

ATTACHMENT 6B

PHASE 2 SCOPE COMMENTS

(since Jan 29)



From: Fowler, Brian <brian.fowler@norfolk.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, February 5, 2019 3:11 PM
To: Camelia Ravanbakht
Cc: Inman, Amy M; Armstrong, Christine
Subject: RE: Regional Connectors Study Meeting Follow Up

Regarding the Draft Phase 2 Scope/Schedule, our key comments follow:

Camelia,

The City of Norfolk has the following comments:

[Regional Connectors Study Phase 2 Draft Scope - Comments from City of Norfolk](#)

OVERALL

Work-flow in terms of logical sequencing and relationship between TASK sections is difficult to ascertain. Our interpretation of the sequence of events based on the provided scope and schedule is that there are significant pitfalls. Also, there seems to be some lack of congruence between TASKS 2, 3 and 4 on the issue of alternatives evaluation processes, a crucial aspect of the study.

Sequence of Tasks

Please provide a project schedule that applies a CPM approach. This would ensure that the sequence of events and TASK durations are logically thought out and the proposed schedule is achievable. This should include reasonable times for Working Group, Steering Committee, Public, and other key collaborations that will be necessary for success. The Working Group in particular needs time to consume task and subtask products for consideration and subsequent guidance.

In the Scope there appears to be virtually no relationship between the Development of Alternatives and the Scenario Planning Tasks. These are in fact inextricably linked. For consideration of inclusion in the Financially Constrained LRTP, the first criteria that a major project should meet is that it is consistent with the Vision Plan. The Scenario Planning process exists to provide crucial input into the development of the Vision Plan. It is only after the initial alternatives (remaining segments from the SEIS) vetting and results of the Scenario Planning/Vision Plan process, that a truly productive identification-development of new or modified alternatives can take place.

As such, the efforts for Tasks 2 and 3 should be scaled back, and this should be reflected in the proposed Phase 2 fee. During the time-frame allocated in the proposed schedule for Task 2, the Consultant should establish a thorough understanding of the “remaining” SEIS-defined segments, design/alignment drivers and natural environment impacts, as well as other critical study issues such as, but not limited to, freight/truck movement demands, military access needs, and evacuation needs. Following this knowledge-gathering, the Consultant should conduct a series of meetings/presentations to inform Working Group members sufficiently for future collaborative engagement in the alternatives development process. Depending on the outcome of this exercise, there may be some investigation into alternative approaches to concepts aimed at mitigating environmental, cost or constructability obstacles that could be applied during the later development of additional alternatives.

Developing Goals/Purpose and Need and Evaluation Criteria/Processes

This is an extremely critical portion of this project. Some aspect of this seems to be addressed in Tasks 2, 3 and 4, with some inconsistencies. What is described in Task 4.3 seems to be on the right track. Notably, we believe that it may be necessary to incorporate some “new” analysis methodologies

to support critical criteria, and this task could take longer than proposed. Further, we believe at a minimum the evaluation criteria should include innovative or advanced methods for assessing accessibility and reliability.

Task 3/3.1 seems to suggest that the first level of screening/permitability analysis will only consider some measures of congestion relief on the benefits side of analysis, rather than applying some level of analysis of the full evaluation criteria emerging from Task 4.3.

Respectfully,

Brian C. Fowler, PE, PTOE

Assistant City Transportation Engineer



Department of Public Works – Division of Transportation

810 Union Street, Suite 200

Norfolk, VA 23510

757-664-7303

Connect with us:

www.norfolk.gov





<< The City of Norfolk comments are under consideration and responses to their comments will be provided in a supplemental agenda packet that includes alternative scope and costs.>>

=====

From: Rob Case <rcase@hrtpo.org>
Sent: Monday, February 4, 2019 9:26:47 AM
To: Camelia Ravanbakht (camelia.ravanbakht@outlook.com)
Cc: Dale Stith; Kendall Miller; Keith Nichols; Mike Kimbrel
Subject: comments on draft Phase 2 Scope distributed for 1-29-19 joint meeting

Camelia,

My comments on the draft Phase 2 scope (version prepared for the joint meeting today) follow:

- On page 8, concerning Task 3 “Determination of Candidate Alternatives (Screen 1)”, given that any projects emerging from the RCS will only be built if they pass the **congestion-relief screen required by law for HRTAC funding**, it is good that you have included “congestion relief” as one of the key criteria for the screening process. To explain and support this consideration of congestion relief in the screening process, we recommend that you mention the legal HRTAC congestion-relief requirement in this section. **The HRTAC requirement has been incorporated into the text.**
- On page 11, now that **alternatives analysis has been removed from Task 4**, we recommend re-labeling of that task (currently: “Task 4- Conduct Alternatives Analysis via Scenario Planning”). Likewise, the two paragraphs under the Task 4 heading should be revised to indicate that alternatives analysis will be conducted in Phase 3. (For example, given that no testing of candidate projects will be done in Phase 2, Task 4, it is no longer appropriate to include “The RCS Steering Committee...will receive the results of the scenario planning testing of Candidate Alternatives...” in this section as written.) **Revisions made in accordance with these comments.**

- On page 15, given that VDOT/HRTPO are currently updating the model, the three bullets of “recommended actions” under Task 4.1j (“Review Data Describing Regional Travel Behavior”) seem unnecessary: It is **the responsibility of VDOT & HRTPO** 1) that “the model represent well the travel markets that use the Harbor crossings” (the first bullet), 2) to “evaluate and update external travel (XX, XI, IX) with respect to the region” (the second bullet), and 3) to “assess need for special generator representation” (the third bullet). **Scope revised and text removed in accordance with this comment.**

Rob

=====

From: Camelia Ravanbakht <camelia.ravanbakht@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, February 01, 2019 11:05 AM
To: Tracee Strum-Gilliam <tstrum-gilliam@prrbiz.com>
Cc: Eddy, Craig <Craig.Eddy@mbakerintl.com>
Subject: EXTERNAL: FW: Phase 2 Scope Development and Engagement Plan Alignment

Tracee- Please see below responses from the TPO staff as you had requested for Comments 4, 5, and 9.

Thanks,
-Camelia

Camelia Ravanbakht, PhD
RCS Project Coordinator
757.617.5685

From: Mike Kimbrel <mkimbrel@hrtpo.org>
Sent: Friday, February 1, 2019 9:49:58 AM
To: camelia.ravanbakht@outlook.com
Cc: Kendall Miller
Subject: FW: Phase 2 Scope Development and Engagement Plan Alignment

Camelia – I agree with Kendall’s comments below. Please forward to the sub-consultant.

Thanks

MK

From: Kendall Miller
Sent: Friday, February 01, 2019 9:38 AM
To: Mike Kimbrel
Cc: camelia.ravanbakht@outlook.com
Subject: RE: Phase 2 Scope Development and Engagement Plan Alignment

Mike,

Please signal to Camelia, that once you have approved, this can go back to the Sub consultant

Thanks

Kendall

Comment #4 – The PRR proposed action is unclear. To HRTPO staff knowledge, the only documents PRR has stated will be printed are a brochure and a rack card. Both of those items should be translated. If there are additional documents that PRR will be producing, please advise and we’ll provide an HRTPO staff response. **PRR will prepare postcard/rack card, factsheets, posters/flyers, meeting presentation templates and comments cards for printing in Phase 2. We have not budgeted for printing of the brochure as the public meetings will not be held in Phase 2. The team will advance the draft brochure so that its ready for phase 3 when meeting locations and dates are secured. PRR has budget to translate the factsheet and flyer into two languages. The only items that would necessitate additional budget would be the translation of a full report and the draft brochure in advance of Phase 3. REPLY REQUESTED BY HRTPO**

Kendall: There is no need to translate the full report. The draft brochure slated for phases 3 should also be digital so that it can be uploaded to the RCS website. From there, it can be translated.

Comment #5 – This items needs additional discussion. HRTPO staff recommends the scope be modified to clarify that the Consultant Team will document the outreach and engagement efforts as related to EJ, Title VI, and NEPA and submit such documentation to HRTPO staff for review/approval. **The scope covers language regarding the preparation of an engagement summary (Engagement Report will be completed in Phase 3). PRR will add the language requested above. ACTION REQUIRED BY PRR**

Kendall: Acceptable

Comment #9 – If the Consultant Team believes a project video is appropriate for inclusion in Phase 2, it should be included in the scope and budget for phase 2 along with reasoning and justification. **We With respect of to the budget this task along with the ziosks were slated for investigation and concept development in Phase 2 to ensure HRTPO supported the cost and concept for incorporation in Phase 3. REPLY REQUESTED BY HRTPO**

Kendall: Acceptable

From: Mike Kimbrel
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 3:28 PM
To: Kendall Miller
Subject: Fwd: Phase 2 Scope Development and Engagement Plan Alignment

What do you think regarding the items for which they want an HRTPO response?

Thanks

MK

Begin forwarded message:

From: Camelia Ravanbakht <camelia.ravanbakht@outlook.com>
Date: January 31, 2019 at 3:21:41 PM EST
To: Mike Kimbrel <mkimbrel@hrtpo.org>, Kendall Miller <kmillier@hrtpo.org>
Subject: **FW: Phase 2 Scope Development and Engagement Plan Alignment**

Please see below and a need for the TPO staff to respond to comments 4,5,and 9.

Camelia Ravanbakht, PhD

RCS Project Coordinator

757.617.5685

From: Tracee Strum-Gilliam <tstrum-gilliam@prrbiz.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 3:15:59 PM
To: Camelia Ravanbakht
Cc: Eddy, Craig
Subject: RE: Phase 2 Scope Development and Engagement Plan Alignment

Please see correction below.

TRACEÉ STRUM-GILLIAM, AICP

Director, East Coast Business Development | Transportation Lead

202.550.6373 | tstrum-gilliam@prrbiz.com

PRR

8 Market Place, Suite 300

Baltimore, Maryland 21202

www.prrbiz.com

Experts in human-powered change

From: Tracee Strum-Gilliam [<mailto:tstrum-gilliam@prrbiz.com>]
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 3:11 PM
To: Camelia Ravanbakht <camelia.ravanbakht@outlook.com>

Cc: Eddy, Craig <Craig.Eddy@mbakerintl.com>

Subject: Re: Phase 2 Scope Development and Engagement Plan Alignment

Camelia-

We reviewed the responses, the scope and have back checked the draft plan. We are in need of HRTPO response and acknowledgement for Comments 4, 5 and 9.

10. Comment #1 omitted. Assumed PRR response is ok.
11. Comment #2 – Kendall should be listed as the point of contact for public questions on the website and all printed materials. **Confirmed**
12. Comment #3 – We are good with the PRR response. **Confirmed**
13. Comment #4 – The PRR proposed action is unclear. To HRTPO staff knowledge, the only documents PRR has stated will be printed are a brochure and a rack card. Both of those items should be translated. If there are additional documents that PRR will be producing, please advise and we'll provide an HRTPO staff response. **PRR will prepare postcard/rack card, factsheets, posters/flyers, meeting presentation templates and comments cards for printing in Phase 2. We have not budgeted for printing of the brochure as the public meetings will not be held in Phase 2. The team will advance the draft brochure so that its ready for phase 3 when meeting locations and dates are secured. PRR has budget to translate the factsheet and flyer into two languages. The only items that would necessitate additional budget would be the translation of a full report and the draft brochure in advance of Phase 3. REPLY REQUESTED BY HRTPO**
14. Comment #5 – This items needs additional discussion. HRTPO staff recommends the scope be modified to clarify that the Consultant Team will document the outreach and engagement efforts as related to EJ, Title VI, and NEPA and submit such documentation to HRTPO staff for review/approval. **The scope covers language regarding the preparation of an engagement summary (Engagement Report will be completed in Phase 3). PRR will add the language requested above. ACTION REQUIRED BY PRR**
15. Comment #6 – When it comes to the public meetings, the Consultant Team should be the contact to answer questions about the location, accessibility, etc. of the meeting facilities. General questions about HRTPO, Title VI, EJ, etc. should be directed to Kendall. **Confirmed**
16. Comment #7 – A media strategy is not the same as acting as a media spokesperson. It is not assumed that PRR will act as the media spokesperson, but it is expected that they will develop a media strategy. **Confirmed**
17. Comment #8 – HRTPO staff will incorporate the social media strategy for the RCS into the current HRTPO social media strategy for the HRTPO as a whole. As such, HRTPO staff will facilitate the RCS Facebook campaign. PRR will prepare the material and HRTPO staff will upload it. **Confirmed**
18. Comment #9 – If the Consultant Team believes a project video is appropriate for inclusion in Phase 2, it should be included in the scope and budget for phase 2 along with reasoning and justification. **We With respect of to the budget this task along with the ziosks were slated for investigation and concept development in Phase 2 to ensure HRTPO supported the cost and concept for incorporation in Phase 3. REPLY REQUESTED BY HRTPO**

TRACEÉ STRUM-GILLIAM, AICP

Director, East Coast Business Development | Transportation Lead

202.550.6373 | tstrum-gilliam@prrbiz.com

PRR

8 Market Place Suite 300

Baltimore, Maryland 21202

www.prrbiz.com

Experts in human-powered change

On Jan 30, 2019, at 8:45 AM, Tracee Strum-Gilliam <tstrum-gilliam@prrbiz.com> wrote:

Thank you Camelia. We'll review today and get back to you with any questions.

TRACEÉ STRUM-GILLIAM, AICP

Director, East Coast Business Development | Transportation Lead

202.550.6373 | tstrum-gilliam@prrbiz.com

PRR

8 Market Place Suite 300

Baltimore, Maryland 21202

www.prrbiz.com

Experts in human-powered change

On Jan 29, 2019, at 3:31 PM, Camelia Ravanbakht <camelia.ravanbakht@outlook.com> wrote:

Tracee – Please see below TPO staff responses regarding your 9 questions.

Best,

Camelia

Camelia Ravanbakht, PhD

RCS Project Coordinator

757.617.5685

From: [Mike Kimbrel](#)

Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 3:24 PM

To: '[Camelia Ravanbakht](#)'; [Kendall Miller](#)

Subject: RE: Phase 2 Scope Development and Engagement Plan Alignment

Camelia,

Kendall and I have discussed her comments below and agree on the following:

10. Comment #2 – Kendall should be listed as the point of contact for public questions on the website and all printed materials. Confirmed
11. Comment #3 – We are good with the PRR response. Confirmed
12. Comment #4 – The PRR proposed action is unclear. To HRTPO staff knowledge, the only documents PRR has stated will be printed are a brochure and a rack card. Both of those items should be translated. If there are additional documents that PRR will be producing, please advise and we'll provide an HRTPO staff response. PRR will prepare PowerPoint templates, comments cards and other items. We have not budgeted to translate reports at this time.
13. Comment #5 – This item needs additional discussion. HRTPO staff recommends the scope be modified to clarify that the Consultant Team will document the outreach and engagement efforts as related to EJ, Title VI, and NEPA and submit such documentation to HRTPO staff for review/approval. The scope covers language regarding the preparation of an engagement summary. PRR will add the language above.

14. Comment #6 – When it comes to the public meetings, the Consultant Team should be the contact to answer questions about the location, accessibility, etc. of the meeting facilities. General questions about HRTPO, Title VI, EJ, etc. should be directed to Kendall. Confirmed
15. Comment #7 – A media strategy is not the same as acting as a media spokesperson. It is not assumed that PRR will act as the media spokesperson, but it is expected that they will develop a media strategy. Confirmed
16. Comment #8 – HRTPO staff will incorporate the social media strategy for the RCS into the current HRTPO social media strategy for the HRTPO as a whole. As such, HRTPO staff will facilitate the RCS Facebook campaign. PRR will prepare the material and HRTPO staff will upload it. Confirmed
17. Comment #9 – If the Consultant Team believes a project video is appropriate for inclusion in Phase 2, it should be included in the scope and budget for phase 2 along with reasoning and justification. We are not in a position to develop scope and budget for the video or ziosks. We will advance conversations and submit in phase 3.

We hope you find this helpful.

MK

<1EF36973881643FF8DA8CE3CB08F3E8A.jpg>

Michael S. Kimbrel

Deputy Executive Director

Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization

The Regional Building 723 Woodlake Drive Chesapeake, Virginia 23320

mkimbrel@hrtpo.org | www.hrtpo.org | Phone: 757.420.8300 | Fax: 757.523.4881

<6E9FBE8352404029A0FB55F2FD2BF60A.png>[like us on Facebook](#) <90583F556C50417EABADC990A843577D.jpg>[follow us on twitter](#)

From: Tracee Strum-Gilliam

Sent: Thursday, January 24, 2019 3:24 PM

To: Kendall Miller <kmiller@hrtpo.org>; camelia.ravanbakht@outlook.com

Cc: Eddy, Craig <Craig.Eddy@mbakerintl.com>; Meghan Robinson <mrobinson@prrbiz.com>; Mike Kimbrel <mkimbrel@hrtpo.org>; Jill Hannay <jhannay@prrbiz.com>

Subject: Phase 2 Scope Development and Engagement Plan Alignment

Importance: High

Good Afternoon-

PRR is in the process of reviewing the Phase 2 scope per HRTPO's request. It was brought to my attention that HRTPO may have concerns about the possible need for HRTPO staff support outside of the typical review and coordination process for the engagement program in Phase 2. I believe these questions are related to the engagement plan versus the engagement scope as submitted but I wanted to take the time make sure that PRR is in alignment with HRTPO's expectations. Below you will find a series of questions from HRTPO's review of the draft engagement plan. We are in need of feedback on the proposed actions highlighted in yellow to update the Phase 2 scope and budget. Please advise as soon as possible.

Engagement Plan Questions

Comment #1 "HRTPO will build informed consent for the project among community members and other stakeholders."

- HRTPO comment – I was not aware that this effort will be conducted by HRTPO, Rather, my understanding is that it will be conducted but by the consultants. We haven't budgeted time or resources for this effort.
- Topic – HRTPO Community Engagement Goals
- **PRR Response** – PRR wrote the engagement plan from the perspective that HRTPO was the owner of the plan and the study team was acting on HRTPO's behalf to deliver. The bullets noted under goal 3 are the responsibility of the study team. PRR will update the language in the document if that is the preferred remedy.
- **Proposed Action** – Goal 3 requires that HRTPO and the Working Group review and provide comments on the materials that the study team develops. No Scope or budget action required by PRR.

Comment #2 "The study team will research and respond to public inquires, ideas, and concerns in a timely manner."

- HRTPO's comment – I would like to work with the study team to arrive at a method for handling public inquires- would like to have it mimic HRTPO procedural steps to responding to public inquires. .
- Topic – HRTPO Community Engagement Goals
- **PRR Response** – PRR will schedule a meeting in Phase 2 to work with HRTPO to understand process so that the team can follow approved steps.
- **Proposed Action** – PRR will add scope to cover this specific meeting with HRTPO if desired. HRTPO to confirm who should be listed as the point of contact for public questions on the website and all printed materials. Should this be the Craig, a PRR team member or another HRTPO Staff person. The study team will develop responses to all comments. No budget action is required by PRR.

Comment #3 “The study team will provide a process and the tools to allow stakeholders and the public to engage in meaningful ways, giving feedback and input on major decisions before they are finalized.”

- HRTPO’s comment – No specifics?
- Topic – HRTPO Community Engagement Goals
- **PRR Response** – PRR added the following statement “This will be accomplished through the implementation of the tools and tactics put forth this plan with a focus on timing and frequency to ensure that feedback is received at critical decision points in the study development process.”
- **Proposed Action** – No Scope or budget action required by PRR.

Comment #4 “The study team will ensure that all project documents are clearly written and easily understood by a non-technical audience.”

- HRTPO’s comment – Please allow for certain items to be done in alternate languages and or altered for the elderly (larger print, avoidance of certain font colors, etc.)
- Topic – HRTPO Community Engagement Goals
- **PRR Response** – PRR has planned for the translation of factsheets and flyers in the current budget.
- **Proposed Action** – HRTPO please confirm which additional documents to be produced in phase 2 should be assumed for budget purposes. Scope and budget action by PRR pending.

Comment #5 “HRTPO will document all outreach and engagement efforts as required by the NEPA, including the Environmental Justice (EJ) analysis and outreach effort outlined in Executive Order (EO) 12898 – Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.”

- HRTPO’s comment – How can HRTPO Document your efforts? I think the consultant needs to document their efforts, and then submit to HRTPO staff (KLM, MK, CR) for review and an assurance that the efforts meet HRTPO standards per EJ and Title VI Guidelines.
- Topic – Environmental Justice Regulatory Requirements
- **PRR Response** – PRR wrote the engagement plan from the perspective that HRTPO was the owner of the plan and the study team was acting on HRTPO’s behalf to deliver. All EJ analysis, outreach and documentation are the responsibility of the study team. PRR will update the language in the document if that is the preferred remedy.
- **Proposed Action** – The EJ effort requires that HRTPO and the Working Group review maps, data and summaries that the study team develops. No Scope or budget action required by PRR.

Comment #6 Excerpt from Public Meeting Notice Title VI Statement “The HRTPO will strive to provide reasonable accommodations and services for persons who require special assistance to participate in this public involvement opportunity. Contact Ms. Kendall Miller, Public Involvement and Title VI Administrator, at (757) 420-8300 for more information. Para información en español, llame al (757) 366-4375.”

- HRTPO’s comment - We need to discuss this. Why am I (Kendall) providing this level of support for this effort? I would think calls would go to the consultant. I don’t to be put in the position of having to message the team with issues, etc.
- Topic – Title VI, Public Meeting Notices (request for interpreter and sign language services)
- **PRR Response** – PRR will revise to list the staff person who will facilitate requests for translation and sign language support.
- **Proposed Action** – HRTPO to confirm who should be listed as the point of contact for public requests. We suggest that a PRR Team Member do this if it is determined that an HRTPO Staff person should not be the public facing contact person. No Scope or budget action required by PRR at this time. This will be applicable in to the Phase 3 scope.

Comment #7 “The study team may provide information on the project to media outlets under the direction of HRTPO. For example, the study team will evaluate the use of ethnic media outlets such as Tidewater Hispanic News and mainstream media outlets including the Virginian-Pilot and the Daily Press.”

- HRTPO’s comment - Please explain, “under the direction of HRTPO> Is this an effort HRTPO is expected to initiative, or, are you asking that we grant approval for a proposed effort, for example?”
- Topic – News Media Outreach
- **PRR Response** – PRR has not assumed that we will serve as spokesperson for HRPTO on this project. All requests for interviews should be the responsibility of HRTPO. PRR has assumed that the team will develop press kits and coordinate with the press as **directed and/or approved** by HRTPO to respond to press inquiries, pitch positive news coverage, etc.
- **Proposed Action** – HRTPO to confirm if PRR should take on the expressed duty to serve as project spokesperson. Scope and budget action by PRR pending.

Comment #8 “HRTPO will manage Social Media Accounts. Consultant Team to prepare content and posting schedule each month”

- HRTPO’s comments – in reference to the table, “Why? We don’t have the time/resource etc. budgeted to do that.” “Are you proposing that a new FB account be established strictly for the study?”
- Topic – Social Media
- **PRR Response** – PRR made the assumption that HRTPO would like to use exiting social media accounts and post content for the project as provided by PRR.
- **Proposed Action** – HRTPO to confirm if PRR should create new social media accounts specific to the project or if HRPTO will give PRR’s social media team its passwords to exiting accounts for the team to make posts after receiving content approval from HRTPO. Scope and budget action by PRR pending.

Comment #9 Study Video (listed as a tool)

- Kendall's comment – who is filming? What are the details?
- **PRR Response** – PRR has added exploration of the development of a project video concept as a pending task along with kiosks. Scope and budget for a project video or kiosks campaign are not included in Phase 2 at this time.
- **Proposed Action** – HRTPO to confirm if PRR should include scope and budget for video development in Phase 2. Scope and budget action by PRR pending.

Website

- Kendall and Camelia: the website review period starts tomorrow (1/25/19). Jill will be emailing you today with instructions for completing that process.

TRACEÉ STRUM-GILLIAM, AICP

Director, East Coast Business Development | Transportation Lead

202.550.6373 | tstrum-gilliam@prrbiz.com

PRR

8 Market Place, Suite 300

Baltimore, Maryland 21202

www.prrbiz.com

Experts in human-powered change

