

May 9, 2018

Memorandum #2018-53

TO: Regional Connectors Study Working Group

BY: Robert A. Crum, Jr., Executive Director

RE: Regional Connectors Study

Attached is the **agenda** for the **Regional Connectors Study Working Group meeting** scheduled for **Friday, May 11, 2018 11:00 am** at The Regional Board Room, Board Room B located at 723 Woodlake Drive, Chesapeake 23320.

BC/sc

Voting Members:

Earl Sorey (CH)
Lynn Allsbrook (HA)
Bryan Stilley (NN)
Brian Fowler (NO)
Sherry Earley (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)
LCDR Colleen Symansky (US Coast Guard)
Tony Gibson (VDOT)
Scott Smizik (VDOT)
Kit Chope (VPA)

Staff:

Bob Crum (HRTPO)
Mike Kimbrel (HRTPO)
Rob Case (HRTPO)
Keith Nichols (HRTPO)
Dale Stith (HRTPO)

AGENDA

Regional Connectors Study

Working Group – May 11, 2018

11:00 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. Status Report: Contract Negotiations with Selected Consultant
6. Discussion of Approaches for Project Manager
7. Next Steps
8. Adjournment

HRCS SEIS Additional Corridors Study
Working Group
September 15, 2017 – Regional Building
Minutes

1. Call to Order
 - Bob Crum (HRTPO) called the meeting to order at 10am.
2. Welcome and Introductions
 - Bob Crum welcomed members and audience.
 - Noted that written comments were received from Portsmouth the previous afternoon and included as a handout.
3. Public Comment Period
 - [none]
4. Approval of Minutes
 - Minutes approved with one amendment: correct spelling of Suffolk representative Sherry Earley's surname
5. Membership – Working Group and Steering (Policy) Committee
 - Steering (Policy) Committee
 - Bob Crum provided an overview of membership as outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
 - Letters were sent out to heads of agencies/localities requesting names of representatives
 - Still need appointments for Chesapeake and Newport News. Steve Froncillo stated he would discuss with Earl Sorey.
 - Working Group
 - Bob reviewed comments from July Working Group meeting regarding changes to membership. Voting members include representatives from localities. Non-voting members include representatives from VPA, US Navy, Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), FHWA, VDOT, HRTAC, and HRTPO staff.
 - Staff has not heard back from the US Coast Guard regarding representative. Rhonda Murray stated that she or representatives from the USACE could reach out to their point-of-contact at the Coast Guard.
 - Bob asked the Group if there were any stakeholders missing that needed to be added to either the Policy or Working Group. No additional suggestions were provided.
6. Scope of Work: Review and Approve
 - Guidance for Scope of Work included in agenda
 - Camelia Ravanbakht provided an overview of the guidance, stating feedback and comments from the July Working Group meeting were incorporated
 - Study purpose
 - Used MOU to create framework for guidance
 - HRBT will be included as improved project in any analysis
 - Any corridor recommendations that come out of this process will be considered for inclusion in the 2045 LRTP
 - Brian Fowler: Not all July comments were captured and concerned the study would rely too heavily on 20-year old concepts. Stated that Existing Conditions for this analysis should reflect improvements such as HRBT, High Rise, and other Regional Priority Projects, which is a different picture than SEIS analyzed. Also stated that this study

should develop a new purpose and need separate from the SEIS, and should minimize references to the SEIS. Also stated the need to come up with (possibly new) corridors that are financially feasible and permissible.

- Bob Crum: Study purpose could be modified to incorporate the “broader thinking” that Brian described
- Kevin Page: There are implications and cascading effects after selecting the HRBT as preferred alternative, and agreed with starting this study with a blank slate. Asked Scott Smizik about implications of ROD from SEIS.
- Scott Smizik: The Record of Decision identifies HRBT as the Preferred Alternative and the remaining segments become “previously studied corridors.” ROD/SEIS notes that HRTPO will continue to analyze corridors.
- Bob Crum: A new baseline including improvements to HRBT, High Rise, and HOT lanes can be captured in preamble of scope, and will also include language stating that other corridors may be identified in the analysis.
- Brian Fowler: The scope should include more background and history.
- Lynn Allsbrook: The RFP can reference all work done to date. Camelia agreed and plans to include references to all work that has been done.
- Lynn Allsbrook: Elected board should look at the segments that haven’t been selected that can be constructed and are financially feasible.
- Brian Fowler: Possible outcome is that none of the segments will meet this criteria, which is another reason to come up with additional, new-thinking projects.
- Bob Crum: Key point is taking this message from this Working Group to the Policy Committee in order to have policy level discussion on this.
- James Wright: Echoed Brian concerns that this is a fresh start and therefore we should have a new study title.
- Bob asked members for ideas. Several ideas were discussed.
- Brian Fowler: Study is primarily about water crossing. Widening roadways is too limiting.
- Bob Crum suggested coming back to the group with 3 examples of titles (working with Kevin Page). Bob also stated he would like to invite some of the Working Group to the Oct 5 Policy Committee meeting to assist in communicating the broader viewpoint for the study to the policy group.
- Background
 - Camelia: References to what the Boards have approved in regards to funding for this study
 - Brian Fowler: clean up limiting words that reference segments from SEIS
- Minimum Requirements
 - Camelia: Based on MOU and feedback from July Working Group meeting
- Stakeholders
 - Kit Chope: Trucking Industry is too narrow a term. Freight is the right word that should be included. Will work on a better word/phrase.
 - Camelia: Trucking Industry term was used because of HRTF highway focus
 - Working Group members agree with list of stakeholders
- Phases and Tasks – Phase I - Environmental Permitability Analysis
 - Camelia: Phase 1 will remove corridors with fatal flaws (environmental fatal flaws)
 - Kevin Page: Will there be a basis of design or assumptions to define an environmentally fatal flaw. For example, establishing on the front end how many wetlands acres, etc. would be considered a fatal flaw.

- Scott Smizick: You can set screening criteria/thresholds as part of an analysis.
- Kevin Page: If VDOT can share, that'd be great. Establishing this up front will help make the process more efficient.
- Brian Fowler: Phase 1 should be updating purpose and need – reflecting 21st century thinking. Determining any fatal flaws could be next phase.
- Bob Crum: Purpose and Need is NEPA language. Goals and objectives are better terminology. Suggests waiting to have an objective consultant on board before establishing study goals and objectives.
- James Wright: As you're looking at environmental impacts, not all wetlands are treated the same. Go one step beyond and identify what the wetlands are and see if there are mitigation steps that can be taken. Also, property takings need to be addressed.
- Bob Crum: A decision making matrix that takes into account some of these factors (considering types of wetlands).
- Wright: Needs to be a part of this at this point
- George Janek: There is no mitigation for wetlands. There are no commercial banks right now. Thresholds are tricky.
- Robert Pruhs: Also need to consider the complexity of a project – does the project cross a federal facility that may impact the mission of that facility.
- James Wright: Portsmouth's comments #4-#8 apply to this section
- Camelia: To summarize, Phase 1 will describe goals and objectives. Phase 2 will be the environmental screening. We will add a decision matrix, and include factors to conduct screening.
- Bob Crum: I see three possible outcomes for this screening phase – projects can advance to analysis, projects can be removed, or projects can be denoted with a "caution" and depending on transportation benefit, look for mitigation. Consultants that have done this screening process may have a decision making matrix process already.
- Phases and Tasks – Phase II - Transportation Benefits and Financial Feasibility Analysis
 - Item A – Camelia: Interview Policy and Working Group members
 1. Bob Crum: Interviews can be conducted during Phase 1 (goals and objectives). Might have another touch point during this phase too.
 2. Camelia: Kendall Miller can also conduct surveys of general public and stakeholders in addition to Policy/Working Group interviews
 - Item B – Camelia: Next step under this stage will be to identify operationally independent candidate projects.
 1. Brian Fowler: This can be an iterative process in terms of identifying projects. We shouldn't pin ourselves into a sequential process. Replace B) with "Developing initial projects"
 2. Bob Crum: Identify Operationally Independent Candidate Projects should be after C)
 - Item C – Camelia: For the Study Approach, will include regional scenario planning, merging these efforts with the development of the 2045 LRTP. This effort will look at land use, technology, and other What If scenarios.
 1. Brian Fowler: Not just about the 2045 LRTP, it's also about economic vitality, resiliency, connectivity, etc. These are the real benefit points for the region.
 2. Bob Crum: HRPDC staff working on a regional economic sites inventory. Right now, the region doesn't have large sites ready. So the question is where should the sites be? Need to think about this holistically and what these sites mean for the region

and transportation. Might be missing, after the interviews, a brain storming phase. The new B) should be a brainstorming of potential scenario/transportation options.

3. Brian Fowler: How do we measure accountability, reliability, and resiliency? These are measures of the network and impact the economy.
 4. Camelia: The DOT is doing a pilot program using Hampton Roads as a case study to develop an Economic Impact model that will look at resiliency. We can use these models.
 5. Camelia: Financial feasibility measures will include cost effectiveness to know return on investments. Will also look at fiscal-constraint.
 6. Brian Fowler: Not all projects will be included in 2045
 7. James Wright: Will a project that doesn't meet HRTF criteria fall out?
 8. Bob Crum: Don't see this study as only looking at "HRTF feasibility." We will identify other potential funding sources (such as P3 for example)
 9. Phil Pullen: Remove fiscal constraint. Group had consensus.
 10. Bob Crum: Do we need some statement on community impacts?
 11. Brian Fowler: Include social impacts. There are EJ areas that could benefit with better Southside and Peninsula connectivity.
 12. Camelia: We have an EJ Methodology that can be applied to this process.
 - Item D – Evaluate Candidate Projects Based on Criteria and Scenarios
 1. Camelia: Minimum set of highways based on July Working Group comments. Others?
 2. Phil Pullen: Add I-264 from Bowers Hill to Oceanfront
- Phase III – Order of Implementation
 - No comments
 - Schedule
 - Brian Fowler: Worried might not be enough time.
 - Bob Crum: We'll leave the timeline open for now.
7. Next Steps
- Prepare for October 5 Policy Committee meeting
 - Approval of agreement at HRTAC next week
 - Bob Crum: We have revisions to make, incorporating comments from today. Will circulate revisions to the Working Group. Will also send out a reminder of Oct 5 meeting – would be good to have a few Working Group members present. Kevin and Bob to brand and come up with 3 options for new study name.