FREDERICKSBURG AREA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING
September 18, 2017 - 7:15 p.m.
The Robert C. Gibbons Conference Room
406 Princess Anne Street, Fredericksburg, Virginia
www.fampo.gwregion.org

AGENDA

1. Call FAMPO Meeting to Order – Chairman Paul Milde

2. Determination of Quorum – FAMPO Administrator Paul Agnello

3. Approval of FAMPO Agenda (ACTION ITEM)

4. Public Involvement
   Comments and questions from members of the public are welcome at this time.

5. Chairman’s Comments

6. Consent Agenda
   a.) Approval of Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of August 21, 2017 – Mr. Paul Agnello

7. Action/Discussion Items
   a.) DC2RVA DEIS Public Comment Period and FAMPO Informational Meeting – Mr. Paul Agnello
   b.) Update on Smart Scale Round 3 – Mr. Paul Agnello
   c.) 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update – Mr. Paul Agnello
   d.) Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) – Mr. Paul Agnello
   e.) Harry Nice Bridge Letters – Mr. Nick Quint

8. Staff and Agency Reports

9. Board Member Comments

10. Correspondence

11. FAMPO Committees Meeting Minutes – Mr. Paul Agnello

12. Adjourn / Next FAMPO Policy Committee Meeting: October 16, 2017
The Policy Committee, the FAMPO Technical Committee, and the Citizens Transportation Advisory Group meetings are open to the public. Public participation is solicited without regard to race, color, national origin, age, sex, religion, disability or family status. Persons who require special accommodations under the American with Disabilities Act or persons who require translation services (free of charge) should contact the GWRC/FAMPO at 540-373-2890 or fampo@gwregion.org at least four days prior to the meeting. If hearing impaired, telephone 1-800-273-7545 (TDD).

La participación pública solicitada sin distinción de raza, color, origen nacional, edad, sexo, religión, discapacidad o suestado familiar. Las personas que requieren alojamiento especial de acuerdo con el American with Disabilities Act, o personas que requieren servicios de traducción (libre de cargo) deben comunicarse con la GWRC / FAMPO al 540-373-2890 o fampo@gwregion.org al menos dos días antes de la reunión. Personas con problemas auditivos, llama 800-273-7545 (TDD).
6a.) Approval of Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of August 21, 2017
Members Present:

Mr. Paul Milde, Chairman, Stafford County  
Mr. Matt Kelly, City of Fredericksburg  
Mr. Tim Barody, City of Fredericksburg  
Ms. Nancy Long, Caroline County (Non-Voting Member)  
Ms. Ruby Brabo, King George County (Non-Voting Member)  
Mr. Greg Benton, Spotsylvania County  
Mr. David Ross, Spotsylvania County  
Mr. Tim McLaughlin, Spotsylvania County  
Ms. Laura Sellers, Stafford County  
Mr. Chuck Steigerwald, Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC)  
Ms. Marcie Parker, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)

Others Present:

Mr. Tim Roseboom, Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT)  
Ms. Emily Stock, Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT)  
Ms. Susan Gardner, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)  
Ms. Linda LaSut, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)  
Ms. Michelle Shropshire, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)  
Mr. Scott Shenk, Free Lance Star  
Mr. Michael Smith, Stafford County  
Mr. Todd Rump, Citizen  
Ms. Cindy Shelton, Citizen

Staff Members Present:

Mr. Paul Agnello, FAMPO  
Mr. Nick Quint, FAMPO  
Mr. John Bentley, FAMPO  
Mr. Colin Cate, FAMPO  
Mr. Tim Ware, GWRC  
Ms. JoAnna Roberson, GWRC
CALL FAMPO MEETING TO ORDER

Chairman, Mr. Milde, called the meeting to order at 7:18 p.m. and received acknowledgement that a quorum was present.

APPROVAL OF FAMPO AGENDA

Upon motion by Mr. Kelly and seconded by Mr. Benton, with all concurring, the FAMPO Policy agenda for the August 21st meeting was accepted as submitted.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

None

CHAIRMAN’s COMMENTS

None

CONSENT AGENDA

a.) Approval of Policy Committee Meeting Minutes of June 19, 2017 – Mr. Paul Agnello

b.) Approval of Resolution No. 18-01, Amending the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Add Funds for Safety Improvements for UPC #109519 (Rt. 711 Crossover Movement Conversion), UPC #109477 (Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities on Leeland Rd) and UPC #109467 (Rt. 1 and Telegraph Rd) – Mr. Nick Quint

Upon motion by Mr. Kelly and seconded by Mr. McLaughlin, with all concurring, items a & b from the Consent Agenda were adopted.

ACTION ITEMS/DISCUSSION ITEMS

a.) DC2RVA Update – Ms. Emily Stock, Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT)

Ms. Stock advised that DRPT is expecting a draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to be published in early September. Ms. Stock stated that unofficially, the target release date is September 8th. Ms. Stock stated that once the draft is released, a 60-day public comment period will be held located in all regions across the state. Ms. Stock relayed that all public comments received will be included with the final EIS study. Ms. Stock advised that the meeting to be held in the Fredericksburg region will be scheduled early October and will be held at the Dorothy Hart Community Center beginning at 7:00 p.m.

Ms. Stock stated the study began in 2014 and is looking to add improvements to a 123-mile corridor from Richmond to Washington, D.C. Ms. Stock stated that most of the improvements will result in converting the existing two tracks to three tracks. Ms. Stock stated the track improvements will also result in by-passes, bridges, etc. being constructed in certain areas (several new bridges will be constructed in the Fredericksburg region).
Ms. Stock stated that the purpose of the study and project is to provide enhanced reliability to Virginia Railway Express (VRE), decreased travel times, and increased frequency of service. Ms. Stock advised that the 123-mile corridor has been divided into six sections. Ms. Stock relayed that the Ashland recommendations have been removed from the study, and this area will be re-evaluated and re-studied independently after the on-going study has been completed.

Ms. Stock advised that DRPT is conducting the study and have made recommendations to the Federal Railroad Administration (FRA); however, FRA has the final approval on which improvement projects are implemented and the time frame for each to begin. Ms. Stock stated that currently DRPT does not anticipate FRA to be in disagreement with the recommendations. With this being said, Ms. Stock advised that the original eastern by-pass alternative that was considered as an option going through or around Fredericksburg is no longer a recommendation from DRPT. DRPT’s recommendation now for the Fredericksburg region is to build a third track along the existing tracks. Ms. Stock stated a third track will double the rail capacity, have a much less expensive cost, and be able to utilize the existing tracks. Ms. Stock advised that DRPT’s recommendations will be submitted to the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB) this fall, and the final EIS and Record of Decision (ROD) will be completed in 2019.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that once completed, the DC2RVA project is going to cost $2 million. Mr. McLaughlin asked if DRPT can provide FAMPO with a return on investment briefing that the committee members can use to explain to citizens how the use of their taxpayer money will benefit them.

b.) Approval of Resolution No.18-02, Amending the Transportation Improvement Program – (TIP) to Add Funds for UPC #110914 (I-95 Exit 126, Rt. 1 SB onto Southpoint Parkway) -Mr. Nick Quint

Upon motion by Mr. McLaughlin and seconded by Ms. Sellers, with all in consent, Resolution No. 18-02 was adopted by the FAMPO Policy Committee meeting at the August 21st meeting.

c.) Update on Smart Scale Round 3 – Mr. Paul Agnello

i. State Response to Recommendations from FAMPO Smart Scale Task Force

Mr. Agnello advised that FAMPO submitted 27 recommendations to the State regarding changes to Smart Scale. Mr. Agnello relayed that FAMPO was the only MPO who provided input. Mr. Agnello relayed that the State accepted part or all of nine of the recommendations. Mr. Agnello stated that four accepted recommendations regard process changes and five regard prioritization methodology changes.

Mr. Agnello stated that significant changes in the Smart Scale process that resulted from FAMPO input in the Process and Scoring Metrics are:

- Process – to make the Smart Scale Technical Guide available before start of the application process
- Scoring Metrics – to add an accessibility factor of using existing traffic data versus projected traffic
counts that were previously used

Mr. Agnello advised that the CTB is scheduled to meet on August 22nd and they will adopt a final Smart Scale application process that will be utilized beginning with Round 3. Mr. Agnello stated that some major proposed changes are:

- Application period moved up from August 1st to March 1st in 2018
- Limits being applied to the number of applications that either an MPO, locality or applicant could submit (In the first 2 rounds, there was no limit on the number of projects an entity could present)
- Limits being applied on how far apart multimodal projects within the same application can be

Mr. Agnello stated that with the MPO’s population being at less than 500,000, a total of four applications can be submitted from FAMPO, GWRC, GWRC localities and Fredericksburg Regional Transit (FRED). Mr. Agnello advised that for regions over 500,000 in population, eight applications can be submitted. This applies to PRTC and VRE.

Mr. Agnello advised that the Fredericksburg District Smart Scale meeting will be held on August 29th. Mr. Agnello relayed that a meeting will be open to staff from 1-3:30 p.m. for the purpose of discussing the Smart Scale changes.

ii. Discussion on Potential Candidate Projects

Mr. Agnello advised that each jurisdiction needs to review the current list of potential regional projects they would like to see pursued. Mr. Agnello stated that each locality needs to review with their respective boards and provide feedback so FAMPO will know which projects to submit. Mr. Agnello asked for a project listing to be brought back for discussion at the upcoming September Policy Committee meeting.

Mr. Kelly stated that he felt the concept of Smart Scale is good whereas once a project is selected it will be completely funded. However, as the amount of funding continues to decrease and the competitiveness increases, the region may need to re-think whether it wants to get out of the “interstate” business and submit other regional projects that possibly would be approved for funding. As the NB I-95 Rappahannock River Crossing project will continue to be the most expensive project from this region, and more than likely statewide, maybe it is time for the region to turn over interstate projects to the Commonwealth. By eliminating them from the application selection process, this could allow the region to receive more funding for smaller projects.

Mr. Kelly stated that even though the State has agreed to make some changes this year in the Smart Scale process, some of the major changes that FAMPO had requested be made – i.e. including all seven days of traffic, etc. — will not be incorporated into the Round 3 process. Mr. Kelly said the region is faced with two choices: 1) stay focused on what needs to be done and keep re-submitting every cycle, or 2) submit projects that would likely be approved.

Mr. Ross concurred with Mr. Kelly that he too felt FAMPO should get away from submitting interstate projects for Smart Scale consideration. Mr. McLaughlin stated that he too felt the region would never be able to afford the I-95 NB Rappahannock River Crossing project. Ms. Brabo
commented that the region could also only submit the I-95 NB River Crossing project and that maybe this approach would provide for more funding. Mr. Milde stated that in theory this would be a good approach; however, the risk is that the State could easily reject the I-95 NB River Crossing project and then the region would receive no funding as no other applications would have been submitted.

Mr. Ross stated that even though he feels the region needs to submit more local projects for consideration, studies clearly show the I-95 NB River Crossing project is desperately needed, so how can the committee now say the project is no longer important.

Mr. McLaughlin stated that as the region’s population continues to grow, the committee needs to look outside of the box when trying to solve and re-solve transportation problems. Mr. McLaughlin stated that the region needs to have government agencies relocate within the region and get the commuters out of the D.C. area.

Ms. Sellers asked if the match money for a project could come from private donors instead of localities. Mr. Agnello stated that there is nothing that prevents private donations from being contributed. Mr. Milde stated that even though money allocated is going to decrease annually, the I-95 SB River Crossing project was approved and funded through the Smart Scale application process so he feels the I-95 NB project should remain on this region’s project list, and it should be resubmitted.

d.) Update on Exploration of Additional Sources for Transportation Funding – Mr. Paul Agnello

  i. Additional Research on State Gas Taxes

Mr. Agnello advised that staff was asked by Mr. Ross from the June meeting for follow-up on the gas tax revenue from other states compared to Virginia. Mr. Agnello advised that research was completed and Virginia still ranks 40th out of 52 in receiving less revenue than the other states. Mr. Ross stated that he felt this information still does not accurately reflect how Virginia compares to the other states. Mr. Ross stated that some states have no sales tax whereas Virginia does so they may receive less funding from one taxing authority but make up the difference in other areas. Mr. Ross asked if staff could compile a comparison listing taxes from all categories with the revenues generated.

  ii. Regional Motor Fuels Tax

Mr. Agnello stated that also per request from the June meeting, staff was asked to provide a breakdown of how much additional revenue could be received for each FAMPO locality, as well as regionally, should a VRE gas tax floor be implemented. A spreadsheet of additional revenue opportunities was included in tonight’s presentation. At this time, there is no additional discussion needed, and the spreadsheet was provided to committee members for their review.

Mr. Agnello advised that should a gas tax floor be implemented, the financial increase to each average driver would be $18.15 per year or $1.51 per month. Mr. Agnello stated that the pros/cons of implementing a gas tax floor are:
Pros:

- Helps to raise additional funding to be applied to local transportation funding projects
- Helps to raise additional funding for PRTC/VRE projects
- Could help local governments have funding leverages for consideration of statewide transportation funding programs such as Smart Scale and Revenue Sharing
- Could collect some additional tax revenues from out of the region drivers who pass through the region that could ultimately be used for local transportation funding

Cons:

- Concept can be viewed as a tax increase

iii. Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) Discussion

Mr. Milde stated that support of an RTA is currently only endorsed by the City of Fredericksburg. Mr. Milde relayed that even though Stafford County is considering it after receiving additional information, a majority are still resistant. Mr. Milde stated that the Stafford Board of Supervisors will have new members after the first of the year, and at that time the discussion results could be different. Mr. Milde also stated that Spotsylvania County is still adamantly against implementing this funding opportunity, and Mr. McLaughlin concurred. Mr. Milde recommended that this item be removed from meeting agendas until after the first of the year when it could be reevaluated. With this in mind, Mr. Milde stated that he did not see any reason to have representatives from NVTA and HRTAC come and provide presentations to the FAMPO Policy Committee.

Mr. McLaughlin concurred and made a motion that a briefing from both NVTA and HRTAC be provided to the committee at the September meeting. In turn, committee members can discuss this with their respective boards and provide feedback at the October Policy Committee meeting. If at that time a full presentation is needed or requested it can be scheduled accordingly, but in the meantime the Policy Committee did not want to waste either the presenter’s time and/or the committee’s time in listening to a presentation on a matter that currently does not have regional support. Ms. Sellers seconded the motion, with Mr. Kelly voting no and all others being in concurrence.

e.) Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) – Ms. Marcie Parker, VDOT

Ms. Parker advised that from a presentation made to the Policy Committee in June regarding HSIP projects, questions arose as to what types of projects have been funded. Ms. Parker stated that HSIP’s purpose is to significantly reduce traffic fatalities and serious injuries on all public roads. Ms. Parker advised that HSIP is a federally-mandated program that is data driven, strategically approached, and includes three components: a strategic highway safety plan, highway safety improvement projects, and railway-highway crossing projects.

Ms. Parker stated that data obtained from the VDOT Fredericksburg District office in development of the strategic highway safety plan has focused on the following reasons for accidents: roadway departures, intersections, speeding, unrestrained drivers, distracted drivers, and young drivers.
Ms. Parker advised that six HSIP projects were approved by the CTB in June 2017 for FY2018-2023 funding:

3 – Districtwide – retroreflective back plates; shoulder rumble strips; & traffic actuated flashers

3 – FAMPO region – Fredericksburg – flashing yellow arrow upgrades; Spotsylvania – offset right turn lane on Old Plank Road at Ashleigh Park; Spotsylvania – mini roundabout at Old Dominion Parkway & Lee Hill Elementary School road

Ms. Parker relayed that the projects approved by the CTB prior to June, 2017 for the FAMPO region are as follows:

Stafford – bike/ped improvements on Leeland Road; Sidewalk on Courthouse Road
Spotsylvania – access management on Southpoint Parkway

Ms. Parker stated that the following two projects in the FAMPO region are currently under construction and these projects are as follows:

Fredericksburg – I-95 safety improvements at Route 3
Spotsylvania – intersection improvements at Route 1 and Harrison Road

Ms. Parker advised that before and after results from the projects being funded by HSIP reflects a 40% reduction in total crashes and a 74% reduction in injury crashes.

f.) 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Update – Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that as there will be limited funding for the 2045 Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) for the FY2018-2045 timeframe, a lot of projects will likely not be included. Mr. Agnello relayed that staff is required to complete a CLRP; however, an Unconstrained Needs Plan that was completed for FY2040 is not required to be updated this year.

Mr. Agnello stated that if the Policy Committee is in favor, staff could complete an additional/potential revenue source that goes beyond the CLRP. Mr. Agnello stated development of this plan could result in potentially an additional $2 billion.

Mr. Agnello relayed that additional funding could come from the following sources:

Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) - $1.343 b (FY2019-2045) (no regional consensus)
VRE Gas Tax Floor - $146.8 m (FY2019-2045 @ $3.17/gallon floor) (no regional consensus)
DC2RVA Rail Improvements - $493 m (regional support)
Additional I-95/395 Transit/TDM - $25 m (regional support)
Additional Volkswagen Settlement Funding (some Transit/TDM) - $5 m
Mr. Milde stated that the region has nothing to lose and potentially could receive additional funding so he feels staff should proceed. Mr. Milde stated the plan does need to include both private/public partnerships that are available as well.

Mr. Agnello advised the FY2045 LRTP and I-95 Phase 2 schedule will be as follows:

2017:
- August/September – Alternatives Development and Analysis for I-95 Phase 2 & LRTP
- May to October – Development of Bicycle/Pedestrian projects
- September/October – Draft results and additional analysis
- November – Final Plan with MPO Committee review
- December – Draft report for LRTP to be reviewed by MPO committees

2018:
- January – Final review of Draft LRTP
- January 25th – March 22nd – Public Comment Period
- March – Round 3 of Smart Scale process begins
- March/April – I-95 Phase 2 Highway Study completed
- Late March/Early April – LRTP revisions (based on public comments received)
- April – CLRP/LRTP approved by FAMPO and GWRC committees

i. Summary of 2045 LRTP Advisory Committee meeting of June 22, 2017

Included in agenda packet

STAFF AND AGENCY REPORTS

Mr. Agnello advised that new federal performance requirements that the region will have to comply with are forthcoming. Mr. Agnello stated that FAMPO will be meeting quarterly with VDOT to ensure the new guidelines are implemented. Mr. Agnello stated that seven additional performance measures in the safety category are the most significant changes, and this is the biggest change in federal regulations in quite some time.

MEMBER REPORTS -

Ms. Brabo advised that the Maryland Transportation Authority Harry Nice Bridge project currently has stated the improvements to the bridge will not contain shoulder and bicycle lanes. Ms. Brabo stated that King George County Board of Supervisors is adopting a letter of opposition that will be adopted at the upcoming board meeting on Tuesday. Ms. Brabo asked if FAMPO would also submit letters of opposition to both of the governors in Virginia and Maryland requesting that shoulders and bicycle lanes remain as part of the total improvement project. Ms. Brabo relayed that GWRC also agreed to provide letters of opposition earlier at tonight’s meeting.

Mr. Milde stated that even though the request came from a non-voting FAMPO member, he did not see any reason why FAMPO too could not provide letters of opposition. Mr. Milde asked Ms. Brabo
to forward a copy of the letter to be approved by King George County and then FAMPO would forward documentation as well.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

In packet and self-explanatory

**FAMPO COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

Minutes from the Technical Committee and CTAG are included in tonight’s agenda packet.

**ADJOURN FAMPO MEETING/NEXT MEETING, AUGUST 21, 2017**

The August 21, 2017 meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m. & the next meeting date will be September 18, 2017 at 7:15 p.m.
7a.) DC2RVA DEIS Public Comment Period and FAMPO Informational Meeting
DC2RVA Draft EIS and Public Comment Period

The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) have released the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on the Washington, D.C. to Richmond Southeast High Speed Rail Project. FRA and DRPT are evaluating options for rail capacity improvements that will improve reliability, expand passenger rail service, and provide a competitive travel option between Washington, D.C. and Richmond, Virginia. The Draft EIS provides an overview and comparison of the alternatives under consideration, including recommendations for a preferred alternative in each corridor segment.

A 60-day comment period will begin on September 8, 2017, and end on November 7, 2017. You are encouraged to submit a comment that will be included for the record. All comments will be addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Public hearings will be planned for October, where you can discuss the project with the team and sign up to offer verbal comments publicly. More details to come.

To view the Draft EIS electronically please visit the project website by clicking the button below.

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
We Want Your Feedback!

You are encouraged to review the Draft EIS and provide your comments. DRPT will be holding public hearings to address questions and solicit comments. Information on the October public hearing schedules will be available shortly. Comments should be submitted by November 7, 2017, in order for your feedback to be incorporated into the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

There are several options for providing public comments on the Draft EIS:

- Deliver verbal comments publicly during one of the planned public hearings.
- Provide written comments at one of the planned public hearings.
- Provide written comments at any time during the public comment period using the online comment form at http://dc2rvarail.com/contact-us/ or send via email to info@DC2RVArail.com.
- Provide verbal comments at any time by calling the toll-free hotline: 888-832-0900.
- Mail written comments at any time during the public comment period to: Emily Stock, Manager of Rail Planning, DRPT, 600 E. Main St, Suite 2102, Richmond, VA 23219.

General comments and questions may be submitted at any time through the following methods:
Mail To: Emily Stock  
Manager of Rail Planning  
Virginia Department of Rail & Public Transportation  
600 E Main St, Suite 2102  
Richmond, VA 23219

Stay Connected

Visit our website at: DC2RVArail.com  
Facebook: DC2RVArail  
Twitter: @DC2RVArail  
Call us toll-free at: 888-832-0900 or TDD 711

Sincerely,  
The DC2RVA Team

DRPT is committed to ensuring that no person is excluded from participation in, or denied the benefits of its services on the basis of race, color, or national origin, as protected by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For additional information on DRPT’s nondiscrimination policies and procedures or to file a complaint, please visit the website at www.drpt.virginia.gov or contact the Title VI Compliance Officer, Mike Mucha, 600 East Main Street, Suite 2102, Richmond, VA 23219.

DRPT’s mission is to improve the mobility of people and goods while expanding transportation choices in the Commonwealth through rail, public transportation, and commuter services.

Washington, D.C. to Richmond Southeast High Speed Rail Team  
801 East Main Street, Suite 1000  
Richmond, VA 23219

This email is intended for agnello@gwregion.org.  
Update your preferences or Unsubscribe
DC2RVA Study Update

FAMPO Technical Committee
September 11, 2017
Agenda

- Tier II EIS Schedule
- DRPT Recommended Alternatives
- Next Steps
- Other Corridor Projects
EIS Project


- Scoping
- Purpose & Need
- Alternatives
- Screening

- Draft EIS
- Final EIS
- Ashland Alternatives Study

Public Involvement
- Public Scoping Meetings
- Public Information Meetings
- Public Information Meetings
- Public Hearings

Record of Decision
DC2RVA Purpose & Need

IMPROVED Reliability

INCREASED Frequency of Service

DECREASED Travel Time
Alternatives Review
Must have additional track capacity to support passenger, commuter, and freight growth on the corridor

Northern Virginia is most congested area, needs to be implementation priority

Expanding capacity on the Long Bridge across the Potomac River is critical
Area 1: Arlington (~1 mile)

DRPT Recommendation:
Add Two Tracks Within Existing Right-of-Way consistent with Long Bridge Study Recommendation ($36-$47 Million)

- 1A. Add two tracks east
- 1B. Add two tracks west
- 1C. Add one track west and one track east
- Final decision tied to DDOT Long Bridge EIS Recommendation
Area 2: Northern VA (47 miles)

DRPT Recommendation:
Add Fourth Track Crystal City to Alexandria; Add Third Track Alexandria to Fredericksburg within Existing Right-of-Way ($1.7 Billion)

- Major water crossings at Occoquan, Neabsco, Powells, and Aquia (New bridges parallel to existing rail bridges)
- 8 miles of 3rd track from Franconia to Occoquan- environmental clearance through separate categorical exclusion (CE)
Area 3: Fredericksburg (14 miles)

DRPT Recommendation: Add Third Track through City of Fredericksburg on Existing Right-of-Way ($507 Million)

- Major water crossing at Rappahannock River (New bridge parallel to existing rail bridge)
Area 4: Central VA
(29 miles)

DRPT Recommendation:
Add Third Track in Existing Right-of-Way, Spotsylvania to Doswell ($643 Million)

• Multiple small waterway crossings, wetlands
Recommended Grade Separations/Closures

- **Stafford County**
  - Mount Hope Church Road - closure
    - New connection to Andrew Chapel Road

- **City of Fredericksburg**
  - Landsdowne Road - grade separation

- **Caroline County**
  - Colemans Mill Road - closure
    - Access via Dry Bridge Road
## DRPT’s Prioritized Recommendation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area in Order of Construction Priority</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Approximate Comparative Cost (millions 2025 $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia</td>
<td>Additional third or fourth track</td>
<td>$1,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>Three options depending on Long Bridge</td>
<td>$36 to $47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericksburg</td>
<td>Additional third track through City</td>
<td>$507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>Main Street Station and Staples Mill Road Station – Full Service via S-Line</td>
<td>$1,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Virginia</td>
<td>Additional third track</td>
<td>$643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>Separate study to evaluate additional capacity</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DC2RVA Project – Next Steps

- Publish the Draft EIS - early September
- 60-day public comment period
- Hold Public Hearings in early-October
- CTB decision on Preferred Alternative
- Preliminary Engineering on Preferred Alternative
- Final EIS and ROD
Other Corridor Projects

- **Atlantic Gateway Rail Components**
  - 8 miles of 3rd track from Franconia to Occoquan - environmental clearance through a categorical exclusion (CE)
  - 6 miles of 4th track RO to AF in Arlington/Alexandria - environmental clearance through DC2RVA
- **DDOT Long Bridge Project**
  - Level 1 alternative screening complete
  - Level 2 screening results September 2017
  - Draft EIS late 2018
  - Final EIS/ROD 2019
7b.) Update on Smart Scale Round 3
Update on Smart Scale Round 3

September, 2017
Summary of Fall Training Session and Draft Technical Guide

1. Smart Scale Resource Materials available online: [http://vasmartscale.org/resources/default.asp](http://vasmartscale.org/resources/default.asp)
   - Fall Training Session presentation (139 slides)
   - Draft Technical Guide

2. Several planned improvements to Smart Scale program
   - Some Major changes to Application process
   - Changes to Scoring process generally minor with a few exceptions, e.g., Accessibility

3. Staff reviewing Draft Technical Guide
   - Application period moved up from August 1st to March 1st in 2018
   - Limits on number of applications MPOs, Localities, and other applicants can submit
   - Limits on how far apart Multimodal projects in the same application can be
### Recommended Limits on Number of Applications from Fall Training Session

**Recommended Limits on Number of Applications**

#### June CTB Meeting Generated Significant Discussion
- Approach modified
- Established 2 tiers based on population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Localities</th>
<th>MPOs/PDCs/Transit Agencies</th>
<th>Maximum Number of Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 200K</td>
<td>Less than 500K</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Greater than 200K</td>
<td>Greater than 500K</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Four Applications:**
1. FAMPO
2. GWRC
3. GWRC Localities
4. FRED
5. PRTC

**Eight Applications:**
1. VRE
Planned Smart Scale Schedule

Biennial Schedule

- Prepping for Round 3 – Start Now
- Begin application intake March 1st 2018
- June 1st deadline for creation of an application
- August 1st submission deadline

5 month project evaluation and scoring window - 2 more months than previous rounds

5 month application intake window - 3 more months than previous rounds
FAMPO/GWRC: Planned Schedule for Smart Scale

September to January, 2018: Discussion/Development of Regional Candidate Projects

Early 2018: CMAQ/RSTP Call for Projects and Allocations for FY 19-24 SYIP and FY-25
Coordination between CMAQ/RSTP process and Round 3 of Smart Scale (FY 20-25 SYIP)

February/March, 2018: FAMPO/GWRC Review and Approval of Regional Candidate Projects
FAMPO Approval: Stafford, City, and Spotsylvania
GWRC Approval: Stafford, City, Spotsylvania, King George and Caroline

Spring, 2018: FAMPO/GWRC Approval of Local District Grant Candidate Projects
FAMPO Approval: Stafford, City, and Spotsylvania
GWRC Approval: King George and Caroline

March 1, 2018: Smart Scale Round 3 Application Period Begins
June 1, 2018: Deadline to initiate a new project application
August 1, 2018: Application deadline
Discussion on Draft Potential Regional Projects

- FAMPO and GWRC likely to have a maximum of 8 applications

1. I-95 NB Rappahannock River Crossing ~ $132 Million
2. I-95 SB at Rte 17 Interchange Improvements and Rte 17 STARS Study Improvements ~ $17 Million
3. I-95 NB at Rte 3 Interchange Improvements & Rte 3 STARS Study Improvements ~ $11 Million
4. US 301/Rte 3 Intersection Improvements
5. Regional PNR Lot Improvements (Several improvements packaged together)
   - Example: Mine Rd PNR Lot, Rte 630 PNR Lot enhancements, New Chatham Heights PNR Lot, Rte 17 PNR Lots, New Rte 3 East PNR Lots, Rte 1 PNR Lot expansion, & VRE PNR Lot enhancements
6. Mine Rd PNR Lot Expansion ~ $16 Million
7. New Chatham Heights PNR Lot
8. Lafayette Intersection improvements at Kenmore and Charles Street ~ $7 Million
9. Several Bike/Ped Improvements in City of Fredericksburg
10. Other?

Other Potential Projects from ongoing studies (Results expected in time for Smart Scale Round 3)
1. I-95 Phase 2
2. US 301/207
3. STARS Studies: Rte 1 & Exit 126
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Primary Improvement</th>
<th>Primary Improvement Type</th>
<th>Estimated Primary Improvement Cost</th>
<th>Potential Secondary Improvements</th>
<th>Secondary Improvement Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | I-95 NB Rappahannock River Crossing                                                  | Highway                  | 132000000?                      | X                               | Highway = I-95 SB Offramp to WB Rte 17 improvement and Rte 3 & 17 STARS Studies Improvements  
TDM = PNR Lot Expansions for Existing Rte 17 Lot and for a New Rte 17 Lot East of I-95  
Bike/Ped: Rte 17 improvements from Rte 3 & Rte 17 STARS studies  
ITS = Coordinated Signals from Rte 3 & 17 STARS Studies |
| 2   | I-95 SB at Rte 17 Interchange Improvements & Rte 17 STARS Study Improvements         | Highway                  | 17,000,000?                     | X                               | TDM = PNR Lot Expansions for Existing Rte 17 Lot and for a New Rte 17 Lot East of I-95  
Bike/Ped: Rte 17 improvements from Rte 17 STARS study  
ITS = Coordinated Signals from Rte 17 STARS Study |
| 3   | I-95 NB at Rte 3 Interchange Improvements & Rte 3 STARS Improvements                | Highway                  | 11,000,000?                     | X                               | TDM = New Small PNR Lot Near Rte 3 Interchange?  
Bike/Ped: Rte 3 Bike/Ped Overpass  
ITS = Coordinated Signals from Rte 3 STARS Study |
| 4   | US 301/Rte 3 Intersection Improvements                                              | Highway                  | 15,000,000?                     | X                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 5   | Regional PNR Lot Improvements for I-95 at Rte 610, Rte 17 (Existing Lot & a New Lot E. of I-95), Rte 3, Rte 1, and for Chatham Heights and Rte 3 East | TDM                      | ?                                | X                               | TDM = Electric Charging Stations  
Bike/Ped: Improved Bike/Ped amenities and access |
| 6   | Mine Rd PNR Lot Expansion                                                           | TDM                      | $16,000,000?                    | X                               | TDM = Electric Charging Stations  
Bike/Ped: Improved Bike/Ped amenities and access |
| 7   | New Chatham Heights PNR Lot                                                         | TDM                      | ?                                | X                               | TDM = Electric Charging Stations  
Bike/Ped: Improved Bike/Ped amenities and access |
| 8   | Lafayette Intersection Improvements at Kenmore and Charles Street                   | Highway                  | $7,000,000?                     | X                               | Bike/Ped Improvements at and near Intersections |
| 9   | Several Bike/Ped Improvements from Bike Study                                      | Bike/Ped                | ?                                |                                 | Study completion expected in September |

**Other Studies underway that could produce additional projects by Early 2018**

1. I-95 Phase 2
2. US Rte 301/207
3. Rte 1 STARS
4. Exit 126 STARS
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2045 Long Range Transportation Plan Update

September, 2017
1. Fiscal Constraint

2. New Map-21/FAST Act Requirements

3. I-95 Phase 2

4. Schedule
Fiscal Constraint: Limited Funding for 2045 CLRP

Highway Capacity Expansion
1. Available Funding ~ $706 Million
2. Critical Needs from I-95 Phase 1 & Unfunded Smart Scale ~ $1.1 Billion
3. All unfunded needs from 2040 LRTP effort ~ $10 Billion

Transit
1. Available Funding ~ $111 Million; Most funding needed for existing service
2. Limited Funding for New Transit Capitol
3. Limited Funding for Additional Transit Operating

Additional Funding Sources
1. Atlantic Gateway FASTLANE Grant (“Fred Ex”) ~ $165 Million
2. GWRC 5307 National Transit Database funding ~ $30 Million
3. Local Funding ~ $463 Million (Stafford, City, & Spotsylvania)
Proposed Funding Scenarios

1. Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP)
   - Highway Funding ~ $706 Million
   - Transit Funding ~ $111 Million *(Note: Does not include VRE)*
   - Local Funding ~ $463 Million
   - Additional Funding ~ $195 Million (Atlantic Gateway & GWRC 5307)
   - Total: $1.475 Billion

2. Additional Potential Revenues above CLRP (Additional $2 Billion)
   - Potential Sources:
     - Regional Motor Fuels Tax Floor
     - Additional Local Revenue
     - Additional Federal/State Revenue
     - Volkswagen Settlement Funding
     - I-95/I-395 Express Lanes Transit/TDM funding
     - DC2RVA Rail Funding
     - Other?

3. Unconstrained Needs Plan (About $10 Billion for 2040 LRTP)
New Map-21/FAST Act
Performance Measure Requirements

1. New Federal Requirements for MPOs

2. Seven performance measures areas
   a. National Highway System Performance: Freight Movement on the Intestate System
   b. National Highway System Performance: Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program
   c. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
   d. National Highway System – Asset Management: Pavement and Bridge
   e. National Highway System – Asset Management: Transit Asset Management Plans and Emergency Relief Program
   f. Transit Asset Management – National Transit Database
   g. Transit Safety
Map-21/FAST Act
Performance Measure Requirements

3. First Deadline for MPO CLRP/TIP: 5/27/2018
   c. Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
   d. National Highway System – Asset Management: Transit Asset Management Plans and Emergency Relief Program
   e. Transit Asset Management – National Transit Database
   f. Transit Safety

4. Second Deadline for MPO CLRP/TIP: 5/20/2019
   a. National Highway System Performance: Freight Movement on the Interstate System
   b. National Highway System Performance: Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program
   d. National Highway System – Asset Management: Pavement and Bridge

5. If a MPO completes its CLRP/TIP under SAFETEA-LU regulations before 5/27/2018, it is acceptable
   • But CLRP/TIP amendments after 5/27/2018 could trigger the need for compliance with Map-21/FAST Act performance measure requirements
6. **First Goal: To make 2045 FAMPO CLRP as compliant as possible with 1st Deadline performance measures**
   a. FAMPO is 1st MPO in Virginia that will go through new Map-21/FAST Act Requirements
   b. Consultant support being utilized
   c. Working with State: OIPI, VDOT, & DRPT
      - August 10th VDOT Letter: Quarterly meetings to start in September, 2017
      - State targets for all 1st Deadline performance measures expected by November, 2017
   d. **Will need to hold a Special FAMPO meeting in December, 2017**
      - Target Date/Time: December 18th: 6 to 7 PM

7. **Second Goal: To meet all Map-21/FAST Act Performance Measure requirements by 2nd Deadline**
   a. FAMPO is 1st MPO in Virginia that will go through new Map-21/FAST Act Requirements
   b. Working with State: OIPI, VDOT, & DRPT
   c. Consultant support will be needed
   d. **Will need to do a Mini-2045 LRTP Update in FY-18 to be completed before 5/20/2019**
      - Schedule of Federal process does not allow this to be done in time for April, 2018 FAMPO 2045 LRTP Update
I-95 Phase 2 Update: Highway
Potential Build Alternatives

Various ideas are available to the Advisory Committee when considering build alternatives for testing; such as:

1. General purpose widening in select areas
2. Express Lanes extension to various points in the study area
3. New I-95 access points
4. Collector-Distributor Lanes in key areas
5. Improvements to existing interchanges
6. Combinations of the above
Examples of Potential Build Alternatives

1. General Purpose Lane Widenings:
   • Exit 148 to Exit 133: Widen from 6 to 8 Lanes
   • Exit 130 to Exit 126: Widen from 6 to 8 Lanes
   • Exit 126 to Exit 110: Widen 6 to 8 Lanes

2. 95 Express Lane Improvements:
   • Extension from Exit 133 to Exit 126
   • New Access point at Exit 128: Harrison Rd

3. Interchange Improvements:
   • New Interchange: Exit 131 to Central Park Area
   • New Interchange: Exit 128: Harrison Rd
   • Exit 126 interchange improvements to Rte 1/Rte 17

4. Other Road Improvements:
   • Stafford Parkway from Exit 136 to Rte 17 (West)
   • New Arterial west of I-95 in Stafford between Garrisonville and Rte 17
   • ITS Improvements, e.g., Active Traffic Management System like I-66
Submission of Potential Highway Improvements for Consideration in I-95 Phase 2 Study

1. Each Advisory Committee member can submit up to 3 improvements for consideration
   - Each GWRC locality
   - DRPT
   - PRTC
   - VDOT
   - CTAG
   - MWCOG
   - FHWA

2. Deadline for Submittal: 9/20/2017
   - Submit to Paul Agnello: agnello@gwregion.org
Alternative Evaluation Criteria

When testing candidate alternatives, the following evaluation criteria will be considered:

1. Forecasted increase in person movement when compared to the no-build condition
2. Forecasted decrease in person travel delay when compared to the no-build condition
3. Physical (footprint) impacts
4. Consistency with local, state & federal plans and policies
5. Planning level cost estimates
I-95 Phase 2 Transit/TDM Overview

Market Analysis Recap

- Building on results of State OIPI Study
- Using Streetlight Data
- Large increase in commuter trips expected between GWRC/FAMPO and NOVA/DC
Initial Results of Reverse Peak VRE Service Analysis

Commuter Bus Routes - 2030

- Add reverse peak route
  - Provides service to Quantico (60% of employees live in Northern Virginia)
  - Also serves as supplemental service to VRE when VRE is not operating

- Reverse Commuter Bus likely a more cost effective way to provide reverse VRE service

- Reverse Commuter Bus could offer additional flexibility to stop at non-VRE commuter lots such as Garrisonville or provide supplemental service if VRE not operating.
About 24K New Commuter Trips Expected by 2045: GWRC to NOVA/DC

Commuter Trips: GWRC to NOVA/DC

2015: 47,800
2030: 58,100  - 22% Growth
2045: 72,000  - 51% Growth

Prioritized into LRTP

New Commuter Bus
VRE Improvements
New Bus Feeder Services
New Vanpools
TDM Measures
Expected Timeframe for I-95 Phase 2 Draft Results

- October/November: Transit/TDM
- November/December: Highway
High Level 2045 FAMPO/GWRC LRTP and I-95 Phase 2 Schedule

2017
1. August/September – Alternatives Development and Analysis for I-95 Phase 2 and LRTP
2. May to October – Development of Bicycle/Pedestrian projects
3. September/October – Draft Results and Additional Analysis
4. November/December – Completion of I-95 Phase 2 Transit/TDM
5. November/December – Final Results, MPO Committee Review

2018
1. January 25th to March 22nd – Public Involvement
2. March 1st – Smart Scale Round 3 Begins
3. March/April – Completion of I-95 Phase 2 Highway
4. Late March/Early April – LRTP revisions based on public comment
5. April – CLRP/LRTP Approval by FAMPO and GWRC committees
Questions & Input?

2045 Long Range Transportation Plan
7d.) Regional Transportation Authority
Regional transportation revenue in the Code of Virginia

Regional revenue streams

In 2013, Virginia passed legislation establishing transportation revenues for regions meeting certain thresholds indicative of transportation demand. The law established four revenue streams, with two tiers of regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional revenue stream</th>
<th>Tier I: Highest demand</th>
<th>Tier II: High demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional retail sales and use tax of 0.70%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional wholesale fuel tax of 2.1%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional regional transient occupancy tax of 2.0%</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional congestion relief fee on grantors of real property equal to $0.15 per $100 of the property value</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qualification thresholds

Three measures of transportation demand are used to determine a region’s eligibility for the regional transportation revenues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of transportation demand</th>
<th>Tier I: Highest demand</th>
<th>Tier II: High demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2 million</td>
<td>1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicles registered</td>
<td>1.7 million</td>
<td>1.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit riders annually</td>
<td>50 million</td>
<td>15 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified region</td>
<td>Northern Virginia (planning district 8)</td>
<td>Hampton Roads (planning district 23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eligible uses of funding

The law limits the type of projects that can be funded with the regional revenues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Type of projects eligible for funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Northern Virginia (planning district 8) | Regional funds (70% of revenues): Capital costs for construction of any transportation project contained in the regional long-range transportation plan.  
Local funds (30% of revenues): New urban or secondary highway construction, capital improvements that reduce congestion, projects in the regional long-range transportation plan, or for public transportation purposes. |
| Hampton Roads (planning district 23)    | “solely for new construction projects on new or existing highways, bridges, and tunnels...” |

Recipient of regional transportation revenues

The General Assembly has demonstrated a preference for regional transportation revenues to be deposited in a regional fund that is managed by a regional transportation authority established by the Commonwealth of Virginia and which is separate from the federally-designated regional transportation planning organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Regional transportation authority</th>
<th>Fund (under Code of VA) receiving regional revenues</th>
<th>Federally-designated transportation planning (MPO)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern Virginia (planning district 8)</td>
<td>Northern Virginia Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Northern Virginia Transportation Authority Fund11</td>
<td>National Capital Region Transportation Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Roads (planning district 23)</td>
<td>Hampton Roads Transportation Accountability Commission</td>
<td>Hampton Roads Transportation Fund12</td>
<td>Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 See HB 2313 (2013).  
2 Regions are identified as planning districts as defined in Va. Code. Ann. § 15.2-4200 et seq.  
Economic Vitality and Quality of Life
Unlocking Hampton Roads

HRTAC Overview

Kevin B. Page
Executive Director
CONGESTION/FUTURE CONNECTIVITY

The Stage is set for Regional Transportation Solution Consensus Building
For two decades the Region has identified these projects.
MOVING THE REGION FORWARD
HRTAC/HRTF Overview

• Hampton Roads Transportation Fund created 2013 Acts of Assembly HB2313

• HRTAC created 2014 Acts of Assembly HB1253 – Hired Executive Director August 2015

• Empowered to procure, finance, build and operate highway, bridge and tunnel projects in Hampton Roads

• Authorized to use HRTF monies and tolls for construction projects on new or existing highways, bridges and tunnels and to issue bonds using revenues to support bond debt

• Regional Collaboration - Works closely with the Hampton Roads Transportation Planning Organization (HRTPO) who determines Project Prioritization for the region
HRTAC Membership

19 Voting members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Cities</th>
<th>4 Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chesapeake</td>
<td>Isle of Wight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>James City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td>York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poquoson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Beach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Non-Voting Ex-officio members

- Commonwealth Transportation Board Member
- Virginia Department of Transportation
- Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation
- Virginia Port Authority

- HRTAC is a political subdivision of the Commonwealth
- Primarily funded with HB 2313 revenue (Hampton Roads Transportation Fund) approved by the 2013 General Assembly
HAMPTON ROADS TRANSPORTATION FUND

Additional Sales Tax
• Additional 0.7%
• $126.56M Revenue FY16 – ($129.97M FY2015)

Additional Fuels Tax
• Regional tax on motor fuels
• Additional 2.1% - $26.65M Revenue FY16 – ($40.94M FY2015)
• Fuel tax not floored in 2013 – Loss of nearly $14-15M per year

➢ No Floor on Gas Tax for HRTAC or NVTA
➢ State Code requires HRTF funds to be spent Hampton Roads highway construction projects
Legislation: Congestion Relief

HRTAC (HB 1253, 2014)

• “...shall give priority to those projects that are expected to provide the greatest impact on reducing congestion for the greatest number of citizens residing within Planning District 23...”

Statewide Prioritization Process (HB 2, 2014)

• “...Hampton Roads highway construction districts...shall ensure that congestion mitigation...is weighted highest among the factors in the prioritization process...”
• 45% weighted factor in Hampton Roads
General Assembly – 2016
HRTAC Omnibus Bill HB1111
Fine Tuning HRTAC

• Allows investment and provides liability protections
• Allows counties to designate a representative
• Allows all localities to have representation at the meetings if Chief Elected Officer or County Designee is unable to attend. Notice must be given 48 hours before meeting if regular member is unable to attend
• Administrative and operating expenses shall be paid by HRTAC Revenues
General Assembly Actions – 2016 Tolling

- Language within the State budget establishes new toll policy restricting CTB, VDOT, HRTAC, and NVTA from tolling existing un-tolled lanes without General Assembly approval except on:
  - HOV/HOT Lanes
  - New Lane capacity
  - New bridges
  - Short segments of highways between existing toll facilities
- Legislation was adopted allowing better collection of unpaid toll bills from other states
- HRTAC now has state guidance on tolling
# Defining the Roles of the HRTPO and HRTAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>HRTPO</th>
<th>HRTAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepares and Maintains Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocates RSTP and CMAQ Monies</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses Hampton Roads Transportation Fund (HRTF) to Build Highways, Bridges, and Tunnels</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues Bonds and Uses HRTF to Support These Bonds</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procures, Finances (HRTF, Tolls, Bonds) and Operates Highway, Bridge, and Tunnel Projects</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• HRTPO Long Range Transportation Plan identifies priority projects in the constrained plan or vision plan as under study/development/construction

• HRTAC develops a six year funding plan to guide in project funding for development and construction – HRTAC feeds LRTP funding plans

• HRTAC allocates funds to specific projects, asks that the HRTPO add them to the TIP

• The CTB selects the Local Preferred Alternative, maintains Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, allocates state funding to projects in Six Year Improvement Program

• VDOT assists in project readiness and construction through HRTAC/VDOT MOA and HRTAC project construction agreements
2040 LRTP: Regional Priority Projects
‘Sequencing Based on Project Readiness’

- I-64 Peninsula Widening
- I-64/I-264 Interchange
- I-64 Southside Widening/High-Rise Bridge - Phase 1
- Hampton Roads Crossing: Locally Preferred Alternative - Phase 1
- I-64 Southside Widening/High-Rise Bridge - Phase 2
- I-64/Fort Eustis Blvd Interchange
- US Route 460/58/13 Connector

▶ A major step forward in Regional Consensus Building - February 18, 2016
Unlocking Hampton Roads

Hampton Roads Regional Transportation Priority Projects
“Moving Projects Forward – HRTF Investments”
Projects Planned and Prioritized by HRTPO, Powered by HRTAC

I-64 Peninsula Widening: Segment 3
- $145 Million in SMART SCALE funding
- Construction Pending
- $156 Million HRTF

I-64 Peninsula Widening: Segment 2
- Under Construction
- $213 Million HRTF

I-64 Peninsula Widening: Segment 1
- $100 Million in Federal/State Funding
- Under Construction
- $44 Million HRTF

I-64/HRBT Widening
- PE (Geotechnical and Survey) Funded
- $25 Million HRTF

I-64/I-264 Interchange Improvements
- $17 Million in Federal/State Funding
- Phase 1 - Under Construction
- Phase 2 - PE and ROW Funded
- Phase 3 - Design Funded
- $217 Million HRTF

Remaining Segments of HRCS SEIS
- Study Funded
- $3 Million HRTF

US Route 460/58/13 Connector
- PE Funded
- $5 Million HRTF

Bowers Hill Interchange
- Study Funded
- $4 Million HRTF

I-64 Southside/High-Rise Bridge Widening
- Phase 1 - Fully Funded
- $600 Million HRTF

March 2017
HRTAC Funding Plan Adopted and HRTPO Long Range Plan Approved

- 2040 Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan
  - HRTAC’s Funding Plan was approved and communicated on March 17, 2016 to update HRTAC projects in the Constrained Long Range Plan
    - HRTAC identified project financing scenarios and information shared with HRTPO for the 2040 CLRTP - first constrained plan for construction of HRTAC Regional Projects
  - HRTPO approved project sequencing approach at its February 18, 2016 meeting, Approved 2040 CLRTP with projects developed by HRTAC at its July 21, 2016
- Legislation adopted to assist in advancing the mission of the HRTAC and improve its ability to conduct business
## HRTAC Funding Plan

### HRTAC 2016-2022 Funding Plan

**HRTAC Program Level Spreadsheet**

**Approved March 17, 2016**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Drawdowns</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>HRTAC Funding</th>
<th>HB2 Funding</th>
<th>VDOT Funding</th>
<th>Previous Jan-Dec 2016</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2017</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2018</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2019</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2020</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2021</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Seg I- UPC 104905</td>
<td>$122,351,685</td>
<td>$22,351,685</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>$54,904,155</td>
<td>($28,429,982)</td>
<td>($54,957,495)</td>
<td>($26,976,631)</td>
<td>($12,487,577)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Seg II- UPC 106665</td>
<td>$189,707,675</td>
<td>$21,707,675</td>
<td>$100,000,000</td>
<td>($24,186,868)</td>
<td>($60,100,000)</td>
<td>($58,831,351)</td>
<td>($14,429,401)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Seg III- UPC 106689</td>
<td>$311,303,820</td>
<td>$221,303,820</td>
<td>$90,095,845</td>
<td>($800,000)</td>
<td>($4,400,000)</td>
<td>($19,958,448)</td>
<td>($93,367,598)</td>
<td>($101,050,838)</td>
<td>($84,916,017)</td>
<td>($6,810,919)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64/264 - UPC 57048 (Phase I)</td>
<td>$157,142,416</td>
<td>$152,094,716</td>
<td>$5,047,700</td>
<td>($5,054,702)</td>
<td>($18,201,817)</td>
<td>($49,211,271)</td>
<td>($58,130,306)</td>
<td>($26,544,320)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64/264 - UPC 17630 (Phase II)</td>
<td>$190,031,747</td>
<td>$178,428,847</td>
<td>$11,602,900</td>
<td>($14,240,679)</td>
<td>($18,162,221)</td>
<td>($32,199,910)</td>
<td>($38,592,666)</td>
<td>($31,000,000)</td>
<td>($31,000,000)</td>
<td>($24,836,271)</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Southside-High Rise Br- UPC 106692 (Phase I)</td>
<td>$600,000,000</td>
<td>$600,000,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($341,708)</td>
<td>($19,658,292)</td>
<td>($150,000,000)</td>
<td>($190,000,000)</td>
<td>($190,000,000)</td>
<td>($50,000,000)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64/I-264 Interchange (Phase III)</td>
<td>$266,647,109</td>
<td>$266,647,109</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($266,647,109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Eustis Interchange- UPC 106700</td>
<td>TBD*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64 Southside-High Rise Br- Phase II</td>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rte 460/58/13 Connector</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-64/I-264 Interchange (Phase III)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton Roads Crossing Study- UPC 106724 (SEIS)</td>
<td>$6,352,527</td>
<td>$6,352,527</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($1,875,000)</td>
<td>($2,500,000)</td>
<td>($1,977,527)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,843,736,979</td>
<td>$1,575,733,852</td>
<td>$145,000,000</td>
<td>$123,003,127</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Future Projects

- **Harbor Crossing Project (Phase I)**: $266,647,109
- **Ft Eustis Interchange - UPC 106700**: TBD*
- **I-64 Southside-High Rise Br - Phase II**: TBD**
- **Rte 460/58/13 Connector**: TBD
- **I-64/I-264 Interchange (Phase III)**: TBD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>HRTAC Funding</th>
<th>HB2 Funding</th>
<th>VDOT Funding</th>
<th>Previous Jan-Dec 2016</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2017</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2018</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2019</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2020</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2021</th>
<th>Jan-Dec 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$266,647,109</td>
<td>$266,647,109</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>($266,647,109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD**</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,843,736,979</td>
<td>$1,575,733,852</td>
<td>$145,000,000</td>
<td>$123,003,127</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total Yearly Costs

- Previous year carryover: $0
- HRTF Funding***: $0
- Projected HRTAC Revenue****: Total: $1,677,560,513
- Total Funding: $420,712,528
- Residual Cash Flow: $366,645,457

---

**HRTAC Program Level Spreadsheet**

- **Updated Cost Based Upon Contract Award**
- **Construction Phase Estimate Still Under Development**
- **Added by PFM**
- **Adjusted to VDOT Comments 3/4/2016**

---

## Unlocking Hampton Roads

- $1.8B in project value, $1.4B already allocated to projects
Smart Scale (HB2) Funding

- Smart Scale (Formerly known as HB2) funding is a competitive prioritization process administered by the Commonwealth to advise the Commonwealth Transportation Board in its funding decisions.
  - $144,927,753 awarded in June 2016 to the I-64 Peninsula Widening Project
  - $150,000,000 recommended for award in June 2017
    - $100,000,000 to the I-64 Southside Widening/High Rise Bridge Project
    - $50,000,000 to the I-64/I-264 Interchange Phase II Project
Hampton Roads Crossing Study
A study that led to Unanimous Regional Decisions
### 2040 FCLRTP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved Projects</th>
<th>HRBT (seg. 8&amp;9)</th>
<th>HRB II</th>
<th>Bower's Hill Interchange</th>
<th>Rt 460/58/13</th>
<th>Ft. Eustis Interchange</th>
<th>Total FV Cost</th>
<th>Funded by HRTF Bonds</th>
<th>Funded by Toll Bonds</th>
<th>Funded by HRTF Pay-Go</th>
<th>Funded by Other Pay-Go</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2040 FCLRTP with HOT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflated Costs (MM)</td>
<td>$1,576</td>
<td>$4,031</td>
<td>$1,493</td>
<td>$568</td>
<td>$368</td>
<td>$297</td>
<td>$8,333</td>
<td>$4,912</td>
<td>$347</td>
<td>$2,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscally Constrained Construction End Year</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2024</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2040 FCLRTP without HOT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflated Costs (MM)</td>
<td>$1,576</td>
<td>$4,131</td>
<td>$1,529</td>
<td>$583</td>
<td>$368</td>
<td>$297</td>
<td>$8,484</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$2,234</td>
<td>$750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscally Constrained Construction End Year</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- HRBT is the only Harbor Crossing component in Alternative A
- Alt A can be completed under the approved 2040 FCLRTP without impact to other projects
- HRBT, HRB II/Bowers Hill Interchange, the Rt 460/58/13 and the Ft. Eustis Boulevard Interchange can all be completed within 2040 FCLRTP
## Regional Projects: Fiscal-Constraint - $8.33B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>YOE COST ($M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2022</td>
<td>I-64 Peninsula – Segments 1, 2, and 3</td>
<td>$624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2021</td>
<td>I-64/I-264 Interchange – Phases I &amp; II</td>
<td>$347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>I-64 Southside/High-Rise Bridge – Phase I</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>US 460/58/13 Connector – PE</td>
<td>$5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>HRBT</td>
<td>$4,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>I-64 Southside/High-Rise Bridge – Phase II</td>
<td>$1,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>Bowers Hill Interchange</td>
<td>$568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>US 460/58/13 Connector</td>
<td>$368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>I-64/Fort Eustis Blvd Interchange</td>
<td>$297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Vision Plan** | I-564/I-664 Connectors (Patriots)  
|             | I-664/MMMBT                                                             |               |
|             | VA 164/164 Connector                                                   |               |
Hampton Roads SEIS Unanimous Regional Decisions

• October 20, 2016 - HRTPO Selected Alternative A-Modified as its Preferred Alternative

• October 20, 2016 – HRTAC qualified Alternative A-Modified as a feasible funding plan and allocated $7.0M for future study of remaining segments not included in Alternative A-Modified
  - $4.0M contingency to be added by HRTAC June 15, 2017
The Road Ahead

- Programmed for Construction
- Under Study
- HRCS SEIS Alternative A and Bowers Hill
- Remaining Segments of Alternative D

- Alternative A
- Remaining Segments of Alternative D
- HOV to HOT
- I-64/I-264 Interchange
- US 460/58/13 Connector
- Bowers Hill
- I-64 Southside/High-Rise Bridge
- HOV to HOT — Segment 2

Source: RITIS using INRIX data.
Next Steps

• HRTAC will continue work to develop solutions
• Considerations will be made as more information is available
  • Incorporate General Assembly and Smart Scale (HB2) outcomes
• Continue construction of HRTAC approved/funded projects
• Record of Decision of SEIS Alternative A
  • HRTAC will work with HRTPPO and impacted jurisdictions to study the remaining projects not selected in the SEIS Alternative A
• Public discussion on how to fund the projects
  • HRTAC will advance its approved 2016-2022 Funding Plan, calibrate funding option for selected SEIS Alternative, advance project readiness and continue preparations for bonding/financing of projects
7e.) Harry Nice Bridge Letters
The Honorable Larry Hogan  
Office of the Governor  
100 State Circle  
Annapolis, MD 21401  

RE: Request for Assistance (Harry W. Nice Memorial Bridge Replacement Project)  

Dear Governor Hogan:  

I am writing on behalf of the George Washington Regional Commission to express our concerns regarding the plans for the Harry W. Nice Memorial Bridge Replacement Project.  

BACKGROUND. The Harry W. Nice Bridge, located on U.S. 301, is a 1.7-mile bridge that spans the Potomac River between King George County, VA and Charles County, MD. Its two lanes service 6.6 million vehicles annually, and the bridge is the second oldest facility in the Maryland Transportation Authority's (MDTA) inventory. In 2006, the MDTA reviewed the Nice Bridge's limited capacity, negative impacts on traffic, and effects on public safety. The MDTA concluded with an initiative to replace the current bridge with a wider four-lane structure.  

CONCERNS. Since announcing its "selected alternate" in 2012, the MDTA planned for the bridge's replacement to include a barrier-separated shared-use path and road shoulders wide enough to accommodate vehicle breakdowns. Unfortunately, the MDTA has recently announced the development of a "practical design" with no vehicle breakdown lanes and the option to remove the barrier-separated shared-use path.  

We understand that this "practical option" is but one of a few alternatives that the MDTA is considering. However, we fear the MDTA may prioritize cutting costs over the burden a cheaper option would place on our region. Failing to install wider shoulders will only serve to reinforce the traffic congestion King George County suffers on a recurring basis.  

Currently, a single accident can shut down this major interstate thoroughfare for hours. This is especially troublesome as the Virginia Department of Transportation is ramping up its promotion of U.S. 301 as an alternative to the soon-to-be project laden Interstate 95.  

Removal of the barrier-separated shared-use path is additionally bothersome. In addition to quality of life concerns, the MDTA's practical design option plays a key role in our regional planning. Currently, the Nice
Bridge serves as a critical connection between multiple legs in the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail, a tourism attraction that spans both Virginia and Maryland. In January, the George Washington Regional Commission jurisdictions of King George County, Stafford County and the City of Fredericksburg signed a memorandum of understanding with the National Park Service designating the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail through our region. The route includes a connection to the Nice Bridge, so users can access the Maryland portion of the trail network. Although currently an on-road route, this connection will eventually be a paved shared-use path adjacent to U.S. 301. If the MDTA moves forward without bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on the Nice Bridge, there will not be a safe way for trail users to access the other side of the Potomac River in this region.

REQUEST. The George Washington Regional Commission would like for the MDTA to consider the repercussions the Nice Bridge Replacement Project will have on our region. As such, we are asking to remove any options that fail to include safe bicycle and pedestrian access and vehicular breakdown lanes. We humbly request your assistance with achieving that aim.

I appreciate your consideration. If you have any additional questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Matthew Kelly
Chairman
The Honorable Terence "Terry" McAuliffe  
Office of the Governor  
Patrick Henry Building, 3rd Floor  
1111 East Broad Street  
Richmond, VA 23219

RE: Request for Assistance (Harry W. Nice Memorial Bridge Replacement Project)

Dear Governor McAuliffe:

I am writing on behalf of the George Washington Regional Commission to express our concerns regarding the plans for the Harry W. Nice Memorial Bridge Replacement Project.

BACKGROUND. The Harry W. Nice Bridge, located on U.S. 301, is a 1.7-mile bridge that spans the Potomac River between King George County, VA and Charles County, MD. Its two lanes service 6.6 million vehicles annually, and the bridge is the second oldest facility in the Maryland Transportation Authority's (MDTA) inventory. In 2006, the MDTA reviewed the Nice Bridge's limited capacity, negative impacts on traffic, and effects on public safety. The MDTA concluded with an initiative to replace the current bridge with a wider four-lane structure.

CONCERNS. Since announcing its "selected alternate" in 2012, the MDTA planned for the bridge's replacement to include a barrier-separated shared-use path and road shoulders wide enough to accommodate vehicle breakdowns. Unfortunately, the MDTA has recently announced the development of a "practical design" with no vehicle breakdown lanes and the option to remove the barrier-separated shared-use path.

We understand that this "practical option" is but one of a few alternatives that the MDTA is considering. However, we fear the MDTA may prioritize cutting costs over the burden a cheaper option would place on our region. Failing to install wider shoulders will only serve to reinforce the traffic congestion King George County suffers on a recurring basis.

Currently, a single accident can shut down this major interstate thoroughfare for hours. This is especially troublesome as the Virginia Department of Transportation is ramping up its promotion of U.S. 301 as an alternative to the soon-to-be project laden Interstate 95.
Removal of the barrier-separated shared-use path is additionally bothersome. In addition to quality of life concerns, the MDTA's practical design option plays a key role in our regional planning. Currently, the Nice Bridge serves as a critical connection between multiple legs in the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail, a tourism attraction that spans both Virginia and Maryland. In January, the George Washington Regional Commission jurisdictions of King George County, Stafford County and the City of Fredericksburg signed a memorandum of understanding with the National Park Service designating the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail through our region. The route includes a connection to the Nice Bridge, so users can access the Maryland portion of the trail network. Although currently an on-road route, this connection will eventually be a paved shared-use path adjacent to U.S. 301. If the MDTA moves forward without bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on the Nice Bridge, there will not be a safe way for trail users to access the other side of the Potomac River in this region.

REQUEST. The George Washington Regional Commission would like for the MDTA to consider the repercussions the Nice Bridge Replacement Project will have on our region. As such, we are asking to remove any options that fail to include safe bicycle and pedestrian access and vehicular breakdown lanes. We humbly request your assistance with achieving that aim.

I appreciate your consideration. If you have any additional questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Matthew Kelly
Chairman
September 18, 2017

The Honorable Larry Hogan
Office of the Governor
100 State Circle
Annapolis, MD 21401

RE: Request for Assistance (Harry W. Nice Memorial Bridge Replacement Project)

Dear Governor Hogan:

I am writing on behalf of the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) to express our concerns regarding the plans for the Harry W. Nice Memorial Bridge Replacement Project.

BACKGROUND. The Harry W. Nice Bridge, located on U.S. 301, is a 1.7-mile bridge that spans the Potomac River between King George County, VA and Charles County, MD. Its two lanes service 6.6 million vehicles annually, and the bridge is the second oldest facility in the Maryland Transportation Authority's (MDTA) inventory. In 2006, the MDTA reviewed the Nice Bridge's limited capacity, negative impacts on traffic, and effects on public safety. The MDTA concluded with an initiative to replace the current bridge with a wider four-lane structure.

CONCERNS. Since announcing its "selected alternate" in 2012, the MDTA planned for the bridge's replacement to include a barrier-separated shared-use path and road shoulders wide enough to accommodate vehicle breakdowns. Unfortunately, the MDTA has recently announced the development of a "practical design" with no vehicle breakdown lanes and the option to remove the barrier-separated shared-use path. We understand that this "practical option" is but one of a few alternatives that the MDTA is considering. However, we fear the MDTA may prioritize cutting costs over the burden a cheaper option would place on our region. Failing to install wider shoulders will only serve to reinforce the traffic congestion King George County suffers on a recurring basis.

Currently, a single accident can shut down this major interstate thoroughfare for hours. This is especially troublesome as the Virginia Department of Transportation is ramping up its promotion of U.S. 301 as an alternative to the soon-to-be project laden Interstate 95.

Removal of the barrier-separated shared-use path is additionally bothersome. In addition to quality of life concerns, the MDTA's practical design option plays a key role in our regional planning. Currently, the Nice Bridge serves as a critical connection between multiple legs in the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail, a tourism attraction that spans both Virginia and Maryland. In January, the George Washington Regional
Commission jurisdictions of King George County, Stafford County and the City of Fredericksburg signed a memorandum of understanding with the National Park Service designating the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail through our region. The route includes a connection to the Nice Bridge, so users can access the Maryland portion of the trail network. Although currently an on-road route, this connection will eventually be a paved shared-use path adjacent to U.S. 301. If the MDTA moves forward without bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on the Nice Bridge, there will not be a safe way for trail users to access the other side of the Potomac River in this region.

REQUEST. The Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization would like for the MDTA to consider the repercussions the Nice Bridge Replacement Project will have on our region. As such, we are asking to remove any options that fail to include safe bicycle and pedestrian access and vehicular breakdown lanes. We humbly request your assistance with achieving that aim.

I appreciate your consideration. If you have any additional questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Paul Milde
Chairman
September 18, 2017

The Honorable Terence "Terry" McAuliffe
Office of the Governor
Patrick Henry Building, 3rd Floor
1111 East Broad Street
Richmond, VA 23219

RE: Request for Assistance (Harry W. Nice Memorial Bridge Replacement Project)

Dear Governor McAuliffe:

I am writing on behalf of the Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) to express our concerns regarding the plans for the Harry W. Nice Memorial Bridge Replacement Project.

BACKGROUND. The Harry W. Nice Bridge, located on U.S. 301, is a 1.7-mile bridge that spans the Potomac River between King George County, VA and Charles County, MD. Its two lanes service 6.6 million vehicles annually, and the bridge is the second oldest facility in the Maryland Transportation Authority's (MDTA) inventory. In 2006, the MDTA reviewed the Nice Bridge's limited capacity, negative impacts on traffic, and effects on public safety. The MDTA concluded with an initiative to replace the current bridge with a wider four-lane structure.

CONCERNS. Since announcing its "selected alternate" in 2012, the MDTA planned for the bridge's replacement to include a barrier-separated shared-use path and road shoulders wide enough to accommodate vehicle breakdowns. Unfortunately, the MDTA has recently announced the development of a "practical design" with no vehicle breakdown lanes and the option to remove the barrier-separated shared-use path. We understand that this "practical option" is but one of a few alternatives that the MDTA is considering. However, we fear the MDTA may prioritize cutting costs over the burden a cheaper option would place on our region. Failing to install wider shoulders will only serve to reinforce the traffic congestion King George County suffers on a recurring basis.

Currently, a single accident can shut down this major interstate thoroughfare for hours. This is especially troublesome as the Virginia Department of Transportation is ramping up its promotion of U.S. 301 as an alternative to the soon-to-be project laden Interstate 95.

Removal of the barrier-separated shared-use path is additionally bothersome. In addition to quality of life concerns, the MDTA's practical design option plays a key role in our regional planning. Currently, the Nice
Bridge serves as a critical connection between multiple legs in the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail, a tourism attraction that spans both Virginia and Maryland. In January, the George Washington Regional Commission jurisdictions of King George County, Stafford County and the City of Fredericksburg signed a memorandum of understanding with the National Park Service designating the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail through our region. The route includes a connection to the Nice Bridge, so users can access the Maryland portion of the trail network. Although currently an on-road route, this connection will eventually be a paved shared-use path adjacent to U.S. 301. If the MDTA moves forward without bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on the Nice Bridge, there will not be a safe way for trail users to access the other side of the Potomac River in this region.

**REQUEST.** The Fredericksburg Area Metropolitan Planning Organization would like for the MDTA to consider the repercussions the Nice Bridge Replacement Project will have on our region. As such, we are asking to remove any options that fail to include safe bicycle and pedestrian access and vehicular breakdown lanes. We humbly request your assistance with achieving that aim.

I appreciate your consideration. If you have any additional questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Paul Milde
Chairman
10.) Correspondence
I-95 Express Lanes
Fredericksburg Extension
Prince William County and
Stafford County
Location and Design Public Hearing

Monday, September 25, 2017, 6-8 p.m.
Inclement weather date is Wednesday, September 27, 2017
Stafford High School
63 Stafford Indians Lane
Fredericksburg, VA 22405
Brief presentation will be delivered at 7 p.m.

Find out about design plans for the proposed Interstate 95 Express Lanes Fredericksburg Extension. The project is proposed to extend Express Lanes by 10 miles from just south of Garrisonville Road to Route 17 in Stafford County. Two reversible Express Lanes would be built in the existing median of I-95. New access points to Express Lanes would be built near the Route 17 and Route 630 (Courthouse Road) I-95 interchanges in Stafford and at Russell Road near Quantico Marine Corps Base in Prince William County.

Stop by between 6-8 p.m. to review the proposed plans and the revised Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act. Project plans are available for review at the District Office. The revised EA will be available beginning September 8, 2017 on the project website at www.VirginiaDOT.org and at VDOT’s Fredericksburg District Office at 87 Deacon Road, Fredericksburg, VA 22405, in Stafford County. Please call 540-899-4288 ahead of your visit to ensure appropriate personnel are available to answer your questions.

Property impact information, relocation assistance policies and tentative construction schedules are available for your review at the District Office and will be available at the public hearing.

In compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 and 36 CFR Part 800, information concerning the potential effects of the proposed project on properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places is provided in the environmental documentation.

Give your written or oral comments at the hearing or submit them by October 10, 2017, to Krishna Potturi, Project Manager, 87 Deacon Road, Fredericksburg, VA 22405. You may also email your comments to I95fredex@vdot.virginia.gov. Please reference "I-95 Express Lanes FredEx" in the email subject line.

VDOT ensures nondiscrimination and equal employment in all activities in accordance with Title VI and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. If you need more information or special assistance for persons with disabilities or limited English proficiency, contact VDOT’s Civil Rights District Manager Valerie Talley at 540-899-4562 or TDD/TTY 711.

State Project 0095-969-739
UPC 110527
September 13, 2017

Mr. Stan Huie
5 Belle Meade Ct.
Fredericksburg, VA 22407

Dear Mr. Huie:

At its September 12, 2017 meeting the Board of Supervisors appointed you to serve on the Citizens Transportation Advisory Group representing the Courtland District. The Transportation Advisory Group meets the 2nd Wednesday monthly at 6:00 p.m. at 406 Princess Anne St. in Fredericksburg. Your term commences immediately and will expire on September 12, 2019.

The Spotsylvania County Board of Supervisors requires that all members of Boards, Commissions and Committees sign the Spotsylvania County Code of Ethics. Two copies are enclosed. Please read, sign and return one copy to the attention of Nadera Greene. Also enclosed is the portion from the Bylaws regarding attendance.

On behalf of the Board, I would like to thank you for serving in this position for Spotsylvania County. If my staff or I can be of assistance to you, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mark L. Cole
Deputy County Administrator

Enclosures
C: Karl Holsten, County Attorney
   Lloyd Robinson, FAMPO Administrator
11.) FAMPO Committees Meeting Minutes
Members Present:

Mr. Erik Nelson, Chair, City of Fredericksburg
Mr. Bassam Amin, City of Fredericksburg
Mr. Doug Morgan, County of Spotsylvania
Mr. Christopher Rapp, County of Stafford
Mr. Tim Roseboom, Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT)
Mr. Rodney White, Fredericksburg Regional Transit (FRED)
Mr. Stephen Haynes, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)
Ms. Sonali Soneji, Virginia Railway Express (VRE)

Others Present:

Ms. Michelle Shropshire, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)
Mr. Gregory Burnside, Citizen

Staff Members Present:

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

CALL TO ORDER

The FAMPO Technical Committee meeting was called to order at 9:33 a.m. by Chair, Mr. Nelson.

APPROVAL OF TECHNICAL COMMITTEE AGENDA

Upon request made from staff, the following two items were added to the June agenda:

Category 6 – Action/Discussion items – C – Resolution No. 17-36
Category 6 – Action/Discussion items – F – Resolution No. 17-37

Upon consent from members present, the June Technical Committee agenda was approved with requested items mentioned above to be added to the agenda.
APPROVAL OF TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES FROM MAY 1, 2017

The minutes from the May 1, 2017, FAMPO Technical Committee meeting were accepted as submitted.

REVIEW OF FAMPO POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING ON MAY 15, 2017

Mr. Agnello advised that a presentation was given by VDOT regarding project scope changes in the original SB Rappahannock River Crossing project. Mr. Agnello stated that Ms. Shropshire is also here at today’s meeting to give the same information to the Technical Committee.

Mr. Agnello stated that there was lengthy discussion on the consideration of establishing a tax floor with the VRE gas tax. Mr. Agnello also advised that discussion occurred on the possibility of establishing a Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) for the region. Mr. Agnello stated that both of these revenue funding options, if implemented, would bring additional revenue to the region annually. Mr. Agnello stated that both of these options will be discussed in more detail at today’s meeting.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

a.) Election of Officers - Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that the cycle slate for officers from the FAMPO Technical Committee for the upcoming FY2018 year is:
   Chair – Mr. Joey Hess – Stafford County
   Vice-Chair – Mr. Dan Cole – Spotsylvania County
   Second Vice-Chair – Mr. Erik Nelson – City of Fredericksburg

There was unanimous consent from the members present to accept the slate of officers as presented.

b.) Resolution No. 17-36, Adoption of the Fiscal Year 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that the public comment period for adoption of the FY2018 UPWP began last month and ended June 16, 2017. Mr. Agnello stated that comments can still be accepted up to June 16th; however, to date, no comments have been provided. Mr. Agnello stated that staff continues to work on updating the 2045 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). Mr. Agnello advised that staff is continuing work on Phase 2 of the I-95 Corridor Study.
Mr. Roseboom with DRPT advised that DRPT has conditionally approved FAMPO’s UPWP as submitted; however, adoption still needs to be received from the Policy Committee. Mr. Roseboom stated that there are some minor technical issues and housekeeping updates that will be forthcoming prior to receiving Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) endorsement. Mr. Roseboom advised that for the FAMPO region one amendment for an item from Stafford County will need to be updated and that FAMPO will need to submit a Resolution for support as well. Mr. Roseboom stated that DRPT will forward these updates to FAMPO staff by June 20th.

There was unanimous consent from the FAMPO Technical Committee to move forward Resolution No. 17-36 for adoption of the FY2018 UPWP by the Policy Committee at their upcoming meeting in June.

c.) I-95 SB Rappahannock River Crossing Project Changes – Ms. Michele Shropshire, VDOT

Ms. Shropshire advised that even though there has not been any cost changes, VDOT has a new design for the I-95 SB Rappahannock River Crossing project. Ms. Shropshire stated the new design came about from citizen comments expressed at public meetings. Ms. Shropshire stated there was public concern on the weaving that would have occurred with the first concept. The new concept is still being reviewed by VDOT engineers, but is expected to be endorsed.

Ms. Shropshire stated the new concept will result in a total of six lanes, three of which will be collector-distributor lanes, and the changes will be implemented between Route 17 in Stafford County and just south of Route 3 in Spotsylvania County. Ms. Shropshire stated that the other 3 lanes will continue to be used as general purpose lanes. Ms. Shropshire stated traffic will begin to merge back onto the general purpose lanes of I-95 south of exit 130, before the Harrison Road Bridge overpass. The new configuration at Route 17 is simpler in design. Ms. Shropshire advised the Request for Proposals (RFP) will be released in July.

Ms. Shropshire relayed that the Route 3 Safety Improvement project is still moving forward as originally planned and these improvements will include safety improvements to both the I-95 SB and NB lanes.

Ms. Shropshire stated that as a result of change in the termini of the project description, a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) from FAMPO is needed in order to release the RFP in July.

i. Resolution No. 17-38 – Amending the FY2015-2018 TIP to Update UPC 101595 – Mr. Paul Agnello

There was unanimous consent from the FAMPO Technical Committee to request that Resolution No. 17-38 be moved forward for adoption by the FAMPO Policy Committee at the upcoming June meeting.

d.) Regional Transportation Authority (RTA) Discussion – Mr. Paul Agnello
Mr. Agnello relayed that discussion occurred at the Fredericksburg Regional Chamber of Commerce forum regarding the region considering establishing its own RTA. Mr. Agnello stated this has been an item of recent months at the FAMPO Policy Committee as well. Mr. Agnello stated the City of Fredericksburg is in support of forming an RTA; Stafford County still needs additional information and presentations made from both Hampton Roads and NOVA (who currently have an RTA in place) & Spotsylvania County is adamantly opposed to the concept.

Mr. Agnello stated that as transportation needs continue to rise and federal, state & local funding sources will more than likely continue to decrease, regions are looking at developing other revenue sources. Mr. Agnello advised that the regions that have additional options in place have tended to outscore other regions in the Smart Scale process.

Mr. Agnello advised that the following three transportation revenue sources are being studied by the region:

1. Legislatively updating the 1986 District Grant formulas for Smart Scale to be less focused on city/town population within its district (In FAMPO, only the City of Fredericksburg and the town of Colonial Beach areas are eligible for this funding source) Item 1 could generate an additional $5M revenue source in Smart Scale projects and an approximate $35M to the District Grant Program.

2. Establishing a motor fuel tax floor for the VRE gas tax. Implementation of this revenue source could generate an additional $5.5M annually to the FAMPO jurisdictions – if implemented, an additional $158M would be allocated to the FAMPO region (City of Fredericksburg, and Counties of Spotsylvania and Stafford) between FY2018 and FY2045.

3. Creating a Regional Transportation Authority – this option generates the largest amount of revenue and would result in an additional $35M generated in FY2018. Between FY2019 and FY2045, the revenue increase could be $1.3B (in order to establish an RTA, Mr. Agnello advised that at least 2 adjacent jurisdictions need to be on board).

e.) FAMPO Committee Meetings Calendar – Mr. Nick Quint

Mr. Quint advised that the new FAMPO calendar gives meeting dates for the next year, and is included in today's packet. Mr. Quint reminded everyone that the next FAMPO Technical Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, September 11th at 9:30 a.m.

Mr. Agnello stated that as the Policy Committee will not be meeting until the middle of August, there will be no business and/or activity applicable for a meeting in July, so both the Technical Committee and CTAG will cancel meetings for both July and August. Mr. Agnello relayed that the 2045 LRTP Advisory Committee will still be meeting in July/August.

f.) Resolution No. 17-37, Amending the Fiscal Years 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program to Update UPC 107463 – Mr. Nick Quint

Mr. Quint advised that Resolution No. 17-37, is requesting the TIP be amended for the Mine Road Sidewalk project in Northern Stafford County that was added to the Six Year Improvement
Program (SYIP) after it was selected for funding from the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). Mr. Quint stated the Resolution will add funding to the construction phase of this project.

Resolution No. 17-37 was unanimously endorsed by the FAMPO Technical Committee with a request that it be forwarded to the Policy Committee for adoption at the upcoming June meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Agnello advised that a public information meeting is being conducted by VDOT on Thursday, June 8th from 5-7:00 p.m. The purpose of this meeting is for discussion of the upcoming safety improvement projects at the Route 3 interchange in Spotsylvania County.

STAFF REPORT:

Mr. Agnello advised that FAMPO has two new staff members; both are graduates of the University of Mary Washington and previously served as FAMPO interns. The new staff members are Mr. John Bentley and Ms. Kari Barber.

Mr. Agnello also relayed that staff is glad to report that Ms. Donley is now back after being out for medical issues.

MEMBER REPORTS

Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT): Mr. Roseboom advised that DRPT’s Revenue Advisory Board meeting is scheduled to occur a week from Friday. Mr. Roseboom relayed that Ms. DeBruhl will be making a presentation on what is being submitted and proposed for State approval at the upcoming Policy Committee meeting.

Fredericksburg Regional Transit (FRED): Mr. White advised that FRED has placed its order to receive 12 new buses. To date, 4 have been received, inventoried, inspected, etc. Mr. White stated the other 8 buses are forthcoming.

George Washington Regional Commission (GWRC): Ms. Utz advised that GWRideConnect is wrapping up the FY2017 year and looking forward to success in FY2018 with the rideshare program. Ms. Utz relayed that GWRideConnect signed up 1,000 new applicants in 2017. Ms. Utz stated that the Advantage self-insured vanpool insurance program is still operating, and GWRC staff maintains the program in conjunction with DRM in Richmond.

Ms. Utz also advised that GWRideConnect will begin its summer marketing campaign with weekly ads being run on the local radio stations. The ad campaign will run from June to September. Ms. Utz also advised that GWRideConnect also has a new part-time receptionist (Mr. Spencer Diehl) coming on board on June 12th.

Virginia Railway Express (VRE): Ms. Soneji advised that the monthly VRE board meeting will be held on June 16th in Fredericksburg. Ms. Soneji relayed that VRE is celebrating its 25th year of
operation, and after the June 16th meeting is concluded, a ribbon-cutting ceremony will occur at the Fredericksburg station.

NEXT TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEETING, September 11th, 2017 at 9:30 a.m.
/ADJOURN

The next Technical Committee meeting will be held on Monday September 11th, 2017. The June 5th meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m.
Committee Members Present:
Mr. Todd Rump, Chair, Spotsylvania County
Mr. Dave McLaughlin, City of Fredericksburg
Mr. Tim Davis, Caroline County
Mr. Michael Wood, Spotsylvania County
Ms. Dawn McGarrity, Stafford County
Mr. David Swan, Stafford County
Mr. Rupert Farley, At-Large
Mr. Larry Gross, At-Large

Others in Attendance:
Ms. Michele Shropshire, Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT)

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. Leigh Anderson, GWRC
Ms. JoAnna Roberson, GWRC

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rump called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Upon motion by Mr. Farley and seconded by Mr. Gross, with all concurring, the June 19th agenda was approved as submitted.

APPROVAL OF CTAG MEETING SUMMARY OF MAY 10, 2017

Mr. Rump requested an edit to comments he made on page 3. The comments requested were clerical in nature and not in context. Upon motion by Mr. Farley and seconded by Mr. Gross, with all
concurring, the May 10th minutes were approved with the understanding an amendment would be made after the conclusion of tonight’s meeting.

**REVIEW OF FAMPO POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING OF MAY 15, 2017**

Mr. Agnello advised that VDOT provided an update for a new design for the I-95 SB Rappahannock River Crossing project. Mr. Agnello advised that Ms. Shropshire from VDOT will be giving the same presentation tonight later in the agenda.

Mr. Agnello advised that there was lengthy discussion from the Policy Committee on the pros and cons of considering forming its own Regional Transportation Authority (RTA). This is an additional revenue source that other regions have implemented that would result in additional dollars being brought into the region. Mr. Agnello relayed that the Policy Committee has requested staff to provide more data on this funding option, and the item will be readdressed at upcoming meetings.

Mr. Agnello relayed that on June 1st the Chamber of Commerce hosted a transportation forum, and the public was invited to participate.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**NEW BUSINESS**

None

**DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS**

a.) I-95 SB Rappahannock River Crossing Change – Ms. Michele Shropshire, VDOT

Ms. Shropshire stated that as a result of citizen feedback received at VDOT public meetings regarding the I-95 SB Rappahannock River Crossing project, a new design is being considered by VDOT engineers. Ms. Shropshire stated that there were safety concerns regarding the original concept that involved the weaving of traffic from one lane to another. Ms. Shropshire stated the new design, which as of this point has not been finalized, will allow for an additional travel lane. Ms. Shropshire stated that there is no cost savings with the new concept; however, it does add an extra lane and decreases the weaving and associated safety concerns.

Mr. Davis asked if at an upcoming meeting that VDOT staff could explain how a model is chosen; how it plays into a project moving forward; etc. Mr. Davis stated that for him personally, the hand-out in tonight’s agenda packet was very confusing and he does not feel it depicts the real impacts of what
the project is desired to accomplish. Mr. Davis stated that the map made much more sense after hearing Ms. Shropshire’s presentation.

Ms. Shropshire advised that VDOT uses the FAMPO Travel Demand model but feels that between both FAMPO staff and VDOT staff a more in-depth modeling presentation can occur.

Mr. Wood stated that it appears that 91% of traffic data focuses on traffic that is passing through the region versus the number of those traveling from one county to the next. He stated that he too would like to receive a presentation on the traffic volumes and how they are being calculated.

Ms. McGarrity asked if the planning that is ongoing now for the I95 SB River Crossing project also includes a future potential NB project. Ms. Shropshire advised that the new Route 3 safety improvement project design includes a potential for a NB project, so VDOT is trying to ensure that all approved projects will also have the capability to tie into other future projects.

Mr. Swan stated he is aware that VDOT uses the FAMPO Travel Demand Model (I was not knowledgeable of its title); however, he wondered if additional models are available for comparison. Mr. Swan stated it’s possible the model used for the New Jersey Turnpike might be a good one for comparison purposes. He speculated that it may take into account weekend traffic and that it might be useful for the Fredericksburg region. He opined that data collected using a more comprehensive model might confirm the persistent traffic issues the region faces.

Mr. McLaughlin asked if regional input at the upcoming June 28th meeting would include facts, figures, heat charts, etc. Ms. Shropshire stated this type of detailed information is not included in an IMR.

Mr. Davis asked how VDOT determines if a project is a good or better project. Ms. Shropshire stated that VDOT is using the 2040 model and feels that adding an additional travel lane on I-95 will accommodate the increased traffic expected through 2040. Mr. Davis asked if a discussion at a later meeting could also occur that explains the project process from start to finish.

Mr. Farley asked where the new I-95 SB River Crossing Project concept come from. Ms. Shropshire stated the new concept was considered before; however, it was removed and is now being reconsidered. Mr. Farley asked if the new project concept includes future growth. Ms. Shropshire concurred that growth factors are included.

Mr. Farley asked if the Route 3 safety improvements are included in tonight’s hand-out. Ms. Shropshire stated that the safety improvement projects are not depicted on the hand-out in tonight’s agenda packet.
Mr. Davis asked if a “cause/effect” analogy could also be included that clearly shows a pro/con comparison for each project because he feels this information would be helpful for the citizens to better understand the concept.

Mr. Swan asked if any new bridges are included in the upcoming projects. Ms. Shropshire stated that the bridge at Route 17 is structurally deficient in the NB direction, so a bridge project is included.

Mr. Swan asked how many lanes can ultimately go into the median. Ms. Shropshire advised the new project concept will include an additional three lanes (six lanes total), and the design concept still allows for some additional growth.

Ms. McGarrity stated that even though the improvements will help, she feels the project is designed to help those who pass through the region as opposed to the local residents.

Mr. Gross asked for clarification on Route 17 as to how the east-bound truck traffic would connect with SB I-95 traffic. Ms. Shropshire stated that truck traffic heading south on I-95 from Route 17 would stay in the lanes that are there now, and the Route 3 Rest Area would stay the same. Ms. Shropshire stated that if you enter the lanes by accident, you can still exit.

i. Resolution No. 17-38, Amending the Fiscal Years 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Update UPC 101595 – Mr. Nick Quint

Mr. Quint advised that as a result of the design change for the I-95 SB River Crossing Project, a TIP amendment is needed. Mr. Quint stated the TIP amendment will adjust the project scope and move construction funding from FY2017 to FY2018.

Upon motion by Mr. Davis and seconded by Mr. Swan, with Mr. Farley in opposition and all others in concurrence, Resolution No. 17-38 was endorsed by the FAMPO CTAG committee with a request that it be adopted by the FAMPO Policy Committee at the upcoming June meeting.

b.) Proposed Legislative Items – Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that the potential draft transportation legislative items for FY2018 are as follows:

- enabling additional rural multilane divided highways to have a speed limit increase to 60 mph
- update of the 1986 District Grant formula for Smart Scale to be less focused on City/Town populations
- support of a regional motor fuels tax floor based on the statewide floor of $3.17 a gallon
- support for adjacent localities, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), or Planning District Commissions (PDCs) to create a Regional Transportation Authority (RTA)
Mr. Farley placed a motion to add as a fifth item adding congestion pricing to all roads. There was no second to the motion, so it was not added to the legislative items being considered for presentation later this year.

Mr. Agnello advised that recommended Smart Scale revisions are as follows:
- use total project cost instead of total public sector cost
- include weekend traffic counts in the analysis for all applicable metrics instead of using the current data for weekday travel congestion

Mr. Davis asked if any items/concerns are available for review that will be submitted from other regions. Mr. Agnello advised this would be the next step in the process. Currently there is no consensus on related issues across the state, and all entities need to submit their requests to the General Assembly by September. Mr. Agnello stated that after September, requests from other regions should be available for review.

c.) Election of Officers – Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that the rotation cycle for FAMPO officers for FY2017-2018 are as follows:
- Chair – Stafford County
- Vice-Chair – City of Fredericksburg
- Second Vice-Chair – Spotsylvania County

Mr. Agnello asked that CTAG members make their recommendations to fill the positions listed above and advise staff accordingly.

d.) Resolution No. 17-36, Adoption of the Fiscal Year 2018 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) – Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that the public comment period for adoption of the FY2018 UPWP will end on Friday, June 16th. To date, limited comments have been received and none required content updates. The comments received were regarding clerical/housekeeping requests.

Upon motion by Mr. Farley and seconded by Mr. Swan, with all concurring, Resolution No. 17-36 was endorsed by the FAMPO CTAG committee with a request that it be adopted by the Policy Committee at the upcoming June meeting.

e.) Update on Transportation Funding and Potential Sources for Additional Revenue – Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that the re-cap from the June 1st Fredericksburg Regional Chamber of Commerce Transportation forum are the following challenges for PDC 16:
• severe reoccurring congestion along the I-95 corridor
• congestion is hurting the existing and potential future economic development
• critical transportation needs are costly
• funding expected for transportation improvements from both the State/Federal levels is limited

Mr. Agnello stated that funding continues to decrease and necessary projects continue to increase. In order for regions to continue moving forward, they are going to need to implement alternate revenue sources. No longer are the state/federal revenues sufficient to meet the needs. Even though it is still in the discussion phase, there is not regional consent on the alternatives being considered. Mr. Agnello advised that the Policy Committee is considering the following transportation revenue options:

• Legislatively updating the 1986 District Grant formula for Smart Scale to be less focused on City/Town populations
• Setting a regional motor fuels tax floor which comes from the revenues generated by Virginia Railway Express (VRE) gas tax
• Creating a Regional Transportation Authority

Mr. Agnello advised that of the three options noted above, the one that generates the largest amount of revenue is forming a Regional Transportation Authority. Mr. Agnello relayed that both Hampton Roads and NoVA have an RTA established. Mr. Agnello stated that presentations from both of these localities will be given to the FAMPO Policy Committee at upcoming meetings. Mr. Agnello stated that if any of the alternate revenue sources are approved, it would take a couple of years to implement.

Mr. Davis asked if endorsement from CTAG would be beneficial to both the Policy Committee and each respective Board of Supervisors. Mr. Agnello stated that CTAG can present their input to the Policy Committee for their review; however, the support needs to come from the Board of Supervisors in each locality.

Mr. Rump stated that the consequences need to be stressed to the citizens, etc. Everyone agrees that they want to see things accomplished without raising taxes; however, if citizens feel this way then they need to be reminded that the region’s congestion will continue.

Mr. Agnello advised this will continue to be discussed at upcoming Policy Committee meetings. Currently, the City of Fredericksburg, Potomac and Rappahannock Transportation Commission (PRTC), & VRE fully support; the counties of Stafford, Caroline and King George want additional information on how these have worked in other localities; and the County of Spotsylvania is adamantly opposed and have indicated that regardless of the additional information provided their decision will remain firm.
f.) **FAMPO Meeting Calendar** – Mr. Nick Quint

Mr. Quint advised that the FAMPO meeting calendar for the three FAMPO committees (Policy, Technical & CTAG) has been updated with meeting dates for the next year. Mr. Quint relayed that copies of the calendar are available at tonight’s meeting.

g.) **Resolution No. 17-37, Amending the Fiscal Years 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to Update UPC 107463** – Mr. Nick Quint

Mr. Quint advised that Resolution No. 17-37 is a TIP amendment for the Mine Road sidewalk project that was added to the SYIP after it was selected for funding through the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP). Mr. Quint advised the TIP amendment will add funding to the construction phase of the project.

Upon motion by Mr. McLaughlin and seconded by Mr. Gross, with all concurring, Resolution No. 17-37 was endorsed by the FAMPO CTAG committee with a request that it be adopted by the Policy Committee at the upcoming June meeting.

h.) **Commonwealth Transportation Fund Revenue Report** – Mr. Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that Mr. Gross provided a handout for tonight’s meeting that is a Commonwealth Transportation Revenue report. Mr. Gross relayed the report is available on the State website. The report provides a summary of revenues received statewide from the following categories: Motor Fuels Tax, Motor Vehicle Sales/Use Tax, Sales Tax and Motor Vehicle License revenues. Mr. Gross stated that he thought this would be a great source of information if this could be generated to reflect revenue for this region as well. Mr. Gross relayed that it gives you information on where the state money received goes – i.e. 50% goes to maintenance/operation of road improvements, etc. Mr. Gross stated the report was generated by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). Mr. Gross stated the report may be helpful for citizens to review so they are more aware of how funds are allocated.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

Mr. Agnello advised that a citizen information meeting regarding the I-95 SB Collector-Distributor (CD) lanes for the Rappahannock River Crossing project is being conducted by VDOT. The meeting will be held at the Fredericksburg Hospitality House on Wednesday June 28th from 5:7:00 p.m.

**STAFF REPORT**

Mr. Agnello advised that Mr. Quint has been promoted to Principal Planner, and FAMPO has hired two new employees: Kari Barber & John Bentley.
Mr. Rump relayed that he was glad to see Ms. Donley back after being out for a medical issue. Ms. Donley stated that it was good to be back and she appreciated Mr. Rump’s leadership as Chair over the last year.

MEMBER REPORTS

Mr. Todd Rump advised that he would be stepping down from serving as a member from the Lee Hill District in Spotsylvania County. Mr. Rump relayed that he is running for the supervisor of that district and did not feel it was appropriate protocol to ask the incumbent to re-appoint him to serve on CTAG. Mr. Rump stated that he enjoyed his time serving on CTAG and enjoyed working regionally with the other localities. The CTAG thanked Mr. Rump for his service and commitment to CTAG and wished him well with his new endeavors.

ADJOURN

The June 14th meeting concluded at 8:40 p.m. The next CTAG meeting will be held on September 13, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes completed by Joanna Roberson