

Defining “Regionally Significant”

Presented to TTC by
Robert B. Case, PE
June 4, 2008



Impetus

- Baker Rd Extension
 - Regionally Significant?
- City of Va. Beach request (Apr 2 TTC mtg.):
 - Develop guidelines

Authority

- These guidelines and the application of them are apparently the purview of the ICG.
 - “**Interagency** consultation procedures shall also include the following specific processes:”
 - “(ii) Determining which minor arterials and other transportation projects should be considered “regionally significant” for the purposes of regional emissions analysis....”

Consequences

- According to federal conformity regulations:
 - A regionally significant project may be adopted or approved by VDOT or HRMPO only if it has been included in TIP and LRP **conformity** analyses.

Definition

- Federal conformity regulations
 - 1) set a **minimum** definition, and
 - 2) allow for regional **interpretations**.
- According to conformity regulations:
 - the set of regionally significant projects is equal to:
 - principal arterial and fixed guideway transit projects, plus
 - other projects on roadways which both
 - serve a regional transportation need and
 - normally would be included in the **model**.

Regional Model

- A comparison of the model network and the actual network revealed that **minor arterials** are typically included in the model, whereas some collectors are included and some are excluded:

<u>Functional Class</u>	<u>Example</u>	<u>Members of this Class Included in 2000 Model</u>
Rural Minor Arterial	Rte 30- James City	Yes
Rural Major Collector	Hosier Rd- Suffolk	Mostly Yes
Rural Minor Collector	Old Myrtle Rd- I.W.	Mixed
Urban Minor Arterial	Briarfield Rd- Ham/NN	Yes
Urban Collector	First View St- Norfolk	Mixed

Guidelines by Others

- The ICG in the Boise area considers the following regionally significant:
 - Minor arterials with a future volume of 45,000
 - Construction of a lane on a roadway which joins two arterials
 - Construction of a lane on a roadway which parallels the interstate, covering at least two interchanges.
- According to a “working definition” from VDOT, the following projects should be considered regionally significant:
 - **Arterials** and above
 - Adding or removing an **interchange** to a freeway

Fit with Planning Process

- For fiscal constraint accounting in the LRP planning process, projects for **minor arterials and above** were considered “listable”, and projects for collectors and below were considered not “listable”.
- Federal regulations require that all regionally significant projects be listed in the LRP.
- Therefore, a definition of “regionally significant” based on **minor arterials and above** would fit well with the current planning process.

Analysis

- The purpose of drawing a line establishing regional significance is to **balance**:
 - the desire to include enough projects in conformity analyses to be accurate
 - the desire to not include so many projects in conformity analyses that the process bogs down

Recommendation

- Considering the purpose of drawing the “regionally significant” line and considering federal, state, and local inputs
 - particularly regulatory reference to the regional model which normally includes **minor arterials and above**,
 - VDOT’s working definition which covers **minor arterials and above**, and
 - the MPO’s practice of considering **minor arterials and above** as listable in its LRP
- the following draft Hampton Roads definition is recommended:

Recommended Definition

The following types of projects will generally be considered “regionally significant”:

- Highway projects which add thru lane(s) to roadways classified as **minor arterial and above**
- Adding or removing an **interchange** on a limited-access facility
- **Fixed guideway** transit projects