

Local Performance and Accountability For Transportation Funding

Implementation of SB 563 (2004 Session)



**Local Assistance Division
Virginia Department of Transportation
1401 E. Broad Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219
(804) 786-2746**

April 16, 2007

I. Executive Summary

In 2004, the General Assembly modified Sections 33.1-23.5:1 and 33.1-41.1 of the Code of Virginia pertaining to local payment programs to place additional financial accountability and performance measurement in place for localities receiving payments for maintenance and construction activities. Since that time, the Department has worked with a group of local government stakeholders, the Virginia First Cities Coalition, and the Virginia Municipal League to establish a program that meets the intent of this legislation utilizing available reporting mechanisms and nationally recognized performance measurement methodologies.

Accountability – Enhanced Financial Reporting:

At the time the Code was modified, there were two reporting mechanisms which were being used to collect data for state and federal purposes, neither of which met the new requirement. Both the Stakeholders Group and VDOT staff recommended the implementation of a modified and enhanced Weldon Cooper Center Local Finance Survey as the prescribed reporting mechanism. This format provided the necessary categories for reporting and eliminated duplicative reporting processes. The Commonwealth Transportation Board approved the use of the enhanced financial survey as the required mechanism for reporting local government maintenance and construction expenditures in September 2005. To assist with the transition to the new format, parallel reporting processes continued for FY2005. The new reporting format was fully implemented with reporting for FY2006. The FY2006 survey will begin in January 2007, following completion of local financial audits, with summary data available in the Summer of 2007.

Performance – Establishing Performance Targets and Measures:

Following completion of the work on the enhanced reporting form, the focus shifted to development of performance targets and measures for the locally maintained system. Various means to report performance were extensively discussed with the Stakeholders Group. Based on the complexity of the issue and the variety of local governments, focus was placed on measuring performance of pavements and bridges utilizing national methodologies and VDOT performance targets.

Bridges: The National Bridge Inspection Standards (NBIS) have been established by the Federal Highway Administration to provide a national standard for proper safety inspection and data reporting of all highway bridges longer than 20 feet on public roads. Localities are responsible for regular bridge inspection on structures that they maintain. VDOT's performance target is that less than 40% of bridges are in need of repair or rehabilitation. The Stakeholder's Group agreed to set the same overall standard for the local system. As of January 2007, 24% of the bridges on the locally maintained system are in need of repair or rehabilitation. This information is now available on VDOT's Dashboard.

Pavement: The Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) is a system utilized by the Federal Highway Administration that includes data on the extent, condition, performance, use, and operating characteristics of the Nation's highways. The HPMS includes information on pavement condition for sample segments based on International Roughness Index (IRI). IRI is a worldwide standard for measuring pavement smoothness established by the World Bank. VDOT

collects this data for sample segments around the state for federal reporting. Approximately 62% of localities maintaining their own systems are currently part of this sample.

While this information is beneficial, it is not compatible with VDOT's own pavement performance measurement system and does not provide for a direct correlation in reporting performance. The use of IRI data from the HPMS is seen as an interim indicator of pavement performance until a more global measure of pavement performance can be implemented. In the meantime, data from the HPMS will be reported but a specific performance target will not be established.

II. Introduction

In 2004, the General Assembly modified Sections 33.1-23.5:1 and Section 33.1-41.1 to require annual categorical reporting of expenditures and reporting on their performance as specified in subdivision B 3 of Section 33.1-23.02. Copies of the Code are included in the Appendix of this document for reference. Before this legislative change the Counties of Arlington and Henrico were not required to report their expenditures to the Board. The cities and towns were required to report a lump sum amount and certify on a one page report. While cities and towns were subject to an annual inspection of arterial streets by VDOT, there were no system-wide performance measurements or tracking of performance for the locally maintained system.

A stakeholders group was formed, with assistance from the Virginia Municipal League, consisting of representatives from the two counties and from cities and towns across the state. An effort was made to ensure the group reflects the size and scope of all localities impacted by this legislative change. Participants in the Stakeholders Group included personnel from the Cities of Alexandria, Bristol, Manassas, Blacksburg, Chesapeake, Norfolk, Richmond, Danville and Virginia Beach, from the Counties of Arlington and Henrico, and staff from the Virginia Municipal League and Virginia First Cities Coalition. VDOT personnel from the Local Assistance, External Audit, and Asset Management Divisions worked with the Stakeholders Group throughout this process.

III. Accountability – Enhanced Financial Reporting

At the time the Code was modified the counties of Arlington and Henrico had no financial reporting responsibilities to VDOT concerning the use of maintenance payments provided to them. The cities and towns had to only report and certify a lump sum amount on an annual report (U-3). Since the Code now requires counties to report their expenditures including delineation between construction and maintenance expenditures and the cities and towns to categorical report expenditures, a new format needed to be used.

The full stakeholders group selected a smaller working group of local representatives to work cooperatively on the development of a reporting tool. The working group identified that the localities already had to submit a survey to the Weldon Cooper Center on an annual basis. This survey was used by VDOT to provide finance data to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for policy analysis, the annual Highway Statistics publication, and biennial Conditions and Performance Report to Congress. The cities and towns in the urban system were also required to report to VDOT on an annual basis. The consensus of the group was to combine the two existing reporting mechanisms into a modified Weldon Cooper Survey.

The group identified categorical items including pavement, traffic control, and roadside services. They also recommended including separate columns for eligible (streets that qualify for payments) expenditures and ineligible expenditures. This was done to capture the total amount of local funding expended for transportation purposes. A companion guideline was also developed to provide consistency in how expenditures would be reported. The companion guidance was incorporated into the new form with detailed instructions on where specific activities would be charged to what category.

The modified survey was presented to the Commonwealth Transportation Board and adopted July 21, 2005. A letter was sent to all the localities informing them of the new reporting procedures. Since this new process required localities to report audited numbers, the survey for FY06 will be sent to the localities in January 2007 with a return date of March 2007. To assist with the transition to the new format, parallel reporting processes continued for FY2005. A link was provided to the Weldon Cooper Site so they could begin to use this reporting mechanism as required by the Code.

IV. Performance – Establishing Targets and Measures

This effort focused on the performance measurement aspect of the legislation. The legislation requires that localities establish performance targets and report on their accomplishments on a biennial basis. This information must be compiled statewide by VDOT and reported to the Commonwealth Transportation Board. The stakeholders group discussed performance measures that many already have in place and also discussed VDOT's performance measurement methodology. After significant discussion, the stakeholders group determined that bridges and pavement represented the largest investment in transportation infrastructure and should be the first step in reporting on local performance.

Staff explored the data available in existing performance monitoring systems, including VDOT's Asset Management System, the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) and the National Bridge Inventory (NBI) to begin development a local system performance measure.

Bridge Performance:

The National Bridge Inspection Standards (NBIS) have been established by the Federal Highway Administration to provide a national standard for proper safety inspection and evaluation of all highway bridges. The NBIS applies to all publicly owned highway bridges longer than 20 feet on public roads. Data on these structures is part of the National Bridge Inventory (NBI). Such bridges must be inspected on a regular, ongoing basis. Localities are responsible for regular bridge inspections on structures that they maintain.

Inspections cover the following: superstructure, substructure, deck, and culvert. A general condition rating (GCR) is assigned to each based on a scale from 0-9, with nine being the best condition and 0 the worst. The overall condition of the bridge is based on the lowest rating received by the superstructure, substructure, and deck (for bridges) and the culvert for box culverts. Example: If a bridge receives a rating of 8 for the superstructure, 6 for the substructure, and 5 for the deck, the overall bridge condition would be a GCR of 5.

VDOT measures performance of bridges based on the GCR. The performance target for the end of fiscal year 2006 is that less than 40% of bridges are in need of repair or rehabilitation, meaning that less than 40% of structures have a minimum GCR rating of less than 6. The baseline measure in 2004 showed that 39% of structures had a minimum GCR rating of less than 6.

VDOT shows bridge deficiency rates in “real time” on the maintenance dashboard. Bridges with a minimum GCR of 6-9 are shown as green on the dashboard. Bridges with a minimum GCR of 4-5 are shown as yellow, and those with a GCR of 0-3 are shown as red. All bridges in the NBI are reflected on VDOT’s maintenance dashboard, including those that are locally maintained.

It was the consensus of the stakeholders group that the same bridge performance measurement methodology and target utilized by VDOT be applied to the locally managed system.

Pavement Performance:

There are many different methodologies available to evaluate pavement condition. Staff from VDOT’s Asset Management Division provided presentations on VDOT’s methodology for pavement analysis and new Asset Management System to the Stakeholder’s Group for consideration. At the time of their presentation, VDOT was using detailed windshield surveys by VDOT staff to collect information on pavement condition in a number of identified categories. A complete assessment was made of the Interstate and Primary systems and a 5% sampling was conducted for the Secondary System. This methodology has recently been replaced with a fully automated system that enables more efficient and objective data collection for the entire VDOT maintained system.

Many localities already have pavement monitoring systems in place, but the amount of data, type of measurement methodology, and performance ranking vary widely across the state. The Stakeholders Group focused on the identification of pavement data and performance standards that were based on national criteria using readily available, consistently collected data through which system-wide performance could be reported.

The Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) is a highway information system utilized by the FHWA that includes data on the extent, condition, performance, use, and operating characteristics of the Nation’s highways. The HPMS includes information on pavement condition for most sample segments based on International Roughness Index (IRI) reporting formats.

The International Roughness Index is a worldwide standard for measuring pavement smoothness established by the World Bank. Since 1990, the Federal Highway Administration has required states to report road roughness on the IRI scale for inclusion in the Highway Performance Monitoring System. States are required to report IRI data for the interstate system, other principal arterials, and rural minor arterials including those that are locally maintained. VDOT currently collects this data for sample segments of highways around the state for federal reporting.

Based on federal pavement rating criteria, pavements have a good ride quality if the IRI is less than 100. As the IRI increases, the ride quality decreases. Pavements with an IRI between 100 and 170 are considered fair. Pavements with an IRI of 170 or greater are considered to be poor quality.

IRI data is currently available for sample segments in 52 localities, representing 62% of those localities maintaining their own transportation systems. The sampled routes represent approximately 5% of the lane miles currently maintained by local governments. The data included in this sample indicate that 35% of locally maintained pavements are deemed as having poor quality based on pavement roughness.

IRI data has some basic limitations in its effectiveness to evaluate pavement condition in a comprehensive manner. IRI only captures one aspect of pavement performance; roughness of the traveling surface. IRI data is less accurate when collected at lower rates of speed and with frequent stops, as found in more urbanized areas. Also, there are other indicators of pavement condition which should be considered when evaluating overall pavement performance including surface cracking, rutting, and other condition assessment measures.

While the IRI data and related performance information is beneficial, it is not compatible with VDOT's own pavement performance measurement system and does not provide for a direct correlation in reporting performance. It is also not directly compatible with some of the local pavement management systems. **The use of IRI data from the HPMS is seen as an interim indicator of pavement performance on the locally maintained system and should not be used in direct comparison with VDOT's established performance measures.** In the meantime, IRI data from the HPMS will be reported but a specific performance target will not be established.

As mentioned previously, VDOT has recently implemented a fully automated data collection system which collects information on several different characteristics of pavement condition. This methodology has the capability to collect data for the entire system, on a rotating basis, rather than just a small sampling of locations. VDOT staff continue to explore how this new data collection methodology can be expanded to include the locally maintained system at minimal cost or impact to systems local governments may already have in place. The Stakeholders Group will be part of the consideration and potential implementation of this methodology.

V. Appendices

- Chapter 118 – 2004 Acts of Assembly
- 2006 Summary Baseline Data & analysis

CHAPTER 118

An Act to amend and reenact §§ 33.1-23.5:1 and 33.1-41.1 of the Code of Virginia, relating to payments to cities and certain towns for maintenance of certain highways; payments to counties that elect to withdraw from the secondary system of state highways.

[S 563]

Approved March 15, 2004

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That §§ [33.1-23.5:1](#) and [33.1-41.1](#) of the Code of Virginia are amended and reenacted as follows:

§ [33.1-23.5:1](#). Funds for counties which have withdrawn or elect to withdraw from the secondary system of state highways.

Notwithstanding the provisions of § [33.1-23.5](#), pursuant to *subsection A* of § [33.1-23.1-A](#), the Commonwealth Transportation Board shall make the following payments to counties which have withdrawn or elect to withdraw from the secondary system of state highways under the provisions of § 11 of Chapter 415 of the Acts of Assembly of 1932, and which have not elected to return: to any county having withdrawn prior to June 30, 1985, and having an area greater than 100 square miles, an amount equal to \$3,616 per lane-mile for fiscal year 1986, and to any county having an area less than 100 square miles, an amount equal to \$7,201 per lane-mile for fiscal year 1986; to any county that elects to withdraw after June 30, 1985, the Commonwealth Transportation Board shall establish a rate per lane-mile for the first year using (i) an amount for maintenance based on maintenance standards and unit costs used by the Department of Transportation to prepare its secondary system maintenance budget for the year in which the county withdraws, and (ii) an amount for administration equal to five percent of the maintenance figure determined in (i) above. The payment rates shall be adjusted annually by the Board in accordance with procedures established for adjusting payments to cities and towns under § [33.1-41.1](#), and lane mileage shall be adjusted annually to include (i) streets and highways accepted for maintenance in the county system by the local governing body, or (ii) streets and highways constructed according to standards set forth in the county subdivision ordinance or county thoroughfare plan, and being not less than the standards set by the Department of Transportation. Such counties shall, in addition, each receive for construction from funds allocated pursuant to *subdivision B 3* of § [33.1-23.1](#) ~~B-3~~ an annual amount calculated in the same manner as payments for construction in the state secondary highway system are calculated.

Payment of the funds shall be made in four equal sums, one in each quarter of the fiscal year, and shall be reduced, in the case of each such county, by the amount of federal-aid construction funds credited to each such county.

The chief administrative officer of such counties receiving such funds shall make annual reports of expenditures to the Board, in such form as the Board shall prescribe, accounting for all expenditures, including delineation between construction and maintenance expenditures and reporting on their performance as specified in subdivision B 3 of § [33.1-23.02](#). Such reports

shall be included in the scope of the annual audit of each county conducted by independent certified public accountants.

§ [33.1-41.1](#). Payments to cities and certain towns for maintenance of certain highways.

The Commonwealth Transportation Commissioner, subject to the approval of the Commonwealth Transportation Board, shall make payments for maintenance, construction, or reconstruction of highways, as hereinafter provided, to all cities and towns eligible for allocation of construction funds for urban highways under § [33.1-23.3](#). Such payments, however, shall only be made if those highways functionally classified as principal and minor arterial roads are maintained to a standard satisfactory to the Department of Transportation. Whenever any city or town qualifies under this section for allocation of funds, such qualification shall continue to apply to such city or town regardless of any subsequent change in population and shall cease to apply only when so specifically provided by an act of the General Assembly. All allocations made prior to July 1, 2001, to cities and towns meeting the criteria of the foregoing provisions of this section are hereby confirmed.

No payments shall be made by the Commissioner to any such city or town unless the portion of the highway for which such payment is made either (a) has (i) an unrestricted right-of-way at least ~~forty~~ 50 feet wide and (ii) a hard-surface width of at least ~~thirty~~ 30 feet; or (b) has (i) an unrestricted right-of-way at least ~~eighty~~ 80 feet wide, (ii) a hard-surface width of at least ~~twenty-four~~ 24 feet, and (iii) approved engineering plans for the ultimate construction of an additional hard-surface width of at least ~~twenty-four~~ 24 feet within the same right-of-way; or (c) (i) is a cul-de-sac, (ii) has an unrestricted right-of-way at least ~~forty~~ 40 feet wide, and (iii) has a turnaround that meets applicable standards set by the Department of Transportation; or (d) either (i) has been paved and has constituted part of the primary or secondary system of state highways prior to annexation or incorporation or (ii) has constituted part of the secondary system of state highways prior to annexation or incorporation and is paved to a minimum width of ~~sixteen~~ 16 feet subsequent to such annexation or incorporation and with the further exception of streets or portions thereof which have previously been maintained under the provisions of § [33.1-79](#) or § [33.1-82](#); or (e) was eligible for and receiving such payments under the laws of the Commonwealth in effect on June 30, 1985; or (f) is a street established prior to July 1, 1950, which has an unrestricted right-of-way width of not less than ~~thirty~~ 30 feet and a hard-surface width of not less than ~~sixteen~~ 16 feet; or (g) is a street functionally classified as a local street and constructed on or after January 1, 1996, which at the time of approval by the city or town met the criteria for pavement width and right-of-way of the then-current edition of the subdivision street requirements manual for secondary roads of the Department of Transportation (24 VAC [30-90-10](#) et seq.); (h) is a street previously eligible to receive street payments that is located in a city having a population of at least 200,000 but no more than 250,000 and is closed to public travel, pursuant to legislation enacted by the governing body of the city in which it is located, for public safety reasons, within the boundaries of a publicly funded housing development owned and operated by the local housing authority; or (i) is a local street, otherwise eligible, containing one or more physical protuberances placed within the right-of-way for the purpose of controlling the speed of traffic.

However, the Commissioner may waive the requirements as to hard-surface pavement or right-of-way width for highways where the width modification is at the request of the local governing body and is to protect the quality of the affected local government's drinking water supply or, for highways constructed on or after July 1, 1994, to accommodate some other special circumstance where such action would not compromise the health, safety, or welfare of the public. The modification is subject to such conditions as the Commissioner may prescribe.


























For the purpose of calculating allocations and making payments under this section, the Department shall divide affected highways into two categories, which shall be distinct from but based on functional classifications established by the Federal Highway Administration: (i) principal and minor arterial roads and (ii) collector roads and local streets. Payments to affected localities shall be based on the number of moving-lane-miles of highways or portions thereof available to peak-hour traffic in each category of highways in that locality. For the fiscal year 1986, payment to each city and town shall be an amount equal to \$7,787 per moving-lane-mile for principal and minor arterials and \$4,572 per moving-lane-mile for collector roads and local streets.































The Department of Transportation shall establish a statewide maintenance index of the unit costs for labor, equipment, and materials used on roads and bridges in the fiscal year 1986, and use changes in that index to calculate and put into effect annual changes in the base per-lane-mile rate payable under this section.

The fund allocated by the Board shall be paid in equal sums in each quarter of the fiscal year, and no payment shall be made without the approval of the Board.

The *chief administrative officer of the city or town* receiving this fund shall make annual *categorical reports of expenditures to the Board*, in such form as the Board ~~may~~ shall prescribe, accounting for all expenditures ~~and~~, certifying that none of the money received has been expended for other than maintenance, construction or reconstruction of the streets, *and reporting on their performance as specified in subdivision B 3 of § [33.1-23.02](#)*. Such reports shall be included in the scope of the annual audit of each municipality conducted by independent certified public accountants.

Bridge Performance Summary - January 2007
National Bridge Inventory Ratings

Abingdon		Charlottesville		Fairfax	
Deficient 20%		Deficient 47%		Deficient 0%	
Alexandria		Chesapeake		Farmville	
Deficient 5%		Deficient 19%		Deficient 50%	
Ashland		Christiansburg		Fredericksburg	
Deficient 0%		Deficient 0%		Deficient 33%	
Bedford		Clifton Forge		Front Royal	
Deficient 50%		Deficient 71%		Deficient 27%	
Big Stone Gap		Colonial Heights		Galax	
Deficient 66%		Deficient 29%		Deficient 0%	
Blacksburg		Covington		Grottoes	
Deficient 0%		Deficient 14%		Deficient 50%	
Blackstone		Culpeper		Hampton	
Deficient 100%		Deficient 0%		Deficient 34%	
Bluefield		Danville		Harrisonburg	
Deficient 42%		Deficient 5%		Deficient 10%	
Bristol		Elkton		Herndon	
Deficient 42%		Deficient 0%		Deficient 0%	
Buena Vista		Emporia		Hopewell	
Deficient 6%		Deficient 17%		Deficient 50%	

Lebanon		Deficient 14%	Newport News		Deficient 17%	Roanoke		Deficient 22%
Leesburg		Deficient 0%	Norfolk		Deficient 42%	Rocky Mount		Deficient 33%
Lexington		Deficient 63%	Norton		Deficient 33%	Salem		Deficient 42%
Luray		Deficient 33%	Orange		Deficient 33%	Saltville		Deficient 25%
Lynchburg		Deficient 23%	Petersburg		Deficient 32%	Smithfield		Deficient 0%
Manassas		Deficient 0%	Portsmouth		Deficient 80%	South Boston		Deficient 60%
Manassas Park		Deficient 0%	Pulaski		Deficient 18%	Staunton		Deficient 0%
Marion		Deficient 55%	Radford		Deficient 0%	Suffolk		Deficient 33%
Martinsville		Deficient 30%	Richlands		Deficient 30%	Tazewell		Deficient 58%
Narrows		Deficient 0%	Richmond		Deficient 18%	Vienna		Deficient 17%

Vinton

Deficient 0%	R	0
	Y	0
	G	2

Va Beach

Deficient 17%	R	0
	Y	13
	G	63

Warrenton

Deficient 0%	R	0
	Y	0
	G	3

Waynesboro

Deficient 33%	R	2
	Y	4
	G	12

Local Systems

Deficient 24%	R	12
	Y	296
	G	973

Williamsburg

Deficient 0%	R	0
	Y	0
	G	5

Winchester

Deficient 14%	R	0
	Y	1
	G	6

Wise

Deficient 0%	R	0
	Y	0
	G	1

Woodstock

Deficient 0%	R	0
	Y	0
	G	4

Wytheville

Deficient 50%	R	0
	Y	1
	G	1

Arlington

Deficient 4%	R	0
	Y	1
	G	21

Henrico County

Deficient 17%	R	0
	Y	10
	G	50

Notes:

**Bridges are measured using a General Condition Rating (GCR) as determined by NBI inspections.

**Bridges with a minimum GCR of 6-9 are shown as green.

**Bridges with a minimum GCR of 4-5 are shown as yellow, and those with a GCR of 0-3 are shown as red.

**Bridges with a minimum GCR rating of less than 6 are in need of repair or rehabilitation.

Pavement Sample Summary

FHWA Highway Performance Monitoring System - March 2006

Deficiency based on International Roughness Index and 5% sample of system lane miles

Abingdon Percent Deficient 0%	Clifton Forge Percent Deficient 0%	Harrisonburg Percent Deficient 9%	Manassas Park Percent Deficient 100%	Suffolk Percent Deficient 5%
Alexandria Percent Deficient 80%	Colonial Heights Percent Deficient 33%	Henrico Percent Deficient 0%	Marion Percent Deficient 50%	Warrenton Percent Deficient 33%
Ashland Percent Deficient 0%	Covington Percent Deficient 0%	Hopewell Percent Deficient 43%	Petersburg Percent Deficient 55%	Waynesboro Percent Deficient 20%
Bedford Percent Deficient 43%	Culpeper Percent Deficient 71%	Manassas Percent Deficient 0%	Portsmouth Percent Deficient 66%	Williamsburg Percent Deficient 0%
Big Stone Gap Percent Deficient 0%	Danville Percent Deficient 17%	Martinsville Percent Deficient 0%	Pulaski Percent Deficient 20%	Winchester Percent Deficient 44%
Blacksburg Percent Deficient 0%	Falls Church Percent Deficient 0%	Newport News Percent Deficient 52%	Radford Percent Deficient 75%	Wytheville Percent Deficient 0%
Bridgewater Percent Deficient 50%	Farmville Percent Deficient 73%	Norfolk Percent Deficient 53%	Richmond Percent Deficient 67%	Va Beach Percent Deficient 19%
Bristol Percent Deficient 43%	Franklin Percent Deficient 67%	Lebanon Percent Deficient 50%	Roanoke Percent Deficient 42%	Vinton Percent Deficient 0%
Buena Vista Percent Deficient 0%	Fredericksburg Percent Deficient 50%	Leesburg Percent Deficient 0%	Rocky Mount Percent Deficient 0%	STATEWIDE Percent Deficient 35%
Charlottesville Percent Deficient 45%	Front Royal Percent Deficient 50%	Lexington Percent Deficient 0%	Salem Percent Deficient 38%	
Chesapeake Percent Deficient 9%	Galax Percent Deficient 0%	Lynchburg Percent Deficient 33%	South Boston Percent Deficient 0%	

Christiansburg
Percent
Deficient 13%

Hampton
Percent
Deficient 20%

Manassas
Percent
Deficient 0%

Staunton
Percent
Deficient 33%

Notes:

- **This is an interim performance measure.**
- This information is based upon IRI performance standards established by the Federal Highway Administration.
- There is not a direct correlation between performance measures for the VDOT maintained system and the locally maintained systems.
- There are currently no samples for the following localities: Altavista, Arlington, Blackstone, Bluefield, Chase City, Chincoteague, Dumfries, Elkton, Emporia, Fairfax, Grottoes, Herndon, Luray, Narrows, Norton, Orange, Pearisburg, Poquoson, Purcellville, Richlands, Saltville, Strasburg, Smithfield, South Hill, Tazewell, Vienna, Wise, Woodstock