

September 7, 2017

**Memorandum #2017-108**

**TO: SEIS Working Group**

**BY: Camelia Ravanbakht, Deputy Executive Director**

**RE: HRCS SEIS Additional Corridors Study**

Attached is the **agenda** for the **SEIS Working Group meeting** scheduled for **Friday, September 15, 2017 10:00 am** at The Regional Board Room, located at 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake 23320.

CR/sc

**SEIS Working Group**

**Voting Members:**

Earl Sorey (CH)  
Lynn Allsbrook (HA)  
Bryan Stiley (NN)  
Brian Fowler (NO)  
Sherry Early (SU)  
James Wright (PO)  
Phil Pullen (VB)

**Nonvoting Members:**

Jason Flowers (Army Corps)  
George Janek (Army Corps)  
Robert Pruhs (Army Corps)  
Ivan Rucker (FHWA)  
Kevin Page (HRTAC)  
Rhonda Murray (US NAVY)  
Tony Gibson (VDOT)  
Scott Smizik (VDOT)  
Kit Chope (VPA)

**Staff:**

Bob Crum (HRTPO)  
Camelia Ravanbakht (HRTPO)  
Rob Case (HRTPO)  
Keith Nichols (HRTPO)  
Dale Sith (HRTPO)

**AGENDA**

**HRCS SEIS Additional Corridors Study**

**Working Group – September 15, 2017**

**10:00 AM**

**723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake, Virginia**

1. Call to Order
2. Welcome and Introductions
3. Public Comment Period (limit 3 minutes per individual)
4. Approval of Minutes
5. Membership – Working Group and Steering (Policy) Committee
6. Scope of Work: Review and Approve
7. Next Steps
8. Adjournment

## HRCS SEIS Additional Feasibility Studies

### Working Group

14 July 2017 @ Regional Building

### Summary Notes

1. Call to Order
  - a. Bob Crum (HRTPO) called the meeting to order.
2. Welcome and Introductions
  - a. Bob Crum welcomed members and audience.
3. Public Comment Period
  - a. [none]
4. Chronology of Events / Purpose of Study
  - a. Camelia Ravanbakht (HRTPO) presented a chronology of recent events (handout), highlights:
    - i. HRTPO transmitted invitations for this working group on 13 June 2017, one day after FHWA issued Record of Decision (ROD).
  - b. Camelia presented an overview of the 1 May 2017 MOU between HRTAC, HRTPO, and VDOT, highlights:
    - i. HRTPO to lead a working group
    - ii. HRTPO to lead the formation of a steering committee
5. Review Working Group membership and potential additions
  - a. Additional members
    - i. Bob Crum proposed adding members to the Working Group.
    - ii. Brian Fowler (Norfolk) stated a desire to limit the Working Group to cities.
    - iii. Earl Sorey (Chesapeake) suggested the Port Authority and others be added.
    - iv. Bob Baldwin (Portsmouth) proposed that cities be voters and others be advisors.
    - v. Crum reiterated Baldwin's proposal.
  - b. Project manager
    - i. Brian Fowler proposed an independent project manager, perhaps a full- or half-time-job, perhaps from a consulting firm (different from firm doing the studies).
    - ii. Bob Crum: MOU says HRTPO to lead, Camelia would be point of contact.
    - iii. Brian Fowler: TPO is federally funded, tied to FHWA and VDOT.
    - iv. Bob Baldwin: TPO has local jurisdiction bosses; proposed non-TPO project manager; does not want TPO pushback on requested technical analyses.
    - v. Earl Sorey: I trust Camelia as project manager.
    - vi. Lynn Allsbrook (Hampton): I agree, TPO staff good at dealing with politics.
    - vii. Sherry Early (Suffolk) proposed starting with TPO as p.m. then revisit later if necessary.
    - viii. Bob Crum: Revisit p.m. after getting consultant on board; asked for show of hands; several hands raised.

- c. Process
    - i. Bob Baldwin suggested that the study take a fresh look, without preconceived conclusions.
    - ii. Kevin Page (HRTAC): Given that SEIS moved Alt A forward, we have a clean slate concerning the omitted segments.
  - d. Working Group non-voting members
    - i. Bob Crum proposed adding VPA, Navy, and Corps
    - ii. Lynn Allsbrook (Hampton): FHWA
    - iii. Bob Baldwin: Coast Guard
    - iv. Kevin Page: VMA?
    - v. Bob Crum: VPA, Navy, Corps, FHWA, and Coast Guard as non-voting members.
    - vi. Kevin Page: HRT?
    - vii. Bob Crum: Show of hands on list of 5 (VPA, Navy, Corps, FHWA, and Coast Guard); show of hands; hands raised.
    - viii. Bob Crum: Cities are only voting members (not VDOT, HRTAC, TPO).
6. Scope
- a. Bob Crum asked for input before staff prepares a draft scope.
  - b. Lynn Allsbrook: Prioritize order of implementation so that a phase does not negatively impact the network, including local streets.
  - c. Brian Stilley (NN): Moving people back and forth across the harbor.
  - d. Sherry Early (Suffolk): Examine US 17 interchange at Harbor View.
  - e. Kevin Page: Transit usage is down 15% year over year.
  - f. Brian Fowler:
    - i. I submitted written thoughts on scope.
    - ii. HRBT widening makes a new base network.
    - iii. A project is not feasible if it does not have enough benefits to be environmentally permit-able.
  - g. Kevin Page: HRTF is limited to congestion relief.
  - h. Phil Pullen (Virginia Beach):
    - i. How does sea level rise impact this?
    - ii. Ports are important.
    - iii. Supports prioritization mentioned by Allsbrook.
  - i. Bob Baldwin:
    - i. Rte. 164 has been impacted by changes wrought by Midtown Tunnel widening, MLK construction, and PMT re-birth.
    - ii. Do not ignore rail coming from Craney Island port.
    - iii. Consider Portsmouth being trapped by tolls.
  - j. Scott Smizik (VDOT):
    - i. Consider the next steps for a project, i.e. NEPA.
  - k. Tony Gibson (VDOT):
    - i. I like the idea of interim improvements
  - l. Earl Sorey:

- i. Consider unintended consequences
- ii. Provide simulation for the public.

7. Procurement Options

- a. Bob Crum: We will send a draft scope to you.
- b. Camelia Ravanbakht: We will send draft scope in the next couple of weeks, and work with Nancy Collins (HRTPO) on an RFP.
- c. Bob Crum: High-level scope for RFP. Next Working Group meeting in August (policy group meeting after that).
- d. Bob Crum: RFP to TPO Board in September.
- e. Brian Fowler: I would love to have the best people in the country do this project.
- f. Bob Crum: We will take the time to find them.

**SEIS Working Group  
Attendance Sheet  
Meeting of July 14, 2017**

Name	Member Email
Bob Crum	HRTPO
Camelia Ravanbakhsh	"
<del>Bob Crum</del>	<del>_____</del>
Bob Case	"
Lynn Alsbrook	HANDTOWN
Bryan Staley	Newport News
Sherry Earley	City of Suffolk
Scott Smizik	VDOT
Bryan Fowler	Norfolk
Phil Puller	Virginia Beach
Bob Baldwin	Portsmouth
Tony Gibson	VDOT
Keith Nichols	HRTPO
Dale STA	HRTPO
Earl Sorey	Ches
Sarah McCaff	Port of Virginia
Susan Wilson	City of Portsmouth
Rob Brown	Norfolk : rob.brown@norfolk.gov
Thelma Drake	Norfolk : thelma.drake@norfolk.gov
Jessica Dennis	Norfolk : jessica.dennis@norfolk.gov
Kevin Page	HRTAC
Jeff Koliski	Norfolk



## SEIS Working Group

Member	Organization
Earl Sorey	City of Chesapeake
Lynn Allsbrook	City of Hampton
Bryan Stiley	City of Newport News
Brian Fowler	City of Norfolk
Sherry Early	City of Suffolk
James Wright	City of Portsmouth
Phil Pullen	City of Virginia Beach
Jason Flowers	Army Corps of Engineers
George Janek	Army Corps of Engineers
Robert Pruhs	Army Corps of Engineers
Ivan Rucker	FHWA
Kevin Page	HRTAC
Rhonda Murray	US NAVY
Tony Gibson	VDOT
Scott Smizik	VDOT
Kit Chope	VPA
Robert Crum	HRTPO
Camelia Ravanbakht	HRTPO
Rob Case	HRTPO
Keith Nichols	HRTPO
Dale Stith	HRTPO



# Feasibility Study of Additional Corridors from the Hampton Roads Crossing Study (HRCS) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)

## Guidance for Scope of Work

Prepared by HRTPO Staff for Working Group and Steering (Policy) Committee  
August 2017

### Study Purpose

According to the May 1, 2017 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission (HRTAC), Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO), and Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), the purpose of this study is to evaluate the “**feasibility, permitability, and transportation benefits**” of the following segments not included in the HRCS alternative recommended by the HRTPO (“Alternative A Modified”), known as “Additional Corridors”, shown in Fig. 1:

- i. **VA 164** (segment 14)
- ii. **I-564 Connector** (segment 10)
- iii. **VA 164 Connector** (segment 13)
- iv. **I-664 Connector** (segment 11)
- v. **I-664** (segments 2 thru 7, from I-64 in Hampton to [but not including] Bowers Hill interchange in Chesapeake)



**Figure 1**

Source: HRCS SEIS, Apr 2017, Appendix A, p. A-3

This study will start with a baseline assumption that the I-64 / Hampton Roads Bridge Tunnel (**HRBT**) project will be advanced and built. The primary goal of this feasibility study will be to evaluate the region’s long-range transportation needs beyond the HRBT project. Projects emerging from this study will be considered by the HRTPO Board for inclusion in its **2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)**.

## **Background**

In 2015, the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), in coordination with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) initiated the preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the March 2001 Hampton Roads Crossing Study (HRCS) Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).

On July 25, 2016, the FHWA and Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) approved the Hampton Roads Crossing Study Draft Supplemental Impact Statement (HRCS SEIS). At its September 2016 meeting, the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO), unanimously approved the HRCS SEIS **Alternative A, “modified”** to include the Bowers Hill Interchange, as the region’s Preferred Alternative. On October 20, 2016, the Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission (HRTAC) also unanimously supported the HRTPO’s selection of Alternative A-modified, and allocated up to \$7 million of HRTF for **further study** of the HRCS SEIS components not included in the selected Alternative A.

On December 7, 2016, the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) approved Alternative A and instructed VDOT to continue to work with HRTPO, HRTAC, USACE, Navy, the Port of Virginia, and other parties to advance separate studies to identify appropriate access options around Craney Island to include I-564/I-664 Connectors, I-664/MMMBT and 164/164 Connector. The resolution also directed VDOT to continue to work with HRTPO, HRTAC, USACE, and other parties to advance a separate study of the Bowers Hill Interchange in Chesapeake.

In January 2017, the HRTPO Board directed staff to work with VDOT, HRTAC, and other partners to develop a **Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)** for supporting studies on how to move forward with the remaining segments of the SEIS and the Bowers Hill Interchange. The May 1, 2017 Memorandum of Understanding was signed between the HRTPO, VDOT, and HRTAC to advance two separate components:

- \$4 million for study of Bowers Hill Interchange following the NEPA process, to be managed by VDOT.
- \$3 million for Additional Feasibility Studies of the remaining components of the HRCS SEIS not included in the approved Alternative A, to be managed by the HRTPO. In March 2017, HRTAC approved a contingency of \$4 million to be available if additional funding is required for the completion of the HRTPO Feasibility Studies.

## Minimum Requirements

Reflecting the MOU's specification that the "steering committee...will develop the scope of work", this "**Guidance for Scope of Work**" will assist the Steering (Policy) Committee in specifying minimum requirements for the consultant's final scope of work.

## Stakeholders

- **General public**
- **Trucking Industry**
- **Military**
- **Hospitality and tourism**

The interests of these stakeholders will be represented by the **Working Group** and the **Steering (Policy) Committee**:

## Working Group

- Voting members- **technical staff** from "local impacted jurisdictions":
  - Chesapeake, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Suffolk, Va Beach
- Non-voting members- staff from:
  - Virginia Port Authority (VPA), US Navy, Army Corps of Engineers, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and Coast Guard
  - VDOT and HRTAC staffs
- Staff: HRTPO staff

## Steering (Policy) Committee

- Members:
  - **elected officers** from "local impacted jurisdictions": Chesapeake, Hampton, Newport News, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Suffolk, Va Beach
  - **representatives** from "U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the U.S. Navy (Navy), and the Port of Virginia, and other parties"
- Staff: HRTPO staff

## Phases and Tasks

Based on the MOU's interrelated "feasibility, permitability, and transportation benefits", this effort will base overall feasibility on **Financial Feasibility, Environmental Permitability, and Transportation Benefits** (including congestion relief).

### Phase I: **Environmental Permitability Analysis**

Remove from consideration corridors with environmental fatal flaws.

## Phase II: **Transportation Benefits and Financial Feasibility Analysis**

### A. Interview:

- members of Working Group and Steering (Policy) Committee
- representatives of Stakeholder groups

### B. Identify operationally independent candidate projects.

### C. Develop study approach.

- Develop appropriate **relationship to NEPA**
- To provide input to HRTPO 2045 LRTP, all forecasts shall be done for **year 2045**
- 2045 regional scenario planning
  - Develop **scenarios** (land use, technology, etc.) in cooperation with HRTPO
  - Develop scenario planning techniques, outreach strategies, tools, etc.
- Use new/improved models, as appropriate
- Develop **Transportation and Financial** evaluation **criteria** including, but not limited to, the following:

#### Transportation Benefit Measures

- Congestion
- Accessibility (including Craney Island), Reliability, and Resiliency
- Multimodalism (excluding rail)
- Economic impact
- HRTPO Prioritization Tool score (for 2045 LRTP consideration)

#### Financial Feasibility Measures

- Cost-effectiveness
- Fiscal constraint

### D. Evaluate candidate projects based on **criteria and scenarios**.

- Minimum set of highways on which to measure impact of the subject projects:
  - The entire I-64/I-664 Beltway
  - I-564 in Norfolk
  - US17 & US258 from I-664 Suffolk to I-64 Hampton including James River Br.
  - VA 164 (Western Freeway and MLK Freeway)
  - Downtown Tunnel and Midtown Tunnel
- Based on transportation benefits and financial feasibility, **identify projects considered overall to be feasible**.

### Phase III: **Order of Implementation**

Determine whether or not implementing the feasible projects in the order of HRTPO Prioritization Tool scores would negatively impact the transportation system (including local streets) **during interim periods**.

#### Communication and Outreach

The consultant will communicate with:

- the Steering (Policy) Committee via **quarterly meetings**
- the Working Group via meetings scheduled in advance of Steering (Policy) Committee meetings, with additional Working Group meetings as necessary

The consultant will develop:

- study website
- interactive public meetings
- **simulations**

#### Reports

At the end of each phase, the consultant will prepare a report documenting that phase.

#### Schedule

In order to provide **input to the HRTPO 2045 LRTP**, the final report will be **published by the end of calendar 2019**.