# 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**.