

**Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
2045 Long Range Transportation Planning Advisory Committee
Meeting #6 – 09/27/17**

Committee Members Present:

Mr. Erik Nelson, City of Fredericksburg
Mr. Craig Pennington, Caroline County
Mr. Dan Cole, Spotsylvania County
Mr. Joey Hess, Stafford County
Mr. Christopher Rapp, Stafford County
Mr. Tim Roseboom, DRPT
Mr. Chuck Steigerwald, PRTC
Mr. Stephen Haynes, VDOT
Ms. Sonali Soneji, VRE
Mr. Rupert Farley, CTAG

Others in Attendance:

Mr. Ram Jagannathan, Baker
Mr. Paul Prideaux, Baker
Ms. Katie List, Foursquare ITP (via Go-to Call In)
Mr. Jarred Toyos, Foursquare ITP
Mr. Adam Recchia, Foursquare ITP

George Washington Regional Commission (GWRC) Staff:

Mr. Paul Agnello, FAMPO
Ms. Marti Donley, FAMPO
Mr. Nick Quint, FAMPO
Ms. Kari Barber, FAMPO
Mr. John Bentley, FAMPO
Ms. Diana Utz, GWRC
Ms. JoAnna Roberson, GWRC

Review of 2045 LRTP Advisory Committee Meeting of September 6, 2017 – Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello asked if there were any questions or comments from the Advisory Committee from the September 6 meeting and there were no comments expressed.

I-95 Phase 2 Transit TDM Study – Mr. Adam Recchia - Foursquare

Mr. Recchia advised that Foursquare has made revisions based on the comments received from the committee and these revisions are included in today's handout. Mr. Recchia stated that Foursquare is in the process of finalizing the transit route recommendations and finalizing the TDM plan. Mr. Recchia relayed Foursquare's task order will be completed soon and he will be

providing a final update at the upcoming November 1st meeting. Mr. Recchia stated a complete overview from start to finish will occur in November, followed up with the draft and final report that will be submitted to FAMPO staff.

Mr. Recchia advised the study has shown the implementation of commuter bus service would be of benefit to the region and are listed as alternatives for consideration. The recommendations are:

- 8 routes in place by 2024
- 9 routes in place by 2030
- 13 routes in place by 2045
- Reverse peak routes
- Commuter lot expansions

Mr. Recchia stated that VRE service improvements were also studied. Mr. Recchia stated that without commuter buses being added, the region would then need to determine how much new service options would be needed to satisfy the demand. Mr. Recchia advised that VRE improvements would include feeder services to Spotsylvania, Leeland Road, Brooke and Quantico stations.

In regard to vanpools, Mr. Recchia relayed that both expansion and maintaining existing vanpool service would still be needed as the market supports. Mr. Recchia stated that TDM strategies would occur that will support all modes of commuting options and will include Marketing & Incentives and Last-Mile connections.

Mr. Recchia relayed that two transit service improvement scenarios were studied. Scenario 1 includes what we currently have in place as well as the introduction of commuter bus services. This scenario would also include commuter buses as an alternate mode of transit. The study showed the following information on Scenario 1:

- Growth and transit demands will be absorbed by a commuterbus, VRE, and vanpools
- 13 commuter bus routes would be expected to meet the need by 2045
- Commuter buses will also provide reverse peak routes and will be supplemental to the VRE routes
- Additional feeder routes to commuter lots and to the VRE station will be needed
- Commuter lot & VRE lot expansions will be needed
- TDM strategies will be implemented

Mr. Recchia advised that Scenario 2 data is if commuter bus service is not introduced and just to meet the demand for existing services would focus on growth with the existing VRE/vanpool services and study showed the following:

- Growth would be absorbed by both the VRE and vanpools
- Feeder routes to commuter lots & VRE stations would still be needed
- Commuter lot & VRE lot expansion would still be needed
- TDM strategies would need to be included

Mr. Recchia advised that Foursquare is not advocating that commuter bus service is the only alternative; however, data did reveal it could be considered as an additional mode for

consideration. Mr. Recchia stated that based on recommendations made from the Advisory Committee that a potential commuter bus option could have the following two options:

1. Commuter bus service that is operated by either/or FRED/PRTC – this service could be directly operated or bid out to a private bus entity such as MARTZ
2. Commuter bus service that could be operated by a new regional transit authority agency – this service could be directly operated or bid out to a private entity such as MARTZ

Mr. Recchia stated that the TDM study was not done for the purpose of showing that commuter buses were the better alternative for what we currently have. Even though if commuter bus service is implemented, and some commuters would switch from their current mode of travel; however, commuter buses are not geared at competing with existing services but simply are providing an additional option and are to be complimentary. Mr. Recchia stated that providing citizens with more options could encourage more commuters to utilize one of the alternatives thus resulting in less single vehicle congestion on the roadways.

Ms. List with Foursquare advised the TDM plan is being developed to support transit recommendations and other non-SOV modes within the corridor. The TDM plan shows the following four elements:

- GWRideConnect I-95 multimodal target marketing – ongoing
- Commuter bus marketing
- Enhanced commuter programs & services
- First Mile/Last Mile connections – could allow for interest in a bike share program

Ms. List stated that a TDM plan would include follow-up and monitoring for the following areas: Target Marketing; Commuter Bus Marketing; Enhanced Commuter Programs; & First Mile/Last Mile Connectivity.

Mr. Recchia stated that Foursquare will be finalizing the TDM recommendations and the final report will also include cost estimates for support for other improvements.

I-95 Phase 2 Highway Study – Mr. Paul Prideaux, Baker

Mr. Prideaux with Baker International gave an update on the I-95 Phase 2 Highway Corridor study. Mr. Prideaux stated that the study is defining a no-build alternative on which we will build and this is what is being used as the base years for comparisons.

Mr. Prideaux re-stated that for the purpose of this study, the no-build alternative is defined as the future conditions that will include all of the planned and programmed improvements to the region other than the changes that are expected to be tested as part of the study.

Mr. Prideaux stated the future no-build assumptions include:

- I-95 corridor as it exists today
- Southbound CD lanes between Exits 133 & 130
- FredEx project to extend 95 Express Lane to Exit 133
- Interchange safety improvements at Exit 130.

Mr. Prideaux advised that introducing a new concept of No-Build +, which would include everything in the no-build scenario plus the northbound I-95 Rappahannock River Crossing project (CD-lanes) is still being tested. Mr. Prideaux stated that results of study data on this alternative will be analyzed for operational performance levels and will be presented for review at the upcoming November 1 meeting. Mr. Prideaux advised that just so as much data that can be compiled for comparison will be available in the final report will contain a couple of additional alternatives/possibilities beyond the no-build alternative.

Mr. Agnello stated that staff has received comments on additional potential alternatives for consideration that are not on the original no-build project list. A few of these are:

- Widening of Courthouse Road west of I-95 (submitted by CTAG)
- New Park & Ride lot on the Route 3 east corridor (King George)
- New interchange at Exit 101 (Carmel Church/Doswell – Caroline County)

Mr. Prideaux stated that study efforts have already been completed on other concepts, such as:

- Improvement or construction of non-interstate roads that run parallel to I-95 in the east & west bound directions
- New roadway that would connect the Stafford Courthouse area to King George County heading towards Dahlgren
- Improvements being made at Exit 133 to assist traffic going to and from in the east bound direction
- ITS improvements such as Active Traffic Management Systems (ATMS), Integrated Corridor Management (ICM), ramp metering, variable speeds, shoulder lane usage & other innovations

Mr. Prideaux stated the additional testing will show comparisons versus the person movement and travel times. Mr. Prideaux stated the next steps in the study process are:

- Obtain committee feedback from today's presentation
- Complete the modeling/calibrations for future no-build alternatives that will also include Sunday traffic analysis
- Continue working with Advisory Committee to come to an agreement on the bundling of three-build alternatives for testing purposes with concepts for a low, medium, or high build-out
- Test all build alternatives into the VISSIM modeling tool to build a stronger study
- Report results to Advisory Committee that shows the comparative results
- Screen additional alternatives that work towards a preferred solution

Update on Schedule– Mr. Paul Agnello

October:

- Alternative development & analysis for I-95 Phase 2 Highway study – Underway and any additional input is to be submitted by October 6
- Completion of Transit/TDM and Bike/Ped analysis

November:

- November 1 – Meeting #7 for LRTP AC committee – meeting to begin at noon with lunch to be served
- Completion of I-95 Phase 2 Transit/TDM study
- Completion of Highway Analysis for LRTP – Marti Donley currently compiling data
- Additional analysis for I-95 Phase 2 Highway study – Technical analysis to be completed by March 2018

December:

- December 8 – LRTP Draft Documentation to be available
- December 11 – Tentative timeframe for LRTP AC review plan at the 8th advisory committee meeting
- December 18 – special FAMPO Policy Committee – approval of some LRTP items, including Map-21/Safety performance measures
- Additional analysis for the I-95 Phase 2 Highway study

Questions & Input from Advisory Committee Members– None given at today’s meeting; Mr. Agnello asked that committee members submit any additional comments to him by October 6.

Next Steps & Adjourn

Mr. Agnello advised the next advisory committee meeting will be scheduled for November 1 at noon. The 6th 2045 LRTP Advisory Committee meeting was adjourned at 2:38 p.m.