

**FREIGHT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OF THE HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

DECEMBER 8, 2010 MEETING

AGENDA

This agenda is issued for the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization's (HRTPO) Freight Technical Advisory Committee (FTAC) December 8, 2010 meeting.

Following is the meeting agenda.

1. Call to Order
2. Taking of Attendance
3. Public Comment Period
4. Old business
 - a. Committee Membership Review
5. New Business
 - a. HRTPO Presentation: Latest Project Prioritization Results (Andy Pickard)
 - i. Q&A and Discussion of Prioritization Results
 - ii. Review/Revise FTAC Resolution on Prioritization Results
 - b. Review Draft Presentation for FTAC Business Outreach
 - c. Hypothetical Inland Intermodal Transfer Facility Discussion (Keith Nichols)
6. Announcement of Next Meeting Date, Place, Time
7. Adjournment

**FREIGHT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
OF THE HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION**

OCTOBER 12, 2010 MEETING

DRAFT MINUTES

Co-Chair Bill Bell called the HRTPO Freight Technical Advisory Committee to order at 10:00 a.m. in the Virginia Port Authority (VPA) Board Room with the following in attendance:

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bill Bell, Co-Chair (Northrop Grumman Shipbuilding)
David White (Virginia Maritime Association)
Homer Crane (K Line America, Inc.)
Keith Helton (Givens Logistics)
Ron Drogan (The CrossGlobe Group)

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Art Moye (Virginia Maritime Association)
Chris Luebbers (Norfolk Southern Corporation)
Curtis Hall (Target Import Warehouse)
Stan Clark, Co-Chair (Isle of Wight Board of Supervisors)

STAFF:

Jeff Florin (Virginia Port Authority)
Sam Belfield (HRTPO)
Andy Pickard (HRTPO)
Andy Hecker (Moffatt & Nichol)
Allison Mall (Moffatt & Nichol)

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jeff Raliski (Norfolk Department of Planning)
Vonda Johnson (Norfolk State University)

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

All the meeting attendees introduced themselves and Co-Chair Bill Bell opened the public comment period. Mr. Jeff Raliski from the City of Norfolk Planning Department and Ms. Vonda Johnson from Norfolk State University introduced themselves but had no comments to make. Hearing no requests for public comment, Mr. Bell declared the public comment period closed.

2. OLD BUSINESS

a. Adoption of Last Meeting's Minutes

Mr. Bell noted the minutes of the July 14, 2010 FTAC meeting and asked for any revisions. There being none, Mr. Bell moved the minutes be approved as submitted. Mr. Crane seconded the motion and the minutes were approved unanimously.

b. Update on CTAC and TTAC Communication

Mr. Andy Hecker discussed the meetings that he had with the leadership of the HRTPO's Citizen Transportation Advisory Committee (CTAC) and Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC), which were held in order to work towards integrating FTAC with other HRTPO committees. Mr. Hecker met with CTAC chairperson Mr. William Harrison, and learned that the committee includes "citizens from every walk of life." It is a much larger committee than FTAC, without a lot of transportation experience. Mr. Harrison expressed an interest in having an FTAC member attend a CTAC meeting and discuss freight and its impact on the economy, etc. They would like to discuss what the transportation needs for the region are and how we will get there. However, since both committees need until the end of the year to get organized, it will be best to attend a CTAC meeting in the New Year.

Mr. Hecker also met with TTAC's chairperson, Mr. Richard Drumwright, who also expressed an interest in having an FTAC member attend a TTAC meeting and give a presentation or lead a discussion on freight and the economy. Mr. Drumwright says that all things are on the table and is intrigued by our idea of looking at systems rather than projects by city. Mr. Jeff Florin emphasized that TTAC "has a lot of influence, and a lot of what happens at TTAC gets on the HRTPO agenda." He believes that they would be interested in gaining a better understanding of freight's impact on transportation.

3. NEW BUSINESS

a. HRTPO Prioritization Tool and 2034 LRTP

i. Presentation and Discussion of First Set of Draft Results

Mr. Bell led a presentation and discussion on the draft inputs that the HRTPO provided to the FTAC staff, with the understanding that they were the first round of inputs and the HRTPO is still in the process of developing and refining the tool.

Mr. Bell praised the HRTPO for their work on the prioritization tool and said that it is a great tool, but that further analysis of the weighting is needed, in addition to making sure inputs are kept objective. The

Committee agreed and offered their assistance in validating freight-related project inputs.

He emphasized that the FTAC's role is to educate and advocate on behalf of the systematic needs for transport and movement of freight in region, and especially to inform citizens about the "hidden tax," — the cost of goods that will rise if freight movement is hindered by an inefficient transportation system.

Mr. Bell focused on the importance of freight to the economic vitality of the region and the need to view transportation infrastructure as "systems" that move freight along corridors in the region, rather than dividing up infrastructure improvement projects by locality. If one part of the system is fixed but not the rest, goods are not going to get to where they need to go. Both intra- and inter-regional movement is important to consider, as well as the ability for businesses to bring freight into the region, not just to transport it out. The FTAC identified the major systems benefitting freight movement as: I-64, US 460, US 58, US 13, and US 17.

The discussion concluded with the reiteration by Mr. Bell that a "really good tool has been developed; we just need to make sure tool is valid and consistent."

ii. HRTPO Discussion of Inputs

Mr. Andy Pickard, Principal Transportation Engineer for the HRTPO, thanked the Committee for having him and said that it was "good to see the Committee as it evolves, and to hear about your concerns regarding the input."

Mr. Pickard then gave a presentation about the prioritization tool and said that the HRTPO staff is in charge of validating inputs. He explained that, per advisement of the HRTPO Board in September 2010, each project will get a single score, out of 300. At this time, over 150 projects were being evaluated with the prioritization tool. He said that "right now, the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) subcommittee is our roll-up-your-sleeves working group."

Mr. Pickard stressed that the outputs coming from the prioritization tool are for information only; the HRTPO Board will determine which projects get prioritized. He said, "Ultimately, the Board has the prerogative to choose whatever projects they choose. The tool is merely information to provide the Board with." He also said that this is the first time the HRTPO has used a formal tool for prioritizing projects; the next time around advantage can be taken of valuable lessons learned.

The presentation outlined the three components of the tool: Project Utility, Project Viability, and Economic Vitality. There are four evaluation categories being scored: Bridges and Tunnels, Highways, Intermodal, and Transit.

The intermodal projects being evaluated with the prioritization tool are:

- Intermodal Connector and Air Terminal Interchange
- Craney Island Access Road
- Finney Ave. Flyover (Suffolk)
- Hampton Blvd. at International Terminal Blvd.

Mr. Jeff Florin pointed out that the state does not actually fund projects categorized as “Intermodal,” but Mr. Pickard stated that the Intermodal projects that are being evaluated also coincide with other categories.

Mr. Pickard then further clarified how the tool works in order to give the Committee an “idea of the magnitude of the tool.” Each project is scored by way of 15-20 questions. Those scores are developed by the HRTPO staff, who use the best sources possible to obtain the needed data and compile the score. These sources include the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), The Virginia Port Authority (VPA), Hampton Roads Transit (HRT), Williamsburg Area Transit Authority (WATA), the U.S. Navy, and locality staff. Data were compiled from cost estimates and project histories, comprehensive plans, travel demand models, the HRTPO’s Congestion Management Process (CMP) report and database, and ESRI Business Analyst software. He said that it is a “very data-intensive tool.”

Mr. Sam Belfield, Senior Transportation Engineer at the HRTPO, explained the CMP report further. This report has in-depth traffic count information from VDOT for existing conditions, and traffic forecasts 20 years into the future. The report maps before and after conditions, and breaks down existing congestion levels along different corridors.

Mr. Pickard continued his presentation by outlining the review process for the prioritization tool. Extensive comments have been received and continue to be reviewed. The HRTPO’s committees—the LRTP subcommittee, TTAC, FTAC, and CTAC—are the primary outlets for review, with the LRTP subcommittee serving as the initial advisory team. In November, the HRTPO staff will present their “final” results to the committees, and will then present the results to the HRTPO Board in December. [As of 11-8-10, this order will be reversed.]

The presentation ended on the note that HRTPO is implementing a new public outreach program, to focus on outreach via schools, Google Earth visualization, and community conversations. Ms. Kendall Miller is the new Outreach Coordinator at the HRTPO.

iii. FTAC Comment on Tool Progress

Mr. David White asked Mr. Pickard if there was a way within the tool to give projects extra points for being in “systems,” or a way to differentiate between intra- vs. inter-regional projects. He answered that there was not, but there was a way to differentiate between regional and/or local projects and to determine travel time reduction and traffic volume.

Mr. Bell expressed concern with the Project Viability component scores, because projects were getting very low scores and there was no differentiation between projects such as the Midtown Tunnel, etc. that are “shovel-ready,” and ones that are not. Mr. Pickard explained that there are two sides to the viability component — the process (required paperwork, Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), record of decision, design timeline, etc.) and funding. He stated that the questions to evaluate each project have changed and are more reasonable now than they were for the results that the FTAC had previously seen.

Mr. Andy Hecker asked Mr. Pickard to talk a little bit about the process for rationalizing inputs. He asked, “Once you get the inputs, then how is the decision made and how does feedback work to the person who originally submitted the project for consideration?” Mr. Pickard answered that the HRTPO is not doing the prioritization in isolation. He then reiterated where the data comes from, i.e. VDOT, CMP report, travel demand models, etc. He said that some questions were subjective and that the HRTPO staff tried as much as possible to be consistent in where it obtained data from. Mr. Pickard continued by saying that Economic Vitality has not traditionally been considered to a great extent in transportation planning, but Federal stimulus efforts have helped raise the discussion of this relationship.

The Committee then discussed specific results of the prioritization tool’s first round of inputs because they were concerned after reviewing initial inputs. Mr. Bell asked: “How did the Southeastern Expressway get such a high score on a single category? I’m surprised at the magnitude of the difference in scores, not that it got a good score. Something isn’t right, it causes me to throw a flag down and see why it is so significantly different.”

Mr. Pickard explained that, at the last LRTP subcommittee meeting, the US 460 and Southeastern Expressway project scores were discussed and analyzed. Mr. White asked why the Southeastern Expressway project did so well in the tourism score when other projects that impact tourism (US 460 and I-64) were not evaluated. Mr. Pickard said that the subcommittee indicated that perhaps US 460 should have scored higher than it did, based on travel time, tourism, and Department of Defense concerns.

Mr. Pickard said that the travel time impact calculation is “region-wide” for the whole system, not simply on the project. He also was asked whether the Economic Vitality score is mathematical, and he answered by explaining the process of determining weights and the technical and economic expertise that was used to determine the vitality score.

Mr. White said that the FTAC should seek an opportunity to be involved in providing freight data, and that their expertise can be taken advantage of in this process. He thinks that “we would all like to see a systemic process incorporated.” He also said that it’s good that the time crunch on completing the tool has been pushed back.

iv. FTAC Position on Prioritizing Potential LRTP 2034 Projects

The Committee agreed that the FTAC’s official statement on prioritizing potential 2034 LRTP projects made its point, but should be condensed into more of an executive summary. Several edits were agreed upon and Mr. Crane made a motion to amend the document as suggested. Mr. Helton seconded the motion, all were in favor, and the motion carried. The statement will go into the packet for the next HRTPO meeting if it is complete in time.

v. Other New Business

Mr. Bill Bell brought up the topic of FTAC members conducting outreach to the business community, and said that he would be happy to lead the effort. The FTAC can find local businesses, through the Chambers of Commerce, and discuss inter-regional cargo movement and its impact on the economy. The Committee agreed that informing the business community about the FTAC’s role and getting input from them on transportation projects priorities is a good idea. Committee members will assist with presentations upon their availability.

Mr. Jeff Florin said that the FTAC staff will put together a presentation that can be used for doing outreach to different business groups. This will help get the Committee’s message out into the community, along with a greater understanding of freight, the economy, and funding issues.

b. Presentation and Discussion of HRTPO Draft Legislative Priorities

In preparation for the 2011 General Assembly session, the HRTPO Legislative Ad-Hoc Committee developed a set of legislative priorities. Mr. Pickard answered the Committee’s questions about the priorities. For instance, he explained that the HRTPO supports merging the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program and the Six-Year Improvement Program into one document, because the Federal Highway Administration does not recognize the Six-Year Improvement Program.

4. ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING DATE, PLACE, TIME

The next meeting will take place on Wednesday, November 9th, from 10:00 – 11:30 a.m., in the VPA Board Room. The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m. [The meeting was later rescheduled to Wednesday, December 8th, from 10:00 – 11:30 a.m., in the VPA Board Room.]

Review and Analysis of HRTPO Prioritization

HRTPO published an updated draft of the Hampton Roads Prioritization of Transportation Projects “Evaluation and Scoring,” dated December 2010.

We have reviewed the document and submit the following review for FTAC committee members:

1. A summary of the results and comments on key scores and methodology employed by HRTPO
2. A revised statement from FTAC on the status of the prioritization effort
3. A draft resolution for the consideration of the committee
4. The draft document published by HRTPO

Summary of prioritization draft:

The draft outputs now provide one score for each project. The highest possible score is 300. The score was arrived at by totaling the individual scores each project receives for project utility, viability and economic vitality. Projects are ranked based on those scores within the following project categories:

- Highways
 - Interstate
 - Primary
 - Secondary
 - Urban
- Bridge and Tunnel
 - Interstate
 - Primary
- Multimodal Passenger
- Intermodal
- Interchange
- Transit

About 150 projects were reviewed. Seven projects received a score over 200.

1. Midtown Tunnel	242
2. Dominion Boulevard	216
3. HRBT (8 Lane)	208
4. Virginia Beach Fixed Guide-way Transit	204
5. Third Crossing (Partial 564 to 164)	203
6. Route 17 in York	202
7. Third Crossing (Complete Project)	201

The Midtown Tunnel, HRBT (8 lane) and Third Crossing projects are of particular importance to freight movement as the region maintains or improves its competitiveness. The Third Crossing and/or HRBT add capacity to the limited pipelines or corridors connecting the region to the rest of the country. The Midtown Tunnel adds capacity between international cargo handled in Norfolk and Portsmouth.

Eighteen more projects received a score over 170. Thirteen of these were varying versions of HRBT or Third Crossing projects, an extension of MLK for the Midtown Tunnel, Interchanges or urban roads and a fixed guide-way transit project. The remaining five projects are of particular importance to the movement of freight.

1. Craney Island Access Road	189
2. US 460 relocation	187
3. US 58 (bypass to Manning Road)	180
4. Southeastern Parkway	180
5. I-64 Widening (Peninsula)	178

The review of the scoring methodology and outputs shows that more objectivity appears to be occurring although more is needed. We first point out that perhaps at this point FTAC might support and the region might be swayed to whittle prioritization and funding to a manageable discussion focused on the 12 projects previously listed.

Utility Score:

A review of the utility score (congestion relief, capacity added, safety and cost/use) appears to be technically and mathematically sound.

Viability Score:

The viability scores seem to be ranked somewhat logically but questions arise on the weighting or scores applied to certain aspects of a projects viability. For FTAC consideration and discussion with HRTPO staff at the next meeting is the following:

The project scores highlighted several criteria or data points considered to arrive at scores. It is not visible on how scores were determined for each of the following:

1. A completed EIS
2. A record of decision
3. An unsolicited PPTA proposal
4. A vetted PPTA proposal moving to an IRP (state sponsored Independent Review Panel)
5. Partial funding
6. In the Six Year Plan
7. Environmental review terminated by FHWA

With the exception of the Midtown Tunnel (242) the score range between the twelve referenced projects is 38. The viability scores for these projects range from 18 to 80.

Economic Vitality:

Economic Vitality continues to have the appearance of retaining the most subjectivity. Scores of the twelve project listed generated economic vitality scores with a range between 34 and 100. The economic vitality score outputs are provided below.

1. Third Crossing (Partial 564 to 164)	100
2. Third Crossing (Complete Project)	100
3. HRBT (8 Lane)	95
4. Virginia Beach Fixed Guide-way Transit	94
5. Midtown Tunnel	82
6. Southeastern Parkway	80
7. I-64 Widening (Peninsula)	75
8. Craney Island Access Road	60
9. US 460 relocation	53
10. Dominion Boulevard	45
11. Route 17 in York	40
12. US 58 (bypass to Manning Road)	34

When these scores are considered:

- in comparison to each other and
- from the perspective of freight movement and
- generating economic benefits,

the concerns regarding the subjectivity of scoring economic vitality remain but can be expressed economically:

1. Weighting future growth compared to access to existing economic activity should be discussed. For freight movement this is highlighted by the positions of the US 460 and Craney Island Access projects.
2. Additional capacity across the harbor is shown as having the highest economic impact and is supported by previous research and analysis
3. While the review provided to date has not singled out a particular project, if the Southeastern Parkway environmental review was terminated by FHWA should it be removed as a viable project for prioritization?

As shown below (and only counting the Third Crossing once) the costs published by the HRTPO for these twelve projects exceed \$17 billion. This is more than seven times the forecasted funding that will be available over the next twenty years.

1. Third Crossing (Partial 564 to 164)	\$2.1
2. Third Crossing (Complete Project)	\$5.4
3. HRBT (8 Lane)	\$4.5
4. Virginia Beach Fixed Guide-way Transit	\$? – TBD by HRTPO
5. Midtown Tunnel	\$1.3
6. Southeastern Parkway	\$2.5
7. I-64 Widening (Peninsula)	\$0.8
8. Craney Island Access Road	\$0.4
9. US 460 relocation	\$2.7
10. Dominion Boulevard	\$0.4
11. Route 17 in York	\$0.06
12. US 58 (bypass to Manning Road)	\$? Not in HRTPO output

Conclusion:

In considering the mission of FTAC and the direction of the committee, staff has reviewed the prioritization and provides the committee with the following:

1. Much improvement has been made in the prioritization process
2. The goal is to construct projects based on merit
 - a. It may now be timely to limit the discussion to a dozen projects or less
 - b. It is time to add funding constraints, breaking projects into smaller fundable pieces, additional sources of revenues, PPTA's and Tolling Authorities into the discussion
3. Actions to remove subjectivity from the process should continue
4. FTAC should continue to actively participate in the process and promote the economic benefits that occur when freight movement in a region with; one of the largest international gateways on the east coast, major shipbuilding and construction activity, coal exports and other good movements is considered in the project funding process

FTAC Statement on HRTPO Prioritization Tool

&

Resolution

The HRTPO has been developing a tool that serves to prioritize candidate transportation projects based on their technical merits and benefits. With scarce financial resources project prioritization is needed. The Freight Technical Advisory Committee (FTAC) has previously expressed support for the concept of a prioritization tool along with improvement suggestions throughout the development process. Key to that support was FTAC's recommendation that objective methodologies be used to prioritize projects.

HRTPO has released its "DRAFT Project Evaluation and Scoring" report dated December 2010. The Freight Transportation Advisory Committee (FTAC) has reviewed the latest report and outputs from HRTPO's prioritization tool. A review and analysis of the report has resulted in further comments and recommendations from FTAC.

In summary, FTAC states that:

- The December report provides much clarity on the methodology used and the results generated from the model
- Revisions to scoring in previous drafts indicate progress towards objectivity continues to be made
- Economic benefits that result from freight movement in Hampton Roads require that the needs for the major "corridors" into the region (I-64, US 58, US 460, US 13 and US 17) and mobility throughout the region be evaluated as systemic assets. Goods movement across the region requires that transportation infrastructure be viewed as "systems" to be improved.
- Identified projects next need to be broken into small, doable parts that can become "starts," and qualify for funding.
- Involvement of FTAC experts to identify and comment on freight-related projects is available.

and recommends that:

1. Appendix B: Project Dot Maps display the count of the trips that are forecasted to use the project represented by the dots
2. That information be provided for clarification and discussion on maintaining objectivity for:
 - a. Project Viability

- i. The relative weighting of project readiness data such as; Environmental Decisions vs., ROD, vs. unsolicited PPTA, vs. PPTA approved for an Independent Review Panel (IRP)
- b. Economic Vitality
 - i. The relative weighting of data used to score the economic benefit potential of the project such as; travel delay reductions vs. access to existing high density employment areas vs. access to new and emerging areas of employment density
 - ii. The method in which local comprehensive land use plans are used to assist in deriving the scoring criteria

The Freight Technical Advisory Committee (FTAC) is a subcommittee of the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) whose focus is on the transportation needs of freight as it moves along the major systems and corridors within and throughout Hampton Roads. This focus is aimed at the economic well-being of the region that results from free-flowing commerce based on predictability of on-time deliveries at reasonable costs.

As such, FTAC will work to prioritize freight-related projects deemed most critical for the 2034 LRTP in conjunction with the prioritization work being performed by the HRTPO.

RESOLUTION OF HRTPO PRIORITIZATION TOOL USE FOR CANDIDATE PROJECTS

A RESOLUTION OF THE FREIGHT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FTAC)

WHEREAS, FTAC WAS FORMED AS A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION (HRTPO) FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADVOCATING THE TRANSPORTATION NEEDS OF FREIGHT AND TO PROMOTE THE ECONOMIC BENEFITS THAT RESULT FROM THE MOVEMENT OF FREIGHT ACROSS THE REGION;

AND

WHEREAS HRTPO HAS DEVELOPED A PRIORITIZATION TOOL FOR THE PURPOSE OF RANKING CANDIDATE TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS;

AND

WHEREAS, HRTPO INTENDS TO USE THE OUTPUTS FROM THIS TOOL TO FORMULATE THE PROJECT PRIORITIES AND RANKINGS FOR THE 2034 LONG RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN THAT WILL BE FINALIZED JULY 2011 AND STAND AS THE REGION'S PLAN FOR FOUR YEARS;

AND

WHEREAS, FTAC HAS REVIEWED THE OUTPUTS OF THE MOST RECENT TOOL RESULTS GENERATED DECEMBER 2010;

AND

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT THE FTAC ENDORSES THE USE OF THE PRIORITIZATION TOOL BY HRTPO FOR ITS INTENDED PURPOSE;

AND

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT THE FTAC HEREBY MAKES KNOWN ITS DESIRE AND INTENT TO ASSIST THE HRTPO IN CONTINUING TO DEVELOP THE OBJECTIVITY OF THE PRIORITIZATION TOOL TO ENSURE THAT THE RESULTS AND RANKINGS OF CANDIDATE PROJECTS ARE BASED ON TECHNICAL MERITS AND REGIONAL BENEFITS.

ADOPTED:
DECEMBER 8, 2010

(Chairman Freight Technical Advisory Committee)