mi/day (above)	g/day	Increase, kg/day	days/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.590	160	94	0.09	250	24
NOx	12.461	160	1,994	1.99	250	498

2 - REDUCED AUTO EMISSIONS:

Ridership Estimate: Vehicle Occupancy Rate:

Reduction in Daily Vehicle Trips:

100 boardings/day ⁽²⁾ 1.15 persons/veh ⁽⁴⁾ 87 veh trips / day

Average Trip Length:

Reduction in VMT:

10 miles/trip ⁽⁵⁾ 870 miles/day

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/mi ⁽⁶⁾	VMT Reduction, mi/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, days/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	0.665	870	578	0.58	250	145
NOx	0.797	870	693	0.69	250	173

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Project Cost:	\$150,000 above
Project life, years:	3 (2)

Annual Cost: \$50,000

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Net Emissions Reduction, kg/yr	Cost Effectiveness, \$/kg	Conversion Factor, kg/ton	Cost Effectiveness, \$/ton
VOC	\$50,000	121	\$413	907	\$374,901
NOx	\$50,000	-325	negative	907	negative

(1) VDOT SYIP

⁽²⁾ From application

⁽³⁾ VDOT, Hampton Roads average for Diesel Transit & Urban Buses on minor arterials, 2011, 35mph

⁽⁴⁾ 1.15 for work trips, 1.30 for non-work trips, as previously assumed

 $^{\rm (5)}$ Average trip length for personal vehicle trips, 2001 NHTS

⁽⁶⁾ VDOT, Hampton Roads average for all vehicle types on minor arterials, 2011, 35mph

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY TRANSIT SHELTERS/FACILITIES

LOCALITY/AGCY: PROJECT NAME: DESCRIPTION: DATE: PROJECT COST:	Newport News Lee Hall Bus Construct tran 7/27/2011 \$250,000	Transfer Cente sfer center for the for the formation of t	r ne bus stop lini)	king Williamsbu	rg Transit and I	HRT	
1- INCREASED BUS	SEMISSIONS:			No Increase in S	Service or Emis	ssions	
2- TRAVEL REDUC	TIONS:						
			Increas	se in Ridership:	200	boardings/day ⁽¹)
	Vehicle Occupancy Rate (work): Reduction in Dai			y Vehicle Trips:	1.15 174	persons/veh ⁽³⁾ vehicles/day	
	Average Trip L	.ength:	Re	duction in VMT:	10 1,739	miles/trip ⁽⁴⁾ miles/day	
3- EMISSIONS RED	UCTIONS:						
Туре	Emissions Factor, g/mi	VMT Reduction, mi/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, days/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr	
VOC	0.676	1,739	1,175	1.175	365	429	
NOx	0.640	1,739	1,113	1.113	365	406	
4- COST EFFECTIV	ENESS:	Total Cost: Useful Life, yea	ars: Annual Cost:	\$250,000 15 \$16,667	above as assumed in	previous CMAQ	analyses
			Emissions				

		Emissions			
	Cost,	Reduction,	Cost	Conversion	Cost
	\$/yr	kg/yr	Effectiveness,	Factor,	Effectiveness,
Туре	(above)	(above)	\$/kg	kg/ton	\$/ton
VOC	\$16,667	429	\$39	907	\$35,246
NOx	\$16,667	406	\$41	907	\$37,204

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ From Application

⁽²⁾ Source: VDOT, Hampton Roads average for light-duty vehicles and all roadway functional classes, 2011, 35mph

⁽³⁾ As assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years

⁽⁴⁾ 2001 NHTS Table Designer

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY CITYWIDE SIGNAL SYSTEM

JURISDICTION:	Norfolk
PROJECT NAME:	Citywide Signal Retiming, Phase III
LOCATION:	Citywide
DESCRIPTION:	Updating/developing a plan and procedure for analyzing and prioritizing the signals within a five year period, and retime multiple corridors
DATE:	8/17/2011 (1)
PROJECT COST:	\$600,000
	Madium

1 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION		Low Volume Intersections	<u>Volume</u> Intersections	High Volume Intersections	Total Intersections
	veh / pm pk hr:	Less than 2,690	2,690 to 5,900	More than 5,900	
Number of Intersections ^{(1):}	Γ	16	30	0	46
	multiplied by:	2,690	5,900	9,500	veh / pm pk hr (2)
	multiplied by:	10.7	10.7	10.7	sec/veh ⁽²⁾
	divided by:	3,600	3,600	3,600	sec/hr
	divided by:	0.17	0.17	0.17	delay factor (3)
Change in Vehicle Delay:		752	3,095	0	hrs/day

Total Change in Vehicle Delay (sum of 3 col's above):

Emissions Emissions Change in Veh Conversion Emissions Emissions Factor, Reduction, Delay, hr/day Factor, Reduction, Reduction, g/day (5) g/hr (4) (above) kg/day wkdays/yr kg/yr Type 3,847 30,674 7,668 VOC 7.973 30.7 250 NOx 3.996 3,847 15,373 15.4 250 3,843

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:		\$600,000 (from above)
Useful Life, years:		10 (2)
	Annual Cost:	\$60,000

		Emissions	Cost		Cost
	Cost, \$/yr	Reduction,	Effectiveness,	Conversion	Effectiveness,
Туре	(above)	kg/yr (above)	\$/kg	Factor, kg/ton	\$/ton
VOC	\$60,000	7,668	\$7.82	907	\$7,097
NOx	\$60,000	3,843	\$15.61	907	\$14,160

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ From application

⁽²⁾ As previously assumed

⁽³⁾ Portion of daily delay represented by peak hour

Source: "Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements", HRPDC, June 1997.

⁽⁴⁾ VDOT, Hampton Roads Average for all vehicle types and roadway functional classes, 2011, idle

⁽⁵⁾ Emission Factor * Change in Vehicle Delay

3,847 hrs/day

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY CITYWIDE SIGNAL SYSTEM

JURISDICTION:	Poquoson
PROJECT NAME:	Poquoson Traffic Signal Upgrade
LOCATION:	Wythe Creek Road Corridor
DESCRIPTION:	Upgrade all traffic signals into a communications system and link with the City of Hampton's Traffic Signal Network
DATE:	8/10/2011 (1)
PROJECT COST:	\$260.000

1 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION		Low Volume Intersections	<u>Medium</u> <u>Volume</u> Intersections	High Volume Intersections	Total Intersections
	veh / pm pk hr:	Less than 2,690	2,690 to 5,900	More than 5,900	
Number of Intersections ^{(1):}	Γ	4	0	0	4
	multiplied by:	2,690	5,900	9,500	veh / pm pk hr ⁽²⁾
	multiplied by:	10.7	10.7	10.7	sec/veh ⁽²⁾
	divided by:	3,600	3,600	3,600	sec/hr
	divided by:	0.17	0.17	0.17	delay factor (3)
Change in Vehicle Delay:		188	0	0	hrs/day

Total Change in Vehicle Delay (sum of 3 col's above):

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/hr ⁽⁴⁾	Change in Veh Delay, hr/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day ⁽⁵⁾	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, wkdays/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	7.973	188	1,500	1.5	250	375
NOx	3.996	188	752	0.8	250	188

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:		\$260,000 (from above)
Useful Life, years:		10 ⁽²⁾
	Annual Cost:	\$26,000

		Emissions	Cost		Cost
	Cost, \$/yr	Reduction,	Effectiveness,	Conversion	Effectiveness,
Туре	(above)	kg/yr (above)	\$/kg	Factor, kg/ton	\$/ton
VOC	\$26,000	375	\$69.34	907	\$62,887
NOx	\$26,000	188	\$138.35	907	\$125,482

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ From application

⁽²⁾ As previously assumed

⁽³⁾ Portion of daily delay represented by peak hour

Source: "Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements", HRPDC, June 1997.

⁽⁴⁾ VDOT, Hampton Roads Average for all vehicle types and roadway functional classes, 2011, idle

⁽⁵⁾ Emission Factor * Change in Vehicle Delay

188 hrs/day

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

JURISDICTION:PoquosonPROJECT NAME:South Lawson Park Bike PathLOCATION:South Lawson ParkDESCRIPTION:Construction of a circular bike path around South Lawson Park with connections to Poquoson AvenueDATE:8/9/2011 (on application)PROJECT COST:§195,100

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Ground counts for reasonableness check re: CMAQ Post Evaluation study (12).

Bikeway	Bicycle Count	S		Pedestrian C	ounts	
			Avg. Day			Avg. Day
	Weekday	Weekend	Estimate	Weekday	Weekend	Estimate
Sampled Bikeway	<u>Counts</u>	<u>Counts</u>	(1)	<u>Counts</u>	<u>Counts</u>	(1)
Goodwin Neck	2	4	3	0	0	0
Warwick Blvd	13	31	18	11	10	11
Col. Pkwy Conn.	34	81	47	7	5	6
Average:	16	39	23	6	5	6

Demand estimation for proposed facility re: NCHRP Report 552:

Local Bicycle Commute Share (C):	0.3%	(2)
Facility Length (L):	1.00	mi. ⁽¹³⁾

		2009			Existing			
		Density			<u>Adult</u>		Existing	New
Buffer,		(D),	Area of	Residents in	<u>Cyclists</u>	New	<u>Adult</u>	<u>Adult</u>
Distance from		persons/	Buffer (A),	Buffer	<u>(R*C*0.8)</u>	Adult Cyclists	Pedestrians	Pedestrians
Project	TAZ (13)	sq.mi.	<u>sq.mi</u> . ⁽⁶⁾	(R=D*A)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(5)
0.00-0.25 mi.	1230	1,422	0.50	711	2	4	1	1
0.25-0.50 mi.	1231	495	0.50	247	1	1	0	0
0.50-1.00 mi.	1232	81	1.00	81	0	0	0	0
				1.039	3	5	1	1

Checking reasonableness of bicycle demand estimation via comparison to ground counts:

Existing Adult Cyclists:	3 above
New Adult Cyclists:	5 above
Total Adult Cyclists:	8
Trips, per day per cyclist:	2 trip to destination + return trip
Total Trips per Day:	16
vs. Trips on Sampled Bikeways:	23 above
	Therefore, the demand calculation results are reasonable

HRTPO CMAQ/RSTP Projects and Allocations | 2011 | Appendix A - CMAQ Project Evaluation Worksheets | 62
Calculating VMT reduction:

	Biking	<u>Walking</u>	
New Users:	5	1 above	
Trips, per day per user:	2	2 trip to des	stination + return trip
New Person Trips on Facility:	10	2	
Eliminated Person Trips by Auto:	10	2 above $^{(7)}$	
Occupancy of Eliminated Auto Trips:	1.25	1.25 ⁽¹¹⁾	
Eliminated Vehicle Trips (Auto):	8	2	
Avg. Alt. Mode Trip Length, mi.:	2	1 ⁽⁹⁾	
Factor (for converting alt. mode trip lengths):	2	2 (10)	
Avg. Eliminated Auto Trip Length, veh-mi.	4	2	
VMT Reduction, mi:	32	4	
		Total:	36 vehicle-miles

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/mi ⁽⁸⁾	VMT Reduction, mi/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, days/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	0.676	36	24	0.024	365	9
NOx	0.640	36	23	0.023	365	8

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Total Cost: Useful life, years: Annual Cost: \$195,100 above

15 as assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years \$13,007

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (above)	Cost Effective- ness, \$/kg	Con- version Factor, kg/ton	Cost Effective- ness, \$/ton
VOC	\$13,007	9	\$1,465	907	\$1,328,788
NOx	\$13,007	8	\$1,546	907	\$1,402,592

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ Average Day Estimate = [(Weekday Count * 5) + (Weekend Count * 2)] / 7

⁽²⁾ "A Review of 2000 Census Commute Data for Hampton Roads", HRPDC, Nov. 2005, p. 28

⁽³⁾ "Low" estimate, re: NCHRP Report 552, pg. 38

⁽⁴⁾ "New": i.e. as a result of proposed facility; New = Existing * B, where B varies

by buffer: 0-0.25mi: 1.93; 0.25-0.50mi: 1.11; 0.50-1.00mi: 0.39, re: NCHRP Report 552, pg. 39 ⁽⁵⁾ Pedestrians = Cyclists / 4, based on ground counts at top of page

⁽⁶⁾ Only areas lateral to facility are included in buffers; semi-circular areas at ends of facility are not included in buffers

⁽⁷⁾ Assuming each new alt. mode trip eliminates an auto trip

⁽⁸⁾ Source: VDOT, Hampton Roads average for light duty vehicles and roadway functional classes, 2011, 35mph

⁽⁹⁾ Source: 2001 NHTS Table Designer

⁽¹⁰⁾ It is assumed that the eliminated auto trips will have length lower than regular auto trips (10 miles; source ⁽⁹⁾) and higher than regular alt. mode trips (shown above).

⁽¹¹⁾ All-trip occupancy, based on occupancies assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years: work- 1.1; non-work- 1.3

⁽¹²⁾ HRPDC, Feb. 2003, Appendix C

⁽¹³⁾ From application

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

JURISDICTION:	Portsmouth
PROJECT NAME:	Clifford/Bart/South Street Bike Boulevard
LOCATION:	From Powhatan Avenue to Airline Boulevard
DESCRIPTION:	Construct a bicycle route along Clifford/Bart/South Streets
DATE:	7/25/2011 (on application)
PROJECT COST:	\$500,000

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Ground counts for reasonableness check re: CMAQ Post Evaluation study (12):

Bikeway	Bicycle Count	S		Pedestrian Co	ounts	
						<u>Avg. Day</u>
	<u>Weekday</u>	Weekend	<u>Avg. Day</u>	<u>Weekday</u>	Weekend	<u>Estimate</u>
Sampled Bikeway	Counts	<u>Counts</u>	Estimate (1)	Counts	<u>Counts</u>	(1)
Goodwin Neck	2	4	3	0	0	0
Warwick Blvd	13	31	18	11	10	11
Col. Pkwy Conn.	34	81	47	7	5	6
Average:	16	39	23	6	5	6

Demand estimation for proposed facility re: NCHRP Report 552:

Local Bicycle Commute Share (C): Facility Length (L):

0.3%	(2)	
1.15	mi.	(13)

		Density			
Buffer,		<u>(D),</u>	Buffer,		2009 Density
Distance from		persons/	Distance_		(D), persons/
<u>Project</u>	<u>TAZ (13)</u>	<u>sq.mi.</u>	from Project	<u>TAZ ⁽¹³⁾</u>	<u>sq.mi.</u>
0.00-0.25 mi.	491	3,590	0.25-0.50 mi.	490	5,031
	910	2,540		491	3,590
	Average:	3,065		917	5,892
			-	Average:	4,838
0.50-1.00 mi.	455	4,441			
	456	5,305			
	488	4,022			
	489	1,158			
	Average:	3,732			

2009

		2009			Existing			
		Density			<u>Adult</u>		Existing	
Buffer,		(D),	Area of	Residents in	Cyclists	New	<u>Adult</u>	New
Distance from		persons/	<u>Buffer (A),</u>	Buffer	<u>(R*C*0.8)</u>	Adult Cyclists	Pedestrians	<u>Adult</u>
Project	TA	Z <u>sq.mi.</u>	sq.mi. ⁽⁶⁾	(R=D*A)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Pedestrians (5)
0.00-0.25 mi.	above	3,065	0.58	1,762	4	8	1	2
0.25-0.50 mi.	above	4,838	0.58	2,782	7	8	2	2
0.50-1.00 mi.	above	3,732	1.15	4,291	10	4	3	1
				8,836	21	20	6	5

Checking reasonableness of bicycle demand estimation via comparison to ground counts:

	Existing Adult Cy	/clists:	21	above	
	New Adult Cyclis	sts: Total Adult Cyclists:	<u> </u>	above	
	Trips, per day pe	er cyclist: Total Trips per Day:	2 82	trip to desti	nation + return trip
,	vs. Trips on Sam	npled Bikeways:	23 Therefore, th	above e demand c	alculation results are reasonable.
Calculating VMT red	uction:				
			<u>Biking</u>	Walking	
New Users:			20	5	above
Trips, per day per us	er:		2	2	trip to destination + return trip
	New Per	son Trips on Facility:	40	10	
Eliminated Person Ti	rips by Auto:		40	10	above ⁽⁷⁾
Occupancy of Elimin	ated Auto Trips:		1.25	1.25	(11)
	Eliminated	Vehicle Trips (Auto):	32	8	•
Avg. Alt. Mode Trip L	ength, mi.:		2	1	(9)
Factor (for converting	alt, mode trip le	enaths):	2	2	(10)
Avg. I	Eliminated Auto	Trip Length, veh-mi.:	4	2	
		VMT Reduction, mi:	128	16	
				Total:	144 vehicle-miles

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/mi ⁽⁸⁾	VMT Reduction, mi/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, days/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	0.676	144	97	0.097	365	36
NOx	0.640	144	92	0.092	365	34

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Total Cost:	\$500,000 above
Useful life, years:	15 as assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years
Annual Cost:	\$33,333

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (above)	Cost Effective- ness, \$/kg	Con- version Factor, kg/ton	Cost Effective- ness, \$/ton
VOC	\$33,333	36	\$939	907	\$851,350
NOx	\$33,333	34	\$991	907	\$898,637

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ Average Day Estimate = [(Weekday Count * 5) + (Weekend Count * 2)] / 7

⁽²⁾ "A Review of 2000 Census Commute Data for Hampton Roads", HRPDC, Nov. 2005, p. 28

⁽³⁾ "Low" estimate, re: NCHRP Report 552, pg. 38

⁽⁴⁾ "New": i.e. as a result of proposed facility; New = Existing * B, where B varies

by buffer: 0-0.25mi: 1.93; 0.25-0.50mi: 1.11; 0.50-1.00mi: 0.39, re: NCHRP Report 552, pg. 39

⁽⁵⁾ Pedestrians = Cyclists / 4, based on ground counts at top of page

⁽⁶⁾ Only areas lateral to facility are included in buffers; semi-circular areas at ends of facility are not included in buffers

⁽⁷⁾ Assuming each new alt. mode trip eliminates an auto trip

⁽⁸⁾ Source: VDOT, Hampton Roads average for light duty vehicles and roadway functional classes, 2011, 35mph

⁽⁹⁾ Source: 2001 NHTS Table Designer

⁽¹⁰⁾ It is assumed that the eliminated auto trips will have length lower than regular auto trips (10 miles; source ⁽⁹⁾) and higher than regular alt. mode trips (shown above).

⁽¹¹⁾ All-trip occupancy, based on occupancies assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years: work- 1.1; non-work- 1.3 ⁽¹²⁾ HRPDC, Feb. 2003, Appendix C

⁽¹³⁾ From application

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY CITYWIDE SIGNAL SYSTEM

JURISDICTION:	Portsmouth
PROJECT NAME:	Signal System Citywide Upgrades
LOCATION:	Citywide
DESCRIPTION:	Upgrade signal systems to be in compliance with MUTCD standards and maximize the functionality of the signal system.
DATE:	8/2/2011 (1)
PROJECT COST:	\$6,000,000

1 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION		Low Volume Intersections	<u>Medium</u> <u>Volume</u> Intersections	High Volume Intersections	Total Intersections
	veh / pm pk hr:	Less than 2,690	2,690 to 5,900	More than 5,900	
Number of Intersections (1):	Γ	12	6	0	18
	multiplied by:	2,690	5,900	9,500	veh / pm pk hr ⁽²⁾
	multiplied by:	10.7	10.7	10.7	sec/veh ⁽²⁾
	divided by:	3,600	3,600	3,600	sec/hr
	divided by:	0.17	0.17	0.17	delay factor ⁽³⁾
Change in Vehicle Delay:		564	619	0	hrs/day

Total Change in Vehicle Delay (sum of 3 col's above):

Emissions Emissions Change in Veh Conversion Emissions Emissions Factor, Reduction, Delay, hr/day Reduction, Factor, Reduction, g/day (5) g/hr (4) (above) kg/day wkdays/yr kg/yr Type 2,359 VOC 7.973 1,183 9,435 9.4 250 4,728 NOx 3.996 1,183 4.7 250 1,182

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:		\$6,000,000 (from above)
Useful Life, years:		10 (2)
	Annual Cost:	\$600,000

		Emissions	Cost		Cost
	Cost, \$/yr	Reduction,	Effectiveness,	Conversion	Effectiveness,
Туре	(above)	kg/yr (above)	\$/kg	Factor, kg/ton	\$/ton
VOC	\$600,000	2,359	\$254.38	907	\$230,724
NOx	\$600,000	1,182	\$507.58	907	\$460,374

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ From application

⁽²⁾ As previously assumed

⁽³⁾ Portion of daily delay represented by peak hour

Source: "Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements", HRPDC, June 1997.

⁽⁴⁾ VDOT, Hampton Roads Average for all vehicle types and roadway functional classes, 2011, idle

⁽⁵⁾ Emission Factor * Change in Vehicle Delay

1,183 hrs/day

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY HIGHWAY - CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

JURISDICTION:	Suffolk
PROJECT NAME:	Bridge Road Signal Coordination and ITS Network
LOCATION:	Bridge Road from College Drive to Eclipse Drive
DESCRIPTION:	Upgrade signal control equipment and coordinate signals along Bridge Road
DATE:	8/15/2011 ⁽¹⁾
PROJECT COST:	\$1,257,000

1 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION

Arterial				Delay	Delay	Delay
Internetion (a)	Number of		Peak Hour	Savings	Savings	Savings
intersection(s)	Intersections	AADT ⁽¹⁾	Volume ⁽²⁾	(s/veh) ⁽³⁾	(s / pk hr) ⁽⁴⁾	(hr/day) ⁽⁵⁾
Bridge Rd						
College Dr to	5	30,000	2 640	10.7	141 240	231
Shoulders Hill Rd	5	50,000	2,040	10.7	141,240	251
Shoulders Hill Rd to	3	24 000	2 112	10.7	67 705	111
Bennetts Pasture Rd	5	24,000	2,112	10.7	07,795	
Bennetts Pasture Rd to	2	18 000	1 594	10.7	33 808	55
Eclipse Dr	2	18,000	1,564	10.7	55,696	55

Total Delay Savings

397 hr/day

		Change in				
	Emissions	Veh Delay,	Emissions	Emissions	Conversion	Emissions
	Factor,	hr/day	Reduction,	Reduction,	Factor,	Reduction,
Туре	g/hr ⁽⁶⁾	(above)	g/day	kg/day	wkdays/yr	kg/yr
VOC	10.948	397	4,346	4.3	250	1,086
NOx	3.573	397	1,418	1.4	250	355

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:	\$1,257,000 (from above)
Useful Life, years:	10 ⁽³⁾
Annual Cost:	\$125,700

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (above)	Cost Effectiveness, \$/kg	Cost Effectiveness, \$/ton
VOC	\$125,700	1,086	\$116	\$104,943
NOx	\$125,700	355	\$355	\$321,585

⁽¹⁾ From application

⁽²⁾ VDOT AADT * Regional k factor from 2009 CMP database (0.088)

⁽³⁾ As previously assumed

⁽⁴⁾ Number of Signals * Peak Hr Volume * Delay Savings

⁽⁵⁾ Delay Savings / Delay Represented by Peak Hour (.17) / 3600 s/hr

Peak Hour Delay Factor Source: "Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements", HRPDC, 6/97 ⁽⁶⁾ VDOT, Hampton Roads Average for all vehicle types, average of principal and minor arterials, 2011, idle

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY OTHER

JURISDICTION:	Suffolk
PROJECT NAME:	Route 10 and 13 - Turnouts
LOCATION:	Various locations
DESCRIPTION:	Paved turnouts to allow traffic to safely pass maintenance vehicles along corridors.
DATE:	8/16/2011 ⁽¹⁾
PROJECT COST:	\$458,000

1 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION

Arterial Number of Turnouts	Number of Vehicles Delayed ⁽¹⁾	Avg Delay Before (s/veh) ⁽¹⁾	Avg Delay After (s/veh) ⁽¹⁾	Delay Savings (s/veh)	Delay Savings (s/day)	Delay Savings (hr/day)
Route 10 (Godwin Blvd)						
4 Turnouts (2 Northbound & 2 Southbound)	315	255	175	80	25,200	7
Route 13 (Carolina Rd/Whaleyville Blvd)						
8 Turnouts (4 Northbound & 4 Southbound)	117	204	106	98	11,466	3

Total Delay Savings

10 hr/day

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/hr ⁽²⁾	Change in Veh Delay, hr/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, wkdays/yr ⁽³⁾	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	0.899	10	9	0.0	52	0
NOx	0.845	10	9	0.0	52	0

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:	\$732,800 ⁽⁴⁾
Useful Life, years:	24 (4)
Annual Cost:	\$30,533

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (above)	Cost Effectiveness, \$/kg	Cost Effectiveness, \$/ton
VOC	\$30,533	0	\$64,128	\$58,164,425
NOx	\$30,533	0	\$68,227	\$61,881,441

⁽¹⁾ From application

⁽²⁾VDOT, Hampton Roads Average for all vehicle types, principal arterials, 2011, 15 mph

⁽³⁾ Service occurs one day per week

⁽⁴⁾ According to City, turnouts would need to be milled and overlaid every 6 years at 20% of initial cost

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY HIGHWAY - CORRIDOR IMPROVEMENTS

JURISDICTION:	Suffolk
PROJECT NAME:	Shoulders Hill Rd/Nansemond Pkwy/Wilroy Rd Signal Coordination
LOCATION:	and Wilroy Rd
DESCRIPTION:	Upgrade signal control equipment and coordinate signals along corridor
DATE:	8/15/2011 ⁽¹⁾
PROJECT COST:	\$2,454,000

1 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION

Arterial				Delay	Delay	Delay
	Number of		Peak Hour	Savings	Savings	Savings
Intersection(s)	Intersections	AADT ⁽¹⁾	Volume ⁽²⁾	(s/veh) ⁽³⁾	(s / pk hr) ⁽⁴⁾	(hr/day) ⁽⁵⁾
Shoulders Hill Rd						
Bridge Rd to Nansemond Pkwy	2	9,800	862	10.7	18,455	30
Nansemond Pkwy						
Shoulders Hill Rd to Wilroy Rd	3	12,000	1,056	10.7	33,898	55
Wilroy Rd						
Nansemond Pkwy to Route 58 Bypass	3	8,600	757	10.7	24,293	40

Total Delay Savings

125 hr/day

		Change in				
	Emissions	Veh Delay,	Emissions	Emissions	Conversion	Emissions
	Factor,	hr/day	Reduction,	Reduction,	Factor,	Reduction,
Туре	g/hr ⁽⁶⁾	(above)	g/day	kg/day	wkdays/yr	kg/yr
VOC	10.948	125	1,371	1.4	250	343
NOx	3.573	125	447	0.4	250	112

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:	\$2,454,000 (from above)
Useful Life, years:	10 ⁽³⁾
Annual Cost:	\$245,400

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (above)	Cost Effectiveness, \$/kg	Cost Effectiveness, \$/ton
VOC	\$245,400	343	\$716	\$649,363
NOx	\$245,400	112	\$2,194	\$1,989,895

⁽¹⁾ From application

⁽²⁾VDOT AADT * Regional k factor from 2009 CMP database (0.088)

⁽³⁾As previously assumed

⁽⁴⁾Number of Signals * Peak Hr Volume * Delay Savings

⁽⁵⁾ Delay Savings / Delay Represented by Peak Hour (.17) / 3600 s/hr

⁽⁶⁾VDOT, Hampton Roads Average for all vehicle types, average of principal and minor arterials, 2011, idle

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

JURISDICTION:	Suffolk
PROJECT NAME:	Shoulders Hill Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
LOCATION:	Approaches to the Shoulders Hill Rd and Bennett's Creek Park Rd Intersection
	Improve pedestrian crossings at the intersection of Shoulders Hill Rd and Bennett's Creek Park Rd and add a
DESCRIPTION:	multi-use trail and sidewalk along Shoulders Creek Road (provides access to Creekside Elementary School)
DATE:	8/17/2011 (on application)
PROJECT COST:	\$272,000

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Ground counts for reasonableness check re: CMAQ Post Evaluation study (12):

Bikeway	Bicycle Counts			Pedestrian Co	ounts	
						Avg. Day
	Weekday	Weekend	<u>Avg. Day</u>	Weekday	Weekend	Estimate
Sampled Bikeway	Counts	Counts	Estimate (1)	Counts	Counts	(1)
Goodwin Neck	2	4	3	0	0	0
Warwick Blvd	13	31	18	11	10	11
Col. Pkwy Conn.	34	81	47	7	5	6
Average:	16	39	23	6	5	6

<u>2009</u>

Demand estimation for proposed facility re: NCHRP Report 552:

Local Bicycle Commute Share (C):
Facility Length (L):

0.3%	(2)
0.25	mi. ⁽¹³⁾

		<u>Density</u>			
		<u>(D),</u>	<u>Buffer,</u>		2009 Density
Buffer,		persons/	Distance		(D), persons/
Distance from Project	<u>TAZ ⁽¹³⁾</u>	<u>sq.mi.</u>	from Project	<u>TAZ (13)</u>	<u>sq.mi.</u>
0.00-0.25 mi.	553	1,030	0.25-0.50 mi.	553	1,030
	554	807		554	807
	Average:	918		Average:	918
0.50-1.00 mi.	552	407			
	553	1,030			
	554	807			
	555	135			
	Average:	718			
				E. de file e	
		<u>2009</u>		Existing	

			2009			Extourig			
			Density			<u>Adult</u>		Existing	
			(D),	Area of	Residents in	Cyclists	New	Adult	New
Buffer,			persons/	Buffer (A),	Buffer	<u>(R*C*0.8)</u>	Adult Cyclists	Pedestrians	<u>Adult</u>
Distance from Project		TAZ	sq.mi.	<u>sq.mi. ⁽⁶⁾</u>	(R=D*A)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Pedestrians (5)
0.00-0.25 mi.	above		918	0.13	115	0	0	0	0
0.25-0.50 mi.	above		918	0.13	115	0	0	0	0
0.50-1.00 mi.	above		718	0.25	180	0	0	0	0
					409	0	0	0	0

Checking reasonableness of bicycle demand estimation via comparison to ground counts:

	Existing Adult Cyclists: New Adult Cyclists: Total Adult Cyclists:	0 0 0	above above	
	Trips, per day per cyclist: Total Trips per Day:	2	trip to destination +	return trip
	vs. Trips on Sampled Bikeways:	23 Therefore, the	above e demand calculation	n results are reasonable.
Estimation of students (p	edestrians) that can walk to school as a	a result of side	walk project:	
Number of buses serving Avg number of students Estimated percentage of will walk: New users, walking:	g new area: 1 per bus: 54 ⁽¹⁴⁾ f children that 15% ⁽¹⁵⁾ 8			
Calculating VMT reduction	on:			
		Biking	Walking	
New Users:		0	8 above 2 trip to d	optination + roturn trin
Thps, per day per user.	New Person Trips on Facility:	0	2 inp to di 16	
Eliminated Person Trips	by Auto:	0	16 above ⁽⁷	7)
Occupancy of Eliminated	Auto Trips:	1.25	1.25 (11)	
	Eliminated Vehicle Trips (Auto):	0	13	
Avg. Alt. Mode Trip Leng	jth, mi.:	2	1 ⁽⁹⁾	
Factor (for converting alt	. mode trip lengths):	2	2 (10)	
Ανς	g. Eliminated Auto Trip Length, veh-mi.:	4	2	
	VMT Reduction, mi:	0	26	
			Total:	26 vehicle-miles

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/mi ⁽⁸⁾	VMT Reduction, mi/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, days/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	0.676	26	18	0.018	365	6
NOx	0.640	26	17	0.017	365	6

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Total Cost:	\$272,000 above
Useful life, years:	15 as assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years
Annual Cost:	\$18,133

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (above)	Cost Effective- ness, \$/kg	Con- version Factor, kg/ton	Cost Effective- ness, \$/ton
VOC	\$18,133	6	\$2,828	907	\$2,565,054
NOx	\$18,133	6	\$2,985	907	\$2,707,523

Notes:

- ⁽¹⁾ Average Day Estimate = [(Weekday Count * 5) + (Weekend Count * 2)] / 7
- ⁽²⁾ "A Review of 2000 Census Commute Data for Hampton Roads", HRPDC, Nov. 2005, p. 28
- ⁽³⁾ "Low" estimate, re: NCHRP Report 552, pg. 38
- ⁽⁴⁾ "New": i.e. as a result of proposed facility; New = Existing * B, where B varies
 - by buffer: 0-0.25mi: 1.93; 0.25-0.50mi: 1.11; 0.50-1.00mi: 0.39, re: NCHRP Report 552, pg. 39
- $^{(5)}$ Pedestrians = Cyclists / 4, based on ground counts at top of page
- ⁽⁶⁾ Only areas lateral to facility are included in buffers; semi-circular areas at ends of facility are not included in buffers
- ⁽⁷⁾ Assuming each new alt. mode trip eliminates an auto trip
- ⁽⁸⁾ Source: VDOT, Hampton Roads average for light duty vehicles and roadway functional classes, 2011, 35mph
- ⁽⁹⁾ Source: 2001 NHTS Table Designer
- ⁽¹⁰⁾ It is assumed that the eliminated auto trips will have length lower than regular auto trips (10 miles; source ⁽⁹⁾) and higher than regular alt. mode trips (shown above).
- ⁽¹¹⁾ All-trip occupancy, based on occupancies assumed in CMAQ analyses of previous years: work- 1.1; non-work- 1.3
- (12) HRPDC, Feb. 2003, Appendix C
- ⁽¹³⁾ From application
- (14) Source: http://www.schoolbusinfo.com/faq.asp
- ⁽¹⁵⁾ Source: US Environmental Protection Agency. Travel and environmental implications of school siting. Washington, DC: US Environmental Protection Agency: 2003. Available at http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/pdf/school travel.pdf

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY HIGHWAY PROJECTS - INTERSECTION GEOMETRY

JURISDICTION:	Virginia Beach
PROJECT NAME:	Intersection Improvements - First Colonial Road and Laskin Road
LOCATION:	First Colonial Rd and Laskin Rd Intersection
DESCRIPTION:	Addition of a second westbound left-turn lane
DATE:	7/29/2011 ⁽¹⁾
PROJECT COST:	\$1,000,000

1 - REDUCED AUTO EMISSIONS

Weekday PM Peak Hour

Intersection Delay Before Project Intersection Delay After Project	53.8 sec/veh ⁽¹⁾ 51.3 sec/veh ⁽¹⁾
Change In Intersection Delay	2.5 sec/veh, pk hr
Total Vehicles During Peak Hour	4,701 veh/hr ⁽¹⁾ divided by 3,600 sec/hr
Change In Intersection Delay	3.3 veh hr's, pk hr
Change In Intersection Delay	divided by <u>17%</u> pk hr delay factor ⁽²⁾ 19.2 hours/day

Туре	Emissions Factor, g/hr ⁽³⁾	Delay Change, hr/day (above)	Emissions Reduction, g/day	Emissions Reduction, kg/day	Conversion Factor, weekdays/yr	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr
VOC	10.98	19.2	211	0.211	250	52.7
NOx	3.49	19.2	67	0.067	250	16.7

2 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:	\$1,000,000 (from above)
Useful life, years:	10 (4)
Annual Cost:	\$100,000

		Emissions			
	Cost, \$/yr	Reduction,	Cost Effective-	Conversion	Cost Effective-
Туре	(above)	kg/yr (above)	ness, \$/kg	Factor, kg/ton	ness, \$/ton
VOC	\$100,000	52.7	\$1,897	907	\$1,720,624
NOx	\$100,000	16.7	\$5,973	907	\$5,417,192

Notes:

(1) From application

(2) pk hr delay factor = pk hr delay / daily delay;

Source: "Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements", HRPDC, Page 8, June 1997.

(3) Source: VDOT, Hampton Roads average for all vehicle types and principal arterials, 2011, idle speed.

(4) As previously assumed.

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY OTHER

JURISDICTION: Virginia Port Authority

 PROJECT NAME:
 Green Operator, Ocean-Going Vessel Hybridization & Fuel Switching Demonstration Project

 DESCRIPTION:
 Expand the Green Operator Program to containsership lines servicing the Port of Virginia through the Earl Energy Flex Gen System and the Maersk Line Limited - Fuel Switching Project

 DATE:
 8/17/2011 (on application)

 PROJECT COST:
 \$10,400,000

1 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:		\$10,400,000 (from above)
Useful Life, years:		4 ⁽¹⁾
	Annual Cost:	\$2,600,000

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, ton/yr ⁽¹⁾	Cost Effectiveness, \$/ton
VOC	\$2,600,000	116	\$22,337
NOx	\$2,600,000	721	\$3,606

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ From application

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY OTHER

JURISDICTION: Virginia Port Authority

 PROJECT NAME:
 Green Operator - Truck Replacement Program

 DESCRIPTION:
 Continue operator of Green Operator Program, providing incentives to replace heavy duty diesel port drayage trucks with later models meeting EPA standards.

 DATE:
 8/17/2011 (on application)

 PROJECT COST:
 \$9,400,000

1 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:		\$9,400,000 (from above)
Useful Life, years:		15 ⁽¹⁾
	Annual Cost:	\$626,667

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, ton/yr ⁽¹⁾	Cost Effectiveness, \$/ton
VOC	\$626,667	117	\$5,356
NOx	\$626,667	504	\$1,243

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ From application

AGENCY: PROJECT NAME: DESCRIPTION: DATE: PROJECT COST: WATA **ADA Body-n-Chassis Bus Replacements** Replacement of 12 paratransit vehicles 8/10/2011 ⁽¹⁾ \$1,083,000

Number of Vehicles Being Retired Number of New Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for Retired Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for New Vehicles

	_
12	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
12	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
40,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾
40,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾

1 - CHANGE IN VEHICLE EMISSIONS

		Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
Current	Emissions Rate	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
Vehicles	g / bhp-hr ⁽¹⁾	g/mi ⁽²⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.30	1.42	40,000	12	679,391	679.4
NOx	2.5	11.70	40,000	12	5,614,800	5,615

		Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
New	Emissions Rate	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
Vehicles	g / bhp-hr ⁽¹⁾	g/mi ⁽²⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.28	1.30	40,000	12	625,264	625.3
NOx	2.5	11.70	40,000	12	5,614,800	5,615

2 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION Reduction in Emissions VOC NOx

54.1 kg/yr 0 kg/yr

3 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost: Useful life, years: Annual Cost:

\$1,083,000 (from above) <u>15</u> ⁽³⁾ \$72,200

Type	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (aboye)	Cost Effectiveness \$/ka	Cost Eff., \$/Ton
VOC	\$72,200	54.1	\$1.334	\$1 209 855
NOY	\$72,200	04.1	\$1,554	\$1,209,000 no chango
NUX	\$72,200	0	no change	no change

⁽¹⁾ From application; given values for NMHC converted to VOC by factor of .484 (source: fhwa.dot.gov)

 $^{(2)}$ Applying a conversion factor of 4.679 bhp-hr / mi, EPA data for Mobile6

AGENCY: PROJECT NAME: DESCRIPTION: DATE: PROJECT COST: WATA **CNG Bus Replacements** Replacement of 7 - 40' CNG buses 8/10/2011 ⁽¹⁾ \$3,073,000

Number of Vehicles Being Retired Number of New Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for Retired Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for New Vehicles

	-
7	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
7	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
28,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾
28,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾

1 - CHANGE IN VEHICLE EMISSIONS

	Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
Current	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
Vehicles	g/mi ⁽¹⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.15	28,000	7	29,400	29
NOx	1.10	28,000	7	215,600	216

	Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
New Vehicles	g/mi ⁽¹⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.01	28,000	7	1,960	2
NOx	0.20	28,000	7	39,200	39

2 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION	VOC	27 kg/yr
Reduction in Emissions	NOx	176 kg/yr

3 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:	
Useful life, years:	
Annual Cost:	

\$3,073,000 (from above) <u>15</u> (2) \$204,867

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (above)	Cost Effectiveness, \$/kg	Cost Eff., \$/Ton
VOC	\$204,867	27	\$7,466	\$6,771,650
NOx	\$204,867	176	\$1,161	\$1,053,368

⁽¹⁾ From application

⁽²⁾ As assumed previously

AGENCY:	WATA
PROJECT NAME:	Hybrid Bus Capital Replacements
DESCRIPTION:	Replacement of 8 diesel transit buses with diesel-electric hybrid buses
DATE:	8/10/2011 ⁽¹⁾
PROJECT COST:	\$6,480,000

Number of Vehicles Being Retired Number of New Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for Retired Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for New Vehicles

8	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
8	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
35,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾
40,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾

1 - CHANGE IN VEHICLE EMISSIONS

	Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
Current	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
Vehicles	g/mi ⁽¹⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.04	35,000	8	11,200	11.2
NOx	10.40	35,000	8	2,912,000	2,912

	Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
New Vehicles	g/mi ⁽¹⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.03	40,000	8	9,600	9.6
NOx	0.60	40,000	8	192,000	192

2 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION	VOC	1.6 kg/yr
Reduction in Emissions	NOx	2,720 kg/yr

3 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:	\$6,480,000 (from above)
Useful life, years:	15 ⁽²⁾
Annual Cost:	\$432,000

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, kg/yr (above)	Cost Effectiveness, \$/kg	Cost Eff., \$/Ton
VOC	\$432,000	1.6	\$270,000	\$244,890,000
NOx	\$432,000	2,720	\$159	\$144,053

⁽¹⁾ From application

⁽²⁾ As assumed previously

AGENCY: PROJECT NAME: DESCRIPTION: DATE: PROJECT COST: WATA **Trolley Bus Replacements** Replacement of 5 Trolley Transit Buses 8/10/2011 ⁽¹⁾ \$2,018,000

Number of Vehicles Being Retired Number of New Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for Retired Vehicles Average Yearly Vehicle-Miles for New Vehicles

5	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
5	vehicles ⁽¹⁾
20,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾
28,000	vehicle-miles ⁽¹⁾

1 - CHANGE IN VEHICLE EMISSIONS

	Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
Current	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
Vehicles	g/mi ⁽¹⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.04	20,000	5	4,000	4.0
NOx	16.60	20,000	5	1,660,000	1,660

	Emissions			Yearly	Yearly
	Rate	VMT	Number of	Emissions	Emissions
New Vehicles	g/mi ⁽¹⁾	mi/yr/bus	Vehicles	g/yr	kg/yr
VOC	0.04	28,000	5	5,600	5.6
NOx	0.80	28,000	5	112,000	112

2 - EMISSIONS REDUCTION

Reduction in Emissions

-1.6 kg/yr 1,548 kg/yr

3 - COST EFFECTIVENESS

Total Cost:	
Useful life, years	:
1	Annual Cost:

\$2,018,000 (from above) <u>15</u> ⁽²⁾ \$134,533

VOC

NOx

Туре	Cost, \$/yr (above)	Emissions Reduction, ka/vr (above)	Cost Effectiveness. \$/ka	Cost Eff., \$/Ton
VOC	\$134,533	-1.6	negative	negative
NOx	\$134,533	1,548	\$87	\$78,825

⁽¹⁾ From application

⁽²⁾ As assumed previously

APPENDIX B

RSTP Project Evaluation Worksheets

	Total	(0-100)	69	69	:	63	54		[53	50	50	20	48
		0-10)	10	~		7	10		ſ	m	m	m	m	m
	Project Readiness (detailed design and cost estimates, ready	to go: 10 pts) (Yes (community support, detailed design and \$estimate, and all approvals)	Community support and approvals: Yes; detailed design and \$estimate: No	Community support, detailed design and \$estimate: Yes; all	approvals: No	Yes (community support, detailed design and \$estimate, and all approvals)		Community support: Yes; detailed design and \$estimate, all	approvals: No	Community support: Yes; detailed design and \$estimate, all approvals: No	Community support: Yes; detailed design and \$estimate, all approvals: No	Community support: Yes; detailed design and \$estimate, all approvals: No	Community support: Yes; detailed design and \$estimate, all approvals: No
		(0-10)	10	10	:	10	10		ç	10	10	10	10	10
	Air Quality (reduces NOx = 5; reduces	HC = 5)	PM: Reduces NOx (0.01 kg); reduces VOC (0.01 kg)	Reduction in idling at intersection	Reduction in idling at congested	intersections	PM: Reduces NOx (0.04 kg); reduces VOC (0.04 kg)		Reduction in idling at	intersection	Reduction in idling at intersection	Round-about expected to reduce idling	Reduction in idling at congested intersections on Denbigh Blvd	Includes multi- purpose trail
		(020)	10	10	:	10	10		ç	10	10	10	10	10
	Safety (20 pts to project with highest safety improve-	ments)	Add'I lane to avoid turning veh's; median to separate directions	Reduces queue length	Signalization, bike/ped accomodation s, access	management	Add'I lane to avoid turning veh's; median to separate directions	Vehicles	currently use shoulder w/ obstructed	view	Reduces queue lengths, removes some blockage caused by	Queue lengths shortened	Reduces congestion on Denbigh Blvd; fewer driveways & intersections than Denbigh Blvd	4 lanes safer than 2 lanes
		(0-Z0)	10	10	:	10	10		ç	10	10	10	20	10
	System Continuity (for missing links: total completion = 20, partial	completion = 10)	Yes	Yes	:	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (missing link: no crossing between Ft Eustis Blvd and Denbigh Blvd)	Yes
		(0-20)	15	18	:	16	0		ç	20	10	10		6
	Cost- Effectiveness (lowest \$/vmt = 20; highest \$/vmt = 0; straight line	interp)	Annual: (\$24m * 5%) / (32k * 1.83mi * 338days) = \$0.06/vmt	Annual: (\$1m * 5%) / (48k * 0.19mi * 338days) = \$0.02/vmt	Annual: (\$72.5m * 5%) / (68k * 3.5mi * 338days)	= \$0.05/vmt	Annual: (\$38m * 5%) / (32k * 0.77mi * 338days) = \$0.23/vmt	Annual: (\$0.3m *	5%) / (38k * 0.25mi * 338days) =	\$0.005/vmt	Annual: (Ş1.42m * 5%) / (10k * 0.17mi * 338days) = \$0.12/vmt	Annual: (\$5m * 5%) / (30k * 0.20mi * 338days) = \$0.12/vmt	Annual: (\$52m * 5%) / (30k * 1.19mi * 338days) = \$0.22/vmt	Annual: (\$12.55m * 5%) / (28k * 0.5mi * 338days) = \$0.13/vmt
		(0-Z0)	14	14	:	10	14		c	0	7	~	ڡ	ە
	Congestion Level (ex., fut 10 pts each; severe=7, moderate=3,	low=0)	Current LOS: F; Future LOS: F	Current LOS: D/E; Future LOS: E/F	Current LOS: D;	Future LOS: F	Current LOS: F; Future LOS: F		Current LOS: A-C;	Future LOS: A-C	Current LOS: C; Future LOS: E	Current LOS: D; Future LOS: E	Relieves Denbigh Blvd- Current LOS: D; Future LOS: D	Current LOS: D; Future LOS: D
122		Total Cost	\$ 24,000,000	\$		\$ 72,500,000	\$ 38,000,000			\$ 300,000	\$ 1,420,000	\$	\$ 52,000,000	\$ 12,550,000
Lanes, intersection improvernen		Project Name	Centerville Tpke Widening - Kempsville R to Indian River Rd	Godwin Blvd Interchange Improvement	U.S. Route 58/Holland Rd	Corridor Improvements	Centerville Tpke Widening - Lynnhaven Pkwy to Kempsville Rd		Right turn lane at Turner Dr	(Route 644) onto Route 10/32	Nansmond Pkwy & Wilroy Rd Intersection Improvements	I-264/Ballentine Blvd/Light Rail Crossing - Modified Diverging Diamond Interchange	Atkinson Blvd - Construct New Road	Croaker Rd Widening & Multi- Purpose Trail
нідпмау- мем		Applicant	Virginia Beach	Suffolk		Suffolk	Virginia Beach		lelo of Milab+Co	Isle of Wight Co	Suffolk	Norfolk	Newport News	James City Co

Evaluation of RSTP Applications

Applicant Establishes connections Improves connections Improves correlations Improves correlation correlation correlations Improves correlations	Intermodal Pr	ojects											
Applicant Project Name Total Cost centers? (0-40) movements? (0-25) industries? (0-25) to go? (0) Review Ves (improves) Ves (improves) Ves (improves) and \$estimate, an					Establishes connections between modes/ corridors/		Improves operating system to accommodate intermodal		Improves rail or vehicular access to freight facilities or major		Project has detailed design and cost estimates and is ready		Tota
James City Co Corridor Upgrade 5 Community James City Co Corridor Upgrade 5 6,100,000 Pes (connected Ves (connected all approvals: James City Co Corridor Upgrade 5 6,100,000 ped, bike) 20 bike) 12.5 No	Applicant	Project Name	F	otal Cost	centers? ((0-40)	movements?	(0-25)	industries?	(0-25)	to go?	(0-10)	(0-100
		Route 60 Multi-Modal			Yes (connected modes: bus,	C C	Yes (connected modes: bus, ped,	с С	Yes (improves vehicular access to Greenmount	, , ,	Community support: Yes; detailed design and \$estimate, all approvals: No	C C	÷
	חמווובא רווא רח		ĥ		hen' nivel	۶U		C.21		C.21	D	n	Ŧ

Evaluation of RSTP Applications

Transit & Fi	ixed Guideway- Passenge	r-related Proj	ects												
Applicant	Project Name	Total Cost	Congestion Relief (10 pts to project w highest % removed; 0 pts to lowest)	(0-10)	Facility Usage, Daily Ridership (20 pts to highest; 0 pts to lowest) (1	0-20)	Cost Effective- ness- Subsidy/ Passenger (20 pts to lowest, 0 pts to highest) (0-2(- Q	Air Quality VOx reductions = 10; HC reductions = 10) (0-	20)	Coverage Area (based on population and employment) ((0-20)	Project Readiness (detailed design and cost estimates, ready to go: 10 pts) (0.	-10) (0	Total -100)
нкт	Install 200 Bus Shelters	\$ 1,600,000	"0 2 2	0	Ridership of routes served ("after project"): 55,620	20	Subsidy/ passenger of routes served: \$3.54	0	 	0	For routes served- oopulation: 1,296k; employ-ment: 8886k	20	"Yes" to all	10	50
нкт	Town Center/Pembroke Mall Transfer Station	\$ 750,000	"° N	0	Ridership of routes served ("after project"): 8,642	m	Subsidy/ passenger of routes served: \$1.65 2	50	"0 2 "	0	For routes served- population: 488k; employ-ment: 447k	7	Some (community support but no detailed design or \$estimate and no approvals)	ں ا	30
НКТ	Military Circle Transfer Area	\$ 750,000	"oN"	0	Ridership of routes served ("after project"): 11,214	4	Subsidy/ passenger of routes served: \$1.90	17	"oN"	0	For routes served- population: 555k; employ-ment: 596k	2	Some (community support but no detailed design or \$estimate and no approvals)	ى ت	28
нкт	Pleasure House Rd Transfer Area Upgrades	\$ 250,000	"°N"	0	Ridership of routes served ("after project"): 4,131	H	Subsidy/ passenger of routes served: \$1.72 1	19	"o N "	0	For routes served- population: 376k; employ-ment: 321k	H	Some (community support but no detailed design or \$estimate and no approvals)	ى ت	26
НКТ	Pacific Ave Transfer Area Upgrades	\$ 550,000	"oN"	0	Ridership of routes served ("after project"): 5,187	2	Subsidy/ passenger of routes served: \$1.81	18	"oN"	0	For routes served- population: 301k; employ-ment: 279k	1	Some (community support but no detailed design or \$estimate and no approvals)	ى ت	26
НКТ	Oceanview Transfer Area	\$ 650,000	"oN"	0	Ridership of routes served ("after project"): 5,988	7	Subsidy/ passenger of routes served: \$1.89	17	"oN"	0	For routes served- population: 367k; employ-ment: 324k	1	Some (community support but no detailed design or \$estimate and no approvals)	ى ت	25
НКТ	Evelyn Butts Transfer Station	\$ 1,000,000	"oN"	0	Ridership of routes served ("after project"): 9,541	m	Subsidy/ passenger of routes served: \$2.24 1	14	"oN"	0	For routes served- population: 564k; employ-ment: 546k	2	Some (community support but no detailed design or \$estimate and no approvals)	ى ت	24
HRT	Rehabilitate Reon Dr Transfer Center	\$ 350,000	"oN"	0	Ridership of routes served ("after project"): 471	0	Subsidy/ passenger of routes served: \$2.98	و	" ⁰ N"	0	For routes served- population: 160k; employ-ment: 65k	0	Some (community support but no detailed design or \$estimate and no approvals)	ى ى	11
HRT	Victory Crossing Park & Ride Lot	\$ 225,000	"0 N "	0	Ridership of routes served ("after project"): 3,410	7	Subsidy/ passenger of routes served: \$3.45		"ON"	0	For routes served- population: 445k; employ-ment: 383k	2	"oN"	0	4

Evaluation of RSTP Applications

Transit & F.	ixed Guideway- Vehicle R	Repla	cement/Purch	ase										
Applicant	Project Name		Total Cost	Average age of vehicles (FTA standard is	(0-35)	Number of vehicles to replace/ total fleet (0-		Emissions hanges of the old and new vehicles	(0-30)	Cost Effective- ness (Cost/ Ridership)	(0-10)	Average mileage of the vehicles to be replaced (FTA Standards)	(0-15)	Total (0-100)
НКТ	Purchase 41 Forty-Foot Buses	<u>م</u>	16,195,000	12 years	17.5	41 replace- ments out of 140 total 40' fleet (29%)	ى د	HC: 0.14g (old) /s. 0.02g (new); NOX: 4.0g (old) vs. 0.2g (new)	15	Ridership unknown b/c buses are used on changing routes	Ω.	575k (vs. 500k standard)	7.5	50
нкт	Purchase 29 Twenty-Nine- Foot Buses	<u>۰</u>	10,875,000	12 years	17.5	29 replace- ments out of 51 total 29' fleet (57%)	сл	HC: 0.17g (old) vs. 0.003g (new); NOX: 3.8g (old) vs. 0.2g (new)	15	Ridership unknown b/c buses are used on changing routes	Ω.	540k (vs. 500k standard)	7.5	50

Evaluation of RSTP Applications Transit & Fixed Guidewov- Vehicle Replace

Transit & F	ixed Guideway- Other Pro	njects												
Applicant	Project Name		otal Cost	Will the project increase service reliability?	(0-25)	Will the project improve passenger safety, comfort, and conven-ience?	(0-30)	Does the project improve efficiency of the transit system?	(0-10)	Does the project improve the revenue collection? ((0-25)	Does the project improve transit data collection system?	(0-10)	Total (0-100)
WATA	Administration & Operations Facility	ې د	000,000,6	"Yes"	12.5	"Yes"	15	"Yes"	5	"Yes"	12.5	"oN"	0	45
нкт	Solar Lights Upgrade	Ş	500,000	"Yes"	12.5	"Y es"	15	"oN"	0	"oN"	0	"oN"	0	27.5
нкт	Renovate Parks Ave Maintenance Facility	Ś	1,000,000	"Yes"	12.5	"0N"	0	"Yes"	Ŋ	"oN"	0	"oN"	0	17.5
НКТ	Transfer Area Bathroom Design & Construction	\$	1,000,000	"Yes"	12.5	"ON"	0	"Yes"	5	"oN"	0	"oN"	0	17.5
нкт	Concrete Pavement Repair/Replacement	Ş	600,000	"Yes"	12.5	"oN"	0	"oN"	0	"oN"	0	"oN"	0	12.5
нкт	LEED Existing Building Upgrades	Ŷ	200,000	"oN"	0	"0N"	0	"Yes"	5	"oN"	0	"oN"	0	5

Total	(0-100)	45	42.5
	(0-10)	Ŋ	'n
7. Do the goals and objectives demonstrate preservation or protection-	ment?	"Yes"	Yes
	(0-10)	Υ	Ω
 Do the Do the goals and objectives of the study show support for economic develop- 	ment?	"Yes"	"Yes"
	(0-10)	Ŋ	ъ
5. Is the study well defined in terms of purpose, design concept	and scope?	"Yes"	"Yes"
	(0-20)	10	10
 Does the study address the mobility or access-ibility needs of the 	region?	"Yes"	"Yes"
	(0-10)	0	Ω
3. Is the 3. Is the study concerned with encourag- ing multi- modal transport-	ation?	" ON."	"Yes"
	(0-15)	7.5	0
2. Is the study necessary to address a safety	issue?	"Yes"	"0 "
	(0-25)	12.5	12.5
 Is the study necessary to address a major issue or to revise 	the Plan?	"Yes"	"Yes"
	Total Cost	\$ 400,000	\$ 800,000
	Project Name	Economic Analysis of Toll Pricing in Hampton Roads (effect of toll rates on freight bus.)	Completion of Before & After Study of Norfolk LRT Project
	Applicant	VPA	нкт

	Total 100)	56.5	56.5	32
	ن ا	Г	5	<u>ں</u>
	t (0-11			
	6. Is project part of the Regional ITS Strategid	"Yes'	"Yes"	"Yes'
	(0-20)	10	10	10
	 Does project improve linkage between operating agencies to provide traffic info to motorists? 	"Yes"	"Yes"	"Yes"
	(0-10)	ы С	5	<u>ى</u>
	4. Does the study address the mobility or accessibility needs of the region?	"Yes"	"Yes"	"Yes"
	(0-20)	14	14	7
	3. Will project improve LOS, increase capacity, or contribute to incident management?	"Yes"	"Yes"	LOS: "No"; Incident Man't: "Yes"
	(0-25)	12.5	12.5	0
	2. Will project directly reduce number or severity of roadway	"Yes"	"Yes"	"oN"
	(0-15)	10	10	ъ.
	 Will project improve flow during peak peak special events? 	"Yes"	"Yes"	Peak: "Yes"; Events: "No"
	otal Cost	\$ 1,650,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 133,000
2	Project Name	Suffolk Bypass, ITS Upgrades	Suffolk Traffic Operations Center (TOC)	Regional Signal Pre- Emption Program
ITS Project:	Applicant	Suffolk	Suffolk	Virginia Beach

Air Quality Evaluation of CMAQ Proposals -

Agency:	HRT				
Project Category:	Transit				
Fiscal Year:	2009, 2010,	2011			
Project Name:	Norfolk Ligh	t Rail Tr	ansit - Opera	ting Assistance	
Project Number:	CMAQ 19				
Project Location:	Southside				
Project Description:	Operation a	ssistanc	e for new 7.4	mile light rail tra	ansit
Length (mi):		7.4 or	neway		
Activity Centers:	Norfolk				
Completion Date:		2009	A- - - - - - - - - -		
Project Cost:	Total Cost:		\$7,000,000		
Assumptions:					
a. Auto travel factors					
Average trip length - 7	miles				
Average auto speed - 3	35 mph				
Vehicle occupancy rate	e - 1.15 for wo	k trips:	1.3 for Non-W	/ork trips	
b. Transit data					
Daily Ridership:	1	2000			
No.of Days per week:		7 N	umber of day	s per vear:	365
Hours/vehicles/day:		18 N	o of Trips/day	/:	164
Seats/Vehicle		64	. ,		
LRT VMT/r# of vehicles'	length*2way				
1- Increased LRT Emis	sions : (new s	service			
Trains will be electric an	d, therefore, w	vill not p	roduce emiss	ions	
2- Travel Reductions:					
Daily Riders:	1	2000		Daily Trips:	10435
Reduced VMTs =	146	5,087			
_ / .		E	missions Red	uction	
Type g/mi	VMT		g/day	kg/day	
HC 0.71	6 146	5,087	104,598	104	4.60
NUX 0.87	9 146	5,087	128,410	128	3.41
3- Cost Effectiveness:	han alla dalla a di	4-4-1 -			
I his ratio is determined	by alviaing the	total ar	mual cost by	annual emissior	n changes.
Operating Cost:			\$7,000,000	over 2 years	
AnnualizeuCost.			φ 3,500,000		
AnnualizedCost:			\$3,500,000		

Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton
HC	104.60	38,178	42.08	\$83,166
NOx	128.41	46,870	51.67	\$67,744

Hampton Roads Regional STP and CMAQ Projects FY 2007 - 2010





July 2006

HAMPTON ROADS PLANNING DISTRICT COMMISSION

CHESAPEAKE

VACANT AMAR DWARKANATH DALTON S. EDGE W. JOE NEWMAN

* DEBBIE RITTER

FRANKLIN

- MARK S. FETHEROLF
- * ROWLAND L. TAYLOR

GLOUCESTER COUNTY

- JOHN J. ADAMS, SR.
- * WILLIAM H. WHITLEY

HAMPTON

* RANDALL A. GILLILAND ROSS A. KEARNEY, II JESSE T. WALLACE, JR.

ISLE OF WIGHT COUNTY

- W. DOUGLAS CASKEY
- * STAN D. CLARK

JAMES CITY COUNTY

* BRUCE C. GOODSON SANFORD B. WANNER

NEWPORT NEWS

- CHARLES C. ALLEN
- JOE S. FRANK
 RANDY W. HILDEBRANDT

NORFOLK

* PAUL D. FRAIM DONALD L. WILLIAMS REGINA V.K. WILLIAMS BARCLAY C. WINN W. RANDY WRIGHT

POQUOSON

^r CHARLES W. BURGESS, JR. GORDON C. HELSEL, JR.

PORTSMOUTH

JAMES B. OLIVER, JR. CHARLES B. WHITEHURST, SR.

SOUTHAMPTON COUNTY

- ANITA T. FELTS
- MICHAEL W. JOHNSON

SUFFOLK

R. STEVEN HERBERT BOBBY L. RALPH

SURRY COUNTY

* TYRONE W. FRANKLIN JUDY S. LYTTLE

VIRGINIA BEACH

- HARRY E. DIEZEL ROBERT M. DYER
- * LOUIS R. JONES MEYERA E. OBERNDORF JIM REEVE PETER W. SCHMIDT JAMES K. SPORE

WILLIAMSBURG

JACKSON C. TUTTLE, II JEANNE ZEIDLER

YORK COUNTY

JAMES O. McREYNOLDS THOMAS G. SHEPPERD, JR.

*EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER

PROJECT STAFF

ARTHUR L. COLLINS

DWIGHT L. FARMER CAMELIA RAVANBAKHT MICHAEL S. KIMBREL NICOLE C. FOX

ROBERT C. JACOBS MICHAEL R. LONG BRIAN MILLER RACHAEL V. PATCHETT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR/SECRETARY

DEPUTY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, TRANSPORTATION PRINCIPAL TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER SENIOR TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER TRANSPORTATION ENGINEER

DIRECTOR OF GRAPHIC & PRINTING SERVICES GRAPHIC ARTIST/ILLUSTRATOR TECHNICIAN II GRAPHIC TECHNICIAN II REPROGRAPHIC SUPERVISOR

HAMPTON ROADS REGIONAL STP AND CMAQ PROJECTS FY 2007- 2010

This report was included in the Work Program for Fiscal Year 2005-2006, which was approved by the Commission and the Metropolitan Planning Organization at their meetings of March 16, 2005.

PREPARED BY:



JULY 2006

REPORT DOCUMENTATION

TITLE:

Hampton Roads Regional STP and CMAQ Projects FY 2007 - 2010

AUTHORS:

Camelia Ravanbakht, Ph.D. Michael S. Kimbrel Nicole C. Fox, P.E. REPORT DATE July 2006

GRANT/SPONSORINGAGENCY FHWA/VDOT/LOCAL FUNDS

ORGANIZATION NAME, ADDRESS AND TELEPHONE

Hampton Roads Planning District Commission 723 Woodlake Drive Chesapeake, Virginia 23320 (757) 420-8300 http://www.hrpdc.org

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the work of selecting Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program projects for FY 2007-2010. Recommended projects will be incorporated into the FY 2006-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The report also includes a summary of the Hampton Roads Project Selection Process for RSTP and CMAQ as approved by the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This report was prepared by the Hampton Roads Planning District Commission (HRPDC) in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (VDRPT), and the local jurisdictions and transit agencies within the Hampton Roads Planning District. The contents of this report reflect the views of the staff of the Hampton Roads Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). The MPO staff is responsible for the facts and the accuracy of the data presented herein. The contents do not necessarily reflect the official views or policies of the FHWA, VDOT, or HRPDC. This report does not constitute a standard, specification, or regulation. FHWA or VDOT acceptance of this report as evidence of fulfillment of the objectives of this planning study does not constitute endorsement/approval of the need for any recommended improvements nor does it constitute approval of their location and design or a commitment to fund any such improvements. Additional project level environmental impact assessments and/or studies of alternatives may be necessary.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	i
LIST OF TABLESii	ii
LIST OF FIGURESiv	v
	1
BACKGROUND	1
SCHEDULE	2
STUDY ORGANIZATION	3
	4
	3
APPENDIX A: CMAQ Policies, Procedures, and Analysis Methodologies	2
APPENDIX B: CMAQ Candidate Project Application Forms	3
APPENDIX C: CMAQ Project Analysis Worksheets27	7
APPENDIX D: RSTP Policies, Procedures, and Analysis Methodologies61	1
APPENDIX E: RSTP Candidate Project Application Forms	1
APPENDIX F: RSTP Project Analysis Worksheets82	2



LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	E 1 CMAQ and RSTP Project Selection Process Schedule for 2006
TABLE	E 2 CMAQ Project Proposals5-6
TABLE	E 3 Scoring and Ranking of CMAQ Project Proposals7-8
TABLE	E 4 Final CMAQ Allocations – FY 2007 – 20108-9
TABLE	E 5 RSTP Project Proposals13
TABLE	E 6 Scoring and Ranking of RSTP Project Proposals14
TABLE	E 7 Final RSTP Allocations – FY 2007 – 201015



LIST OF FIGURES

FIGUF	RE 1 CMAQ Allocations by Category, 1993 – 2006	1
FIGUF	RE 2 RSTP Allocations by Category, 1993 – 2006	2
FIGUF	RE 3 CMAQ Allocations by Jurisdiction, FY 2007-20101	0
FIGUF	RE 4 CMAQ Allocations by Project Type, FY 2007-20101	1
FIGUF	RE 5 RSTP Allocation by Jurisdiction, FY 2007-20101	6
FIGUF	RE 6 RSTP Allocation by Project Type, FY 2007-20101	7



INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

This report summarizes the work of selecting Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) projects for FY 2007-2010 funding allocations. These projects will be included in the FY 2006-2009 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Hampton Roads.

Between 1993 and 2006, the Hampton Roads region received over \$240 million of RSTP and \$111 million of CMAQ funding. As shown in **Figure 1**, 49 percent of the total CMAQ funds were allocated to bikeway/pedestrian, new/expanded transit service, transit shelters and vehicle replacement, Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and park-&-ride lots projects. Signal system integration, intersection geometric improvements, and ITS projects received 51 percent of the total funds. **Figure 2** shows the distribution of RSTP funds with 65 percent to highway and 35 percent to non-highway projects.



Figure 1- CMAQ Allocations by Project Type, 1993-2006





Figure 2- RSTP Allocation by Category, 1993-2006

SCHEDULE

Table 1 shows the schedule used for the 2006 session of the project selection process. The projects selected during this session received funding allocations during fiscal years 2007 - 2010.

Table 1
CMAQ and RSTP Project Selection Process Schedule for 2006

Process Elements	Completed In
Methodology & Criteria Revision	-
Project Solicitation	March 1
Project Application Submittals	March 31
Project Evaluation & Ranking – HRPDC staff	April 1- May 15
Transportation Technical Subcommittee Review	May 18
Transportation Technical Committee/MPO Action	June
Inclusion in the Revised TIP	October


STUDY ORGANIZATION

This study has been organized into two sections:

Section 1, CMAQ Project Selection, includes a list of all of the projects proposed for CMAQ funding, scoring and ranking of those projects, and the final selection of projects to receive funding allocations.

Section 2, RSTP Project Selection, includes a list of all of the projects proposed for RSTP funding, scoring and ranking of those projects, and the final selection of projects to receive funding allocations.

The appendices to this report include the uniform application forms used for submitting CMAQ and RSTP project proposals and the detailed worksheets used in the analysis of each project proposal.



CMAQ PROJECT SELECTION

In Hampton Roads, projects are selected for funding with Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Improvement Program funds based on the amount of air quality improvement expected per dollar spent. This is analyzed in terms of reductions in the emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and nitrogen oxides (NOx).

The original analysis policies and procedures were developed in December 1992 after the passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). Over the years since 1992 the policies and procedures have been reviewed and revised in 1995, 2001 and 2006. Details on the policies, procedures, and analysis methodologies used for CMAQ project selection in Hampton Roads are included in **Appendix A**.

To help insure that all of the necessary information is included with each project proposal, and to provide some uniformity to the way that project information is submitted, HRPDC staff developed application forms to be used by localities and transit agencies when submitting CMAQ project proposals. The latest version of the CMAQ Candidate Project Application form is included in **Appendix B**. An automated version of the application form is made available in a special area of the HRPDC web site for use by locality and transit agency staffs.

Table 2 shows all of the new projects proposed for CMAQ funding during the 2006 session of the project selection process. As shown in the table, 58 new proposals and 7 funding application requests for previously approved projects were proposed with a total cost of nearly \$64 million.



TABLE 2 CMAQ PROJECT PROPOSALS

JUNE 2006

Project No	Jurisdiction	Project Name	TOTAL COST	TOTAL CMAQ REQUEST
		PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PROJECTS		
A1	Chesapeake	Citywide Fiber optic Communications Ring, Phase III		*
A2	Newport News	Signal System Retiming -Phases VI-XI		*
A3	Virginia Beach	Citywide ITS project, Phase I26		\$3,000,000
A4	Chesapeake	Greenbrier Pkwy NBLTL EXT at Woodlake Drive		\$45,000
A5	Hampton	Citywide CCTV Camera Installations		\$50,000
A6	Newport News	JCMorris BLVD- Phase IV (Canon Blvd & Oyster Point Rd)		\$1,250,000
A7	Newport News	Rivermont Bike Trail		\$440,000
A8	Newport News	Signal System Upgrade 255 intersections		\$3,000,000
A9	Norfolk	Norview Ave/Azalea Garden Rd-Add EB & NB L.T. Lanes		\$200,000
A10	Virginia Beach	Rosemont & VA Beach Blvd Intersection Imprts.		\$436,000
A11	Virginia Beach	General Booth Blvd/Dam Neck Rd Intersection Improvements		\$43,000
		NEW PROPOSED PROJECTS		
1	Chesapeake	Signal System Retiming (Battlefield Blvd, Portsmouth Blvd, Taylor Rd)	\$200,000	\$200,000
2	Chesapeake	Volvo Pkwy & Executive Blvd Intersection Improvements	\$300,000	\$300,000
3	Chesapeake	Volvo Pkwy & Progressive Drive Intersection Improvements	\$320,000	\$320,000
4	Chesapeake	Pughsville Road and Taylor Road Intersection Improvements	\$95,000	\$95,000
5	Gloucester Co	Rte 17 Coord Timing & Sig Sys Upgrades - Courthouse Area (Rte 615 to Walter Reed Hos)	\$55.000	\$55.000
		Rte 17 Coord Timing & Sig Sys Upgrades - Gloucester Pt Area (Rte 1206 to	\$ 00,000	***
6	Gloucester Co	Rte 636 N)	\$60,000	\$60,000
7	Hampton	Hampton Roads Center Parkway & Big Bethel Road Intersection Improvement	\$125,000	\$125,000
8	Hampton	Big Bethel Road / Radford Drive New Traffic Signal Installation	\$160,000	\$160,000
9	Hampton	Big Bethel Road / Todds Lane Intersection Improvements	\$700,000	\$700,000
10	Hampton	Coliseum Central Transit Shelters	\$300,000	\$300,000
11	Hampton	Citywide AVL For Emergency Services Vehicles	\$270,000	\$270,000
12	Hampton	Citywide CCTV Camera Locations Phase II (10 Locations)	\$500,000	\$500,000
13	Hampton	Citywide Traffic Signal System Retiming (6 Corridors)	\$150,000	\$150,000
14	Hampton	Citywide Traffic Sig System Upgrade Phase II (Install fiber to close communication gaps)	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
15	Hampton	Coliseum Drive & Cunningham Drive Intersection Improvements	\$785,000	\$785,000
16	Hampton	Mercury Blvd and Fox Hill Rd Intersection Improvements	\$350,000	\$350,000
17	Hampton	Wayfinder Signs	\$350,000	\$350,000
18	Hampton	Coliseum Central Transit Shuttle	\$5,324,480	\$5,324,470
19	HRT	Commuter Route 62	\$3,161,170	\$3,161,170
20	HRT	New Buses	\$4,590,000	\$4,590,000
21	HRT	Norfolk Light Rail Transit - Operating Assistance	\$7.000.000	\$7.000.000
22	HRT	Route 60 Rapid Express	\$2,178,034	\$2,178,034
23	HRT	Vans for TRAFFIX Vanpool Program	\$600,000	\$600,000
24	James Citv Co	Airport Road Bikeway	\$29,900	\$29,900
25	James City Co	Croaker Road Bikeway	\$1,130,000	\$1,130,000
26	James City Co	John Tyler Hwy & Ironbound Rd (Five Forks) Intersection Improvements	\$300.000	\$300.000
27	James City Co	Monticello Avenue Geometric Changes	\$860.000	\$860.000
28	James City Co	Mooretown Road Bikeway	\$512,000	\$512,000
29	Newport News	Citywide Bus Shelter Program	\$110.000	\$110.000
30	Newport News	Jefferson Avenue Sidewalk Project from Buchanan Dr. to J. Clyde Morris Blvd.	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
	· ·			
31	Newport News	Mariner's Museum Multi-Purpose Trail	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
32	Newport News	J. Clyde Morris Blvd. Corridor Bike Trail: Phase V	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000

* Projects have prior allocations for FY 07 - FY 10



Project No	Jurisdiction	Project Name	TOTAL COST	TOTAL CMAQ REQUEST
33	Newport News	Newport News Shuttle, Phase 2	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
34	Newport News	Citywide Signal System Retiming Phase IX, X (14 Systems, 169 Intersections)	\$450,000	\$450,000
35	Newport News	Warwick Boulevard Wide Sidewalk between Menchville Rd. and Lucas Creek Rd.	\$1,300,000	\$1,300,000
36	Newport News	Newport News Cultural and Business District Wayfinding Sign Project, Phase 2	\$500,000	\$500,000
37	Norfolk	Citywide Signal Retiming (City of Norfolk)	\$300,000	\$300,000
38	Norfolk	Develop and Deploy Incident Management Diversion System	\$500,000	\$500,000
39	Norfolk	Research Partnership with Virginia Universities (Regional ITS Data)	\$300,000	\$300,000
40	Portsmouth	Equipment Support for Shuttle Bus Service	\$900,000	\$900,000
41	Portsmouth	Airline Blvd. Coordinated Signal Upgrade from Alexander corner to WCLL	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
42	Portsmouth	Resignalization of Alexander's Corner	\$900,000	\$900,000
43	Portsmouth	Downtown Shuttle Bus Service	\$465,000	\$465,000
44	Ports/Ches/VPA	Relocation of Commonwealth Rail to the Centerlines of VA Rte. 164 and I-664	\$60,000,000	\$4,800,000
45	Regionwide	Regional Concept of Transportation Operations (RCTO)	\$650,000	\$650,000
46	Virginia Beach	General Booth Boulevard/London Bridge Road Left Turn Lane	\$900,000	\$900,000
47	Virginia Beach	City of Virginia Beach Citywide Retiming Project	\$1,200,300	\$1,200,300
48	Virginia Beach	Indian River Road/Kempsville Road Intersection Improvements	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
49	Virginia Beach	Rosemont Road/Lynnhaven Parkway Left Turn Lane	\$700,000	\$700,000
50	Virginia Beach	S. Independence Boulevard/Dahlia Drive Intersection Improvements	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
51	Virginia Beach	S. Independence Boulevard/Lynnhaven Parkway Intersection Improvements	\$900,000	\$900,000
52	Virginia Beach	Salem Road/Princess Anne Road Intersection Improvements	\$900,000	\$900,000
53	WAT	Newport News/James City County Employee Connection	\$282,000	\$282,000
54	WAT	Service Frequency and Sunday Service	\$4,370,000	\$4,370,000
55	WAT	Mooretown Road Corridor	\$315,000	\$315,000
56	York County	Route 17/Route 620 Intersection Improvements	\$800,000	\$800,000
57	York County	Lightfoot Road bikeway	\$184,000	\$184,000
58	York County	Route 143 Bikeway	\$173,000	\$173,000

TABLE 2 – CONTINUED

TOTALS >> \$117,004,884 \$70,268,874

Table 3 shows the scoring and ranking of the submitted projects. As shown in the table, each project was scored and ranked based on its cost-effectiveness at reducing VOC and NOx emissions. The ranks for VOC and NOx reduction were added to produce the composite ranking. The detailed analysis worksheets for each proposed project are included in **Appendix C**.



TABLE 3 CMAQ PROJECT PROPOSALS RANKED BY COST EFFECTIVENESS (\$/TON/YEAR)

JUNE 2006

								Annualized Cost/Emissions Reduction			tion		
						Emissions	Reductions	VOC	;	NOx			
Project Number	Jurisdiction	Project Name	TOTAL COST	PROJECT LIFE (Yoars)	ANNUALIZED COST	VOC (Kg/Year)	NOx (Kg/Year)	\$/Ton/Year	Ranking (1)	\$/Ton/Year	Ranking (2)	Total (1 + 2)	Composite Ranking
	PREVIOUS	SLY APPROVED PROJECTS		(Tears)									-
A1	Chesapeake	Citywide Fiber optic Communications Ring, Phase III											
A2	Newport News	Signal System Retiming -Phases VI-XI											
A3	Virginia Beach	Citywide ITS project, Phase I26											
A4	Chesapeake	Greenbrier Pkwy NBLTL EXT at Woodlake Drive											
Ab	Hampton	Citywide CCTV Camera Installations											
A6	Newport News	Point Rd)											
A7	Newport News	Rivermont Bike Trail											
A8	Newport News	Signal System Upgrade 255 intersections											
A9	Norfolk	Norview Ave/Azalea Garden Rd-Add EB & NB L.T.											
A10	Virginia Beach	Rosemont & VA Beach Blvd Intersection Imprts.											
A11	Virginia Beach	General Booth Blvd/Dam Neck Rd Intersection											
ATT	virginia Beach	Improvements											
	NEW	PROPOSED PROJECTS											
34	Norfolk	Citywide Signal Retiming (City of Norfolk)	\$300,000	2	\$150,000	86,701	28,891	\$1,570	1	\$4,710	1	2	1
12	Hampton	Citywide Traffic Sig System Upgrade Phase II (Install fiber to close communication gaps)	\$1 000 000	10	\$100.000	41 311	13 766	\$2 196	2	\$6.590	2	4	2
43	Virginia Beach	City of Virginia Beach Citywide Retiming Project	\$1,000,000	2	\$600,150	119.380	39,781	\$4,561	3	\$13,686	3	6	2
<u> </u>	-g Douon	Hampton Roads Center Parkway & Big Bethel Road	+.,200,000	-	\$000,100	,000		\$ 1,001	Ť	÷.0,000		~	3
5	Hampton	Intersection Improvement	\$125,000	10	\$12,500	2,199	733	\$5,156	4	\$15,474	4	8	4
44	Virginia Beach	Indian River Road/Kempsville Road Intersection	\$1 500 000	10	\$150.000	10 979	5.611	\$12 205	6	\$24 250	6	12	5
26	Newport News	Citywide Bus Shelter Program	\$110.000	15	\$7,333	331	415	\$20,108	8	\$16.028	5	13	6
		Mercury Blvd and Fox Hill Rd Intersection	* ··• ; •••		÷.1000			1 -01.00	-	\$	-		
14	Hampton	Improvements	\$350,000	10	\$35,000	3,798	1,266	\$8,360	5	\$25,088	8	13	7
41	Regionwide	Regional Concept of Transportation Operations (RCTO)	\$650.000	2	\$325.000	22 347	7 447	\$13 193	7	\$39 592	10	17	8
54	York County	Route 143 Bikeway	\$173,000	15	\$11.533	351	431	\$29.828	11	\$24,297	7	18	9
		Citywide Signal System Retiming Phase IX, X (14	10 , 1					+-010-0		\$ = 1,= \$ 1			, ,
31	Newport News	Systems, 169 Intersections)	\$450,000	2	\$225,000	9,726	5,047	\$20,987	9	\$40,441	11	20	10
11	Hampton	Citywide Traffic Signal System Retiming (6 Corridors)	\$150.000	2	\$75.000	2 696	1 235	\$25,234	10	\$55 107	12	22	11
21	James City Co	Airport Road Bikeway	\$29,900	15	\$1,993	43	53	\$42.285	14	\$34,444	9	23	12
		Rte 17 Coord Timing & Sig Sys Upgrades -	,			-		• 1		,		-	.=
56	Gloucester Co	Courthouse Area (Rte 615 to Walter Reed Hos)	\$55,000	2	\$27,500	703	402	\$35,480	12	\$62,089	16	28	13
33	Newport News	Newport News Cultural and Business District Wayfinding Sign Project Phase 2	\$500.000	10	\$50,000	606	761	\$74 802	20	\$59.623	13	33	14
18	HRT	New Buses	\$4.590,000	15	\$306.000	3.817	4,506	\$72,719	19	\$61,601	15	34	15
53	York County	Lightfoot Road bikeway	\$184,000	15	\$12,267	148	182	\$75,243	21	\$61,290	14	35	17
		Develop and Deploy Incident Management Diversion											
35	Norfolk	System	\$500,000	5	\$100,000	2,433	811	\$37,290	13	\$111,906	22	35	16
4	Chesapeake	Improvements	\$95.000	10	\$9,500	175	58	\$49.174	15	\$147.572	24	39	18
19	HRT	Norfolk Light Rail Transit - Operating Assistance	\$7,000,000	2	\$3,500,000	38,178	46,870	\$83,166	23	\$67,744	17	40	19
		Salem Road/Princess Anne Road Intersection						A =0.070		A / E 0 0 0 E			
48	Virginia Beach	Improvements Signal System Batiming (Battlefield Blud	\$900,000	10	\$90,000	1,562	520	\$52,279	17	\$156,885	25	42	20
1	Chesapeake	Portsmouth Blvd, Taylor Rd)	\$200.000	2	\$100.000	1.754	474	\$51,711	16	\$191.328	27	43	21
		Jefferson Avenue Sidewalk Project from Buchanan											
27	Newport News	Dr. to J. Clyde Morris Blvd.	\$1,000,000	15	\$66,667	664	815	\$91,065	26	\$74,178	18	44	22
20	HRT	Route 60 Rapid Express	\$2,178,034	3	\$726,011	6,154	7,671	\$107,018	27	\$85,861	19	46	23
7	Hampton	Improvements	\$700,000	10	\$70,000	941	313	\$67,511	18	\$202,592	29	47	24
55	HRT	Vans for TRAFFIX Vanpool Program	\$600,000	6	\$100,000	668	1,050	\$135,868	31	\$86,363	20	51	25
29	Newport News	J. Clyde Morris Blvd. Corridor Bike Trail: Phase V	\$1,000,000	15	\$66,667	474	582	\$127,530	30	\$103,881	21	51	26
e	Homotor	Big Bethel Road / Radford Drive New Traffic Signal	¢100.000	10	\$46.000	100	63	\$76 E07	22	\$220.600	21	52	07
0	Hampton	Warwick Boulevard Wide Sidewalk between	\$160,000	10	\$16,000	190	03	\$70,527	22	\$229,000	31	55	21
32	Newport News	Menchville Rd. and Lucas Creek Rd.	\$1,300,000	15	\$86,667	455	558	\$172,937	33	\$140,868	23	56	28
47		S. Independence Boulevard/Lynnhaven Parkway		10		000	000	\$00.400	05	\$070 A77		50	
47	Virginia Beach	Intersection Improvements	\$900,000	10	\$90,000	906	302	\$90,130	25	\$270,477	34	59	29
20	Newport News	Manner's Museum Multi-r uipose man	\$1,000,000	15	\$00,007	202		\$214,370	- 55	\$171,031	20	01	30
9	Hampton	Citywide AVL For Emergency Services Vehicles	\$270,000	6	\$45,000	373	124	\$109,331	28	\$328,107	36	64	31
8	Hampton	Coliseum Central Transit Shelters	\$300,000	15	\$20,000	71	90	\$254,458	36	\$201,143	28	64	32
24	James City Co	Monticello Avenue Geometric Changes	\$860,000	10	\$86,000	702	234	\$111,136	29	\$333,508	38	67	33
17	HRT	Commuter Route 62	\$3,161,170	3	\$1,053,723	3,737	4,577	\$255,780	37	\$208,839	30	67	34
49	WAT	Connection	\$282.000	3	\$94.000	277	346	\$307.642	38	\$246.648	32	70	35
25	James City Co	Mooretown Road Bikeway	\$512,000	15	\$34,133	94	116	\$328,771	40	\$267,805	33	73	36
/-			A	17		410	400	0 4 0 0		A 170 A		70	
45	virginia Beach	Rosemont Road/Lynnhaven Parkway Left Turn Lane	\$700,000	10	\$70,000	416	139	\$152,621	32	\$458,006	41	/3	37
30	Newport News	Coliseum Drive & Cunningham Drive Intersection	ຈ ၊ ,ວບບ,ບບບ	15	\$100,000	∠04	292	a307,088	41	¢310,080	30	01	30
13	Hampton	Improvements	\$785,000	10	\$78,500	360	120	\$197,838	34	\$593,694	43	77	39
15	Hampton	Wayfinder Signs	\$350,000	10	\$35,000	77	97	\$414,267	42	\$328,175	37	79	40
57	Clausastar Ca	Rte 17 Coord Timing & Sig Sys Upgrades -	¢e0 000	2	\$20,000	326	-225	¢03 609	24	\$115 766	57	Q1	41
37	Portsmouth	Equipment Support for Shuttle Bus Service	\$00,000 \$900,000	15	\$30,000	115	140	\$471 501	44	\$380,818	30	83	42
51	WAT	Mooretown Road Corridor	\$315,000	2	\$157.500	305	359	\$468,939	43	\$397,899	40	83	43



								Annualized Cost/Emissions Reduction		lion			
						Emissions	Reductions	VOC		NOx			
Project Number	Jurisdiction	Project Name	TOTAL COST	PROJECT LIFE (Years)	ANNUALIZED COST	VOC (Kg/Year)	NOx (Kg/Year)	\$/Ton/Year	Ranking (1)	\$/Ton/Year	Ranking (2)	Total (1 + 2)	Composite Ranking
NEW PROPOSED PROJECTS													
10	Hampton	Citywide CCTV Camera Locations Phase II (10 Locations)	\$500,000	10	\$50,000	139	46	\$325,668	39	\$977,354	45	84	44
22	James City Co	Croaker Road Bikeway	\$1,130,000	15	\$75,333	117	143	\$584,913	48	\$476,448	42	90	45
23	James City Co	John Tyler Hwy & Ironbound Rd (Five Forks) Intersection Improvements	\$300,000	10	\$30,000	53	18	\$516,814	45	\$1,550,735	47	92	46
40	Portsmouth	Downtown Shuttle Bus Service	\$465,000	3	\$155,000	128	157	\$1,102,017	50	\$898,293	44	94	47
42	Virginia Beach	General Booth Boulevard/London Bridge Road Left Turn Lane	\$900,000	10	\$90,000	151	50	\$539,667	46	\$1,619,643	48	94	48
52	York County	Route 17/Route 620 Intersection Improvements	\$800,000	10	\$80,000	129	43	\$563,772	47	\$1,691,711	49	96	49
50	WAT	Service Frequency and Sunday Service	\$4,370,000	3	\$1,456,667	989	1,044	\$1,336,424	51	\$1,265,692	46	97	50
2	Chesapeake	Volvo Pkwy & Executive Blvd Intersection Improvements	\$300,000	10	\$30,000	45	15	\$599,194	49	\$1,797,583	50	99	51
46	Virginia Beach	S. Independence Boulevard/Dahlia Drive Intersection Improvements	\$1,000,000	10	\$100,000	53	18	\$1,709,081	53	\$5,128,208	51	104	52
3	Chesapeake	Volvo Pkwy & Progressive Drive Intersection Improvements	\$320,000	10	\$32,000	16	5	\$1,784,251	54	\$5,356,044	52	106	53
38	Portsmouth	Airline Blvd. Coordinated Signal Upgrade from Alexander corner to WCLL	\$1,500,000	10	\$150,000	101	4	\$1,350,640	52	\$35,162,016	55	107	54
39	Portsmouth	Resignalization of Alexander's Corner	\$900,000	10	\$90,000	40	13	\$2,062,294	55	\$6,190,008	53	108	55
16	Hampton	Coliseum Central Transit Shuttle	\$5,324,480	3	\$1,774,827	186	216	\$8,643,218	56	\$7,468,769	54	110	56
58	Portmouth/Ches/ VPA	Relocation of Commonwealth Rail to the Centerlines of VA Rte. 164 and I-664	\$60,000,000	20	\$3,000,000	55	18	\$49,509,301	57	\$148,575,009	56	113	57
36	Norfolk	Research Partnership with Virginia Universities (Regional ITS Data)	\$300,000	3	\$100,000			Qualitative		Qualitative			

TABLE 3 – CONTINUED

Table 4 shows the final allocations recommended by the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) and approved by the Metropolitan Planning Organization on June 21, 2006. The Transportation Technical Subcommittee (TTS) excluded projects 56, 57, and 58 because the applications were submitted after the deadline.

TABLE 4 HAMPTON ROADS CMAQ AND RSTP PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

							FY-07	FY-08	FY-09	FY-10
Project Number	Jurisdiction	Project Name	UPC #	TOTAL CMAQ REQUEST	TOTAL ALLOCATION	Allocated	Allocated	Allocated	Allocated	Allocated
	PREVIOU	JSLY APPROVED PROJECTS								
A1	Chesapeake	Citywide Fiber optic Communications Ring, Phase III			\$500,000		\$500,000			
A2	Newport News	Signal System Retiming -Phases VI-XI			\$200,000		\$200,000			
A3	Virginia Beach	Citywide ITS project, Phase I26	52355	\$3,000,000	\$10,792,360		\$5,500,000	\$4,026,972	\$1,265,388	
A4	Chesapeake	Greenbrier Pkwy NBLTL EXT at Woodlake Drive	72797	\$45,000	\$45,000	\$45,000				
A5	Hampton	Citywide CCTV Camera Installations	73234	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000				
A6	Newport News	JCMorris BLVD- Phase IV (Canon Blvd & Oyster Point Rd)	16103	\$1,250,000	\$1,250,000		\$1,250,000			
A7	Newport News	Rivermont Bike Trail	52343	\$440,000	\$440,000			\$440,000		
A8	Newport News	Signal System Upgrade 255 intersections	52350	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000				\$2,000,000	\$1,000,000
A9	Norfolk	Norview Ave/Azalea Garden Rd-Add EB & NB L.T. Lanes	52365	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000				
A10	Virginia Beach	Rosemont & VA Beach Blvd Intersection Imprts.	19013	\$436,000	\$436,000		\$436,000			
A11	Virginia Beach	General Booth Blvd/Dam Neck Rd Intersection Improvements	19012	\$43,000	\$43,000			\$43,000		
NEW PROPOSED PROJECTS										
1	Chesapeake	Signal System Retiming (Battlefield Blvd, Portsmouth Blvd, Taylor Rd)	T4164	\$200,000	\$200,000		\$100,000	\$100,000		
2	Chesapeake	Volvo Pkwy & Executive Blvd Intersection Improvements	T4165	\$300,000	\$300,000					\$300,000
3	Chesapeake	Volvo Pkwy & Progressive Drive Intersection Improvements	T4166	\$320,000	\$320,000					\$320,000
4	Chesapeake	Pughsville Road and Taylor Road Intersection Improvements	T4167	\$95,000	\$95,000			\$25,000	\$70,000	
5	Hampton	Hampton Roads Center Parkway & Big Bethel Road Intersection Improvement	T4168	\$125,000	\$125,000		\$25,000	\$100,000		
6	Hampton	Big Bethel Road / Radford Drive New Traffic Signal Installation	T4169	\$160,000	\$160,000		\$160,000			
7	Hampton	Big Bethel Road / Todds Lane Intersection Improvements	T4170	\$700,000	\$700,000			\$195,000	\$505,000	
8	Hampton	Coliseum Central Transit Shelters	T4171	\$300,000	\$300,000			\$300,000		
9	Hampton	Citywide AVL For Emergency Services Vehicles	T4172	\$270,000	\$270,000		\$270,000			
10	Hampton	Citywide CCTV Camera Locations Phase II (10 Locations)	T4173	\$500,000	\$500,000				\$500,000	
11	Hampton	Citywide Traffic Signal System Retiming (6 Corridors)	T4174	\$150,000	\$150,000		\$57,697	\$92,303		
12	Hampton	Citywide Traffic Sig System Upgrade Phase II (Install fiber to close communication gaps)	T4175	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000		\$470,000	\$530,000		

FY 2007 – 2010 CMAQ ALLOCATIONS



						FY-06	FY-07	FY-08	FY-09	FY-10
Project	lunia di atiana	Drain at Nama		TOTAL CMAQ	TOTAL	Allesseed		Alleseted	Allegeted	Allegated
Number	Jurisdiction	Project Name	UPC #	REQUEST	ALLOCATION	Allocated	Allocated	Allocated	Allocated	Allocated
	NEW									
							1	1	1	
13	Homoton	Collseum Drive & Cunningnam Drive Intersection	T/176	\$785.000	\$785.000		\$180.000	\$605.000		
15	папроп	Improvementa	14170	\$705,000	\$705,000		\$100,000	\$003,000		
14	Hampton	Mercury Blvd and Fox Hill Rd Intersection Improvements	T4177	\$350,000	\$350.000		\$50.000	\$300.000		
15	Hampton	Wayfinder Signs	T/178	\$350,000	\$350,000		\$50,000	\$300,000		
10	Hampion	Collegum Control Tropolt Shuttle	T4170	\$330,000	\$350,000		\$50,000	\$300,000		£4 252 0C0
10	Hampton		14241	\$5,324,470	\$1,352,000					\$1,352,000
17	HRT	Commuter Route 62		\$3,161,170						
A	HRT	Commuter Route 62, Phase 1	T4179		\$2,177,346			\$1,123,758	\$1,053,588	
B	HRT	Commuter Route 62, Phase 2	T4182		\$983,824					\$983,824
18	HRT	New Buses	T4183	\$4,590,000	\$4,590,000		\$4,590,000			
19	HRT	Norfolk Light Rail Transit - Operating Assistance	T4184	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000				\$3,500,000	\$3,500,000
20	HRT	Route 60 Rapid Express		\$2,178,034						
A	HRT	Route 60 Rapid Express. Phase 1	T4186	• / • /• •	\$1.606.927		\$855,445	\$751,482		
B	HRT	Boute 60 Bapid Express Phase 2	T4188		\$571 107		\$000,110	¢	\$571 107	
55		Vans for TRAFEIX Vannaal Bragram	T4190	\$600.000	\$600,000	\$600.000			φ0/1,10/	
33		Aiment Dead Dilement	T4109	\$000,000	\$000,000	\$000,000			* 00.000	
21	James City Co	Airport Road Bikeway	14191	\$29,900	\$29,900				\$29,900	
22	James City Co	Croaker Road Bikeway	T4192	\$1,130,000	\$1,130,000				\$200,000	\$930,000
		John Tyler Hwy & Ironbound Rd (Five Forks) Intersection	-	•••••						
23	James City Co	Improvements	T4193	\$300,000	\$300,000					\$300,000
24	James City Co	Monticello Avenue Geometric Changes	T4194	\$860,000	\$860,000				\$200,000	\$660,000
25	James City Co	Mooretown Road Bikeway	T4195	\$512,000	\$512,000					\$512,000
26	Newport News	Citywide Bus Shelter Program	T4196	\$110,000	\$110,000			\$110,000		
		Jefferson Avenue Sidewalk Project from Buchanan Dr. to								
27	Newport News	J. Clyde Morris Blvd.	T4197	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000				\$400,000	\$600,000
28	Newport News	Mariner's Museum Multi-Purpose Trail	T4198	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000			
29	Newport News	J. Clyde Morris Blvd. Corridor Bike Trail: Phase V	T4199	\$1.000.000	\$1.000.000				\$400.000	\$600.000
30	Newport News	Newport News Shuttle, Phase 2	T4200	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000			\$700.000	\$800.000	+
		Citywide Signal System Retiming Phase IX X (14	200	\$1,000,000	ψ.,000,000			¢100,000	\$300,030	
31	Newport News	Systems, 169 Intersections)	T4201	\$450.000	\$450.000				\$225.000	\$225.000
	nonpon nono	Warwick Boulevard Wide Sidewalk between Menchville		\$100,000	\$ 100,000				\$220,000	\$220,000
32	Newport News	Rd, and Lucas Creek Rd.	T4202	\$1.300.000	\$1.300.000				\$350.000	\$950.000
		Newport News Cultural and Business District Wayfinding		* · , • • • , • • •	+.,				++++,+++	+,
33	Newport News	Sign Project, Phase 2	T4203	\$500.000	\$500.000			\$500.000		
34	Norfolk	Citywide Signal Retiming (City of Norfolk)	T4204	\$300,000	\$300,000		\$300.000	+		
04	Norroik	Develop and Deploy Incident Management Diversion	11201	φ000,000	4000,000		4000,000			
35	Norfolk	System	T4205	\$500.000	\$500.000		\$275.000	\$225.000		
	- tonont	Research Partnership with Virginia Universities (Regional		\$000,000	4000,000		\$210,000	\$220,000		
36	Norfolk	ITS Data)	T4206	\$300.000	\$300.000				\$100.000	\$200.000
37	Portsmouth	Equipment Support for Shuttle Bus Service	T4207	\$900,000	\$900,000		\$900.000	-	 ,	+===;===
- 0.	- ontoiniodan	Airline Blvd. Coordinated Signal Llograde from Alexander		\$000,000	\$000,000		\$000,000			
38	Portsmouth	corner to WCLL	T4208	\$1,500,000	\$1.500.000			\$1.500.000		
39	Portsmouth	Resignalization of Alexander's Corner	T4209	\$900,000	\$900,000		000 0002			
40	Destemouth	Downtown Shuttle Rue Sonico	11200	\$465,000	\$300,000		4300,000			
40	Portsmouth	Downtown Chuttle Bus Convice	T4210	\$403,000	¢210.000		\$455.000	\$455.000		
A	Portsmouth	Downlown Shulle Bus Service, Flase 1	14210		\$310,000		\$155,000	\$155,000	A	
В	Portsmouth	Downtown Shuttle Bus Service, Phase 2	T4211		\$155,000				\$155,000	
44	a	Deviced Occurst of Transmitted Occursticate (DOTO)	T1010	\$050 000	\$050 000		¢ 450.000	\$200.000		
41	Regionwide	Regional Concept of Transportation Operations (RCTO)	14212	\$650,000	\$650,000		\$450,000	\$200,000		
42	Minute Deach	General Booth Boulevard/London Bridge Road Left Turn	T4000	¢000.000	¢000.000			\$200.000	¢c00.000	
42	Virginia Beach		14220	\$900,000	\$900,000			\$300,000	\$600,000	
43	Virginia Beach	City of Virginia Beach Citywide Retiming Project		\$1,200,300						
		City of Virginia Beach Citywide Retiming Project, Phase	- 1010		0017157					
A	Virginia Beach		14213		\$317,457	\$317,457				
	Virginic D-	City or Virginia Beach Citywide Retiming Project, Phase	T4044		\$000 0 / C			\$000 0 (s		
в	virginia Beach	Z City of Vizzinia Basek Cityside Detimine Desired Bi	14214		\$283,043			\$283,043		
~		ony or virginia Beach Citywide Retiming Project, Phase	T4045		PEOO 000					\$F00.000
0	virginia Beach	Indian Divor Road/Kompeville Bood Interportion	14215		¢298,800					\$599,800
44	Virginia Roach	Improvements	T4216	\$1 500 000	\$1 500 000				\$750.000	\$750.000
	• riginia DedUll		. 72 10	φ1,500,000	φ1,300,000				\$130,000	\$150,000
45	Virginia Reach	Rosemont Road/Lynnhaven Parkway Left Turn Lane	T4217	\$700.000	\$700.000			\$292 200	\$407 800	
	gina Deaon	S. Independence Boulevard/Dablia Drive Intersection		<i>\</i>	<i>wi</i> 00,000			<i>4101,100</i>	÷ 101,000	
46	Virginia Beach	Improvements	T4218	\$1 000 000	\$1 000 000				\$400.000	\$600.000
	gina Dodon	S. Independence Boulevard/Lynnhaven Parkway		\$1,000,000	÷.,000,000				+.00,000	+ 500,000
47	Virginia Beach	Intersection Improvements	T4219	\$900.000	\$900.000				\$200.000	\$700.000
	5	Salem Road/Princess Anne Road Intersection		\$000,000	2000,000				+100,000	÷: 00,000
48	Virginia Beach	Improvements	T4221	\$900.000	\$900.000		\$300.000	\$600.000		
	5			\$000,000	2000,000		+500,050	+ 200,000		
49	WAT	Newport News/James City County Employee Connection		\$282.000						
-		Newport News/James City County Employee		<i> </i>						
A	WAT	Connection, Phase 1	T4222		\$184,000		\$92,200	\$91,800		
		Newport News/James City County Employee								
В	WAT	Connection, Phase 2	T4223		\$98,000				\$98.000	
50	WAT	Service Frequency and Sunday Service		\$4.370.000						
Δ	WAT	Service Frequency and Sunday Service Phase 1	T4224	\$ 1,010,000	\$2 835 500			\$1,362,200	\$1 473 300	
	WAT	Service Frequency and Sunday Service, Phase 1	T4225		\$1 534 500			ψ1,302,200	\$1, 4 73,300	\$1 524 500
E4	VVAI	Magretour Deed Cerrider	14220	604E 000	\$1,534,500		\$450.0C0	\$405.0C0		\$1,334,500
51	WAT	Mooretown Road Corridor	14226	\$315,000	\$315,000		\$150,000	\$165,000		
52	York County	Route 17/Route 620 Intersection Improvements	T4227	\$800,000	\$800,000		\$500,000	\$300,000		
53	York County	Lightfoot Road bikeway	T4228	\$184,000	\$184,000			\$184,000		
54	York County	Route 143 Bikeway	T4229	\$173,000	\$173,000			\$173,000		
		Rte 17 Coord Timing & Sig Sys Upgrades - Courthouse								
56	Gloucester Co	Area (Rte 615 to Walter Reed Hos)		\$ 55,000	\$0					
		Rte 17 Coord Timing & Sig Sys Upgrades Gloucester								
57	Gloucester Co	Pt Area (Rte 1206 to Rte 636 N)		\$ 60,000	\$0					
	D : (0) :	Relocation of Commonwealth Rail to the Centerlines of								
58	Ports/Unes/VPA	VA KIB. 164 and 1-664		\$4,800,000	\$0					

\$70,268,874 \$69,874,632 \$1,212,457 \$19,716,342 \$16,073,758 \$16,254,083 \$16,617,992

MARK	\$1,212,457	\$19,716,342	\$16,073,758	\$16,254,083	\$16,617,992
ALLOCATED	\$1,212,457	\$19,716,342	\$16,073,758	\$16,254,083	\$16,617,992
8% RESERVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
UNALLOCATED	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0







Figure 4





RSTP PROJECT SELECTION

Projects selected for funding with Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds must meet certain criteria originally developed by the TTC in 1992 and reviewed and revised in 1999, 2001, 2003, and 2006. Details on the policies, procedures, and analysis methodologies used for RSTP project selection in Hampton Roads are included in **Appendix D**.

To help insure that all of the necessary information is included with each project proposal, and to provide some uniformity to the way that project information is submitted, HRPDC staff developed application forms to be used by localities and transit agencies when submitting RSTP project proposals. The latest version of the RSTP Candidate Project Application form is included in **Appendix E**. An automated version of the application form is made available in a special area of the HRPDC web site for use by locality and transit agency staffs.

Table 5 shows all of the projects proposed for RSTP funding during the 2006 session of the project selection process. As shown in the table, 17 new projects and 13 funding request applications for previously approved projects were proposed, with a total funding requests of over \$265 million.



TABLE 5 HAMPTON ROADS CMAQ AND RSTP PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS RSTP PROPOSALS

JUNE 2006

Project Number	Jurisdiction	Project Name	TOTAL COST	TOTAL REQUEST
	PREVIOUSLY	APPROVED PROJECTS		
A1	Chesapeake	Portsmouth Blvd widening to 4 lanes fr. WCL to Joliff Rd.		\$2,000,000
A2	Hampton	Saunders Road- Widening (2 to 4LD) fr. Big Bethel to WCL 29		\$0
A3	James City Co.	Route 60 Relocation & Upgrade		\$38,753,000
A4	Newport News	Oyster Point Subarea CCTV & Static Signs		\$0
A5	Norfolk	Wesleyan Drive- Widen to 4 Lanes, Northampton Blvd to ECL		\$0
A6	HRT	Peninsula Rapid Transit Project		\$5,000,000
A7	HRT	Regional TDM Program: TRAFFIX		\$4,650,000
A8	HRT	Replacement of HRT Southside Bus Facility		\$16,000,000
A9	Chesapeake	Mt Pleasant Rd/Fentress Airfield Rd: Add LTL		\$1,202,000
A10	Chesapeake	Greenbrier Pkwy: Construct 3rd NB Lane from Volvo Pkwy to Eden Way		\$59,000
A11	Gloucester Co.	Route 17 Widening and Install Raised Median		\$1,748,000
A12	James City Co.	Rt 615 Ironbound Rd: 4 Lane from Rt 747 to 0.26 Mi E Rt 616		\$2,600,000
A13	Newport News	Route 60 Relocated/Upgrade		\$25,000,000
A14	Norfolk	Princess Anne Rd/Kilmer Ln: Add EB and WB LTLs		\$3,100,000
A15	Poquoson	Wythe Creek Rd: Widen to 5-L from Alphus St to SCL		\$2,000,000
A16	Virginia Beach	Wesleyan Drive- Widen to 4 Lanes, WCL to Baker Rd.		\$4,950,000
A17	HRT	Norfolk LRT: 8 mile/11 stations		\$25,000,000
	NEW HIGHWA	AY PROJECTS		
1	Chesapeake	U.S. Route 17/Dominion Boulevard	\$9,000,000	\$9,000,000
2	Chesapeake	Hanbury Road	\$11,100,000	\$11,100,000
3	Chesapeake	U.S. Route 17 Business Long Bridge Replacement	\$3,450,000	\$3,450,000
4	Chesapeake	Mt. Pleasant Road	\$8,300,000	\$8,300,000
5	Gloucester County	Rte. 17 Access Management - Crossover Improvements	\$6,000,000	\$1,000,000
6	Hampton	Commander Shepard Blvd. Phase 2	\$18,000,000	\$18,000,000
7	Hampton	Wythe Creek Rd Widening	\$25,000,000	\$12,000,000
8	HRT	Purchase of Replacement Buses	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000
9	HRT	Paratransit Replacement Vehicles	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
10	HRT	New Ferry Vessels	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000
11	Newport News	Middle Ground Blvd from Warwick Blvd (Rte 60) to Jefferson Ave (Rte 143)	\$40,000,000	\$40,000,000
12	Norfolk	Princess Anne Road & Sewell's Point Road	\$300,000	\$300,000
13	WAT	Vehicle Purchase (Service Expansion/Sunday Service)	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000
14	WAT	Three Body-on-Chassis Vehicles	\$180,000	\$180,000
15	WAT	Bus Replacement (Public Transit - Colonial Williamsburg)	\$300,000	\$300,000

TOTALS >> \$151,830,000 \$26

0,000 \$265,892,000

Table 6 shows the scoring and ranking of the submitted projects. As shown in the table, the projects were placed into categories of similar projects. Each project was scored against projects within the same category. The detailed scoring worksheets for each proposed project are included in **Appendix F**.



TABLE 6HAMPTON ROADS CMAQ AND RSTP PROJECT SELECTION PROCESSRSTP PROJECTS PROPOSALS RANKED WITHIN CATEGORIES

JUNE 2006

Project Number	Jurisdiction	Project Name	TOTAL COST	TOTAL REQUEST	Total Score (Max = 100)
	HIGHWAY PR	OJECTS			
1	Chesapeake	U.S. Route 17/Dominion Boulevard	\$9,000,000	\$9,000,000	84
6	Hampton	Wythe Creek Rd Widening	\$25,000,000	\$12,000,000	79
4	Chesapeake	Mt. Pleasant Road	\$8,300,000	\$8,300,000	78
2	Chesapeake	Hanbury Road	\$11,100,000	\$11,100,000	67
3	Chesapeake	U.S. Route 17 Business Long Bridge Replacement	\$3,450,000	\$3,450,000	57
5	Hampton	Commander Shepard Blvd. Phase 2	\$18,000,000	\$18,000,000	57
7	Newport News	Middle Ground Blvd from Warwick Blvd (Rte 60) to Jefferson Ave (Rte 143)	\$40,000,000	\$38,000,000	56
15	Gloucester County	Rte. 17 Access Management - Crossover Improvements	\$6,000,000	\$1,000,000	47
8	Norfolk	Princess Anne Road & Sewell's Point Road	\$300,000	\$300,000	43
	TRANSIT - NE	W OR REPLACEMENT VEHICLES			
9	HRT	Purchase of Replacement Buses	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000	70
14	WAT	Bus Replacement (Public Transit - Colonial Williamsburg)	\$300,000	\$300,000	65
10	HRT	Paratransit Replacement Vehicles	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	57
13	WAT	Three Body-on-Chassis Vehicles	\$180,000	\$180,000	52
11	HRT	New Ferry Vessels	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	12
12	WAT	Vehicle Purchase (Service Expansion/Sunday Service)	\$4,200,000	\$4,200,000	12

\$131,830,000

Table 7 shows the final allocations recommended by the Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) and approved by the Metropolitan Planning Organization on June 21, 2006.



TABLE 7
FY 2007 – 2010 RSTP ALLOCATIONS

						FY-06	FY-07	FY-08	FY-09
Project Number	Jurisdiction	Project Name	UPC #	TOTAL REQUEST	TOTAL ALLOCATION	Allocated	Allocated	Allocated	Allocated
	PREVIOUSLY	APPROVED PROJECTS							
		Portsmouth Blvd widening to 4 lanes fr. WCL to		_					
A1	Chesapeake	Joliff Rd.	18591	\$2,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$3,000,000		
A9	Спезареаке	Mt Pleasant Rd/Fentress Airfield Rd: Add LTL Groophright Rhwy: Construct 3rd NR Lang from Volvo	52151	\$1,202,000	\$1,202,000	\$1,202,000			
A10	Chesapeake	Pkwy to Eden Way	72796	\$59.000	\$59.000	\$59,000			
A11	Gloucester Co.	Route 17 Widening and Install Raised Median	56934	\$1,748,000	\$1,748,000		\$1,748,000		
A2	Hampton	Saunders Road- Widening (2 to 4LD) fr. Big Bethel to WCL 29	57047	\$0	\$8,200,000		\$6,200,000	\$1,682,613	\$317,387
A6	HRT	Peninsula Rapid Transit Project	NA	\$5,000,000	\$4,900,000		\$3,400,000		
A7	HRT	Regional TDM Program: TRAFFIX	NA	\$3,550,000	\$2,450,000	\$250,000	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	
A8	HRT	Replacement of HRT Southside Bus Facility	T1824	\$16,000,000	\$10,455,116	-	\$1,980,425		\$6,122,112
A17	HRT	Norfolk LRT: 8 mile/11 stations	T1822	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000	\$2,990,669		\$6,000,000	\$3,509,331
A3	James City Co.	Route 60 Relocation & Upgrade	13496	\$38,753,000	\$3,729,010		\$1,729,010	\$1,000,000	
A12	James Citv Co.	E Rt 616	50057	\$2,600,000	\$2.600.000		\$686.232	\$1.913.768	
A4	Newport News	Oyster Point Subarea CCTV & Static Signs	73002	\$0	\$550,000		\$550,000		
A13	Newport News	Route 60 Relocated/Upgrade	14598	\$25,000,000	\$3,000,000			\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
A5	Norfolk	Wesleyan Drive- Widen to 4 Lanes, Northampton Blvd to ECL	52147	\$0	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000		
A14	Norfolk	Princess Anne Rd/Kilmer Ln: Add EB and WB LTLs	52150	\$3,100,000	\$3,100,000	\$3,100,000			
A15	Poquoson	Wythe Creek Rd: Widen to 5-L from Alphus St to SCL	13427	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	
A16	Virginia Beach	Wesleyan Drive- Widen to 4 Lanes, WCL to Baker Rd.	52148	\$4,950,000	\$4,950,000			\$4,950,000	
	NEW HIGHW/	AY PROJECTS							
1	Chesapeake	U.S. Route 17/Dominion Boulevard		\$9,000,000	\$9,000,000				\$5,000,000
2	Chesapeake	Hanbury Road		\$11,100,000	\$0				
3	Chesapeake	U.S. Route 17 Business Long Bridge Replacement		\$3,450,000	\$3,378,037		\$850,000	\$2,528,037	
4	Chesapeake	Mt. Pleasant Road		\$8,300,000	\$8,300,000			\$700,000	\$3,600,000
5	Hampton	Commander Shepard Blvd. Phase 2	60970	\$18,000,000	\$12,000,000		\$1,500,000	\$3,750,000	\$6,750,000
6	Hampton	Wythe Creek Rd Widening Middle Crewed Blod from Warvish Blod (Bto CO) to		\$12,000,000	\$0				
7	Newport News	Jefferson Ave (Rte 143)	11816	\$40,000,000	\$2 000 000			\$500.000	\$500.000
8	Norfolk	Princess Anne Road & Sewell's Point Road		\$300.000	\$300.000			\$300.000	++++,+++
45		Rte. 17 Access Management - Crossover		* 4 000 000	6 1 000 000		A. 50 000		4454 444
15	Gloucester County	Improvements		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000		\$150,000	\$350,000	\$250,000
	TRANSIT - NE	W OR REPLACEMENT VEHICLES							
9	HRT	Purchase of Replacement Buses		\$20,000,000	\$0				
10	HRT	Paratransit Replacement Vehicles		\$2,000,000	\$0				
11	HRT	New Ferry Vessels		\$4,000,000	\$0				
12	WAT	Vehicle Purchase (Service Expansion/Sunday Service)		\$4,200,000	\$2,100,000		\$2,100,000		
13	WAT	Three Body-on-Chassis Vehicles		\$180.000	\$0		+_,,		
14	WAT	Bus Replacement (Public Transit - Colonial Williamsburg)		\$300,000	\$0				
13	WAT	Bus Replacement (Public Transit - Colonial Williamsburg)		\$180,000	\$0 \$0				

\$264,792,000	\$118,021,163	\$9,601,669	\$26,993,667	\$26,774,418	\$27,048,830
	MARK	\$9,601,669	\$26,993,667	\$26,774,418	\$27,048,830
	ALLOCATED	\$9,601,669	\$26,993,667	\$26,774,418	\$27,048,830
	5% RESERVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
	UNALLOCATED	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Note: Mark shown for FY 06 consists of the remaining reserve for FY 06.



Figure 5





Figure 6





APPENDIX A

CMAQ Policies, Procedures, and Analysis Methodologies



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Program Policies and Criteria:

- Funding Program Criteria, 1992 The Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) agreed to the following set of criteria for the use of CMAQ Funds:
 - Highest reduction in hydrocarbons (HC)
 - Improve air quality over the long term
 - Provide funding for mix of forward thinking and traditional projects
 - Projects should be of regional significance

• Funding Change Policy – Adopted in June 13, 1995

- 1. Approve a CMAQ reserve account of up to 5% of the current year allocation. The Hampton Roads CMAQ allocation has averaged approximately \$7 million per year during the past ten years.
- 2. If the cost/annual allocation and the scope of a project change less than 10% on any one CMAQ funded project, the locality/agency should notify the TTC with a request and justification for a change in funding. The TTC must review the request and recommend use of the reserve account or, if possible, commit future year funding to preserve the project.
- 3. If the cost/annual allocation and/or scope of the project change by more than 10% on any one CMAQ funded project, the locality/agency should notify the TTC and MPO with a request and justification for a change in funding and/or scope. The TTC and MPO must review the request and may recommend one or any combination of the following:
 - Scale back the project
 - Use local funds
 - Use urban funds
 - Use reserve account CMAQ funds
 - Use existing CMAQ funds from another project
 - Use future CMAQ allocations
 - Use future non-CMAQ funds
 - Drop the project





u Funding Change Policy – Adopted in June 2001

- On-going projects will be funded to completion before funding is committed to a new CMAQ project.
- To increase the reserve account from 5% of the mark to 8%.

Reserve Account Policy Change – Adopted in May 2006

• To allocate the full amount of FY 07-10 CMAQ Marks without allowing any amount in the reserve account.

Application Process and Preliminary Screening:

HRPDC staff provides standard application forms for submitting CMAQ project proposals. These forms are made available in electronic format and on the HRPDC web site. Jurisdictions and transit agencies return completed forms to HRPDC within a set time schedule. Projects are screened using the following criteria:

- Must meet all applicable SAFETY-LU requirements
- Must be included in the current Regional Transportation Plan
- Must be well defined
- Reasonable data (including data required for the emissions analysis) and cost estimates must be provided

Emissions Analysis of Eligible Projects:

HRPDC staff performs an emissions analysis on all eligible projects. Emissions are estimated for volatile organic compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NOx). Analysis results are tabulated for the eligible projects.

Project Ranking:

Projects are ranked based on their cost-effectiveness ratios for VOC and NOx reduction. Each project is analyzed to estimate the impact of the project on VOC and NOx emissions. The cost per reduction of emissions is computed using the total cost of each project and annualizing the cost over the effective life of the project. Once all of the projects are analyzed, they are ranked on the basis of their cost effectiveness ratios. In the cost effectiveness analysis, the amount of emissions reduction per dollar spent is computed for VOC and NOx . A rank is then applied for each of these emission types, with a lower rank number indicating greater cost effectiveness. Finally, the two ranks are combined and these composite ranks are scored, again with the lower composite

rank number indicating greater cost effectiveness.

Project Selection:

The Transportation Technical Subcommittee (TTS) reviews the ranked set of eligible CMAQ projects and makes recommendations to the TTC.

CMAQ Analysis Methodologies:

Projects proposed for CMAQ funding are analyzed for their effectiveness in reducing emissions of VOCs, also known as hydrocarbons, and NOx. The analysis methodologies for various types of CMAQ projects were originally developed in 1993. Over the years, as "new" types of projects were proposed, analysis methodologies were developed to evaluate them. The projects can be divided into three primary groups:

- Highway Projects
- Non-Highway Projects
- Other Projects including ITS

A. HIGHWAY PROJECTS

Highway Projects include improvements to traffic signal timing and intersection/interchange geometric design, upgrades to traffic signal systems, and Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) projects. Analysis methodologies vary depending on the type of project being evaluated. A brief description of the analysis methodologies used for each type of highway project is included below.

Isolated Intersection Analysis

This project type refers to improvements at individual intersections that are not part of a coordinated signal system. The projects may include improvements in the geometric design of the intersection and signal timing or improvements in timing only. The change in emissions for a project is based on the change in delay (in hours per day) at the intersection as a result of the project.

Highway Capacity Software is used to compute the intersection delay for the afternoon peak hour with and without the project. Then, using the total number of vehicles entering the intersection during the afternoon peak hour and the change in intersection delay resulting from the project, vehicle-hours of delay are computed for the afternoon peak hour. That value is then converted to vehicle-hours of delay per day by using a seventeen percent conversion factor derived in the **Cost Benefit Model for**



Intersection Level of Service Improvements, a study published by the HRPDC in June 1997. The Idle Emissions Factors are applied to the vehicle-hours of delay per day to compute the change in emissions of VOC and NO_x for the intersection in units of kilograms per day.

Coordinated Signal Systems

This type of project includes several intersections along a section of roadway for which the signal timing is coordinated to promote progression of traffic along that section. Most of the projects in this category consist of improvements to signal timing only. The change in emissions for a project is based on the change in average speed (in miles per hour) along the section of roadway as a result of the project.

The initial average speed along the section of roadway is either submitted with the project proposal or taken from one of the HRPDC **Regional Travel Time** studies. In an analysis of a sample of before and after studies of coordinated signal system improvements, it was determined that an average increase of four miles-per-hour in average speed resulted from such improvements. Therefore, for the purposes of the emissions analyses, an increase of four miles-per-hour is assumed to occur as a result of the coordinated signal system projects.

The emissions factors are determined for the "before" and "after" average speeds. These factors are multiplied by the daily VMT (vehicle miles traveled) for the section of roadway to compute the daily change in emissions of VOC and NO_x for the section in units of kilograms per day.

Citywide Signal System Improvements

This type of project includes a large number of intersections within a jurisdiction. Nearly all of the intersections included in this type of project are part of a coordinated signal system. The projects in this category include improvements to signal equipment and signal timing. The change in emissions for a project is based on the change in average speed (in miles per hour) for the citywide system.

To analyze these projects, "citywide" values for average speed and VMT for principal and minor arterials are obtained from a VDOT Conformity Analysis. Then, using the analysis discussed in the section on Coordinated Signal Systems, a four miles-per-hour increase in average speed is assumed to result from the project. If the applicant submits additional "before" and "after" data and analyses, the staff will use this data in lieu of the average value estimated for this category.

The emissions factors are determined for the "before" and "after" average speeds. These factors are multiplied by the citywide daily VMT to compute the daily change in emissions of VOC and NO_x in units of kilograms per day.



Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

A wide array of projects are classified as ITS projects, including Advanced Traffic Management Systems, variable message signs, communications, incident management and other innovative applications that take advantage of new technologies to help improve traffic flow, safety, driver information and, often as a result, air quality. Analysis methodologies for ITS projects are usually project-specific and may be qualitative or quantitative depending on the type of project and the availability of input data.

B. NON-HIGHWAY PROJECTS

Transit Projects

Transit projects include park & ride lots, replacement buses, and new/expanded transit services. Emissions benefits for most transit projects are based on the predicted reduction in automobile trips and VMT resulting from the project. Projects that involve new or expanded service also take into account the increase in emissions due to the "new" transit vehicles on the road. Park and ride lot projects take into account the emissions due to the automobile trips to the lot. Emissions reductions resulting from replacement buses are due to emissions improvements in the newer bus engines and any increases in ridership due to newer vehicles.

Bikeway Projects

Air quality benefits of bikeway projects are calculated as a function of a reduction in the number of automobile trips and VMT. Specifically, emissions reductions are based on cold start and hot soak emissions produced at the beginning and end of a trip, respectively. The methodology is based on Census data for Hampton Roads, results from the regional model and a review of CMAQ studies conducted in different regions of the country. The Benefit Cost Analysis of Bicycle Facilities tool based on the Guidelines for Analysis of Investments in Bicycle Facilities (NCHRP Report #552) was used to determine the reduction of vehicle trips attributable to a given bikeway.

C. OTHER PROJECTS

The "Other" group includes projects that may not fit perfectly within the Highway or Non-Highway groups. Innovative projects in this group may include alternative fuels, truck idling controls, early engine retirement programs, and Intermodal freight projects, among others.



APPENDIX B

CMAQ Candidate Project Application Forms



HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

CMAQ CANDIDATE PROJECT APPLICATION

To be considered for CMAQ funding, a proposed project must be included in the current Regional Transportation Plan. Data necessary for evaluating the project must be submitted for each candidate project. Filling out the appropriate sections of this application will insure that the necessary data are submitted. One application should be filled out for each project being proposed for CMAQ funding.

Form A must be filled out for each project. At the end of Form A, you will indicate the CMAQ Project Type that best fits your proposed project. Depending upon the CMAQ Project Type selected, you will be directed to fill out one of the following forms: Form B, Form C, Form D, Form E, or Form F. If you select the "Other" category, please contact HRPDC staff for input data requirements.

CMAQ FORM-A

Locality/Agency:	Date:
Prepared By:	Phone:
E-mail <u>:</u>	Fax:
PPMS#:	_
Project Name:	
Project Location:	
Project Description:	
(Brief description of project. If applicable, include additional data or ma	ps as attachments.)
Is this a new project?	
Is this project included in the Regional Transportation Plan?	
Estimated Start Date:	
Estimated Completion Date:	



CMAQ FORM-A (Continued)

Need for and Benefit to be Derived from Project: (Probable impact on air quality)				
Project Cost and Funding: Total Project Cost: \$ Indicate Requested CMAQ Funding Per Fiscal Y	∕ear Below:			
Fiscal Year 1: Year:	Requested CMAQ Amount: \$			
Fiscal Year 2: Year:	Requested CMAQ Amount: \$			
Fiscal Year 3: Year:	Requested CMAQ Amount: \$			
CMAQ Project Type (Please check ONE below and then use the ass	ociated form to complete your application)			
Citywide Signal System	USE FORM-B, Section 1			
Intersection Geometric/Timing	USE FORM-B, Section 2			
Signal System Coordination	USE FORM-B, Section 3			
Park & Ride Lots	USE FORM-C			
	USE FORM-D			
I ransportation Demand Management				
I ransit Service (New or Expanded)	USE FORM-F, Section 1			
	USE FURIVI-F, SECTION 3			



CMAQ FORM-B

HIGHWAY PROJECTS

(Fill out only ONE section below, depending on the Project Type)

SECTION 1: Citywide Signal System

1-a. Number of intersections included in project:

1-b. Other data: -

SECTION 2: Intersection Geometric/Timing

2-a. Attach the intersection analysis showing the total intersection delay (seconds/vehicle) and the total number of vehicles entering the intersection during the AM and PM peak hours, with and without the proposed improvements **OR**

- 2-b. Attach a drawing of the current intersection geometry
- 2-c. Attach the current signal timing plan
- 2-d. Attach recent turning movement counts for the AM and PM peak hours

SECTION 3: Signal System Coordination

- 3-a. Segment length in miles:
- 3-b. Posted speed limit:
- 3-c. Current average speed during the peak hour:
- 3-d. Current Average Daily Traffic for the segment (vehicles/day):



CMAQ FORM-C

PARK & RIDE LOTS

1.	Is this a new Park & Ride lot?	If "yes", what is	If "yes", what is the size of the lot?		
2.	Please provide the current mode share of trips expected to use this P&R lot:				
	a. Single Occupant Vehicle:	%			
	b. Carpool/Vanpool:	%			
	c. Bike/Walk:	%			
	d. Transit:	%			
3.	Number of parking spaces:	Current:	After Project:		
4.	Is the lot currently served by tra	nsit?			
5.	Will the lot be served by transit	after the project?			
6.	Services available at this P&R I	ot:			
	a. Local Bus?	Frequency:	Boardings:		
	b. Express Bus?	Frequency:	Boardings:		
	c. HOV Express?	Frequency:	Boardings:		
7. 8.	Estimated average distance per Additional information on improv	ople drive from home to I vements:	ot (miles):		





CMAQ FORM-D

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS

1.	Type of facility (shoulder lane, separated, etc.):	
2.	Length of facility (miles):	
	a. Existing:	
	b. After Project:	
3.	Expected primary use of facility (Check all that apply):	
	a. Recreation:	
	b. Work trips:	
	c. Non-Work trips:	
4.	Is this a Bikeway project? (If yes, fill in a through d below)	
	a. Population within 3 miles of the corridor:	
	b. Percentage of trips that are work trips within 3 miles of the corridor: %	
	c. Percentage of trips that are non-work trips within 3 miles of the corridor: <u>%</u>	
	d. List the TAZs within 3 miles of the corridor:	
5.	Is this a pedestrian project? (If yes, fill in a through d below)	
	a. Population within 1 mile of the corridor:	
	b. Percentage of trips that are work trips within 1 mile of the corridor: %	
	c. Percentage of trips that are non-work trips within 1 mile of the corridor:%	
	d. List the TAZs within 1 mile of the corridor:	

6. Additional information: -





CMAQ FORM-E

TDM PROGRAM

1.	Type of TDM Program:
2.	Current total number of employees at site or area:
3.	Number of employees expected to participate in this program:
4.	Number of employees currently driving to work alone:
5.	Number of employees currently car/vanpooling:
6.	Number of employees currently using transit:
7.	Number of employees currently biking or walking:
8.	Number of employees currently telecommuting: Days/week:
9.	Average one-way distance of employees' commute (miles):

10. Additional information: —



CMAQ FORM-F

TRANSIT PROJECTS

(Fill out only ONE section below, depending on the Project Type)

SECTION 1: New or Expanded Transit Service (Includes tourist shuttles & special events service)

1-a.	Estimated daily ridership:
1-b.	Number of transit trips during peak hours: AM PM
1-c.	Number of transit trips per day:
1-d.	Number of vehicles used for this service:
1-e.	Hours of service per day:
1-f.	Number of days per week service is available:
1-g.	Number of days per year service is available:
1-h.	Length of route (miles):
1-i.	Does the project include a change in service frequency?
	If "Yes", please specify:
	Expected increase in daily ridership:
1-j.	Does the project include a change in service coverage?
	If "Yes", please specify:
	Expected increase in daily ridership:
	SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase
2-a.	SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase Type of new vehicles:
2-a. 2-b.	SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase Type of new vehicles: Number of new vehicles:
2-a. 2-b. 2-c.	SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase Type of new vehicles: Number of new vehicles: Emissions rates of new vehicles (specify units, i.e. grams/brake-horsepower/hour):
2-a. 2-b. 2-c.	SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase Type of new vehicles: Number of new vehicles: Emissions rates of new vehicles (specify units, i.e. grams/brake-horsepower/hour): VOC: NOx:
2-a. 2-b. 2-c.	SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase Type of new vehicles: Number of new vehicles: Emissions rates of new vehicles (specify units, i.e. grams/brake-horsepower/hour): VOC:
2-a. 2-b. 2-c. If the n	SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase Type of new vehicles: Number of new vehicles: Emissions rates of new vehicles (specify units, i.e. grams/brake-horsepower/hour): VOC: NOx: New vehicles are replacements for old vehicles, fill in 2-d through 2-h; otherwise, skip to 2-i.
2-a. 2-b. 2-c. If the n 2-d.	SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase Type of new vehicles: Number of new vehicles: Emissions rates of new vehicles (specify units, i.e. grams/brake-horsepower/hour): VOC: NOx: New vehicles are replacements for old vehicles, fill in 2-d through 2-h; otherwise, skip to 2-i. Type of vehicles being replaced:
2-a. 2-b. 2-c. If the n 2-d. 2-e.	SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase Type of new vehicles: Number of new vehicles: Emissions rates of new vehicles (specify units, i.e. grams/brake-horsepower/hour): VOC: NOx: Hew vehicles are replacements for old vehicles, fill in 2-d through 2-h; otherwise, skip to 2-i. Type of vehicles being replaced: Average age of vehicles being replaced (years):
2-a. 2-b. 2-c. If the n 2-d. 2-e. 2-f.	SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase Type of new vehicles: Number of new vehicles: Emissions rates of new vehicles (specify units, i.e. grams/brake-horsepower/hour): VOC: NOx: vew vehicles are replacements for old vehicles, fill in 2-d through 2-h; otherwise, skip to 2-i. Type of vehicles being replaced: Average age of vehicles being replaced (years): Average mileage of vehicles being replaced:
2-a. 2-b. 2-c. If the n 2-d. 2-e. 2-f. 2-g.	SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase Type of new vehicles: Number of new vehicles: Emissions rates of new vehicles (specify units, i.e. grams/brake-horsepower/hour): VOC: NOx: wew vehicles are replacements for old vehicles, fill in 2-d through 2-h; otherwise, skip to 2-i. Type of vehicles being replaced: Average age of vehicles being replaced (years): Average mileage of vehicles being replaced: Number of vehicles being retired:
2-a. 2-b. 2-c. If the n 2-d. 2-e. 2-f. 2-g. 2-h.	SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase Type of new vehicles:
2-a. 2-b. 2-c. If the n 2-d. 2-e. 2-f. 2-g. 2-h.	SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase Type of new vehicles: Number of new vehicles: Emissions rates of new vehicles (specify units, i.e. grams/brake-horsepower/hour): VOC: NOx: wew vehicles are replacements for old vehicles, fill in 2-d through 2-h; otherwise, skip to 2-i. Type of vehicles being replaced: Average age of vehicles being replaced (years): Number of vehicles being replaced: Number of vehicles being replaced (specify units, i.e. grams/brake-horsepower/hour): VOC: Number of vehicles being replaced (specify units, i.e. grams/brake-horsepower/hour): VOC:



CMAQ FORM-F (Continued)

SECTION 3: Transit Shelters/Facilities

3-а.	Type of improvement: (Check below)
	Shelters
	Signs
	Pull offs
	Transit center/facility
3-b.	Affected area: (Check below)
	Regionwide
	Multijurisdiction – Specify:
	Citywide – Specify:
	Specific Neighborhood(s) – Specify:
3-с.	Estimated population within ½ mile of the improvements:
3-d.	Expected increase in ridership due to the proposed improvements:
	Explain why ridership is expected to increase:



APPENDIX C

CMAQ Project Analysis Worksheets



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION COORDINATED SIGNAL SYSTEMS

JURISDICTION:ChesapeakePROJECT:Signal Retiming (Battlefield Blvd, Portsmouth Blvd, and Taylor Rd Corridors)PPMS #:PROJECT COST:\$200,000

		I	BEFORE	PROJEC	г	AFTER PROJECT				CHANGE		
ARTERIAL	CURRENT VMT	AVG SPEED (mph)	HC	EMISSIONS ilograms/da CO	y) NOx	AVG SPEED (mph)	HC	EMISSIONS ilograms/da CO	s y) NOx	E (kil HC	MISSIONS lograms/day) CO	NOx
Battlefield Blvd Great Bridge Blvd Walmart Way	170,400	36	140.41	3,174.21	176.02	40	137.17	3,243.56	177.73	-3.24	69.35	1.70
Portsmouth Blvd Peek Trail Dock Landing Rd	37,700	26	34.31	705.78	40.83	30	32.84	696.55	39.25	-1.47	-9.24	-1.58
Taylor Rd Portsmouth Blvd Taylorwood Blvd	32,400	25	29.87	608.96	35.45	29	28.51	600.40	34.25	-1.36	-8.55	-1.20
Battlefield Blvd Cedar Rd Johnstown Rd	18,600	23	17.67	353.96	20.79	27	16.72	346.95	19.98	-0.95	-7.01	-0.82

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day): 7.02 -44.55 1.90

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year): 1,754.33 -11,137.62 474.15



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION GEOMETRIC IMPROVEMENTS AND SIGNAL RETIMING

Chesapeake PPMS NO.: Volvo Pkwy & Executive Blvd Intersection Improvements Volvo Pkwy & Executive Blvd Intersection Install an Eastbound Right Turn Lane on Volvo Pkwy \$300,000 \$300,000	
T COUNTS: 3/2006	
PM Peak Hour	
Using the total number of vehicles entering the intersection peak hour and the change in intersection delay resulting project, compute the vehicle-hours of delay for the PM per Convert that value to hours of delay per day using the 17% derived in the Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Lev Improvements , HRPDC, June 1997.	during the PM from the eak hour. K(d) factor el of Service
TOTAL VEHICLES DURING PM PEAK HOUR: 2,712	
INTERSECTION DELAY BEFORE PROJECT (sec/veh): INTERSECTION DELAY AFTER PROJECT (sec/veh): CHANGE IN INTERSECTION DELAY (sec/veh): CHANGE IN VEHICLE DELAY (hours/day):	34.5 31.9 2.6 11.52
	Chesapeake PPMS NO.: Volvo Pkwy & Executive Blvd Intersection Improvements Volvo Pkwy & Executive Blvd Intersection Install an Eastbound Right Turn Lane on Volvo Pkwy \$300,000 \$300,000 TCOUNTS: 3/2006 PM Peak Hour Using the total number of vehicles entering the intersection peak hour and the change in intersection delay resulting project, compute the vehicle-hours of delay for the PM pe Convert that value to hours of delay per day using the 17% I derived in the Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Lev Improvements, HRPDC, June 1997. TOTAL VEHICLES DURING PM PEAK HOUR: 2,712 INTERSECTION DELAY BEFORE PROJECT (sec/veh): INTERSECTION DELAY AFTER PROJECT (sec/veh): CHANGE IN INTERSECTION DELAY (hours/day):

PROJECT EFFECT ON AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	0.18	1.39	0.06
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	45.42	348.28	15.14



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION GEOMETRIC IMPROVEMENTS AND SIGNAL RETIMING

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	Chesapeake Volvo Pkwy & Progressive Volvo Pkwy & Progressive Install an Eastbound Right Left Turn Lane on Volvo Pl \$320,000 \$320,000	PPMS NO.: Dr Intersection Improveme Dr Intersection Turn Lane and Extend Eas wy	ents stbound
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS: 3/2006		
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour		
PROCEDURE:	Using the total number of v peak hour and the chan project, compute the ve Convert that value to hours derived in the Cost Ber Improvements , HRPD	ehicles entering the interse ge in intersection delay res hicle-hours of delay for the of delay per day using the hefit Model for Intersectio C, June 1997.	ection during the PM sulting from the PM peak hour. 17% K(d) factor on Level of Service
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLES DURIN	G PM PEAK HOUR:	2,526
	INTERSECTION DELAY E INTERSECTION DELAY A CHANGE IN INTERSECTI	EFORE PROJECT (sec/ve FTER PROJECT (sec/veh ON DELAY (sec/veh):	eh): 15.5 .): 14.5 1
	CHANGE IN VEHICLE DE	LAY (hours/day):	4.127

PROJECT EFFECT ON AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	0.07	0.50	0.02
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	16.27	124.77	5.42

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION GEOMETRIC IMPROVEMENTS AND SIGNAL RETIMING

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	Chesapeake I Pughsville Rd & Taylor Rd Ir Pughsville Rd & Taylor Rd Ir Install an Eastbound Right T \$95,000 \$95,000	PPMS NO.: htersection Improvements htersection furn Lane on Pughville Ro	5
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS: 1/2006		
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour		
PROCEDURE:	Using the total number of ve peak hour and the chang project, compute the veh Convert that value to hours of derived in the Cost Bene Improvements , HRPDC	hicles entering the interse e in intersection delay res icle-hours of delay for the of delay per day using the efit Model for Intersection , June 1997.	ection during the PM sulting from the PM peak hour. a 17% K(d) factor on Level of Service
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLES DURING	B PM PEAK HOUR:	2,834
	INTERSECTION DELAY BE INTERSECTION DELAY AF CHANGE IN INTERSECTIC CHANGE IN VEHICLE DEL	FORE PROJECT (sec/ve TER PROJECT (sec/veh N DELAY (sec/veh): AY (hours/day):	eh): 39.2): 29.6 9.6 44.45

PROJECT EFFECT ON AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	0.70	5.38	0.23
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	175.26	1,343.79	58.40

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION COORDINATED SIGNAL SYSTEMS

JURISDICTION: **Gloucester Co** Route 17 Coordination & Signal System Upgrades - Courthouse Area PROJECT: DESCRIPTION: From Route 615 to Walter Reed Hospital PPMS #: \$55,000

PROJECT COST:

BEFORE PROJECT		AFTER PROJECT				CHANGE						
ARTERIAL	CURRENT VMT	AVG SPEED (mph)	E (ki HC	EMISSIONS lograms/day CO	/) NOx	AVG SPEED (mph)	E (ki HC	EMISSIONS lograms/day CO	y) NOx	(ł HC	EMISSIONS ilograms/day CO) NOx
Route 17 Route 615 Walter Reed Hosp	80,360	29	70.72	1,489.15	84.94	33	67.90	1,486.58	83.33	-2.81	-2.57	-1.61

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day): 2.81 2.57 1.61

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year): 703.15 642.88 401.80


CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION COORDINATED SIGNAL SYSTEMS

JURISDICTION:Gloucester CoPROJECT:Route 17 Coordination & Signal System Upgrades - Gloucester Point AreaDESCRIPTION:From Route 1206 to Route 636 NorthPPMS #:PROJECT COST:\$60,000

		BEFORE PROJECT		AFTER PROJECT			CHANGE					
ARTERIAL	CURRENT VMT	AVG SPEED (mph)	E (ki HC	MISSIONS lograms/day CO	′) NOx	AVG SPEED (mph)	E (ki HC	EMISSIONS ilograms/day CO) NOx	НС	EMISSIONS (kilograms/day CO) NOx
Route 17 Route 1206 Route 636 N	72,336	37	59.24	1,355.43	74.94	41	57.94	1,385.38	75.88	-1.30	29.95	0.94

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day): 1.30 -29.95 -0.94

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year): 325.51 -7,486.78 -235.09



JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION:	Hampton Hampton Roads Center Pk Hampton Roads Center Pk Add a Free-Flow Accelerati HRCP towards the I-64 Inter	PPMS NO.: wy & Big Bethel Rd Inters wy & Big Bethel Rd Inters on Lane from NB Big Beth erchange	ection Improvements ection nel to EB
PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	\$125,000 \$125,000	-	
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS: 2006		
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour		
PROCEDURE:	Using the total number of very peak hour and the chang project, compute the very Convert that value to hours derived in the Cost Ben Improvements , HRPDC	ehicles entering the inters ge in intersection delay re nicle-hours of delay for the of delay per day using the efit Model for Intersection C, June 1997.	ection during the PM sulting from the PM peak hour. 17% K(d) factor In Level of Service
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLES DURING	G PM PEAK HOUR:	5,212
	INTERSECTION DELAY BI INTERSECTION DELAY AI CHANGE IN INTERSECTION CHANGE IN VEHICLE DEL	EFORE PROJECT (sec/v FTER PROJECT (sec/veł ON DELAY (sec/veh): _AY (hours/day):	eh): 96.3 n): 30.8 65.5 557.8
PROJECT EFFECT ON	I AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emis	ssions Factors	
EQUATION: Emission	(grams/hour) x Change in Dela	ay (hours/day)	

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	8.80	67.45	2.93
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	2,199.21	16,861.93	732.84





JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	Hampton Big Bethel Rd & Radford E Big Bethel Rd & Radford E Install a Fully-Actuated Tra \$160,000 \$160,000	PPMS NO.: or New Traffic Signal Insta or Intersection Iffic Signal	llation
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS: 2006		
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour		
PROCEDURE:	Using the total number of y peak hour and the char project, compute the ve Convert that value to hours derived in the Cost Be Improvements , HRPD	vehicles entering the inters onge in intersection delay re whicle-hours of delay for the s of delay per day using th mefit Model for Intersecti C, June 1997.	section during the PM sulting from the e PM peak hour. e 17% K(d) factor on Level of Service
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLES DURIN	IG PM PEAK HOUR:	3,067
	INTERSECTION DELAY E INTERSECTION DELAY A CHANGE IN INTERSECT	BEFORE PROJECT (sec/v AFTER PROJECT (sec/ve ION DELAY (sec/veh): LAY (hours/day):	veh): 12.7 h): 3.1 9.6 48.11

PROJECT EFFECT ON AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	0.76	5.82	0.25
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	189.67	1,454.28	63.20



JURISDICTION:	Hampton	PPMS NO.:
PROJECT NAME:	Big Bethel Rd & Todds Ln I	ntersection Improvements
LOCATION:	Big Bethel Rd & Todds Ln I	ntersection
DESCRIPTION:	Install an additional WB Rig	ht Turn Lane and an additional
	EB Left Turn Lane on Todd	ls Lane
PROJECT COST:	\$700,000	
CMAQ REQUEST:	\$700,000	

TURNING MOVEMENT COUNTS: 2006

ANALYSIS PERIOD: PM Peak Hour

- PROCEDURE: Using the total number of vehicles entering the intersection during the PM peak hour and the change in intersection delay resulting from the project, compute the vehicle-hours of delay for the PM peak hour. Convert that value to hours of delay per day using the 17% K(d) factor derived in the **Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Level of Service Improvements**, HRPDC, June 1997.
- ANALYSIS: TOTAL VEHICLES DURING PM PEAK HOUR: 4,320 INTERSECTION DELAY BEFORE PROJECT (sec/veh): 78.5 INTERSECTION DELAY AFTER PROJECT (sec/veh): 44.7 CHANGE IN INTERSECTION DELAY (sec/veh): 33.8
 - CHANGE IN VEHICLE DELAY (hours/day): 238.6

PROJECT EFFECT ON AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	3.76	28.85	1.25
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	940.63	7,212.10	313.45



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT SHELTERS/FACILITIES

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION:	Hampton Coliseum Central Transit Shelters Hampton Installation of new, enhanced transit shelt Central Business District: stops along HR	ters at high T routes 11	priority Coliseum 5 and 118
FISCAL YEAR:	2007		
NO. OF SHELTERS:	9 Total (Cunningham-1; C	Coliseum-3;	Saville-2; Pwr Plant-3)
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	Coliseum Central Business District		
COMPLETION DATE:	2007		
PROJECT COST:	\$300,000		
ASSUMPTIONS:	 a. Auto travel factors Average trip length - 7 miles Average auto speed - 35 mph Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.15 for work the b. Transit data Existing Daily Ridership: Increase in Ridership Due to Shelters: 	rips; 1.3 for 967	Non-Work trips 2%
1- INCREASED BUS EMIS	SSIONS:		
No Increase in Service or	Emissions		

2- TRAVEL REDUCTIONS:

Daily Riders:	19	Daily Trips:	17
Reduced VMTs:	235		

Emissions Reduction						
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day		
HC	0.83	235	195	0.20		
NOx	1.05	235	247	0.25		

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.

Total Cost:	\$300,000
Useful life, years :	15
Annualized Cost:	\$20,000

Cost Effectiveness							
туре	kg/day	r.g/yi	TONS/yr	\$/T0N			
HC	0.20	71	0.08	\$254,458			
NOx	0.25	90	0.10	\$201,143			



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION CITYWIDE AUTOMATIC VEHICLE LOCATION FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES VEHICLES

	Hampton		
JUNIODICTION.	nampton		
PROJECT NAME:	Citywide AVL	for Emergency Services Vehicles	
LOCATION:	Citywide		
DESCRIPTION:	Install Automa	tic Vehicle Location systems in the City's	
	Emergency S	ervices Vehicles to Improve Response Tim	nes
	To Incidents		
PROJECT COST:	\$270,000		
CMAQ REQUEST:	\$270,000		

TURNING MOVEMENT COUNTS: 2006

PROCEDURE: The City turned in a Measures of Effectiveness table that included twenty roadway segments along five arterials. The MOE table took into account the estimated time saved per incident, number of vehicles on each road segment per day, number of crashes per year on the included road segments, and the estimated savings in delay expected as a result of the AVL systems.

ANALYSIS:	DELAY SAVED ANNUALLY (Hours/Year)	23677
-----------	-----------------------------------	-------

PROJECT EFFECT ON AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/year)

HC	CO	NOx
----	----	-----

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year): 373.39 2862.90 124.42



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION CITYWIDE CCTV CAMERAS

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION:	Hampton PPMS NO.: Citywide CCTV Camera (10) Locations Phase II Citywide Install CCTV cameras with feed to City Traffic Control Center and Emergency 911 Center. Ten locations as follows: Coliseum/ Cunningham, Executive/Cunningham, Armistead/Rip Rap, Armistead/Todds, Big Bethel/Burton, Pembroke/Armistead, Todds/Orcutt, Power Plant/Queen, Power Plant/Pine Chapel, Mercury/Andrews.
PROJECT COST:	\$500,000
CMAQ REQUEST:	\$500,000
TURNING MOVEMENT	F COUNTS: 2004-2005
PROCEDURE:	The City turned in a Measures of Effectiveness table that included twenty roadway segments along five arterials. The MOE table took into account the estimated time saved per incident, number of vehicles on each road segment per day, number of crashes per year on the included road segments, and the estimated savings in delay expected as a result of the CCTV cameras.

ANALYSIS: DELAY SAVED ANNUALLY (Hours/Year) 8832

PROJECT EFFECT ON AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/year)

	HC	СО	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	139.28	1067.90	46.41



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION COORDINATED SIGNAL SYSTEMS

JURISDICTION:HamptonPROJECT:Citywide Traffic Signal System Retiming (6 Arterials)PPMS #:PROJECT COST:\$150,000

				BEFORE PROJECT			AFTER PROJECT			CHANGE		
ARTERIAL	CURRENT VMT	AVG SPEED (mph)	I (k HC	EMISSIONS ilograms/da CO	s y) NOx	AVG SPEED (mph)	l (k HC	EMISSIONS ilograms/da CO	y) NOx	НС	EMISSIONS (kilograms/da <u>)</u> CO	/) NOx
Armistead Ave Warehouse Rd Marcella Rd	63,832	25	58.85	1,199.72	69.83	29	56.17	1,182.87	67.47	-2.68	-16.85	-2.36
Mercury Blvd Seldendale Dr Langley Square	20,399	37	16.71	382.24	21.13	41	16.34	390.69	21.40	-0.37	8.45	0.27
Big Bethel Rd Saunders Rd Semple Farm Rd	2,495	26	2.27	46.71	2.70	30	2.17	46.09	2.62	-0.10	-0.61	-0.08
Magruder Blvd Butler Farm Rd Hardy Cash Dr	18,264	25	16.84	343.26	19.98	29	16.07	338.44	19.30	-0.77	-4.82	-0.68
Mercury Blvd Newmarket Dr Power Plant Way	126,349	37	103.48	2,367.52	130.90	41	101.21	2,419.83	132.54	-2.27	52.31	1.64
Mercury Blvd Coliseum Dr Charlton Dr	44,173	26	40.20	826.95	47.84	30	38.47	816.13	46.34	-1.72	-10.82	-1.50
Coliseum Dr/ Von Schilling Dr Cunningham Dr/ Hartford Rd	26,143	16	29.10	533.35	32.63	20	26.22	509.01	30.40	-2.88	-24.34	-2.22

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day): 10.79 -3.31 4.94

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year): 2,696.31 -826.95 1,234.66



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION CITYWIDE SIGNAL SYSTEMS

JURISDICTION: LOCATION: PROJECT: PPMS # : PROJECT COST:	Hampton Citywide Install additional fiber to close communi \$1,000,000	ications ga	ps			
ANALYSIS NOTES	5: Overall average reduction = 10.7 seconds/vehicle Overall average intersecti Low = 2,690 vehicles/P Medium = 2,690 vehicle High = Over 5,900 vehicle Using the values listed ab in the analysis, compu hour. Convert that val as derived in the Cost Service Improvement	in initerse on volume M peak ho es/PM pea cles/PM p ove and th te the vehi ue to hours Benefit N ts, HRPDO	ction delay res M peak hour. bur k hour to 5,90 eak hour ne number of i cle-hours of d s of delay per lodel for Inte C, June 1997.	sulting from 00 vehicles/ ntersection elay for the day using a rsection Le	retiming PM peak hor s included PM peak factor of 17 evel of	Jr '%
ANALYSIS:	Number of Intersections:	Total 170	Low 128	Meduim 40	High 2	
	Change in Delay per Intersection: Total Change in Delay: Change in Vehicle Delay (hours/day): Total Change in Vehicle Delay (hours/d	av):	-10.7 -1369.6 -6019.97 -10.478.31	-10.7 -428 -4126.14	-10.7 (se -21.4 (se -332.19	c/veh) c/veh)
	T ON AIR OUALITY: 2007 Emission	ay). Factors	-10,470.01			
EQUATION: EMI	ssion (grains/nour) x Change in Delay (hour	s/day)				

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	165.24	1266.96	55.06
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	41,310.73	316,740.89	13,765.88



JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	Hampton PPMS NO.: Coliseum Dr & Cunningham Dr Intersection Coliseum Dr & Cunningham Dr Intersection Widen Coliseum Dr to allow for dual NB 8 Widen Cunningham Dr to allow for an Exc \$785,000 \$785,000	on Improvements on SB Left Turn Lanes clusive EB Right Turr	and Lane
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS: 2006		
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour		
PROCEDURE:	Using the total number of vehicles enterin peak hour and the change in intersecti project, compute the vehicle-hours of of Convert that value to hours of delay per d derived in the Cost Benefit Model for Improvements , HRPDC, June 1997.	g the intersection du on delay resulting fro delay for the PM peal ay using the 17% K(o Intersection Level	ring the PM m the < hour. d) factor of Service
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLES DURING PM PEAK H	OUR: 3,605	
	INTERSECTION DELAY BEFORE PROJ INTERSECTION DELAY AFTER PROJEC CHANGE IN INTERSECTION DELAY (se CHANGE IN VEHICLE DELAY (hours/day	ECT (sec/veh): CT (sec/veh): cc/veh): /): S	58.6 43.1 15.5 01.3

PROJECT EFFECT ON AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	1.44	11.04	0.48
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	359.96	2,759.93	119.95



JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	Hampton Mercury Blvd & Fox Hill Rd Mercury Blvd & Fox Hill Rd Add Dual EB Left Turn Land \$350,000 \$350,000	PPMS NO.: Intersection Improvemen Intersection es on Mercury Blvd	ts
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS: 2006		
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour		
PROCEDURE:	Using the total number of very peak hour and the change project, compute the very Convert that value to hours derived in the Cost Ben Improvements , HRPDC	ehicles entering the inters ge in intersection delay re nicle-hours of delay for the of delay per day using the efit Model for Intersectio C, June 1997.	ection during the PM sulting from the PM peak hour. 17% K(d) factor In Level of Service
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLES DURING	G PM PEAK HOUR:	4,624
	INTERSECTION DELAY B INTERSECTION DELAY A CHANGE IN INTERSECTION	EFORE PROJECT (sec/v FTER PROJECT (sec/vel ON DELAY (sec/veh):	reh): 148.3 n): 20.8 127.5
	CHANGE IN VEHICLE DEL	_AY (hours/day):	963.3
PROJECT EFFECT ON	I AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emis	ssions Factors	

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	15.19	116.48	5.06
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	3,797.94	29,119.88	1,265.58



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION OTHER (WAYFINDING SIGNS)

JURISDICTION:	Hampton
PROJECT NAME:	Wayfinder Signs
LOCATION:	Hampton
	Design, fabrication & installation of signing that will direct tourists, visitors, and
DESCRIPTION:	citizens to major activity centers.
FISCAL YEAR:	2007, 2008
LENGTH (MI):	citywide
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	Community facilities, transportation facilities, and tourist attractions.
COMPLETION DATE:	2008
PROJECT COST:	\$350,000

ASSUMPTIONS:

Total annual Visitors:576,448Source: Hampton Convention and Visitors BureauCity estimates that up to 20% of these visitors get lost and travel an average of 2 extra miles while lost.

Total number of people:	115,290 (20% of total visitors)
Vehicle Occupancy Counts:	2.5
Total Number of Vehicles Impacted:	46,116
Average Trip length (mi):	2
Total VMTs:	92,232
Average Travel Speed: 35 MPH	

1- REDUCED EMISSIONS:

Emissions Reductions				
Туре	Factors, g/mi	Annual VMTs	kg/yr	ton/yr
НС	0.831	92,232	76.64	0.08
NOx	1.049	92,232	96.75	0.11

2-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Total Cost:	\$350,000
Useful life, years :	10
Annual Cost:	\$35,000

Cost Effectiveness				
Туре	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton	
HC	77	0.08	\$414,267	
NOx	97	0.11	\$328,175	



Appendix C

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT SERVICE (NEW OR EXPANDED)

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME:	Hampton Coliseum Central Transit Shuttle		
	New full-time shuttle service connecting key nodes within Coliseum Central		
DESCRIPTION.	Business District	nodes within consettin central	
FISCAL YEAR	2007 2008 2009		
LENGTH (MI):	4.8 oneway		
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	Coliseum Central Business District		
COMPLETION DATE:	2009		
PROJECT COST:	\$5,324,480		
ASSUMPTIONS:	a. Auto travel factors		
	Average trip length - 7 miles		
	Average auto speed - 35 mph		
	Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.15 for work trip	s; 1.3 for Non-Work trips	
	b. Transit data		
	Daily Ridership:	84	
	No.of Days per week:	7 Number of days per year:	365
	Hours/bus/day:	14 No of Trips/day:	75
	Bus VMT/day= # of trips*length*2way		

1- INCREASED BUS EMISSIONS : (NEW SERVICE)

Increased Emissions				
Туре	g/mi	Bus VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.470	720	338.4	0.34
NOx	0.671	720	483.12	0.48

2- TRAVEL REDUCTIONS:

Daily Riders:	84	Daily Trips:	73
Reduced VMTs:	1,023		

Emissions Reduction				
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.830	1,023	849	0.85
NOx	1.050	1,023	1,074	1.07

3-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.Operating Cost:\$5,324,480 over 3 yearsAnnualizedCost:\$1,774,827

Cost Effectiveness				
Type kg/day Kg/yr Tons/yr \$/Ton				
HC	0.51	186	0.21	\$8,643,218
NOx	0.59	216	0.24	\$7,468,769

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT SERVICE (NEW OR EXPANDED)

JURISDICTION:	HRT		
PROJECT NAME:	Commuter Route 62		
LOCATION:	Southside		
DESCRIPTION:	New commuter service from downtown Su	ffolk via Portsmouth to downtown Norfolk	
FISCAL YEAR:	2008. 2009. 2010		
LENGTH (MI):	25 oneway		
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	Suffolk, Portsmouth, Norfolk		
COMPLETION DATE:	2010		
PROJECT COST:	\$3,161,170		
ASSUMPTIONS:	a. Auto travel factors		
	Average trip length - 7 miles		
	Average auto speed - 35 mph		
	Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.15 for work tri	ps; 1.3 for Non-Work trips	
	b. Transit data		
	Daily Ridership:	1287	
	No.of Days per week:	7 Number of days per year:	365
	Hours/bus/day:	12 No of Trips/day:	75
	Bus VMT/day= # of trips*length*2way		-

1- INCREASED BUS EMISSIONS : (NEW SERVICE)

Increased Emissions				
Туре	g/mi	Bus VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.470	3750	1762.5	1.76
NOx	0.671	3750	2516.25	2.52

2- TRAVEL REDUCTIONS:

Daily Riders:	1287	Daily Trips:	1119
Reduced VMTs:	15,668		

Emissions Reduction					
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day	
HC	0.766	15,668	12,002	12.00	
NOx	0.961	15,668	15,057	15.06	

3-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes. Operating Cost: \$3,161,170 over 3 years AnnualizedCost: \$1,053,723

Cost Effectiveness					
Туре	kg/day Kg/yr Tons/yr \$/Ton				
HC	10.24	3,737	4.12	\$255,780	
NOx	12.54	4,577	5.05	\$208,839	

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT VEHICLE REPLACEMENT/PURCHASE

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: FISCAL YEAR: LENGTH (MI): ACTIVITY CENTERS: COMPLETION DATE: PROJECT COST:	HRT New Buses Region wide Purchase thirteen (13) 40' coach 2008 Throughout the region 2007 \$4,590,000	style passenger buses	
ASSUMPTIONS:	a. Auto travel factors Average trip length - 7 miles Average auto speed - 35 mph Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.3 ; w	ork trips=1.15	
	b. Transit data Daily Ridership: No.of Days per week: Hours/bus/day: Bus VMT/day= # of trips*leng Emission factor changes * Bus V	3147 Route length (mi): 7 Number of days per year: 12 No of Trips/day: h*2way MT *# of new buses	67.3 365 172

1- INCREASED BUS EMISSIONS:

Increased Emissions					
Туре	g/mi	Bus VMT	g/day	kg/day	
HC	0.470	11,576	5,440.53	5.44	
NOx	0.671	11,576	7,767.23	7.77	

2- TRAVEL REDUCTIONS:

New daily Riders:	3,147
Reduced Vehicle Trips:	2,737
Reduced VMTs:	19,156

Emissions Reduction					
Туре	g/mi	VMT	kg/day		
HC	0.83	19,156	15.9		
NOx	1.05	19,156	20.1		

3-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Number of new buses:	30
Useful life of a bus:	15
Total Program Cost:	\$4,590,000
Annualized Total Cost:	\$306,000

Cost Effectiveness				
Туре	kg/day Kg/yr Tons/yr \$/Ton			
HC	10.459	3,817	4.21	\$72,719
NOx	12.346	4,506	4.97	\$61,601

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT SERVICE (NEW OR EXPANDED)

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: FISCAL YEAR: LENGTH (MI): ACTIVITY CENTERS: COMPLETION DATE: PROJECT COST:	HRT Norfolk Light Rail T Southside Operation assistan 2009, 2010, 2011 7.4 c Norfolk 2009 \$7,000,000	Transit - Operating Assi nce for new 7.4 mile ligh oneway	stance It rail transit	
ASSUMPTIONS:	a. Auto travel facto Average trip lengt Average auto spe Vehicle occupanc	ors µth - 7 miles eed - 35 mph cy rate - 1.15 for work tr	ips; 1.3 for Non-Work trips	
	b. Transit data Daily Ridership: No.of Days per we Hours/vehicles/day Seats/Vehicle LRT VMT/day= #	2 eek: y: # of vehicles*length*2w:	2000 7 Number of days per year: 18 No of Trips/day: 64 ay	365 164

1- INCREASED LRT EMISSIONS : (NEW SERVICE)

Trains will be electric and, therefore, will not produce emissions

2- TRAVEL REDUCTIONS:

Daily Riders:	12000	Daily Trips:	10435
Reduced VMTs:	146,087		

Emissions Reduction					
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day	
HC	0.716	146,087	104,598	104.60	
NOx	0.879	146,087	128,410	128.41	

3-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.Operating Cost:\$7,000,000 over 2 yearsAnnualizedCost:\$3,500,000

Cost Effectiveness				
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton
HC	104.60	38,178	42.08	\$83,166
NOx	128.41	46,870	51.67	\$67,744



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT SERVICE (NEW OR EXPANDED)

JURISDICTION:	HRT Route 60 Rapid Express			
	Southside			
DESCRIPTION	New commuter service from Virginia Beach to downtown Norfolk			
FISCAL YEAR	2007 2008 2009			
LENGTH (MI):	21.2 oneway			
ACTIVITY CENTERS	Virginia Beach Norfolk			
COMPLETION DATE:	2007			
PROJECT COST:	\$2,278,035			
ASSUMPTIONS:	a. Auto travel factors			
	Average trip length - 7 miles			
	Average auto speed - 35 mph			
	Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.15	for work trips; 1.3 for Non-Work trips		
	b. Transit data			
	Daily Ridership:	1860		
	No.of Days per week:	7 Number of days per year:	365	
	Hours/bus/day:	12 No trips/day:	97	
	Bus VMT/day= # of buses*le	ngth*2way		

1- INCREASED BUS EMISSIONS : (NEW SERVICE)

Increased Emissions				
Туре	g/mi	Bus VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.470	4112.8	1933.016	1.93
NOx	0.671	4112.8	2759.6888	2.76

2- TRAVEL REDUCTIONS:

Daily Riders:	1860	Daily Trips:	1617
Reduced VMTs:	22.643		

Emissions Reduction				
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.83	22,643	18,794	18.79
NOx	1.05	22,643	23,776	23.78

3-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.Operating Cost:\$2,278,035 over 3 yearsAnnualizedCost:\$759,345

Cost Effectiveness				
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton
HC	16.86	6,154	6.78	\$111,932
NOx	21.02	7,671	8.46	\$89,803



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT VEHICLE REPLACEMENT/PURCHASE

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: FISCAL YEAR: COMPLETION DATE: PROJECT COST:	HRT Vans for TRAFFIX Vanpool F Hampton Roads Replace fifteen vans and exp 2007 2007 \$600,000	Program and van fleet by five	
ASSUMPTIONS:	a. Auto travel factors Average trip length - 7 miles Average auto speed - 35 mp Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.1	s oh 15 for work trips; 1.3 for Non-Work trips	
	b. Transit data Number of New Vans: Daily Ridership: No.of Days per week: Average miles travelled: Van VMT/day:	20 Number of Vans being Replac 300 Number of days per year: 5 No trips/day: 37 (roundtrip) # of vans*length*#trips	15 252 2

300

1- INCREASED VAN EMISSIONS: (NEW SERVICE)

Increased Emissions				
Туре	g/mi	Van VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	3.400	1480	5032	5.03
NOx	0.080	1480	118.4	0.12

2- TRAVEL REDUCTIONS:

Daily Riders: Reduced VMTs: 3,652

Daily Trips:

261

Emissions Reduction				
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.766	3,652	2,798	2.80
NOx	0.961	3,652	3,510	3.51

3 - CURRENT VAN EMISSIONS:

Current Emissions				
Туре	g/mi	Van VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	4.400	1110	4884	4.88
NOx	0.700	1110	777	0.78

4-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Number of new vans:	20
Useful life of a bus:	6
Total Program Cost:	\$600,000
Annualized Total Cost:	\$100,000

Cost Effectiveness				
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton
HC	2.65	668	0.74	\$135,868
NOx	4.17	1,050	1.16	\$86,363



JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: FISCAL YEAR: LENGTH (MI): ACTIVITY CENTERS: COMPLETION DATE: PROJECT COST: JCC Airport Road Bikeway Airport Road: from Richmond Road to Mooretown Road Shoulder paving and widening 2009 0.13 Multijurisdictional connectivity 2009 \$29,900

ASSUMPTIONS:

- Bikeway trips are estimated from the guidelines in NCHRP Report 552: Guidelines for Analysis of Investments in Bicycle Facilities and demand model from
 - www.bicyclinginfo.org/bikecost (Mid Estimate used for calculations).
- 0.31% assumed potential % of work trips removed with bike facility.
- 1.0% assumed potential % of non-work trips removed with bike facility (estimate).
- Used results of the 2002 CMAQ Post Evalaution study
- Each new cyclist will make two trips per day
- Average trip length distance for Work/Non-Work Trips = 9 miles and 7.5 miles
- Average number of persons per vehicle for Work Trips and Non-Work trips=1.1 and 1.4
- Work trips have been reduced to 5/7ths to account for 7 day week.

2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation Study				
Sampled Bikeway	Wkday Counts	Wkend Counts		
YC Bikeway,1	2	4		
NN Bikeway,1	13	31		
JCC Bikeways,2	34	81		
Average:	16	39		

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Demand Estimates					
Work Non-Work Total					
New Cyclists	2	12	14		
New Person Trips by Bike	4	24	28		
Converted to Reduction in Veh Trips	4	17	21		
Converted to VMT Reduction	35	129	164		

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

VMT Emissions Reduction					
Type g/mi VMT g/day kg/day					
HC	0.716	164	117.16	0.12	
NOx	0.879	164	143.84	0.14	

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

r

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.

Useful life of a Bikeway:	15	Total Cost:	\$29,900
Days of Use:	365	Total Annual Cost:	\$1,993
Cost Effectiveness			

Cost Effectiveness					
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton	
HC	0.12	43	0.05	\$42,285	
NOx	0.14	53	0.06	\$34,444	



JURISDICTION:	JCC
PROJECT NAME:	Croaker Road Bikeway
LOCATION:	Croaker Road: from Norge Public Library to Richmond Road
	Richmond Road: from Croaker Road to Old Church Road
DESCRIPTION:	Off road, multi-use path
FISCAL YEAR:	2008, 2009
LENGTH (MI):	1.5
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	Shopping, library, schools, residential
COMPLETION DATE:	2009
PROJECT COST:	\$1,130,000

ASSUMPTIONS:

- Bikeway trips are estimated from the guidelines in NCHRP Report 552: Guidelines for Analysis of Investments in Bicycle Facilities and demand model from
 - www.bicyclinginfo.org/bikecost (Mid Estimate used for calculations).
- 0.31% assumed potential % of work trips removed with bike facility.
- 1.0% assumed potential % of non-work trips removed with bike facility (estimate).
- Used results of the 2002 CMAQ Post Evalaution study
- Each new cyclist will make two trips per day
- Average trip length distance for Work/Non-Work Trips = 9 miles and 7.5 miles
- Average number of persons per vehicle for Work Trips and Non-Work trips=1.1 and 1.4
- Work trips have been reduced to 5/7ths to account for 7 day week.

2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation Study				
Sampled Bikeway	Wkday Counts	Wkend Counts		
YC Bikeway,1	2	4		
NN Bikeway,1	13	31		
JCC Bikeways,2	34	81		
Average:	16	39		

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Demand Estimates						
Work Non-Work Total						
New Cyclists	6	33	39			
New Person Trips by Bike	11	66	77			
Converted to Reduction in Veh Trips	10	47	58			
Converted to VMT Reduction	94	354	447			

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

VMT Emissions Reduction					
Type g/mi VMT g/day kg/day					
HC	0.716	447	320.11	0.32	
NOx	0.879	447	392.98	0.39	

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.

Useful life of a Bikeway:	15	Total Cost:	\$1,130,000
Days of Use:	365	Total Annual Cost:	\$75,333

Cost Effectiveness							
Type kg/day Kg/yr Tons/yr \$/Ton							
HC	0.32	117	0.13	\$584,913			
NOx	NOx 0.39 143 0.16 \$476,448						

Prepared By: Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, May 2006.



JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	James City Co John Tyler Hwy & Irc John Tyler Hwy & Irc Install NB and SB Ri \$300,000 \$300,000	PPM onbound Rd onbound Rd ight Turn Lar	S NO.: Intersection Impro Intersection (Five nes on Ironbound	ovements Forks) Rd	
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS: 200	03			
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour				
PROCEDURE:	Using the total numb peak hour and th project, compute Convert that value to derived in the Co Improvements, I	ber of vehicle e change in the vehicle-t b hours of de st Benefit N HRPDC, Jun	es entering the intering the intersection delay nours of delay for a lay per day using lodel for Intersec ter 1997.	ersection d resulting f the PM pe the 17% K ction Leve	luring the PM rom the ak hour. (d) factor I of Service
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLES I	DURING PM	PEAK HOUR:	1,858	
	INTERSECTION DE INTERSECTION DE CHANGE IN INTER CHANGE IN VEHIC	ELAY BEFOF ELAY AFTER SECTION D LE DELAY (I	RE PROJECT (sec PROJECT (sec/v ELAY (sec/veh): nours/day):	:/veh): /eh):	35.1 30.7 4.4 13.36
PROJECT EFFECT ON	I AIR QUALITY: 200	07 Emissions	s Factors		

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	0.21	1.62	0.07
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	52.66	403.79	17.55



JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	James City Co Monticello Avenu Monticello Ave & Add WB LTL on Add Thru Lane o Add SB LTL on N \$860,000 \$860,000	ue Geomet News Rd/ Monticello on NB Iront News Rd fo (All three i	PPMS NO.: ric Changes (3 Ir Ironbound Conne Ave for Dual Lef oound Connector or Dual Left Turns ntersections)	ntersectio ector Inte t Turns; ; ;	ns) (#1) rsection	
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS:	2015 Fore	cast			
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour					
PROCEDURE:	Using the total ne peak hour and project, comp Convert that valu derived in the Improvemen	umber of vo d the chang oute the vel- ue to hours Cost Ben ts, HRPDC	ehicles entering t ge in intersection nicle-hours of del of delay per day efit Model for In C, June 1997.	the inters delay res ay for the using the tersectic	ection d sulting fi PM pe e 17% K on Leve	luring the PM rom the ak hour. (d) factor (d) factor
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLE	ES DURIN	G PM PEAK HOU	JR:	3,951	
	INTERSECTION INTERSECTION CHANGE IN INT CHANGE IN VEI	I DELAY B I DELAY A ERSECTIO HICLE DEL	EFORE PROJEC FTER PROJECT DN DELAY (sec/ AY (hours/day):	CT (sec/ve ^r (sec/veł veh):	eh): ı):	36.1 20.8 15.3 98.78
PROJECT EFFECT ON	I AIR QUALITY:	2007 Emis	ssions Factors			

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	1.56	11.94	0.52
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	389.42	2,985.80	129.77



JURISDICTION:	JCC
PROJECT NAME:	Mooretown Road Bikeway
LOCATION:	Mooretown Road: from Airport Road to Rain Tree Road
DESCRIPTION:	Const of bikeway by shoulder wedging, widening, and paving, striping and signs.
FISCAL YEAR:	2009
LENGTH (MI):	1.3
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	Retail, residential, employment, recreation, multijurisdictional connectivity
COMPLETION DATE:	2009
PROJECT COST:	\$512,000
LENGTH (MI): ACTIVITY CENTERS: COMPLETION DATE: PROJECT COST:	1.3 Retail, residential, employment, recreation, multijurisdictional connectivity 2009 \$512,000

ASSUMPTIONS:

- Bikeway trips are estimated from the guidelines in NCHRP Report 552: Guidelines for Analysis of Investments in Bicycle Facilities and demand model from

www.bicyclinginfo.org/bikecost (Mid Estimate used for calculations).

- 0.31% assumed potential % of work trips removed with bike facility.

- 1.0% assumed potential % of non-work trips removed with bike facility (estimate).

- Used results of the 2002 CMAQ Post Evalaution study

- Each new cyclist will make two trips per day

- Average trip length distance for Work/Non-Work Trips = 9 miles and 7.5 miles

- Average number of persons per vehicle for Work Trips and Non-Work trips=1.1 and 1.4

- Work trips have been reduced to 5/7ths to account for 7 day week.

2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation Study			
Sampled Bikeway	Wkday Counts	Wkend Counts	
YC Bikeway,1	2	4	
NN Bikeway,1	13	31	
JCC Bikeways,2	34	81	
Average:	16	39	

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Der	nand Estimates		
	Work	Non-Work	Total
New Cyclists	5	26	31
New Person Trips by Bike	10	52	62
Converted to reduction in Veh Trips	9	37	46
Converted to VMT Reduction	82	279	360

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

VMT Emissions Reduction				
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.716	360	258.04	0.26
NOx	0.879	360	316.78	0.32

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes. Useful life of a Bikeway: 15 To

Useful life of a Bikeway: 15 Total Cost: \$512,000 Days of Use: 365 Total Annual Cost: \$34,133

Cost Effectiveness				
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton
HC	0.26	94	0.10	\$328,771
NOx	0.32	116	0.13	\$267,805



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT SHELTERS/FACILITIES

JURISDICTIO PROJECT N LOCATION: DESCRIPTIO FISCAL YEA NUMBER OF ACTIVITY CI COMPLETIC PROJECT C	ON: AME: DN: R: SHELTERS: ENTERS: DN DATE: OST:	Newport News Citywide Bus Shelte Newport News Provide bus shelters 2008 12 To Activity centers cityw 2007 \$110,000	r Program s at key bus st otal vide	ops throughou	ut the City.	
ASSUMPTIC	DNS:	a. Auto travel factor Average trip length Average auto spee Vehicle occupancy	s i - 7 miles ed - 35 mph r rate - 1.15 fo	r work trips; 1.	3 for Non-Work trips	i
		b. Transit data Existing Daily Riders Increase in Ridershi	ship: p Due to Shel	4,860 ters:	2%	
1- INCREAS	ED BUS EMISS	SIONS:				
No Increase	in Service or Er	nissions				
2- TRAVEL F	REDUCTIONS:					
		Daily Riders: Reduced VMTs:	97 1,183		Daily Trips:	85
	E	missions Reduction				
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day		
HC	0.766	1,183	906	0.91		
NOx	0.961	1,183	1,137	1.14		

3-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.

Total Cost:	\$110,000
Useful life, years :	15
Annual Cost:	\$7,333

		Cost Effectivenes	S	
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton
HC	0.91	331	0.36	\$20,108
NOx	1.14	415	0.46	\$16,028



JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: FISCAL YEAR: LENGTH (MI): ACTIVITY CENTERS: COMPLETION DATE:	Newport News Jefferson Avenue Sidewalk Project from Buchanan Dr. to J Clyde Morris Blvd. Jefferson Avenue from Buchanan Drive to J Clyde Morris Boulevard Widen ex sidewalk on both sides of Jefferson Ave to 8' for use by adult cyclists 2008, 2010 4.75 (total 9.5 mi) Shopping, residential, bicycle network connections
COMPLETION DATE:	2011
PROJECT COST:	\$1,000,000

ASSUMPTIONS:

Bikeway trips are estimated from the guidelines in NCHRP Report 552: Guidelines for Analysis
of Investments in Bicycle Facilities and demand model from
www.bicyclinginfo.org/bikecost (Mid Estimate used for calculations).

- 0.31% assumed potential % of work trips removed with bike facility.
- 1.0% assumed potential % of non-work trips removed with bike facility (estimate).
- Used results of the 2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation study
- Each new cyclist will make two trips per day
- Average trip length distance for Work/Non-Work Trips = 9 miles and 7.5 miles
- Average number of persons per vehicle for Work Trips and Non-Work trips=1.1 and 1.4
- Work trips have been reduced to 5/7ths to account for 7 day week.

2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation Study			
Sampled Bikeway	Wkday Counts	Wkend Counts	
YC Bikeway,1	2	4	
NN Bikeway,1	13	31	
JCC Bikeways,2	34	81	
Average:	16	39	

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Demand Estimates					
Work Non-Work Total					
New Cyclists	80	115	195		
New Person Trips by Bike	160	230	390		
Converted to reduction in Veh Trips	145	164	310		
Converted to VMT Reduction	1,309	1,232	2,541		

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

VMT Emissions Reduction				
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.716	2541	1819.52	1.82
NOx	0.879	2541	2233.74	2.23

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by a	dividing the total	annual cost by	annual er	nission changes	S.
	I loof all the of o	Dileases	4 -	-	т.

Useful life of a Bikeway: 15 Total Cost: \$1,000,000 Days of Use: 365 Total Annual Cost: \$66,667

Cost Effectiveness				
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton
HC	1.82	664	0.73	\$91,065
NOx	2.23	815	0.90	\$74,178



JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION:	Newport News Mariner's Museum Multi-Purpose Trail From the intersection of Warwick Blvd (Rte 60) and the Avenue for the Arts parallel to Warwick Blvd to just short of the Harpersville Road intersection.
DESCRIPTION:	Separate multi-use trail meandering thru woods & fields & crossing Lake Maury
FISCAL YEAR:	2007, 2008
LENGTH (MI):	1.0
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	University, bicycle and pedestrian network connections
COMPLETION DATE:	2008
PROJECT COST:	\$1,000,000

ASSUMPTIONS:

Bikeway trips are estimated from the guidelines in NCHRP Report 552: Guidelines for Analysis
of Investments in Bicycle Facilities and demand model from
www.bicyclinginfo.org/bikecost (Mid Estimate used for calculations).

- 0.31% assumed potential % of work trips removed with bike facility.
- 1.0% assumed potential % of non-work trips removed with bike facility (estimate).
- Used results of the 2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation study
- Each new cyclist will make two trips per day
- Average trip length distance for Work/Non-Work Trips = 9 miles and 7.5 miles
- Average number of persons per vehicle for Work Trips and Non-Work trips=1.1 and 1.4
- Work trips have been reduced to 5/7ths to account for 7 day week.

2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation Study			
Sampled Bikeway	Wkday Counts	Wkend Counts	
YC Bikeway,1	2	4	
NN Bikeway,1	13	31	
JCC Bikeways,2	34	81	
Average:	16	39	

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Demand Estimates				
Work Non-Work Total				
New Cyclists	32	45	77	
New Person Trips by Bike	64	90	154	
Converted to Reduction in Veh Trips	58	64	123	
Converted to VMT Reduction	526	482	1,008	

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

VMT Emissions Reduction				
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.766	1008	772.22	0.77
NOx	0.961	1008	968.80	0.97

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.

Useful life of a Bikeway	: 15	Total Cost:	\$1,000,000
Days of Use	: 365	Total Annual Cost:	\$66,667

Cost Effectiveness				
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton
HC	0.77	282	0.31	\$214,570
NOx	0.97	354	0.39	\$171,031



rail: Phase V
lvd west on Middle Ground to to Thimble Shoals Blvd to City Center.
for 5,400 feet.
etwork connections

ASSUMPTIONS:

- Bikeway trips are estimated from the guidelines in NCHRP Report 552: Guidelines for Analysis of Investments in Bicycle Facilities and demand model from
 - www.bicyclinginfo.org/bikecost (Mid Estimate used for calculations).
- 0.31% assumed potential % of work trips removed with bike facility.
- 1.0% assumed potential % of non-work trips removed with bike facility (estimate).
- Used results of the 2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation study
- Each new cyclist will make two trips per day
- Average trip length distance for Work/Non-Work Trips = 9 miles and 7.5 miles
- Average number of persons per vehicle for Work Trips and Non-Work trips=1.1 and 1.4
- Work trips have been reduced to 5/7ths to account for 7 day week.

2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation Study			
Sampled Bikeway	Wkday Counts	Wkend Counts	
YC Bikeway,1	2	4	
NN Bikeway,1	13	31	
JCC Bikeways,2	34	81	
Average:	16	39	

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Demand Estimates					
	Work	Non-Work	Total		
New Cyclists	58	81	139		
New Person Trips by Bike	116	162	278		
Converted to Reduction in Veh Trips	105	116	221		
Converted to VMT Reduction	947	868	1,815		

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

VMT Emissions Reduction				
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.716	1815	1299.26	1.30
NOx	0.879	1815	1595.04	1.60

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.

	Days of Use:	365	Total Annual Cost:	\$66,667
Useful	life of a Bikeway:	15	Total Cost:	\$1,000,000

Cost Effectiveness				
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton
НС	1.30	474	0.52	\$127,530
NOx	1.60	582	0.64	\$103,881



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT SERVICE (NEW OR EXPANDED)

JURISDICTION:	Newport News				
PROJECT NAME:	Newport News Shuttle, Phase 2				
LOCATION:	Newport News				
DESCRIPTION:	Purchase 2 29-ft buses to expand shuttle service				
FISCAL YEAR:	2008				
LENGTH (MI):	10 oneway				
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	Newport News				
COMPLETION DATE:	2008				
PROJECT COST:	\$1,500,000				
ASSUMPTIONS:	a. Auto travel factors				
	Average trip length - 7 miles				
	Average auto speed - 35 mph				
	Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.15	for work trips; 1.3 for Non-Work trips			
	b. Transit data				
	Daily Ridership:	120			
	No.of Days per week:	7 Number of days per year:	365		
	Hours/bus/day:	12 No trips/day:	45		
	Bus VMT/day= # of buses*ler	ngth*2way			

1- INCREASED BUS EMISSIONS : (NEW SERVICE)

Increased Emissions					
Туре	be g/mi Bus VMT g/day kg/day				
HC	0.470	900	423	0.42	
NOx 0.671 900 603.9 0.60					

2- TRAVEL REDUCTIONS:

Daily Riders:	120	Daily Trips:	104
Reduced VMTs:	1,461		

Emissions Reduction				
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.766	1,461	1,119	1.12
NOx	0.961	1,461	1,404	1.40

3-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Number of new buses:			
Useful life of a bus:			
Total Bus Costs:			
Annualized Bus Cost:			

2	
15 Years of Operation:	2
\$600,000 Total Operation Costs:	\$900,000
\$40,000 Annualized Operation Costs:	\$450,000

Cost Effectiveness					
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton	
HC	0.70	254	0.28	\$874,865	
NOx	0.80	292	0.32	\$761,165	



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION COORDINATED SIGNAL SYSTEMS

JURISDICTION:Newport NewsPROJECT:Citywide Signal System Retiming Phases IX, XDESCRIPTION:Phases IX and X include 14 Signal Systems comprised of 169 IntersectionsPPMS #:PROJECT COST:\$450,000

		I	BEFORE	PROJECT		AFTER PROJECT				CHANGE		
SYSTEM	CURRENT VMT	AVG SPEED (mph)	HC	EMISSIONS ilograms/da CO	y) NOx	AVG SPEED (mph)	HC	EMISSIONS ilograms/da CO	y) NOx	(ł HC	EMISSIONS kilograms/day CO) NOx
Jefferson & Operations	92,732	27	83.37	1,729.72	99.59	31	79.93	1,714.05	96.90	-3.43	-15.67	-2.69
Jefferson & Hogan	161,096	25	148.53	3,027.80	176.24	29	141.76	2,985.27	170.28	-6.77	-42.53	-5.96
Jefferson & Center	239,228	32	204.06	4,423.56	249.04	36	197.12	4,456.34	247.12	-6.94	32.77	-1.91
Jefferson & 25th	8,561	30	7.46	158.18	8.98	34	7.17	158.43	8.85	-0.29	0.25	-0.13
39th & Marshall	8,363	32	7.13	154.64	8.71	36	6.89	155.78	8.64	-0.24	1.15	-0.07
26th & Marshall	7,075	25	6.52	132.97	7.74	29	6.23	131.10	7.48	-0.30	-1.87	-0.26
27th & Wickham	7,131	25	6.57	134.03	7.80	29	6.28	132.15	7.54	-0.30	-1.88	-0.26
Jefferson & Turnberry	184,896	34	154.76	3,421.50	191.18	38	150.51	3,483.81	192.11	-4.25	62.31	0.92
Warwick & Logan	30,821	31	26.57	569.69	32.21	35	25.58	570.55	31.75	-0.99	0.86	-0.46
Warwick & Merry Oaks	100,113	31	86.30	1,850.49	104.62	35	83.09	1,853.30	103.12	-3.20	2.80	-1.50
Denbigh & Old Lucas Creek	93,656	22	90.47	1,794.73	106.02	26	85.23	1,753.33	101.43	-5.24	-41.40	-4.59
Warwick & Colony	94,547	34	79.14	1,749.60	97.76	38	76.96	1,781.46	98.23	-2.17	31.86	0.47

Continued on Next Page



Continued from Previous Page

JURISDICTION:Newport NewsPROJECT:Citywide Signal System Retiming Phases IX, XDESCRIPTION:Phases IX and X include 14 Signal Systems comprised of 169 IntersectionsPPMS #:PROJECT COST:\$450,000

		BEFORE PROJECT			AFTER PROJECT				CHANGE			
ARTERIAL	CURRENT VMT	AVG SPEED (mph)	HC	EMISSIONS ilograms/da <u>y</u> CO	y) NOx	AVG SPEED (mph)	E (ki HC	MISSIONS lograms/da CO	y) NOx	E (k HC	EMISSIONS lograms/day CO) NOx
Warwick & Maxwell	97,730	26	88.93	1,829.60	105.84	30	85.12	1,805.66	102.52	-3.81	-23.94	-3.32
Warwick & 75th	28,394	30	24.73	524.61	29.79	34	23.77	525.43	29.36	-0.97	0.82	-0.43

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day): 38.90 -5.54 20.19

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year): 9,725.91 -1,384.79 5,047.30



JURISDICTION: Newport News PROJECT NAME: Warwick Blvd Wide Sidewalk between Menchville Rd. and Lucas Creek Rd. LOCATION: Warwick Blvd from Menchville Road to just north of Lucas Creek Road **DESCRIPTION:** Widen existing sidewalk to 8' to allow for use by adult cyclists FISCAL YEAR: 2008, 2010 LENGTH (MI): 2.7 ACTIVITY CENTERS: Recreation center, park, bicycle network connections COMPLETION DATE: 2010 PROJECT COST: \$1,300,000

ASSUMPTIONS:

- Bikeway trips are estimated from the guidelines in NCHRP Report 552: Guidelines for Analysis of Investments in Bicycle Facilities and demand model from
 - www.bicyclinginfo.org/bikecost (Mid Estimate used for calculations).
- 0.31% assumed potential % of work trips removed with bike facility.
- 1.0% assumed potential % of non-work trips removed with bike facility (estimate).
- Used results of the 2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation study
- Each new cyclist will make two trips per day
- Average trip length distance for Work/Non-Work Trips = 9 miles and 7.5 miles
- Average number of persons per vehicle for Work Trips and Non-Work trips=1.1 and 1.4
- Work trips have been reduced to 5/7ths to account for 7 day week.

2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation Study					
Sampled Bikeway	Wkday Counts	Wkend Counts			
YC Bikeway,1	2	4			
NN Bikeway,1	13	31			
JCC Bikeways,2	34	81			
Average:	16	39			

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Demand Estimates						
	Work	Non-Work	Total			
New Cyclists	58	74	132			
New Person Trips by Bike	116	148	264			
Converted to Reduction in Veh Trips	105	106	211			
Converted to VMT Reduction	947	793	1,740			

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

VMT Emissions Reduction						
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day		
HC	0.716	1740	1245.56	1.25		
NOx	0.879	1740	1529.12	1.53		

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.

Useful life of a Bikeway:	15	Total Cost:	\$1,300,000
Days of Use:	365	Total Annual Cost:	\$86,667

Cost Effectiveness						
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton		
HC	1.25	455	0.50	\$172,937		
NOx	1.53	558	0.62	\$140,868		

Prepared By: Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, May 2006.



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION OTHER (WAYFINDING SIGNS)

JURISDICTION:	Newport News
PROJECT NAME:	Wayfinder Sign Project
LOCATION:	Newport News
	Design, fabrication & installation of signing that will direct tourists, visitors, and
DESCRIPTION:	citizens to major activity centers.
FISCAL YEAR:	2008
LENGTH (MI):	citywide
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	Community facilities, transportation facilities, and tourist attractions.
COMPLETION DATE:	2008
PROJECT COST:	\$500,000

ASSUMPTIONS:

Total annual Visitors:9,895,411Source: Newport News Department of PlanningCity estimates that up to 10% of these visitors get lost and travel an average of 2 extra miles while lost.

Total number of people:		989,541 (10%	of total visitors)
Vehicle Occupancy Counts:		2.5	
Total Number of Vehicles Impa	acted:	395,816	
Average Trip length (mi):		2	
Total VMTs:		791,633	
Average Travel Speed:	35 MPH		

1- REDUCED EMISSIONS:

Emissions Reductions						
Туре	Factors, g/mi Annual VMTs kg/yr ton/yr					
НС	0.766	791,633	606.39	0.67		
NOx	0.961	791,633	760.76	0.84		

2-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Total Cost:	\$500,000
Useful life,years :	10
Annual Cost:	\$50,000

Cost Effectiveness						
Туре	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton			
HC	606	0.67	\$74,802			
NOx	761	0.84	\$59,623			



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION CITYWIDE SIGNAL SYSTEMS

JURISDICTION: LOCATION: PROJECT:	Norfolk Citywide Citywide Signal Retiming				
PROJECT COST:	\$300,000				
ANALYSIS NOTE	S: Overall average = 10.7 secor Overall average Low = 2,690 Medium = 2,6 High = Over Using the value in the analys hour. Conve as derived in	e reduction in interse nds/vehicle for the P e intersection volume vehicles/PM peak h 690 vehicles/PM peak 5,900 vehicles/PM p s listed above and t is, compute the veh ert that value to hour in the Cost Benefit N	ection delay re M peak hour e our ak hour to 5,9 peak hour he number of nicle-hours of rs of delay pe Model for Int	esulting from 000 vehicles, intersection delay for the r day using a ersection L	n retiming /PM peak hour ns included e PM peak a factor of 17% evel of
	Service imp	Total	C, June 1997	Moduim	High
ANALYSIS:	Number of Intersections: (Provided by City staff)	284	138	139	7
	Change in Delay per Intersec Total Change in Delay:	tion:	-10.7 -1476.6	-10.7 -1487.3	-10.7 (sec/veh) -74.9 (sec/veh)
	Change in Vehicle Delay (hou	ırs/day):	-6490.28	-14338.35	-1162.66
	Total Change in Vehicle Dela	y (hours/day):	-21,991.30		
PROJECT EFFEC	T ON AIR QUALITY: 2007	Emission Factors			
EQUATION: Em	ission (grams/hour) x Change in I	Delay (hours/day)			
		HC	со	NOx	

	HC	00	NOX
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	346.80	2659.03	115.56
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	86,700.69	664,758.44	28,891.07



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION OTHER

JURISDICTION:	Norfolk
PROJECT NAME:	Develop and Deploy Incident Management Diversion System
LOCATION:	Norfolk
DESCRIPTION:	Identify 2 to 5 primary diversion corridors for an Incident Management Diversion
	Signage System to provide wayfinding for motorists during freeway incidents.
FISCAL YEAR:	2007, 2008, 2009
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	I-64, I-264
COMPLETION DATE:	2009
PROJECT COST:	\$500,000

ASSUMPTIONS:

Idle Emissions:

Mobile6.2 provides emissions for 2.5 mph as equivalent to idle 2.5 mph emissions, in g/mi, multiplied by 2.5 mph to get g/hr

HC	15.770 g/hr
NOx	5.255 g/hr

Emissions will be reduced by reducing time vehicles idle while waiting for incidents to clear.

1- DECREASED PASSENGER VEHICLE EMISSIONS:

See attached worksheet to see calculations of delay. Delay: 154,265 hrs/year

Emissions Reduction			
Туре	g/hr	g/year	kg/year
HC	15.770	2,432,761	2432.76
NOx	5.255	810,663	810.66

2- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.

Total Cost:	\$500,000
Useful life, years :	5
Annual Cost:	\$100,000

Cost Effectiveness				
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton
HC	n/a	2,433	2.68	\$37,290
NOx	n/a	811	0.89	\$111,906



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT VEHICLE REPLACEMENT/PURCHASE

JURISDICTION:	Portsmouth			
PROJECT NAME:	Equipment Support for Shuttle Bus Service			
LOCATION:	Portsmouth			
DESCRIPTION:	Purchase two diesel/electric hybrid shuttle buses			
FISCAL YEAR:	2007			
LENGTH (MI):	3.2 oneway			
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	Downtown Portsmouth, Naval Hospital			
COMPLETION DATE:	2009			
PROJECT COST:	\$900,000			
ASSUMPTIONS:	a. Auto travel factors			
	Average trip length - 7 miles			
	Average auto speed - 35 mph			
	Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.15 for work trips	s; 1.3 for Non-Work trips		
	b. Transit data			
	Daily Ridership:	50		
	No.of Davs per week:	6 Number of days per year:	312	
	Hours/bus/day:	4 No trips/day:	32	
	Bus V/MT/dav- # of buses*length*2way			

1- INCREASED BUS EMISSIONS : (NEW SERVICE)

Increased Emissions				
Туре	g/mi	Bus VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.470	204.8	96.256	0.10
NOx	0.671	204.8	137.4208	0.14

2- TRAVEL REDUCTIONS:

Daily Riders:	50	Daily Trips:	43
Reduced VMTs:	609		

Emissions Reduction				
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.766	609	466	0.47
NOx	0.961	609	585	0.58

3-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

Number of new buses:	2
Useful life of a bus:	15
Total Program Cost:	\$900,000
Annualized Total Cost:	\$60,000

Cost Effectiveness									
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton					
HC	0.37	115	0.13	\$471,501					
NOx	0.45	140	0.15	\$389,818					



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION COORDINATED SIGNAL SYSTEMS

JURISDICTION:	Portsmouth
PROJECT:	Airline Blvd: From Victory Blvd to Greenwood Dr
PPMS #:	
DESCRIPTION:	Replace all equipment at five intersections with mast arm poles, video detection, LED signal heads, radio interconnect, battery backup, and fully actuated controllers.
PROJECT COST:	\$1,500,000

		BEFORE PROJECT			AFTER PROJECT			CHANGE				
ARTERIAL	CURRENT VMT	AVG SPEED (mph)	E (kil HC	MISSIONS ograms/da CO	y) NOx	AVG SPEED (mph)	E (kil HC	MISSIONS ograms/day CO	/) NOx	HC	EMISSIONS (kilograms/da CO	S NOx
Airline Blvd Victory Blvd Greenwood Dr	15,500	33	13.10	286.73	16.07	37	12.69	290.44	16.06	-0.40	3.70	-0.02

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day): 0.40 -3.70 0.02

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year): 100.75 -926.12 3.87


JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	Portsmouth PPMS NO.: Portsmouth Blvd & Airline Blvd Intersection Improvements Intersect. of Portsmouth Blvd, Airline Blvd, & McLean St (Upgrade intersection with new controller, LED signal head new monopole structure. \$900,000 \$900,000	s Alexander's Corner) Is, video detection,
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS: 2006	
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour	
PROCEDURE:	Using the total number of vehicles entering the intersection peak hour and the change in intersection delay resulting project, compute the vehicle-hours of delay for the PM Convert that value to hours of delay per day using the 179 derived in the Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Le Improvements , HRPDC, June 1997.	n during the PM ng from the peak hour. % K(d) factor evel of Service
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLES DURING PM PEAK HOUR: 3,61	5
	INTERSECTION DELAY BEFORE PROJECT (sec/veh): INTERSECTION DELAY AFTER PROJECT (sec/veh): CHANGE IN INTERSECTION DELAY (sec/veh): CHANGE IN VEHICLE DELAY (hours/day):	52.6 50.9 1.7 10.04

PROJECT EFFECT ON AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	0.16	1.21	0.05
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	39.59	303.54	13.19

Prepared By: Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, May 2006.



ROAD

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT SERVICE (NEW OR EXPANDED)

Dortomouth			
Polismouli			
Downtown Snuttle Bus			
Portsmouth			
Provide shuttle bus service along core streets and to the Naval Hospital			
2007, 2008, 2009			
3.2 oneway			
Downtown Portsmouth, Naval Hospital			
2009			
\$465,000			
a. Auto travel factors			
Average trip length - 7 miles			
Average auto speed - 35 mph			
Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.15 for work trips	; 1.3 for Non-Work trips		
b. Transit data			
Daily Ridership:	50		
No.of Davs per week:	6 Number of days per year:	312	
Hours/bus/day:	4 No trips/day:	32	
Bus VMT/day= # of buses*length*2way		02	
	Portsmouth Downtown Shuttle Bus Portsmouth Provide shuttle bus service along core street 2007, 2008, 2009 3.2 oneway Downtown Portsmouth, Naval Hospital 2009 \$465,000 a. Auto travel factors Average trip length - 7 miles Average auto speed - 35 mph Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.15 for work trips b. Transit data Daily Ridership: No.of Days per week: Hours/bus/day: Bus VMT/day= # of buses*length*2way	Portsmouth Downtown Shuttle Bus Portsmouth Provide shuttle bus service along core streets and to the Naval Hospital 2007, 2008, 2009 3.2 oneway Downtown Portsmouth, Naval Hospital 2009 \$465,000 a. Auto travel factors Average trip length - 7 miles Average auto speed - 35 mph Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.15 for work trips; 1.3 for Non-Work trips b. Transit data Daily Ridership: 50 No.of Days per week: 6 Number of days per year: Hours/bus/day: 4 No trips/day: Bus VMT/day= # of buses*length*2way	

1- INCREASED BUS EMISSIONS : (NEW SERVICE)

Increased Emissions				
Туре	g/mi Bus VMT g/day kg/day			
HC	0.470	204.8	96.256	0.10
NOx	0.671	204.8	137.4208	0.14

2- TRAVEL REDUCTIONS:

Daily Riders:	50	Daily Trips:	43
Reduced VMTs:	609		

Emissions Reduction				
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.83	609	505	0.51
NOx	1.05	609	639	0.64

3-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes. Operating Cost: \$465,000 over 3 years

Annualized

Cost:	\$465,000 over 3 years
Cost:	\$155,000

Cost Effectiveness				
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton
HC	0.41	128	0.14	\$1,102,017
NOx	0.50	157	0.17	\$898,293



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION OTHER (FREIGHT)

JURISDICTION:	Portsmouth, Chesapeake, VPA
PROJECT NAME:	Relocation of Commonwealth Rail to the Centerline of VA Rte. 164 and I-664
LOCATION:	Portsmouth & Chesapeake
DESCRIPTION:	Relocate the Commonwealth Rail from residential areas to the
	centerlines of Rte. 164 and I-664 and eliminate at-grade crossings.
FISCAL YEAR:	2007
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	Maersk Terminal
COMPLETION DATE:	2009
PROJECT COST:	\$60,000,000

ASSUMPTIONS:

Idle Emissions:

Mobile6.2 provides emissions for 2.5 mph as equivalent to idle 2.5 mph emissions, in g/mi, multiplied by 2.5 mph to get g/hr

HC	15.770 g/hr
NOx	5.255 g/hr

Project will have no effect on rail emissions, but will reduce passenger vehicle emissions by grade-separating sixteen (16) roadway crossings.

1- DECREASED PASSENGER VEHICLE EMISSIONS:

Total vehicle delay/day =

573 min 9.55 hr

Emissions Reduction			
Туре	g/hr	g/day	kg/day
HC	15.770	151	0.15
NOx	5.255	50	0.05

2- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.

Total Cost:	\$60,000,000
Useful life, years :	20
Annual Cost:	\$3,000,000

Cost Effectiveness						
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton		
HC	0.15	55	0.06	\$49,509,301		
NOx	0.05	18	0.02	\$148,575,009		



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION OTHER

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME:	VDOT/Regionwide Regional Concept of Transportation Operations (RCTO)
LOCATION:	Hampton Roads
DESCRIPTION:	Development of a document to detail RCTO and a pilot program to implement CAD
FISCAL YEAR:	2007, 2008
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	Interstates within Hampton Roads
COMPLETION DATE:	2008
PROJECT COST:	\$650,000

ASSUMPTIONS:

Idle Emissions:

Mobile6.2 provides emissions for 2.5 mph as equivalent to idle 2.5 mph emissions, in g/mi, multiplied by 2.5 mph to get g/hr

HC	15.770 g/hr
NOx	5.255 g/hr

Emissions will be reduced by reducing time vehicles idle while waiting for incidents to clear.

1- DECREASED PASSENGER VEHICLE EMISSIONS:

See attached worksheet to see calculations of delay. Delay: 1,417,076 hrs/year

Emissions Reduction						
Туре	g/hr	g/year	kg/year			
HC	15.770	22,347,281	22347.28			
NOx	5.255	7,446,732	7446.73			

2- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.

Total Cost:	\$650,000
Useful life, years :	2
Annual Cost:	\$325,000

Cost Effectiveness						
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton		
HC	n/a	22,347	24.63	\$13,193		
NOx	n/a	7,447	8.21	\$39,592		



JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	Virginia Beach PPMS NO.: General Booth Blvd & London Bridge Rd Intersection Impro General Booth Blvd & London Bridge Rd Intersection Install an NB Left Turn Lane on General Booth Blvd to Prov \$900,000 \$900,000	ovements vide Dual Left Turns
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS: 2006	
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour	
PROCEDURE:	Using the total number of vehicles entering the intersection peak hour and the change in intersection delay resulting project, compute the vehicle-hours of delay for the PM p Convert that value to hours of delay per day using the 17% derived in the Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Lev Improvements , HRPDC, June 1997.	during the PM g from the beak hour. K(d) factor vel of Service
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLES DURING PM PEAK HOUR: 3,613	3
	INTERSECTION DELAY BEFORE PROJECT (sec/veh): INTERSECTION DELAY AFTER PROJECT (sec/veh): CHANGE IN INTERSECTION DELAY (sec/veh): CHANGE IN VEHICLE DELAY (hours/day):	36.2 29.7 6.5 38.37
PROJECT EFFECT ON	NAIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors	

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	0.61	4.64	0.20
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	151.29	1,159.96	50.41

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION CITYWIDE SIGNAL SYSTEMS

JURISDICTION: LOCATION: PROJECT: PPMS # : PROJECT COST:	Virginia Beach Citywide Citywide Signal Retiming \$1,200,300					
ANALYSIS NOTE	S: Overall average re = 10.7 seconds Overall average in Low = 2,690 ve Medium = 2,690 High = Over 5,9 Using the values I in the analysis, hour. Convert as derived in th Service Impro	eduction in interse s/vehicle for the F htersection volum hicles/PM peak h 0 vehicles/PM peak 200 vehicles/PM p isted above and t compute the veh that value to hou ne Cost Benefit I ovements, HRPD	ection delay re PM peak hour e nour ak hour to 5,9 beak hour the number of nicle-hours of rs of delay pe Model for Int PC, June 1997	esulting fron	h retiming /PM peak h hs included e PM peak a factor of 1 evel of	our 7%
		Total	Low	Meduim	High	
ANALYSIS:	Number of Intersections: (Provided by City staff)	277	38	178	61	
	Change in Delay per Intersectio Total Change in Delay:	n:	-10.7 -406.6	-10.7 -1904.6	-10.7 -652.7	(sec/veh) (sec/veh)
	Change in Vehicle Delay (hours	/day):	-1787.18	-18361.34	-10131.78	
	Total Change in Vehicle Delay (hours/day):	-30,280.30			
PROJECT EFFEC	CT ON AIR QUALITY: 2007 E	mission Factors				
EQUATION: Em	ission (grams/hour) x Change in De	lay (hours/day)				

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	477.52	3661.28	159.12
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	119,380.09	915,320.50	39,780.74



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION COORDINATED SIGNAL SYSTEMS

 JURISDICTION:
 Virginia Beach

 PROJECT:
 Indian River Rd & Kempsville Rd Intersection Improvements

 DESCRIPTION:
 This project will remove the left turn movements from Indian River Rd at the intersection with Kempsville Rd by providing indirect turns north and south of the intersection. This is expected to result in a reduction in the congestion along the Indian River Rd corridor from I-64 through Kempsville Rd.

 PPMS #:
 PPMS

PROJECT COST: \$1,500,000

BEFORE PROJECT		AFTER PROJECT			CHANGE							
ARTERIAL	CURRENT VMT	AVG SPEED (mph)	E (ki HC	EMISSIONS ilograms/day CO	y) NOx	AVG SPEED (mph)	E (ki HC	EMISSIONS ilograms/da CO	y) NOx	(HC	EMISSIONS kilograms/day) CO	NOx
Indian River Rd I-64 Kempsville Rd	97,590	8	164.24	2,457.40	153.31	13	120.33	2,094.66	130.87	-43.92	-362.74	-22.45

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day): 43.92 362.74 22.45

Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year): 10,978.82 90,685.06 5,611.40



JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	Virginia Beach PPMS NO.: Rosemont Rd & Lynnhaven Pkwy Intersection Improvement Rosemont Rd & Lynnhaven Pkwy Intersection Add a NB left turn lane on Rosemont Rd to accommodate \$700,000 \$700,000	nts dual left turns.
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS: 2006	
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour	
PROCEDURE:	Using the total number of vehicles entering the intersection peak hour and the change in intersection delay resulting project, compute the vehicle-hours of delay for the PM Convert that value to hours of delay per day using the 17% derived in the Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Le Improvements , HRPDC, June 1997.	n during the PM g from the peak hour. o K(d) factor vel of Service
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLES DURING PM PEAK HOUR: 5,046	6
	INTERSECTION DELAY BEFORE PROJECT (sec/veh): INTERSECTION DELAY AFTER PROJECT (sec/veh): CHANGE IN INTERSECTION DELAY (sec/veh): CHANGE IN VEHICLE DELAY (hours/day):	67.8 55 12.8 105.5

PROJECT EFFECT ON AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	1.66	12.76	0.55
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	416.08	3,190.21	138.65





JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	Virginia Beach PPMS NO.: S Independence Blvd & Dahlia Dr Intersection Improvement S Independence Blvd & Dahlia Dr Intersection Add a WB Left Turn Lane and an EB Right Turn Lane on Da \$1,000,000 \$1,000,000	s ahlia Dr
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS: 2006	
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour	
PROCEDURE:	Using the total number of vehicles entering the intersection of peak hour and the change in intersection delay resulting project, compute the vehicle-hours of delay for the PM per Convert that value to hours of delay per day using the 17% H derived in the Cost Benefit Model for Intersection Leve Improvements , HRPDC, June 1997.	during the PM from the eak hour. <(d) factor el of Service
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLES DURING PM PEAK HOUR: 2,943	
	INTERSECTION DELAY BEFORE PROJECT (sec/veh): INTERSECTION DELAY AFTER PROJECT (sec/veh): CHANGE IN INTERSECTION DELAY (sec/veh): CHANGE IN VEHICLE DELAY (hours/day):	36.3 33.5 2.8 13.46
PROJECT EFFECT ON	AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors	

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	0.21	1.63	0.07
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	53.08	407.01	17.69

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	Virginia Beach S Independence S Independence Install Dual Left T S Independence \$900,000 \$900,000	Blvd & Lyn Blvd & Lyn ⁻ urn Lanes Blvd	PPMS NO.: nhaven Pkwy I nhaven Pkwy I on the NB and	ntersectior ntersectior I SB appro	າ Improv າ aches o	/ements f
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS:	2006				
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour					
PROCEDURE:	Using the total nupeak hour and project, comport Convert that valuderived in the Improvement	Imber of ver the chang ute the ver to hours Cost Ben e s, HRPDC	ehicles entering ge in intersection iicle-hours of de of delay per da efit Model for s, June 1997.	g the inters on delay res elay for the ny using the Intersectio	ection d sulting fi ∋ PM pe ∋ 17% K on Leve	uring the PM rom the ak hour. (d) factor I of Service
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLE	S DURING	G PM PEAK HO	OUR:	6,421	
	INTERSECTION INTERSECTION CHANGE IN INT CHANGE IN VEH	DELAY BI DELAY AI ERSECTIO IICLE DEL	EFORE PROJE FTER PROJEC DN DELAY (sec AY (hours/day)	ECT (sec/ve CT (sec/veh c/veh):):	eh): ı):	140.5 118.6 21.9 229.8

PROJECT EFFECT ON AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors

EQUATION: Emission (grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	3.62	27.78	1.21
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	905.87	6,945.58	301.86



JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION:	Virginia Beach PPMS NO.: Salem Rd & Princess Anne Rd Intersection Imp Salem Rd & Princess Anne Rd Intersection Add a lane on the EB Windsor Oaks Blvd appro approach. Reconfigure EB approach for dual L Reconfigure WB approach for one LTL two thr	provements bach and the WB Salem R TL, one thru lane, one RT	≀d Ľ.
PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	\$900,000 \$900,000		
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS: 2006		
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour		
PROCEDURE:	Using the total number of vehicles entering the peak hour and the change in intersection de project, compute the vehicle-hours of delay to Convert that value to hours of delay per day usi derived in the Cost Benefit Model for Inter Improvements , HRPDC, June 1997.	intersection during the PM lay resulting from the for the PM peak hour. ng the 17% K(d) factor section Level of Service	1
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLES DURING PM PEAK HOUR:	6,122	
	INTERSECTION DELAY BEFORE PROJECT (INTERSECTION DELAY AFTER PROJECT (se CHANGE IN INTERSECTION DELAY (sec/veh CHANGE IN VEHICLE DELAY (hours/day):	sec/veh): 109.4 ec/veh): 69.8): 39.6 396.1	
PROJECT EFFECT ON	AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emissions Factors		
EQUATION: Emission	(grams/hour) x Change in Delay (hours/day)		
	HC CO NO	x	

	-		-
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	6.25	47.90	2.08
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	1,561.74	11,974.30	520.42





CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT SERVICE (NEW OR EXPANDED)

	1A/A T		
	WAI Nounart Nours/James City County Employee Connection		
PROJECT NAME.	Revipent News/James City County Employe	e connection	
	Demonstration convice between Newport N	owe and Jamas City County	
DESCRIPTION.		ews and James City County	
FISCAL YEAR:	2007, 2008, 2009		
LENGTH (MI):	6 oneway		
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	Newport News, James City County, William	isburg	
COMPLETION DATE:	2007		
PROJECT COST:	\$282,000		
ASSUMPTIONS:	a. Auto travel factors		
	Average trip length - 7 miles		
	Average auto speed - 35 mph		
	Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.15 for work trip	os; 1.3 for Non-Work trips	
	b. Transit data		
	Daily Ridership:	85	
	No.of Days per week:	7 Number of days per year:	358
	Hours/bus/dav:	5 Trips/day:	15
	Bus VMT/day= # of trips*length*2way	- F	

1- INCREASED BUS EMISSIONS : (NEW SERVICE)

Increased Emissions					
Type g/mi Bus VMT g/day kg/day					
HC	0.470	180	84.6	0.08	
NOx	0.671	180	120.78	0.12	

2- TRAVEL REDUCTIONS:

Daily Riders:	85	Daily Trips:	74
Reduced VMTs:	1,035		

Emissions Reduction					
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day	
HC	0.830	1,035	859	0.86	
NOx	1.050	1,035	1,087	1.09	

3-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes. Operating Cost: \$282,000 over 3 years AnnualizedCost: \$94,000

Cost Effectiveness					
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton	
HC	0.77	277	0.31	\$307,642	
NOx	0.97	346	0.38	\$246,648	



Appendix C

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT SERVICE (NEW OR EXPANDED)

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION:	WAT Service Frequency and Sunday Service Peninsula Increasing service from hourly to half-hour Sunday, consistent with long range plans	ly frequency and adding service for	
FISCAL YEAR:	2007, 2008, 2009		
LENGTH (MI):	135		
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	James City County, York County, & Willian	nsburg	
COMPLETION DATE:	2007		
PROJECT COST:	\$4,370,000		
ASSUMPTIONS:	a. Auto travel factors Average trip length - 7 miles Average auto speed - 35 mph Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.15 for work tri	ps; 1.3 for Non-Work trips	
	b. Transit data		
	Daily Ridership:	625	
	No.of Days per week:	7 Number of days per year:	358
	Hours/bus/day:	14 Trips/day:	28
	Bus VMT/day= # of trips*length*2way		

1- INCREASED BUS EMISSIONS : (NEW SERVICE)

Increased Emissions				
Туре	g/mi Bus VMT g/day kg/day			
HC	0.470	7560	3553.2	3.55
NOx 0.671 7560 5072.76 5.				

2- TRAVEL REDUCTIONS:

Daily Riders:	625	Daily Trips:	543
Reduced VMTs:	7,609		

Emissions Reduction					
Туре	g/mi VMT g/day kg/day				
HC	0.83	7,609	6,315	6.32	
NOx 1.05 7,609 7,989 7.					

3-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.Operating Cost:\$4,370,000 over 3 yearsAnnualizedCost:\$1,456,667

Cost Effectiveness					
Туре	e kg/day Kg/yr Tons/yr \$/Ton				
HC	2.76	989	1.09	\$1,336,424	
NOx	2.92	1,044	1.15	\$1,265,692	



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION TRANSIT SERVICE (NEW OR EXPANDED)

JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION:	WAT Mooretown Road Corridor York County, Williamsburg, James City Co Continuation of demonstration service bet	ounty ween York County,	
FISCAL YEAR: LENGTH (MI):	Williamsburg, and James City County. 2007, 2008 20		
ACTIVITY CENTERS: COMPLETION DATE: PROJECT COST	Mooretown Road Corridor in York County 2007 \$315,000	and Williamsburg Transportation Center	
ASSUMPTIONS:	a. Auto travel factors Average trip length - 7 miles Average auto speed - 35 mph Vehicle occupancy rate - 1.15 for work tri	ips; 1.3 for Non-Work trips	
	b. Transit data Daily Ridership: No.of Days per week: Hours/bus/day: Bus VMT/day:	150 6 Number of days per year: 14 Trips/day:	308 28

1- INCREASED BUS EMISSIONS : (NEW SERVICE)

Increased Emissions				
Туре	g/mi Bus VMT g/day kg/day			
HC	0.470	1120	526.4	0.53
NOx	0.671	1120	751.52	0.75

2- TRAVEL REDUCTIONS:

Daily Riders:	150	Daily Trips:	130
Reduced VMTs:	1,826		

Emissions Reduction				
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day
HC	0.830	1,826	1,516	1.52
NOx	1.050	1,826	1,917	1.92

3-COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes. 15,000 over 2 years

Operating Cost:	\$315,000
AnnualizedCost:	\$157,500

Cost Effectiveness				
Туре	kg/day	Kg/yr	Tons/yr	\$/Ton
HC	0.99	305	0.34	\$468,939
NOx	1.17	359	0.40	\$397,899



JURISDICTION: PROJECT NAME: LOCATION: DESCRIPTION:	York Co Route 17 & Route 620 Inter George Washington Memor Install an NB Left Turn Lane Oriana Rd. Add a lane on L and exclusive RTL.	PPMS NO.: section Improvements rial Hwy & Oriana Rd/Lakesid o n Route 17, install an EB Lakeside Dr to provide WB d	de Dr Intersection Left Turn Lane on ual LTL, one thru lane,
PROJECT COST: CMAQ REQUEST:	\$800,000 \$800,000		
TURNING MOVEMENT	COUNTS: 2005		
ANALYSIS PERIOD:	PM Peak Hour		
PROCEDURE:	Using the total number of very peak hour and the change project, compute the very Convert that value to hours derived in the Cost Bend Improvements , HRPDC	ehicles entering the intersect ge in intersection delay result nicle-hours of delay for the Pl of delay per day using the 13 efit Model for Intersection C, June 1997.	ion during the PM ting from the M peak hour. 7% K(d) factor Level of Service
ANALYSIS:	TOTAL VEHICLES DURING	G PM PEAK HOUR: 4,7	758
	INTERSECTION DELAY BI INTERSECTION DELAY AI CHANGE IN INTERSECTION CHANGE IN VEHICLE DEL	EFORE PROJECT (sec/veh) FTER PROJECT (sec/veh): DN DELAY (sec/veh): .AY (hours/day):	: 30.3 26.1 4.2 32.65
PROJECT EFFECT ON	I AIR QUALITY: 2007 Emis	ssions Factors	
EQUATION: Emission	(grams/hour) x Change in Dela	ay (hours/day)	

	HC	CO	NOx
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/day):	0.51	3.95	0.17
Reduction in Emissions (kilograms/year):	128.73	987.04	42.90

CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

JURISDICTION: York County PROJECT NAME: Lightfoot Road Bikeway Lightfoot Rd (Rte 646) between Mooretown Rd (Rte 603) & Richmond Rd (Rte 60) LOCATION: DESCRIPTION: Four-foot (4') shoulder bike lanes on both sides FISCAL YEAR: 2008 LENGTH (MI): 0.63 ACTIVITY CENTERS: Employment, retail, regional connection COMPLETION DATE: 2008 PROJECT COST: \$184,000

ASSUMPTIONS:

Bikeway trips are estimated from the guidelines in NCHRP Report 552: Guidelines for Analysis
of Investments in Bicycle Facilities and demand model from
www.bicyclinginfo.org/bikecost (Mid Estimate used for calculations).

- 0.31% assumed potential % of work trips removed with bike facility.
- 1.0% assumed potential % of non-work trips removed with bike facility (estimate).
- Used results of the 2002 CMAQ Post Evalaution study
- Each new cyclist will make two trips per day
- Average trip length distance for Work/Non-Work Trips = 9 miles and 7.5 miles
- Average number of persons per vehicle for Work Trips and Non-Work trips=1.1 and 1.4
- Work trips have been reduced to 5/7ths to account for 7 day week.

2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation Study				
Sampled Bikeway	Wkday Counts	Wkend Counts		
YC Bikeway,1	2	4		
NN Bikeway,1	13	31		
JCC Bikeways,2	34	81		
Average:	16	39		

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Demand Estimates						
Work Non-Work Total						
New Cyclists	6	43	49			
New Person Trips by Bike	13	86	99			
Converted to Reduction in Veh Trips	12	61	73			
Converted to VMT Reduction	105	461	566			

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

VMT Emissions Reduction					
Туре	g/mi VMT g/day kg/day				
HC	0.716	566	405.19	0.41	
NOx	0.879	566	497.43	0.50	

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.

	Useful	life of a Bikeway:	15	Total Cost:	\$184,000
Days of Use: 365 Total Annual Cost: \$12		Days of Use:	365	Total Annual Cost:	\$12,267

Cost Effectiveness					
Туре	kg/day Kg/yr Tons/yr \$/Ton				
HC	0.41	148	0.16	\$75,243	
NOx	0.50	182	0.20	\$61,290	



CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY PROJECT EVALUATION BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES

JURISDICTION:	York County
PROJECT NAME:	Route 143 Bikeway
LOCATION:	Capitol Landing Rd (Rte 143) between East Rochambeau Dr
	(Rte F-137) and the Queens Creek Bridge/Williamsburg city line.
DESCRIPTION:	Four-foot (4') shoulder bike lanes on both sides
FISCAL YEAR:	2008
LENGTH (MI):	0.6
ACTIVITY CENTERS:	Park, athletic facilities, school, regional connection
COMPLETION DATE:	2008
PROJECT COST:	\$173,000

ASSUMPTIONS:

 Bikeway trips are estimated from the guidelines in NCHRP Report 552: Guidelines for Analysis of Investments in Bicycle Facilities and demand model from www.bicyclinginfo.org/bikecost (Mid Estimate used for calculations).

- 0.31% assumed potential % of work trips removed with bike facility
- 1.0% assumed potential % of non-work trips removed with bike facility (estimate).
- Used results of the 2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation study
- Each new cyclist will make two trips per day
- Average trip length distance for Work/Non-Work Trips = 9 miles and 7.5 miles
- Average number of persons per vehicle for Work Trips and Non-Work trips=1.1 and 1.4
- Work trips have been reduced to 5/7ths to account for 7 day week.

2002 CMAQ Post Evaluation Study				
Sampled Bikeway	Wkday Counts	Wkend Counts		
YC Bikeway,1	2	4		
NN Bikeway,1	13	31		
JCC Bikeways,2	34	81		
Average:	16	39		

1- ESTIMATES OF VMT REDUCTIONS:

Domand Estimatos					
Demand Estimates					
Work Non-Work					
New Cyclists	18	98	116		
New Person Trips by Bike	36	196	232		
Converted to Reduction in Veh Trips	32	140	172		
Converted to VMT Reduction	292	1,050	1,342		

2- EMISSIONS CALCULATIONS:

VMT Emissions Reduction					
Туре	g/mi	VMT	g/day	kg/day	
HC	0.716	1342	961.02	0.96	
NOx	0.879	1342	1179.80	1.18	

3- COST EFFECTIVENESS:

This ratio is determined by dividing the total annual cost by annual emission changes.

Useful life of a Bikeway:	15	Total Cost:	\$173,000
Days of Use:	365	Total Annual Cost:	\$11,533

Cost Effectiveness					
Type kg/day Kg/yr Tons/yr \$/Ton					
HC	0.96	351	0.39	\$29,828	
NOx	1.18	431	0.47	\$24,297	



APPENDIX D

RSTP Policies, Procedures, and Analysis Methodologies



REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP)

Program Policies and Criteria:

- **Funding Program Criteria, 1992** The Transportation Technical Committee (TTC) agreed to the following set of criteria for the use of RSTP Funds:
 - RSTP funds should play a significant role in the region's transportation system generally affecting two or more localities
 - The region could use RSTP funds to implement a regional project, which would have a low probability of funding under the current allocation program
 - RSTP funds will not be used for interstate improvements
 - RSTP funds should be used for projects that are unfundable by a locality or present funding sources
 - In many cases, full funding could not be achieved, however, multiple years of supplemental funding will enable the region to fund these projects at a significant level
- RSTP Policy for 2020 LRP Adopted by the MPO on December 15, 1999. The MPO action endorsed the following regarding the use of RSTP funds during the next 20 years:
 - To supplement, as necessary, the funding of the Regional Priority Setting projects
 - To cover cost overruns of regionally significant projects
 - To finance ITS improvements
 - To finance new regionally significant projects when substantive progress can be made as a result of RSTP funding

RSTP Reserve Account Policy – Adopted in June 2001

• To set aside <u>5%</u> of the mark in the reserve account as a contingency measure.

RSTP Reserve Account Policy Addendum – March 2003

At its meeting on February 20, 2003, the Transportation Technical Subcommittee (TTS) recommended that a policy similar to the one in place for CMAQ funded projects be put in place for cost overruns of RSTP funded projects. The addendum to the RTSP reserve account policy is therefore as follows:

1. If the cost/annual allocation and the scope of a project change less than 10% on any one RSTP funded project, the locality/agency should notify



the TTC with a request and justification for a change in funding. The TTC must review the request and recommend use of the reserve account or if possible commit future year funding to preserve the project.

- 2. If the cost/annual allocation and/or scope of the project change by more than 10% on any one RSTP funded project, the locality/agency should notify the TTC and MPO with a request and justification for a change in funding and/or scope. The TTC and MPO must review the request and may recommend one or any combination of the following:
 - Scale back the project
 - Use local funds
 - Use urban funds
 - Use reserve account RSTP funds
 - Use existing RSTP funds from another project
 - Use future RSTP allocations
 - Use future non-RSTP funds
 - Drop the project

RSTP Reserve Account Policy Change – Adopted in May 2006

• To allocate the full amount of FY 07-10 RSTP Marks without allowing any amount in the annual reserve account.

Application Process and Preliminary Screening:

HRPDC staff provides standard application forms for submitting RSTP project proposals. These forms are made available in electronic format and on the HRPDC web site. Jurisdictions and transit agencies return completed forms to HRPDC within a set time schedule. Projects are screened using the following criteria:

- Must meet all applicable SAFETY-LU requirements
- Must be included in the current Regional Transportation Plan
- Must be well defined
- Reasonable data and cost estimates must be provided
- Must meet all requirements developed and approved by the Transportation Technical Subcommittee



Project Evaluation and Methods:

Projects are placed into six categories and then scored. Projects within each category are then compared to one another. The six categories are:

- 1. Highway Capacity, Accessibility and Operational Improvements, including:
 - Roadway Widening
 - New Facilities
 - HOV Lanes
 - New Interchange
 - Intersection/Interchange Improvements
 - Corridor Operational Improvements
 - Bridge Rehabilitation
- 2. Intermodal Transportation Projects, including:
 - Passenger facilities
 - Freight facilities
- 3. Transit Projects, including:
 - New Service
 - Expansion of Existing Service
 - Bus Shelters/Facilities
 - Vehicle Replacement/Purchase
 - Fixed Guideway
 - Other Transit and ITS Projects
- 4. Planning Studies, including:
 - Alternatives Analysis
 - Other Planning Studies
- 5. Transportation Demand Management Projects, including:
 - Regional Rideshare
 - Marketing and Outreach Program
 - HOV Express Bus Service
 - Park-and-Ride Lots
- 6. Intelligent Transportation Systems

HRPDC staff evaluates all projects according to the criteria developed by the TTS. The staff prepares a list of candidate projects that have been scored and ranked by category. Projects with insufficient data or late submittals are dropped from the process. The list of projects is then submitted to the TTS for review.



Project Selection:

The TTS reviews, discusses and revises candidate projects as appropriate, and makes recommendations to the TTC. Projects are selected based upon:

- Project Score/Ranking
- Funding Availability
- Other Criteria (prior commitment, federal mandates, etc.)

Project Prioritization:

Selected projects are assigned to fiscal years based on priority and on project readiness.

RSTP PROJECT EVALUATION METHOD BY PROJECT CATEGORY

Project Category	Evaluation Method
Highway Capacity, Accessibility & Operational Improvements - Roadway widening, new facilities, HOV lanes, new interchanges, Intersection improvements - Corridor operational improvements - Bridge rehabilitation	See Table 2 See Table 3 See Table 4
Intermodal Transportation Projects - Intermodal facilities	See Table 5
Transit - New service, Expansion of Service, Shelters & Facilities (Bus, fixed-guideway, HOV express) - Vehicle replacement/purchase - Other transit & ITS projects	See Table 6 See Table 7 See Table 8
Planning Studies - Alternatives Analysis - Feasibility Studies	See Table 9
Transportation Demand Management - Regional rideshare - Marketing & outreach	See Table 10





Project Category	Evaluation Method	
- HOV lane express bus service		
- Park-&-ride lots		
Intelligent Transportation Systems	See Table 11	



HIGHWAY CAPACITY, ACCESSIBILITY AND OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

Table 2

Roadway Widening, New Facility, HOV Lanes, Intersection Improvements

Evaluation Criteria	Points	Scoring Instructions
Congestion Level	0-20	Existing and future conditions (10 points each): severe=7, moderate=3, low=0
Cost-Effectiveness	0-20	Lowest cost/vmt = 20 Highest cost/vmt = 0 Straight line interpolation between
System Continuity	0-20	Completion of a missing link in the transportation system Total completion = 20 Partial completion = 10
Safety	0-20	20 points to the project with highest safety improvements
Air Quality	0-10	Reduces NOx =5 points Reduces HC=5 points
Project Readiness	0-10	Projects with detailed design and cost estimates that are ready to go will receive 10 points

Table 3

Corridor Operational Improvements

Evaluation Criteria	Points	Scoring Instructions
Arterial LOS based on Average Travel Speed	0-25	Relative Scale- maximum points to arterial with lowest average speed (worst LOS), 0 to arterial with LOS C or better
ADT of Roadway	0-20	Existing and future ADT (10 points each). Relative scale - maximum points to highest corridor ADT/Lane
Cost-Effectiveness	0-35	Relative Scale- maximum points to the project with lowest cost/vmt
Existing Accident Experience	0-20	Relative Scale- maximum points to the project With highest accident rate or frequency
Project Readiness	0-10	Projects with detailed design and cost estimates that are ready to go will receive 10 points



HIGHWAY CAPACITY, ACCESSIBILITY AND OPERATIONAL IMPROVEMENTS

Table 4

Bridge Rehabilitation

Evaluation Criteria	Points	Scoring Instructions
Bridge Condition per VDOT Sufficiency Index	0-60	Relative Scale- maximum points to the bridge with worst condition
ADT of Bridge	0-30	Relative Scale- maximum points to the bridge with highest ADT
Project Readiness	0-10	Projects with detailed design and cost estimates that are ready to go will receive 10 points

INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Table 5

Intermodal Facilities

Evaluation Consideration	Points
Will the project establish opportunities for linkages or connections between transportation modes or existing corridors or centers?	Up to 40 points
Will the project improve the operating system to better accommodate intermodal movements?	Up to 25 points
Will the project improve rail or vehicular access to freight distribution facilities, ports, or major industrial clients?	Up to 25 points
Project Readiness Projects with detailed design and cost estimates that are ready to go will receive 10 points	Up to 10 points



TRANSIT

Table 6

New Service, Expansion of Existing Service, Facilities, etc.

Evaluation Criteria	Points	Scoring Instructions
Congestion relief	0-10	Impacts of new/expanded service on area highways- 10 points to the project with the highest % of trips removed from highways; 0 points to the project with no impact on adjacent highway.
Facility Usage- Daily Ridership	0-20	Relative Scale Highest ridership=20 points Lowest ridership=0 points
Cost Effectiveness - Subsidy/ passenger (or use other FTA formula depending on the project)	0-20	Relative scale Lowest subsidy/passenger=20 Highest subsidy/passenger=0
Air Quality	0-20	NOX reductions=10 HC reductions=10
Coverage Area	0-20	Relative scale - Population and Employment data.
Project Readiness	0-10	Projects with detailed design and cost estimates that are ready to go will receive 10 points

Table 7

Vehicle Replacement/Purchase

Evaluation Criteria	Points	Scoring Instructions
Average age of the vehicles	35	FTA standard=12 years
Number of vehicles to replace/total fleet	10	
Emissions changes of the old and new vehicles	30	
Cost Effectiveness	10	Cost/Ridership
Average mileage of the vehicles to be replaced	15	FTA Standards



TRANSIT

Table 8

Other Transit and ITS Projects

Evaluation Consideration	Points
Will the project increase service reliability of the transit system?	0-25
Will the project improve passenger safety, comfort and convenience?	0-30
Does the project improve efficiency of the transit system?	0-10
Does the project improve the revenue collection?	0-25
Does the project improve transit data collection system?	0-10

PLANNING STUDIES

Table 9

Alternatives Analysis & Feasibility Studies

Evaluation Consideration	Points	Yes or No
1) Is the study necessary to address a major issue or to revise the Plan?	0-25	
2) Is the study necessary to address a safety issue?	0-15	
3) Is the study concerned with encouraging multimodal transportation?	0-10	
4) Does the study address the mobility or accessibility needs of the region?	0-20	
5) Is the study well defined in terms of purpose, design concept and scope?	0-10	
6) Do the goals and objectives of the study show support for economic development?	0-10	
7) Do the goals and objectives demonstrate preservation or protection of the environment?	0-10	



TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT

Table 10

Regional Rideshare, Marketing & Outreach, HOV Lane Express Bus Service, Park-and Ride Lots, Telecommuting, etc. The TDM Committee developed the following criteria. Measures will be evaluated against the base year's figures (TDM Manager will provide appropriate data for base and target years).

Measures of Success	Base Year	Target Year
Number of employers offering some TDM programs		
% of employees ridesharing (car, van, bus)		
% of employees walking or biking		
Number of contacts made		
Parking Management (availability, price, zoning requirements)		
Mixed use land use (trip reduction)		
HOV usage/ Vehicle occupancy rates		
Other measures		

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS Table 11

ITS Projects	
---------------------	--

Evaluation Consideration	Points
Will the project improve traffic flow during peak congestion periods and special events?	0-15
Will the project directly reduce the number or severity of accidents, which occur on roadways?	0-25
Will the project improve level of service, increase service capacity, or contribute to incident management?	0-20
Does the project address the mobility or accessibility needs of the region?	0-10
Does the project improve the linkage and communications among various operating agencies to provide better and accurate traffic information to the motorists?	0-20
Is the project part of the Regional ITS Strategic Plan?	0-10



APPENDIX E

RSTP Candidate Project Application Forms





HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM **PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS**

RSTP CANDIDATE PROJECT APPLICATION

To be considered for RSTP funding, a proposed project must be included in the current Regional Transportation Plan. Data necessary for evaluating the project must be submitted for each candidate project. Filling out the appropriate sections of this application will insure that the necessary data are submitted. One application should be filled out for each project being proposed for RSTP funding.

Form A must be filled out for each project. At the end of Form A, you will indicate the RSTP Project Type that best fits your proposed project. Depending upon the RSTP Project Type selected, you will be directed to fill out one of the following forms: Form B, Form C, Form D, Form E, Form F, or Form G. If you select the "Other" category, please contact HRPDC staff for input data requirements.

FORM-A	
Locality/Agency:	Date:
Prepared By:	Phone:
E-mail:	Fax:
PPMS#:	
Project Name:	
Project Location:	
Project Description:	
(Brief description of project. If applicable, include additional data or map	os as attachments.)
Is this a new project?	
Is this project included in the Regional Transportation Plan?	
Is this project included in the Regional Transportation Plan? Estimated Start Date:	

RS1



RSTP FORM-A (Continued)

Need for and Benefit to be Derived from Project:	(Probable impact on air quality)
Project Cost and Funding:	
Total Project Cost: \$	
Indicate Requested RSTP Funding Per Fiscal Ve	ar Below.
Fiscal Vear 1: Vear	Requested RSTP Amount: \$
Fiscal Year 2: Year:	Poquested RSTP Amount: \$
Fiscal Year 3: Year:	Requested RSTP Amount: \$
RSTP Project Type	
(Please check ONE below and then use the asso	bclated form to complete your application)
Highway Project	USE FORM-B
Intermodal Transportation Project	USE FORM-C
Transit Service (New, Expanded, Facili	ties) USE FORM-D, Section 1
Transit Vehicle Replacement/Purchase	USE FORM-D, Section 2
Transit ITS	USE FORM-D, Section 3
Planning Study	USE FORM-E
Transportation Demand Management	USE FORM-F
Intelligent Transportation System	USE FORM-G
Other	Contact PDC Staff for Input Data Requirements



RSTP FORM-B

HIGHWAY PROJECTS

1. Traffic Count Data:			
"Current" ADT (vpc "Current Peak Hou Forecasted ADT (v Forecasted Peak H (vph): 2. Length of Project Se):		
3. Functional Classifica	ition of Project Section:		
4. Peak Hour Average	Speed in Project Section:		
AM Peak (mph):	PM Peak (mph):		
5. Total accidents in pr	oject section over the last three years:		
6. Will this project improve safety?			
If "yes", explain:			
7. Will this project impr	ove system continuity?		
If "yes", explain:——			
8 Will this project help			
	improve air quality?		
If "yes", explain (qua	ntify the impacts on VOC and NOx):		
If "yes", explain (qua	improve air quality? Intify the impacts on VOC and NOx):		
 9. Project Readiness: 	improve air quality?		
 9. Project Readiness: Do you have a detai 	improve air quality? intify the impacts on VOC and NOx): ed design and cost estimates?		
 9. Project Readiness: Do you have a detai Is there community store 	Improve air quality? Intify the impacts on VOC and NOx): led design and cost estimates? Support for the project?		
 9. Project Readiness: Do you have a detail Is there community states 10. Sponsor Readiness: Do you have all people 	Improve air quality? Intify the impacts on VOC and NOx): led design and cost estimates? Support for the project?		
 9. Project Readiness: Do you have a detai Is there community s 10. Sponsor Readiness: Do you have all nec 11 Is this a Bridge Reb 	Improve air quality? Intify the impacts on VOC and NOx): led design and cost estimates? support for the project? essary local, state, and federal permits and approvals? abilitation/Replacement project?		



RSTP FORM-C

INTERMODAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECT

1. Will the project establish opportunities for linkages or connections between transportation modes, existing corridors, or centers?

If "yes", explain: —————————————————

2. Will the project improve intermodal movements?

If "yes", explain: _____

3. Will the project improve rail access to freight distribution facilities, ports, or major clients?

4. Will the project improve vehicular access to freight distribution facilities, ports, or major clients?

If "yes", explain:

If "yes", explain: ----

5. Project Readiness:

Do you have a detailed design and cost estimates?

Is there community support for the project?_____

6. Sponsor Readiness:
 Do you have all necessary local, state, and federal permits and approvals?



RSTP FORM-D

TRANSIT PROJECT

(Fill out only ONE section below, depending on the Project Type)

SECTION 1: New Service, Expanded Service, Shelters & Facilities

1-a.	Daily ridership:
	Current:
	Expected after project:
1-b.	Subsidy per Passenger:
	Existing:
	After Project:
1-c.	Service Coverage Area of Project:
	Population:
	Employment:
1-d.	Will this project help improve air quality?
	If "yes", explain (quantify impacts on VOC and NOx):
1-e.	Will this project provide congestion relief?
	If "yes":
	Expected reduction in daily VMT:
	Expected reduction in daily Vehicle Trips:
1-f.	Project Readiness:
	Do you have a detailed design and cost estimates?
	Is there community support for the project?
1-g.	Sponsor Readiness:
	Do you have all necessary local, state, and federal permits and approvals?
1-h.	Additional information:



RSTP FORM-D (Continued)

TRANSIT PROJECT

SECTION 2: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase

2-a.	Number of vehicles to be purchased:		
	Average daily revenue miles (DRM) per new veh	icle:	
	Average operational days per year per new vehic	cle:	
2-b.	Number of old vehicles being retired:		
	Average DRM per vehicle being retired:		
	Average operational days per year per vehicle be	eing retired:	
	Average age of vehicles being retired:	_	
	Average mileage of vehicles being retired:		
2-c.	Type of vehicles to be purchased:		
2-d.	Emissions Factors for new vehicles: (specify unit	s, i.e. grams/brake-horsepower/hour):	
	New vehicles:		
	VOC:	NOx:	
	Vehicles being replaced:		
	VOC:	NOx:	

RSTP FORM-D (Continued)

TRANSIT PROJECT

SECTION 3: Transit ITS Projects

Will this project improve the reliability and ridership of the transit system?		
Explain how:		
Will this project improve passenger safety, comfort, and convenience?		
If "yes", explain:		
Will the project improve the efficiency of the transit system?		
If "yes", explain:		
Will the project improve revenue collection? If "yes", explain:		
Will the project improve transit data collection?		
If "yes", explain:		
Estimated total passenger miles traveled (PMT) resulting from this project:		
Is this project part of the Regional ITS Strategic Plan?		
If "yes", explain:		


RSTP FORM-E

PLANNING STUDY

- 1. Is the study necessary to address a major issue or to revise the Regional Transportation Plan?
- 2. Is the study necessary to address a safety issue?_____
- 3. Is the study concerned with encouraging multimodal transportation?
- 4. Will the study address the mobility or accessibility needs of the region?
- 5. Is the study well defined in terms of purpose, design concept, and scope?____
- 6. Do the goals and objectives of the study show support for economic development?
- 7. Do the goals and objectives of the study demonstrate preservation or protection of the environment?
- 8. Please describe the purpose, scope, and/or any detail related to the proposed study:



RSTP FORM-F

TRANSPORTATION DEMAND MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

- 1. Number of employers offering some type of TDM program:
- 2. Percent of employees that rideshare (car, van, bus): %
- 3. Percent of employees walking or biking: _____%
- 4. Number of contacts made:_____
- 5. Parking management (availability, price, zoning requirements):------

6. Mixed use land use (trip reduction):

- 7. HOV Usage:
- 8. Number of employers participating in Telecommuting:
- 9. Additional information:



RSTP FORM-G

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

- 1. Will the project improve traffic flow during peak congestion periods? _____
- 2. Will the project improve traffic flow during special events?
- 3. Will the project directly reduce the number of accidents that occur on roadways?
- 4. Will the project directly reduce the severity of accidents that occur on roadways?
- 5. Will the project improve level of service?

If "yes", explain below and quantify in terms of VMT/Lane-Mile:----

6. Will the project increase capacity?

- 7. Total VMT served by this project:
- 8. Will the project contribute to incident management?
- 9. Does the project address the mobility needs of the region?
- 10. Does the project address the accessibility needs of the region?
- 11. Does the project improve the linkage and communications among various operating agencies to provide better and more accurate traffic information to motorists?
- 12. Is the project part of the Regional ITS Strategic Plan?
- 13. Please provide additional information to help evaluate this project:----



APPENDIX F

RSTP Project Analysis Worksheets







REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM PROPOSED HIGHWAY PROJECTS

ROADWAY WIDENING, NEW FACILITY, HOV LANES, INTERCHANGE/INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

						Congestion Level (0-20 Points)		Cost Effectiveness (0-20 Points)	System Continuity (0-20 Points)	Safety (0-20 Points)	Air Quality (0-10 Points)	Project Readiness (0-10 Points)	
Project Number	Jurisdiction	Project Name	Total Cost	Project Life (Years)	Annualized Cost	Existing (0-10 Points)	Future (0-10 Points)		1 01113)			1 011137	Total Score (Max = 100)
1	Chesapeake	Route 17: Widen to 4 lanes from Cedar Rd southward to current 4 lane section	\$9,000,000	20	\$450,000	7	10	20	15	20	10	2	84
6	Hampton (Must be added to 2026 LRP if approved)	Wythe Creek Rd: Widen to 4 lanes with bike lanes and sidewalks from Commander Shepard Blvd to Poquoson CL	\$25,000,000	20	\$1,250,000	7	8	12	20	20	10	2	79
4	Chesapeake	Mount Pleasant Rd: Widen to 4 lanes from Chesapeake Expwy to Ethridge Rd	\$8,300,000	20	\$415,000	7	10	19	10	20	10	2	78
2	Chesapeake	Hanbury Rd: Widen to 4 lanes from Battlefield Blvd to Johnstown Rd	\$11,100,000	20	\$555,000	7	10	18	10	10	10	2	67
3	Chesapeake	Route 17: Replace the bridge over Deep Creek (Long Bridge) with a 4 lane span with sidewalks on both sides	\$3,450,000	20	\$172,500	10	10	0	20	5	4	8	57
5	Hampton	Commander Shepard Blvd Phase 2: Construct new 4 LD road from Big Bethel Rd/Saunders Rd to Middle Rd (UPC 60970)	\$18,000,000	20	\$900,000	0	0	16	20	5	6	10	57
7	Newport News	Middle Ground Blvd: Construct new 4LD road from Warwick Blvd/Maxwell Ln to Jefferson Ave/Middle Ground Blvd (UPC 11816)	\$40,000,000	20	\$2,000,000	0	3	16	20	5	10	2	56
19	Gloucester Co	Route 17 Access Management - Crossover Improvements from Gloucester Point to Gloucester Courthouse	\$6,000,000	20	\$300,000	3	7	20	0	5	10	2	47
9	Norfolk	Princess Anne Rd & Sewells Point Rd Intersection Improvements	\$300,000	20	\$15,000	0	3	18	5	5	10	2	43

Prepared By: Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, May 2006.



Proposed RSTP Projects Fiscal Years 2007-2010 Transit: Vehicle Replacement/Purchase

					Evaluation Criteria					
					Average Age of Vehicles (0-35 points)	Number of Vehicles to replace/Total Fleet (0-10 points)	Emission Changes (0-30 points)	Cost effectiveness (0-10 points)	Average Mileage of Vehicles to Replace (0- 15 points)	
Item #	Jurisdiction	Project Name	Project Description	Total Project Cost						Total Score Max=100
13	HRT	Purchase of Replacement Buses	60 buses	\$20,000,000	35	5	20	10	0	70
14	HRT	Paratransit Replacement Vehicles	40 vehicles	\$2,000,000	20	7	15	0	15	57
15	HRT	New Ferry Vessels	2 ferries	\$4,000,000	0	2	0	10	0	12
16	WAT	Vehicle Purchase (Service Expansion/Sunday Service)	8 buses	\$4,200,000	0	2	5	5	0	12
17	WAT	Three (3) Body-on- Chassis Vehicles	3 vehicles	\$180,000	15	10	15	2	10	52
18	WAT	Purchase of Replacement Buses (Colonial Williamsburg)	3 vehicles	\$300,000	35	5	15	10	0	65

Prepared By: Hampton Roads Planning District Commission, May 2006.



