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House Bill 2 Update

- Late February/Early March – Held meetings in each district to get feedback on measures/process
- April/May – Public Comment on draft
- Today – Progress on HB2 Pilot Project Scoring
- May CTB – Revised process presented
- June CTB – Final process considered by the Board
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HB2 Project Evaluation Process

- Screened HB2 Project
- Calculation of HB2 Measures values
- Internal/External Review for QA/QC
- Input: Measure Values and Weights
- Input: Factor Weights
- Project Score
- Input: Project Costs
- Advance Projects to CTB Prioritization
## Factor Weighting Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Congestion Mitigation</th>
<th>Economic Development</th>
<th>Accessibility</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Environmental Quality</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category A</td>
<td>35%**</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category D</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note** – For metropolitan planning areas with a population over 200,000 (TPB, HRTPO, RRTPO, FAMPO, RVTPO), the prioritization process shall also include a factor based on the quantifiable and achievable goals in VTrans (referred to as the Transportation-Land Use Coordination factor).

**Note** – For Northern Virginia and Hampton Roads construction districts, congestion mitigation is weighted highest among the factors in the prioritization process.
## Overview of Pilot Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train Station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Expansion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Route Transit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Location Roadway</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen Existing Roadway</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction w/ Added Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Replacement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal – Park and Ride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illustrative Scorecard Examples
**Sample Scorecard**

**HB2 Project Scorecard**

**Project Name:** Route Z - Project A  
**Description:** This is a generic project description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Information</th>
<th>Performance Information</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Total Cost:** $2,500,000 | **Rank:** Overall 7 (out of 800)  
**Percentile:** Based on Value 99%  
**Within District:** 2 (out of 25)  
**Percentile:** Based on HB2 Cost Effectiveness 85% | **Safety:** Fatal & Severe Crash Rate Reduction 5.2 |
| **System:** NHS Non-Interstate  
**Location:** District 9  
**Area Type Typology:** A | |  
**Congestion Mitigation:** Delay Savings in Person-Hours 400  
**Number of Non-SOV Users Reached through Ridesharing Programs,**  
**Increased Transit Use, and other Energy Efficiency Efforts:** 650 |

**Environmental Quality:**  
**Tonnage of Freight Goods Moved through Improved Intermodal Connectivity:** 200  
**Land Use Coordination:** Change in Corridor Population Job Accessibility 0.08

**Project Score by Criteria**

- **Economic Development:** 75  
- **Concentration Mitigation:** 56  
- **Accessibility:** 48  
- **Safety:** 35  
- **Land Use Coordination:** 20  
- **Environmental Quality:** 10

*Best Possible*
Project Scoring
Cost-Effectiveness
Findings from Initial Scoring of Pilot Projects

Overall Findings:

• Develop consistent and clear definitions and criteria for applications
  – Minimize interpretation of responses
  – Ensure consistency of information provided

• Reduce complexity and improve clarity of certain measures
  – Congestion
  – Accessibility
  – Economic Development
Findings from Initial Scoring of Pilot Projects

Safety Factor Area

- Finding: Inconsistent project scope descriptions—dictates scope of analysis
- Recommended Action: Crashes as performance measure—emphasis on locations with greatest potential for fatalities and injuries
- Finding: Insufficient number of incidents in certain locations
- Recommended Action: Expand to larger sample size to be consistent with federal guidelines—five years
Findings from Initial Scoring of Pilot Projects

Congestion Factor Area

• Finding: Using multiple evaluation techniques based on location provided inconsistent results. For example, a regional model may provide one answer while a calculation based on the Highway Capacity Manual may provide a different answer.

• Recommended Action: Use a uniform, consistent, and repeatable process that will allow projects to be comparably evaluated.
Findings from Initial Scoring of Pilot Projects

Economic Development

• Finding: It is difficult to determine which undeveloped or underdeveloped parcels within the project area should be considered as benefitting from improved transportation facility

• Recommended Action: Incorporate levels of commitment- active site plans, occupancy permits, water and sewer in place, letters of intent, market studies, etc.
Potential Changes to Measures

- **Economic development factor area**
  - Undertaking analysis to determine if a reliability measure can be incorporated into this factor area

- **Environmental factor area**
  - Concern that accessibility for disadvantaged populations is not an environmental justice measure
  - Concern over lack of consideration of natural, historic and cultural resources

- **Accessibility factor area**
  - Concern over appropriateness and definition of “essential destinations”
Next Steps

• April/May–
  – Public comment on draft will be solicited
  – Six-Year Improvement Program hearings
• May CTB – Pilot Results and process revisions presented
• June CTB – Final process considered by Board