

October 7, 2010

**Memorandum #2010-158**

**TO: LRTP Subcommittee**

**BY: Andy Pickard, Principal Transportation Engineer**

**RE: LRTP Subcommittee, October 13, 2010**

Attached is the agenda for the Long-Range Transportation Plan Subcommittee meeting scheduled for Wednesday, October 13, 2010 at 10:00 a.m. in the Regional Building, Board Room B, 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake.

AP/kg

**LRTP Subcommittee:**

Kevin Abt, VPA  
W. Keith Cannady, HA  
Joseph Carter, PQ  
Amanda Christon, NO  
Timothy C. Cross, YK  
Richard Drumwright, WATA  
Anne Ducey-Ortiz, GL  
Sherry Earley, SU  
Tony Gibson, VDOT  
Richard A. Hartman, P.E., PO  
Steven W. Hicks, JC  
Jane Hill, IW  
Michael S. King, NN  
Reed T. Nester, WM

Jeffrey K. Raliski, NO  
Ivan P. Rucker, FHWA  
Mark Schnauffer, VB  
Mark Shea, CH  
Earl Sorey, CH  
Eric Stringfield, VDOT  
Joseph Swartz, DRPT  
Wendy Vachet, NAVY  
Luke Vinciguerra, JC  
Chris Voigt, VDOT  
Karen Waterman, HRT  
Jayne B. Whitney, HRT  
Edwin P. Wrightson, IW  
Mark Yehlen, PO

**Cc:** Benito Pérez  
Andy Pickard  
Camelia Ravanbakht  
Dale Stith

**AGENDA**  
**HRTPO LRTP SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**  
**OCTOBER 13, 2010**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Regional Building, 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia

**CALL TO ORDER**

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD** (Limit: 3 minutes per individual)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**AGENDA**

1. Prioritization of Projects: Further Refinements
2. Kiosk Questions
3. Greenhouse Gas Emissions
4. Next Meeting

**ADJOURNMENT**

## **ITEM #1: PRIORITIZATION OF PROJECTS: FURTHER REFINEMENTS**

In its on-going refinement of the transportation project prioritization process, HRTPO staff has received a number of questions, in addition to developing its own set of proposed modifications to the prioritization tool. Mr. Andy Pickard, Principal Transportation Engineer, will review the latest modifications, outstanding data needs, and suggested actions with the Subcommittee.

## **ITEM #2: KIOSK QUESTIONS**

HRTPO Staff has a mobile kiosk which can house a computer interface for presenting questions to the public and enhancing outreach and marketing efforts for HRTPO. A short set of transportation “trivia” questions have been prepared for use in the kiosk. These questions are not meant to determine the public’s knowledge or be a statistically sound survey, but rather as a means of having participants walk away from the survey with additional knowledge of transportation. Ms. Dale Stith, Transportation Planner, will present the questions and answers being proposed for use. Please provide your comments on these questions to her by October 20th.

## **ITEM #3: GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS**

One of the stated goals of the 2034 Long-Range Transportation Plan is “Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve quality of life, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.” The primary mobile source greenhouse gas (GHG) pollutant is CO<sub>2</sub>. In an effort to estimate the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions for the region, HRTPO staff has consulted with VDOT air quality staff. They suggested that factors from the EPA’s Mobile 6.2 software be used until the EPA’s MOVES software is fully incorporated into use by VDOT.

The CO<sub>2</sub> factors for Hampton Roads in 2034, as provided by VDOT using Mobile 6.2, are 467.0 grams per mile for arterials / collectors and 473.8 grams per mile for freeways. Combining the emission factors with vehicle miles of travel (VMT) estimates from the regional travel demand model, HRTPO Staff will be able to make an estimate of regional CO<sub>2</sub> emissions with and without the resulting projects in the 2034 LRTP. HRTPO staff will be available to answer questions on this effort to quantify greenhouse gas emissions.

## **ITEM #4: NEXT MEETING**

The next regularly-scheduled meeting of the LRTP Subcommittee is scheduled for December 1, 2010, immediately following the Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TTAC) meeting at the Regional Building, Boardroom D (723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, VA 23320).

It is expected that Draft results from the prioritization tool will be sent to the LRTP Subcommittee at the end of October. Based on feedback received, an additional meeting of the Subcommittee can be scheduled if needed.



**Summary Minutes**  
**HRTPO Long-Range Transportation Plan Subcommittee**  
**Meeting of September 16, 2010**

Mr. Earl Sorey called the 2034 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Subcommittee to order at 10:03 a.m. in the Regional Building Board, Conference Room A, with the following in attendance:

**Members Present:**

Earl Sorey, Interim Chair (CH)	Jeff Raliski (NO)
Amanda Christon (NO)	Mark Schnauffer (VB)
Timothy C. Cross (YK)	Thomas Slaughter (NN)
Anne Ducey-Ortiz (GL)	Eric Stringfield (VDOT)
Sherry Earley (SU)	Wendy Vachet (USN)
Jeffrey Florin (VPA)	Debbie Vest (PQ)
Frank Haltom (IW)	Jayne Whitney (HRT)
Richard Hartman (PO)	John Yorks (HM)
Steven Hicks (JC)	

**Members Absent:**

Richard Drumwright, Chair (WATA)	Ivan Rucker (FHWA)
Reed T. Nester (WM)	Joseph Swartz (DRPT)

**Others Attending:**

Tony Gibson (VDOT)	Ray Taylor (FHR)
--------------------	------------------

**HRTPO Staff:**

Andy Pickard	Benito Pérez
Camelia Ravanbakht	Dale Stith

**Public Comment Period**

Mr. Earl Sorey asked if there were any public comments. Mr. Ray Taylor came forward with the following summarized comments:

*Attended three National AMPO conferences. At the conference, had conversations with folks who went through the drama of prioritization. In some regions, prioritization took 10 years. One region had issue with fiscal constraint. In order to make prioritization work, a region has to be conservative with fiscal constraint.*

*Pleased with HRTPO Board motion to use a single score. Prioritization methodology of FAMPO is one that is adopted by VDOT and the state as a model.*

*Concern with passenger rail; currently not part of prioritization/picture. Passenger rail needs to be in prioritization. The notion of passenger rail not being in competition with anything is flawed. The Southside High Speed Rail will be competing for PRIIA and HSR funding, while the Peninsula Intercity Passenger Rail will be competing for PRIIA funding. Both components of Hampton Roads High Speed and Intercity Passenger Rail will be in competition with each other, and in competition with other transportation investments. Furthermore, Richmond MPO has rail projects within their TIP.*

*The region has got to fix their long range transportation plan and prioritize. Lastly, the Third Crossing needs to be divided into parts. The major projects need to be broken down into manageable parts.*

## **Approval of Agenda**

Mr. Earl Sorey asked for the approval of the meeting agenda. Approval was unanimous.

### **1. Review of the September 15, 2010 HRTPO Board Meeting**

*At its meeting of September 15, 2010, the HRTPO Board agenda included an item on the prioritization of transportation projects in preparation for the 2011 General Assembly. An overview of the HRTPO Board discussion will be provided.*

Mr. Andy Pickard started off his PowerPoint presentation, providing an overview of the schedule for prioritization as presented to the HRTPO Board on September 15, 2010. The revised schedule calls for the tool to be revised in September/October 2010, presentation of preliminary results to the HRTPO Board advisory committees in November 2010, and a presentation of results to the HRTPO Board in December 2010. Public outreach would happen concurrently with prioritization efforts. Furthermore, the next LRTP Subcommittee, originally scheduled for October 6, 2010 would be rescheduled to October 13, 2010.

Mr. Thomas Slaughter inquired whether the response from HRTPO staff to revise the timeline was preprogrammed. Mr. Andy Pickard noted that the City of Chesapeake wanted results in September. The City of Norfolk was disappointed by the lack of valid results in September, but understood work remains to be done for valid results.

Mr. Andy Pickard noted that the HRTPO Board stated at their September 15 meeting that they would like the presentation of project scores to be done via one score. In order to do that, the HRTPO staff recommended the sum of the three-component scores be presented with the three component scores. Mr. Earl Sorey opened up debate on how to present one composite score to the Subcommittee. Mr. Jeffrey Raliski noted how that would occur, since the original scoring to be displayed for Economic Vitality and Project Viability was to be done via a letter grade. Mr. Jeffrey Florin noted that the prioritization tool needs to show the numbers for all components of the tool, to understand the output. Combining letter grades and numbers and giving the HRTPO Board a score of "78 Alpha Blue" gives no confidence to the HRTPO Board.

Mr. Ray Taylor requested a comment. With no objections from the LRTP Subcommittee, Mr. Earl Sorey permitted Mr. Ray Taylor to speak. Mr. Ray Taylor wanted to ensure there is an

understanding between planning and programming and how prioritization fits into such distinction. Prioritization as well is important to the program and less important to the plan. Project Viability is very important to the program, yet Project Utility is very important to the plan. Lastly, there is no real money in the plan; real money only exists in the program (SYIP).

Mr. Andy Pickard noted that non-capacity prioritization of projects are being done by Mr. Rob Case. Mr. Thomas Slaughter noted that the funding pots are not broken into funding categories. Mr. Eric Stringfield noted that the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO's) focus is on the project list itself. The MPO needs to focus on strategies then the project list before priorities can be defined. Mr. Earl Sorey noted that the list needs to be developed before strategies could be defined. Mr. Eric Stringfield stated that a strategy should be used to develop a list of projects; select projects that will advance the plan's strategies.

Mr. Jeffrey Florin noted how Northern Virginia is breaking projects down and advancing them, whereas Hampton Roads has too many large projects. The region needs to look at regional flows in/out of Hampton Roads.

Mr. Mark Schnauffer inquired as to what is the purpose of the output of the tool. Mr. Andy Pickard noted that the output is for prioritization of 2034 LRTP transportation investments and projects. Mr. Mark Schnauffer noted that the output may be useful in future stimulus efforts as well.

Mr. John Yorks stated that the Subcommittee should move forward in the interim with equally weighted components scored and summed together. Mr. Earl Sorey noted that the HRTPO Board is very much concerned with the viability of projects, but for now to follow along with Mr. John Yorks recommendation, with the reservation of the LRTP Subcommittee to be able to revisit the weighting of the three tool components.

## **2. Review of Comments of the Prioritization Tool**

*The HRTPO staff has received numerous comments on the work-in-progress results of the project prioritization tool. The comments received, in addition to modifications suggested by the HRTPO staff, will be reviewed and solutions discussed.*

Mr. Andy Pickard continued the meeting by discussing in his presentation the issues and concerns that remain with refining the tool mechanics and the input data to yield a confident output for HRTPO Board consideration. Among the issues raised was cost figures that were not provided thus far. Mr. Andy Pickard inquired about cost figures for the Craney Island Access Road project, which Mr. Jeffrey Florin stated his agency will provide.

For the Hampton Boulevard at Terminal Boulevard grade separation project, the cost figure from the City of Norfolk and the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) differed considerably. Mr. Jeffrey Raliski advised that his figure is dated, and he is comfortable with the more recent \$200 million VDOT cost figure. VDOT stated they will revisit this project to ensure the latest cost figure.

For the Downtown Tunnel project, Mr. Eric Stringfield noted that the project should be listed as a citizen recommended need in the plan without supporting data for further consideration in the prioritization tool. Currently, \$500 million in improvements for the Downtown Tunnel have been identified, but between Right-of-Way (ROW) maritime access, and Berkeley Bridge Interchange issues, the Downtown Tunnel widening project is not feasible for consideration. Mr. Earl Sorey also noted that the new Jordan Bridge will add capacity to the Elizabeth River crossings, and reduce demand at the Downtown Tunnel. Mr. Andy Pickard stated that the Downtown Tunnel will be removed from prioritization.

For the Virginia Route 10 realignment project, Mr. Eric Stringfield noted that this project should be noted similarly like the Downtown Tunnel in the 2034 LRTP. The Virginia Route 10 realignment project would benefit Isle of Wight and Surry County, for there are safety issues along the corridor; a realigned 4-lane median divided corridor would address safety. VDOT has not studied this concept along the Virginia Route 10 corridor, since it parallels U.S. Route 460. Dr. Camelia Ravanbakht noted that Virginia Route 10 should be studied since it is a route part of the Hurricane Evacuation plan. Mr. Andy Pickard stated that if this project is to be prioritized, then the HRTPO Staff will need a cost figure to evaluate it. Mr. Eric Stringfield stated VDOT will revisit the project and provide an update.

For the I-64 North Peninsula widening project, no cost estimates have been provided, since VDOT is currently studying concepts along the corridor to determine the best solution. The HRTPO staff presented the idea of using a per mile estimate of \$61 million, yielding \$1.1 billion for the 18-mile project. The I-64 North Peninsula widening project will likely encompass HOV lanes to the City of Williamsburg, then conventional lanes to the City of Richmond. VDOT could provide a centerline cost estimate for the project, without any consideration for interchanges impacted along the corridor. Mr. Steven Hicks noted that I-64 needs to be improved with toll. With the project, VDOT needs to keep their eye on the ball where the tolls will be, and ensure colonial aesthetics to compliment the historical character along the corridor. Mr. Eric Stringfield noted that a technical committee has been formed on the I-64 Peninsula widening project. Dr. Camelia Ravanbakht inquired whether the MPO will be involved, especially in light of sensitivities regarding VDOT's Hampton Roads Bridge-Tunnel (HRBT) study announced at the September 15, 2010 HRTPO Board meeting and the issue of coordination between VDOT, the MPO, and involved localities with the project. Mr. Eric Stringfield noted that all stakeholders will be on board for the I-64 Peninsula widening project, and the door is always open with VDOT to address concerns. Mr. Thomas Slaughter inquired whether the region would widen I-64 from the City of Williamsburg to New Kent County before the City of Williamsburg to the City of Newport News. Mr. Thomas Slaughter further inquired whether the region should consider breaking down the I-64 widening project into smaller pieces (i.e. between interchanges - logical termini) that can be phased to be manageable for the purposes of fiscal constraint. Mr. Tony Gibson noted how I-64 could be defined as a strategy, and phased projects between interchanges serve as implementation of the strategy.

Dr. Camelia Ravanbakht noted that for fiscal constraint, the region needs to be aware that tolls will only cover one-third of the project's debt. Regional projects will need combinations of funding. Mr. Jeffrey Florin noted that the Port of Virginia builds incrementally. Mr. Jeffrey Florin further notes how the Midtown Tunnel and U.S. Route 460 projects will be Public-

Private Transportation Act (PPTA) projects, and I-64 widening should be built in phases, segment by segment. Mr. Earl Sorey noted that for major projects, there should be a master preliminary engineering (PE) effort, and then construct segment by segment. Mr. Tony Gibson noted that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will not grant environmental documents for a project not completely funded for construction. Dr. Camelia Ravanbakht noted that FHWA is revising guidance on the issue of PE only projects in the LRTP.

Mr. Earl Sorey noted that for cost estimates, such estimates be generated best by scope, with the awareness that estimates are not an exact science. Mr. Eric Stringfield noted that for any projects along the I-64 Peninsula corridor, estimates can be generated, as long as there is notation of the I-64 Peninsula study that will study best approaches to address corridor issues, which in turn could change the scope of the corridor project.

Moving the discussion of the meeting forward, Mr. Jeffrey Raliski noted that the City of Norfolk had concern that new projects were being penalized. Mr. Andy Pickard noted that for crash rates, existing daily traffic, and level of service, a proxy parallel facility was used. Mr. Jeffrey Raliski still expressed concern, for the parallel facility was not used for infrastructure condition. Mr. Andy Pickard noted that the HRTPO staff will revisit the issue and report at the next Subcommittee meeting. Mr. Thomas Slaughter noted that rules and regulations on the state and federal level call for maintaining rather than building new roads. Mr. Jeffrey Raliski noted that the plan is evaluating capacity improvements. Mr. Andy Pickard noted that bridge replacements are also being considered in the LRTP, per earlier priorities set by the LRTP Subcommittee. Mr. Thomas Slaughter inquired why new projects are being evaluated against a bridge replacement. Mr. Andy Pickard noted that the discussion of maintaining versus building new facilities is a HRTPO Board policy decision. Mr. Thomas Slaughter inquired why construction money is being used on maintenance projects, when there is a maintenance fund for the region. Mr. Andy Pickard noted that the 2034 LRTP doesn't prescribe all maintenance work for the next 30 years. Mr. Eric Stringfield noted that Mr. John Lawson of VDOT provided the regional revenue figures, broken out by funding stream. Furthermore, some maintenance work involves so much work, such as bridge replacements, it is like a construction project.

Mr. Andy Pickard continued the presentation, presenting the next issue within prioritization, relating to intermodal projects. A prioritization question addressing cost effectiveness inquires "what is the increase in intermodal revenue" as a result of the project. The HRTPO staff and the Virginia Port Authority (VPA) noted that such a figure is not available, and using project cost over vehicle miles traveled (similar to highways and bridge/tunnel projects) is more appropriate. Ms. Wendy Vachet stated that intermodal projects should not be evaluated with highway projects. Mr. Benito Pérez noted that the project was evaluated in both intermodal and highways category, ensuring that the project was evaluated due to the HRTPO staff concerns on the validity of the output of the intermodal scores, especially with the cost effective criterion unanswered for intermodal projects, per the HRTPO Board approved prioritization methodology. Mr. Andy Pickard suggested that perhaps that intermodal projects be noted as what roadway system category they belong. The HRTPO staff will revisit this measure for the next meeting. Mr. Thomas Slaughter noted also that two projects in the City of Newport News should not be noted as intermodal, rather as bridge/tunnel projects.

Furthermore, one Newport News bridge/tunnel project should be noted as intermodal, since it is accommodating light rail.

The maritime crossing criterion was discussed next, with questions of what constitutes a continuous maritime crossing. Dr. Camelia Ravanbakht suggested professional judgment in defining maritime crossing; perhaps to signify continuous commercial maritime crossing.

The geometric deficiencies criterion was discussed next, and the HRTPO staff recommended removing the criterion, due to the expectation that all construction projects have to meet FHWA design rules and regulations. Mr. Mark Schnauffer recommended perhaps rephrasing the question to address substandard road conditions to standard road conditions; the Subcommittee took no action on this suggestion. Points from this criterion are being moved to the critical crash criterion in the safety and security category.

The modal enhancement criterion generated questions among the HRTPO staff and localities in how it is defined. Mr. Mark Schnauffer suggested that the question be rephrased as to whether a project has a dedicated enhancement to another model of transportation. Mr. Steve Hicks noted that bike paths/multi-use trails are great to have them, but these guidelines to have them are pricing the region out of project implementation. Mr. Steve Hicks stated bike paths do not improve congestion or retain business. Furthermore, Mr. Steve Hicks questioned what is the critical goal in the region. Mr. Earl Sorey noted that federal and state regulations are requiring bicycle/pedestrian accommodations in projects. Mr. Steve Hicks noted that projects can get exceptions to prevent the project from being priced out of implementation. Dr. Camelia Ravanbakht reminded the Subcommittee that one of the goals for the 2034 LRTP is to improve the quality of life for the region. Ms. Jayne Whitney recommended that the HRTPO define this criterion and report back to the Subcommittee.

The 2034 LRTP Subcommittee next addressed concerns with Project Viability in the meeting. Mr. Tony Gibson inquired as to what is the difference between environmental documents complete versus an environmental decision received. Mr. Andy Pickard noted that environmental documents complete signifies the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process has been conducted and is now pending review from the federal level, whereas an environmental decision received signifies a decision on the NEPA process has been rendered. This ensures that projects that have started their NEPA process can get some points.

Mr. Mark Schnauffer made a comment to ensure that the 'additional environmental permits' question gave full points to projects that don't require permits for construction. Mr. Thomas Slaughter inquired as to how Project Viability took into account design-build/PPTA projects. Mr. Andy Pickard noted that for funding, note in the total funding the tolled funding, and an additional question will parse that total funding cost to provide a percentage of funding that is toll revenue. Furthermore, an additional question will ask if PPTAs have been solicited on the project. Mr. Andy Pickard further stressed the HRTPO staff's need for concrete direction as it pertains to tolling. Dr. Camelia Ravanbakht noted that projects can be tolled, but questioned if they are viable.

Mr. Ray Taylor requested a comment. Mr. Ray Taylor stated that PPTAs are an interesting question. Hypothetically, if the region went down the path of noting the PPTAs in the plan, and a majority of them are not approved, then the region is going to stretch fiscal constraint. The region should be fiscally conservative. Lacking sure guidance, the region should set PPTA projects aside and proceed on them when a funding windfall is present, or PPTA is signed.

The City of Norfolk staff inquired why the HRBT was defined as compatible with land use and documented. Mr. Jeffrey Raliski noted that a widening of the HRBT is not in the City of Norfolk's comprehensive plan. Mr. John Yorks of the City of Hampton noted that the widening was within their comprehensive plan. The issue at hand is how to address this question when one locality defines a project as compatible, and the other locality does not. Ms. Wendy Vachet recommended that the question be answered by default by the environmental document that has a Record of Decision (ROD). Mr. Jeffrey Raliski noted that the Norfolk City Council has a resolution opposing any expansion of the HRBT. The LRTP Subcommittee recommended giving this criterion 5 points for the HRBT project, as a compromise between localities.

Mr. Andy Pickard continued the presentation, presenting a question from the VPA staff. The VPA staff inquired why the Economic Vitality score for the U.S. Route 460 project was significantly lower than the Southeastern Parkway. Ms. Wendy Vachet noted that access to defense measure is interesting. Furthermore, if a project is in Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET), the project should get a boost in points for the access to defense measure (minimum of a medium rating for the project.). Dr. Camelia Ravanbakht inquired as to why STRAHNET had not factored into the tool at this juncture. Mr. Andy Pickard noted that earlier discussion was mixed on including STRAHNET in the tool, and how STRAHNET is defined for new projects.

Another issue presented to the LRTP Subcommittee is the merger of candidate projects for prioritization. The City of Poquoson recommended merging their portion of Victory Boulevard with York County's portion of Victory Boulevard. Mr. Benito Pérez also noted that the City of Poquoson also has a request to merge Wythe Creek Road project with the City of Hampton's Wythe Creek Road project (request dating back to March 2010). Mr. Timothy Cross had reservations merging the Victory Boulevard project with the City of Poquoson, least of which is the issue of roadway system category between urban (Poquoson's project), and secondary roadway system (York's project). Mr. Timothy Cross and Ms. Debbie Vest noted they will discuss the issue beyond the Subcommittee.

Mr. Andy Pickard presented a few additional edits and recommendations for Transit projects, Virginia Beach projects, and Suffolk projects. The representatives of Hampton Roads Transit (HRT), the City of Virginia Beach, and the City of Suffolk approved the recommended changes with no additional comments.

Ms. Dale Stith noted that a sheet requesting Project Viability data and a brief sentence describing the purpose of the project will be sent out by close-of-business, and will be due in one week. Mr. Benito Pérez noted that the HRTPO staff has prepared a sentence that states whether it is a new or widening of a road, how many lanes, and point A to point B. The second sentence being requested is to define the purpose for the public and HRTPO Board members.

### **3. Next Meeting**

*The next meeting is scheduled for October 13, 2010, starting at 10:00 a.m. at the Regional Building, Boardroom A at 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, VA 23320.*

**Meeting Adjourned at 12:40 PM**