

October 4, 2019

Memorandum #2019-149

TO: Regional Connectors Study (RCS) Working Group

BY: Camelia Ravanbakht, RCS Project Coordinator

RE: Regional Connectors Study Working Group Meeting – October 10, 2019

Attached is the agenda for the **Regional Connectors Study Working Group Meeting** scheduled for **Thursday, October 10, 2019 at 9:00 a.m.** in the Regional Board Room (A), located at 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia 23320.

MK/nb

RCS WG Voting Members:

Earl Sorey (CH)	James Wright (PO)
Angela Rico (HA)	Jason Souders (SU)
Bryan Stilley (NN)	Phil Pullen (VB)
Brian Fowler (NO)	

RCS WG Nonvoting Members:

Jason Flowers (Army Corps)	Gene Leonard (US Coast Guard)
George Janek (Army Corps)	Michael King (US Navy)
Robert Pruhs (Army Corps)	Tony Gibson (VDOT)
Ivan Rucker (FHWA)	Jennifer Salyers (VDOT)
Kevin Page (HRTAC)	Kit Chope (VPA)
Tim Dolan (US Coast Guard)	Barbara Nelson (VPA)

RCS WG Other:

Pat Jones (CH)	Carl Jackson (PO)
Amy Inman (NO)	Tara Reel (VB)
Anne Doyle (NO)	Rick Dwyer (HRMFFA)
Robert Brown (NO)	Meghan Robinson (PRRBIZ)
Evandro Santos (NO)	COL Patrick Kinsman (US Army)
	Robin Grier (VDOT)

Staff:

Bob Crum (HRTPO)
Mike Kimbrel (HRTPO)
Rob Case (HRTPO)
Kendall Miller(HRTPO)
Keith Nichols (HRTPO)
Dale Stith (HRTPO)
Sharon Lawrence (HRPDC
Keith Cannady (HRPDC)

Project Coordinator:

Camelia Ravanbakht

Project Consultants:

Craig Eddy
Lorna Parkin



Agenda

Regional Connectors Study

Working Group Meeting

October 10, 2019

9:00 AM

The Regional Building, Regional Board Room, 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia

1. Call to Order
2. Welcome and Introductions
3. Public Comment Period (Limit 3 minutes per individual)
4. Minutes

Summary Minutes from September 18, 2019 Working Group Meeting – Attachment 4

Recommended Action: For Approval

5. Regional Connectors Study Phase 2 Update – Craig Eddy, MBI
 - Recommended Action: For Information
6. Regional Connectors Study: Draft Phase 3 Scope of Work –Craig Eddy, MBI, Project Manager

All comments received and discussed at the September 18 Working Group meeting have been incorporated into the attached Draft Revised Phase 3 Scope of Work (SOW).

Mr. Craig Eddy, RCS Project Manager, will review the revised draft Phase 3 SOW including Tasks, Budget, and Schedule.

Attachment 6A – Comments and Responses on draft Phase 3 SOW

Attachment 6B – Draft Phase 3 Revised SOW

Attachment 6C – Draft Schedule

Attachment 6D – Draft Budget

- Recommended Action: Recommend Approval to the Steering (Policy) Committee the Draft Phase 3 Revised SOW, Budget, and Schedule.

7. Next Meetings and Planned Activities: Camelia Ravanbakht, Project Coordinator

- HRPDC Planning Directors Meeting: **October 29**, 2019, 12:00 -1:30 PM, Portsmouth (location TBD)
- RCS Steering (Policy) Committee: Tuesday **November 5**, 2019, 9:30 – 11:00 AM, Regional Building
- Proposed 4th Marine Terminal Site Visit and Presentation: Date TBD

8. Other Items

9. Adjournment

**Regional Connectors Study
Working Group Meeting
Minutes
September 18, 2019, 10:00am
Regional Board Room, Chesapeake**

The following were in attendance (alphabetically by last name):

Rob Case (HRTPO)
Craig Eddy (Michael Baker Intl.)
Brian Fowler (Norfolk)
Robin Grier (VDOT)
Carl Jackson (Portsmouth)
Robert Lewis (Suffolk)
Mike Kimbrel (HRTPO)
Deborah Mangiaracina (Norfolk)
Kendall Miller (HRTPO)
Barbara Nelson (Port of Va.)
Keith Nichols (HRTPO)
Lorna Parkins (Michael Baker Intl.)
Camelia Ravanbakht (RCS Project Coordinator)
Tara Reel (Va. Beach)
Angela Rico (Hampton)
Jennifer Salyers (VDOT)
Evandro Santos (Norfolk)
Earl Sorey (Chesapeake)
Jason Sounders (Suffolk)
Bryan Stilley (NN)
Dale Stith (HRTPO)
James Wright (Portsmouth)

1. Call to Order

Bryan Stilley (Newport News) called the meeting to order at 9:10am.

2. Welcome and Introductions

Attendees introduced themselves around the table.

3. Public Comment Period

No public comments.

4. Minutes

The minutes of the June 13, 2019 meeting were approved.

5. Phase 2 Update

Lorna Parkins (MBI) presented slides concerning this matter.

Brian Fowler (Norfolk) asked to see the number of work trips generated under the Greater Growth scenario.

6. Draft Phase 3 Scope of Work

Craig Eddy (MBI) presented slides concerning this matter.

Bryan Stilley (Newport News, chair) led attendees in orally presenting/summarizing their written comments on the Phase 3 scope (by agency), included in the agenda package.

Camelia Ravanbakht (Project Coordinator) asked the group whether or not they wanted the study to analyze benefits of un-permitable candidates. A discussion of how to determine permitability ensued. Based on the written comments by Mr. Fowler, Mr. Eddy proposed using Freeval software (instead of VISSIM) to analyze alternative projects. Mr. Stilley gave the working group an opportunity to object to this proposal, and the working group did not object. Mr. Eddy asked whether the study should be finished in one scope (Phase 3) or several. Ms. Ravanbakht said one scope.

7. Meetings and Planned Activities

- Tour of the Navy Fuel Depot: September 30, 2019, 9:30am
- Regional Economic Development Directors meeting: October 3, 2019, 9:00am
- HRPDC Planning Directors meeting: October 2019
- RCS Working Group meeting, October 10, 2019, 9:00am
- Tour and Presentation of the Proposed 4th Marine Terminal: TBD
- RCS Steering Committee meeting: November 5, 2019, 9:30am
- HRTAC meeting: December 12, 2019, 12:30pm
- HRTPO meeting: January 16, 2019, 10:30am

8. Other Items

No other items were discussed.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00am.

ATTACHMENT 6A

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS

Corps of Engineers

Task 2 - We support following a step-wise process for alternatives development, which is discussed at the end of the Task 2 section. Some of these alternatives were previously examined in the Final SEIS for the Hampton Roads Crossing Study. **The study will take that approach.**

On page 8, Task 2.5, the sentence should be corrected to read: The impacts will be based on limits of disturbance. In that same section, wetland mitigation costs should be estimated for both tidal and non-tidal wetland impacts. **Change made.**

Task 3 - Determination of Candidate Alternatives: We support the use of evaluation criteria, presented in a matrix, table or other method that will facilitate comparison between the different alternatives. **The study will take that approach.**

Task 3.2 - We will offer comments on permitability issues associated with the different alternatives, but the Corps cannot speak for the DEQ, VMRC, or other permitting agencies. These comments will not commit the Corps to any permitting course of action, nor will they be interpreted as endorsement of any particular alternative(s). **This language has been inserted into the scope.**

Also, the Corps can only permit the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative, or LEDPA, and we can't permit alternatives that obstruct or restrict navigation to the CIDMMA, or that will adversely affect other federal navigation projects. **This language has been inserted into the scope.**

Task 3.2(b), third paragraph: A key aspect of the evaluation parameters will be integrated with... (instead of integration). **Change made.**

Task 3.2(d) - Indirect and cumulative effects assessment should be conducted for the various alternatives. **Inserted into the scope.**

City of Norfolk

We are not supportive of the approach that is being taken. **Working Group has decided to complete the study in a single phase (this is applicable to the comments in the next 2 paragraphs as well).**

These comments are preliminary and do not reflect a complete review. Our approach begins with an expectation that we do not write a “Study Completion” phase at this point. Our desire would be for the Working Group, at an appropriate time, to dedicate a meeting to discussing options for the approach to the remainder of the project, and the identification of Tasks for the next Phase. We do not believe that it is feasible, or necessary, to push this to an HRTPO Board meeting in November.

The approach taken with this Scope is not consistent with desires that we expressed when we asked to disconnect the RCS from the LRTP and create an “appropriate pace” for this project. Linked to that request (which was supported) are several key principles that we still feel are critical to follow.

- Make project involvement for the Working Group participants manageable
- Use a “stepwise” or “tiered” approach to eliminate wasted expenditures on unnecessary analysis.
- Allow the “addition” of items as desired based on knowledge gained during the process. We are exploring new areas of information-seeking that are likely to need adjusting or supplementing along the way, or generate additional questions to be considered.

We did not receive a schedule or fee proposal – these items (especially schedule) are critical to these scope/contract decisions. Notably, evaluating such in smaller chunks (stepwise approach), is one of the items that makes our involvement more manageable. **A draft schedule and budget were not prepared with the draft scope. It was decided to solicit feedback on the scope before developing a schedule and budget so that effort developing those items, which were likely to change, was not initiated until the scope was in better focus.**

The “Urban Planning/Transportation Systems”-oriented approach we are wanting to take (and have been promoting since the inception of this project) demands more investigation of “cross-Hampton Roads” travel markets and sensitivity than what appears to be included. We would want to see additional items in this area, and subsequently have that and other knowledge gained from Task 2, better inform ensuing activities. This should include a “base” alternative including the I-564/I-664 Connector, as a means of forming an understanding of the benefits of the increased accessibility that a new connection would provide. **An unconstrained travel demand model run will be added to the scope so that we can understand the “true” demand between the Peninsula and Southside.**

An early Phase 3 task should be an HCM/FREEVAL analysis of existing conditions (validation), and for the 2045 Baseline scenario. **This is included in Sections 4.8d and 4.8e and can be shown early in the schedule.**

TASK 2 – Development of Preliminary Alternatives

This task seems to contain multiple elements that overlap, and potentially conflict with, products and processes developed in Phase 2, and items contained in other tasks. While the task acknowledges use of existing information, to the greatest extent possible, it would appear to me that:

- the preliminary alternatives already exist (from the SEIS),
- the information that is described, at the level necessary for this “tier”, already exists and is obtainable from VDOT,
- The USACOE has already reviewed these and can offer comments/discussion regarding their impacts.

However named, this task could be boiled down to the Consultant gathering and summarizing this information for discussions within the Working Group, as part of the information base that would support identification of a next tier of alternatives. **A new subtask entitled “Summarize Background Information” has been added to the scope and includes compilation and presentation of existing documentation.**

Task 3.2: Conduct Permitability Assessments

The activities that are reflected in this task are too restrictive. It appears that this effort would completely ignore the benefits side of environmental assessment. It seems to be written to eliminate alternatives – potentially all new water crossings – before there is any “benefits” or “need” considerations even evaluated. **A travel demand model run, and subsequent traffic analysis will be performed on all alternatives in order to see the congestion levels of each. If the congestion reduction is significantly higher than other alternatives, permitability as a sole determining factor may not be used to automatically discard an alternative.**

TASK 4

Microsimulation (VISSIM) is not necessary for most, if not all, of the alternatives analysis. A tiered approach is not only feasible but desirable for the processes of developing, eliminating, and refining alternatives. TDM output can be used for some, HCM and FREEVAL analysis for some (all or partial corridors), and VISSIM if deemed necessary for final differentiations or refinement. **FREEVAL will be used to analyze all alternatives. However, in order to be able to demonstrate congestion relief benefits of a recommended alternative, VISSIM microsimulation models will be developed for the following:**

- Existing PM peak hour (for calibration)
- 2045 PM peak hour for 2045 no-build condition with the selected planning scenario
- 2045 PM peak hour for the Recommended Alternative with the selected planning scenario

City of Portsmouth

Task 1: Public Engagement Plan

- Please include the Working Group oversight with each HRTPO staff approval. **Change made**
- Please substitute Working Group for “project management team”. **Change made**
- Who is the “Engagement Team”, will this be a subcontractor? **The Engagement team is a subset of the Consultant team. Consultant Team has replaced Engagement team throughout the scope.**
- In addition to print materials, please consider improving your online and social media presence. **This will be emphasized in the revised scope.**
- Portsmouth would like to offer The Churchland Library or Churchland High School as a possible public meeting locations, they are also very close to Western Branch. **The Working Group decided that the Churchland/Western Branch location for public meetings be changed to Chesapeake.**
- The online open house in Task 1.3 is a good idea, Portsmouth has some experience with Virtual Meetings. **No action necessary.**
- Page 4, Paragraph 2 should say “kiosks” not ziosks. **Ziosks will remain.**
- Task 1.4a Please continue to include meeting minutes on your website

Task 2: Preliminary Alternatives

- Please add the JRB, Route 17 and Bowers Hill to your corridor list. **Route 17 and JRB were added to the scope narrative. Bowers Hill is part of identified study segments already so there is no need to state it again.**
- Please consider incorporating the NEPA Merged Process which incorporates other state and federal agencies. **This was deemed inappropriate for this study given that it is not a NEPA study.**
- Please incorporate transit in your design alternative, such as a dedicated lane or tunnel for bus, LRT or BRT. **Transit will be considered as a stand alone alternative or as an element of a roadway alternative.**
- VDOT’s Jamestown Ferry is not a sufficient ferry alternative, please consider larger ferries that carry more vehicles or passenger ferries like the Elizabeth River Ferry. **Not applicable to this study since the operating characteristics (size and headways) of any proposed ferry service would not be part of the scope of work.**

Tasks 4-7:

- Have Tasks 4.1-4.7 been completed yet? Please incorporate a project schedule. **A project schedule will be developed with the next iteration of the scope.**
- Please incorporate a project budget. **A draft project budget will be developed with the next iteration of the scope.**
- Task 6.1 Please change to say “Weekly Coordination with **Working Group** and TPO Staff. **Change made.**

- Task 6.5 There's a stray "t" in line 2. **Change made.**
- The numerical number of meetings with TPO staff and the Working Group is missing (they should be the same) as well as meetings with the steering committee and stakeholders. **No schedule was developed in conjunction with the draft scope of work due to the uncertainty of the scope composition of the next phase.** Now that the Working Group has decided to complete the study in on phase, a schedule will be developed, and the number of meetings will be estimated and included in the next version of the draft scope.
- Please show the cost and fee structure for this Phase. **A budget will be prepared in conjunction with the next version of the scope.**

VDOT

As a collective team in the region, there are numerous highway projects underway, some consideration of shoulder running and HOT lanes, etc.

Before the RCS goes out for public input, there needs to be a briefing, or graphic and educational materials to show the efforts underway to be completed in 2025, and then others can intelligently discuss ideas for RCS in 2045. Is anyone working on this? It's definitely needed. **HRTPO volunteered to create such a map at the September 18 Working Group meeting.**

Comments:

- use charette style public meetings and/or small groups table top style. **Comment has been incorporated into the revised scope.**
- perhaps piggy back on the upcoming fall transportation meeting. **This study's public outreach program will not be initiated until well after this fall transportation meeting, but perhaps in subsequent months study activities can be scheduled closely together with other appropriate events.**
- more social media updates and feedback. **This has been specified in the revised scope.**
- gain working group approval prior to developing planning level cost estimates and models. **Model output and costs are needed in order to help the Working Group decide which alternatives to screen out/advance so gaining Working Group approval of alternatives before those features are developed is inappropriate.**
- narrow the alternatives to 2/3 total. **Study is scoped to consider a minimum of 5 segments, which when combined constitute a minimum of 2 or 3 alternatives. Limiting the scope to 2 or 3 alternatives would not allow the investigation of any new alternatives suggested by stakeholders.**

TPO Staff

- Responses to Portsmouth comments:

- With regards to your comments on the Public Engagement Plan, the word “ziosk” is correct. **So noted.**
- Ziosks, are the little computers that now sit on the tables at restaurants and allow you to play games, pay your bill, order food, etc. from your table. They are also prime for advertising. **So noted.**
- The Engagement Team is the subcontractor. TPO staff is not conducting the public involvement effort for this study. **“Engagement team” has been replaced by “Consultant team” throughout the scope.**
- I agree with you --- the sub consultant should increase their social media presence. **The specifics of such an increase will be incorporated into the revised scope.**

General Comments:

1. “HRTPO” is misspelled as “HRPTO” a number of times throughout the scope. **Changes made.**
2. It’s difficult to tell without the task timelines, but isn’t the plan to assess the permitability of the various alternatives prior to spending a lot of effort and expense on engineering design work, modelling, etc.? **That is the plan.**
3. Study Recommendations – Given that the study’s recommendations (stated to be published under 7.1 Report) are perhaps the most important part of the RCS, it is recommended that the **development** of those recommendations (i.e. when, where, how, with whom) be specified, perhaps under its own subtask. Recommendations are mentioned under 1.3 Engagement and 4.9a Scenario Results Workshops (“provide input on investment, policy, and other recommendations to carry forward from the analysis”). Therefore, recommend either a) adding a subtask for the final development of recommendations, or b) renaming 4.9a (and fleshing out its verbiage concerning development of recommendations) to reflect this “recommendation development” purpose. **Revised scope reflects option b – 4.9b renamed “Recommendation Documentation”. Recommendations will be formulated as an outcome of the Scenario Results Workshop (Task 4.9a) with the Working Group/Steering (Policy) Committee. The consultant team will prepare a summary of analysis results, risks, costs, and public comments on the candidate alternatives so the advantages and disadvantages of each can be understood and used by voting members of the two groups as a basis for recommending an alternative. Wording to this effect have been added to Task 4.9a.**

Specific Comments:

4. Task 1.3a – Will HRTPO be able to view and utilize the mailing list without the software the consultant team intends to purchase in order to maintain the lists? If not, will the software be turned over to HRTPO with the lists? **HRTPO will be able to view and utilize the mailing list software.**
5. Task 1.3b – Please specify the minimum number of meetings of each type in which the consultant team will engage. **Meetings will be specified in the next scope iteration.**

6. Task 1.3c – For a region of 1.7 million people and hundreds of potential outlets, 3,500 rack cards is not enough. Recommend at least 20,000 cards for distribution. **20,000 cards are specified in the revised scope.**
7. Task 1.3d:
 - a. With regard to the four Southside meetings, rather than specifying the Churchland/Western Branch area, recommend replacing with Chesapeake. **The Working Group agreed with this proposal and it is reflected in the revised scope.**
 - b. Please note that all of the meetings must be accessible by public transit. **Inserted into the scope.**
 - c. With regard to the section on online open house or live stream session – the HRTPO does not currently do live streaming or online open house meetings. It is the understanding of HRTPO staff that the consultant team will be conducting the public involvement activities related to the RCS – not HRTPO staff. **Scope revised accordingly.**
 - d. Third paragraph, second sentence – what is meant by “full mailing list and locality networks”? **“and locality networks” was deleted from the scope.**
8. Task 1.3e:
 - a. Please work to address the underserved populations in ways other than having a single EJ symposium. Given the region’s racial diversity, achieving EJ goals may be done by compiling a good database and outlet source for all of the outreach materials.
 - b. HRTPO staff cannot guarantee turnout and attendance for the symposium and recommend the consultant team put its resources to work to ensure this outreach is successful. That said, HRTPO staff will conduct outreach to the ad-hoc EJ Roundtable. **Understood, not scope change necessary.**
 - c. Second paragraph, second sentence – strike “assist HRTPO to”. The consultant team is responsible for conducting all activities mentioned in the paragraph (as opposed to assisting HRTPO). **Change made.**
9. Task 2 – It is important to differentiate between corridors and alternatives in this section. Task 2 describes the five corridors that were not programmed for funding in the HRCS SEIS (I-664, I-664 Connector, I-564 Connector, VA 164, and VA 164 Connector), and then in the next sentence refers to them as five preliminary alternatives. However, some of these corridors (specifically the three Connectors) cannot be standalone alternatives since independently these corridors would be roadways to nowhere. **Scope wording has been changed to reflect comment.**
10. Task 2.5 – ITS systems should be assumed for all freeway alternatives, not only those where HOT lanes are proposed. **Scope now reads “ITS systems along all interstates”.**
11. Task 3.2 – It is unclear why the scope mentions “develop a prioritization tool for the analyzed alternatives” under the Conduct Permitability Assessments task. **This statement has been deleted.**
12. Task 4.8c:

- a. For clarity, recommend that the action title of 4.8c be re-worded (e.g. “4.8c Evaluate Performance of Candidate Projects under Baseline and 3 Greater Growth Scenarios”).
Change made.
- b. The meaning of the following is unclear:
“The Consultant Team will work with HRTPO staff and the Working Group to identify the most meaningful comparisons [comparisons of what?] (performance measure metrics) and will then determine any further iterations to run to explore cause-and-effect [cause and effect of what?] (variances or observed peculiarities in performance measure metrics) in performance in Task 4.8c. A maximum of 5 additional iterations will be performed to help isolate cause-and-effect relationships among the drivers [what drivers?].” **Will delete “among the drivers”.**

13. Task 4.8d – Because VISSIM models are so complex and data intensive, the existing study area roadway network that will be included in the VISSIM models should be more defined. What level of the roadway network will be included in the VISSIM models? **We intend to model the interstate system in the study area as well as other key facilities like 164, 17 (James River Bridge to I-664), and US 58/13/460 west of Bowers Hill. The VISSIM models will also include adjacent intersections at interchange locations. The VISSIM models will only be prepared for the PM peak hour for Existing Conditions (for calibration), a 2045 No-Build condition with the preferred scenario, and a 2045 Recommended Alternative condition with the preferred scenario. We are proposing to use FREEVAL to evaluate the same network (minus the adjacent intersections at interchanges) for all alternatives and land use scenario combinations in both peak hours. In addition, we are incorporating Synchro analysis for AM and PM peak hours at 100 intersections into the scope in case some other corridor analysis is desired (Hampton Boulevard?).**

14. Task 4.8e – Considering that 1) the main evaluation of candidate alternatives is to be conducted under 4.8c above, and 2) the stated purpose of this 4.8e is “to evaluate congestion relief in much greater detail” via microsimulation model VISSIM, a) to avoid confusion between 4.8c and 4.8e (which are currently worded similarly), b) to build on the title of 4.8d (“Develop Microsimulation Models”), and c) for consistent usage of the word “project” (as in titles of 4.8, 4.8a, 4.8b, 4.8c), we recommend that the 4.8e title be re-worded (e.g. “4.8e Further Evaluate Congestion Relief of Candidate Projects (via microsimulation models)”).

15. As an alternative, in order to avoid confusion with Task 4.8c (Performance evaluation using the travel demand model and additional regional models), Task 4.8d (Develop VISSIM model) and Task 4.8e (Performance evaluation with VISSIM) should be combined. **We eliminated 4.8e and 4.8f and combined them with 4.8d under “Evaluate Traffic Operation Conditions”.**

ATTACHMENT 6B

REGIONAL CONNECTORS STUDY

PHASE 3 – STUDY COMPLETION

SCOPE OF WORK

Introduction

Phase 3 of the study will entail the development and screening of preliminary alternatives, the determination of candidate alternatives, and the recommendation of a preferred alternative to enhance connectivity between the Peninsula and the Southside of Hampton Roads. The Phase 3 scope is intended to include all tasks required to bring the Regional Connectors Study (RCS) to a successful conclusion. Phase 3 tasks are described in the following paragraphs.

TASK 1 – Execute Engagement Plan

This task outlines the process for the implementation of a Public Engagement Plan developed in Phase 1 of the Hampton Roads Regional Connectors Study (RCS). The subtasks associated with implementation of the Public Engagement Plan seek to inform, educate and engage stakeholders, residents, businesses, and travelers in the Hampton Roads Region. The Consultant Team will adhere to all applicable policies and procedures as directed by HRTPO and applicable federal guidelines covering MPOs and recipients of federal funds for planning purposes. Social media will be a highly emphasized medium through which study information and public meeting information will be made available in the Hampton Roads area (see Task 1.3g).

Task 1.1: Task Management

The engagement task lead will provide a task-based progress report, participate in monthly team meetings and bi-weekly calls as appropriate with HRTPO staff and the Working Group. Progress reports will summarize and report the percentage complete of each task and provide the basis for the monthly

invoice. The engagement task leader will attend Consultant Team meetings as needed, including but not limited to bi-weekly **Consultant** team meetings, internal team meetings, and meetings with **HRTPO** staff as required. The engagement task leader will provide schedule updates to inform the master project schedule.

Task 1.2: Engagement Plan Review

The Public Engagement Plan will be reviewed on a quarterly basis to ensure alignment with the goals and objectives of the study and to address any additional information obtained through the engagement process. This review will include evaluation of the demographic profile, tools and tactics, metrics, stakeholder groups and key messages. Any revisions will be provided to the **Working Group and HRTPO** staff in track changes for review and acceptance. An electronic copy of each plan revision will be submitted.

Task 1.3: Implementation of Engagement Program

The **Consultant** team will conduct stakeholder outreach tasks to engage regional stakeholders as directed and approved by the **Working Group and HRTPO**. This will consist of outreach to the targeted stakeholders representing or living in the jurisdictions covered by HRTPO agreements. Activities to be implemented include:

Task 1.3a Study Mailing list and Comment Database

The **Consultant** team will create, organize, and maintain a project database and mailing list to house contact details for agency representatives, elected officials, civic groups, businesses, and other important stakeholders. The **Consultant** team will work closely with HRTPO to **update** the agency and locality mailing list. The list will be used to disseminate project status information such as a study brochure and to notify people of upcoming in-person and online engagement opportunities.

Throughout the course of the study, the **Consultant** team will expand and update the **mailing** list and **database** by encouraging interested parties to refer others to the **Consultant team** or through mailing list signups via the study website. The **Consultant** team will utilize database software such as MailChimp to maintain the database.

This database can also be used to house public meeting comments for extraction and future response development. The **Consultant team** will accept all public comments submitted during public outreach efforts and at public meetings. This effort will include: developing a public comment section of the database; collecting and cataloging all correspondence sent to the Consultant team; categorizing all comments for inclusion in comment analysis or reports and creating the public outreach comment table summary for inclusion in the Engagement Report.

Task 1.3b Community Briefings and Presentations

The **Consultant** team will schedule and attend **25** community nonprofit and organization meetings to provide an overview of the project. Presentation task elements will include the development of handouts, PowerPoint presentations, maps, and the recording of meeting minutes as appropriate. **A total of 25** presentations will be conducted in Phase 3.

Task 1.3c Brochures, Factsheets and Handouts

The Consultant team will prepare one (1) draft meeting brochure per round of public meetings (2 total) to report on key project elements, milestones, and recommended meeting dates. The brochure will be distributed at public meetings in Phase 3 and made available on the project website. The content will include background information, schedule, study area maps, and other pertinent project information to support full participation by the public at the meetings. In addition, the Consultant team will prepare postcards or rack cards throughout the duration of the study to be featured at community facilities. These smaller, more portable formats could highlight topics or special interests and could be distributed at outreach events, community facilities, and as notification tools in advance of public meetings. The study team will print a total of 20,000 postcards or rack cards for distribution.

The Consultant team will develop posters, flyers and meeting presentation templates for the study. The team will generate 6 comment cards, fact sheets and/or flyers that highlight topics, promote events, or announce key milestones in the process. They may target specific audiences or interests or be oriented more generally. The fact sheets and flyers will support and supplement key messages throughout the process to keep the public and stakeholders informed.

Task 1.3d Public Meetings

The Consultant team will work with HRTPO to plan, host and facilitate two rounds of seven public meetings during Phase 3 of the study for a total of 14 public meetings. Each meeting will have an informational component and targeted and purposeful input opportunities. Meetings will be developed in a way that manages stakeholder expectations, promotes transparency and accountability for the process, creates understanding, and builds consensus for decisions and recommendations. The team will incorporate appropriate tools and techniques to engage and inform minority, low-income, and Title VI populations. The team anticipates each meeting series to be held as follows: three (3) Peninsula meetings (Williamsburg, Newport News, and Hampton) and four (4) Southside meetings (Norfolk, Virginia Beach, Chesapeake, and Suffolk). The Consultant team will identify meeting locations for HRTPO approval, conduct onsite walk throughs and verify ADA accessibility, book meeting locations, provide refreshments, book court reporters, advertise meetings in various media (newspapers, social media, ad buys, etc.) and secure, if required, any sign language interpreter and/or language translator as appropriate. All meetings will be accessible by public transit.

Meeting content will include, but not be limited to, scenario planning methodology and analysis results, potential alternatives, and alternatives' analysis results. The meeting format will be a charette style public meeting and/or small group table style.

The Consultant team will offer an online open house or live stream session for each meeting series for a total of two (2) online events. Meeting notifications will be made in accordance with HRTPO policies and will use the full mailing list. Social media (see Task 1.3g) and web announcements will be used. Additionally, in advance of the first round of meetings, a printed ad announcement with meeting information will be published in local media as approved by the Working Group and HRTPO.

An online open house is very much like a traditional public open house, but information and community discussions are offered through a web forum or webinar. A variety of options are available. With a webinar option, participants would register using the GoToMeeting software. Once registered for the online open house, participants would be able to access a library of information, view a PowerPoint

presentation, and ask questions of staff through an interactive messaging feature. Interactive polling is also available. Another option is to live stream a public meeting via Facebook or another online tool. Providing these easy and accessible online tools will encourage community members to convene online to learn more about a project, share their ideas, and provide input to decision-makers.

Task 1.3e Regional Connectivity Symposium

To engage traditionally underserved populations the **Consultant** team will plan a symposium with the HRTPO EJ Roundtable, students and faculty from local Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Title VI advocacy groups. The two- to three-hour meeting will be a facilitated conversation focused on regional connectivity for the purposes of informing the study recommendations and priorities.

The **Consultant** team will plan the Regional Connectivity Symposium, select event location, develop an event management plan, speaker talking points, review of collateral materials, and provide day-of-event coordination. The Symposium is in addition to the other outreach tools such as direct mail, community briefings, public meetings, and pop up events to reach and engage EJ populations.

Task 1.3f Community Events and Outreach

The **Consultant** team will plan up to **five (5)** informal in-person pop-up events to introduce the project and to obtain stakeholder perspectives on regional mobility, transportation planning, and connectivity. The team will select event locations, schedule, develop event activity plans, determine required staffing, and review collateral material.

In addition, the **Consultant** team will investigate the use of ad space on ziosks in the region and a project informational video to be priced for HRTPO and Working Group consideration and approval.

Task 1.3g Social Media Engagement

The consultant team will develop a social media program to support outreach to a variety of stakeholder groups across the region including environmental justice, Title VI and student populations for the purposes of promoting the study, events, and public meetings. The Consultant team will develop a social media content calendar to coincide with study engagement efforts and milestone announcements. Information posted on HRTPO's Facebook account will link the audience to the RCS website for additional details. HRTPO staff will review and approve draft social media content in addition to the content calendar. HRTPO will post all social media content and pay for social media advertising, if desired, on HRTPO's Facebook media account.

Task 1.3h Engagement Report

The final outreach documentation for the project will clearly highlight all activities, what we heard, and how it was considered and addressed. The final outreach summary will aid in communications for the project by telling the story of the engagement process and how the plan represents an inclusive and community-supported vision for the future.

Task 1.4: Website Upgrades and Maintenance

The team will develop content for use and subsequent uploading to the study website by the study team. This effort includes initial content development to be reviewed and approved by the Working

Group and HRTPO along with the development of content updates by the study team at project milestones and other pertinent events.

Task 1.4a Prepare Website Content

The Consultant team will develop a creative brief for Phase 3 to orient readers to the Regional Connectors Study and its phases.

As a part of Phase 3, the study website will be populated with fresh information as it becomes available, including analysis results, meeting dates, reports, and meeting/briefing dates. Updates and reporting documents such as one-pagers will be shared as they become available. Templates for these updates will be designed and developed as a part of this task. New content, including microsimulation of alternatives' traffic operating conditions, will be integrated into the site, and new components will be added to the site as needed to accommodate this content. Original copywriting will be delivered as a part of these updates, and publication will be managed by the Consultant team. Regular hosting and maintenance of the study website (including the posting of meeting minutes and presentation materials) will also be covered under this scope.

A key feature of Phase 3 will be the development of an Interactive Map, which will require coordination to establish visual goals, data sources, and other content needs. Once designed, this map will be integrated into the existing study website. The budget is an estimate based on the assumption that the map will require integration with a GIS database.

Phase 3 will also feature a new Scenario Planning pages which will appear at the top-level navigation on the site. New copy will be developed, and technical analysis elements performed by team members will be uploaded. This page will be designed to feature animations and other graphical elements. The budget is an estimate based on the assumption that the subpages will require interactive functionality surpassing what is possible in the templates created for Phase 1 and Phase 2. Additionally, this budget assumes support and maintenance up to the project completion date of April 2021.

As the Study gathers momentum, a plan will be created to report events on a regular schedule, and a post template for these events posts will be created.

Survey results will be shared in the form of a final report. Survey-generated publications will be added, and categories for these publication types will be created and added to the website backend.

Finally, bi-monthly website analytics summaries will be submitted to HRTPO provide information regarding the number of visits to the RCS website, number and type of public comments and other pertinent information.

Timing: 20 months

Meetings:

- 14 public meetings
- 25 community briefings and presentations
- 5 “pop-up” events
- 1 Regional Connectivity Symposium
- Meetings with HRTPO staff: 0
- Working Group Meetings: 4
- Steering Committee Meetings: 2
- Other/Stakeholder Meetings: None

Deliverables:

- Study mailing list (electronic format)
- Comment database (electronic format)
- Meeting notes for stakeholder briefings, presentations, and public meetings
- Brochures, fact sheets, and handouts and comment sheets for public meetings
- Social media content calendar
- Engagement Summary Report
- Website deliverables

TASK 2 – Development of Preliminary Alternatives

The intent of this task is to develop preliminary alternatives to a sufficient level of detail to enable construction, right-of-way, and utility relocation planning-level costs to be developed, as well as to be able to determine each alternative’s potential to be permitted and constructed. Permitability and constructability are two criteria that will be used to help screen the preliminary alternatives down to candidate alternatives. More information on that screening is provided in Task 3.2.

It is assumed that a maximum of ten (10) preliminary alternatives will be developed. They will include combinations of five (5) segments not programmed for funding in the HRCS SEIS which are:

- I-664
- I-664 Connector
- I-564 Connector
- VA 164
- VA 164 Connector

In addition to combinations of these five segments, an additional five (5) combination of segments will be developed as a result of suggestions made at stakeholder interviews and comments received during other project engagement activities. Those segments may include US 17 (including the segment on the James River Bridge) and any new harbor crossing connections (roadway, ferry, or transit). These combinations of segments, 10 in all, will be called preliminary alternatives.

Task 2.1: Summarize Background Information

The Consultant team will compile documentation on the non-programmed roadway segments from the SEIS. The information gathered will be summarized and presented to the Working Group and HRTPO staff and form the basis for the development of a next tier of preliminary alternatives (combination of segments). Estimates of cost should be redone to account for any increases in planning level unit costs since the original estimates. The rest of the information associated with these 5 segments should still be applicable to the RCS.

Task 2.2: Develop Geometry of Preliminary Alternatives

To the greatest extent possible, the Consultant team will use existing information available for the conceptual design of the alternatives, which includes: typical cross sections, alignments for roadways on new location, and geometric configurations of connection points to existing roadways.

The Consultant team will develop alternatives at a conceptual level in MicroStation format utilizing aerial photography and available GIS data. Elements of the conceptual development of the alternatives will include subtasks that follow.

Based on Corps of Engineers input, the Corps will offer comments during the development of the alternatives, but the alternatives development should follow a step-wise process. Milestones in the development process may include the following steps:

- Defining a project purpose and need
- Developing a scope and methodology for alternatives analysis
- Documenting the alternatives analysis, including the practicability of the different alternatives
- Developing the preferred alternative

Task 2.2a Design Criteria

Engineering design criteria for the Preliminary Alternatives will be established based on VDOT and AASHTO standards for the design speed and type of facility. Alignments will be developed to minimize known environmental impacts, minimize the need for right-of-way, minimize costs, and accommodate forecast traffic volumes. Horizontal alignments and vertical profiles will follow existing geometry where existing roadways are being widened. The beginning and ending stations of the alignments will be tabulated as well as proposed curve data.

The design of the alternatives will also include traffic analyses of connection points to existing facilities. These analyses will be undertaken to ensure that the design can adequately accommodate projected traffic volumes. The traffic analyses will be limited to Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) methodologies for merge, diverge, and weave sections on freeways and capacity analyses for arterial intersections. They will not include micro-simulation analyses (these will only be performed on the Candidate Alternatives).

Task 2.2b Typical sections and cross-sections

Typical sections for each alternative will be developed to meet VDOT and AASHTO requirements. Materials will match existing facilities (concrete or asphalt pavement). A description of the proposed pavement design will be developed, including proposed pavement depths for construction cost development. New facilities will be assumed to be asphalt pavement, unless otherwise directed. Cross-sections will be developed at 500' intervals for the purposes of developing earthwork quantities. Additional cross-sections will be developed at critical locations to assist in determining tie-in points and environmental and right-of-way impacts.

Task 2.3: Hydraulics and Hydrology

Conceptual analysis will be performed for major drainage structures ($Q_{100} > 500$ cfs), to determine feasibility and cost impacts. A description of floodplain impacts will be included where there is proposed encroachment on a floodplain. Roadway drainage will generally be assumed to be an open system (ditches). Where bridge structures, roadway barriers, sound walls, or retaining walls are required, closed drainage systems (inlets and pipes) will be assumed. These areas and approximate limits will be determined as part of the alternative development. Stormwater management will be estimated based on pollutant loading calculations for new impervious area. Approximate sizing of Stormwater management facilities to mitigate increases in Stormwater runoff will be performed based on "rule of thumb" estimates, but no design will be performed.

Task 2.4: Structures

Any new, widened, or reconstructed structures will be described. The approximate size and location of proposed bridge work will be developed at a conceptual level. The location, limits, and height of retaining walls and sound walls will also be developed at a conceptual level.

Task 2.4: Utilities and Railroad Crossings

Any major overhead utilities (such as electrical transmission lines, and transformer stations) will be identified, and the impact of any conflicts will be discussed. Any railroad crossings within the proposed roadway improvements will be identified and impacts described.

The conceptual plans will be turned into graphics for inclusion into the study report.

Task 2.6: Planning Cost Estimates

A planning level cost estimate (present year costs) will be developed for each preliminary alternative based on the conceptual designs and potential mitigation estimates. Quantities for major items such as roadway pavement, earthwork, drainage structures, bridges and walls will be based on the conceptual plans. The quantities will be multiplied by the average unit costs for the Hampton Roads District to arrive at the construction cost for these items. The cost of the remaining disciplines will be based on allowances or lump sum costs as follows:

- Mobilization
 - Mobilization will be presented as a lump sum cost based on a percentage of construction cost.
- Traffic Control & Maintenance of Traffic (MOT)

- Ground Mounted signs will be estimated on a “per mile” basis
- A planning level estimate will be prepared for ITS systems along all interstates. The ITS system will be presented as a lump sum amount.
- Traffic MOT will be based on a percentage of the total construction cost of the project, typically 4-5% of construction cost.
- Lighting will be based on a “per mile” basis where applicable.
- Stormwater Management, E&S and Wetlands
 - It will be assumed that Nutrient Credits will be purchased for approximately 25% of the increased pollutant load
 - Plantings for constructed wetlands or bioretention facilities will be based on a lump sum cost based on VDOT District averages.
 - The presence of wetlands and streams will be based on publicly available wetland inventories (NWI) and topographic maps and coordinated with the work described in Task 3.2. The impacts will be based on limits of disturbance. Wetland mitigation costs will be based on a per acre cost for both tidal and non-tidal wetland impacts; stream impacts will be based on a linear foot cost.
 - Erosion & Sediment Control (E&SC) costs will be presented as a lump sum cost.
- Preliminary Engineering (Design) costs will be based on a percentage of the total construction cost of the project.
- Right-of-Way estimated costs will be determined by categorizing the property (residential vs. commercial), quantifying the right-of-way taking and applying per acreage costs for partial takes. Total takes will include relocation costs where applicable. Unit costs for right-of-way and relocation costs will be based on VDOT unit costs for the Hampton Roads District.
- Utility Protection and Relocation costs will be based on observations of above ground features, and record research. Utilities will be aggregated by type (water, sewer, power, gas, communication) and assigned to a range of sizes. An allowance will be made for smaller utilities/distribution lines. Larger utilities/transmission lines will be based on a linear footage basis.
- Railroad crossings – A cost for railway flaggers and watchperson service will be estimated for proposed railroad crossings. The cost will be presented as a lump sum cost.

For any ferry service alternative, a planning level estimate will be prepared for the capital costs and operating costs of ferry service. This estimate will be based on a life cycle cost analysis. The length of the period used for life cycle analysis will be determined in conjunction with the HRTPO, prior to development. The design ferry vehicle will be the Pocahontas which is the largest ferry vehicle on VDOT’s Jamestown-Scotland ferry route and can carry tractor trailers up to 56,000 pounds. Capital costs will be developed for major items, with allowances for smaller, aggregated items. Major capital costs will include the cost of ferries and ferry infrastructure, including the cost of docks and bulkheads, approach roadways/parking lots, right-of-way and support buildings with communications and other utilities. Operating costs will include ferry and support staff, and O&M costs for the ferries and supporting infrastructure.

Timing: 11 months

Meetings:

- Meetings with HRTPO staff: 0
- Working Group Meetings: 0
- Steering Committee Meetings: 0
- Other/Stakeholder Meetings: 0

Deliverables:

- Roadway typical sections
- Roadway alignment plans
- Cost estimates

TASK 3 – Determination of Candidate Alternatives (Screen 1)

Evaluation criteria will be determined for use in screening the Preliminary Alternatives down to Candidate Alternatives. The criteria will include, but not be limited to:

- Congestion relief
- Permitability
- Constructability

The intent of this initial screening is twofold. First, it will eliminate from consideration any alternative whose permitability is questionable. Second, it will eliminate any alternative that does not compare favorably to the other alternatives in these criteria. An alternative matrix will be prepared to illustrate the characteristics of each Preliminary Alternative and to facilitate comparison between them.

Task 3.1 Conduct Congestion Relief Assessments

Congestion relief performance measures determined through interaction with the Working Group and HRTPO staff in Phase 2 will be used to evaluate Candidate Alternatives.

The comparison of these measures is part of the screening of the Preliminary Alternatives. In this task, the Consultant Team will run each alternative using the travel demand model for the 2045 Baseline future and organize the outputs based on the approved performance measures characterizing congestion relief.

Task 3.2: Conduct Permitability Assessments

Overview

The purpose of this task is to evaluate the regulatory permitability of preliminary alternatives. All regulatory permitability evaluations will be conducted by reviewing Federal, State, and Local regulatory requirements in conjunction with existing environmental conditions. The study team will determine potential **significant** regulatory flaws.

The Consultant Team understands that the Corps will not permit an alternative that would obstruct or restrict navigation to the Craney Island Dredged Material Management Area (CIDMMA), or that would

otherwise impair the Corps' ability to maintain and operate the CIDMMA. Likewise, the Corps will have to assess the impact of the different alternatives on the federally authorized Norfolk Harbor and Channel Federal Navigation Project and coordinate with maritime stakeholders on the impacts of those alternatives. The Corps will offer comments on permitability issues associated with the alternatives but cannot speak for the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), Virginia Marine Resources Commission (VMRC), or other permitting agencies. These comments will not commit the Corps to any permitting of action, nor will they be interpreted as endorsement of any alternative(s).

The Corps can only permit the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) and cannot permit alternatives that will adversely affect other federal navigation projects.

Task 3.2a. Data Collection Review

The focus of this task will be to review and analyze environmental (natural and cultural resources) data created to develop the regional mapping, with the goal of establishing a unified dataset for GIS based environmental alternatives review. The regional mapping and environmental overlays will define where sensitive natural and cultural resources are located to determine if preliminary alternatives can avoid and /or minimize impacts as part of the risk analysis. In addition, should resources not be able to be avoided and/or minimized, mitigation concepts will be evaluated as part of the analysis. This information will form the basis for regulatory permitability evaluations as part of the alternatives analysis. The data will be evaluated to provide regional leaders and analysts with accurate information from which to make strong, technically-supported decisions regarding regulatory viability.

Task 3.2b: Develop permitability requirements and evaluation parameters

In this task, a set of evaluation parameters will be developed to evaluate environmental and regulatory viability of the alternatives. Each evaluation parameter will relate to the targeted environmental resources and potential impacts in conjunction with Federal, State, and Local laws and regulations to create a framework for risk analysis, fatal flaw analysis, and alternative prioritization.

In addition, this task will establish a series of regulatory permitability factors that will be used to measure how each alternative contributes to the direct and indirect environmental impacts to ensure there is not a negative environmental impact to the resources of the region. The factors will serve as the measures of effectiveness against which to test each alternative. A matrix will be developed that aligns each metric according to an established objective for the region.

A key aspect of the evaluation parameters that will be explored in this task will be integrated with HRTPO's Project Prioritization Tool to ensure compatibility between measures that are used in this project with measures used by the HRTPO in their transportation planning and programming efforts.

The final performance measures will be vetted with the Working Group and HRTPO staff and, as needed, and will be reviewed with the Steering Committee. The result will be a consensus on the methods and metrics that will be used to gauge success in the regulatory evaluation of each of the alternatives.

Task 3.2c: Evaluate Preliminary Alternatives

The next step in the regulatory permitability analysis is to evaluate environmental factors in conjunction with the design and construction factors. The goal of this task is to assemble and evaluate the performance measures for each Scenario based on land use/environmental metrics, design alternatives, and reasonable constructability. This is a key step in understanding the comprehensive environmental impacts of each alternative.

All regulatory permitability parameters and evaluations will be conducted by reviewing Federal, State, and Local regulatory requirements in conjunction with existing environmental conditions. This information will be used to determine potential regulatory fatal flaws as well as develop a prioritization tool for the analyzed alternatives.

Task 3.2d: GIS based environmental alternatives review to identify risk factors for permitability and fatal flaw analysis

At this point in the process, all the environmental conditions and regulatory drivers will have been assembled to allow the alternative evaluation process to begin. The purpose of this evaluation will be:

1. Establish the interaction between design and constructability requirements with existing environmental conditions
2. Evaluate potential high level direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts for each alternative
3. Evaluate potential regulatory fatal flaws
4. Create a framework for comparison to establish a prioritization of alternatives

Task 3.3 Conduct Constructability Assessments

Constructability assessments will consist of a benefit/cost (B/C) analysis using the planning level cost estimates prepared in Task 2.5 and costs associated with mitigation measures identified in the permitability assessment. The benefit criteria will be determined as part of the Scenario Planning Task 4.3 – Defining Measures of Success. A threshold for an acceptable C/B ratio will be determined through interaction with the Working Group and HRTPO staff and subsequently used as a determinant in the screening of the Preliminary Alternatives.

Timing: 11 months

Meetings:

- Meetings with HRTPO staff: 1
- Working Group Meetings: 2
- Steering Committee Meetings: 1
- Other/Stakeholder Meetings: 0

Deliverables:

- Alternative Matrix
- Memo Summarizing Environmental Drivers and Parameters for Evaluation

- Memo Summarizing Environmental Data and Regulatory Permit Review
- Presentation materials, posters and slide decks of Deliverables for public outreach process

TASK 4 – Conduct Scenario Planning

The Regional Connectors Study (RCS) Regional Scenario Planning process will provide insight to decisionmakers regarding the need for and the benefits of alternative transportation investments considering potential alternative future trends. The Scenario Planning process will consider a baseline 2045 scenario and three alternative 2045 scenarios that present plausible futures with respect to economic, demographic and technology drivers. The scenario analysis will link alternative future economic and demographic trends with land use, and the resulting socioeconomic forecasts will be tested with the regional travel demand model to understand the impacts to transportation and other performance measures. The scenario outcomes will provide a series of benchmarks against which to test the resilience of different transportation investments. A potential benefit of this process will be to identify those transportation investments and projects that fare best in the analysis - that provide the most cumulative benefit to the region regardless of which alternative future scenario is tested. This will be done by testing each of the Preliminary Alternatives against each scenario to gauge how robust each investment is with respect to the range of possible futures.

Throughout the RCS Regional Scenario Planning process, the RCS Working Group will work closely with HRTPO staff and the Consultant team to provide guidance, affirm scenarios, select drivers and performance measures, and evaluate interim and final results. The RCS Steering Committee that is overseeing the overall RCS process will also be updated on the progress on the Regional Scenario Planning effort and will receive the results of the scenario testing of Candidate Alternatives for evaluation and consideration in the overall RCS process. The results will also be shared with the public to provide input as part of the final assessment of investment and policy insights in the study.

Task 4.8: Evaluating the Candidate RCS Projects

Overview

The final step in the scenario analysis is the assessment of transportation investment impacts by scenario. In this task, the Consultant Team will run each Candidate Alternative for each scenario (the 2045 Baseline Scenario and the three Greater Growth Scenarios). The Consultant Team will scope up to 20 model runs per scenario that will be a combination of runs used to develop demand estimates associated with each Candidate Alternative and additional runs to check for cause and effect relationships (such as particular pairings of Candidate Alternatives).

Task 4.8a: Confirmation/Network Coding of Candidate RCS projects for testing

Transportation improvements defined by the Candidate Alternatives will be "coded" into the Existing + Committed network using planning data available from HRTPO. Coding will include information such as facility description, alignment, and capacity information associated with improvements. Network coding will also specify locations of toll assessment and toll values, if applicable. The Consultant Team will review and confirm project coding assumptions with HRTPO. There will be one project network for each

Candidate Alternative. Note, the schedule assumes the Candidate Alternatives will have already been coded into the travel demand model network by Michael Baker some time prior to the beginning of this task.

Task 4.8b: Travel Demand Modeling for Baseline and 3 Greater Growth Scenarios (each Candidate project)

Using the networks developed in earlier tasks and scenario specific socio-economic data and parameters, The Consultant team will run the travel demand model for each Candidate Alternative over the 2045 Baseline and each of the 3 Greater Growth scenarios. The team will provide quality control checks on associated output. The modeling results for the newly coded Candidate Alternatives will be compared against results of similar alternatives or benchmarks (if available) to determine appropriateness of the results. Ad-hoc sensitivity testing may be performed under certain circumstances if the results of the Candidate Alternatives are not intuitive. The results for each Candidate Alternative will be compared against all project scenarios and the Existing + Committed network demand estimates to uncover and flag any potential issues in the results.

Task 4.8c: Evaluate Performance of Candidate Projects under Baseline and 3 Greater Growth Scenarios

In this task, the Consultant team will complete the performance dashboard for each candidate RCS project, though not necessarily each model run due to the large volume of information. The Consultant Team will work with HRTPO staff and the Working Group to identify the most meaningful comparisons and will then determine any further iterations to run to explore cause-and-effect in performance in Task 4.8c. A maximum of 5 additional iterations will be performed to help isolate cause-and-effect relationships. Also, the Consultant Team will provide all necessary input data for each set of Candidate Alternatives under each scenario to provide a ranking of each Candidate Alternative by scenario, as illustrated in the table below. This information will provide an important basis for assessing how robust the Candidate Alternatives are for potential future conditions.

Project Rank	2045 Baseline E+C	Scenario 1 E + C	Scenario 2 E + C	Scenario 3 E + C
E+C + RCS 1	5	8	15	8
E+C + RCS 2	4	6	4	2
E+C + RCS 3	5	3	20	15
...E+C + RCS 20	8	9	3	9

HRTPO seeks to evaluate the transportation benefits of Candidate Alternatives and the extent to which they achieve the goal of enhancing economic vitality and improving the quality of life in the region. To do so, the Consultant Team will use TREDIS to translate travel model results describing travel time, distance, reliability, and market access, into regional economic impacts expressed in terms of jobs, labor income, business sales, and GDP, with detail available by industry sector, and over time, as specified in the performance measures developed in Phase 2. The TREDIS FREIGHT module will allow targeted analysis of the implications of transportation performance for freight-reliant industries. Given the number of Candidate Alternatives, and the desire to test performance of every alternative under the baseline as well as all alternative scenarios, the Consultant Team will make use of TREDIS's batch mode to support easy import of project details and export of key economic performance results.

Task 4.8d: Evaluate Traffic Operating Conditions

This task will analyze three candidate alternatives resulting from the screening of the preliminary alternatives in Task 3. Three types of evaluations will be conducted for the traffic operations:

1. The **FREEVAL** software will be used to evaluate the **full interstate network and limited access facilities** (mainline and ramp junctions) for the AM and PM peak hours within the study area for the conditions listed below. There will be a total of 28 conditions evaluated in this process. (2 peak hours x 14 conditions = 28 total conditions)
 - Existing Condition
 - 2045 Baseline Condition
 - 2045 Baseline Condition – Alternative Land Use Scenario 1
 - 2045 Baseline Condition – Alternative Land Use Scenario 2
 - 2045 Baseline Condition – Alternative Land Use Scenario 3
 - 2045 Candidate Alternative 1 – Alternative Land Use Scenario 1
 - 2045 Candidate Alternative 1 – Alternative Land Use Scenario 2
 - 2045 Candidate Alternative 1 – Alternative Land Use Scenario 3
 - 2045 Candidate Alternative 2 – Alternative Land Use Scenario 1
 - 2045 Candidate Alternative 2 – Alternative Land Use Scenario 2
 - 2045 Candidate Alternative 2 – Alternative Land Use Scenario 3
 - 2045 Candidate Alternative 3 – Alternative Land Use Scenario 1
 - 2045 Candidate Alternative 3 – Alternative Land Use Scenario 2
 - 2045 Candidate Alternative 3 – Alternative Land Use Scenario 3
2. The **VISSIM** software will be used to evaluate the **six system-to-system interchanges** for the AM and PM peak hours within the study area for the conditions listed below. There will be a total of six conditions evaluated in this process. (2 peak hours x 3 conditions = 6 total conditions)
 - Existing Condition
 - 2045 No-Build (E+C) network for Baseline land use scenario
 - 2045 Preferred Alternative for Baseline land use scenario
3. The **Synchro** software will be used to evaluate the AM and PM peak hours for **up to 100 at-grade intersections** for the condition that includes the preferred alternative and the baseline land use scenario.

The evaluation procedure for each condition listed previously is described in the following sections.

Existing Conditions

This task will involve developing FREEVAL models based on the traffic conditions for the existing study area roadway network. The FREEVAL model will evaluate the interstate network in Hampton Roads and other limited access facilities (US 17 James River bridge to I-664, SR 164, and US 58/13/460 west of Bowers Hill).

A VISSIM model will also be developed to evaluate the six system-to-system interchanges within the study area. The most important aspect of this existing conditions VISSIM model is to accurately model existing roadway operations and driving behavior so that these characteristics can be carried forward when the model is updated with future land use travel patterns and future traffic data. This will involve calibrating the microsimulation using the queue lengths obtained from INRIX data and travel times developed as part of Phase 1. This task may also involve some adjustment of the model inputs and additional model runs to ensure that the existing conditions microsimulation model accurately outputs known measurable conditions in the Region.

2045 Baseline

Similar to the task of updating the Regional Travel Demand Model to a 2045 baseline scenario, the existing conditions AM and PM FREEVAL models will be updated to establish baseline 2045 models. This will include adding committed roadway projects and updating traffic volumes and travel patterns based on the outputs from the Regional Travel Demand Model for the 2045 baseline scenario.

It is important that this task be coordinated with 2045 regional model updates so that the baseline scenarios for both components (travel demand model and regional model) correlate with the HRTPO's Long Range Transportation Plan.

This task will also involve affirming the assumptions and outputs to-date with the Working Group as an important check before proceeding to the next steps.

2045 Traffic Analysis for 3 Scenarios (3 No-Build Conditions)

Similar to the alternative scenarios that will be coded into the Regional Travel Demand Model, it is important to note that each of the alternative Future Scenarios will allocate traffic volume growth that is in addition to the growth inherent in the 2045 Baseline microsimulation model. This means that each Scenario is dealing with an additional increment of traffic increases above and beyond the assumed growth for the 2045 baseline microsimulation model. The 2045 baseline FREEVAL model will be updated by adding the traffic volumes and traffic patterns for each of the three alternative scenarios.

The AM and PM 2045 Baseline VISSIM models will be updated with traffic volumes and traffic patterns for the baseline land use scenario only.

The outputs from these three 2045 Scenario No-Build analyses will be used for comparison against the 2045 Scenario Build analyses to determine the congestion relief achieved by each planning scenario/Candidate Alternative pair. This will maintain consistency and provide an 'apples-to-apples' comparison among Candidate Alternatives for each planning scenario.

2045 Traffic Analysis for 3 Scenarios (3 Candidate Alternatives)

Three Candidate Alternatives will be analyzed using updated FREEVAL models for each of the three land use scenarios. The AM and PM FREEVAL models from the no-build conditions discussed previously will be updated to include the candidate alternative and changes in traffic volumes. There are no VISSIM models included in this step.

Evaluate the Preferred Alternative and the Baseline Scenario Plan

The Preferred Alternative will be coded into the AM and PM 2045 VISSIM models for the baseline land use scenario. These VISSIM models will only include the major highways and system-to-system interchanges, not the entire study area roadway network. The outputs of the AM and PM models will be compared to the 2045 baseline no-build models that includes the baseline land use.

The Consultant team will also conduct AM and PM peak hour intersection capacity analyses with the Synchro software for up to 100 intersections within the Hampton Roads area. Traffic volumes for the Synchro analyses will be obtained from the Regional Travel Demand Model.

Additional iterations to check for cause and effect relationships and preparation of final results

After the initial testing of individual candidate projects, the Consultant Team will hold a workshop with the Working Group and HRTPO staff to identify any final questions to be addressed with final model runs and/or extraction of data (such as select link analysis) from the model set. After this meeting, the Consultant Team will conduct any final iterations and will prepare the final results for presentation to the Working Group and Steering Committee. In these meetings, these groups will provide input on the most relevant data, insights, and 'story lines' to be carried forward in final reporting.

Timing:

- 12 months (concurrent with other tasks to the extent possible)

Meetings:

- Meetings with HRTPO staff: 3
- Working Group Meetings: 2
- Steering Committee Meetings: 1
- Other/Stakeholder Meetings: 0

Deliverables:

- VISSIM models
- Technical Memorandum on microsimulation analysis results
- Travel Demand model, economic model, and prioritization tool runs
- Dashboard Outputs for Model Runs
- Tech Memo on RCS project evaluation
- Final scenario planning land use and travel demand model files

Task 4.9: Reporting Results

Overview

The Consultant Team will work with HRTPO Staff, the Working Group, and the Steering Committee to distill the insights from the scenario process and package them for sharing with the public.

Task 4.9a Scenario Results Workshops

In this task, the Consultant Team will take the materials and input generated in Task 4.8 and prepare a work session to be held individually or jointly with the Working Group and Steering Committee to discuss the scenario analysis results, risks, costs, and public comment associated with each Candidate Alternative. This information will be presented in a concise format and illustrate the advantages and disadvantages of each Candidate Alternative so comparisons between them can be made easily. This information will be used by voting members of the Working Group and Steering Committee to recommend an alternative, which is the intended outcome of this subtask and the most important outcome of the entire study as the recommendation will provide input to regional investment and policy decisions.

Task 4.9b Recommendation Documentation

The Consultant Team will document the results of the Task 4.9a workshop in the form of a presentation, website content, and a draft report that capture the full scenario planning steps and findings. This information will be used for ongoing outreach. After a period of initial outreach and input, the Consultant Team will present final recommendations to the Working Group and Steering Committee at the conclusion of Task 4.9.

Timing: 12 months

Meetings:

- Meetings with HRTPO staff: 1
- Working Group Meetings: 4
- Steering Committee Meetings: 2
- Other/Stakeholder Meetings: 0

Deliverables:

- Draft and final presentation of scenario planning results
- Draft and final website content of scenario planning results
- Draft and final scenario planning report

TASK 5—Prepare for and Attend Meetings (Working Group and Steering Committee)

Task 5.1: Working Group Meetings

The Consultant team will be represented by the Project Manager at all meetings (barring unforeseen conflicts) and supplemental team members depending upon the type of expertise being presented/discussed at each meeting. Discipline experts have estimated the number of Working Group meetings they will attend in each of the task/subtask summaries in this scope of services.

Task 5.2 Steering Committee Meetings

The Consultant team will be represented by the Project Manager at all meetings (barring unforeseen conflicts) and supplemental team members depending upon the type of expertise being presented/discussed at each meeting. Discipline experts have estimated the number of Working Group meetings they will attend in each of the task/subtask summaries in this scope of services.

Timing: 20 months

Meetings:

- Meetings with HRTPO staff: 0
- Working Group Meetings: 12
- Steering Committee Meetings: 5
- Other/Stakeholder Meetings: 0

Deliverables:

- Power Point slides and meeting handouts

TASK 6 – Manage the Project

Task 6.1: Weekly Coordination with HRTPO leadership

Consultant Project Manager will participate in weekly coordination calls with Working Group and HRTPO staff (assume 86 conference calls).

Task 6.2: Schedule and Budget Oversight

Consultant Project Manager will monitor schedule and budget on monthly basis and make changes to schedule, as needed. Budget monitoring will occur monthly during preparation of monthly progress reports so that any budget issues can be included in those reports.

Task 6.3: Quality Assurance of Deliverables

Consultant PM will review all documentation and deliverables before they are forwarded to the HRTPO Project Manager for distribution to the Working Group and HRTPO staff.

Timing: 20 months

Meetings:

- Meetings with HRTPO staff: 86 (weekly calls for 20 months)
- Working Group Meetings: 0
- Steering Committee Meetings: 0
- Other/Stakeholder Meetings: 0

Deliverables:

- Coordination meeting minutes

TASK 7 – Prepare Documentation

Task 7.1: Draft Study Report

The study report will include summaries of Phases 1-3 activities and be supplemented via appendices, which will include, but not be restricted to, the technical reports and technical memorandums for each of the major tasks in Phases 1-3. The report outline is shown below:

- Executive Summary
- Introduction
- Existing Conditions
- Regional Survey
- Stakeholder Interviews
- Travel Demand Model
- Engagement
- Scenario Planning/Alternatives
- Recommendations

Review comments will be solicited from the Working Group, Steering Committee, and HRTPO staff. Comments from the Working Group, the Steering Committee, and HRTPO staff will be discussed in the respective Working Group and Steering Committee meeting forums (unless a joint meeting is preferred). Those meetings will provide direction regarding the revisions to be made to the draft report that will subsequently be made available to the public prior to the second round of public information meetings. An electronic version of the draft report will be made available through channels outlined in the engagement plan.

Following the second round of public meetings, comments received at the meetings will be presented to the Working Group, Steering Group and HRTPO staff for discussion that will lead to decisions regarding the revisions to be made. If the revisions are substantive (i.e. – new alternatives are agreed to be studied, or more detailed analyses are required), another draft report will be prepared for review by the Working Group, Steering Committee, and HRTPO staff. An electronic version of the revised draft report will be made available. 50 hard copies will be produced, complete with appendices.

If the revisions are not substantive, the Consultant Team will initiate the preparation of the final report.

Task 7.2: Final Study Report

Following discussion of the comments received on the Draft Report and the notice to proceed on the preparation of the Final Report from the Working Group and Steering Committee, the Consultant Team will prepare the Final Report.

An electronic version of the final report will be made available through engagement channels. 50 hard copies will be produced, complete with appendices.

Timing: 6 months

Meetings:

- Meetings with HRTPO staff: 1
- Working Group Meetings: 1
- Steering Committee Meetings: 1
- Other/Stakeholder Meetings: 0

Deliverables:

- Draft study report (200 Executive Summaries and 50 complete reports)
- Final study report (200 Executive Summaries and 50 complete reports)
- Draft and final study report appendices (50 copies for draft and 50 copies for final)
- Draft and final website content of study report

ATTACHMENT 6C

		DRAFT - Regional Connectors Study - Phase 3 Schedule																				
Task No.	Task	2020												2021								
		JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP
TASK 1	EXECUTE ENGAGEMENT PLAN																					
1.1	Task Management																					
1.2	Engagement Plan Review																					
1.3a	Study Mailing List and Comment Database																					
1.3b	Community Briefings and Presentations																					
1.3c	Brochures, Factsheets, and Handouts																					
1.3d	Public Meetings																					
1.3e	Regional Connectivity Symposium																					
1.3f	Community Events and Outreach																					
1.3g	Social Media Engagement																					
1.3h	Engagement Report																					
1.4	Website Upgrades and Maintenance																					
TASK 2	DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES																					
2.1	Summarize Background Information																					
2.2	Develop Geometry of Preliminary Alternatives																					
2.3	Hydraulics and Hydrology																					
2.4	Structures																					
2.5	Utilities and Railroad Crossings																					
2.6	Planning Cost Estimates																					
TASK 3	DETERMINATION OF CANDIDATE ALTERNATIVES																					
3.1	Conduct Congestion Relief Assessments																					
3.2	Conduct Permitability Assessments																					
3.3	Conduct Constructability Assessments																					
TASK 4	CONDUCT SCENARIO PLANNING																					
4.8a	Confirmation/Network Coding of Candidate RCS projects for testing																					
4.8b	Travel Demand Modeling for Baseline and 3 Greater Growth Scenarios (each Candidate Project)																					
4.8c	Evaluate Performance of Candidate Projects under Baseline and 3 Greater Growth Scenarios																					
4.8d	Evaluate Traffic Operating Conditions																					
4.9a	Scenario Results Workshops																					
4.9b	Recommendation Documentation																					
TASK 5	PREPARE FOR AND ATTEND MEETINGS (WORKING GROUP AND STEERING COMMITTEE)																					
5.1	Working Group Meetings																					
5.2	Steering Committee Meetings																					
TASK 6	MANAGE THE PROJECT																					
6.1	Weekly Coordination with Study Leadership																					
6.2	Schedule and Budget Oversight																					
6.3	Quality Assurance of Deliverables																					
TASK 7	PREPARE DOCUMENTATION																					
5.1	Draft Study Report																					
5.2	Final Study Report																					

 Steering Committee Meetings
 Working Group Coordination Meeting
 Public Meeting

 Continuous Task
 Task Schedule

ATTACHMENT 6D

Michael Baker International, Inc.

Cost Proposal



October 4, 2019

TASK SUMMARY

Task No.	Task	Hours	Labor Costs	ODC's	TOTAL COST
1 EXECUTE ENGAGEMENT PLAN					
1.1 Task Management		108	\$18,886	\$0	\$18,886
1.2 Engagement Plan Review		54	\$8,652	\$0	\$8,652
1.3 Implementation of Engagement Program		0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1.3a Study Mailing List and Comment Database		68	\$8,020	\$0	\$8,020
1.3b Community Briefings and Presentations		552	\$97,630	\$6,725	\$104,355
1.3c Brochures, Factsheets, and Handouts		216	\$31,565	\$15,100	\$46,665
1.3d Public Meetings		1616	\$273,189	\$17,910	\$291,099
1.3e Regional Connectivity Symposium		76	\$14,524	\$1,370	\$15,894
1.3f Community Events and Outreach		321	\$54,413	\$2,800	\$57,213
1.3g Social Media Engagement		312	\$50,667	\$1,000	\$51,667
1.3h Engagement Report		216	\$33,951	\$0	\$33,951
1.4 Website Upgrades and Maintenance		1054	\$188,633	\$2,500	\$191,133
	Total Task 1	4593	\$780,132	\$47,405	\$827,537
2 DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES					
2.1 Summarize Background Information		0	\$29,731	\$0	\$29,731
2.2 Develop Geometry of Preliminary Alternatives		864	\$121,522	\$200	\$121,722
2.3 Hydraulics and Hydrology		88	\$13,831	\$0	\$13,831
2.4 Structures		360	\$58,936	\$0	\$58,936
2.5 Utilities and Railroad Crossings		72	\$9,828	\$0	\$9,828
2.6 Planning Cost Estimates		292	\$45,446	\$50	\$45,496
	Total Task 2	1,676	\$279,294	\$250	\$279,544
3 DETERMINATION OF CANDIDATE ALTERNATIVES (Screen 1)					
3.1 Conduct Congestion Relief Assessments		376	\$61,943	\$50	\$61,993
3.2 Conduct Permitability Assessments		600	\$77,268	\$3,600	\$80,868
3.3 Conduct Constructability Assessments		80	\$11,682	\$50	\$11,732
	Total Task 3	1056	\$150,893	\$3,700	\$154,593
4 CONDUCT SCENARIO PLANNING					
4.8a Confirmation/Network Coding of Candidate RCS projects for testing		150	\$26,098	\$0	\$26,098
4.8b Travel Demand Modeling for Baseline and 3 Greater Growth Scenarios (each Candidate Project)		800	\$139,189	\$500	\$139,689
4.8c Evaluate Performance of Candidate Projects under Baseline and 3 Greater Growth Scenarios		898	\$143,969	\$33,715	\$177,684
4.8d Evaluate Traffic Operating Conditions		5308	\$678,498	\$50	\$678,548
4.9a Scenario Results Workshops		404	\$67,761	\$400	\$68,161
4.9b Recommendation Documentation		668	\$106,803	\$100	\$106,903
	Total Task 4	8228	\$1,162,317	\$34,765	\$1,197,082
5 PREPARE FOR AND ATTEND MEETINGS (WORKING GROUP AND STEERING COMMITTEE)					
5.1 Working Group Meetings		630	\$136,094	\$8,048	\$144,142
5.2 Steering Committee Meetings		222	\$49,091	\$1,625	\$50,716
	Total Task 5	852	\$185,185	\$9,673	\$194,858
6 MANAGE THE PROJECT					
6.1 Weekly Coordination with Study Leadership		1328	\$287,395	\$50	\$287,445
6.2 Schedule and Budget Oversight		556	\$109,949	\$0	\$109,949
6.3 Quality Assurance of Deliverables		372	\$100,536	\$1,000	\$101,536
	Total Task 6	2,256	\$497,880	\$1,050	\$498,930
7 PREPARE DOCUMENTATION					
7.1 Draft Study Report		882	\$143,490	\$20,300	\$163,790
7.2 Final Study Report		438	\$68,548	\$20,100	\$88,648
	Total Task 6	1,320	\$212,038	\$40,400	\$252,438
	TOTALS	19,981	\$3,267,739	\$137,243	\$3,404,982

TEAM SUMMARY

Task No.	Task	HOURS							LABOR COSTS							
		Baker	PRR	EPR	EDR Group	McPherson	Solstice	TOTAL	Baker	PRR	EPR	EDR Group	McPherson	Solstice	TOTAL	
1 EXECUTE ENGAGEMENT PLAN																
1.1	Task Management	0	108	0	0	0	0	108	\$0	\$18,886	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$18,886	
1.2	Engagement Plan Review	0	54	0	0	0	0	54	\$0	\$8,652	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,652	
1.3	Implementation of Engagement Program	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
1.3a	Study Mailing List and Comment Database	0	68	0	0	0	0	68	\$0	\$8,020	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,020	
1.3b	Community Briefings and Presentations	132	230	170	0	20	0	552	\$38,674	\$33,186	\$22,590	\$0	\$3,180	\$0	\$97,630	
1.3c	Brochures, Factsheets, and Handouts	20	184	0	0	0	12	216	\$6,473	\$23,547	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,545	\$31,565	
1.3d	Public Meetings	706	472	154	0	224	60	1616	\$152,828	\$62,900	\$19,494	\$0	\$30,240	\$7,727	\$273,189	
1.3e	Regional Connectivity Symposium	20	48	0	0	0	8	76	\$6,473	\$7,021	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,030	\$14,524	
1.3f	Community Events and Outreach	180	117	0	0	0	24	321	\$35,938	\$15,384	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,091	\$54,413	
1.3g	Social Media Engagement	96	216	0	0	0	0	312	\$22,692	\$27,976	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50,667	
1.3h	Engagement Report	136	80	0	0	0	0	216	\$25,139	\$8,812	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$33,951	
1.4	Website Upgrades and Maintenance	64	914	76	0	0	0	1054	\$13,731	\$166,910	\$7,992	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$188,633	
	Total Task 1	1354	2491	400	0	244	104	4593	\$301,948	\$381,295	\$50,076	\$0	\$33,420	\$13,393	\$780,132	
2 DEVELOPMENT OF PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES																
2.1	Summarize Background Information	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$29,731	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$29,731	
2.2	Develop Geometry of Preliminary Alternatives	704	0	0	0	160	0	864	\$99,922	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,600	\$0	\$121,522	
2.3	Hydraulics and Hydrology	88	0	0	0	0	0	88	\$13,831	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$13,831	
2.4	Structures	360	0	0	0	0	0	360	\$58,936	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$58,936	
2.5	Utilities and Railroad Crossings	72	0	0	0	0	0	72	\$9,828	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,828	
2.6	Planning Cost Estimates	292	0	0	0	0	0	292	\$45,446	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$45,446	
	Total Task 2	1,676	0	0	0	160	0	1836	\$257,694	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$21,600	\$0	\$279,294	
3 DETERMINATION OF CANDIDATE ALTERNATIVES (Screen 1)																
3.1	Conduct Congestion Relief Assessments	376	0	0	0	0	0	376	\$61,943	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$61,943	
3.2	Conduct Permitability Assessments	0	0	0	0	0	600	600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$77,268	\$77,268	
3.3	Conduct Constructability Assessments	80	0	0	0	0	0	80	\$11,682	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,682	
	Total Task 3	456	0	0	0	0	600	1056	\$73,625	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$77,268	\$150,893
4 CONDUCT SCENARIO PLANNING																
4.8a	Confirmation/Network Coding of Candidate RCS projects for testing	150	0	0	0	0	0	150	\$26,098	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$26,098	
	Travel Demand Modeling for Baseline and 3 Greater Growth Scenarios (each Candidate Project)	800	0	0	0	0	0	800	\$139,189	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$139,189	
4.8c	Evaluate Performance of Candidate Projects under Baseline and 3 Greater Growth Scenarios	272	0	296	330	0	0	898	\$51,933	\$0	\$34,704	\$57,332	\$0	\$0	\$143,969	
4.8d	Evaluate Traffic Operating Conditions	4,190	0	0	0	1,118	0	5308	\$562,248	\$0	\$0	\$116,250	\$0	\$0	\$678,498	
4.9a	Scenario Results Workshops	248	0	80	76	0	0	404	\$45,510	\$0	\$8,532	\$13,718	\$0	\$0	\$67,761	
4.9b	Recommendation Documentation	348	0	244	76	0	0	668	\$62,139	\$0	\$31,680	\$12,984	\$0	\$0	\$106,803	
	Total Task 4	6,008	0	620	482	1118	0	8228	\$887,117	\$0	\$74,916	\$84,034	\$116,250	\$0	\$1,162,317	
5 PREPARE FOR AND ATTEND MEETINGS (WORKING GROUP AND STEERING COMMITTEE)																
5.1	Working Group Meetings	420	48	36	80	16	30	630	\$98,746	\$10,310	\$6,156	\$14,219	\$2,800	\$3,863	\$136,094	
5.2	Steering Committee Meetings	166	24	0	12	0	20	222	\$39,150	\$5,334	\$0	\$2,032	\$0	\$2,576	\$49,091	
	Total Task 5	586	72	36	92	16	50	852	\$137,896	\$15,643	\$6,156	\$16,251	\$2,800	\$6,439	\$185,185	
6 MANAGE THE PROJECT																
6.1	Weekly Coordination with Study Leadership	786	200	100	96	60	86	1328	\$190,180	\$43,266	\$15,660	\$16,714	\$10,500	\$11,075	\$287,395	
6.2	Schedule and Budget Oversight	258	240	0	18	0	40	556	\$58,276	\$43,474	\$0	\$3,047	\$0	\$5,151	\$109,949	
6.3	Quality Assurance of Deliverables	300	72	0	0	0	0	372	\$80,225	\$20,311	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100,536	
	Total Task 6	1,344	512	100	114	60	126	2,256	\$328,681	\$107,051	\$15,660	\$19,762	\$10,500	\$16,226	\$497,880	
7 PREPARE DOCUMENTATION																
7.1	Draft Study Report	732	0	0	30	0	120	882	\$122,899	\$0	\$0	\$5,137	\$0	\$15,454	\$143,490	
7.2	Final Study Report	368	0	0	30	0	40	438	\$58,259	\$0	\$0	\$5,137	\$0	\$5,151	\$68,548	
	Total Task 7 Costs	1,100	0	0	60	0	160	1,320	\$181,158	\$0	\$0	\$10,275	\$0	\$20,605	\$212,038	
	TOTALS	12,524	3,075	1,156	748	1,598	1,040	20,141	\$2,168,120	\$503,989	\$146,808	\$130,321	\$184,570	\$133,931	\$3,267,739	
	ODC															
	TOTALS															
	Work Split	65%														
		16%														
		4%														
		5%														
		5%														
		4%														
		100%														

TEAM SUMMARY

Task No.	Task	Other Direct Costs								TOTAL
		Reproduction	Travel	Lodging	Per Diem	Communication/Postage				
1 EXECUTE ENGAGEMENT PLAN										
1.1 Task Management		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1.2 Engagement Plan Review		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1.3 Implementation of Engagement Program		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1.3a Study Mailing List and Comment Database		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1.3b Community Briefings and Presentations		\$350	\$4,600	\$1,338	\$438	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$6,725
1.3c Brochures, Factsheets, and Handouts		\$15,100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$15,100
1.3d Public Meetings		\$5,800	\$5,922	\$3,250	\$1,438	\$1,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17,910
1.3e Regional Connectivity Symposium		\$120	\$500	\$350	\$150	\$250	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,370
1.3f Community Events and Outreach		\$300	\$1,200	\$400	\$400	\$500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,800
1.3g Social Media Engagement		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000
1.3h Engagement Report		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
1.4 Website Upgrades and Maintenance		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$2,500
Total Task 1 Costs		\$21,670	\$12,222	\$5,338	\$2,426	\$5,750	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$47,405
2 DETERMINE STUDY ALTERNATIVES										
2.1 Summarize Background Information		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2.2 Develop Geometry of Preliminary Alternatives		\$200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200
2.3 Hydraulics and Hydrology		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2.4 Structures		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2.5 Utilities and Railroad Crossings		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
2.6 Planning Cost Estimates		\$50	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50
Total Task 2 Costs		\$200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$200
3 DETERMINATION OF CANDIDATE ALTERNATIVES (Screen 1)										
3.1 Conduct Congestion Relief Assessments		\$50	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50
3.2 Conduct Permitability Assessments		\$800	\$1,600	\$800	\$400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,600
3.3 Conduct Constructability Assessments		\$50	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50
Total Task 3 Costs		\$900	\$1,600	\$800	\$400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,700
4 CONDUCT SCENARIO PLANNING										
4.8a testing		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
4.8b Travel Demand Modeling for Baseline and 3 Greater Growth Scenarios (each Candidate Project)		\$500	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$500
4.8c Evaluate Performance of Candidate Projects under Baseline and 3 Greater Growth Scenarios		\$150	\$265	\$0	\$0	\$33,300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$33,715
4.8d Evaluate Traffic Operating Conditions		\$50	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50
4.9a Scenario Results Workshops		\$100	\$300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$400
4.9b Recommendation Documentation		\$100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$100
Total Task 4 Costs		\$900	\$565	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$33,300	\$0	\$0	\$34,765
5 PREPARE FOR AND ATTEND MEETINGS (WORKING GROUP AND STEERING COMMITTEE)										
5.1 Working Group Meetings		\$2,400	\$4,148	\$900	\$600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,048
5.2 Steering Committee Meetings		\$1,000	\$625	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,625
Total Task 5 Costs		\$3,400	\$4,773	\$900	\$600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,673
6 MANAGE THE PROJECT										
6.1 Weekly Coordination with Study Leadership		\$50	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$50
6.2 Schedule and Budget Oversight		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
6.3 Quality Assurance of Deliverables		\$1,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,000
Total Task 6 Costs		\$1,050	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,050
7 PREPARE DOCUMENTATION										
7.1 Draft Study Report		\$20,300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,300
7.2 Final Study Report		\$20,100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,100
Total Task 7 Costs		\$40,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$40,400
TOTAL COSTS		\$68,520	\$19,160	\$7,038	\$3,426	\$5,750	\$33,300	\$0	\$0	\$137,193