



**Citizens Transportation Advisory Group (CTAG) Meeting Minutes
September 16, 2015**

www.fampo.gwregion.org/transportation-advisory-group

Committee Members Present:

Mr. Todd Rump, Vice-Chair, Spotsylvania County
Mr. Claude Dunn, Spotsylvania County
Mr. Bill Milligan, Spotsylvania County
Mr. Art Snyder, Spotsylvania County
Ms. Dawn McGarrity, Stafford County
Mr. Rupert Farley, At-Large Member
Mr. Larry Gross, At-Large Member

Staff Present:

Mr. Paul Agnello, FAMPO
Ms. Marti Donley, FAMPO
Mr. Nick Quint, FAMPO
Ms. Fiona Curtis, FAMPO

Others Present:

None

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairman Rump called the meeting to order at 6:08 p.m.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The CTAG agenda for September 16, 2015 was approved as submitted.

APPROVAL OF CTAG MEETING SUMMARY OF JULY 10, 2015

The minutes from the CTAG meeting from July 10th were unanimously accepted as presented.

REVIEW OF FAMPO POLICY COMMITTEE MEETING OF JULY 20, 2015

Mr. Agnello introduced himself as the new FAMPO Administrator and advised that this was his first week at FAMPO. Mr. Agnello stated that the minutes from the FAMPO Policy Committee meeting are included in tonight's agenda packet and the highlights from that meeting are as follows:

Resolution No. 16-01, Amendment of the FY15-18 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to add funds for Safety Improvements on I-95

Mr. Agnello advised that the transitional funding program which is a high safety improvement program is available on a state-wide basis. Mr. Agnello relayed that this program provides additional funding for specific projects that meet the criteria requirements. Mr. Agnello stated that this region can utilize funds of this nature for improvements along the I95 corridor. Mr. Agnello relayed that as a result of the traffic congestion that has occurred at Garrisonville with the Express Lane project opening last December there are immediate improvements needed at Exits 133 in Stafford County and 130 in Spotsylvania County.

The improvements needed will go to lengthen both the deceleration and acceleration ramps and this project does qualify for funding under the Safety Improvements category. Mr. Agnello stated that the funding to be received from the Safety category will be approximately \$18 million dollars.

Mr. Agnello advised that this type of funding can only be used for specific purposes and if not used is lost. It is not a funding category that carries over from year to year. Mr. Agnello stated that this is federal money that is hard to get and this is the first time this region has qualified. Mr. Agnello relayed that in previous years this funding had been allocated to either Hampton Roads or Northern Virginia. Mr. Farley stated that his concern with this type of funding is then it would be passed along to the citizens. Mr. Agnello stated that it really is a bonus funding source for this region and again is one we generally do not qualify for.

Resolution No. 16-02, Endorsing a Project of Statewide Significance for Funding Under the HB2 Project Prioritization Program

Mr. Agnello advised that Resolution No. 16-02 has not been adopted but discussion was important as it focused on HB2 candidate projects from the region. Mr. Agnello stated that several meetings have been held and there is regional consensus on FAMPO submitting the Rappahannock River Crossing project. The endorsed project will be for both a south bound and north bound construction. VDOT will be submitted the projects as two separate projects. These were the only two projects that had unanimous consent. There are several other smaller projects being discussed and as no consensus has been reached, Policy Committee instructed staff to continue working with VDOT staff and locality staff to further develop and finalize projects that would meet HB2 requirements and criteria.

Mr. Snyder stated asked that since both Resolutions 16-01 and 16-02 were addressing improvements to the interchanges at Exits 130 & 133, if we actually receive HB2 funding, which is still uncertain, will the \$1.6 million dollars be wasted because the HB2 funding will give better improvements that what would have resulted from funds received in the requests made for Resolution No. 16-01 & 16-02.

Mr. Agnello stated that this was a good question and one that has also been asked by FAMPO staff as well. Mr. Agnello advised that the highway safety money is more restrictive on how it can be used – i.e. it cannot be used for adding a general purpose lane or a straight expansion project. With the River Crossing project, a lot of this project will be to add collector distributor lanes and building new bridges associated with that. What the funding from the safety category can be used for would be for improvements to intersections, interchanges and safer ramps. Usually these improvements would

include lengthening an existing ramp, increase an existing turn lane, etc. Mr. Agnello stated that some of these improvements would have been done anyway with the River Crossing project but because it may be done with this funding program instead then the total cost of the River Crossing project could be lowered somewhat.

Mr. Agnello relayed that the recent word from VDOT now is that even in spite of this, the River Crossing project costs are now increased from the original cost estimates. The current cost for the River Crossing project is approximately \$275 million dollars. Mr. Agnello stated that \$125 million dollars are costs for the south bound lanes and \$151 million dollars for the north bound lanes. Mr. Agnello relayed that there is more bridge work required on the north bound segment.

Mr. Snyder stated that his concern is that the improvements that would have been done with the HSTIF funding are not compatible with the improvements that would be done with the CD lane project. Mr. Agnello relayed that this is not a problem because both projects will complement each other.

Mr. Farley asked for clarification on Resolution 16-01 as it relates to it being a safety funds project. Mr. Agnello stated the HSIF funding is probably one of the funding sources that the MPO will have the least control over. Basically, it has been set-up to state DOT's so the Virginia DOT would be in control and they have the discretion on how this funding is utilized. It is restrictive in that specific criteria must be adhered too in order to utilize the funding and it has to meet certain engineering standards. However, if you have a project that meets the standards then the State does have a lot of latitude with which areas receive it and which areas do not.

Mr. Farley stated that then it is safe to assume that VDOT is out pitching to get very project it can by utilizing every funding source that is available and then passing along the costs associated with this programs to the citizens.

Mr. Agnello advised that this with this type of funding, our region was lucky to be a recipient as this is a VDOT state-wide funding program. Mr. Gross asked if this was local, state or federal money and Mr. Agnello replied that it was federal funding.

Resolution No. 16-03, Recognizing the Dedicated Service of Daniel Reese

This resolution was unanimously adopted.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

NEW BUSINESS

None

Action Items

b.) Resolution No. 16-04, Endorsing a VDOT Effort to Develop a Project to Address Existing Traffic Congestion and Safety Issues at the 95 Express Lanes Terminus North of Garrisonville Road – Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello stated that five to seven years ago the I95 Express Lane project was going to go from Garrisonville to Massaponax. The State was going to support the project cost associated with this project. Two separate letters were sent to the MPO indicating that they needed to include the project into FAMPO's CLRP and to amend the current plans as needed. The project seemed to be on the fast track. The northern section was built from Dumfries to Garrisonville for a nine-mile stretch on I95. Initially, at Garrisonville, the fly-over ramp was intended to be the off-ramp only for those exiting off of Garrisonville Road. It was not intended for everyone exiting the I95 express lanes. VDOT and Trans Urban recognized the concerns and the question now lies with who will pay for the needed immediate repairs.

A solution from the VDOT engineers is to extend lanes two miles further south on both the north bound and south bound directions from Exit 144 to 142. This would temporarily widen the road from three to four lanes and take existing express lanes to this point.

Under the HB2 candidate project, there is another complimentary project which has come from Stafford County to widen the general purpose lanes to four lanes to Courthouse Road which is an even better solution than the one VDOT proposed. However, there are added costs as well though with this project.

Mr. Agnello stated that Resolution No. 16-04 is to endorse VDOT's efforts to support FAMPO staff in working with VDOT on the project and providing updates and feedback to the FAMPO committees. There were some members of the Policy Committee that were concerned that this was an endorsement that FAMPO would pay for the portion of the project. There is a clause being inserted into the Resolution against this.

Mr. Gross asked why did the wording say it affected both the north bound and south bound lanes. Mr. Agnello stated that the project actually will be for repairs for both the north bound and south bound lanes with the south bound lanes being the more expensive. Ms. McGarrity stated that there is no bridge space remaining. Mr. Agnello relayed that one bridge repair for approximately \$25 million dollars is included in the proposal; however, shoulders on the road are wider so increasing to four lanes makes the project cost a little less expensive.

Mr. Agnello stated that the project which both VDOT and Stafford would like to see materialize would be a general purpose lane widening from Exit 143 to Exit 140 with a price tag of approximately \$55 million dollars which would go beyond the express lane extension. At this time we do not have estimates from VDOT on the cost of the I-95 express lane extension or who would be responsible for the payment. Mr. Agnello stated that VDOT is still attempting to finalize the answers to these questions with Trans Urban. VDOT has advised that updates to the FAMPO committees should be forthcoming over the next month.

As there are still uncertainties and unanswered questions, CTAG made no recommendation to endorse Resolution No. 16-04 at this time.

Regarding the following three Resolutions, No. 16-05, 16-06, and 16-07, Mr. Agnello stated that as the MPO has a CLRP and if projects are regionally significant and/or have federal monies associated with them and they are for either study or construction that they need to be included within the CLRP. These three Resolutions are for projects that are already under construction or advancing and are not currently in the CLRP.

c.) Resolution No. 16-05, Directing that a Public Comment Period and Public Hearing be held Prior to the Adoption of an Amendment to the 2040 CLRP to Include the I-95 J-Ramp Project at Exit 126 in Spotsylvania County – Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that in the south bound direction at I95/Exit 126 construction of a ramp that connects directly with South Point Parkway. This is a \$21 million dollar project. Spotsylvania County has some bond money to go towards the funding of this project. The locality also plans to submit this project locally as a HB2 project for consideration as well. This project is just one aspect of an ultimately larger project but is a project that is both supported by the County and by VDOT. Both entities request that this Resolution go to the Policy Committee for endorsement at the upcoming September 21st meeting.

In regards to getting a new project included into a CLRP, it is a two-month process. There has to be a 30-day public comment period and public hearing scheduled. After this has occurred, then the Resolution can be forwarded to the Policy Committee for their endorsement. Mr. Agnello stated that the action asked for this month is not for a vote to amend the CLRP but is instead to support the beginning of the process. If there are no adverse public comments are received in October then the Board will endorse the Resolution and have the FAMPO CLRP amended accordingly.

Mr. Gross asked for clarification regarding the J-Ramp project and he thought this was originally a component of the Super Ramp project. FAMPO staff was uncertain about this and advised CTAG that staff would contact Spotsylvania County for clarification.

Mr. Agnello advised that contact with Mr. Dan Cole in Spotsylvania County revealed the following information. Mr. Cole relayed that Mr. Gross was correct. However, the county felt that only a phase of the entire overall project could be accomplished. Money from the bond referendum was going to be used for construction of the J-ramp and at this time it was not possible for any other phases to be completed. Mr. Cole relayed that the county has an 8-year limit on use of the bond money so neither the money nor the time remaining on the usage of the bond referendum revenues would cover the expenses for the super project. Mr. Cole stated that the j-ramp project also only involves one property owner and this owner had previously indicated that the right-of-way needed could possibly be donated to the county.

d.) Resolution No. 16-06, Directing that a Public Comment Period and Public Hearing be held prior to the Adoption of an Amendment to the 2040 LRTP to Include the VRE Rail Station in Spotsylvania County – Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello stated that Resolution No. 16-06 involves a VRE project. The project is the Spotsylvania VRE station that is scheduled to be completely by November, 2015. Mr. Agnello stated that this is a

project that should have already been included into the CLRP; however, the final construction dates kept changing. When the CLRP was updated in 2013 it was the assumption at that time that this project would be fully completed before the next Plan was updated.

e.) Resolution No. 16-07, Directing that a Public Comment Period and Public Hearing be held prior to the Adoption of an Amendment to the 2040 CLRP to Include the Brooke and Leeland VRE Rail Stations in Stafford County – Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello stated that Resolution No. 16-07 is also a VRE project. This resolution is an improvement project at both the Brooke and Leeland VRE stations in Stafford County. This project will allow for expansion of the current capacities for the addition of a third track and will increase the length of the trains with longer platforms.

Mr. Agnello advised that this project will cost approximately \$28.5 million dollars for the repairs at both stations and is almost totally funded. Mr. Agnello stated that there is approximately \$10 million dollars in funding shortfalls.

There was no action taken by CTAG on Resolutions No. 16-05, 16-06, or 16-07 as additional information is needed.

However, there was discussion from Mr. Snyder and in concurrence with Mr. Rump. Regarding Resolution No. 16-05, they did not feel this would actually alleviate the traffic that is congesting at that location. Both CTAG members are daily commuters to the northern Virginia regions and both stated that traffic backs up turning north on Route 1 and not south on Route 1. Ms. McGarrity also commented that she too did not feel this was the solution. Mr. Farley stated that possibly this project is for the benefit of the businesses and not the commuters.

Mr. Agnello advised that this project is also part of a larger project Spotsylvania refers to as a the super ramp which would ultimately connect South Point Parkway to Route 17 but the Resolution does not actually address congestion problems. Mr. Agnello stated that this is a project that is supported by both VDOT and the locality. Mr. Agnello relayed that CTAG could generate its own resolution that would be submitted to the Policy Committee stating their concerns and why this project was chosen.

f.) Resolution No. 16-08, Authorizing Support of GWRC and FAMPO HB2 Projects – Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that the HB2 funding will result in \$600 million dollars distributed state-wide. There also is a \$600 million dollar funding program that is from the VDOT district grant program. This program money is divided among all the localities within a specific VDOT district. The Fredericksburg District encompasses 9 localities and the Fredericksburg region is expected to receive approximately \$40 million dollars from the \$600 million assigned district-wide.

Mr. Agnello stated that the HB2 project funding has specific criteria that need to be met in order for the project to be considered for funding. The project must meet at least one of the following four needs that are identified by the State and this are: projects on corridors of state-wide significance; projects that have regional network to major arterials; urban development areas; and safety criteria

which is regulated by VDOT. Mr. Agnello stated that the CTB will ultimately still be the agency that makes the decisions on whether projects meet the criteria; whether projects will be approved; and how much funding is allocated to each project. Mr. Agnello stated that a somewhat promising note is that to date the total state-wide projects that have been submitted are much less than what was initially thought to be presented. Currently, approximately 100 hundred projects state-wide have been submitted for review. The last date for projects to be submitted is September 30th and the state expects to receive another 100 projects for consideration by the September 30th deadline.

Mr. Agnello advised that in October a resolution of support for projects submitted by the individual localities will be presented to the Policy Committee for their endorsement. Mr. Agnello stated that the scoring process for each of the projects is done by VDOT, DRPT and the consultants from both agencies.

Mr. Snyder stated that as it took two years for the new HB2 projects to become prioritized what happened to the money that was in “escrow”. Mr. Agnello relayed that the money went to cover deficits on other projects so state-wide there is no “escrow” account remaining.

Mr. Gross asked what is the total percentage of funds to be received from the state-wide budget. Mr. Agnello advised that HB2 equates to less than 10%. State-wide the funding received should be approximately \$13 million dollars and HB2 designations are approximately \$1.2 million dollars.

Mr. Farley asked if HB2 only accounts for approximately 10% of the total funding, then where does the other 90% get designated too. Mr. Agnello stated that the majority of a transportation funding budget is designated for maintenance, system preservation, bridge repairs, etc. and on the transit side, the majority goes for operational expenses.

Mr. Agnello stated that the state-wide funding allocations will reflect approximately the following breakdowns:

Revenue Sharing =	\$150 million dollars total state-wide
CMAQ/RSTP =	\$160 million dollars total state-wide
Transportation Alternatives =	\$22 million dollars total state-wide
HSIF =	\$100 million dollars total state-wide

g.) Resolution No. 16-09, Appointing Staff as a Member and Alternate to the Virginia Association of MPOs (VAMPO) Board – Paul Agnello

CTAG felt Resolution No. 16-09 is simply informational and housekeeping requirements so did not feel any action was needed by the committee.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

a.) VRE Planning System Improvements – Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that the VRE System Plan for 2040 identifies the VRE needs for the next 25-years; identifies projects, initiatives, funding & partners; provides for phased expansions; and ultimately moves VRE from a commuter rail system to a regional rail system.

Mr. Snyder stated that on-going complaints he has heard from a specific Spotsylvania Board of Supervisors member is that the trains are too slow so with their plans of adding additional stations and trains that this will actually result in the service being even slower.

Mr. Agnello stated that another issue that VRE has to deal with in this region is that parking is limited, especially in the City. The City explored constructing a parking deck but it came with a \$400 million dollar price tag so the current Fredericksburg station will be upgraded instead.

Mr. Agnello also relayed that VRE expects some shift from the riders boarding regularly in Fredericksburg when both the Spotsylvania station opens and the repairs are made to the Brooke & Leeland stations.

Mr. Rump stated that he is a commuter that daily takes the VRE. He stated that overall the trains do run consistently and that they usually accommodate his work commute schedule. However, there is back-up that does occur regularly so a third track may help to eliminate some of the back-up. Mr. Rump stated that back-ups occur in the summer when it reaches a certain degrees; when CSX runs their freight trains as they own the tracks so VRE has to let them go first; etc. However, Mr. Rump stated as well that the reality if the VRE usage is going to vary with commuters as rates continue to rise and additional stations and stops are included. Mr. Rump stated that he felt that re-direction of current stations is more feasible than building new ones. Mr. Rump stated that if it starts taking a commuter to get from northern Virginia to Fredericksburg via the VRE over two hours and the rates continue to escalate that commuters are going to be more inclined to just drive themselves if the trip takes two hours any way.

Mr. Farley stated that more parking creates more sprawl and promotes UDA's's and he would still like to see CTAG go on record as being against sprawl. Mr. Rump asked Mr. Farley if he was presenting this request as a motion and the CTAG members told Mr. Rump that he had not been around long enough to know that this was a standing request presented by Mr. Farley. Mr. Farley stated that he was just expressing his opinion but was not asking for a motion. Ms. McGarrity stated that the reality is that single home developments are the trend – people choose quality of life for living arrangements to off-set employment that results in having to make commuting choices.

b.) Revenue Sharing and Transportation Alternatives Programs – Paul Agnello

Mr. Agnello advised that once a year the state allows localities to apply for revenue sharing and transportation alternative funding allocations. The deadline to apply this year is October 30, 2015. Mr. Agnello stated that there will be approximately \$150 million dollars available for revenue sharing projects. This funding allocation can be used for most types of highway projects. Mr. Agnello relayed that a lot of localities utilize this funding source; however, what is received from the revenue sharing requires an equal locality match (i.e. if the state awards Spotsylvania County \$10 million dollars to go to a designated project then Spotsylvania County also has to match the \$10 million dollars in order for funds to be obligated).

Mr. Agnello stated that the transportation alternative projects are primarily bicycle/pedestrian projects. Mr. Agnello relayed that over the last several years Spotsylvania County has not utilized this funding source; however, both the City and Stafford County have. All localities within the region are eligible to apply and FAMPO/MPO is responsible for approving and endorsing a locality's project. Mr. Farley asked if any projects had been submitted this year. Mr. Agnello stated that to date, none have been submitted from the region.

c.) Bypass Alternatives – Paul Agnello and Bill Milligan

Mr. Milligan stated that for about the last fifteen years bypass alternatives have been discussed in the region for potential outer connector options around Fredericksburg. For one reason or another, the proposed options in the past did not move forward; either for political reasons and/or financial restraints. However, citizens on their own have continued to pursue an outer connector alternative. Mr. Milligan stated that he brought the topic up again for discussion by CTAG to see if this was still a topic that was of interest in being re-initiated. There was consensus, with one dissension, from CTAG to look at other regions within the state – i.e. around Richmond, Winchester, etc. for comparisons of what has worked in those areas. Mr. Milligan stated that maps were provided to CTAG to potentially re-evaluate old sites and/or explore potentially new sites.

Mr. Milligan stated that one option was a parkway connecting the Berea Parkway in Stafford County going into Orange County. Mr. Milligan stated that he thinks this is still being reviewed by Spotsylvania County; however, he is not sure why. Mr. Snyder stated that you cannot have an effective bypass alternative if it does not provide connectivity to I-95 south of Route 3. The Berea/Orange county options does not allow for access to I-95. Mr. Milligan stated that he was asking CTAG to review the maps to see if there is a way around either going east-ward off of Route 3 or west-ward.

Mr. Milligan stated that he thinks a bypass around Fredericksburg that is designed for truck traffic, commuters, and through traffic would be the best solution to the problem. Mr. Milligan stated that as 80% of what FAMPO meetings focus on is relieving traffic congestion. With that in mind, Mr. Milligan stated that there are maps available tonight that show various options for CTAG to review and comment on.

The first map reviewed is one from Spotsylvania County that was re-done approximately three months ago. It depicts the outer connector options that have occurred over time. Mr. Milligan is hoping that CTAG can come up with other alternatives that possibly have not been considered in the past. Going through the battlefields will not be viable; however, we might be able to get through a National Park.

Mr. Farley stated or we may not want too. Mr. Milligan stated he was not recommending this but simply bringing it up for discussion purposes and potential alternatives. You will not be able to cut through major subdivisions or businesses and the previously proposed toll road connector knocked out a lot of homes. This proposal does not take of any homes and crosses the river at the narrowest point; however you would have to back track to I-95, even though in all reality the drive back to I-95 does not encompass that many miles but does cause users to have to back track to get there.

Mr. Milligan stated that Orange County has begun to do a lot of work on pursuing this with the development in their area and are now in favor of this alternative. Ms. McGarrity stated that this would be of benefit to the citizens in Orange County because they will then have direct access to I-95; however, she does not see anyone in the Fredericksburg region being in favor because all of the traffic on Route 17 would then be diverted to Route 3.

Mr. Milligan stated that the previous toll road connector would collect tolls from those who utilized and this one connected to two separate Silver developments. In an area off of Gordon Road that is already heavily congested, with connectivity to Harrison Road being a requirement was a project that had an initial \$400 million project cost that would have provided a short-cut for commuter from one corridor to another but still not actually solved or resolved the traffic congestion areas within the region.

Mr. Snyder stated that looking at the distance, the density and the geography, the only alternative he sees for using an internal by-pass option that would encompass both express lanes and local lanes would be a project similar to the one implemented on the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. If a project costs \$4 million dollars to go three miles on a map and the Rappahannock River Crossing project is \$125 million in just one direction then you could put in local and express lanes cheaper and still accomplish the goal.

Mr. Snyder stated that he thinks even the Route 17 truck traffic would be lessened as the back-up to get onto Route 17 to I-95 would be lessened so the truck traffic could continue moving more smoothly. However, if the objective is to actually get the traffic off of the two mile stretch of road he sees no way to accomplish this.

Ms. McGarrity thinks an easier alternative would be an east-bound entrance. However, you still will have a choke point regardless. Mr. Snyder concurred that an east-bound alternative is more viable than any alternative heading west-bound.

Ms. McGarrity stated she is curious as to how 295 works around Richmond. Whenever she goes to Richmond she just goes straight through Richmond. Mr. Snyder stated that 295 works great if you are heading to Hampton Roads and/or if the traffic is backed up on I95 south-bound and you are taking 85 towards Charlotte.

Mr. Milligan stated that 295 also works well for the high traffic peak times going in and out of Richmond and also works less since they removed the toll fees off of going through Richmond. Ms. McGarrity stated that she would like to see traffic data which she is sure available that shows that with 295 going all around Richmond and how many cars actually continue beyond 64. Dawn stated that she thinks the majority of the cars on the road are exiting onto I64.

Mr. Snyder stated as I95 is the number one interstate for both north-bound and south-bound traffic so if you are going to Florida or anywhere in that direction 295 is much faster than going through Richmond. Mr. Agnello stated that as he still lives in Richmond he will address that point. Mr. Agnello stated that there are a lot of people who live in Richmond who take 295 to get to I95 north from Northern Virginia and Fredericksburg heading towards Hampton Roads. Mr. Agnello stated that the north-east quadrant gets a lot of steady and consistent traffic. Once getting south of 64 the traffic

really subsides at the James River, I95 and downtown Richmond has approximately 150,000 vehicles in comparison to approximately 40,000 at 295.

Mr. Agnello stated that Richmond also has a by-pass to the west which is Rt. 288. Rt. 288 has more traffic than I95. There is a lot of north/south capacity in Richmond and Richmond essentially has a complete beltway. Here it does seem that there is more land towards the east so if anything was done here it would be easier to go in that direction.

Mr. Milligan stated if you can get the through traffic and truck traffic off of a major road this will then make it easier for the commuters. Mr. Farley stated that every time you build something you induce traffic so congestion pricing is the only viable solution.

Mr. Rump asked if adding additional lanes has been previously discussed. Mr. Rump stated that additional lanes cannot be used for 100 mile distances but can be beneficial just to get beyond the Fredericksburg exit choke points so dollar-wise additional lanes would be cheaper. Mr. Rump stated that discussion is already occurring about adding an additional lane in Stafford so why not add additional lanes in Spotsylvania as well.

Mr. Agnello stated that the River Crossing project will address this issue if the region gets the needed funding for the project. Mr. Agnello stated that even with the River Crossing project you basically have ten paved lanes crossing the river. You would have constriction between exits 143 and 133 in Stafford. Stafford's idea for fixing the constriction is the following: Option 1 – adding a 4th lane; Option 2 – express lanes; Option 3 – adding a 4th lane and express lane. Mr. Agnello stated that Spotsylvania County's issues arise at Exits 130-126. Spotsylvania localities prefer a CD (collector distributor) project expansion and two carry the bridge project down to Massaponax with some additional interchanges down I95.

Mr. Agnello stated though from a federal highway perspective, there are set restrictions on where additional interchanges could be placed. Ms. McGarrity asked what the actual costs are. Mr. Agnello stated that would depend on where and how far the project goes. In Stafford, from Exits 143-133, this project was not projected to be as costly for a per mile basis and the price came in at approximately \$55 million dollars for three miles in one direction going south-bound. Mr. Agnello stated that there is a requirement that sound walls would have to be built which cost 1-2 million dollars per mile.

Mr. Gross asked for clarification on a comment that was made earlier regarding federal highway access point regulations. Mr. Agnello stated that with FHWA there are restrictions on how close together interchanges can be placed. If you have a lot of interchanges in place you create more friction with the road that slows down traffic. If you build a new interchange that went to Harrison Road, then Harrison Road needs to be upgraded to be able to receive the additional traffic.

Mr. Gross asked what the difference is in CD lanes and express lanes. Mr. Agnello stated that a CD lane is typically for a longer distribution than a ramp would be for and the intent would be that the local traffic would use the CD lanes and the longer distance traffic would use the general purpose lane. Mr. Agnello stated that there is an example of this in Richmond where 288 and Midlothian Turnpike intersect where you have two connected roads for approximately a three-mile stretch.

Mr. Snyder stated that in neighboring counties to the north they have CD lanes that go for maybe ten miles that have cross-overs. Mr. Gross stated that he thought the River Crossing project for the CD lanes would be segregated for a certain place so traffic could not move out from the point.

Mr. Milligan stated as the newspaper articles print how bad the congestion is in this region and that the congestion is the worst in the county so if some kind of solutions and alternatives can be presented to the Policy Committee it may be something that the political officials will seriously look at.

Mr. Milligan stated that he would recommend CTAG taking the maps reviewed tonight and/or contacting Ms. Donley to obtain links for electronic copies so that CTAG can formulate at a future meeting an actual alternative for solutions to be considered or re-considered.

Mr. Dunn asked if it would be more beneficial to form a sub-committee for study of an eastern by-pass alternative as well as for additional study for a 4th lane on I95. Mr. Dunn stated that this would be the shortest distance and may be more economical when purchasing the adjoining land. In the Fredericksburg region if you simply widen I95 with two new lanes in both directions this may be the most cost-effective way to proceed. Mr. Rump asked if this is the solution then why has it not already been implemented.

Mr. Agnello stated that with the I95 express lanes there is an exclusive right to Transurban for them to do express lanes for a set number of years out. So, the option of building a toll road and HOV lanes appears to be off the table for the foreseeable future. Transurban has decided that it is not economically feasible to proceed south to Massaponax at this point in time thusly restricting the State's options.

Mr. Snyder asked for anyone that was here previously, as to why the eastern quadrant of the original outer connector project was not favored or pursued. Mr. Farley stated that the real estate entities did not support it. Mr. Gross stated that it was in the NEPA study and VDOT had it in for consideration but it did not make the CTB recommendations in December of 2012. Mr. Snyder asked again "why". Ms. Donley stated that she did not have specifics to Mr. Snyder's question but would follow-up with FAMPO staff to get feedback for the October committee meeting. Mr. Farley stated that in years past all efforts were going to relieving congestion and at that time all congestion was occurring on the west side of I95 so that was where the focus occurred.

Mr. Snyder stated that the problem is that it does not matter what transportation mode is utilized, unless you regiment the population and force everyone into a high-rise office building where the office buildings and grocery stores are in the same building you will continue to have the same problems as the population density is always the main issue.

CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Agnello advised that correspondence included in tonight's agenda packet and is self-explanatory.

Staff Report – Mr. Agnello relayed that staff is working with both the consultants and VDOT to obtain data on the before and after traffic data of the I-95 express lanes. Staff is asking for data that depicts what was the traffic in our region and Northern Virginia before and after the express lanes

began last December in Garrisonville. Mr. Agnello stated that data is expected to be provided with a full reports included by October. Mr. Agnello stated this is a request that was asked for by all three FAMPO committees and the task order to proceed is included in today's agenda packet

MEMBER REPORTS

None

ADJOURN

The September 16th meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m. The next meeting will be held on October 14, 2015.

Meeting Minutes completed by JoAnna Roberson