

September 13, 2019

**Memorandum #2019-139**

**TO: Regional Connectors Study (RCS) Working Group**

**BY: Camelia Ravanbakht, RCS Project Coordinator**

**RE: Regional Connectors Study Working Group Meeting – September 18, 2019**

Attached is the agenda for the **Regional Connectors Study Working Group Meeting** scheduled for **Wednesday, September 18, 2019 at 9:00 a.m.** in the Regional Board Room (B), 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

**September 18, 2019**

**9:00 AM**

The Regional Building, Regional Board Room (B), 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 June 13, 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

Review all comments

Tasks

Tools for Evaluating Alternatives: FREEVAL, VISSIM, etc.

Schedule and Timeline

Attachment 6A – Draft Phase 3 Scope of Work

Attachment 6B – Comments on Draft Phase 3 Scope of Work

Attachment 6C – Traffic Analysis Software Comparison

- Recommended Action: For Review and Discussion

7. Next Meetings and Planned Activities: Camelia Ravanbakht, Project Coordinator
  - Hampton Roads Regional Economic Development (RED) Directors Meeting: Thursday **October 3, 2019**, 9:00 AM – 10:30 AM, Location TBD
  - RCS Working Group Meeting: Thursday **October 10**, 2019, 9:00 – 11:30 AM, Regional Building
  - HRPDC Planning Directors Meeting: October 2019 (tentative)
  - RCS Steering (Policy) Committee: Tuesday **November 5**, 2019, 9:30 – 11:00 AM, Regional Building
  - Proposed 4<sup>th</sup> Marine Terminal Site Visit and Presentation: Date TBD
  - Navy Fuel Depot Tour – New doodle poll circulating to determine best date/time
8. Other Items
9. Adjournment

**Regional Connectors Study  
Working Group Meeting  
Minutes  
June 13, 2019, 9:00am  
Regional Building, Chesapeake**

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

Rob Case (HRTPO)  
Beth Drylie (Michael Baker Intl.)  
Rick Dwyer (HRMFFA)  
Craig Eddy (Michael Baker Intl.)  
Jason Flowers (USACE)  
Brian Fowler (Norfolk)  
Robin Grier (VDOT)  
Greg Grootendorst (HRPDC)  
Carl Jackson (Portsmouth)  
George Janek (USACE)  
Mike Kimbrel (HRTPO)  
Michael King (Navy)  
Barbara Nelson (Port of Va.)  
Keith Nichols (HRTPO)  
Kevin Page (HRTAC)  
Lorna Parkins (Michael Baker Intl.)  
Camelia Ravanbakht (RCS Project Coordinator)  
Tara Reel (VB)  
Evandro Santos (Norfolk)  
Jason Souders (Suffolk)  
Bryan Stilley (NN)  
Dale Stith (HRTPO)

## **1. Call to Order**

Brian Stilley (Newport News) called the meeting to order at 9:09am.

## **2. Welcome and Introductions**

No attendees introduced themselves.

## **3. Public Comment Period**

There were no public comments.

## **4. Minutes**

The minutes of the May 21, 2019 scenario planning workshop were approved.

## **5. Phase 2 Supplement: Budget Issue due to Omission**

Craig Eddy (Michael Baker Intl.) presented a budget omission totaling approximately \$100,000, recommending it be added to the budget. The working group voted to recommend approval of the budget change to the HRTPO Board.

## **6. Scenario Planning Update**

Lorna Parkins (Michael Baker Intl.) reported on the webinar held last week, and asked the working group if they were ready for the consultant to move ahead with the three proposed scenarios:

- Greater Growth on the Water
- Greater Growth in Urban Centers
- Greater Suburban/Greenfield Growth

The working group voted to approve the scenario narratives.

Ms. Parkins recommended 2045 employment “greater growth” of 16% above the 2015 level (vs. base percentage of 8%). Brian Fowler (Norfolk) explained why he prefers 21% growth. Greg Grootendorst (HRPDC) explained that the base employment growth is low because of the aging population, our core industries, etc. Ms. Parkins noted the base 2045 population growth is 24% over today, and—once the greater employment growth is established—Greg Grootendorst (HRPDC) will estimate the greater population growth based on that greater employment growth. Mike Kimbrel (HRTPO) noted the expertise of the consultant and the need for the analysis to stick with 2045 as the forecast year. Robert Case (HRTPO) suggested that the working group keep in mind the population growth, e.g. that doubling the employment growth could double the population growth, in which case using 16% employment growth (double the base 8% growth) could cause the analysis to use 50% population growth (double the base 24% growth). Carl Jackson (Portsmouth) advocated the higher employment growth (21%); Tara Reel (Va. Beach) advocated the

recommended employment growth (16%); Jason Sounders (Suffolk) recommended a compromise. Ms. Parkins recommended starting with 16%, see the results, then decide whether to go higher. Kevin Page (HRTAC) stated that, if the HRTPO and HRTAC 2045 plans do not fully allocate expected Hampton Roads Transportation Fund (HRTF) revenues to projects, excess HRTF revenues must be used to pay off bonds for currently planned projects. Mr. Fowler moved that the consultant run the models with 16% employment growth, and then present the results to the group for it to decide whether or not that produces sufficient variation in the congestion of the existing+committed network between the scenarios. Ms. Reel seconded. Mr. Page asked the relationship between the RCS and the second round of HRTAC projects. Mr. Kimbrel stated that any project submitted by localities or coming out of the Congestion Management Process (CMP) update being conducted by HRTPO staff will be analyzed as candidates for the 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). The working group approved the motion.

Ms. Parkins presented the draft “Goals and Objectives + Performance Measures” (attachment 6A), having incorporated comments from the webinar. At Mr. Fowler’s request she will add a military component. Mr. Fowler moved that the working group recommend approval of the table (with the subject addition). The working group approved the motion.

## **7. Summary Project Briefing, Issue 1**

Camelia Ravanbakht (RCS Project Coordinator) presented attachment 7, a summary of the overview, past work, and future work of the RCS.

## **8. Schedule and Next Meetings**

Steering (Policy) Committee meeting: July 9, 2019, 10am

HRTPO Board meeting: July 18, 2019, 10:30am

Navy Fuel Depot site visit: date TBD (September was recommended)

4<sup>th</sup> Marine Terminal: date TBD (a visit to either the Va. International Gateway or Norfolk International Terminals was recommended, after the date of the fuel depot visit)

Webinars: June 27, July 11; both at 10am

Working group meeting: August 8 or 15

Barbara Nelson (Port of Va.) asked about the relationship between the RCS and the 2045 LRTP. Mr. Kimbrel stated that the RCS scenario planning tools must be completed by January 2020 to keep the 2045 LRTP on schedule.

## **9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned approximately at 11:15am.

# ATTACHMENT 6A

## 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. 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. Phase 3 covers the period from January 2020 through the completion of the study. 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.

##### **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 project management team. Progress reports will summarize and report the percentage complete of each task and provide the basis for the monthly invoice. Progress reports will be provided to the project management team in acceptable format. The engagement task leader will attend Consultant Team meetings as needed, including but not limited to bi-weekly engagement team meetings, internal team meetings, and

meetings with HRPTO 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 HRPTO 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 engagement team will conduct stakeholder outreach tasks to engage regional stakeholders as directed and approved by HRPTO. This will consist of outreach to the targeted stakeholders representing or living in the jurisdictions covered by HRPTO agreements. Activities to be implemented by the engagement team include:

#### **Task 1.3a Study Mailing list and Comment Database**

The engagement 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 engagement team will work closely with HRPTO to develop 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 engagement team will expand and update the list by encouraging interested parties to refer others to the list or through mailing list signups via the study website. The engagement 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 engagement 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 engagement team will schedule and attend up to 10 community nonprofit and organizations 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 maximum of 10 presentations will be conducted in Phase 3.

#### **Task 1.3c Brochures, Factsheets and Handouts**

The engagement team will prepare 1 draft meeting brochure 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 engagement team will prepare one postcard or rack card 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 maximum of 3,500 copies of the postcard or rack card for distribution.

The engagement team will develop posters, flyers and meeting presentation templates for the study. The team will generate up to 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 engagement team will work with HRPTO to plan, host and facilitate two rounds of seven public meetings during Phase 3 of the study. 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 anticipates each meeting series to be held as follows: 3 Peninsula meetings (Williamsburg, Newport News, and Hampton) and 4 Southside meetings (Norfolk, Virginia Beach, the Churchland/Western Branch area, and Suffolk). The engagement team will identify meeting locations for HRPTO approval, conduct onsite walk through and verify ADA accessibility, book meeting locations, provide refreshments, book court reporters, advertise meetings in various media (newspapers, ad buys, etc.) and secure, if required, any sign language interpreter and/or language translator as appropriate.

Meeting content will include, but not be limited to, scenario planning methodology and analysis results, potential alternatives, and alternatives' analysis results.

The engagement team will work with HRTPO to offer an online open house or live stream session for each meeting series for a total of two online events. Meeting notifications will be made in accordance with HRTPO policies and will use the full mailing list and locality networks. Social media and web announcements will be used. Additionally, in advance of the first set of meetings, a printed ad announcement with meeting information will be published in local media as approved by 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 can register using the GoToMeeting software. Once registered for the online open house, participants can 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 engagement team will plan in coordination with HRPTO staff 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 engagement team will assist HRTPO to 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.

### Task 1.3f Community Events and Outreach

The engagement team will plan up to 2 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 engagement team will investigate the use of ad space on kiosks in the region and a project informational video to be priced for HRTPO and Working Group consideration and approval.

### Task 1.3g 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 HRPTO 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 will also be covered under this scope.

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.

Finally, 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.

*Timing:*

*Meetings:*

- public meetings
- “pop-up” meetings
- Regional Connectivity Symposium
- Meetings with HRTPO staff:
- Working Group Meetings:
- Steering Committee Meetings:
- Other/Stakeholder Meetings:

*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
- 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 the five (5) corridors 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 these five preliminary alternatives, an additional five (5) alternatives will be developed as a result of suggestions made at stakeholder interviews and comments received during other project engagement activities.

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 the following subtasks.

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 scoping and methodology for alternatives analysis
- Documenting the alternatives analysis, including the practicability of the different alternatives
- Developing the preferred alternative

### Task 2.1: Develop Geometry of Preliminary Alternatives

#### **Task 2.1a 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 2.1b 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 2.2: 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 2.3: 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 2.5: 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 an ITS system where HOT lanes are proposed. 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 or disturbance. Wetland mitigation costs will be based on a per acre cost; 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:*

*Meetings:*

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

*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 Task 4.3 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 regulatory fatal flaws as well as develop a prioritization tool for the analyzed alternatives.

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.

### **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 integration 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 and indirect 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 cost/benefit (C/B) 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:*

*Meetings:*

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

*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 Alternatives Analysis via 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 (from Task 4.5) to uncover and flag any potential issues in the results.

#### **Task 4.8c: Performance Evaluation of Baseline and 3 Greater Growth Scenarios (each Candidate project)**

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 among the drivers. Also, the Consultant Team will provide all necessary input data for HRTPO staff to run the HRTPO Project Prioritization Tool 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 under Task 4.3 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: Develop Microsimulation Models**

##### **Existing Conditions Microsimulation Model**

This task will involve developing a VISSIM model based on the traffic conditions for the existing study area roadway network. The most important aspect of this existing conditions 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 Microsimulation Model**

Similar to the task of updating the Regional Travel Demand Model to a 2045 baseline scenario, the existing conditions VISSIM model will be updated to establish a baseline 2045 microsimulation model. 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 (microsimulation model and regional model) correlate with the HRTPO's Long Range Transportation Plan. Simulations will be prepared at the six (6) system-to-system interchanges in the Hampton Roads region (I-64/I-664, I-64/I-564, I-64/I-264, I-64/I-464, I-64/I-264/US 58, and I-664/164).

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 Microsimulation 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 VISSIM microsimulation model will be updated by adding the traffic volumes and traffic patterns for each of the three alternative scenarios. This is a necessary step because it is assumed that one of the three alternative land use scenarios will occur with or without the preferred Candidate Alternative(s).

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

Simulations will be prepared at the six (6) system-to-system interchanges in the Hampton Roads region.

### **Task 4.8e: Evaluate Candidate Alternatives**

Candidate Alternatives will be coded into the VISSIM microsimulation model for each future land use scenario (4 – Baseline and 3 Greater Growth scenarios). The microsimulations for these alternatives will only include the major highways and system-to-system interchanges and not the entire study area

roadway network. The outputs of these microsimulations will be compared to the 2045 baseline outputs to evaluate the congestion relief in much greater detail than the regional model scenario comparison.

Candidate Alternatives will be coded along with the same Existing + Committed roadway network as the microsimulation models for the 2045 Baseline Scenario and 2045 No-Build scenarios. This will maintain consistency and provide an ‘apples-to-apples’ comparison among Candidate Alternatives for each scenario planning option.

*Timing:*

- 10 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

#### **Task 4.8f: 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:*

*Meetings:*

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

*Deliverables:*

- 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 and to provide input on investment, policy, and other recommendations to carry forward from the analysis.

#### **Task 4.9b Packaging Scenario Results**

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 findings to the Working Group and Steering Committee at the conclusion of Task 4.9.

##### *Timing:*

##### *Meetings:*

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

##### *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:*

#### *Meetings:*

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

#### *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 HRTPO Project Manager and other HRTPO staff (assume 100 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.

### Task 6.5: Craney Island Navy Fuel Depot Site Visit

A maximum of three (3) Consultant Team members will accompany Working Group members on a guided tour of the Navy's Craney Island Fuel Depot. The purpose of the field visit is to gain a better appreciation of the surrounding operations and constraints to potential transportation alternatives.

### Task 6.6: Port of Virginia 4<sup>th</sup> Terminal Site Visit

A maximum of three (3) Consultant Team members will accompany Working Group members on a guided tour of the Port of Virginia's planned 4<sup>th</sup> terminal. The purpose of the field visit is to gain a better appreciation of the surrounding operations and constraints to potential transportation alternatives.

*Timing:*

*Meetings:*

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

*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:*

##### *Meetings:*

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

##### *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 6B

## 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.

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.

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.

Task 3.2 - We will offer comments on permittability 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).

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.

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

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

=====

## City of Norfolk

We are not supportive of the approach that is being taken.

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.

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 early Phase 3 task should be an HCM/FREEVAL analysis of existing conditions (validation), and for the 2045 Baseline scenario.

#### 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.

### 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.

## 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.

---

### **City of Portsmouth**

#### Task 1: Public Engagement Plan

- Please include the Working Group oversight with each HRTPO staff approval
- Please substitute Working Group for “project management team”
- Who is the “Engagement Team”, will this be a subcontractor?
- In addition to print materials, please consider improving your online and social media presence
- 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 online open house in Task 1.3 is a good idea, Portsmouth has some experience with Virtual Meetings
- Page 4, Paragraph 2 should say “kiosks” not ziosks
- 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
- Please consider incorporating the NEPA Merged Process which incorporates other state and federal agencies
- Please incorporate transit in your design alternative, such as a dedicated lane or tunnel for bus, LRT or BRT
- 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

#### Tasks 4-7:

- Have Tasks 4.1-4.7 been completed yet? Please incorporate a project schedule.
- Please incorporate a project budget
- Task 6.1 Please change to say “Weekly Coordination with **Working Group** and TPO Staff
- Task 6.5 There’s a stray “t” in line 2
- 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
- Please show the cost and fee structure for this Phase

---

#### **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.

Comments:

- use charette style public meetings and/or small groups table top style
- perhaps piggy back on the upcoming fall transportation meeting
- more social media updates and feedback
- gain working group approval prior to developing planning level cost estimates and models
- narrow the alternatives to 2/3 total

---

#### **TPO Staff**

- Responses to Portsmouth comments:
  - With regards to your comments on the Public Engagement Plan, the word “ziosk” is correct.
  - 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.
  - The Engagement Team is the subcontractor. TPO staff is not conducting the public involvement effort for this study.
  - I agree with you --- the sub consultant should increase their social media presence

General Comments:

1. “HRTPO” is misspelled as “HRPTO” a number of times throughout the scope.
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.?
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.

**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?
5. Task 1.3b – Please specify the minimum number of meetings of each type in which the consultant team will engage.
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.
7. Task 1.3d:
  - a. With regard to the four Southside meetings, rather than specifying the Churchland/Western Branch area, recommend replacing with Chesapeake.
  - b. Please note that all of the meetings must be accessible by public transit.
  - 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.
  - d. Third paragraph, second sentence – what is meant by “full mailing list and locality networks”?
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.
- 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).

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.

10. Task 2.5 – ITS systems should be assumed for all freeway alternatives, not only those where HOT lanes are proposed.

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.

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”).
- 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?] and will then determine any further iterations to run to explore cause-and-effect [cause and effect of what?] 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?].”

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?

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)”).

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.

# ATTACHMENT 6C

## REGIONAL CONNECTORS STUDY

### Traffic Analysis Software Comparison

Software	Analysis type	Suitable for freeway analysis?	Notes	Total Hrs per model (run)	52 models	Total cost	16 models
Highway Capacity Software (HCS)	Deterministic tool	yes	Unsuitable for oversaturated conditions	300			
VISSIM	microsimulation	yes	Labor intensive	518	\$2,836,900	\$1,087,000	
Synchro/Simtraffic	microsimulation	no	Unsuitable for freeway analysis	-			
Freeval	Deterministic tool	yes	High level tool	200	\$1,095,328	\$337,024	
CORSIM	microsimulation	yes	Labor intensive - outdated	400			
Sidra	Deterministic tool	no	Unsuitable for freeway analysis	-			

	Existing Conditions	Existing AM Existing PM	
	Future No-Build	Future Baseline AM Future Baseline PM	
	Future No-Build Land Use Scenario 1	Baseline Scenario 1 AM Baseline Scenario 1 PM	
	Future No-Build Land Use Scenario 2	Baseline Scenario 2 AM Baseline Scenario 2 PM	
	Future No-Build Land Use Scenario 3	Baseline Scenario 3 AM Baseline Scenario 3 PM	
	Future Build Alternative Analyses	42 models for Candidate Alts= (7 alternatives x 3 land use scenarios x 2 peak periods)	

52 Total models

	Existing Conditions	Existing AM Existing PM	
	Future No-Build	Future Baseline AM Future Baseline PM	
	Future No-Build Land Use Scenario 1	Baseline Scenario 1 AM Baseline Scenario 1 PM	
	Future No-Build Land Use Scenario 2	Baseline Scenario 2 AM Baseline Scenario 2 PM	
	Future No-Build Land Use Scenario 3	Baseline Scenario 3 AM Baseline Scenario 3 PM	
	Future Build Alternative Analyses	6 models for Candidate Alts= (1 preferred alternative x 3 land use scenarios x 2 peak periods)	

16 Total models