

**HRTPO Regional Connectors Study - Drivers and Spatial Assumptions Memo Working Group Comment Responses**

Number	Page	Section	Source	Comment	Response
1a	5	Military Growth	Rick Dwyer	I think it is projecting too much military job growth by assuming 13,000 more military jobs by 2045 for the baseline. Think assuming another 16% of the jobs in the greater growth category will be military is also overly optimistic. Even after 9-11, the region only saw a small increase of 6,000 (~4%) military and federal civilians for a few years. We now have 15,000 less military jobs than we had in 2001. Given current budget pressures, I don't think we'll see much growth in the overall military size at all in the future and will likely see it get a bit smaller.	The baseline projections of military job growth from 2015 to 2045 were provided by the TPO, from the accepted 2045 baseline forecasts. The TPO coordinated closely with the U.S. Navy representative at the time and each of the localities, and all were in agreement on the baseline forecast. This formally adopted data set is not subject to change. Any changes to military employment projections would need to go through the formal approval process of the HRTPO.
1b	5	Military Growth	Rick Dwyer	Given current budget pressures, I don't think we'll see much growth in the overall military size at all in the future and will likely see it get a bit smaller.	In the original discussions of drivers in 2018, the Working Group requested to explore significant additional military growth in one of the Greater Growth scenarios, later determined to be the Greater Growth on the Water Scenario. This scenario is intended to support exploratory scenario planning and is not predictive, but rather a way to stress test the transportation system under a range of alternative futures.
2	1	Environmental Driver - Sea Level Rise	HRTPO/HRPDC	Economic Driver - Sea Level Rise section: last paragraph, second sentence: HRPDC (not PDC).	Corrected
3	2	Environmental Driver - Sea Level Rise	HRTPO/HRPDC	Economic Driver - Sea Level Rise section: first paragraph: SE, TAZs, and TDM have not been defined before use.	Corrected
4	2	Environmental Driver - Sea Level Rise	HRTPO/HRPDC	third paragraph: the white paper says that "there is not an elevation-based data set of the transportation network to facilitate a simplified analysis of inundation." Staff disagrees with this statement. There are several PDC studies that did this work, and more recently the HRTPO sea level rise study that looked at flooding of roadways throughout the region based on the PDC models and adjustments were made based on bridge elevations. Also, if the roads are at-grade, which most of them are, road elevation data is not needed if you know the elevation of the ground surface. Recommend rewording this section to account for this.	The memo language was modified to reflect these comments. However, it remains the case that there is no elevation-based data set of the transportation network. All of the prior studies, including those referenced, made assumptions about parts of the network and conducted detailed analyses of others to work around the lack of a single elevation-based GIS dataset of the transportation network. Note that assuming the majority of the network is at ground level is problematic in areas of small-scale bridges and culverts, and the implication of this assumption would be to incorrectly remove many small segments from the available network, which would not have the desired effect for scenario planning.
5	2	Environmental Driver - Sea Level Rise	HRTPO/HRPDC	There are better studies to reference than the JLUS. The top of the list would be the most recent HRTPO sea level rise study.	Corrected
6	2	Environmental Driver - Sea Level Rise	HRTPO/HRPDC	The JLUS projects are HRPDC efforts, not HRTPO.	Corrected
7	2	Environmental Driver - Sea Level Rise	HRTPO/HRPDC	Joint Land Use Study is all capitalized.	Corrected
8	3	Economic Drivers - Assigning Growth Industries to Scenarios	HRTPO/HRPDC	HREDA not defined before use.	Corrected

**HRTPO Regional Connectors Study - Drivers and Spatial Assumptions Memo Working Group Comment Responses**

Number	Page	Section	Source	Comment	Response
9	3	Economic Drivers - Assigning Growth Industries to Scenarios	HRTPO/HRPDC	Some of the bullet headings don't match the terms used in Figure 1. For example, maritime vs marine technology and digital vs data port.	Corrected
10	3	Economic Drivers - Assigning Growth Industries to Scenarios	HRTPO/HRPDC	Port growth is not described in these bullets like all of the rest of sectors and industries.	Corrected
11	11	Economic Driver - Port Growth and Mode Share	HRTPO/HRPDC	You may want to note why Newport News Marine Terminal was not included with the other port facilities.	Corrected
12	12	Economic Driver - Port Growth and Mode Share	HRTPO/HRPDC	(2) Error references.	Corrected
13	12	Economic Driver - Port Growth and Mode Share	HRTPO/HRPDC	Please explain why this is no rail for PMT in each scenario.	Corrected
14	11-14	Economic Driver - Port Growth and Mode Share	HRTPO/HRPDC	Suggest sourcing port data.	Corrected
15	16	Technology Driver – Transportation	HRTPO/HRPDC	Spacing correction (last paragraph, "through 8").	Corrected
16	18	Technology Driver – Transportation	HRTPO/HRPDC	Table 8 header on different page than table.	Corrected
17	2	Environmental Driver – Sea Level Rise	Carl Jackson	Is there a map of the areas expected to be inundated by sea-level rise in 2045?	This map is now Appendix A
18	2	Environmental Driver – Sea Level Rise	Carl Jackson	Portsmouth and Chesapeake are also working on a JLUS study that could be of interest	Any studies that are not yet completed cannot be incorporated into the data set.
19	3	Economic Drivers - Assigning Growth Industries to Scenarios	Carl Jackson	Is there an economic profile that would include retail, commercial strip centers, malls, small businesses?	Locally-serving industries (e.g., retail) were not included as target sectors in the sources reviewed (HREDA Go-to-Market Strategy, 2017 Go Virginia Region 5 Growth and Diversification Plan) and therefore this sector is not listed among the economic profiles defined for the greater growth scenarios. One reason for this omission is that these industries often recycle money within a community, and therefore will grow or decline based on the region's population trends, as opposed to traded or export based sectors, such as manufacturing, which may actually drive growth in a regional economy. To the extent that retail serves visitors to the region, as well as residents, it may be considered part of the Tourism/Arts & Culture profile.
20	9	Defining Suitability Weighting Factors	Carl Jackson	You might want to consider Bikeways to at least have a medium relevance in urban areas (think about the SHRT, ERT, etc).	As noted in the chart on Page 9, "Recreational trails data served as a dispersion factor for growth as trails are concentrated in suburban/greenfield areas." Because of this, this suitability factor was given a low suitability factor to avoid driving allocated growth away from urban centers. This issue is specifically addressed in the second paragraph on page 6.

**HRTPO Regional Connectors Study - Drivers and Spatial Assumptions Memo Working Group Comment Responses**

Number	Page	Section	Source	Comment	Response
21	11	Economic Driver - Port Growth and Mode Share	Carl Jackson	Where did you get the data for the CIMT on Table 3, is this from the Port?	Corrected
22	12	Economic Driver - Port Growth and Mode Share	Carl Jackson	The first full paragraph has some error messages	Corrected
23	1	Introduction	Robin Grier Kelly	In the very beginning, first paragraph, it would be very helpful to share the purpose of this technical memo, the audience, and how one is to use it.	Corrected
24	Overall	Overall	Robin Grier Kelly	The first few pages share a ton of information that is borderline mind-boggling, and challenging to understand. Is there a strategy to bring to light the important takeaways in each section?	Generally speaking, the important takeaways are the model assumptions presented in the tables in each section of the memo, although the discussions of how these assumptions were arrived at are also important.
25	20	Technology Driver – Transportation	Robin Grier Kelly	Figure 11 and beyond- is this a general / universal suitability factors graphic? How does this relate to Hampton Roads regional connector study?	If this is referring to Table 11 on page 7 (Note that some of the table numbering may be out of sequence), then the answer is that this suitability factor table was developed specifically for the Regional Connector Study. Suitability factors were developed based on relevance to the scenario narratives and availability of data. Weighting of suitability factors was developed through an iterative process, testing different weights to determine the optimum weighting that would best match each scenario narrative. The memo has been revised to clarify this.
26	20	Technology Driver – Transportation	Robin Grier Kelly	Subsequent tables and figures look like they're more educational versus relevant to Hampton Roads. Is that the case? I don't see any footnotes or indicators identifying Hampton Roads on these charts and tables.	All of the tables and figures in the report are unique to Hampton Roads, unless references as coming from research as does occasionally occur in the discussion of technology parameters. This is clarified in the memo introduction.