

**Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
2045 Long Range Transportation Planning Advisory Committee
Meeting #4 – 08/02/17**

Committee Members Present:

Mr. Erik Nelson, City of Fredericksburg
Mr. Craig Pennington, Caroline County
Mr. Doug Morgan, Spotsylvania County
Mr. Ed. Petrovitch, Spotsylvania County
Mr. Joey Hess, Stafford County
Mr. Christopher Rapp, Stafford County
Mr. Rupert Farley, CTAG
Mr. Tim Roseboom, DRPT
Ms. Lynn Erickson, National Capital Region Transportation Board (Via Conference Call)
Mr. Chuck Steigerwald, PRTC
Mr. Stephen Haynes (Via Conference Call)
Mr. Jake Herrman, VDOT
Ms. Sonali Soneji, VRE

Others in Attendance:

Mr. Ram Jagannathan, Baker
Mr. Paul Prideaux, Baker
Mr. Adam Recchia, Foursquare ITP (Via Conference Call)

George Washington Regional Commission (GWRC) Staff:

Mr. Paul Agnello, FAMPO
Ms. Marti Donley, FAMPO
Mr. Nick Quint, FAMPO
Ms. Kari Barber, FAMPO (Via Conference Call)
Mr. John Bentley, FAMPO
Mr. Colin Cate, FAMPO
Mr. Tim Ware, GWRC
Ms. JoAnna Roberson, GWRC

Welcome and Purpose of Meeting

Mr. Agnello thanked everyone for attending today's fourth meeting.

I-95 Phase 2 Highway Study – Mr. Paul Prideaux & Mr. Ram Jagannathan - Baker

Mr. Prideaux stated that the software used in Phase 2 is VISSIM and this data was not used in the Phase 1 study efforts. Mr. Prideaux stated that Phase 2 will provide technical documentation for the following: existing conditions (including a.m. peak, p.m. peak & weekend peak travel conditions); a no-build scenario for

both 2030 and 2045; a build condition scenario for 2030 and 2045 which will include the round of data and study for the next round of Smart Scale project consideration. Mr. Prideaux stated that as a group, the “what ifs” that could occur will be analyzed and these scenarios will be included in the final technical documentation that Baker is tasked to accomplish.

Mr. Prideaux advised that the VISSIM data collected to date for the existing conditions reflect the following congestion hotspots:

- 1 – SB I-95 in peak p.m. period
- 2 - Arterial congestion due to both commuter and commercial traffic in both the a.m. and p.m. peak travel periods
- 3- NB I-95 congestion on Sunday in the p.m. peak period

Mr. Prideaux stated that as a starting point for future No-Build assumptions it was critical to have the no-build assumption concepts correct as this will be the basis for all build alternative testing. Mr. Prideaux advised that for the purpose of the study, the “no-build” is defined as the future condition with all planned and programmed improvements included other than the changes expected to be tested as part of the Phase 2 study. The following proposed no-build scenarios and assumptions include the following:

- 1 – I-95 corridor as it exists today
- 2- Southbound CD-lane project between Exits 133 & 130 (the Route 3 Safety projects already in process)
- 3 – FredEX proposal to extend the reversible express lanes further South to Exit 133
- 4- Interchange modifications at Exit 130 which will replace the existing EB to NB loop ramp that currently has a challenging weave pattern in place to a new triple-left turn design

Mr. Prideaux advised the next steps Baker is tasked to complete are continuing the development and calibration of the future No-Build operations analysis; begin the development of a build alternative that will require operational testing and screening; and to begin an analysis of economic impacts of congestion throughout the region.

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

Mr. Recchia advised that using the results of the modeling data to date, a commuter bus service for the I-95 corridor has been completed. Mr. Recchia stated that preliminary route recommendations are included in today’s presentation. Mr. Recchia advised that Four Square is on Task #4 (of 6 total tasks to be completed) which is transit route recommendations. Task 5 is development of a TDM plan and Task 6 is draft and final report. Mr. Recchia stated that the bus routes recommended are designed to not duplicate the current VRE service routes. Mr. Recchia

advised that 8 preliminary routes for FY2018-2020 are based from current market analysis and they are looking for comments on moving forward.

There was considerable discussion and comments expressed from committee members to include the following;

Ms. Soneji stated that she did not understand the modeling analysis that has been completed. Ms. Soneji asked what this data was compared too. Speaking specifically for VRE, Ms. Soneji stated the analysis indicates that other services could be offered on the I-95 corridor; however, data reflects only commuter bus service as an option.

Ms. Soneji relayed that VRE is also in the process of updating its plans and likely changes have been made since the last VRE plan was completed. Ms. Soneji asked if there is data available that provides an analysis and comparison for both plans. Ms. Soneji stated that prior to today's meeting; there has been coordination between FAMPO, Four Square, VRE & PRTC. However, she now feels the process has jumped ahead and speaking for only VRE, staff there has had no contact from Four Square since the last meeting and she feels the region is not getting a full picture being presented. Ms. Soneji stated that she was absolutely not in opposition of consideration of a commuter bus service; however, feels that if FAMPO is completing a TDM model then all options and scenarios need to be included as part of the TDM plan.

Mr. Nelson stated that it appears we are jumping from data collection to solutions and the process seems flawed – a demand has been identified without comparisons provided on all available and/or alternate scenarios. Mr. Agnello stated that the commuter bus service is just one alternative being studied. Mr. Nelson stated then presentations need to clearly state that the data received today is strictly just one of many options that could become available and should not be presented as the preferred or recommended alternative.

Mr. Roseboom stated that conceptually he felt the data presented today has been done well; however, he too feels it is projected as being a final solution/recommendation versus one of many alternatives that could become available. Mr. Roseboom stated that for a regional TDM plan, the State wants to have data available that shows comparisons for all TDM facets and wants to see coordination with current/new TDM agencies. Mr. Roseboom stated that in order to ensure that all TDM options are studied, reviewed, and compared that possibly this needs to become a focal point of a Phase 3 TDM study.

Update on Funding Scenarios and Schedule – Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that the proposed funding scenarios for the Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) include the following funding allocations: Highway Funding = \$706 m; Transit Funding = \$111 m (but does not include VRE); Local Funding = \$463 m; and additional funding = \$195 M (coming from Atlantic Gateway & GWRC 5307). Mr. Agnello stated the unconstrained needs plan revenues needed in the 2040 LRTP are approximately \$10 b.

Mr. Agnello stated that two additional potential revenue sources above the CLRP allocations could provide an additional \$1.490 b to the region if adopted by the Policy Committee. These two alternate sources are developing a Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) which could provide \$1.343 b from FY2019 to 2045). Mr. Agnello advised that this funding source is endorsed by the City of Fredericksburg; however, Stafford County has expressed some resistance and Spotsylvania County is adamantly against. The second source is implementing a VRE Gas Tax Floor which would provide an additional \$146.8 m to the region from FY2019 to 2045. Mr. Agnello stated there is not regional consensus on this funding source either; however, this looks to have more promising possibilities for consent. Mr. Agnello stated that if both of the two sources were adopted the region's current funding allocations would double. Mr. Agnello stated this would be presented to the Policy Committee for discussion at the upcoming August meeting. Mr. Agnello advised completion of the Phase 2 Transit/TDM study will be in November. Mr. Agnello relayed that Round 3 of the Smart Scale application process will begin in March of 2018.

Mr. Nelson stated that he feels emphasizing an unconstrained needs plan tends to be overwhelming and feels staff and the consultants need to provide realistic expectations rather than potential solutions.

Mr. Farley stated that if the study is providing "what if" scenarios then all options need to be put on the table for discussion purposes. Mr. Farley stated that a congestion pricing scenario has not been implemented into the plans for consideration but is clearly an option available and one that needs to be compared with all other scenarios.

Questions & Input from Advisory Committee Members

Mr. Agnello asked if there is additional committee feedback to please forward these to staff by August 15th. Mr. Agnello stated that staff will also schedule a transit TDM meeting in August that will consist of FAMPO staff, DRPT staff, PRTC staff and VRE staff. The purpose of this meeting will be for better collaboration from all representatives on ensuring all TDM options are discussed, included, and considered as recommendations that can be considered and pursued by the FAMPO Policy Committee.

Next Steps & Adjourn

Mr. Agnello stated that the fifth Advisory Committee meeting will be scheduled for either September 6th or September 7th and the "Go To Meeting Portal" will be sent to members to get member availability by the end of the work day today. The 4th 2045 Long Range Transportation Advisory Committee meeting was adjourned at 2:55 p.m.